

ANSIPRA BULLETIN

Arctic Network for the Support of the Indigenous Peoples of the Russian Arctic
Сеть Арктических Организаций в Поддержку Коренных Народов Российского Севера

No. 13 and 13a, July 2005 - English Language Edition

ANSIPRA is a communication network linking Russian Indigenous Peoples' Organisations with international institutions and organisations alarmed about the future of the indigenous peoples of the Russian North. ANSIPRA's main goal is to spread information, to mediate contacts, and to assist in project coordination.

Secretariat: Norwegian Polar Institute, Polar Environmental Centre
N-9296 Tromsø, Norway
Phone: +47 - 77 75 05 00
Fax: +47 - 77 75 05 01
E-mail: ANSIPRA@npolar.no
Internet: <http://npolar.no/ansipra/>
Coordinator / Editor: Winfried K. Dallmann, Tromsø
Assistant Coordinator: Galina Diachkova, Anadyr
Assistant Coordinator: Elena Krikunenko, Moscow
Assistant Editor: Helle V. Goldman, Tromsø

ANSIPRA Bulletin is an information publication of the "Arctic Network for the Support of the Indigenous Peoples of the Russian Arctic". The Bulletin is issued twice a year. Additional issues are produced as new information warrants it. The Bulletin is edited in English and Russian. ANSIPRA Bulletin is distributed – by internet or hard copy – to all registered network participants, as well as relevant state agencies and funding institutions. Distribution is free. All written contributions are appreciated.

ANSIPRA Bulletin is politically independent. A special part of the English language edition, however, presents translations of articles from the newsletter "Мир коренных народов" (Indigenous Peoples' World), the official periodical of RAIPON (Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation), selected in cooperation with RAIPON.



CONTENTS OF THIS EDITION:

Information from the Secretariat <i>W. Dallmann</i>	2
<u>INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND GEORESOURCES:</u>	
Recent developments in Sakhalin <i>O. Murashko, E. Krikunenko</i>	3
A nature reserve off the western coast of Kamchatka? <i>Lach Ethno-Ecological Information Center</i>	7
Digging in deep: Mining's impact on Russia's indigenous peoples <i>M. Jones</i>	8
<u>HEALTH:</u>	
Children of the North – our pain <i>A. Skryagin</i>	9
Impressions from "Terra Madre": World Meeting of Food Communities <i>L.G. Ignatenko</i>	11
<u>POLITICAL AGENDA:</u>	
The Fourth Session of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues <i>IC RAIPON</i>	12
<u>CULTURE:</u>	
Birch-bark craftsmen <i>V. Mikhailova</i>	15
Bone carving should exist <i>A. Morilova</i>	16
<u>NOTES</u>	17
<u>NEW LITERATURE</u>	19
<u>CONFERENCES</u>	22

ANSIPRA Bulletin No. 13a:

TRANSLATIONS FROM "MIR KORENNYKH NARODOV – ZHIVAYA ARKTIKA" No. 15 (2004):

Indig. Peoples of the North: results of 2002 census and political situation <i>V. Bogoyavlensky, O. Murashko</i>	24
Workshop "Survey of Living Conditions in the Arctic: Inuit, Saami, Indig. Peoples of Chukotka" <i>L. Abryutina</i>	28
Agreement between Primore RAIPON branch and the timber company "Terneyles" <i>P. Sulyandziga</i>	29
Development of traditional nature use in Gornaya Shoriya <i>A. Arbachakov</i>	30
Legal defense of indigenous peoples' rights to establish territories of trad. nature use <i>Y. Yakel, E. Khmeleva</i>	32
About poaching and sustainable nature use <i>D. Berezhkov</i>	35
Biodiversity and nature protection in residence areas of IP ... <i>P. Sulyandziga, V. Bocharnikov, R. Sulyandziga</i>	36

Dear readers!

News from the Secretariat

One of our members, Galina Diachkova, has recently moved home from Moscow to Anadyr, Chukotka. In order to maintain ANSIPRA's close connection with Russia's indigenous peoples organizations, Elena Krikunenko has been invited to join the Secretariat. Elena is working as outreach coordinator for the Center for Support of Indigenous Peoples of the North / Russian Indigenous Training Center. Her access to relevant and up-to-date information will hopefully improve our bulletin.

About this issue

The English language edition of the present volume contains an appendix (ANSIPRA Bull. No. 13a) with translations from "Mir korennykh narodov – zhivaya arktika" No. 15. We are grateful to Ms. Maryanne Rygg, Fridtjof Nansen Institute, Norway, for voluntarily editing these translations.

The Russian language edition of this issue follows up our comparative series of contributions about indigenous peoples in other countries, this time addressing local and self-governance issues in northern Canada.

Conference announcements

On several occasions we have been told that conference announcements are often distributed very late by our bulletin, and deadlines for registration may have passed. We are aware of this problem, but cannot improve it with the low frequency of bulletin issues (twice a year). Please let us know as early as possible about upcoming meetings so we can print notices at the earliest opportunity. Our readers are referred to our Internet website, where conferences are announced immediately after we have received the information.

Contact us:

Secretariat:

Norwegian Polar Institute
Polar Environmental Centre
N-9296 Tromsø, Norway
Phone: +47 - 77 75 05 00
Fax: +47 - 77 75 05 01
E-mail: ANSIPRA@npolar.no
Internet: <http://npolar.no/ansipra/>

Members of the Secretariat:

Winfried Dallmann
Coordinator and editor
E-mail: dallmann@npolar.no
Phone: (+47)-77750648 / 77750500
Fax: (+47)-77750501

Galina Diachkova
Assistant coordinator and editor
E-mail: galinadiatchkova@hotmail.com

Elena Krikunenko
Assistant coordinator
E-mail: regions_ritc@km.ru

Helle Goldman
Assistant editor
E-mail: goldman@npolar.no
Phone: (+47)-77750618 / 77750500
Fax: (+47)-77750501

INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND GEORESOURCES:**Recent developments in Sakhalin**

Olga Murashko, with supplements by Elena Krikunenko

Based on materials from the press center of the Regional Council of Authorized Representatives of the Sakhalin Region's INSPN and the press center of OO "Green Patrol"

On 29 October 2004, following the decision of the Fifth Congress of Indigenous Numerically Small Peoples of the North (INSPN) residing in the Sakhalin Region, Sakhalin's indigenous peoples expressed their determination to defend their rights by staging protest actions with regard to the oil companies infringement of indigenous peoples' rights in accordance with international law, Russia's legislation and customary law.

On 15 December 2004 the Administration of the Sakhalin Region hosted negotiations between authorized representatives of Sakhalin's INSPN and relevant oil companies, and inviting P.V. Sulyandziga to represent RAIPON. Unfortunately, the negotiations failed to produce the anticipated result due to the unwillingness of the companies to consider the indigenous peoples' demands.

A draft memorandum was prepared with Mr. Sulyandziga's participation, incorporating the basic demands of Sakhalin's INSPN. Representatives of environmental movements of Sakhalin (*Sakhalinskaya vakhta* – Sakhalin Watch, the Sakhalin division of the Green Party) and the Sakhalin section of the LDPR (Liberal Democratic Party of Russia) took an active part in the elaboration of the draft memorandum. The draft was sent to the Administration of the Sakhalin Region and relevant oil companies.

At the end of December 2004, Aleksey Limanzo, President of the Association of INSPN of the Sakhalin Region, informed RAIPON that the protest action's headquarters had been formed, since there had been no reaction to the draft memorandum from the companies and the authorities, and requested RAIPON to provide advice and legal assistance.

The protest action was due to start on 20 January 2005.

RAIPON supported the action by circulating the following appeal:

***“Appeal of the Association of Indigenous Numerically Small Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of RF to the public and News Media.*”**

SUPPORT THE PROTEST ACTION OF SAKHALIN'S INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

A protest action of the Association of Indigenous Numerically Small Peoples of the Sakhalin Region is planned to take place on 20 January 2005 with the backing of Sakhalin's social movements and parties.

Two pipelines transferring oil and gas from the offshore areas of the Sea of Okhotsk will shortly cut the length and breadth of Sakhalin. The pipelines run across 1,103 brooks and streams, with their majority being spawning grounds, and cuts the migration routes of wild animals and domesticated reindeer. The entire trunk route of the pipelines lies in an area of high seismicity and crosses 55 times 44 tectonic faults with various types of tectonic dislocations. The

potential danger for the population and the negative impact of these projects on the natural environment of Sakhalin and the adjoining water areas are indubitable.

However, these projects have already been well underway with the transnational companies of Exxon, Shell, British Petroleum, Sakhalinskaya Energia and their subsidiaries grossly violating Russian legislation and international standards.

Experts cast well-grounded doubt on the economic expediency professed for Russia by the Agreements on product division signed in connection with these projects between the transnational companies and the Russian Federation. Eight years of oil and gas development in the Sakhalin offshore areas has not been of much benefit to the population either. Even the gasification of Sakhalin's centers of population promised eight years ago has failed to be put into service, while the half-a-million population of the Sakhalin Region is already quite aware of the damage caused by the realization of these projects. Fishing as the leading branch of the Region's economy is suffering a loss and will gradually come to a halt.

Sakhalin's indigenous peoples – the Nivkhs, Nanais, Ulta and Evenks mostly engaged in traditional natural economic activities based on fishing, hunting, reindeer breeding and gathering have felt the negative ecological consequences of these projects' realization far deeper than others. Reindeer pastures and forests are damaged by construction machinery and equipment, the offshore prospecting has led to a sharp reduction of maximum fishing quotas (limits) and actual catch by the indigenous population, while the traditional products have remained practically the only source of subsistence for the people.

The companies' disregard the indigenous peoples' interests. The analysis of the published appraisals of the projects' impact has shown that the assessment of cumulative, long-term negative impacts on the traditional lifestyle of indigenous peoples is missing there. Accordingly, long-term programs to reduce these impacts and adapt the indigenous population to the serious environmental consequences of the projects envisaged to be implemented in the decades ahead are missing too. The attempts indigenous peoples' organizations to initiate a dialogue with the companies about the problems of conducting the appraisal of long-term economic, social and cultural consequences for the indigenous population have failed to be crowned with success.

The lack of access to full information on the projects, as well as disinformation permeating the published project documentation, and unwillingness of the companies to enter a serious dialogue with indigenous peoples' organizations have made these organizations embark on the path of civil protest.

The Fifth Congress of the Sakhalin Region's Indigenous Peoples of the North came to the following decision on 29 October 2004:

'To launch into the realization of self-defense of our constitutional rights by way of carrying out protest actions aimed at the oil companies infringing indigenous peoples' rights in accordance with the standards and principles of international law, Russian legislation and standards of common law'. The Association of Indigenous Numerically Small Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation supported this decision.

We appeal to every one who is not indifferent to the fate of Sakhalin's indigenous peoples and its entire population and to the future of the environment of the North of the Pacific basin to communicate your support of the action of Sakhalin's indigenous peoples to the representatives of the Russian Federation's authorities, and the companies involved in the oil and gas development projects in Sakhalin.

Enclosure:

- 1. The decision of the Fifth Congress of the Sakhalin Region's Indigenous Peoples of the North adopted on 29 October 2004;*
- 2. The impact of the "Sakhalin-2" project on environment and indigenous peoples of the North. Prepared by ROO "Ecological Watch of Sakhalin", December 2004;*
- 3. A list of addresses of relevant Russian Federation authorities and the companies implementing the oil and gas development projects in Sakhalin".*

By the moment the action started some of the metropolitan mass media and a number of foreign public organizations and Russia's social organizations of INSPN had responded to this appeal.

RAIPON decided to send a delegation comprising P.V. Sulyandziga, RAIPON First Vice-President, Olga Murashko, RAIPON expert on legal issues and Ekaterina Khmeleva, member of the International Work Group on Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) and attorney of the Rodnik Legal Center to take part in the beginning of the action. The delegation arrived in Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk on 17 January and immediately found itself in the thick of things.

Vice-Governor G.A. Karlov invited P.V. Sulyandziga to preliminary talks in his office, which were scheduled an hour later to turn into negotiations with the oil companies' representatives. The administration of the Sakhalin Region had prepared its own draft of a tripartite agreement envisaged for signing on 18 January by representatives of the administration, oil companies and Sakhalin's indigenous peoples.

The agreement proposed by the Sakhalin Region's administration had nothing in common with the draft memorandum which the action organizers believed to have been discussed in Sakhalin. According to the RAIPON expert conclusion, the document was rather a declaration of intent to continue interaction. One of the paragraphs of this agreement's preamble expressed the approval of Sakhalin's INSPN with regard to the oil companies' efforts, which was far from reality.

Of all the INSPN representatives authorized by the Fifth Congress only one, E.A. Koroleva, who was also the representative of numerically small peoples of the North in the Sakhalin Regional Duma, attended the negotiations held on 17 January.

The signing of such an agreement after the draft memorandum had been proposed one month prior to that would be, in the opinion of RAIPON, a setback. E.A. Koroleva at the time was of a different opinion. Alexey Limanzo, as a representative of Sakhalin's INSPN authorized by the Fifth Congress, was not invited to the January 17 talks. On 18 January, the agreement was signed by two representatives of INSPN, one of them having been authorized by the Fifth Congress, the other one not authorized. Such a strange INSPN representation was pointed out with dissatisfaction by some representatives of the oil companies attending the signing procedure.

The protest action became unavoidable. The matter was not only the subject of discussion at the headquarters of the action but also received wide coverage on all the Sakhalin television channels keeping an eye on the development of the events.

The action's headquarters planned to organize a public gathering at a sacred burial place of the Nivkhs' ancestors, a storage facility had been constructed, with a special rite cleansing the site of evil spirits, statements made by the action's participants, and making public the action's resolution and draft memorandum. The arrival of the oil companies' representatives for the talks was expected by 3 pm. In case they ignored the invitation it was planned to go ahead with the action by staging picket lines on the roads approaching the construction sites of the Sakhalin-1 and Sakhalin-2 projects.

On 20 January, more than 200 representatives of indigenous peoples from five districts of the Sakhalin Region gathered on the open space of the sacred glade. Many of them came on burans (snow vehicles); others were riding on minivans. There were fifteen representatives of the Sakhalin and metropolitan mass media present to cover the occasion.

The clearing was decorated with slogans. The largest banner stretching across the glade read: "We demand an ethnological impact assessment!"

The deputy head of the Sakhalin Region's administration spoke at the opening of the action reading out the agreement signed on 18 January. This agreement was not supported by the attendees.

The indigenous peoples' representatives from five districts of the Sakhalin Region spoke about the reindeer pastures damaged by the construction teams. They spoke about the loss of fish, the reduction of catches, and demanded the evaluation of the damage caused to traditional natural resource use. They spoke of curbing the further degradation of the primordial habitat of Sakhalin's indigenous peoples, calculating fair compensation for the damage already done, which would help the indigenous inhabitants adapt to the inevitable changes of their habitat, and the need to develop alternative subsistence activities.

Aleksey Limanzo read out the draft resolution, which was met with the audience's approval. Despite the frost of 30 °C, the participants of the action formed a long line to sign the resolution and memorandum. Altogether, 195 people signed these documents.

Representatives of oil companies did not turn up after all. At 5 pm, when it was already dark, it was decided to finalize the action's first day. Volunteers among the men were going to continue the action on the next day by picketing the roads leading to the projects' construction sites.

Picketing was organized for three days running in three different locations. Picket campaigners blocked the way to trucks carrying construction materials and pipes. Their placards cried out: "Oilmen! You should remember whose land you work on. V.V. Putin". Those were the words pronounced by President Putin in April 2004 in Salekhard during the session of the State Council on the problems of the North held outside its head office in Moscow.

During the three-day protest action, the traffic of more than 100 trucks carrying construction materials was brought to a standstill. On the third day of picketing, two vehicles transporting men who were on their way home after their tour of duty was over. There was a skirmish between the workers and picketers. The picket line finally decided to let the trucks go: "We are fighting the management of the companies unwilling to listen to our demands, not the workers", the campaigners declared.

After the incident, the picket activists took a decision to temporarily suspend the action to avoid additional social tension. They decided to give time to the oil companies' management to think the situation over, to convoke an extraordinary congress of Sakhalin's INSPN, approve documents signed by the January 20 action participants during its sessions, and organize a new round of talks.

Below is the resolution signed at the action:

"Resolution of the protest action participants against the direct negative impact made by the oil companies Exxon Neftegaz Limited and Sakhalin Energy Investment Company Ltd. – operators of Sakhalin-1 and Sakhalin-2 projects and their contractors – on the environment and lifestyle of indigenous numerically small peoples residing in the North of Sakhalin.

We, the participants of the protest action in the Noglikskiy district organized on 20 January 2005,

- *emphasizing a special spiritual connection between the indigenous numerically small peoples of the Sakhalin Region's North and its land and the exceptional importance of preservation and protection of their habitat as an integral condition of their ethnic survival and development;*
- *standing out for the priority right of the indigenous numerically small peoples of the Sakhalin Region's North to the use of flora and fauna resources;*
- *pointing out that the indigenous numerically small peoples of the Sakhalin Region's North reside in remote centers of population under severe climatic conditions without any developed infrastructure, facing serious socio-economic problems pertaining to the preservation and development of traditional types of economic activity, the revival of their culture and language;*
- *declare hereby that the prospecting for and development of hydrocarbons, construction of oil and gas pipelines, factories and other major industrial enterprises have a direct negative impact on the environment and lifestyle of indigenous numerically small peoples of the Sakhalin Region's North;*
- *express our determination to establish direct contacts and constructive cooperation with mineral deposit users and administration;*
- *insist on the necessity of participation of representatives of the indigenous numerically small peoples of the Sakhalin Region's North in decision-making on the problems of pro-*

tection of their primordial habitat, traditional lifestyle and socio-economic development;

- *express our disenchantment with the actions of the representatives of the Sakhalin Region's administration and some companies regarding the signing of the agreement between mineral deposit users and representatives of INSPN on 18 January in Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk without dovetailing its content with the original demands and without sufficient authorized INSPN representation;*
- *support the draft memorandum prepared by the Association of the Sakhalin Region's INSPN in collaboration with RAIPON, duly handed over to the Sakhalin Region's administration and disregarded;*
- *appeal to the oil companies engaged in economic activities in the locations of traditional habitat of indigenous numerically small peoples of the Sakhalin Region's North to back up the basic demands contained in the said memorandum: organization of ethnological impact assessments, establishment of a Regional Consultative Council of the indigenous numerically small peoples of the Sakhalin Region's North and a special fund to support INSPN's sustainable development, and sign the memorandum.*

The action's participants appeal to RF President V.V. Putin, Chairman of the Federation Council of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation S.M. Mironov, Chairman of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation B.V. Gryzlov, Plenipotentiary Representative of the RF President in the Far Eastern Federal Okrug K.B. Pulikovskiy, Governor of the Sakhalin Region I.P. Malakhov, Chairman of the Sakhalin Regional Duma V.I. Yefremov with a request to protect our primordial habitat and traditional lifestyle, our rights guaranteed by the Constitution and the existing legislation and render assistance in achieving mutual understanding and civilized relations between indigenous numerically small peoples of the Sakhalin Region's North and industrial companies Exxon Neftegaz Ltd. and Sakhalin Energy Investment Company Ltd. – operators of Sakhalin-1 and Sakhalin-2 projects and their contractors.

The lists signed by the action participants are enclosed herewith".

This resolution and the memorandum are the basis for the negotiation process conducted by RAIPON with representatives of relevant oil companies in Moscow, the administration of the Sakhalin Region, and state authorities.

The first vice-president of RAIPON participated in a number of talks with the management of the companies both in Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk and Moscow. The companies' management express their concern about and interest in a further dialogue with Sakhalin's indigenous peoples and RAIPON representatives. RAIPON also sent a letter to the RF President, both Chambers of the RF Federal Assembly, and corresponding ministries and agencies of the Russian Federation with the request to take urgent measures to restore the violated constitutional rights of the Sakhalin Region's INSPN to protect their primordial habitat and traditional lifestyle under the conditions of expanding oil and gas production and construction of pipelines in Sakhalin.

In addition, an action plan was worked out for the nearest future and another RAIPON appeal sent to indigenous

numerically small peoples of Sakhalin and the oil companies with a proposal to convene an extraordinary congress of the Sakhalin Region's indigenous peoples in March 2005.

The Sixth Extraordinary Congress of the Sakhalin Region's INSPN was convened on 25 and 26 March 2005 in Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk. The resolution of the congress emphasized that in the event the talks failed to result in progress by 1 June 2005, protest actions would be used to develop a productive dialogue, and would continue with utmost effort. In this case, the congress appeals to the entire indigenous population of Sakhalin to take part in the action or render any assistance within their powers and ability. At the same time, the congress views the organization of the action as an extreme measure and urges the interested parties to reach agreement at the negotiation table regarding an ethnological impact assessment before 1 June 2005. The congress recognized as expedient an independent ethnological assessment in the realization of any oil-related project and any activities involved in the development of mineral deposits in the territories where populations of INSPN are concentrated in northern Sakhalin Region.

The delegates of the congress also took a decision about the necessity of establishing a fund to support and develop Sakhalin's indigenous peoples. The basic source of raising the funds will come from mineral resource users. The formulation of the fund's documents and handling of all the problems pertaining to its establishment were assigned to a specially elected Regional Council, comprising eight delegates. Alexey Limanzo was elected Chairman. The Council was also delegated the right to represent in future the interests of indigenous peoples at the negotiations with government authorities and mineral resource users.

The next meeting of the Regional Council took place in the village of Nogliki on 26-27 May 2005. The Council had numerous meetings with representatives of oilmen during the month and a half of its activities. Now, a month and a half of negotiations is over, and the representatives of Sakhalinskaya Energiya (one of the oil companies) attending the session of the Council distributed their plan of assistance to the development of indigenous peoples. In addition, the representatives of Sakhalinskaya Energiya promised to submit a more detailed and concrete plan specifying time and budget. Absolutely no proposals came from the companies British Petroleum and Exxon.

The Council members came to the conclusion that so far the Sakhalinskaya Energiya plan did not fulfill its purpose. In their opinion, it is rather the oilmen's attempt to drag out the negotiation process. "Representatives of 'Sakhalinskaya energiya' insist that they need more time to study the problems of indigenous peoples. It is not clear why they have started to study indigenous peoples' problems only today while ten years have already passed since the company's operations began in Sakhalin. The Sixth congress of Sakhalin's indigenous peoples set the deadline for concrete results of the negotiation process to materialize. That deadline is 1 June 2005. Unfortunately, we have to state that there have been no concrete results obtained. Therefore, the

Council has decided to continue the protest action "Green Wave" in accordance with the congress resolutions", said Aleksey Limanzo.

The groundwork for the beginning of the second stage of the action took one month. In the meantime, notifications were sent to the local offices of self-governance about the beginning of the picket campaign. The second stage of the protest action started on 28 June. It was planned to last longer than the first one. As in the first stage, the Green party and LDPR supported the action and intended to help Sakhalin's indigenous peoples in staging the protest campaign. Approach roads to construction projects were shut off. More than 70 representatives of indigenous people participated in the action in Nogliki District. This time the security guards of the project behaved quite aggressively, trying to force picketers back from the road. Indeed the participants of the action found out that not far from the road alternative routing right through the forest and the traditional pastures were being constructed; these had not been previously not planned by the project. The participants of the action decided to interrupt the picketing and come back to Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk to lodge a complaint about the illegal actions of the oil companies. This was done on 7 July.

In support of the demands of Sakhalin's indigenous peoples, protest actions were carried out in Madison Square Park in New York on 30 June. In Moscow, in front of the Exxon and Sakhalinskaya Energiya buildings, a joint meeting of RAPON and Green Party representatives was held.

The experience gained in the organization and staging of the protest action in Sakhalin has shown that it is possible to unite efforts of indigenous numerically small peoples in the defense of their legitimate rights with the efforts of environmental and political organizations of the region, and that such a union makes the actions of INSPN organizations more effective and significant. On the one hand, RAIPON adheres to its principles in standing up for the legitimate rights and demands of Sakhalin's INSPN; on the other hand, it does its utmost to avoid a situation in which the conflict in Sakhalin would lead to a blind alley.

One of RAIPON's next steps toward successful negotiations with industrial companies is the roundtable "Interaction between indigenous peoples and production companies", due to be convened on 24-25 August 2005 and organized jointly with the International Fund for the Development of Indigenous Peoples "Batani". Such companies as British Petroleum, Sakhalinskaya Energiya, Terneyles, Surgutneftegaz, Koryakgeoldobycha, Mitsubishi have already agreed to participate at this roundtable. Also attending will be representatives of the office of the UN High Commissioner on Human Rights, the International Labor Organization, the World Bank, the European Commission, indigenous peoples of Russia, Canada and Norway, Russian and foreign energy companies. Deputies of the State Duma's and the Federation Council's Committees on the North's problems, representatives of the Ministry of Regional Development and the Ministry for Natural Resources have also confirmed their intention to participate.

A chance to make the company change plans A nature reserve off the western coast of Kamchatka?

Lach Ethno-Ecological Information Center, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy

On 27 January 2005 hearings took place in the Administration of the Kamchatkan Oblast concerning the creation of a federally protected nature area on the shelf of the Sea of Okhotsk west of Kamchatka. Representatives of KamchatNIRO*, KF TIG DVO RAS**, nature environmental conservation organisations, FGU "Sevvostrybvod"***, the administrations of the Kamchatkan Oblast and Koryak Autonomous Okrug as well as Northern indigenous peoples organisations took part.

The shelf off western Kamchatka is a unique breeding area for valuable bioresources and one of the most significant fisheries. Recent human activities on the shelf significantly impact natural conditions there, as well as the interests of Northern indigenous peoples and the population as a whole.

The first proposals regarding hydrocarbon investigations on the shelf were made in 1992. On 8 August 2003 the Ministry of Natural Resources gave a license to the Open Joint Stock Company NK Rosneft for geological investigations of hydrocarbon deposits within a sector on the West Kamchatkan shelf. The license is valid until 1 August 2008. According to the news agency Regnum, Rosneft and the Korean National Oil Corporation (KNOC) entered an Interim Financial Agreement (IFA) on 22 February, in Moscow, according to which KNOC will take part in the development project of a prospective site within Rosneft's license area. Rosneft's press service confirms this. In September 2004, during a visit by the Korean president, No Mu Hen, Rosneft and KNOC signed a memorandum of mutual understanding about joint development of the site. According to this document, the work will be carried out by newly created joint ventures. In accordance with the memorandum, Korea has already carried out a number of investigations in the license area. The parties agreed further that in 2005 an area of 60,000 km² will be seismologically investigated, and three boreholes will be drilled by 2008. In addition, the parties will create a joint company by the end of this year.

According to representatives of the Korean party, KNOC attaches special significance to its participation in the development project for two reasons: first, because of the geographical affinity of the area with the Korean peninsula and, second, because of its industrial potential. Rosneft and KNOC believe that hydrocarbon development on the Russian shelf of Kamchatka will have a stabilising effect on oil delivery for the Asian and Pacific markets and will contribute to a permanent power balance of the region.

The shelf's oil stores consist of 26 oil fields and are preliminarily estimated at 900 million tons. In the opinion of Rosneft's experts, the size of the project is comparable to the Sakhalin-1 and Sakhalin-2 projects (off northern Sakhalin). The first stage of development is expected to take approximately two and half years and will involve investments of nearly \$150 million. It is assumed that the Koreans will finance the project to the point where commercial extraction can begin. According to the Petropavlovsk Evening News, rather than waiting until KNOC recovers its

initial outlay for the project's development, Rosneft will receive a certain part of the income shortly after commercial extraction commences.

But oil exploitation will endanger the fish stocks in Kamchatkan waters, and Kamchatka as a whole. Oil extraction poses a threat to all the biodiversity of the shelf, including 227 species of fish, 9 species of crabs, 6 species of shrimps, almost 200 species of seaweed.

To control the Rosneft's activities, the Council of People's Deputies of Kamchatka has initiated the formation of a federally protected area on the shelf. This initiative was supported by the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Sakhalin regional Duma, the administration of the Primorye Territory, KamchatNIRO, FGU "Sevvostrybvod", and the administration of the Kamchatkan Oblast. On 22 December 2004 the regional Council of People's Deputies sent a letter to President Putin. The answer has not yet been received.

In the Duma of the Koryak Autonomous Okrug, district and regional deputies agree that the ongoing development of the shelf is unacceptable. But at the same time they say that the creation of a protected area is premature as it would exclude *all* economic activities, according to Nikolai Gavrilov, vice governor of the Koryak Autonomous Okrug.

On 22 April the Kamchatkan Regional Electoral Commission assigned a task force to draft a petition in support of a referendum on the geological prospecting on the West Kamchatkan shelf.

The governor of the Kamchatkan Oblast, Mikhail Mashkovtsev, received an official letter on 27 June. The letter says that the Ministry of Agriculture, on behalf of the government of the Russian Federation, is considering an appeal by the governor of Kamchatka on the possibility of establishing the specially protected area on the West Kamchatkan shelf. The Ministry of Agriculture proposed to the Ministry of Natural Resources to hold an interdepartmental meeting with participation of all relevant ministries, departments and representatives of regional administrations of the adjacent territories.

The State Office of the Public Prosecutor of the RF is investigating the legitimacy of Rosneft's activities in connection with the oil fields on the shelf.

In May 2005 the task force had drafted its petition in support of carrying out a referendum in Kamchatka. The petition posed two questions:

1. Do you consider it necessary for the federal authorities, together with the Kamchatkan administration, to carry out an assessment of the special economic interests of indigenous peoples and other population of Kamchatka in connection with the investigations and development of mineral resources on the West-Kamchatkan shelf, by means of:
 - developing and maintaining a long-term concept for the multiple use of the natural resource potential of the Sea of Okhotsk, ecologically and economically balanced ac-

ording to international principles of sustainable development, which also are accepted by Russia;

- developing and maintaining environmental-economic offices in the districts adjacent to the Sea of Okhotsk which are to weigh development priorities against the interests of natural resource conservation;
- developing and maintaining a long-term program for the development of Kamchatka, coordinated with the nature management programmes in adjacent sea and shelf areas;
- carrying out state ecological and economic expert evaluations of the documents specified above (concept, program).

2. Do you think that the governor of Kamchatka must withdraw the license given to the Open Joint Stock Company NK Rosneft to carry out prospecting for hydrocarbon deposits on the West Kamchatkan shelf, in accordance with

the 2003 enactment of the Ministry of Natural Resources, which was given without taking into account the special economic interests of indigenous peoples and other populations in Kamchatka.

The appropriateness of the draft petition has been approved by the Council of People's Deputies of Kamchatka. It is planned to carry out the referendum in Kamchatka in autumn 2005.

* Kamchatkan Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography

** Kamchatkan Branch of Pacific Institute of Geography, Rus. Acad. Sci.

*** Federal State Agency "Northeastern Ocean Office for Environmental Protection, Reproduction of Marine Biological Resources and Fishery Management"

Digging in Deep:

Mining's Impact on Russia's Indigenous Peoples in Siberia and the Far East

Misha Jones, Pacific Environment

As precious mineral prices have gone on the increase in recent years, Russia has started more and more to look like a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. Even coal is starting to look valuable again. So international and national developers are increasingly encroaching on pristine land; in response, Russia's Far Eastern and Siberian NGOs, including indigenous NGOs, monitor and try to mitigate the impact of past, current and future mining projects. From Kamchatka to Kemerovo, mines are on the move, and so are the people who stand to lose their traditional way of life because of them.

In Kamchatka Province, gold mining is a relatively new venture. Although its direct impact on indigenous peoples has, to date, been limited, gold mining's potential impact on salmon—a key local natural resource and a staple of indigenous culture and economics—is tremendous. For instance, in the central part of the Kamchatka peninsula, the headwater regions of the Icha and Kirganik Rivers, one gold mine is operating and a copper-cobalt-nickel mine and a second gold mine are under construction. These mines threaten salmon habitat in rivers that drain west into the Sea of Okhotsk and east into the Pacific Ocean. The road systems being built to service these mines also pose a threat to aquatic and wildlife resources upon which regional indigenous peoples are dependent. A passion has arisen among developers and officials to mine additional mineral resources in these watersheds: today the region lies vulnerable to fallout from the choice of quick profit over sustainable progress.

In the case of central Kamchatka's mines, project managers did hold consultations with local communities, including indigenous communities, as part of the mandatory government environmental assessment (or "expertiza"). The emphasis at these meetings, however, was on job creation, local tax revenue opportunities and other claimed benefits; the mines' technical aspects and potential threats were

secondary considerations. As is too often the case, the promise of social benefits was a powerful enough argument to convince the public to support the projects: even the indigenous community was convinced. Now there is growing dissatisfaction with the one active mine as expected jobs and tax revenues fail to materialize. Recently the Kamchatkan indigenous community drafted a letter reproaching regional officials and company officers responsible for the management of the Aginskoe gold mine as well as the Shanuch copper, nickel and cobalt mines (which lie adjacent to a UNESCO World Heritage site, Bystrinskiy Nature Park). The letter calls on mining officers to establish a mechanism by which indigenous community representatives, accompanied by agency personnel and NGO representatives, can visit the mines, and by which a dialogue can begin on the establishment of access to information relating to mine operations.

Just to the north of Kamchatka, in the Koryak Autonomous Region (Koryakia), platinum and gold mines are already operating, with new gold mines planned for other areas in the region where local indigenous groups live. So far, there have been few direct benefits to the indigenous community from these mines. Of equal concern are the social tensions that have arisen in the communities near these mines which neither the mining management nor the Russian government is addressing.

Unlike Kamchatka, Magadan Province, to its northwest, has been a major center for the extraction of gold, silver and other metals and minerals for more than 70 years. Over this period, lands used by the region's indigenous peoples to pursue traditional activities – reindeer herding, hunting, and fishing – have been annexed for the purposes of resource extraction. These lands have suffered the ills of pollution and other fallout from the mining. The reduced land and natural resource base creates hardship for indigenous people who wish to maintain a traditional way of life.

The indigenous peoples in Magadan Province are feeling the impact of the Kubaka gold deposit in particular. This region's population is predominantly indigenous: Even, Koryak, and Itelmen. Their traditional activities are hunting, fishing, and reindeer herding. Concerns held by local and international stakeholders include the Kubaka mine operator's management of excess water and its severe underestimation of local annual precipitation; tailings dam seepage; the potential for acid mine drainage; extensive settlement of the tailings dam; cyanide in seepage below an old tailings reservoir, and environmental accountability for that site; the operator's lack of explicit reclamation and closure plans; and the operator's failure to identify mechanisms to provide financial guarantees to assure performance of steps to which the operator has agreed. For an example of the mine operator being out of compliance with its own words, it agreed to give but never provided compensation for the damage it caused to reindeer pastures. Sadly, Magadan Province is practically the only place where indigenous peoples have been able to maintain some semblance of a traditional lifestyle: just one accident at the mine could spell disaster for this lifestyle. In another part of the province, the deteriorating tailings pond and facilities of the abandoned gold complex at Karamken, on a tributary to the Khasyn River, near a productive salmon fishery, threatens regional salmon resources— and so also indigenous peoples and other downstream residents surviving on that salmon.

Now there are plans for developing two open pit coal mines in the Olski Region, the landscape base for the watershed of the Lankovaya River ("river of coho salmon" in the indigenous Evenk tongue). The Lankovaya River's key tributary, the Ola, is one of Magadan Province's most productive salmon spawning rivers. Again, the opening of these mines will have a direct, irreversible impact on indigenous communities dependent upon the Lankovaya watershed's salmon resources.

On top of these developments, the indigenous peoples of Magadan Province were victimized by an investment scheme set up to provide economic and social support in return for the community's consent to allow mining activities on part of their traditional lands. Loans were secured to

fund the investment project, but through a series of disreputable manipulations the investment fund collapsed; the local indigenous people were left not with the fund's benefits, but its debts.

In the north of one of Russia's largest provinces on the Chinese border, Amur Province, gold mining— mainly placer gold mining— is reported to be displacing Evenk reindeer herders from their traditional pastures. Infrastructure developments, particularly roads, for the influx of people coming to work at the placer mining operations is suspected as the cause for a decline in wildlife numbers. Further west, in Siberia's Kemerovo Province, an internationally-funded copper mine project threatens a portion of the local indigenous Shors' traditional lands. This mine is planned for the Shor National Park, and if developed, will annex traditional Shor hunting areas.

These are just a few prominent examples of mining impacts on indigenous peoples in Siberia and the Russian Far East. Indeed, the issue of indigenous land rights under the onslaught of mining developments is poorly understood. A comprehensive review of the relationship between mining projects and Russia's indigenous peoples has not yet been compiled; these examples are surely only the edge of a very large open pit!

About the Author:

Misha Jones works out of the Vladivostok office of Pacific Environment, a US-based conservation organization which works to empower communities with tools and information to promote sustainable, transparent, and community-supported natural resource policies. Misha has worked to partner with indigenous communities since the early 1990s when Pacific Environment participated in a community development project organized by the Udege people in the Bikin River watershed in the Russian Far East. Learn more: <http://www.pacificenvironment.org>

*Learn more about Pacific Environment's current environmental/ indigenous NGO partnership project *Environmental Rights in Magadan: Expanding Citizens' Use of Environmental Rights in Magadan District, Russia*: <http://www.pacificenvironment.org/russia/FRAEC>*

HEALTH:

Children of the North – our pain

Aleksandr Skryagin, Palana, Koryak Autonomous Okrug

A person's genetic inheritance is evident from an early age. Unselfconsciously, the child acquires from the world around it, from tutors, the knowledge and skills which later form the basis of his or her mentality. In fact, an individual's mentality already begins to develop in the mother's womb. By the fifth month from the moment of conception the fetus already has a personality, with a temperament and the main features of a nervous system.

Parallel with the early development of mentality, most illnesses are formed at an early age. The health of the child depends very much on the health of the mother. This is so for us in the Koryak Autonomous Okrug as it is for the entire country. There is a high increase in miscarriages and in parents' death rates; hundreds of women carry out heavy physical work, the birth age of mothers has decreased (not

unusually they are as young as 16 years); almost 3% of births are premature.

Pediatricists have coined a new term: often ill children (OIC*). Twenty to 30% of all children in kindergartens of the Koryak AO are OIC. At an average across Russia a child is ill two times a year. When school starts 10-15% of the children are already “chronicles”. This percentage increases considerably with each passing school year. School stress” already develops during the first months of learning for many children. Over half of the pupils have a weakened health. From the first up to the tenth class the quantity of children with sight impairments increases by a factor of seven. Sixty to 65% of the graduates have a poor posture, 40% suffer from circulatory disturbances. Almost 25% of pupils develop “school neuroses”, a significant portion caused by the teachers.

It has been known for a long time that a significant portion of pupils have bad habits that negatively impact their health. In the sixth class 7% of pupils smoke; in the tenth class almost one out of two does. Children probably do not know that the lung cancer rate doubled in our country over the last 20 years, and forecasts for the next decade say that about one million people will die of this illness, in other words, largely from smoking. In the seventh class experiences in connection with binge drinking increased for schoolchildren from 42% to 74%, and those who tried drugs and stupefying substances from 5% to 15%.

When I worked at Palana High School as a physical education teacher I struggled against pupils smoking in toilets and attics, referring to the federal law prohibiting smoking in educational and public institutions as well as the school charter, which prohibits smoking in school by both employees and pupils.

Alas, my efforts have been in vain. There was no understanding among colleagues. Most of all I am disturbed by that fact that in kindergartens, and possibly also in pre-school, children do not learn *not* to smoke – this is definitely bad. Starting school they see the following scene: senior pupils stand around with cigarettes between their teeth during every break. Bad examples are infectious.

It is not surprising, that children cannot run two kilometers without resting, have studied up to the 11th class, but not having learned to ski. As we see, children do not learn to protect their health. At school there is no such subject as “health education”, to teach students how to follow a healthful way of life. While they learn about astronomy, for example, they do not learn how to stay healthy. Health is no priority; priority is only given to education.

It is evident that the educational authorities, including the Ministry of Public Education, do not show responsibility. At certifications of teachers these facts are not considered. As a result, the quantity of healthy children decreases by 4-5 times from the 1st on 8th class, and after they leave high school there are only about 20% who pursue higher education, and 58% of the graduates are restricted in their choice of profession due to health problems.

So what can be done now? To move, create, function – a person has to have a certain level of well-being. In other words: physical training must again become an integral part of our culture. It is established knowledge that, if muscles do not work, the organism “stagnates”. Deficiency of movement is reflected in the general development of children. In fact, motor skills and intellectual skills develop

together. Children who start to walk, swim, and run early have a good foundation for their future development.

The educationalist couple Nikitin have shown that early physical exercise makes kids much healthier: they get ill 8-10 times less often, and almost do not catch colds at all. A very small child should run 30-40 steps in a day, and in kindergarten he or she should run two to four thousand. It is known, that coordination of movements is necessary for a good development up to 5-6 years of age. In our district, day nurseries and kindergartens are not few, but only 15% of them have facilities for physical training. The unique swimming pool in the district center of the Koryak Autonomous Okrug – in the kindergarten “Rabinka” – was closed 15 years ago due to lacking finances for repair. I do not think that we should save money at the expense of children. We have no domestic sports grounds and an insufficient quantity of skiing equipment at the district schools. Where should children be trained in the motor skills?! Are we really not capable of understanding that the future of the nation depends on health?

Educational institutions look generally horrible. When a child starts in the first class, its physical activity is halved at once. Up to 30% of the pupils have no access to sports halls. In our district, 95% of the children are not able to swim. Regional and district games between schoolchildren have ceased. It is not surprising that the quantity of army recruits with a poor health has noticeably increased.

The programme “Physical training and youth policy” only exists on paper. In the Koryak Autonomous Okrug children have no place to train. District branches of the Children’s Junior Sports School in the settlements of the district are getting fewer, stadiums are absent, and the training staff is growing old. The “Goskomsporta” (State Committee of Sports) system does not work for us.

In 1997 in the national village Ust-Khayryuzovo the school burned down; since then children are housed in two modified emergency buildings. The rooms do not meet sanitary standards, nor do the outdoor areas, the furniture, the illumination and other things. During all this time children have had to study under difficult conditions, which is reflected in their health and also in that of the employees of the school. During the school years 2000-2001 alone pupils lost 2187 school days and teachers 412 working days owing to sickness.

All the government authorities, including both the district and federal governments, know about the situation in the village of Ust-Khayryuzovo. The Deputy Minister of Education of the Russian Federation, L.S. Grebnev wrote in his letter (No. 6563/26-08-702): “The reconstruction of the school, which is municipal property, should be carried out with local budgetary funds, funding of sponsors and other unofficial sources of financing. The Ministry of Education has no opportunity to allocate funds for the reconstruction of the school”.

Where can 200 million roubles be found in the local budget, and where are the sponsors that will help?! In my opinion our government is indifferent to the problems of children of the North; it does not understand the severity of the problem. The lack of schools for children of the North in 350 places is an infringement of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Who will help the children of the North? Where is the policy of our state?! How is it possible to state that the

destiny of the children has not appealed to the government, the President, deputies of the State Duma, members of the Federal Assembly?!

We only can express our wish that a child who has been born in and grown up within the vast open spaces of the

North should have access to an education under good conditions.

** from Russian ЧБД (часто болеющие дети)*

Impressions from “Terra Madre”: World Meeting of Food Communities

*L.G. Ignatenko, Chairman of the Aleskam Community, Kamchatka
Turin, Italy. 20-23 October 2004.*

The Terra Madre (Mother Earth) conference has produced an indelible impression on me. This is the first time we have attended such a high profile forum where the main participants were common producers (farmers, fishermen, livestock breeders) from various countries of the world who use traditional subsistence practices, preserving traditional knowledge and focusing on the quality of their products. There were 160 of us from the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries and 100 from Russia. I was deeply impressed by the presentations discussing the sustainable model of production and distribution of foods, based on the principle of natural resource conservation, the equilibrium of the environment and food quality, maintenance of high living standards and work conditions, and consumer health care. All those issues are heart-felt to us, the indigenous peoples of Kamchatka.

Thanks to our partners from the The World Conservation Union (IUCN), and Nikolai Shmatkov personally, we, the residents of Kamchatka, had the opportunity to show our products. The Kamchatka delegates were Nina Banakanova (Anavgai village), Elena and Oleg Posvoskiy (city of Vilyuchinsk), Ulyana Danilova (Esso village), Lyudmila Ignatenko (Razdoly village). We presented spices made from wild herbs, *The Taste of Kamchatka*, which the Aleskam community developed in partnership with herb specialist Vladimir Chechushkov, renowned in Kamchatka and beyond it. *Siberian Pine Syrup*, prepared according to ancient recipes of the indigenous peoples of Kamchatka, was presented by the *Tarya* Community of Vilyuchinsk. The Kamchatka *Phyto Tea*, which has already conquered the Canadian market, was presented by a company from Anavgai. The Bystrinskiy Information Center (BIC) presented a video film on tourism.

Unfortunately, the conference workshop *The Spices Route* was not translated into Russian, so I was unable to exchange my ideas or other information with other producers working along similar lines. However, we had the opportunity to attend other sessions, which were plenty. Sometimes we did not know what session to attend and what would be most useful to us to listen to: in fact there were 61 workshops and they all were of great interest to us. We attended seminars on fishery, honey and its medicinal properties, agrarian economic systems, herb teas, etc.

I wanted very much to attend the session called *The Treasures of Volcanoes*, where the issues of the diversity of volcano areas and the possibilities of living alongside volcanoes were discussed, as well as *Gathering Economies: Cultures to Defend and Lands to Protect*, but the range of sections was so immense that it was impossible to

participate in all of them.

It was extremely interesting to find out in what way my colleagues from Canada employ their traditional knowledge in harvesting marine biological resources (sea cucumbers) and make their ecologically pure products. Of course, we met them, exchanged addresses and had pictures taken to remember them by. We are looking forward to having further cooperation with them.

Briefly, the trip to the subsistence conference has provided an invaluable contribution to our solidarity and the expansion of our knowledge. We experienced some unique exchanges of producers and consumers. Attending the Taste Show Food Exhibition surpassed all imagination. I have never seen anything of the kind before. It is hard to convey our impression of the two activities complementing each other. I have never seen anything like that before. On the one hand, the Terra Madre meeting leads one to think of an alternative agriculture and quality products, on the other the *Taste Show* is concerned with the promotion of quality products and development of consumer tastes.

The meeting encouraged us to think of the future which we are all looking forward to seeing: biological diversity, the preservation of the Earth and its resources, a guarantee of equal and worthy labor conditions for everybody.

The organizer of such a wonderful conference was the noncommercial international association Slow Food, established in 1986 to resist the global standardization of foods and to supply reliable information to the consumer. The President of the Association is Carlo Petrini. As of today, Slow Food has 80 000 members from over 100 countries of the world. The Association is based on the principles of sustainable methods for the development of agriculture and protection of biological diversity. For that purpose, a Fund for the protection of biological diversity has recently been established, which is a noncommercial organization and supports all the Slow Food projects in the agricultural and food sectors.

Slow Food Editore has published over 100 publications and is preparing eight issues of the magazine *Slow Food* for Italian readers, and also *Slow*, the herald of culture and taste, the international magazine of the association, which appears four times a year in six languages. In countries where the movement has been most developed, the members of the association receive national information heralds.

Slow Food is the organizer of the biggest gastronomical exhibitions, among which is the world-important event concerned with quality foods and held every two years in Turin: The Taste Show Food Exhibition. This year the

Taste Show (21-25 October) coincided with the Terra Madre event. At the final meeting, the Russian group came to a unanimous conclusion regarding joining the Slow Food movement as their principles and objectives are very much in harmony with our own.

In conclusion, I would like to extend my sincere thanks to all those who supported us, preparing the necessary documents and sending printed matter on the meeting to come: the representatives of the Slow Food fund and personally to Julia Smelkova, and also our Russian coordinator Nadezhda Zhdanova. We are thankful again to the IUCN and personally to N. Shmatkov for the opportunity to participate in another unique conference, which made it possible to participate in the international exhibition *Forest Gifts: the Culture of Utilization* in the city of Moscow, where our

products (syrup of the dwarf Siberian pine, spices from wild herbs in *The Taste of Kamchatka*, Kamchatka *Phyto Tea*, and birch bark works by Elena and Nikolai from the village of Milkovo) were awarded gold and silver medals at the All-Russian Exhibition Center. Thanks are also due to the Head of the Center of the Wild Salmon—this is our partner who not only supports our ideas on the traditional Salmon festivals, but also actively endorses our concepts of the search for alternative subsistence sources. For instance, in summer the center allocated funds for trips to remote places for the gathering of wild herbs, some of which we apply in our *Taste of Kamchatka* spices. We are looking forward to further mutual understanding and cooperation. In fact, the potential for traditional subsistence has been much spoken about. But few people understand it and few people stick to it.

POLITICAL AGENDA:

The Fourth Session of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues

IC RAIPON, New York, 16-27 May 2005

The 4th Session of the Permanent UN Forum on the problems of indigenous peoples was opened by a picturesque traditional march of a group of children and young people from Peru. Subsequently, Luise Fresche, Deputy Secretary General, UN, Nana Effa-Appenteng, Executive President of the UN General Assembly, Johan Verbeke, Vice-President of the UN Economic and Social Council, and also Rachel Mayagna, assistant to UN Secretary General addressed the Forum. They greeted the Forum on behalf of the United Nations and pronounced their wish for the Forum's fruitful work.

The 4th Session started with the election of Chairperson and Deputies to the Chairperson of the Permanent Forum, approval of the agenda and the working program. Ms. Victoria Talia Corpuz of the Philippines was elected Chairperson, and Pavel Sulyandziga, expert on indigenous peoples of Russia and the countries of Eastern Europe, the first Vice-President of the Association of the Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation was nominated one of the four Deputies to the Chairperson. The main items on the agenda of the 4th session of the Permanent Forum were problems relating to poverty and indigenous children's access to primary education, as expressed in the United Nations Millennium Declaration, which contains eight Millennium Development Goals, adopted by over 150 heads of the states in 2000. Presentations were made by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Luise Arbur, Vice-President of the World Bank, Jan Johnson, head of the United Nations Development Program, Mark Brown, and Adviser to the UN General Secretary, Jeffrey Sax.

In her presentation, the High Commissioner for Human Rights called upon all nations' governments to take all the measures needed to recognize indigenous rights and to

carry out legislative reforms so that some particular results could be achieved. Specialized institutions and agencies were recommended to develop and implement particular projects and programs for indigenous people, envisaging their large-scale and direct representation.

The first week of the Forum was concerned with the discussion of the first two Millennium Development Goals: (1) eradicate extreme poverty and hunger and (2) achieve universal primary education. A statement on the UN Millennium Development Goals was made by representatives of the Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation jointly with the Saami Council and the Inuit Circumpolar Conference.

It was proposed that the Forum should accept the recommendations addressed to the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) regarding revision of the declaration text.

The second week of the Forum started with the discussion of the 4th item of the agenda: Human rights with special focus on the observance of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous peoples. A presentation on the prospects of the activities of the Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights on the development of new international standards and plans of the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations (WGIP), to be held in the July 2005, was made by the Chairman of the WGIP, Mr. Alfonso Martinez. The 23rd session of the WGIP will be held in the head Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights in Geneva from 18 to 23 July 2005. The main item on the agenda is the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples.

POLITICAL AGENDA

Vice-President **Mikhail Todyshev**, on behalf of RAIPON, twice addressed the UN High Commission's Special Rapporteur Rodolfo Stavenhagen and the Permanent Forum

on the issues pertaining to the Forum's future activities. The texts of the presentations by M.A. Todyshev are supplied below.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues Fourth Session New York, 16–27 May 2005

Item 4 a) of the agenda: "Human rights: special focus on an interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights on the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous peoples."
23 May 2005

STATEMENT

of the Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of RF (RAIPON)

Dear Ms. Chairperson,

The activity of Mr. Rodolfo Stavenhagen, the Special Rapporteur on the problem of the human rights and basic freedom of indigenous peoples, is of great importance to promote indigenous rights and setting new international standards.

Annual thematic reports and recommendations of the Special Rapporteur regarding the infringement of human rights and violation of the indigenous peoples presented to the Human Rights Commission can be regarded as an important source of international law.

The setting of international standards in human rights and basic freedoms of indigenous peoples has the ultimate objective of promotion and recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples at the national level and their fixation in the national legislation. The respective concepts should be included in the constitution of states, and special laws on indigenous rights should be adopted.

RAIPON believes that it is important to investigate to what extent the states recognize and observe indigenous rights and in what way those rights are – supported by generally accepted standards and principles of international law – find reflection in the national legislation.

For instance, the causes why the numerous states that took part in the development of the ILO Convention No 169 "Convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries" and who signed it, have not so far ratified this Convention. These countries include the Russian Federation. From the first days of adoption by the ILO of this international convention, the indigenous peoples of Russia have claimed that the government of the Russian Federation should ratify it. However, we are answered that "this is a suit not to your size". Indigenous people say in response: "Let us try this suit on! We have been ready for long". However the appropriate law has not been ready, and the legislation requires refinement and to be brought in line with international law..

Ms. Chairperson,

At its latest session, the Commission on Human Rights has determined the subject of further investigation by the Special Rapporteur: constitutional reforms, legislation on indigenous rights and implementation of these laws. RAIPON welcomes this decision.

Due to the preceding investigation by the Special Rapporteur on the statement of the human rights and basic freedoms of indigenous peoples in the constitutions and national legislations, we wish to approach Mr. Rodolfo Stavenhagen with an earnest request to visit the Russian Federation and appropriately file an appeal for a visit thereof to the government of the Russian Federation.

The above request has been dictated by some substantial changes in the legislation of the Russian Federation, which took place in August 2004, whereby some important articles were deleted, so that in some instances, the standards of the Constitution of the Russian Federation and some international agreements were clearly violated. This was caused by the adoption of the law 122-F3 of 24 August, entitled "On Monetization of Benefits". Subjected to reconsideration and drastic sequestration were 150 federal laws, including two laws on the indigenous rights, over 100 federal laws and enactments, including two laws on the indigenous rights, over 100 federal laws and enactments were declared to have lost effect. This is an on-going process.

Today the State Duma of the Russian Federation discusses the draft Forest and Water Codes tabled by the government of the Russian Federation; the new draft edition of the federal law "On the Subsoil" is shortly to be tabled. The above bills envisage the handing over of forest and water resources in private property. At the same time no guarantees of the protection of the rights of the priority and gratuitous utilization of those resources has been envisaged. RAIPON has been doing much work with the Parliament and the government of the Russian Federation, we have proposed our amendments to those bills but our efforts are so far futile.

Taking into account those legislation changes, a more complete insight can be obtained in the course of your arrival in Russia. It will be necessary to conduct a number of meetings and consultations with the representatives of the government of the Russian Federation, the deputies of the State Duma and organizations of indigenous peoples. RAIPON is ready to render you the necessary assistance in the organization and conducting of those meetings.

We call upon the constant Forum to work in close contact with the Special Rapporteur, the experts of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations during the inter-session period and accept the recommendation addressed to

POLITICAL AGENDA

Mr Rodolfo Stavenhagen, the Special Rapporteur to the following effect:

- *“In preparing the investigation on the Constitution reform, the national legislation on the indigenous rights, and its implementation in particular cases, organizations of indigenous peoples representing the interests of indigenous peoples of those countries at the national and international levels and possessing complete information should be involved”*;

- *“Recommendation to the states regarding analysis of the national legislation for its conformity with the standards of*

international law and international agreements with respect to the indigenous rights and taking active measures for incorporation in the national laws of indigenous rights standards or enactment of respective special laws”.

In conclusion, RAIPON supports the presentation of the Grand Council of the Crees on the draft declaration of the UN on indigenous rights which will be presented at a later date.

Thank you for your attention!

Item 5 of the Agenda: “Future Work of the Forum.”

25 May 2005

STATEMENT

of the Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of RF (RAIPON)

Dear Ms. Chairperson,

On 12 April 2005 in Moscow under the 5th Congress of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation, in collaboration with the Bureau of the Constant Coordinator of the UN system in Russia and with the support of the Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation, RAIPON organized and conducted a roundtable on “Indigenous Peoples and the UN System”. The objective of the roundtable was the discussion of the results of the International Decade of the Indigenous Peoples of the World that ended in December 2004, and preparation of proposals and plan of events for the 2nd International Decade of Indigenous Peoples declared by the UN General Assembly in its resolution A/RES/59/174.

Taking part in the roundtable were representatives of OHCHR, UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, UN Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Populations, UN Information Center in Moscow, UNESCO, WHO, UNDP, WIPO, CBD (Convention on Biological Diversity) Secretariat, state agencies of the Russian Federation, and representatives of indigenous peoples: the delegates of the 5th Congress of the Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation.

RAIPON is grateful to the UN Human Rights Supreme Commissar Ms. Luise Arbur and the Special Rapporteur Mr. Stavenhagen for the warm greetings the wish of fruitful work. We are grateful to Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky, the ex-deputy UN General Secretary, Mr. Parshuram Tamang, the expert of the UN permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, Ms. Elizabeta Stamatopulu, Director of the Secretariat of the Permanent Forum and all other participants of the round table who were able to come to Moscow despite being very busy on the eve of the 4th session of the Permanent Forum and made informative presentations.

The members of the round table approved recommendations that we addressed to the UN Secretary General and the Secretariat of the Permanent Forum.

Ms. Chairperson,

In the context of the issue under discussion regarding the future work of the Permanent Forum, RAIPON proposes the following recommendations:

1. Firstly to exert every effort in order to complete the work on the UN Draft Declaration on Indigenous Rights and its approval by the UN General Assembly. This is an obligation, which passed to the Second Decade of Indigenous Peoples from the First Decade.

2. Under the second International Decade of Indigenous Peoples the efforts of the the agencies of the UN system and primarily the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, UN specialized institutions and agencies, governments, Indigenous Academic institutions and organizations, governments will be focused on the achievement of some particular and practical results. For that, it is necessary to distinguish some key (basic and major) objectives and focus on their attainment. Importantly, some particular objectives and practical results should be achieved.

3. One of the key targets of the Second International Millennium of Indigenous Peoples will the implementation of indigenous rights to land and natural resources. According to RAIPON, the implementation by the indigenous peoples of that right would promote the solution of the problems in other life activities of indigenous peoples. The legal recognition by the states of the right of indigenous peoples to have and utilize their historical lands and territories that they traditionally occupied or used in any other manner, control of the utilization of natural resources on the basis of the principle of voluntary, preliminary and conscious agreement of indigenous peoples help to resolve the age-accumulated problems of the indigenous peoples. We believe that the problems of the conservation of the culture and uniqueness of the language, the moral spiritual and physical health and religious outlook of indigenous peoples is intimately interconnected with the preservation of the traditional lifestyle and traditional subsistence economies, which can be preserved at their historical lands and territories with an access to natural resources needed for their survival.

4. In order to achieve implementation of the right of indigenous peoples for the land and natural resources, it is necessary to utilize, the most effectively, the processes of the achievement of the objectives of the Millennium Development. We are aware that not a single of the declared objectives of the Millennium Development today is in

direct conformity with the rights to land and natural resources, and all the more so does not contain any mention of the indigenous peoples. Nevertheless, the seventh objective of the Millennium Development suggesting the preservation of the environment and sustainable development, although indirectly, can be used by us to solve the problems of legal recognition by the state of the rights of indigenous peoples to the ownership and utilization of their traditional territories and natural resources.

5. Over the period of the International Decade of Indigenous Peoples of the World from 1995 to 2004 we have clearly defined the strategic objectives and targets. However, many have only little understanding in what way and by what methods that can be achieved. Under those conditions, the Permanent Forum should offer clear methods and step-by-step achievement of the proposed goals. For instance, in January 2005, the Permanent Forum organized an excellent seminar on the methodology of the accomplishment of the principle of the voluntary, preliminary and conscious agreement of indigenous peoples. This is a magnificent work with excellent conclusions and recommendations! The summary of the report of this seminar states that the methodology of the above principle should be proposed for discussion at the 4th session of the Permanent Form. However, the agenda for the present session envisages no discussion of this issue. In this connection I believe that the Permanent Forum should pay attention to the recommendations of the seminar on the voluntary, preliminary and conscious agreement of indigenous peoples and respective recommendations should be adopted, including those addressed to the inter-departmental group for support of the indigenous peoples regarding the elaboration of a manual on the application of the principle of voluntary, preliminary and conscious agreement of indigenous peoples.

6. For the stimulation of activity and attraction of attention of the governments to the solution to the problems of indigenous peoples, recommendations should be adopted to call upon all the states to establish national organizing committees for the conducting of the Second International Decade of Indigenous Peoples where they have not yet been established and recommend development and adoption of the state level of integrated plan of measures for the International Decade of Indigenous Peoples. One of the important aspects of those plans should envisage the conducting of the Constitutional reform (where it has not yet been conducted) and legal recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples by the development and enactment of special laws and incorporation of additional sections and articles on the indigenous rights and the existing related laws. The recommendations of the Permanent Forum should envisage the compulsory participation of indigenous peoples in the activity of national organizing committees and development of integrated plans and programs of measurements on the implementation of the 2nd International Decade of Indigenous Peoples at the international level.

7. In order to enhance the effectiveness of the activities of national organizing committees, joint sessions of the Permanent Forum with national committees at the regional level – with the invitation of the coordinator of the International Decade – should be practiced during the inter-session period. The national organizing committees should write annual reports on the course of the implementation of the Second International Decade of Indigenous Peoples in their respective countries, and on the level of the involvement of indigenous peoples' organizations in the activity of the Organizing Committee .

Thank you for your attention!

CULTURE:

Birch-bark craftsman

*Viktoria Mikhailova, Milkovo village, Kamchatka
Published in the newspaper "Aborigen Kamchatki" № 3 (102) of 1 April 2005.*

The Milkovo district is rich in excellent craftsmen. There are good artists. There are wood carvers. Embroidery and quilting masters are renowned. There are also excellent photographers.

I would like to tell you about the family of Nikolai and Lyudmila Shishkins. Elena Pemyakova, the mother of Nikolai, is a past master herself: she sews and weaves, using the natural material skillfully. Her daughters are highly skillful macramé weavers and very good at beadwork. The elder daughter Galina is a lace-maker famous not only in Russia but also abroad, and her works have won numerous awards.

Elena's sons prefer wood carving and birch-bark work. The elder son, Nikolai, is better at it. He works with love

and mastery. He taught his craft to his wife the wife Lyudmila, his daughter and the son.

I remember the first works by Kolya: *chumans, chukoches*, spoons, vases. It is not accidental that they are always in demand! Gradually, the assortment increased. There appeared sugar basins, boxes, business card cases, glass cases, etc. The skill has increased. And what panels do they produce! It is not by chance that foreigners pay attention to their works.

The works by the Shishkins were exhibited in Razdolnoye, Sosnovka, Anavgai, Esso and Petropavlovsk and have won awards.

Foreign visitors paid serious attention to the Shishkins' works. Nikolai was invited to Canada. First he brought

crafts to display, and subsequently they suggested that he conduct master classes. The Kamchatka master has gained increasing recognition in Canada. Each year, Nikolai and his wife spend one to two months in Canada. They visit various cities and provinces to teach their craftsmanship. There are quite a number of volunteers to learn, particularly among Indians. All the traveling and living expenses are covered by the Canadians. The Shishkins participate in numerous exhibitions. In October 2004 they sent about 100 pieces to Edmonton, Canada. In December 2004 in Milan, Italy, the exhibition *Traditional Cuisine of the Peoples of the World* was held. The vessels by Lyudmila and Nikolai, made to special order, contained the dishes and the visitors tasted them with birch-bark spoons.

And Moscow, too, noticed the Milkovo Kamchadal. In the October-November 2004, The World Conservation Union (Moscow) and the Canadian International Development Agency held the First International Forum Exhibition in the All-Russian Exhibition Center (Culture Pavilion) called *Gifts of Forest: Culture of Use*, which involved over

500 organizations and private persons. The exhibition familiarized visitors with various varieties of phyto tea, Siberian pine syrup, honey, scented beverages from various herbs, crafts such as beadwork, articles from twigs, birch-bark and leather. The Kamchatka Region was allotted 15 m² for the exhibition, out of which 6 m² were occupied by the works of Lyudmila and Nikolai Shishkin. The works by Nikolai were awarded a silver medal. In December 2004, in the same Pavilion, the Moscow Board for Culture held a big exhibition sale: *Gift Exhibition*.

L. and N. Shishkins are winners of numerous exhibitions. Their works were distributed among numerous countries, and numerous posters and booklets on their work have been published. In the latest poster the Northern Forestry Center (Canada) offers the works by the Shishkins to all those interested. ...

Nikolai dreams of working in the Milkovo area in a warm, spacious room, which is non-existent, and teach his skill to all those willing to learn.

Bone carving should exist

Albina Morilova, Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy

Published in the newspaper "Aborigen Kamchatki" № 3 (102) of 1 April 2005.

During the last ten days of February in the Sakha Republic (Yakutia), under the guidance of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, a festival of bone-carving art of the peoples of Russia was held. The great event gathered together scientists, artists, and folk craftsmen from numerous regions of the country. The program included a scientific and practical conference on Bone-Carving: Experience and Problems, the exhibition of works, etc. Yegor Chechulin, a member of the Creative Union of Artists of Russia visited Yakutsk. In our editorial offices he shared his impressions of his business trip.

I had the opportunity to visit Yakutia, the republic of hospitable, gifted northerners, for the second time. I represented our bone-carving school there, thanks to the financial assistance of the administration of the Kamchatka Region, without which that trip might not have taken place. It needed to see the development of that ancient art with the Yakuts and other ethnic groups. The visit was very strenuous.

At that meeting in Yakutsk where art critics from Moscow and bone-carvers from Chukotka and other regions were present, the present and future of traditional folk crafts was discussed, and also the problems that those arts and crafts face and their solutions. They also discussed the legal protection of the folk bone carver. It was concluded that in the course of such events it is desirable to work out and table proposals to be addressed to regional and federal agencies. It was proposed that culture and art workers should come up with proposals to modify some individual articles in the Art Law, which is currently in force. Incidentally, the conference concluded that there are very few art critics specializing in bone-carving art in Russia now.

They brought up the problem of protecting the local producer. In Yakutia, for example, excavations revealed huge amount of precious raw materials for bone-carving. That makes it possible to auction off mammoth ivory. But it would be better to carve the products where the raw materials are found. For instance, the United States prohibits the export and import of walrus tusks to protect the interests of their bone carvers.

The exhibition presented works by numerous Russian bone carvers because a large number of schools and master craftsmen responded. They had the opportunity of familiarizing themselves with the works of their colleagues and a lively communication and exchange of ideas took place. In Yakutsk I met a number of old acquaintances and friends. It is nice that the colleagues brought in their works. From the remote districts of Yakutia came some beginning bone carvers.

An interesting collection from animal bones was brought by a representative of the Arkhangelsk Region. Openwork carving is widely distributed in those parts. They say that these works sell very well. The Tobolsk masters who attended that meeting also presented some works made from moose antlers. They learned to make the crafts more commercial by whitening the material

Those who came to the festival were surrounded by the attention of the hosts. They were entertained. I personally visited an art school where I met with students. I conducted a master class. The students were interested in the instruments that I use in my work. I told them that by using a circular saw one can obtain blanks for one's products. So far, the young people only learned to work at a dental drilling machine. Generally, the work of bone carvers arouses universal interest. I was asked to address the students of the Arctic State Institute of Culture and Art (AGIKiI), where

bone carving is taught.. I also met with the students of a design college. As you can see, in the Sakha (Yakutia) Republic they treat bone carving very seriously, which is indicated by the number of schools where young people acquire the relevant knowledge and skills. Our students, too, could study at AGIKiI. Understandably, the road there is long and expensive. But one should strive to get there.

The government of Sakha (Yakutia) gives much attention to the development of culture. There are thousands of people employed in culture and art. Dozens of musical schools operate. And particular attention is given to ethnic folk crafts. That explains why the results (judging by the exhibition) are so impressive. I have seen works made from a whole mammoth tusk, estimated at 100-300 thousand rubles. Bas-reliefs, volume carving – all that can be done by Yakutian masters. What is the difference of their work from ours? The Koryak craftsmen are more naturalistic, whereas Yakutians address myths to a greater extent. They view the horse as a symbol of kindness and the bull as the symbol of evil. The characters of fairy-tales are more often present in the works by bone carvers of the Republic. I think that time will come when the Kamchatka carvers will address local fairy-tales. They will start dedicating their compositions to the characters of folk tales.

The artists of Yakutia participate in international exhibitions. For instance, Fedor Markov went to China to the festival of ice sculptures where he took the first place, and in his second trip he took second place. In Anchorage, Alaska, his sculpture won the grand prix. I visited the studio of that master and saw what tools he used in his work, for instance, good dental machines. They help the master cope with such material as the mammoth tusk. Moose antlers find an increasing application, although the traditional material used by Yakutians has been mammoth ivory.

Incidentally, in Kamchatka we have deer which give up their antlers. We only need to collect it. Why don't we use this material on a larger scale? Deer antlers are a very promising material. In Kamchatka mammoth ivory resources rank significantly lower compared with Yakutian in terms of quality. But they can serve as material for combs and brooches. The articles produced are flat or bas-reliefs. A creative person will always find what can be made from this material. Bone carving only needs investments.

The next such festival is planned in the city of Salekhard. It is easier for participants from European Russia to get there than for us. But I think that Kamchatka residents should take part in it. There is little time left – less than a year. That is why my fellow-countrymen should get ready. It is necessary to try and present the best articles of our craftsmen. We should decide the size of the delegation. We know from experience that it is difficult for a single person to attend all the events. A team of three people can be fully representative both at the conference and at the craft exhibitions, where explanations should be given, and at all the events representing the region.

I believe that the enthusiasts of native culture face a responsible problem – the propaganda of bone carving, in Kamchatka, particularly on the coastal sites where walrus tusks are harvested, some time ago that type of folk crafts was developed. The local people must get back to that craft, which is profitable.

Bone carving should be revived and developed. It will yield good fruit. We should value our craftsmen and create good conditions for them and, hence, for their creative labor.

NOTES:

Saami flag up in Murmansk

Information from Barents Secretariat by Roman Mikhalyuk:
<http://www.barsek.no/?newsid=875&deptid=1677&languageid=4&NEWS=1&showmodul=20>
 (modified by the Editor)

On 6 February 2005 – the National Holiday of the Saami people – the ceremony of hoisting the Saami flag took place in Murmansk near the City Administration and Regional Government building. The Saami people of the Murmansk Region, President of the Kola Saami Association Ms. Nina E. Afanaseva, Chairperson of the Working Group of Indigenous Peoples Ms. Anna D. Prakhova, government representatives, and others took part in the event. The Governor of Murmansk Region Mr. Yuriy A. Evdokimov joined the ceremony and congratulated the Saami people on their National Holiday.

Saami National Holiday

The Saami National Holiday – like the Saami flag – is common for all Saami, residing in Sweden, Norway, Finland and Russia. At the 15th Saami Conference in Helsinki in 1992 it was decided that the Saami common National Holiday should be on 6 February – the date of the first international Saami meeting in Trondheim

in 1917. More than 100 Saami from Sweden and Norway participated in that gathering, among them a great number of women. It was the first time in Saami history that Saami from the north and south came together to discuss their common problems.

The Saami National Holiday was celebrated for the first time in 1993, coinciding with the United Nations International Year of Indigenous Peoples, which opened in Jokkmokk, Sweden. The day is celebrated with cultural activities at many different places in Sápmi, the transborder homeland of the Saami people.

5th Congress of Indigenous Peoples of the North in Moscow

Elena Krikunenko, Center of support for Indigenous Peoples of the North / Russian Indigenous Training Center (CSIPN/RITC); ANSIPRA

The 5th Congress of the Indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia and Far East of the Russian Federation took place on 12-13 April 2005 in Moscow, in the Large Hall of the Russian Academy of State Service. The Congress gathered 334 delegates of 29 territories of the Russian Federation, representing all indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East.

Taking part in the Congress were:

- Foreign Minister of RF, *C.V. Yavrov*,
- Minister of Regional Development of RF, *V.A. Yakovlev*,
- Deputy Chairman of the Federation Council of the Federal Assembly, *M.E. Nikolaev*,
- Chairman of the Committee of the North and Indigenous peoples, *G.D. Oleinik*,
- Chairman of the Committee on the Problems of the North and the Far East of the RF, Deputy Chairman of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly, *A.N. Chilingarov*,
- Chairman of the Council of the Assembly of the Peoples of Russia, *R.G. Abdulatipov*,
- Deputy Minister of Regional Development, *M.N. Ponomarev*,
- Director of the Department of Inter-Ethnic Relations of the Ministry of Regional Policy of RF, *Yu.V. Balakhnin*,
- Chairman of the Committee of Interregional Relations and Ethnic Policy of the City of Moscow, *M.P. Burov*,
- Ambassador Plenipotentiary under special assignments, Chairman of the Arctic Council, *V.I. Churkin*,
- Director of the Department of Federal and Target Programs for the Development of Northern Territories and Urgent Response of the Ministry of Regional Development of RF, *V.A. Dedyukhin*,
- Assistant to the Representative of the President of the Russian Federation in the Far Eastern Federal Region, *A.S. Drozdov*,
- Head of the State Duma of the Yamalo-Nenetskiy Autonomous Okrug, *V.N. Malyutin*,
- Member of the Council of the Federation of the RF, Representative of the Koryak Autonomous Okrug, Chairman of the Committee for Natural Resources and Environmental Protection, *V.P. Orlov*,
- Chairman of the Duma of the Khanty-Mansiyskiy Autonomous Okrug, *V.S. Sodykov*,
- Deputy Chairman of the Committee on the Problems of the North and Far East of RF.

Also present at the 5th Congress were the representatives of the federal and regional bodies of the Russian Federation, representatives of embassies of the Arctic countries, NGOs and research organizations, and foreign and Russian guests engaged in the problems of the development of indigenous peoples.

The participants of the 5th Congress discussed the results of the International Decade of World's Indigenous People (1995-2004), which was declared by the United Nations Organization in 1993 for the solution of legal, economic, social and environmental problems faced by indigenous peoples. The representatives of the state agencies told the guests and delegates of the Congress what has been done during the recent years for indigenous peoples in our country.

In their turn, the leaders of the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON) as well as representatives of indigenous peoples from the northern regions expressed their own viewpoint of the situation. In particular, the delegates criticized the consequences of some recent reforms that have negatively impacted the socio-economic situation of Russia's indigenous peoples. One of the outcomes of the 5th Congress was the determination to find further pathways for the development of indigenous peoples in modern Russia. The set of priority tasks aimed at addressing the legal, economic, social and environmental problems which confront the indigenous peoples of Russia are recorded in the Congress Resolution.

At the final stage of the Congress, the election of the leadership of RAIPON was held. Three candidates for president of the Association were nominated: *V.M. Kurikov*, Deputy Chairman of the State Duma of the Khanty-Mansiyskiy Autonomous Okrug; *G.M. Volkova*, President of the Association of Indigenous Peoples of the Khabarovsk Territory; and *S.N. Kharyuchi*, Chairman of the State Duma of the Yamalo-Nenetskiy Autonomous Okrug. *S.N. Kharyuchi* was elected President for a third term.

CSIPN / RITC joins the University of the Arctic

Between 19 and 21 May 2005, the University of Oulu, Finland, hosted an annual meeting of the Board of the University of the Arctic (U Arctic). Further activities of the university, development of the U Arctic programs and enrollment of new members were among the issues addressed.

U Arctic accepted 18 new member organizations this year, including the Center for Support of Indigenous Peoples of the North / Russian Indigenous Training Center (CSIPN/RITC), Buryat State University, the Institute of the Language, Literature and History of Komi (Scientific Center of the Ural Division of the Russian Academy of Sciences), the Kamchatka State Pedagogical University, the Murmansk State Technical University, the University of Turku and the University of Helsinki. A complete list of the members of the Arctic University and also information on U Arctic programs can be obtained at www.uarctic.org.

Reference information :

U Arctic is a network of universities, colleges and other educational and research institutions in the North which have joined forces to create higher education programs that are suitable and accessible for northern students. Our common objective is the creation of a sustainable and constantly developing Circumpolar Region, with the first step being education and knowledge exchange.

UArctic has been developing education which has a direct bearing on the Sub-Polar Region, is interdisciplinary and diverse in nature and make use of our joint efforts to solve the unique problems of the region. The University of the Arctic recognizes the vital role of indigenous peoples in northern education and has been striving to take into consideration their vision in its activity.

U Arctic has been proposing a number of programs aimed at enhancing the educational potential and the opportunities in the North.

The Circumpolar Studies program for senior students propose an interdisciplinary curriculum at the Bachelor's level, focusing on the problems and issues of northern research.

The Open Learning Program makes it possible for northern residents to develop their education, acquire new skills and receive specialized education outside the traditional university framework.

The student exchange program (North2North) gives to the students of the North the opportunity of exchange studies in U Arctic educational institutions. The NorthTREX Program has been developed to support short-term visits of teachers between U Arctic member organizations.

Arctic Learning Environment shares the experiences of the best educational methods and technologies to support and communicate knowledge to remote students.

The U Arctic Field School and Circumpolar Universities Association support a dialogue, college studies and an international scientific cooperation via conferences and other events.

Small grant competition at Lach on salmon conservation

Lach Ethno-Ecological Information Center

Since January 2005, the Lach Ethno-Ecological Information Center, in Kamchatka, has been implementing a project entitled Implementation of the Efforts of Indigenous Peoples on Salmon Conservation in Kamchatka. This project is funded by the Pacific Environment and Resources Center (PERC), which has been a supporter of Kamchatkan organizations, including, this year, the Lach Center. The main objective of the project is the conservation of salmon. The organization of a small grants competition and, concurrently, the dissemination of information on environmental problems to the network of indigenous organizations of Kam-

chatka and the Koryak Autonomous Okrug (KAO) have been major project activities.

A mini-grant competition for salmon conservation was conducted by the Lach Center among initiative groups, communities, and indigenous peoples' organizations of Kamchatka and the KAO. There were 26 applicants, out of which 15 came from the Kamchatkan Oblast and 11 from the KAO. Many of the applicants were interested in issues concerning environmental protection and poaching control by indigenous peoples. Thirteen applications were received on these issues. Ranking second was the issue of the ecological education and training (10 applications). Finally, 3 applications were concerned with the monitoring of the major environmental hazards in Kamchatka and the KAO. This is quite natural, as indigenous inhabitants lack information and work experience related to the protection of their rights and interests under the industrial development of the peninsula. The mini-grant applicants were supported financially and given guidance while preparing their project applications.

On 28 February 2005 the Lach Center approved 14 projects for funding which were approved by the Association of the Indigenous Peoples of Kamchatka. Project implementation started on 1 April.

List of approved projects for small grants:

Detailed information can be obtained from ANSIPRA or RAIPON. More information about the projects will be posted in Russian on the website <http://npolar.no/ansipra>.

1. Initiative group of the Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North of Palana village: *The Land and Water Areas of Koryakia: Death or Reprieve* (L.G. Khamidulina)
2. Initiative group Junior: *Environmental Education of Young People* (J.G. Arslanova)
3. Project: *Legends of the Salmon* (T.S. Degai)
4. Initiative group of the Association of Indigenous peoples of the North of the Olyutor District (A.V. Yailgina)
5. Project: *Let us Protect the Salmon*, the initiative group Ethnos (E.I. Abakumova)
6. Project of the initiative group Birch Bark: *Environment: Culture: Life* (V.P. Zhilikova)
7. Project of the initiative group Tarya: *Let us Protect the Lands of our Ancestors from Human Degradation* (M.Yu. Posvosky)
8. Ethno-environmental education of the population of the village of Kovran
9. Project of the clan community Tarbagan: *Let us Preserve the Salmon in the Tigel River* (A.A. Mironov)
10. Initiative group Okal: *Say No to Poaching* (I.K. Zaev)
11. Clan community Pimchakh: *The Keepers of the Salmon* (V.I. Koveinik)
12. Initiative group of the Palana District Children's Home Echgan: *Pure Source* (N.S. Longinova)
13. Exhibition in the Tigil Museum
14. Editorial office of the newspaper "Aborigen Kamchatki": Information on the implementation of the projects of the small grant competition

Newspaper "Aborigen Kamchatki"

A.V. Morilova, Deputy Chief Editor of newspaper "Aborigen Kamchatki"

The newspaper "Aborigen Kamchatki" is the printed voice of the Association of Indigenous Peoples of the Kamchatkan Oblast.

It is not only aimed at the indigenous population and "old settlers"* of the peninsula, but at everybody who loves Kamchatka and its nature, and who values the original cultures, customs, traditions and ceremonies of the Koryak, Itelmen, Even, Chukchi, Aleut and other peoples of Kamchatka.

The pages of "Aborigen Kamchatki" concern the socio-economic situation of the indigenous peoples, activities connected with their traditional livelihoods, history, culture, art, ethnography, health, education, and language revival of the Northern peoples. Much attention is paid to economic problems, nature use and traditional activities. It also introduces indigenous cuisine, and the use of wild plants.

The newspaper issues the informational supplements "Lach", "Legal Journal" and "Kamchatka – Global Legacy". Some material is provided in Koryak, Itelmen, Aleut and Even languages.

"Aborigen Kamchatki" is distributed on subscription. It is also sent for free to indigenous peoples' organisations of the Kamchatkan Oblast, the Koryak Autonomous Okrug, and Russia. It is issued monthly.

Subscription outside Russia, unfortunately, is not possible. However, our foreign friends can send money to the editorial office and will receive the newspaper monthly by mail to their home addresses. If you are interested please contact our office.

* Russians and others that have been living in the area for generations

Address:

Редакция газеты "Абориген Камчатки"
ул. Пограничная 19, каб. 400 Б.
г. Петропавловск-Камчатский
RUS-683032

Editorial office of "Aborigen Kamchatki"
ul. Pogranichnaya 19, off. 400 B
Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy
RUS-683032

NEW LITERATURE:

Arctic Human Development Report 2004

Stefansson Arctic Institute, under the auspices of the Icelandic Chairmanship of the Arctic Council 2002-2004

The Arctic Human Development Report is the first comprehensive assessment of human well-being covering the entire Arctic region. Mandated under the Arctic Council's 2002 Ministerial Declaration as a "priority project" designed to provide a "comprehensive knowledge base" for the work of the Council's Sustainable Development Programme, the AHDR was a centerpiece

of the Icelandic Chairmanship of the Arctic Council during 2002-2004.

The report contains 11 substantive chapters, an introduction, a conclusion and a Summary of Major Findings. Based on contributions from some 90 scientists located in all the members of the Arctic Council and coordinated by a secretariat based at the Stefansson Arctic Institute in Akureyri, Iceland, the report offers a wide-ranging scientific assessment of achievements and challenges relating to human development in the Arctic.

According to the AHDR, "Arctic societies have a well-deserved reputation for resilience in the face of change. But today

they are facing an unprecedented combination of rapid and stressful changes” involving both environmental forces like climate change and socioeconomic pressures associated with globalization

Under the circumstances, it is particularly noteworthy that the “... Arctic has become a leader in the development of innovative political and legal arrangements,” including co-management regimes governing the use of natural resources, collaborative arrangements designed to facilitate cooperation between public governments and indigenous peoples organizations, and transnational arrangements like the Northern Forum and the Arctic Council itself.

More information can be found at <http://www.svs.is/AHDR/>.

Copies can be ordered at lrao@unak.is. Cost: 28 US\$, pluss postage (14 US\$ within Europe, including Russia; 24 US\$ outside Europe).

In the way of development Indigenous Peoples, Life Projects and Globalization

Edited by Mario Blaser, Harvey A. Feit & Glenn McRae

Zed/IDRC 2004

ISBN 1-55250-004-7

Paperback, 384 pp.

Purchase book online: Zed Books (<http://www.zedbooks.co.uk/>)

“This book brings together very insightful analyses of indigenous experience and strategies in the context of globalization from several continents and a number of theoretical perspectives. There are broad similarities making this a common struggle but the solutions arise from people solving problems in local contexts. Read this book and you will see that the debate is a very important one for the furtherance of human rights, for the future of these ancient traditions, and for the promotion of cultural, political and economic diversity everywhere.” (Grand Chief Dr Ted Moses, Grand Council of the Crees [Eeyou Istchee])

Indigenous peoples today are enmeshed in the expanding modern economy, subject to the pressures of both market and government. This book takes indigenous peoples as actors, not victims, as its starting point in analyzing this interaction. It assembles a rich diversity of statements, case studies, and wider thematic explorations, primarily from North America, and particularly the Cree, the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois), and Chippewa-Ojibwe peoples who straddle the US/Canada border, but also from South America and the former Soviet Union. It explores the complex relationships between indigenous peoples’ organizations, civil society, and the environment. It shows how the boundaries between indigenous peoples’ organizations, civil society, the state, markets, development, and the environment are ambiguous and constantly changing. These complexities create both opportunities and threats for local agency. People resist or react to the pressures of market and state, while sustaining “life projects” of their own, embodying their own local history, visions, and strategies.

The Right to a Decent Environment: With Special Reference to Indigenous Peoples

Tuula Kolari

Northern Institute for Environmental and Minority Law

(NIEM/Arctic Centre)

ISBN 951-634-950-1

Cost: 32.90 Euros (43.00 USD)

This publication is part of the joint project between NIEM, the law department of the University of Joensuu, and the Human Rights Policy Division of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, which culminated with an expert seminar organised last August in Rovaniemi, Finland. The main focus of Kolari’s research is how a decent environment has been specified in various United Nations processes, especially from the perspective of indigenous peoples.

Contact: marja.collins@ulapland.fi

Indigenous Peoples. Resource Management and Global Rights

Edited by Svein Jentoft, Henry Minde & Ragnar Nilsen

Eburon publisher 2003, 315 pp. ISBN 90-516G-978-x

Cost: € 27,50

Indigenous peoples are under heavy pressure from developments beyond their control. Since the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, a legal process within the auspices of the UN has been underway that may help indigenous peoples to sustain their natural environment, industries, and cultures. This book addresses some of the legal, political and institutional implications of these processes. Are the processes providing indigenous peoples with a more solid foundation for protecting their natural environment and culture? The international group of authors of the essays included draw on examples from different parts of the world, which highlight the issues that are involved in indigenous peoples’ struggle for control of their lives and their future.

To order the book:

Chicago University Press: www.press.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/hfs.cgi/00/16348.ctl

Centre for Saami Studies: www.sami.uit.no

Eburon Academic Publishers: www.eburon.nl

Oil Transport from the Russian Part of the Barents Region

(English and Russian language editions)

A. Bambulyak & B. Frantzen, Svanhovd Environmental Centre

You can download the report as a PDF file or order a printed copy at: <http://www.svanhovd.no>

Oil transportation along the Norway’s northern coastline is one of the hottest topics discussed in the Norwegian society for the recent two years. It is also one of the most important issues of today’s political agenda and bilateral discussions between Norway and Russia.

In 2002 there was a dramatic increase of oil volumes shipped from Northwest Russia along the northern Norway, and then 4 million tons of oil was transported. In 2003, the volume reached 8 million tons, and in 2004 almost 12 million tons of oil was shipped that way. The annual export of the Russian oil being transported to the west through the Barents Sea coast may reach the level of 100-150 million tons in the next decade:

- 40 million tons can be delivered by railway to the ports in the Barents and White Seas.
- 20 million tons may come from the oil fields in the Nenets Autonomous Region and the Pechora Sea.
- 30 million tons can be delivered from the Western Siberia to the terminals in the Kara and Laptev Seas with further transshipment in the Kola Bay of the Barents Sea.
- 50 million tons can be piped by the perspective trunk oil pipeline from the Western Siberia to the Barents Sea coast.

In 2003, Svanhovd Environmental Centre published the first report “Oil transport from the Russian part of the Barents Region” where we described the existing and planned oil terminals in the Russian part of the Barents Euro-Arctic Region. The purpose of this extended and updated report is to provide the reader with new and additional information. We believe this is of crucial importance as the organisation of the oil shipment through the Barents Sea is constantly changing. The report presents the ongoing oil transportation activities in the time period from 2002 to 2004 in the Russian part of the Barents Region. Moreover, the report gives an overview of the oil production and transport systems, as well as some environmental aspects of the oil shipment.

For more information, please, contact the authors:

Alexei Bambulyak, phone (mob.) +7 9217 260468, e-mail alexei.bambulyak@svanhovd.no
 Bjørn Frantzen, phone (mob.) +47 9154 1188, e-mail bjorn.frantzen@svanhovd.no

The present-day situation and prospects for the development of the indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East: An independent expert report .

Novossibirsk: Institute of Archeology and Ethnography of the Siberian Academy of Sciences Publ. 2004. - 184 pp. In Russian.

An independent expert report has been prepared by the leading specialists of Moscow and Saint-Petersburg; edited by V.A. Tishkov, Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences. On the basis of the newest statistical data and original field materials, a wide range of important issues of the life of indigenous peoples in all the regions of the Russian North are addressed, including ethnic composition and demography, the environment and natural resources, economy and social sphere, health and medico-social problems, folk crafts, administrative structure and self-administration, legal framework for development, the language situation and educational problems, spiritual culture and religion.

The book is designed for specialists on the problems of the North, practical workers of northern regions and all those who care for the life of indigenous peoples of the Russian North.

Protection of the historical environment and traditional lifestyle of the indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation: Potential for regional legislation.

Moscow, 2004. - 40 pp. In Russian.

The publication presents the legislative initiatives of the public movement *Association of the Nenets People Yasavey*, which aims to protect the historical environment and traditional lifestyle of indigenous peoples of the Nenets Autonomous Okrug communicated by the Association to the Assembly of the Deputies of the Nenets Autonomous Okrug.

The legislative initiatives have been prepared with the support of the Association of the Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation with the participation of G.P. Fedorova, an adviser of the Nationalities Committee of the State Duma of the Russian Federation, and O.A. Murashko, expert of the Nationalities Committee of the State Duma of the Russian Federation.

The publication is recommended to associations of indigenous peoples and relevant state authorities of the Russian Federation as a manual guiding legislative initiatives aimed at the protection of the historical environment and traditional lifestyle of the indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East.

The sacred sites of the Arctic. Investigation of the indigenous peoples of the Russian North.

Editors: Tamara Semenova, Stanislav Belikov. In Russian.

The Report and supplements have been published on the RAIPON website: www.raipon.org
 Moscow: RAIPON, 2004. - 184 pp., 16 color illustrations.

The book discusses the results of the project *The Conservation Value of Sacred Sites of Indigenous Peoples of the Arctic: A Case Study in Northern Russia*, fulfilled in 2001-2002 by the Association of the Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation jointly with international organizations.

The publication contains information from the final report of the project supported by the Danish Environmental Protection Agency, data on the studies performed in two model areas: the Yamalo-Nentskiy Autonomous Okrug and Koryak Autonomous Okrug by representatives of indigenous peoples.

The publication is of interest to a wide range of readers: indigenous communities, students of the traditional culture of indigenous peoples, governmental organizations and NGOs concerned with natural and cultural heritage conservation.

The voluntary guiding principles of Aguei-Gu in conducting cultural, environmental and social studies of the consequences of the proposed implementation of projects at sacred sites and also on the lands and in water areas occupied or used by indigenous people or local communities.

Moscow., 2004. - 36 pp. In Russian.

The booklet is recommended as a manual for governmental organizations and NGOs in solving the problems of making assessments of cultural, environmental and social consequences of the implementation of projects in residence areas of the indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East and also in working out agreements where those projects are implemented.

Indigenous peoples under conditions of intensive exploitation of energy resources of the Khanty-Mansiyskiy Autonomous Okrug: present conditions and prospects

S.Kh. Khaknazarov

Ed. by A.M. Letuvninkas. - Tomsk: Tomsk University Publ. 2003. - 172 pp. 11 color illustrations. In Russian.

The problem addresses the combination in the present-day industrial society of the three following factors: exploitation of energy and mineral resources, environmental protection and survival of indigenous peoples of the North, as exemplified by the Khanty-Mansiyskiy Autonomous Okrug. Two major problems are considered: the eco-geochemical condition of the environment of the indigenous peoples of the North of the Khanty-Mansiyskiy Autonomous Okrug; and conflicts between the subsoil users and indigenous Northern people over joint utilization of natural resources.

Designed for a wide range of readers: researchers, ecologists, economists, sociologists, students and all those interested in the development of the Yugor Region.

The Shor National Park: Nature, people and prospects

Institute of Coal and Coal Chemistry Studies, Siberian Division, Russian Academy of Science.

Kemerovo, 2003. - 356 pp. In Russian.

This monograph discusses the results of long-term studies of nature and the population of the Shor National Nature Park. Modern problems are defined in the study of various groups of animals and plants, demographic and social structure of the population. The experience of the integration into social and political structure of the state at different historical stages of the Shor indigenous peoples is considered.

The present monograph is the first stage of the ongoing research program: *Integrated Expedition for Kuzbas Research*.

The regional ethnic policy: Historical experience and criteria for the assessment of effectiveness.

Institute of Coal and Coal Chemistry Studies, Siberian Division of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

Kemerovo, vol. 2., 2003. - 302 pp. In Russian.

The collected papers include the materials of the international conference «Regional Ethnic Policy: Historical Experiences and Assessment Criteria», held by the Department of Ethnic Policy and Social Relations on 23-26 November 2002 in the city of Kemerovo. The papers are concerned with integrated studies of the social processes, the history of ethnic policy, modern problems of traditional indigenous subsistence, the education system in ethnic districts, and the conservation of the language and culture.

The interim results of studies on these problems were first published in 2000: *Traditional Systems of Subsistence and Regional Ethnic Policy*, edited by A.N. Sadovnikov and M.N. Gemuev. Novosibirsk. Siberian Division, Russian Academy of Sciences, vol.1.

The reindeer is always right. Investigations in legal anthropology.

Exec. Ed. N.I. Novikova.

Moscow. Strategiya Publ., 2003. - 320 pp. In Russian.

The collected papers are based on lectures delivered at the Third International Summer School on Legal Anthropology (19-24 August, Saint-Petersburg - Pushkin). The school was concerned with the protection and utilization of natural resources and the rights of indigenous peoples to reindeer herding as their current subsistence base. The lecturers analyzed the solution to this problem in terms of international law as well as in terms of the ethnic common law of Russia and Norway. Summer schools are of particular importance since they investigate the rights of indigenous peoples in a broad context of human rights and legal pluralism and focus on the possibility of taking into account the traditions and customs of indigenous peoples in the protection, including legal protection, of their rights to traditional subsistence.

The book is of interest to politicians, lawyers, ethnographers, historians and activists of ethnic and cultural movements.

Series: Library of Indigenous Peoples of the North (Russian Indigenous Training Center, RITC):

Economic and managerial foundations of the activities of the organization

T.B. Bocharnikova

Manual for Communities of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation. Series: Vol. 1. Moscow, 2004. 231 pp. (RITC). In Russian.

Indigenous peoples of the North: Lessons of self-organization and social partnership.

O.A. Aksenova.

Vol. 2. Moscow, 2004. 110 pp. (RITC). In Russian.

The rights of the indigenous peoples of the North to the land and natural resources: Effective utilization and joint management.

A.A. Maksimov

Vol. 3. Moscow, 2005. 89 pp. (RITC)

Book keeping and taxation

Ed.: T.B. Bocharnikova

Textbook for indigenous communities of Russia.

Vol. 4. Moscow, 2005. 126 pp. (RITC). In Russian.

Working with donor organisations

Mads Fægteborg

Handbook for indigenous communities of Russia.

Vol. 5. Moscow, 2005. 130 pp. (RITC). In Russian.

Review of international law and standards on human rights, sustainable development and protection of the rights of indigenous peoples

Eds.: P.V. Sulyandziga & M.A. Todyshev

Vol. 6. Moscow, 2005. 210 pp. (RITC). In Russian.

Review of activities of special agencies of the United Nations concerning indigenous peoples.

Edited by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights

Series: Library of Indigenous Peoples of the North, vol. 7.

Moscow, 2005. 160 pp. (RITC). In Russian.

Review of laws and statutory acts of the Arctic countries protecting the rights of indigenous peoples: Agreements and resolutions

Ed.: P.V. Sulyandziga

Vol. 8. Moscow, 2005. 155 pp. (RITC). In Russian.

CONFERENCES:

3-5 October 2005:

Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Applying Principles of Sustainability to Inhabited Wilderness Resource Management (at 8th World Wilderness Congress)

Anchorage, Alaska

Call for Posters

The poster session will be held as part of the working session "**Evolving Relationships Between People and Wilderness**" at the 8th World Wilderness Congress (30 Sept. – 6 Oct.). The working sessions of the conference will be held in Anchorage Alaska from 3-5 October 2005.

This poster session will be interactive and participants will:

- through their posters share knowledge concerning traditional resource management and sustainable use of wild resources from their region of the world,
- work with other participants to develop a list of principles utilized by various cultures world-wide for managing their traditional harvests and maintaining wilderness use areas, and

- in a group brainstorm ways to apply these principles to modern resource management or human activities in wilderness areas.

A panel of discussants will review session findings and provide recommendations for incorporating indigenous principles into contemporary wilderness and resource management.

Participants are invited to submit abstracts of 500 words or less for their poster that details concepts and practices reflecting the traditional ecological and local knowledge of groups with whom they work.

Abstract Submission Deadline: Sunday, 31 July 2005

Send to: Davin Holen

Division of Subsistence

Alaska Department of Fish and Game

333 Raspberry Road

Anchorage, AK 99518

E-mail: davin_holen@fishgame.state.ak.us

Further information:

http://www.8wwc.org/program/gen_program.htm

MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES

End of September 2005:

**Snowchange 2005:
Indigenous and Local Observations of Ecological and
Climate Change**
Anchorage, Alaska

The independent Snowchange Organization based in Finland is pleased to offer this Pre-Announcement of "Snowchange 2005" in Anchorage, Alaska. It follows the spirit and intent of the previous Snowchange Conferences in Tampere, Finland (2002) and Murmansk, Russia (2003). Over the next months, further information on programme, travel, visa, and other issues will be available at: <http://www.snowchange.org>.

The purpose of this workshop is to highlight voices from communities in the changing Arctic. The Arctic Climate Impact Assessment of the Arctic Council was released in November 2004 in Iceland. It confirms facts that local and indigenous communities of the Arctic have witnessed over several years – snow and ice, our worlds are changing and fast. The message is out now. This workshop will go further by bringing people together to share experiences with scientists, conservation organizations, and other stakeholders.

Organizers are pleased to invite people of different cultures, societies, and communities of the Arctic to join hands in finding solutions to the problems at hand. Of special interest will be voices from northeast Siberia where Snowchange worked with Even, Yukagir, and other indigenous groups as well as voices of change from Iengra, a Siberian Evenki community. Organizers look forward welcoming delegations from these regions, as well as other groups of the Arctic to this special event. Limited travel support is available; priority will be given to the indigenous delegations from the Russian Federation.

Contacts:

Vickie Steere, Head of the Preparatory Committee, Snowchange, Anchorage, Alaska, USA, e-mail: vsteere@alaska.net
Henry Huntington, Independent Researcher, Eagle River, Alaska, USA, e-mail: hph@alaska.net
Tero Mustonen, Project Manager, Snowchange, Finland, e-mail: tero@snowchange.org

Further information: <http://www.snowchange.org>

15-19 September 2005

**Beringia Days Conference:
Tourism, Natural Heritage, Cultural Heritage, and
Traditions and Modern Ways**
Anadyr, Chukotka, Russia

The proposed theme of this year's Beringia Days is "Tourism, Natural Heritage, Cultural Heritage, and Traditions and Modern Ways." In addition to the conference, the "All Russia Native Sports Games" will be held in Anadyr in mid September and conference participants will have an opportunity to view some of the competitions.

Conference Background

Beginning in 1998, the National Park Service conducted an annual international Beringia Days conference in Anchorage, Alaska. The conference celebrates the natural and cultural heritage shared by Russia and the United States across the Bering Strait. It became an open forum for National Park Service funded Beringian project participants and other interested parties to report on their work, to learn about other research in the region, and to promote open communication and cooperation in the Central Beringia area. In 2003, the Administration of the Chukotka Autonomous Region agreed to alternately host the conference with Alaska. The first conference was held in Anadyr that September.

Valid passport information will need to be submitted to the conference organizers by **Thursday, 30 June 2005**.

Contacts:

Peter Richter, e-mail: peter_richter@nps.gov, phone: 907-644-3601
Katerina Wessels, e-mail: katerina_wessels@nps.gov, phone: 907-644-3602

Further information: <http://www.nps.gov/akso/beringia>

Translations from «Мир коренных народов – живая арктика (Indigenous Peoples' World – Living Arctic)»

According to an agreement between ANSIPRA and RAIPON (Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North), we present translations of selected articles of the newsletter «Мир коренных народов – живая арктика» (Indigenous Peoples' World – Living Arctic), the official periodical of RAIPON. The following part of this issue presents translated articles from Indigenous Peoples' World No. 15, 2004.

Indigenous peoples of the North: Results of the 2002 general census and political situation. Interpretation of 2002 census results

D. Bogoyavlenskiy and O. Murashko

Results of the 2002 general census

Statistical data, including census information, should be treated prudently¹. It is important to understand their context, especially regarding to the peoples of the North. As a matter of fact, the populations' census figures are not influenced by natural movement and interethnic processes alone. Administrative decisions and changes in the definition of ethnic groups at the time of the census, as well as simple inaccuracies or mistakes are significant in this respect. What is more, mistakes hardly noticeable with regard to larger peoples lead to considerable fluctuations in the dynamics of the total numbers of the numerically small indigenous Northerners.

Regretfully, there has so far been no information about the distribution of the Northern peoples by regions, but we cannot say for sure that such data are absent in the latest census.

natural growth of population (the difference between birth rate and death rate) to their numbers according to the latest census, with due account of migration figures.

While not being allured by the accuracy of such calculations, let us have a look at the indices of natural movement of the Northern peoples covering the last 20 years.

So far the Northern peoples differ from others in their birthrate exceeding their deathrate, while the opposite is true among the majority of Russia's population. At the same time there was a profound decrease of natural growth due to a sharp reduction in fertility while the death rate remained practically unchanged. The dynamics of birthrate and deathrate among the Northern peoples in the 1990s is reminiscent of the situation in the 1970s – the period of demographic crisis for these peoples. The decrease of infant deathrate in recent years could be a little encouraging if its level were not compared with that of Russia's entire

	Born alive	Dead	Natural growth	Infant death rate**
1984-1988	30.2	10.5	19.7	41.1
1989-1993	25.7	10.8	14.8	30.4
1994-1998	19.8	12.6	7.2	32.5
1999-2002	17.6	11.7	5.9	27.6

Table 1. Natural movement of Russia's Northern peoples (per 1,000)*

* the number of population worked out on the basis of the 1989 census was used to calculate the estimates

** per 1,000 born alive

What is the demographic situation facing the peoples of the North today, and to what extent has the population census reflected it?

Owing to the fact that in the USSR (and until lately in Russia) many documents have been used to register personal ethnicity (entries about ethnic affiliation made in passports, economic management registers in the rural areas as well as in the death and birth records, etc.) making it possible to calculate the total population number of individual peoples the way it is done with current calculations of the entire population, in other words, by adding the

population (15.6 in 1999-2001) or the estimates for foreign indigenous Northerners (about 16 in Greenland in 1997-2001 and less than 7 among Alaskan aborigines in 2000).

The constancy of the general index of mortality can hardly be evidence of stable mortality². It is doubtful that it remained like that while life expectancy in this country as a whole (an indicator of reverse mortality) was reduced from almost 70 years in 1988 to 64 in 1994 and 65 in 2001. However, even in the "good years" of 1988-1989, the life expectancy was 60 years³ among the Northern peoples or

¹ Even regarding the country's total population there is a tangible disparity in the figures of Census 2002 and the current records amounting to 1,800,000, while the results of the census in the Chechen Republic are, mildly speaking, dubious. However, there are no other data, and there will not be any until the next census.

² More accurate measurements are required, such as the average life expectancy, but it is impossible to calculate them until the detailed data of the 2002 census have been published.

³ D.D. Bogoyavlenskiy: Demographic problems of numerically small peoples of the North // Russia's population. The Second Annual Demographic Report. Ed. A.G. Vishnevskiy. M., Eurasia, 1994.

MIR KORENNYKH NARODOV

Northern peoples	Census of population		Growth according to census	Natural growth	Difference ("non-demographic growth")
	1989	2002			
Total	181517	212489	30972	25938	5034
Khant	22283	28773	6490	3620	2870
Mansi	8279	11573	3294	780	2514
Evenk	29901	35377	5476	3687	1789
Itelmen	2429	3474	1045	52	993
Selkup	3564	4367	803	98	705
Kets	1084	1891	807	145	662
Saami	1835	2132	297	-81	378
Nivkhi	4631	5287	656	380	276
Ulta (Orok)	179	432	253	6	247
Yukagir	1112	1529	417	174	243
Tofa	722	1020	298	58	240
Negidal	587	806	219	15	204
Enets	198	327	129	0	129
Nanai	11883	12355	472	354	118
Orochi	883	884	1	-19	20
Aleut	644	592	-52	18	-70
Eskimo	1704	1798	94	169	-75
Chuvan	1384	1300	-84	90	-174
Ulchi	3173	3098	-75	160	-235
Dolgan	6584	7330	746	1014	-268
Udege	1902	1665	-237	96	-333
Nganasan	1262	879	-383	58	-441
Koryak	8942	9077	135	587	-452
Chukchi	15107	15827	720	1814	-1094
Nenets	34190	41454	7264	8849	-1585
Even	17055	19242	2187	3814	-1627

Table 2. Natural movement of the Northern peoples in 1989-2002. (Peoples are arranged by size of "non-demographic growth")

ten years less than in the country as a whole. For the sake of comparison, it could be noted that at the time life expectancy was about 65 years in Greenland and about 69 for the indigenous population of Alaska.

The above can be summed up in this way: the highest mortality is registered among the Northern peoples in a country with a shamefully high death rate (or, if you prefer, with a shamefully low life expectancy) – the highest death rate among the developed countries.

It would seem reasonable to suggest that, taking into consideration both this tendency and the reduced natural growth, the number of Northern peoples should have decreased or increased insignificantly as the 1979 census emphasized in a similar situation in the 1970s. However, according to the 2002 census, the total number of the Northern population has increased dramatically.

One can therefore conclude that assimilation processes have reversed, and now the peoples of the North assimilate other peoples. Local administration calls this process "restoration of ethnicity".

It is possible to correctly sort out the modern ethnodemographic situation among the Northern peoples only by viewing it with regard to each people concerned and to separate territories of their settlement with due account for many socio-economic and administrative/political circumstances. The point is, that having united the Northern peoples into one group and using this term, it is often forgotten that these are very different peoples — even contrary to each other judging by a good deal of their characteristic features. Let's consider one aspect of the demographic situation: namely, comparing separate peoples of the North

in their natural growth during the last period and the growth of their total number according to the data of the last two population censuses of Russia' population as a whole in 1989 and 2002⁴, since the data by regions are not available so far. Let us call the difference between demographic changes and changes according to the census "non-demographic growth (loss)".

We can see that on the whole the Northern peoples have grown by 5,000 due to "non-demographic" reasons. However, it can hardly apply to all the peoples, and their "non-demographic" growths or losses differ greatly.

The Khant and Mansi are distinguished by the size of such growth among separate peoples, their aggregate "non-demographic" growth exceeding the total growth of all the Northern peoples as a whole. Since these peoples experienced a "non-demographic" loss in the past three decades (from the 1959 census to the 1989 census), the existence of large groups of metis population can be assumed. Under conditions where a lot of effort is underway in the Khanty-Mansi Okrug against the background of the current oil boom to foster material support of indigenous peoples, the work of public indigenous organizations is becoming more active, and the growth of ethnic self-consciousness can in

⁴ The state statistical institutions whose data have been used in these calculations elaborate information covering indigenous Northerners not for the country's entire territory but only for the regions of the Far North or the regions inhabited by the Northern peoples. Therefore, a failure is likely to happen when trying to take adequate account of such peoples residing in the regions of habitation, which are not considered to be regions of the Far North (Nanai, Udege, Tofalar).

fact take shape and a greater prestige is likely to be conferred on indigenous ethnicity.

A similar situation observed among Russia's Saami, for whom contacts with their foreign fellow-tribesmen dramatically expanded after the fall of the iron curtain, could well serve as a catalyst for an upsurge in their ethnic self-consciousness. And at the same time, the Saami's birthrate is the lowest among the Northern peoples and their natural growth – to be more exact – their natural loss of population is also the lowest.

The Selkup have a similar situation with their “non-demographic” growth, though in this case, while acknowledging the undoubted existence of numerous metis groups, the possibility of an increase in self-consciousness of a territorially and ethnically scattered people is questionable.

The profound numerical growth of the Itelmens is also difficult to explain: it can be assumed, as a hypothesis, that there has been a change of ethnicity among frontier groups, previously assigned to Koryak, but their calculated loss is not enough, either.

The sharp changes in the number of the Ket and Tofa are also very doubtful. There is no justification for this, in our opinion. It is more likely that these are further mistakes made during the census itself or the processing of its results.

The same can be said about the unprecedented “loss” of the Nganasan – a direct consequence of the fact that during the 1989 census their total number was overestimated (see above).

As to the Evenk, their “non-demographic” growth can be, in our opinion, similarly explained as their mixing up again with the Evens, bearing in mind that their growth almost equals the Even's loss.

The fantastic growth of such peoples as the Ulta (Orok) and Enets can in fact be “the restoration of ethnicity”. Both were registered before the 1989 census as other peoples.

A similar situation occurs among the Enets. During all the censuses they were counted as a part of the Nenets and only the 1989 census registered them as a separate people. One should assume that the increase in their numbers – as impossible as that among the Orok – from a demographic point of view reflects the formation of ethnic self-consciousness of this numerically small Northern people.

The “non-demographic” growth of the Yukagir, going on for over 40 years according to the data of the population censuses, is absolutely inexplicable.

As to other peoples of the North, there has been a non-demographic loss, as during previous censuses. The fact that the Chukchi, Koryak, Chuvan, Eskimo and Aleut are among the peoples “on the decline” is alarming.

Once you digress from possible mistakes and overestimation, there is every reason to believe that we are facing absolutely new tendencies in ethnic processes among indigenous peoples of the North. “Non-demographic” growth has never ever been registered in the postwar period at once among so many indigenous numerically small peoples of the North⁵.

It should be emphasized once again, however, that this growth cannot be a yardstick to measure the demographic situation and in no way does it reflect any improvement of it. The situation among the peoples of the North should still be considered as a crisis, and the level of their mortality disastrously high, even when compared to the extremely negative all-Russian background.

Political situation

The “non-demographic” growth accentuated by demographer D.D. Bogoyavlenskiy assumingly could have been caused by the hopes emerging among the Northern indigenous peoples during the last five years.

Starting in 1999, three federal laws dealing with the rights of indigenous peoples have been adopted, namely: “On Guarantees of Rights of Indigenous Numerically Small Peoples of the Russian Federation”, “On General Principles of Organization of Communities of Indigenous Numerically Small Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation”, and “On Territories of Traditional Nature Use of Indigenous Numerically Small Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation”. These laws guarantee the protection of the primordial habitat and traditional lifestyle of indigenous numerically small peoples, the right to organize communities with tax benefits for traditional nature use, gratuitous use of land of traditional habitation and economic activities, participation of indigenous numerically small peoples in co-governance of natural resources on territories of their traditional habitation and economic activities.

But the practical implementation of the RF government's policy prevailing since 2001 has showed with sufficient evidence that the RF government has failed to execute these federal laws adopted in 1999-2001.

According to the information collected by regional associations of RAIPON, 246 communities have been legally registered during the past three years of the established federal law, though there are more than 700 villages with concentrated indigenous population in Russia.

In some administrative units of RF there is not a single registered community, while in others there are dozens and even hundreds of them, like in the Khanty-Mansi Okrug, though their majority still remain unregistered according to the existing legislation. It has not yet been determined which state body should be responsible for the registration of communities or the issuing of law-making standards with regard to their concessional taxation. The consequent legal instruments concerning communities are intentionally intricate. Hence, in some regions it is assumed that communities should be registered in state legal bodies, while in others it is believed to be the matter of tax inspectorates. In some regions communities are exempt from taxation and free from charges, while other communities are facing exorbitant claims in connection with taxes, and communities are forced to go into liquidation.

During the three years since the federal law on Territories of Traditional Nature Use (TTNU; adopted in May 2001) went into effect, not a single TTNU under federal administration has been formed, while the majority of land incorporating TTNUs is land of federal subordination. All the applications to establish TTNUs have been met with the RF government's refusal. In some regions, regional governments have formed TTNUs under regional administra-

⁵ Constant “non-demographic” growth was witnessed, as already noted, among the Yukagirs. There were cases of such a growth among the Dolgans. But the most profound growth of this kind happened among the Evenks and Evens in Sakha (Yakutia) in 1979-1989.

tion. For example, there are about 500 in the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug; traditionally they are still called "lineage-based kinship areas" covering about 26 percent of the Okrug's territory, but more than 40 percent of these lineage-based kinship areas have already been leased to oil companies on long-term contracts. There are seven of them in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug. They are large-scale reindeer breeding units formed on the basis of defunct sovkhoses (Soviet state-operated farms), whose grazing areas cover about 60 percent of the Okrug's territory. And these TTNUs are threatened by a gradual leasing handover to oil companies. The RF government has already sold licenses for oil and gas production in sectors included in the TTNUs. The RF government holds that the establishment of regional TTNUs is illegal. The tax assessment authority demands TTNU rental payment from communities. On one hand, it is legally fair in accordance with the new RF Land Code, but on the other, it contradicts the federal law "On Payment for Land" in accordance with which Northern indigenous peoples are relieved from payment for land. The intentional confusion in the laws creates uncertainty among indigenous peoples about their future, and leads to closing down their communities.

There is not a single TTNU in the Far East with the exception of the Khabarovskiy Territory, where the RF government also questions the legality of TTNU establishment.

The RF Ministry of Defense holds that the right given to indigenous numerically small peoples to substitute service in the armed forces with alternative work in some traditional spheres of activity (the Federal law "On Guarantees of Rights of Numerically Small Indigenous Peoples of the Russian Federation" was adopted in 1999) is illegal. Even after the confirmation of this right by the Federal Law on the Service in the Armed Forces carried into effect in February 2004, this right is violated everywhere. The local authorities do not know what should be considered to be "traditional types of activity".

The authorities in the regions where the rights of indigenous peoples are violated or not implemented explain their actions by the fact that they have not received any elucidation from the RF government as to how to execute these laws.

The ecological environment of indigenous peoples' habitation is systematically disturbed.

Offshore oil production operations started in 1996 in Sakhalin have already deteriorated the quality of the environment in traditional settlement areas of indigenous peoples, the quality of marine bioresources known to be the indigenous peoples' main food.

RAIPON has repeatedly approached the RF government with letters about the unacceptability of worsening the ecological situation in the seas of the Far East. RAIPON has become one of the claimants mounting a lawsuit against the RF government for defense of the habitat of gray whales in the Sea of Okhotsk.

At present, RAIPON is receiving information about the full-scale realization of the state program of offshore oil and gas production in the Far East – a program which has not been submitted to public evaluation until now, as well as about the pipeline construction project from Sakhalin all across the Khabarovskiy and Primorskiy territories and over the border, and about oil and gas production projects

and oil pipelines construction in Chukotka and Buryatia. These projects will have and already have an inevitable impact on the territories of traditional habitation and economic activities of 14 indigenous numerically small peoples of the Far East (the Chukchi, Even, Evenk, Koryak, Itelmen, Kamchadal, Nivkhi, Nanai, Negidal, Oroch, Alyutor, Ulchi, Udege). Nonetheless, these projects have not been discussed with indigenous representatives, and the opinion of the local population and indigenous inhabitants has not been taken into account during the projects' realization.

In March 2003 a letter came from the president of the Sakhalin Association of Indigenous Peoples about the beginning of prospecting operations in the Piltunskiy Bay, which is an area where traditional fishing takes place. RAIPON reacted to this letter by sending an inquiry to the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR). It has become known from the MNR's answer that the oil company, a branch of Exxon, carried out prospecting operations not only without coming to any agreement with the local indigenous peoples, but even prior to getting a positive conclusion of an environmental expert evaluation. Nonetheless, MNR justifies the company's actions and informs RAIPON that prospecting has been carried out without any infringements ("Mir korennnykh narodov – Zhivaya Arktika", No. 13).

The construction of a gas pipeline along the western seashore of Kamchatka is a serious violation of rights of Kamchatkan indigenous peoples. The gas pipeline construction commenced in 1999 without environmental expert evaluations, public hearings or agreements with indigenous peoples' organizations. The construction went on in 2003. The gas pipeline goes from the north to the south all across the upper reaches of spawning rivers and hunting grounds which used to be traditional areas of nature use by indigenous peoples. By constructing this gas pipeline, which is expected to provide Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy with gas (but so far has not done so), the administration of the Kamchatkan Region with the silent consent of the RF government has violated every standard with regard to observation of the rules of environmental safety, conducting environmental expert evaluations and the rights of the population to information.

In 2002-2003, the MNR issued licenses for gold prospecting on the river Tymlat, for offshore oil and gas prospecting along the eastern coastline of Kamchatka (Koryak Autonomous Okrug), opened for bidding and nominated winners to receive licenses for the development of the Shanuchskiy copper and nickel deposits and the Asachinskiy gold mines (Kamchatka). All these development sites are located on the territories of traditional habitation and economic activities of Kamchatkan indigenous peoples who were never consulted.

Felling of Far Eastern forests with participation of transnational companies not only destroys the environment of several Far Eastern regions, but also undermines the foundation of traditional nature use of more than 30,000 representatives of indigenous peoples engaged in hunting, gathering and fishing there.

Information about the experience gained by the organizations of indigenous peoples residing in the forests of the Bikin river basin is published in issue No. 4 of the journal "Mir korennnykh narodov – Zhivaya Arktika".

In 2001, the administration of the Primorskiy Territory opened for bidding on woodcutting and leased for 25 years to the "Terneyles" Company a section of primordial forests in the Samarga river basin which earlier, in 1992, had been reserved for the establishment of an ethnic territory for the local Udege people, who conduct a traditional lifestyle there. The community of the Samarga Udege lodged a complaint, being convinced that the leasing deal was illegal. At the same time, timber cutting companies started assaulting the virgin forests of the Udege in the Bikin area. The administration of the Primorskiy Territory is looking into the question of closing or reducing the territory of the nature reserve established in 1998 in order to expand industrial felling in this area ("Mir korennykh narodov – Zhivaya Arktika", No. 13).

In Buryatia, long before the ecological expert assessment, the contractors of the Yukos Company began operations connected with the construction of the Angarsk-Datsin oil pipeline. The protests of the indigenous and local population did not reach the government. The referendum of residents of the Zakamenskiy District inhabited by Evenk people was fixed for December 2002, but the authorities foiled the plans ("Mir korennykh narodov – Zhivaya Arktika", No. 13).

RAIPON has repeatedly called the attention of the RF president, RF government, and the RF Federal Assembly to these violations, and suggested ways to solve the problems by setting up a federal body focused on indigenous peoples and adopting necessary changes in and supplements to the existing legislation. All the proposals made by RAIPON,

despite the favorable disposition of the RF president and RF Federal Assembly, have been blocked by the RF government as economically inexpedient ("Mir korennykh narodov – Zhivaya Arktika", No. 14). Nonetheless, RAIPON remains active, monitoring all violations of law, appealing to the RF president, the RF Federal Assembly and the RF Procurator-General, as well as engaging in legal education of indigenous peoples and lawmaking activities ("Mir korennykh narodov – Zhivaya Arktika", Nos. 13, 14).

However, an active public organization is hardly enough to solve the above problems. They will not be solved until a special body is established within the framework of the RF government, authorized to deal with the affairs of indigenous numerically small peoples and bearing responsibility for the implementation of federal legislation. The last reorganization of the RF government, which took place in March 2004, has shown that the authority and responsibility for the problems of indigenous peoples have been dispersed again across the departments of various ministries. In other words, the state power has not yet demonstrated any willpower to solve problems of indigenous peoples.

In case such a policy of state power continues, the reduction of the number of communities of indigenous numerically small peoples might be followed by a reduction of the number of the population identifying itself as indigenous numerically small peoples of the North. Thus, the next census might discover a sharp reduction of the number of indigenous numerically small peoples of the North caused by political rather than demographic reasons.

A workshop in Chukotka: "Survey of Living Conditions in the Arctic: The Inuit, Saami and Numerically Small Indigenous Peoples of Chukotka"

Compiled by L. Abryutina, Vice-President of RAIPON

The Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON) along with an international group of researchers conducted an interviewers' training workshop within the framework of the project "*Survey of Living Conditions in the Arctic: The Inuit, Saami and Numerically Small Indigenous Peoples of Chukotka*" (SLICA) in Anadyr, Chukotkan Autonomous Okrug, on 15-19 April 2004.

The workshop was organized with financial support from the University of Alaska, while prerequisites for the workshop were provided by the so-called non-commercial partnership "Chukotkan Group of Support for Scientific Research".

The major objective of the workshop was to prepare interviewers who would be entrusted with the task of carrying out survey interviews of the population and filling in the survey sheets in their districts. All the interviewers were representatives of indigenous numerically small peoples of Chukotka, thus reflecting concrete realization of the principle of partnership between researchers and indigenous peoples.

Fifteen participants from various districts of Chukotka, two from Moscow and two foreign visitors, Jack and Margaret Cruise, scientists from the Institute of Social and

Economic Research, University of Alaska, Anchorage attended the workshop.

Representatives of the following institutions were invited to attend: the Okrug's and Anadyr associations of Chukotkan Indigenous Peoples, the Elders' Council, the Chukotkan section of ICC, the Department of Affairs of Numerically Small Indigenous Peoples of Chukotka, the Chief Directorate of Health, and the Research Center "Chukotka".

Dr. Larissa Ivanovna Abryutina, vice-president of RAIPON and Candidate of Political Sciences, was responsible for organizing the workshop.

The project's prehistory

The Arctic Leaders' Summit was held in Moscow on 15-16 September 1999 to deal with problems of health of the aboriginal population in the Arctic region.

At the same time, an international scientific conference was held in Moscow focusing on the discussion of priority guidelines of scientific research aimed at the solution of key problems of indigenous peoples of the Russian North. The International Arctic Science Committee, the Russian Academy of Sciences, and RAIPON initiated this confer-

ence with the support and active participation of the RF State Committee for the North.

The summit and conference participants devoted great attention to the problems of worsening health and demographic indicators of the Northern aboriginal population, which is, to a considerable degree, caused by unfavorable socio-economic conditions for vital activity.

In this connection, the workshop participants considered it necessary to carry out international research into the conditions of life of indigenous peoples in the Arctic region. In particular, an international project called “*Survey of Living Conditions in the Arctic: The Inuit, Saami and Numerically Small Indigenous Peoples of Chukotka*” was approved.

The summit of leaders of indigenous peoples of the Arctic also approved this project. It was decided that the project would cover the Murmansk region and the Chukotkan Autonomous Okrug in the territory of Russia.

The SLICA project commenced in the Western regions of the Arctic: in Denmark (Greenland), Norway, Sweden, Finland, Canada, U.S.A. (Alaska) and is close to completion. At present, the project is to be carried out in the territory of the Chukotkan Autonomous Okrug. RAIPON holds that the project is a timely undertaking. The project will, without doubt, facilitate making the existing problems more precise, correlate them with corresponding problems in the Arctic across the border and identify ways to overcome problems of health and ecology, thus creating favorable demographic prospects.

The establishment and development of partnership relations between indigenous peoples of the North, scientists and authorities to foster the creation of a new spirit of harmonious development of the Arctic in the 21st century are among the project’s most significant aspects.

Agreement between Primore RAIPON branch and the timber company “Terneyles”

P. Sulyandziga, 1st Vice-President of RAIPON

See also ANSIPRA Bulletin No. 10a (2003), p. 13; Bulletin No. 11-12 (2004) p. 25

An agreement on interaction and cooperation between the Association of Northern Indigenous Peoples of the Primorskiy Kray and the open joint-stock company “Terneyles” was signed in Vladivostok on 27 May 2004.

This event was not noticed at Federal Russian level in any significant way (though it was an episode of great importance for the Primorskiy Kray), but it seems to me that the signing of such an agreement is a cornerstone on the way to a solid foundation of mechanisms to defend the rights and interests of indigenous peoples in the Russian Federation.

A lot of effort has already been made by indigenous peoples’ organizations, first and foremost by our regional and ethnic associations to solidify this foundation. To name a few, these are:

- active participation in the process of development and adoption of three special laws at the federal level;
- the acquisition of rights of legislative initiative by the Association of the Nenets People “Yasavey” and the Kamchatkan Regional Association;
- the assignment of a special representative of indigenous peoples in Sakhalin’s regional Duma;
- the creation of mechanisms to come to an agreement with associations and communities concerning state development programs of indigenous peoples and allocation of fishing and hunting quotas;
- the cooperation agreements signed by associations with the governors of the Magadan and Sakhalin regions;
- the agreement between RAIPON and the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, the Ministry for Natural Resources and the Ministry of Culture;

and many others. Not to mention the Yamalo-Nenets and Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrugs, where the actual point now is not the foundations, but the beginning of giving the already constructed buildings of cooperation the finishing touches inside.

Why would I like to share my experience of signing the agreement in the Primorskiy Kray? First, of course, because I know well enough the essence of what has happened. We have been paving the way to this agreement for more than ten years. It seems to me that one of the most important lessons of these relations is the mutual education of the parties. It all started, as usual in Russia, with a war, hostilities, and distrust. Second, many principle aspects are contained in the agreement which ought to be a guideline for negotiation between organizations of indigenous peoples and industrial companies. The main thing is that the signing did not take place under pressure of either of the parties or through force of circumstances, but by mutual consent.

What are the aspects of principle I wanted to emphasize? The signed agreement is general and specifies principles of our mutual relations. The agreement makes it possible for us to come to terms about signing four additional agreements. Three of them will deal with the development of concrete communities in three districts of the Territory where indigenous peoples reside and units of “Terneyles” operate. The fourth agreement will deal with the establishment of the development fund for Northern indigenous peoples in the Primorskiy Kray, with an annual contribution by the “Terneyles” company. It is important that additional agreements for the development of communities be elaborated and signed by communities and various subordinate units of the company, while the company undertakes obligations to follow international principles and standards

in the field of defense of indigenous peoples' rights and environmental protection.

The agreement also incorporates a paragraph taken from the recent decision of the Conference of the Parties, the Convention on Protection of Biodiversity about the obligatory nature of ethnological impact assessments while carrying out development projects of natural resources on indigenous peoples' territories.

Further, I would like to point out that the "Terneyles" company has no operations in two out of the three districts, and it is not planning to operate on territories economically used by our communities. Its industrial operations go on in adjacent areas, and the company's willingness to sign agreements with these communities is in recognition of the fact that in the past the entire territory was an area of traditional nature use and economic activities of indigenous peoples, and that indigenous peoples were forced to reduce

their traditional activity under pressure of industry. In this connection, the company undertakes both moral and financial obligations. The fact that the company has included a paragraph about employing an adviser in the company to supervise the work with indigenous peoples provides evidence that the agreement is not simply a PR-action.

It serves as evidence of a long-term strategic approach to cooperation with indigenous peoples on the part of the company. There are various paragraphs in the prepared draft agreements with the communities dealing with hiring, social obligations, etc., but I believe that it would be better for the readers to get acquainted with the original texts of all the agreements, which hopefully will be published in our journal at a later date. In my opinion, various positive experiences like this are extremely important for our progress.

Development of traditional nature use in Gornaya Shoriya

A. Arbachakov, Director, Kemerovo Regional Social Organization (KRSO) "Agency for Taiga Research and Preservation (AIST)"

The federal law "On Territories of Traditional Nature Use (TTNU) of numerically small indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation" was adopted in May 2001. To implement the law it is envisaged that the government of the Russian Federation will approve the statute regulating the legal regime of the establishment and utilization of TTNU. Despite numerous appeals to the government of the Russian Federation by the Chambers of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, bodies of state power of subunits of the Russian Federation, and social organizations representing the interests of Northern indigenous peoples, this statute has not been approved by the government of the Russian Federation. Thus, not only is the federal law not implemented for this reason, but also very important work has been brought to a halt in the subunits of the Russian Federation, which tried within the framework of their competence to solve this problem. For instance, laws "On the legal status of numerically small indigenous peoples in the Kemerovo Region" and "On land of traditional nature use of numerically small indigenous peoples in the Kemerovo Region" were adopted. Proposals about the establishment of a TTNU in Gornaya Shoriya and a financial allocation, and, in this connection, of a number of land-use-related works have been submitted by the administration of the Kemerovo Region to the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) engaged in the GEF project "Preservation of biological diversity in the Sayan-Altai eco-region".

Due to the gaps in the existing legislation and the lack of interest on the part of some functionaries, Shor families and communities are unable to establish a TTNU on the land to which they have historical rights. The majority of the Shors know nothing about existing laws and normative documents, or the procedure of formalizing an application to set up a TTNU. Conflict situations occur on the territory of the Shor National Park formed in December 1989. Traditional nature use in the greater part of its territory is not stipulated

in its statute and the environmental regime. At the same time, there are villages within the boundaries of the park, and the villagers are forced to violate its environmental regime in order to pursue their traditional lifestyle.

The formation of a well conceived system of territories of traditional nature use in the Kemerovo Region could become one of the most important measures for giving an impetus to the development of the situation in real terms. Apart from the adoption of additional normative documents, it is vital to determine the procedures for identifying the boundaries of the territory of traditional nature use; for establishing an optimal regime of nature use, making it possible to preserve and develop traditions of the people in accordance with the principles of sustainable development; for establishing the territory's status without infringing the rights of the non-indigenous population; and the procedure for liquidation of the TTNU.

In 2003, the Kemerovo Regional Social Organization "Agency for Taiga research and preservation (AIST)", with the support of the Association of the Shor People, set about the preparation of a feasibility study for the establishment of a TTNU in Gornaya Shoriya. The objective of this effort is to identify the major criteria of establishing the TTNU: its subjects, the mechanism of forming its borders, and a recommended regime of rational nature use. Historical, ecological and economic prerequisites have been studied while preparing the feasibility report, which, in turn, includes the following:

historical:

- lineage-based kinship principle in the distribution of industrial areas used by the Shors;
- historically formed traditional types of nature use on the territory of Gornaya Shoriya;
- contemporary settlement and economic activity of indigenous population;

ecological:

- the availability of natural resources in the suggested territory sufficient for traditional economic activity;
- the availability of ecosystem sectors substantially unchanged by economic activity;
- relatively large diversity of landscapes and the ensuing diversity of flora and fauna;
- suitability of the territory for development of alternative types of nature use, for example recreation;

economic:

- the absence of industrial nature use;
- the accessibility of the territory through communications in its vicinity or periphery;
- the existence of a possibility that the change of priorities of nature use in the territory would not, at least, worsen the district's economic situation and welfare but, on the contrary, would serve as a catalyst for its economic development.

We deemed it important to be guided by the traditional lineage-based kinship principle of land distribution as the basic criterion in forming the borders of the TTNU and its subject; in other words, the one who would use the territory. Settlement by lineage-based kinship principle has formed historically due to the traditional subsistence and survival system of the Shors. Therefore, attitudes concerning ownership and use of a definite plot of land have also been formed on the basis of the same principle. The presence of a distinct lineage-based kinship or family structure in the distribution of the Shor population bordering industrial areas in the past can serve as one of the main grounds for the formation of borders of the newly established TTNU. At present, this idea of creating a legal entity as "lineage-based kinship community" is spreading among the Shors. Therefore, it seems expedient to use a lineage-based kinship community or a separate family as the basic economic subject while developing a TTNU in Gornaya Shoriya.

We have considered the results of various research efforts carried out at different times by ethnographers, historians, specialists in Turkic studies and other experts on the territory of Gornaya Shoriya as historical prerequisites for the establishment and development of a TTNU using lineage-based kinship and family principles. The research carried out by Miller, Verbitsky, Potapov, Kimeyev, and Sadovy is of special interest to our work. Their papers present not only descriptions of traditional industries and trades of the Shors, but also cover peculiar features like land-related relations and geographic allocation of Shor tribes (seoks).

Gerard Friedrich Miller was in 1734 one of the first to describe the disposition of settlements (volosts – territorial subdivisions of uyezds) of indigenous population (Tatar peoples) in the Kuznetsk uezd (an administrative subdivision of a Guberniya): "... it should be mentioned in general about the Tatar peoples in the Kuznetsk uezd that they largely stick side by side in certain tribes and small districts... Opposite the city of Kuznetsk, on the southwestern bank of Tom, higher than the mouth of the Kondoma River,

the Abinsk Tatars reside who call themselves Abalars – the name derived from a frequently mentioned little river Aba on which they used to live from times immemorial... the following Tatar districts or volosts... are partly on the Tom River, downwards from Kuznetsk, and on the Chumysh River, partly upwards along the Tom River as far as the border with the Krasnoyarsk uezd, partly on the Mras River and the rivulets flowing into it, partly on the Kondoma River and partly on the Biya River and the Altynskoye Lake along with other locations there..." He identified the following Shor settlements (volosts), whose names were derived from the basic tribes (seoks): Keretskaya, Bogorakova, Moinakova, Sagaiskaya, Bel'tirskaya, Beshbayakova, Yedeyeva, Togoyakova, Yeleiskaya, Blizhnyaya Karga, Kuzesheva Karga, Kyzyl-Karga, Kivinskaya, Izusherskaya, Barsayatskaya, Yetiberskaya, Karacherskaya or Shorskaya, Sholka'skaya, Karginskaya.

Missionary V.I. Verbitsky mentioned the lineage-based kinship character of Shor villages (uluses) in his well-known paper "Altai Non-Russians": "The Altai non-Russians, apart from the official division into dyuchins and volosts, divide themselves into numerous tribes or generations (seoks, kosts). The origin of seoks varies. Some of them have people as their founders, others stem from mountains..."

L.P. Potapov, on the basis of the analysis of the material he gathered in the first half of the 20th century, makes a conclusion about the prevailing role of the Shor tribe in the questions of distribution of hunting and nut-gathering areas and regulation of land-oriented relations: "As we had a chance to become convinced personally during the discussions with elders, each tribe used to earn their living only in their sector of the taiga. The lineage-based kinship ownership of hunting grounds was strictly protected. Trespassing on somebody else's kinship territory was considered a violation of the right of the lineage-based kinship property and was subject to persecution". The researcher noted that the memory of lineage-based kinship ownership of hunting territory is so vivid among the Shors that we could determine its borders without difficulty for a number of seoks. Further on, the scientist makes the following conclusion: "... only recently collective kinship ownership of the basic means of production: land, including hunting grounds and arable land".

The well-known Kemerovo ethnographer V.M. Kimeyev came to a similar conclusion in the 1880s: "By the time of the advent of the Russians to the upper reaches of the Tom River, the exogamous tribe ("seok") was the basic economic unit among the people of the Kuznetsk taiga..." (Kimeyev, 1989). He systematized the data collected by various researchers of Gornaya Shoriya and compiled tables of distribution of the Shors by tribe and seok at different times.

In order to specify the locations of settlement and traditional economic activity of the indigenous population in Gornaya Shoriya in the recent past, we conducted a survey by questioning old-timers in the following villages: Orton, Trekhreche, Ust-Kabyrza, Klyuchevoi, Ust-Anzas, Chuvashka, Biskamzha, Ust-Azas (Shor-Taiga). During the interviews a specially prepared questionnaire was filled in covering the information about the families residing in the villages and about the types and locations of traditional nature use. Data were collected about nature use covering

not only the years of residence of the informant but also the period of time when his or her parents lived. Thus, the collected data could be referred to the beginning or middle of the 20th century. The location of nature use was marked on a topographic map to the scale of 1:200,000. In addition, during the interviews of the old-timers, questions were asked about the distribution of various trades and industries by time, ways and means of hunting, fishing, collecting cedar nuts, agriculture, and cattle breeding. It should be noted that the exclusion of the Kemerovo Region from the Tomsk Region in 1943 resulted in certain hunting areas falling outside its borders, and these began to be used on a non-legitimate basis. Some Shors became inhabitants of the Krasnoyarsk Territory and at a later date the Republic of Khakasiya. In this connection, there are certain difficulties with regard to their involvement in the development process of traditional nature use. In order to receive more objective data, we carried out a survey questioning old-timers in the village of Biskamzha in the territory of the Republic of Khakasiya. It was found that recently (in the 1990s), due to the migration inflow, fellow-villagers or close relatives were coming over to the territory of Khakasiya bordering the Kemerovo Region. Therefore, all the survey data were taken into account while analyzing every factor to prepare the present feasibility study and outline the location of the proposed TTNU. However, the territory of Khakasiya is not taken into account since it is a separate territory within the Russian Federation.

In order to carry out additional analysis of the situation and justify the TTNU, data collected by an ethno-social monitoring group of the Kuzbass Laboratory of Anthropology and Ethnography were used. This laboratory conducted research of trade and industry-oriented land use by the population in the Chilis-Anzas, Ust-Anzas and Ust-Konzas village administrations of the Tashtagolskiy district in 2000-2001. In the opinion of this group's participants, "every village, as a rule, has its own nut-gathering and

hunting territory including both lands for joint use and trade-related areas of individual families". As a result of the interviews of old-timers and the analysis of the present-day situation of nature use by the population of taiga villages to satisfy their own needs, we have come to a similar conclusion about the necessity to allot land areas for joint nature use in the process of outlining the borders of the TTNU.

Well regulated relations in the field of nature use based on national traditions within the framework of the so-called tacit (traditional) law have been formed on the territories densely populated by Shors, predominantly in the Tashtagolskiy district.

The research carried out by the ethno-social monitoring group in 2000-2001 and our own examinations have shown that a well regulated system of use of trade and industry-related areas with their clear-cut distribution between the villages has been formed on many indigenous residence territories. In certain locations intra-village distribution of the territory is also practiced. In this case, closely located land areas are in joint use mainly for meat-procuring hunting and gathering. The main types of nature use determining the value of commercial areas are hunting for fur procurement and cedar nut gathering.

The work to prepare the feasibility study for the establishment of territories of traditional nature use in Gornaya Shoriya is close to completion. Now we are faced with the necessity of dovetailing the final decision with authorities and organizations regulating the problems of land and nature use. We are hopeful that the RF government and RAIPON will at long last formulate their position with regard to the development of traditional nature use and work out an effective mechanism to realize the hopes of all Russia's aborigines. We also hope that this work will foster the establishment of a functioning TTNU in Gornaya Shoriya, which, in turn, will become a milestone for the economic and spiritual revival of the Shor people.

Legal defense of indigenous peoples' right to establish territories of traditional nature use

Yu. Yakel and E. Khmeleva, Legal Center "Rodnik"

The federal law "On territories of traditional nature use of indigenous numerically small peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of RF", adopted in 2001, has secured the right of these peoples to establish territories of traditional nature use (TTNU) and stated that such territories are specially protected nature territories formed for such peoples engaged in traditional nature use and pursuing a traditional lifestyle, in order to preserve and defend the primordial living environment, to preserve and develop these peoples' original culture and to preserve biological diversity in these territories.

The law anticipates the establishment of three types of TTNU: federal, regional and local subordination. However, due to the fact that there are sites and units of federal property on practically all the territories of traditional settlement of indigenous numerically small peoples, the establishment of TTNU on a regional and local scale has become virtually

impossible. Moreover, for this reason, many of the previously established TTNU of regional and local category have been liquidated.

Soon after the adoption of the federal law in 2001 the lawyers of the Legal Center "Rodnik", hand in hand with RAIPON, worked out a draft of the application to the RF government for the establishment of a TTNU of federal type, distributed it among representatives of indigenous numerically small peoples and conducted training workshops on how to write such applications correctly.

As a result of such efforts, dozens of applications have been sent to the RF government on behalf of communities and representatives of indigenous numerically small peoples about the establishment of territories of traditional nature use of federal category.

In accordance with Article 6 of the federal law "On territories of traditional nature use of indigenous numeri-

cally small peoples...”, the decisions about the establishment of TTNU of federal category are made by the RF government.

Unfortunately, indigenous representatives received letters from the RF Ministry of Economic Development and Trade instead of an answer from the RF government. These letters referred to some contradictions allegedly slipped into the Russian legislation on TTNU and to the necessity of introducing changes in the existing laws, elaborating and adopting new legislative and normative enforceable enactments. These circumstances, according to the RF Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, are blocking the possibility of realization at the moment of the Federal law “On territories of traditional nature use of indigenous numerically small peoples...”. At the same time, there has been no refusal to establish concrete TTNU in these letters.

Many of those who have received such answers from the Ministry approached the Legal Center “Rodnik” with a request to render assistance in defending their right to establish TTNU.

Having analyzed these applications and answers of federal authorities, the lawyers of the Legal Center “Rodnik” initiated a series of litigation cases to show the RF government the necessity of changing the policy concerning establishment of TTNU.

According to the lawyers, the RF government has grossly violated the provisions of the RF Constitution and the present federal law, created artificial obstacles to realizing the fundamental right of indigenous peoples and to the defense of their primordial living environment.

Such a position has demonstrated the unwillingness of Russia’s governmental bodies to establish TTNU, which would impose a special legal regime on these territories, prohibiting or limiting industrial activity and, first and foremost, the extraction of economic minerals.

The position of the federal authorities that the law cannot be implemented before certain amendments and normative enforceable enactments are in place, does not justify the violation of citizens’ rights. The law “On territories of traditional nature use ...” became effective in May 2001 and declared the obligation to harmonize the RF government’s normative enforceable enactments with it as appropriate. The fact that the law has not been acted upon throughout the period of three years is an indication of the RF government’s failure to take action in the field of TTNU establishment.

Such an approach has proved total disregard of constitutional principles of the Russian Federation on the part of the supreme bodies of executive power pertaining to the priority of human rights over all other values.

The lacking answer from the RF government to the applications from representatives of indigenous numerically small peoples about the establishment of territories of traditional nature use, from a legal point of view, demonstrates the inertia of the RF supreme executive body of state power.

The objective of a series of litigation cases dealing with the defense of the indigenous peoples’ right to establish TTNU is the creation of precedents in legal practice to influence change in the RF government’s position and the orientation of its activity regarding the principles of respect and observance of constitutional human rights.

The appeal against the refusal to establish the TTNU “Thsanom” became the first case in this series.

In 2002, the lawyers of the Legal Center “Rodnik” handled a law case initiated on the basis of a complaint from representatives of indigenous numerically small peoples and their associations about the inactivity of the RF government with regard to the establishment of the TTNU “Thsanom” in Kamchatka.

The court dismissed the complaint. The appeal against this illegal court ruling at a second appeal instance was not successful either. Having failed to secure defense of this right in the Russian institutions of justice, the lawyers of the Legal Center “Rodnik” have prepared and filed a complaint with the European Court of Human Rights.

For the first time, representatives of indigenous numerically small peoples defended their constitutional right to traditional nature use and conservation of primordial living environment in a courtroom.

Unfortunately, this case was not the last one at bar. The RF government and the RF Ministry of Economic Development and Trade continued to turn down all others applying for the establishment of TTNU.

The issue of rendering the inactivity of the RF government as illegal with regard to the establishment of the TTNUs “Katanga”, “Bergima” and “Kunnoir” has stocked up a series of lawsuits.

In 2002, the communities of indigenous numerically small peoples “Ilel”, “Avlakan” and “Katanga” in the Irkutsk Region sent their application to the government of the Russian Federation about the establishment of the TTNU of federal category “Katanga” in the northern part of the Region.

The Katanga District of the Irkutsk Region, where it was intended to establish a specially protected TTNU, is the location of dense and traditional settlement and economic activity of Evenks, both those living now and their predecessors. There are valuable ecological systems in this territory which are of special ecological, biological, esthetic and ethno-cultural value for the Evenks. In 1992, the decision of the Irkutsk Regional Council of Peoples’ Deputies declared the entire Katanga District within its administrative borders as a TTNU of indigenous numerically small peoples. With the adoption of the law it became necessary to register this territory as a TTNU of federal category, since there are sites and units of federal ownership on it (water sites, forest fund land, etc.). This had been done when the communities of indigenous numerically small peoples of the Katanga District sent their application to the RF government about the establishment of a TTNU of federal category.

Commissioned by the RF government, the RF Ministry of Economic Development and Trade considered the application and sent a letter to RAIPON with an actual denial of the right to establish TTNU on illegal grounds. The Ministry referred to the fact that the applicants had failed to carry out certain procedures stipulated by legislation, such as ecological and ethnological expert evaluations, draft planning of the territories and land allocation.

The unlawfulness and illogical nature of the actions taken by the authorities when rejecting the idea of the establishment of a TTNU are reflected in the fact that all these legislative procedures can be fulfilled only after the RF government’s decision about the establishment of a

specially protected TTNU has been made. The execution of all necessary procedures to organize a TTNU of federal category is within the exclusive competence of the RF government and federal authorities. Therefore, representatives of indigenous numerically small peoples, having approached the RF government with the initiative to establish a TTNU, not only should not but also cannot carry out these procedures, since they do not have the corresponding authority.

Besides, the RF Ministry of Economic Development and Trade does not have any authority to make decisions about the establishment of TTNU of indigenous numerically small peoples or to reject such applications. In accordance with Article 6 of the law "On territories of traditional nature use ..." this is the exclusive competence of the RF government.

Analogous letters from the Ministry were received by the communities "Kunnoir" and "Bergima" in the Evenk Autonomous Okrug, which had approached the RF government with their applications to establish TTNU of federal category, also in 2002.

The fact that the RF government has not considered in its essence the question of the establishment of TTNU, has failed to make a decision about the establishment or rejection of the request to establish such TTNU, and has not answered the indigenous representatives, is a lack of action violating their right to a traditional lifestyle and defense of primordial living environment.

The lawyers of "Rodnik" have prepared and submitted to the Presnensk District Court of Moscow two statements of claim dealing with the illegal inactivity of the RF government regarding problems with the establishment of the TTNU "Kunnoir" and "Bergima" in the Evenk Autonomous Okrug and "Katanga" in the Irkutsk Region.

Despite the fact that an analogous case dealing with the complaint about the refusal to establish the territory of traditional nature use "Thsanom" was already tried by the Presnensk court, when faced with new statements of claim the court again intentionally created obstacles and gave numerous illegal decisions, refusing to accept these statements for trial. This has once again confirmed the dependence of the court on the bodies of state power and their unwillingness to observe the statutorily guaranteed right of indigenous numerically small peoples to establish specially protected territories of traditional nature use.

The lawyers have appealed the illegal rulings of the court to the second appeals instance.

Having overcome all the roadblocks preventing the consideration of the statements of claim in court, the lawyers of "Rodnik" submitted a petition about the joinder of claims with regard to the illegal inactivity of authorities on questions of the establishment of TTNUs "Kunnoir" and "Bergima" in the Evenk Autonomous Okrug and "Ka-

tanga" in the Irkutsk Region, to secure a more correct and timely sorting out of the cases in their essence. The court accepted this petition and joined these claims.

The consideration of the statements of claim in their essence took place on 20 April 2004.

The Presnensk district court of Moscow rejected the claims of the communities of indigenous numerically small peoples to recognize as illegitimate the inactivity of the RF government. The representative of the RF government and the RF Ministry of Economic Development and Trade said in court that they had not turned down the applications of indigenous numerically small peoples to establish TTNU, but that they simply could not implement the law, since, in their opinion, there were some contradictions in the legislation and a statutory procedure for the establishment of such territories was not available. Thus, the defendants in court actually admitted their inactivity, since the elimination of contradictions in legislation and the elaboration of provisions required to implement the law were the duty of the RF government. Nonetheless, since 2001 the defendants have failed to take any real measures to make the establishment of TTNU possible.

Despite this statement by the representative of both defendants, the court viewed the letters of the RF Ministry of Economic Development and Trade not as evidence of inactivity on the part of the RF government, but as a real denial by the RF government to establish TTNU of indigenous numerically small peoples.

Having recognized the letter of the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade as a denial to establish TTNU, the court attached new significance to this case. It created grounds to challenge not only the RF government's inactivity, but also the gross violation of the right of indigenous numerically small peoples to establish TTNU.

For three years the RF government and the RF Ministry of Economic Development and Trade have been busy putting false roadblocks in the way, preventing the implementation of the federal law. During this period not a single TTNU has been established. Moreover, many TTNU established before the law had been carried into effect were liquidated as inconsistent with the new legislation.

Irrespective of the fact that at this stage the court disagreed with our position, we believe that it is possible to achieve a change in the RF government's position by combining legal actions oriented towards defending the rights of indigenous numerically small peoples with a broad social movement.

At present, the lawyers of "Rodnik" are working on the appeal of the judgment of the Presnensk court and are elaborating a new strategy of handling the cases in defense of the rights of Russia's indigenous numerically small peoples to establish specially protected TTNU.

About poaching and sustainable nature use

D. Berezikov, RAIPON Vice-president

In April this year a report and election conference of the Kamchatkan Regional Association of Indigenous Numerically Small Peoples of the North was held. I was elected the Association's President and was therefore trusted with the destiny of the organization uniting thousands of representatives of Kamchatka's indigenous population.

As of now, the struggle for the right of indigenous peoples to use resources, to be engaged in traditional nature use, to make use of those methods of economic activity which have been successfully implemented by their predecessors, while at the same time preserving the environment, is one of my major objectives. A favorable ecological situation depends today on several factors, including the so-called sustainable methods of man's economic activity. It has been recognized the world over that basically the preservation of environment and biodiversity in territories suffering impacts by human activities does not depend on the number of fines exacted for various ecological violations. The state of nature on these territories depends on technologies and the methods of human economic activity. When this activity has a long-term perspective, especially in the development of such economic branches as fishing, hunting, sea mammal hunting, gathering – those assuming the extraction of bioresources from the environment – and in cases where reasonable limitation is observed while doing so for a concrete forest sector, a concrete river, then this kind of nature use in fact becomes sustainable and can preserve nature in these sectors no less but often more efficiently than any measures of protective nature.

Indigenous peoples, having succeeded for thousands of years in preserving nature on the territories of their habitation in its primordial condition, have proved in reality that traditional nature use is one of the most successful methods of economic activity invented by mankind. The industrial methods of fishing, timber cutting and other types of modern economic activity replacing the traditional ones have substantially reduced and in many areas undermined the potential of the extracted resources. The principle of extraction of as much as possible from nature has become more and more dangerous. First of all, for man. With a reasonable approach, bioresources can be used as long as one wishes, but conditions are required for its organization. Today, the reform of fishing industry is well underway. Feverish symptoms of this phenomenon can easily be seen from the clashes in the mass media between the region's governor and the procurator's office. What is far more remorseful – we will feel them on our back next winter when after the battles of the election campaign, the new governor will find himself face to face with the necessity of fulfilling the budget, left without the taxes from the fishing enterprises which stayed idle last winter. What is still more distressing – the same muddle seems to be in the offing with the 2004 salmon fishing season.

The basic idea of the reformers is sometimes overlooked behind the smoke of battles – to fix the resources with definite users for a long term. Though a 5-year period is mentioned, the resources will be fixed with their users for a long period indeed if one bears in mind that further distri-

bution will be carried out on the basis of enterprise history. Against the background of cessation of fishing auctions, this step of the government looks like it understands the fact that sustainability and accompanying long-term extraction of profits from the use of bioresources is more important than the receipt of short-term profits, no matter how large. Since the notion of importance in this case is rather moral than anything else, it is not only more significant but more profitable for the state. I am not going to repeat myself, since a lot has been said today about this, but when the resources are fixed for (legally assured to) economic subjects for a long term, enterprises can plan their activity with greater certainty, and involve resources for the expansion and modernization of production. This kind of confidence in the future used to be the basis for the sustainability of a traditional way of life and traditional types of economic activity of indigenous peoples.

Today we come up against the fact that indigenous peoples in the Kamchatkan Region, with the governor's hand in the matter, have found themselves completely excommunicated from the resource basis on which their economy used to be traditionally built. Disregarding the meager permitted limits for bioresources set aside for feeding the aborigines and annually changing them arbitrarily, the Northern indigenous peoples of Kamchatka have no chance of being engaged in traditional economic activity today. The beginning of this logical chain predetermines its continuation: no sectors – no limits, no limits – no chance of attracting credits, no credits – no chance of developing production, perspectives get lost – chances to support traditional culture are lost. At the same time, indigenous peoples remain to be recognized worldwide as leaders in the construction of sustainable models of nature use.

We have heard a lot about the successful experience of Alaskan aborigines, indians in Canada, Saami in Scandinavia, about the fact that reindeer breeding and fishing can be a profitable business. Many believe that it is possible abroad only, where legislation is different and socioeconomic conditions are not like ours. Recently, I had a chance to visit the Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Okrug. Once there, I was lucky to meet with representatives of indigenous peoples' communities who managed to organize profitable traditional production, reindeer breeding and fishing while observing the principle of sustainability. With the organization of deep processing, including the final production outcome, fishing became profitable with minimal permitted limits. Skeptical people would readily jump at the conclusion that with the profits received by Yamal from gas production it was easy to organize, while it is out of the question in our case. It is true that to organize such mini-production units, both an initial financial incentive and the actual provision of a resource basis are required. One should agree with the fact that, unlike the Yamal budget, our meager Kamchatkan budget can hardly give such an incentive to traditional economic structures of indigenous peoples. However, the volume of fishing resources in the Kamchatkan Region and the Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Okrug cannot be compared either. Our capac-

ity is tens of times higher. Hence, it is easier to provide some part of these resources.

One should also take into account the fact that, unlike in Yamal, our fishing is the main source of the region's income. That is why the fight for the right to fish is so fierce. However, with regard to the communities of indigenous peoples, the question on the agenda is not many thousands of tons at all. Far smaller volumes become economically rational with a community-based (or artel-based work association) method of production when members of one tribe, family, or artel are involved in joint work. With the organization of deep processing, such production may well become a source of existence for communities. Communities and enterprises of indigenous peoples would be able to pay for the needs which are now paid for from the target-oriented programs of economic and social development of indigenous numerically small peoples.

The support of indigenous peoples is envisaged in these programs, including medical treatment of those suffering from alcoholism, which is known to be their scourge brought about by civilization. At the same time, the authorities take away the right to traditional economic activity, which could have provide means so that the indigenous peoples were able to support themselves and at the same time could be engaged in their habitual activities. Today, no doubt, alcoholism among the indigenous population is cultivated on purpose and scrupulously propped up by smart dealers making fortunes in this way. Non-engagement of population in traditional activities gives birth to a terrible type of business where, in exchange for vodka easily given as an advance payment, it becomes necessary to bring caviar again and again, which can be produced as a result of poaching only. Why is it necessary to spend public budget money, raised from taxes on that very fish, to cure a few patients from alcoholism every year, when they and a good many more could be engaged in traditional economic activity without any suffering from alcoholism? They will be earning wages and paying taxes in the bargain! Obviously, as long as the bioresources are subject to a fierce haggling, without any understanding on the part of the authorities of the principles of sustainability of traditional nature use, Kamchatkan indigenous peoples

would not be able to occupy the ecological niche their forefathers used to occupy in the past.

Such principles can be laid out in the federal legislation in the form of allocation of percentage content from the total quantity of resources. Regretfully though, in 2000 it became evident that with the advent of new regional authorities, redistribution of roles of economic players will be arranged in the region every time, and this will entail redistribution of resources. Fixation of percentage for indigenous peoples at the federal level would make it possible to avoid such a fate.

It would be one of the first steps on the way to the organization of sustainable nature use of Kamchatkan indigenous peoples. Besides, it is necessary to improve efficiency of management of the communities and enterprises. Already today, it is not sufficient to simply catch fish, shoot animals and sell the products. It is required to effectively adjust to the constantly changing market, to carry out marketing and promotion of one's products. It is vital to attract financial resources to modernize industries, to purchase new technological equipment. It is also important to set up year-round work for community production units. The organization of ethnic and ecological tourism, sport-oriented fishing, and production of souvenirs shows potential.

I would also like to mention the direct protection of nature in the locations of nature use of indigenous peoples' communities. Various state safeguarding structures, no doubt, play a major role in environmental protection and will play it for years to come. Nonetheless, the direct participation of the population in this process ought to be a major condition for environmental protection. Economic incentives could become most effective in this direction, apart from ecological education. If every member of a community understands that catching of each kilo of salmon while poaching in the river where the community goes fishing regularly, is a factual pick pocketing from a community pouch, then hopefully he would understand that it is necessary to protect the river from poachers. If every businessman in fishing industry thinks the same way, the poacher would think twice and a hundred times before coming up to the river.

Biodiversity and nature protection in residence areas of Russia's indigenous peoples

P. Sulyandziga, V. Bocharnikov and R. Sulyandziga

The territory of Russia is 17.1 million square kilometers, and the entire diversity of natural ecosystems of Eurasia exists in this territory. Flora and fauna of circumpolar deserts, tundra, mixed and broad-leaved forests, forest-steppes, semideserts and subtropics of Russia include a total of 160,000 known species, the majority of which are endemic to Russian areas.

There are more than 120,000 rivers and about 2,000,000 fresh and brackish water lakes within Russia's territory; swamps and bogs cover 1,800,000 square kilometers. There are large mountain-masses and vast plains; 13 seas wash its shores. The taiga zone covers Russia's major expanses,

with boreal coniferous forests prevailing. Specific taiga flora and fauna are most diverse in the east of the country, in the northern Amur River area, while a vast mountainous country spreads from Altai to the Amur River area along Russia's borders. It serves as a natural divide between the taiga-covered Siberia and the desert-steppe Central Asia. The Ural Mountains identify the border between Europe and Asia on the continent.

The tundra and taiga ecosystems occupy a major part of Russia's territory. Above all in its Asian part, which is due to the country's latitudinal position, its sharp continental climate and a vastly spread zone of permafrost in Siberia.

The natural ecosystems of Russia's territory are extremely valuable for the biosphere as a whole, performing the most important global regulatory functions vital for the entire planet. The northern ecosystems are distinguished by increased vulnerability, slow rehabilitation after damage, and intense erosive processes when the vegetation cover is damaged. The conditions for human habitation and economic activity are the least favourable here.

The masses of bogs and paludal forests, the largest in the world, play a key role in the global processes of carbon binding and burial, and maintain the balance of carbonic acid in the atmosphere. The forests and boggy areas serve as the most important land-based regenerators of oxygen for the biosphere. The ecosystems of seas and fresh water reservoirs of the North are extremely diverse and at the same time vulnerable. More than one quarter of virgin forests still remaining untouched in the world are situated in Russia. On a considerably large territory, however, due to man's activity, the most valuable coniferous formations have given up their functions – due to burned-out forests and slash areas – to secondary small-leaved forests, while in the western and southern zones of the European part of Russia considerable masses of forests have been wiped out and ploughed up.

More than ten million people reside in Russia's North. The most numerous group among them are immigrants (the first generation residing in a new place). Apart from the newcomers, two more groups can be identified – old-timers and indigenous inhabitants (including the basic contingent of Russia's indigenous numerically small peoples). The population is declining as the degree of the territory's discomfort increases, but more than one half of the entire population lives in discomfort and under extreme conditions. The immigrant contingents engaged in mining of non-ferrous metals, coal, oil and gas dominate in the production sphere. These projects have a great impact on the environment throughout the vast northern territories.

So far in Russia a wide spectrum of cultural traditions connected with natural economy – hunting, fishing, and sea mammal hunting – has been maintained in the most traditional way. Above all, it is important for the use of forest resources and biological resources of the Arctic territories. Fishing, gathering and hunting in Russia serve as the basis for several absolutely original types of traditional vital activity. The taiga hunters belonging to indigenous peoples of Siberia and the Far East are known to have the highest adaptation to life in the forests. Hunting there is still a tangible part of local economy and a condition for the preservation of biodiversity of unique ecosystems.

These types of economic activity characterize the attitude of various groups of population towards nature. Siberia and the North are the regions of commercial hunting. Professional hunters should have hunting grounds which are large enough to guarantee sufficient procurement for themselves and their families, especially when orientated towards valuable fur-bearing game like sable. In the beginning of the 1950s, the number of professional hunters was steadily on the decline, and the main role in extraction of products was passed over to amateurs. Fishing is practically widespread all across Russia's territory and water areas, but it is practiced in different ways from region to region. For indigenous peoples, fishing is the main or second most important type of economy. Gathering continues

to play a tangible role in securing food and medical needs on the vast territories of the North, Siberia and the Far East.

During the last century, human impact has become the decisive factor in the formation of ecosystems. Analyses of the impact has shown that the greatest contribution to the transformation of natural ecosystems comes from agrarian use. The natural vegetation cover has been damaged most severely in Russia's steppe and forest-steppe zones, but there has also been considerable transformation in the forested part of the country from timber felling. In the tundra zone, as a result of high pasture load by domesticated reindeer, up to 20 percent of the pasture lands are in an unfavorable condition. In the North the level of industrial pollution is quite high in the vicinity of mining plants. In various regions of the taiga zone large hotbeds of technogenic abuse occur where oil and gas extraction and pipeline construction are located. More than 10,000 square kilometers of forest territory are devastated by felling and are continuously transformed year by year; tens of thousands of forest fires rage that are the fault of humans.

A system of specially protected natural territories (SPNT) forms the basis of territorial nature protection in Russia. Among these territories, only general nature reserves, national parks and specific nature reserves (to protect particular species) of federal category have a federal status (nature reserves can also be local ones). Other forms of protection of a territory usually have a local status, but Russian legislation postulates the possibility of the establishment of other categories of SPNT. This has been done by establishing of territories of traditional nature use (TTNU). The supreme forms of protection of natural territories in our country are general nature reserves. Their total number is now one hundred. They cover 33.7 million hectares of land, which is 2.5 percent of the total territory of Russia.

The largest general nature reserve in the country is the Big Arctic N.R. (4.2 million hectares) occupying the uninhabited shores and islands of the Arctic. However, in certain territories included in general nature reserves or supposedly intended to become a sanctuary, conflict situations with the local population have not been sorted out, which influences the socio-economic situation in some districts to a serious degree. In general, the territory of nature reserves increase from the southwest to the northeast. Exceptions are a few major nature reserves in the Caucasus. The category of national nature parks is a new form of protection of territories in Russia. In 2001 there were 35 parks in Russia covering 7 million hectares.

International agreements have been fulfilled quite successfully in Russia. Thus, in accordance with its obligations under the Convention on Wetlands (RAMSAR), Enactment of the government of the Russian Federation No. 1050 dated 13 September 1994, names 35 such objects in the country with a total territory of ten million hectares. These areas include not only the water and wetland ecosystems but also land complexes connected with them. The availability of an international status and a special governmental enactment makes it possible to view this form as an essential factor of protection of Russia's ecosystems, primarily for lakes and wetlands. In accordance with recommendations of another well-known convention – the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage – seven territories have been established in Russia

which have an exceptional value for the entire world community. One third of these objects are connected with vital activity of Russia's numerically small indigenous peoples.

It is officially recognized in Russia that, to advance toward a nature-preserving sustainable development, it is necessary for Russia to transfer from the modern economic paradigm viewing the efficiency of economic complex and protection of nature as autonomous processes, to an integral ecological and economic approach integrating nature and economy as two interrelated components of a sociosystem. In this process, the preservation of a traditional lifestyle in the residence and subsistence territories of indige-

nous numerically small peoples is the most important condition to preserve natural ecosystems and biodiversity, not only in Russia but on the planet as a whole.

Information presented in this article is based on:

“National strategy of the preservation of Russia's biodiversity”, Moscow, 2001; The First National Report of the Russian Federation “Preservation of biological diversity in Russia”, Moscow, 1997; and Web-Atlas “Environment and health of Russia's population”,
<http://www.sci.aha.ru/ATL/ra00.htm>.