



Children Claiming Spaces

*Child rights perspectives and the child's right to be heard
in the context of land use in Gállok, Sweden*

Lena Katharina Berg

Division of Human Rights Studies

Department of History

Course Code: MRSM15

Semester: Spring 2026

Supervisor: Linde Lindkvist

Words: 21.975



Abstract

The decision-making process on land use in Gállok between 2013 and 2022 represents an intense political and societal debate on mining, ‘green transition’, Indigeneity and environmentalism. Children have expressed their views throughout this process and have based on article 12(1) UN Convention on the Rights of the Child a right to so. However, whether children are heard and to what extent their rights and perspectives are considered remains unclear. This thesis thus aims to answer the question *How and to what extent are children’s rights, particularly their right to be heard and to have their views taken into account, reflected in political and societal debates on land use in Sápmi in Sweden?*

The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore the substance of article 12(1), how it is taken into consideration and how it interplays with Indigenous children’s rights and child rights perspectives on environmental issues. Additionally, I offer a child rights perspective on one of Sweden’s most debated human rights issues of the past decade.

Policy documents, newspaper articles and social media entries of youth-led organizations were analyzed applying a critical policy analysis. Methodological decisions and the interpretation of findings were led by the critical theoretical childism approach of John Wall.

The findings show that neither article 12(1) nor other children’s rights are considered in the decision-making process for Gállok although children are considered to be affected by the decision. However, children claim spaces they are denied and try to contribute to the debate beyond measures of protest which leads to the question whether the implementation of article 12(1) would allow them to participate in a meaningful way or whether it is political structures itself that would have to change for children to become active members of society.

Keywords: *Gállok; Child Rights Perspectives; Article 12(1); Convention on the Rights of the Child; Childism; Critical Policy Analysis*

To my sons, my god daughter, my brother, my niece and my nephews.

May you all have the confidence to speak up and claim space.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to sincerely thank my supervisor Linde Lindkvist without whom this thesis would not be what it is right now. Thank you for supporting me throughout the past year, challenging me with questions and pushing me to think further.

Special thanks to Tilda Pontén for taking the time to talk to me and helping me gain a deeper understanding of Gállok and the context of the debate.

I would also like to acknowledge the people who supported me in my data collection – Georgia de Leeuw for introducing me to *Rikskansliets arkiv* and the LUX-library staff for introducing me to the right database.

I would like to thank my family and friends near and far for cheering me on, discussing my project and helping me unwind. A very special thanks goes to Lisa for accompanying me through the academic and emotional highs and lows of the project and for never losing faith in my ability to do get it done.

Lastly, I want to thank Daniel and Adam for putting up with me working on weekends and evenings, for keeping me hydrated and for sharing their *godis* and mostly, for being courageous enough to move to another country with me. None of this would have been possible without you two being so loving, patient and understanding. Thank you!

Table of Contents

Abstract	1
Acknowledgements	3
1. Introduction	6
2. Background & Previous Research	10
<i>2.1 Definition of Terms</i>	<i>10</i>
2.1.1 Children	10
2.1.2 Children's rights	10
2.1.3 Child rights perspectives	11
<i>2.2 Gállok in Context.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>2.3 Literature Review.....</i>	<i>16</i>
2.3.1 Article 12	16
2.3.2 Children's right to participate in climate mitigation processes	21
2.3.3 Indigenous children's participation	24
2.3.4 Concluding remarks.....	25
3. Theoretical Framework.....	26
4. Methodology.....	30
<i>4.1 Researcher's Positionality & Ethical Considerations</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>4.2 Case Study</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>4.3 Data Collection & Selection.....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>4.4 Critical Policy Analysis.....</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>4.5 Methodological Limitations.....</i>	<i>38</i>
5. Analysis & Findings.....	39
<i>5.1 The Political Debate.....</i>	<i>39</i>
5.1.1 Children's involvement.....	39

5.1.2 Children’s rights	41
5.1.3 Children’s future	43
<i>5.2 The Public Debate</i>	45
5.2.1 Children’s involvement.....	45
5.2.2 Children’s rights	47
5.2.3 Children’s future	48
<i>5.3 The Voice of the Child</i>	49
5.3.1 Children claiming space	49
5.3.2 Children’s rights	54
5.3.3 Children’s future	55
6. Discussion	56
7. Conclusion	63
Bibliography.....	66
List of Primary Sources	74
<i>Policy Documents</i>	74
<i>Newspaper Articles</i>	75
<i>Social Media Entries</i>	77

“States Parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those views freely in all matters affecting the child, the views of the child being given due weight in accordance with the age and maturity of the child.”¹

1. Introduction

“Stop the mine in Gállok and save our future”² wrote fifteen-year-old Ella-Karin in a reader’s letter in *Dagens Nyheter* in January 2022, two months before the Swedish Ministry of Industries (“the Ministry”) gave permission to the open-cast mining project in the municipality Jokkmokk, Sweden. The decision is the result of a lengthy debate about land use in Sápmi touching upon questions of mineral-based prosperity, Indigeneity, the ‘green transition’ and environmentalism. As Ella-Karin’s and many other children’s views were expressed but contradict the final decision of the government, it remains to question how and to what extent children and their rights were part of the decision-making process or considered as a decision-making factor.

As established in Article 12(1) of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child 1989 (CRC) and as politically emphasized in the incorporation of the latter in Sweden’s domestic law in 2020,³ children have the right to express their views in matters affecting them and to have these views considered in decision-making processes. While we know that children expressed their views on Gállok, this study focuses on whether they are heard and considered. Looking at Gállok from a child rights perspective offers a novel approach to the case and allows me to investigate the role that children’s rights play in decision-making processes on land use. While it does not constitute a fixed concept, I understand land use here as heavily linked to questions of environmentalism and Indigeneity. The engagement of pertinent youth organization such as Fridays for Future and Sáminuorra with Gállok underlines this strong connection to both. Thus, while it has

¹ Art. 12(1) UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989.

² E.-K. Nårsa. Stoppa gruvan i Gállok och rädda vår framtid. *Dagens Nyheter*. (21 January 2022), p. 27. [translated].

³ UNICEF. *Barnkonventionen*. (2026). <https://unicef.se/barnkonventionen> (accessed 2026-04-01).

been discussed from various perspectives, this thesis looks at Gállok in the context of a child rights perspective on environmental issues and Indigeneity.

Previous literature shows that Article 12(1) is open to multiple interpretations regarding its scope, implementation and effect on children's position in society.⁴ This multitude of interpretations intersects with literature on child rights perspectives on climate change offering on the one hand, a paternalistic reading of the CRC⁵ and, on the other, practical observations of Article 12(1) in climate mitigation and among Indigenous children portraying the child as an agentic member of society.⁶ Previous scholarship places much attention on children *expressing* their views, but neglects other elements of Article 12(1) such as being heard and having one's views considered in decision-making processes.

The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore the substance of Article 12(1), how it is taken into consideration and how it interplays with Indigenous children's rights and child rights perspectives on environmental issues. Thus, the project is situated at the intersection of theoretical controversies on the article, practical observations of the latter as well as overarching child rights perspectives and conceptions of children in society.

⁴ see for example: R. Stern. *The child's right to participation. Reality or rhetoric?* . (Uppsala University, 2006); L. Lundy. 'Voice' is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *British Educational Research Journal*. 33: 6 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701657033>; L. Krappmann. The weight of the child's view (Article 12 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child). *International Journal of Children's Rights*. 18: 4 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1163/157181810X528021>.

⁵ see for example: K. Arts. A child rights perspective on climate change. In M. Salih. (ed.). *Climate Change and Sustainable Development: New Challenges for Poverty Reduction*. (Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 2009).

<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/lund/detail.action?docID=449315>; S. Sanz-Caballero. Children's rights in a changing climate: a perspective from the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics*. 13 (2013). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3354/esep00130>; R. Uddin, R. Philipsborn, D. Smith, A. Mutic & L.M. Thompson. A global child health perspective on climate change, migration and human rights. *Current Problems in Pediatric and Adolescent Health Care*. 51: 6 (2021). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cppeds.2021.101029>.

⁶ see for example: N. Blanchet-Cohen. Indigenous children's rights. Opportunities in appropriation and transformation. In W. Vandenhoe, E. Desmet, D. Reynaert & S. Lembrechts. (eds.). *Routledge International Handbook of Children's Rights Studies*. 1. ed. (Routledge, 2015). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315769530-23>; A. Daly. Climate Competence: Youth Climate Activism and Its Impact on International Human Rights Law. *Human Rights Law Review*. 22: 2 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1093/hrlr/ngac011>; L. Parker, J. Mestre, S. Jodoin & M. Wewerinke-Singh. When the kids put climate change on trial: youth-focused rights-based climate litigation around the world. *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment*. 13: 1 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.4337/jhre.2022.01.03>.

I aim to contribute to this interplay of debates by answering the question *How and to what extent are children's rights, particularly their right to be heard and to have their views taken into account, reflected in political and societal debates on land use in Sápmi in Sweden?*

In order to answer this question I analyzed the decision-making process that led to the processing concession for the area Kallak K nr 1 ("Gállok") between 2013 and 2022. The focus of this study is twofold: Firstly, it is placed on the way children's right to be heard is taken into consideration, and secondly on the way child rights perspectives more generally are applied throughout the decision-making process. The analysis is based on a variety of primary sources. First, policy documents represent the political debate leading to the final decision for Gállok. These documents were retrieved from the Swedish Parliament's online archive as well as the archives of the County Administrative Board Norrbotten, the municipality Jokkmokk, Bergstaten, and the Swedish Government Offices. Second, a range of argumentative texts⁷ from Sweden's three largest newspapers accompanying the political decision-making process and representing the public debate were included. This was complemented by children's and youths' voices represented in social media contributions of Swedish youth-led organizations engaging with Gállok.

The analysis is inspired by critical policy analysis approaches of van Hulst et al.⁸ and Fischer.⁹ However, methodological decisions and the interpretation of findings are led

⁷ based on the German concept of "Appelltext"

⁸ M. van Hulst, T. Metze, A. Dewulf, J. de Vries, S. van Bommel & M. van Ostaijen. Discourse, framing and narrative: three ways of doing critical, interpretive policy analysis. *Critical Policy Studies*. 19: 1 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2024.2326936>.

⁹ F. Fischer. In pursuit of usable knowledge: critical policy analysis and the argumentative turn. In *Handbook of Critical Policy Studies*. (Edward Elgar Publishing, 2015). <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781783472352.00008>; F. Fischer. *Critical Policy Inquiry. Interpreting Knowledge and Arguments*. (Edward Elgar Publishing, 2024).

by Wall's critical theoretical childism approach¹⁰ which highlights the marginalization of children and aims at reimagining power structures that place children below adults.¹¹

The findings of the analysis show that neither a general child rights perspective is applied nor article 12(1) systematically taken into consideration in the decision-making process that led to the processing concession in Gállok although children are frequently mentioned to be affected by the latter. Moreover, while children are not formally included in the process, they claim their space within the debate and try to contribute to it. These attempts are differently perceived within the public and the political sphere, suggesting that it is not merely societal norms hindering children from participating but political structures sustaining power imbalances between children and policy-making adults.

The thesis is structured as follows: chapter 2 offers definitions of key terms, a contextualization of the case study within Sweden, broader societal debates and international law, and a review of the most important literature on the subject. Chapter 3 introduces the childism framework and discusses its suitability for this project. Chapter 4 provides insight into my positionality, ethical considerations and methodological decisions. Analysis and findings are presented and discussed in chapters 5 and 6. The thesis concludes with a summary of key findings, limitations and future research possibilities.

¹⁰ J. Wall. From childhood studies to childism: reconstructing the scholarly and social imaginations. *Children's Geographies*. 20: 3 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2019.1668912>; J. Wall. Childism and the Politics of Social Empowerment. *Sociedad e Infancias*. 8: 2 (2024). <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/soci.99146>; J. Wall. Children's rights from a childist perspective. Theorizing social empowerment. In V. Llobet, D. Reynaert, A. Twum-Danso Imoh & W. Vandenhoe. (eds.). *Critical Children's Rights Studies. A Research Companion*. (Routledge, 2025). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003510284-6>.

¹¹ Wall. *From childhood studies to childism: reconstructing the scholarly and social imaginations*, p. 257 ff.

2. Background & Previous Research

2.1 Definition of Terms

2.1.1 Children

The term ‘children’ is defined here by three distinct elements. First, when mentioning children I include people from birth until they are young adults. While most national contexts and the CRC define eighteen as the legal age of maturity,¹² the thesis includes material stemming from various youth organizations which do not have such strict age restrictions and may include voices from ‘youths’ who are above the age of eighteen. Second, following the CRC, children are here defined as human beings rather than “pre-rational ‘human becomings.’”¹³ As such, children are understood to be individual rights holders of human rights. Lastly, children are defined as a particular social group characterized by a systematic marginalization visible through their “universal lack of voting rights [...] disproportionate poverty” and a prevailing positioning below adults.¹⁴

2.1.2 Children’s rights

Children’s rights are understood as rights established to ensure children’s protection, participation and their provision with fundamental goods such as health and education. Following the view that children are human beings, one could argue that various instruments of international law contain children’s rights whether or not they name children as recipients of rights, as they aim to protect all human beings. However, given that children have a very marginalized standing among adults, this thesis refers only to

¹² Art. 1, CRC, 1989; World Population Review. Age of Majority by Country 2026. <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/age-of-majority-by-country> (accessed 2026-05-12).

¹³ L. Lindkvist. The Child Subject of Human Rights. In D. Celermajer & A. Lefebvre. (eds.). *The Subject of Human Rights*. (Stanford University Press, 2020), p. 212. <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/lund/detail.action?docID=6371984>.

¹⁴ Wall. *Childism and the Politics of Social Empowerment*, p. 206.

the CRC established for children and Act 2018:1197, the incorporation of the CRC in Swedish domestic law.¹⁵

2.1.3 Child rights perspectives

A child rights perspective is here defined as taking children's rights into consideration when discussing societal problems. This approach can be used to understand these problems through the lens of children's rights and to find solutions that acknowledge children's specific needs and rights. Moreover, it bears the potential to promote children's rights in general as they are given new emphasis in policy-making processes.¹⁶ Focusing on land use issues, a child rights perspective can include children's rights in the future (i.e. the right to life) as well as children's rights at stake in the present (i.e. the right to be heard).

2.2 Gállok in Context

Empirically, this thesis rests on a single case study of the decision-making process leading to a mining concession in Kallak or Gállok as it is called in Sámi. Gállok is part of Jokkmokk's municipality which lies in Norrbotten, Sweden's northernmost county, but it is also part of Sámi peoples' traditional living area Sápmi which spreads over parts of Sweden, Norway, Finland, and Russia.¹⁷

On 25 April 2013 the Swedish company Jokkmokk Iron Mines AB (JIMAB), a subsidiary to the British Beowulf Mining plc., applied for a processing concession for the area Kallak K nr 1 at Bergstaten, the Swedish Mining Inspectorate, in order to extract iron ore.¹⁸ After Bergstaten and the County Administrative Board Norrbotten could not come to a joint conclusion, the matter was forwarded to the Minister for

¹⁵ Act 2018:1197 om Förenta nationernas konvention om barnets rättigheter. (1/1 2020).

¹⁶ T. Mattson. *Barnrättsperspektivet i LVU-sammanhang*. (Fritzes, 2015), p. 2.
<https://www.lu.se/lup/publication/b78209e7-27ea-467a-bf11-d9ce1727e4e3> (accessed 2026-05-24).

¹⁷ Samiskt informationscentrum. Karta över Sápmi. <https://samer.se/karta> (accessed 2026-05-12).

¹⁸ K.-P. Thorwaldsson & F. Gemsjö. *Ansökan om bearbetningskoncession enligt minerallagen (1991:45) för området Kallak K nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun, Norrbottens län. Regeringens beslut*. (Regeringen (Näringsdepartementet), 2022), p. 1 ff.
<https://jokkmokkiron.se/upload/images/dokument/regeringsbeslut-n201704553.pdf> (accessed 2026-05-12).

Industry (“the Minister”) on 29 June 2017¹⁹ and was thereafter part of a political debate between ministries and in parliament.

The final decision was presented by the then Minister Karl-Petter Thorwaldsson on 22 March 2022.²⁰ It contained a concession permit for JIMAB valid for 25 years and summaries of statements from inter alia JIMAB, Bergstaten, the County Administrative Board Norrbotten, Jokkmokk’s municipality, the Sámi parliament, civil society organizations and affected residents.²¹

In June 2022, two Sámi villages and *Naturskyddsföreningen* appealed against the government’s decision before the Supreme Administrative Court on the grounds of a judicial review.²² On 25 June 2024, the Court sided with the government ruling that the decision did not violate any laws²³ and thereby allowing JIMAB to proceed with the remaining administrative steps to open a mine in Gállok.

Between JIMAB’s application in 2013 and the government’s decision in 2022 this case became “one of the most controversial and lengthy permit processes in Sweden.”²⁴ Unsurprisingly, the political debate was accompanied by an intense public debate. The newspaper *Aftonbladet* described Gállok as “Jokkmokk’s own Brexit issue” splitting society and families²⁵ and attracting international attention.²⁶

¹⁹ *ibid.*, p. 4 f.

²⁰ *ibid.*, p. 1.

²¹ *ibid.*, pp. 1-25.

²² *Högsta Förvaltningsdomstolens Dom 3893-22*, (25/6 2024), p. 1.

²³ *ibid.*, p. 28.

²⁴ G. de Leeuw. *The comfort of alignment: Mining, green steel, and killjoy desires in Sweden/Sápmi*. . (Lund University, 2024), p. 7.
https://lucris.lub.lu.se/ws/portalfiles/portal/170230439/The_comfort_of_alignment_Georgia_de_Leeuw.pdf.

²⁵ T. Engström. Gruvstriden sliter isär familjer och samhällen. *Aftonbladet*. (10/12 2020).
<https://www.aftonbladet.se/kultur/bokrecensioner/a/JJnpbj/gruvstriden-sliter-isar-familjer-och-samhallen> (accessed 2026-05-24) [translated].

²⁶ D. Boffey. The age of extinction. Greta Thunberg condemns UK firm’s plans for iron mine on Sami land. *The Guardian*. (11/2 2022). <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/feb/11/sami-people-said-no-british-firms-plans-open-pit-mine-divide-sweden-greta-thunberg>; A.-F. Hivert. La Suède dit oui à un projet minier très controversé. *Le Monde*. (24/3 2022).
https://www.lemonde.fr/planete/article/2022/03/24/la-suede-dit-oui-a-un-projet-minier-tres-controverse_6118945_3244.html (accessed 2026-05-24); *Al Jazeera*. “The Klondike of ore mining”: Fighting for the Sami way of life. (20/2 2019). <https://www.aljazeera.com/gallery/2019/2/20/the-klondike-of-ore-mining-fighting-for-the-sami-way-of-life>.

Moreover, the debates on Gállok represent broader tensions between mining-based prosperity, the ‘green transition’, climate change and human rights. Sweden, and especially Norrbotten,²⁷ has a longstanding history in mineral mining, claiming “a role as one of Europe’s leading mining nations”²⁸ which is considered to bring jobs, population growth, general prosperity²⁹ and “a sense of pride and security”³⁰ to the country. Recently, the motivation for extensive mining in Sweden shifted from mere prosperity to “[c]limate urgency” demanding the ‘green transition.’³¹ This urgency is to a large extent linked to future generations because, children, as de Leeuw writes, “are invoked as the personified recipients of this sense of obligation.”³² However, this future-oriented attempt of climate mitigation through the ‘green transition’ appears to bear significant environmental and human rights consequences.³³ As Buhman put it “the quest to save humanity in the long term through the energy transition [...] is connected to human rights harm” affecting mostly “local host-communities”³⁴ such as Sámi in Gállok.³⁵ While the latter “were acknowledged as [I]ndigenous by the Swedish parliament in 1977, and received constitutional recognition as a ‘people’ in 2011,” Sámi peoples remain marginalized and lack influence in decision-making processes on land use.³⁶

²⁷ S. Persson, D. Harnesk & M. Islar. What local people? Examining the Gállok mining conflict and the rights of the Sámi population in terms of justice and power. *Geoforum*. 86 (2017), p. 21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.08.009>.

²⁸ de Leeuw. *The comfort of alignment: Mining, green steel, and killjoy desires in Sweden/Sápmi*, p. 1.

²⁹ Persson, Harnesk & Islar. *What local people? Examining the Gállok mining conflict and the rights of the Sámi population in terms of justice and power*, p. 21 ff.; K. Buhmann. Addressing a human rights paradox in the green transition: Guidance for invested mining operations to benefit local communities. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 419 (2023), p. 3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.137903>.

³⁰ de Leeuw. *The comfort of alignment: Mining, green steel, and killjoy desires in Sweden/Sápmi*, p. 1.

³¹ *ibid.*, p. 127.

³² *ibid.*

³³ Persson, Harnesk & Islar. *What local people? Examining the Gállok mining conflict and the rights of the Sámi population in terms of justice and power*, p. 20; de Leeuw. *The comfort of alignment: Mining, green steel, and killjoy desires in Sweden/Sápmi*, p. 130.

³⁴ Buhmann. *Addressing a human rights paradox in the green transition: Guidance for invested mining operations to benefit local communities*, p. 1.

³⁵ Persson, Harnesk & Islar. *What local people? Examining the Gállok mining conflict and the rights of the Sámi population in terms of justice and power*, p. 20.

³⁶ *ibid.*, pp. 23-27, quotation at p. 23.

From a human rights perspective, Gállok has often been discussed against the background of Indigenous peoples' rights frameworks which is highlighted in two communications on Gállok from UN bodies to the Swedish government – one joint communication by the Special Rapporteur on the rights of Indigenous peoples and the Special Rapporteur on the human right to a healthy environment,³⁷ the second one from the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD).³⁸ Both communications are expressing concern over “the significant and irreversible damage that the Gállok project poses to Sámi lands, resources, culture and livelihoods”³⁹ as well as the lack of Sámi peoples' consultation during the process.⁴⁰ The communications remind the government of international legal obligations protecting Indigenous peoples' rights that Sweden has ratified such as inter alia the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).⁴¹ The criticisms of OHCHR and CERD not only highlight the complexity of the case and its connection to international law but also how Gállok was perceived to be a solely Indigenous rights issue.

Arguing that children are affected by the decision, it appears remarkable that the case has not yet been looked at from a child rights perspective especially keeping in mind that children have become a vocal part of climate litigation processes over the past years.

In 2019, *Sacchi v. Argentina*, “the first climate lawsuit petition” was filed before the Committee on the Rights of the Child (“the Committee”).⁴² Making use of the communications procedure, established in the third Optional Protocol to the CRC, 16 children argued that five countries “knowingly caused and perpetuated the climate

³⁷ J.F. Cali Tzay & D.R. Boyd. *Joint Communication from Special Procedures*. (United Nations Office of the High Commissioner, 2022). <https://crd.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/UN-Communication-SWE-03.02.2022-.pdf>.

³⁸ V. Shepherd. (Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, 2022). https://indigenous.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/2023-09/INT_CERD_ALE_SWE_9557_E.pdf (accessed 2026-05-24).

³⁹ Cali Tzay & Boyd. *Joint Communication from Special Procedures*, p. 7.

⁴⁰ *ibid.*, pp. 1, 7; Shepherd, p. 1 f.

⁴¹ Cali Tzay & Boyd. *Joint Communication from Special Procedures*, p. 7 f.

⁴² F. Paz Landeira. Temporalities in Crisis: Analysing the *Sacchi v. Argentina* Case and Children's Rights in the Climate Emergency. *Children & Society*. 39: 4 (2025), p. 854. <https://doi.org/10.1111/chso.12955>.

crisis”⁴³ and thereby violated several of the petitioner’s rights.⁴⁴ While the case was rejected, it “was pivotal in linking the climate crisis to children’s rights”⁴⁵ and Indigenous children’s rights to life and culture.⁴⁶

The connection between CRC, environmental issues and Indigenous rights was highlighted even more in *M.E.V. v. Finland* in 2022 which bears a remarkable resemblance to Gállok. M.E.V. and her sisters from the Kova-Labba community⁴⁷ filed a petition under the third Optional Protocol arguing that Finland violated inter alia articles 8, 27 and 30 CRC by permitting a mining project “in the heart of [Sámi peoples’] winter herding lands” without seeking the petitioners’ free, prior and informed consent (FPIC).⁴⁸

The Committee found a violation of inter alia articles 30 and 12 CRC.⁴⁹ While article 30 essentially mirrors article 27 ICCPR, the Committee offered a novel interpretation of the former by linking Indigeneity and traditional ways of living in a particular place to the notion of heritage.⁵⁰ By stating that “cultural rights have an intergenerational aspect that is fundamental to the cultural identity,”⁵¹ the Committee interpreted the CRC as a tool for children to claim children’s but also Indigenous peoples’ rights. Additionally, while the CRC does not entail a “collective right of peoples to self-

⁴³ S. Lee. *Sacchi v. Argentina: Fighting for Indigneous Children’s Climate Rights*. *UCLA Law Review* (2020). <https://www.uclalawreview.org/sacchi-v-argentina-fighting-for-indigenous-childrens-climate-rights/> (accessed 2026-05-24).

⁴⁴ M.A. Tigre & V. Lichet. The CRC Decision in *Sacchi v. Argentina*. *ASIL insights*. 25: 26 (2021), p. 1.

⁴⁵ Paz Landeira. *Temporalities in Crisis: Analysing the Sacchi v. Argentina Case and Children’s Rights in the Climate Emergency*, pp. 854-860, quotation at p. 854.

⁴⁶ Lee. *Sacchi v. Argentina: Fighting for Indigneous Children’s Climate Rights*.

⁴⁷ Committee on the Rights of the Child. *Views adopted by the Committee under the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure, concerning communication No. 172/2022*. (Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2025), p. 1.

https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F97%2FD%2F172%2F2022&Lang=en; M. Scheinin & M. Åhrén. Evolution of Indigenous Peoples’ Rights as Human Rights: Contribution of Sámi Rights Cases at UN Human Rights Treaty Bodies. *Nordic Journal of Human Rights*. 44: 1 (2026), p. 10.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/18918131.2026.2639220>.

⁴⁸ Committee on the Rights of the Child. *Views adopted by the Committee under the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure, concerning communication No. 172/2022*, pp. 1-3, quotation at p. 3.

⁴⁹ Scheinin & Åhrén. *Evolution of Indigenous Peoples’ Rights as Human Rights*, p. 11.

⁵⁰ *ibid.*, p. 6.

⁵¹ Committee on the Rights of the Child. *Views adopted by the Committee under the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure, concerning communication No. 172/2022*, p. 13.

determination,” the Committee linked seeking FPIC to article 12, providing the inclusion of Indigenous children in decision-making processes.⁵²

While Sweden has not yet ratified the third Optional Protocol to the CRC allowing Swedish children and youth to petition against the State before the Committee, the interpretations of the Committee highlight interdependences between conventions⁵³ and could be “of relevance for articulation of claims and for domestic and international litigation elsewhere.”⁵⁴ Based on this, Gállok shall be looked at from a child rights perspective throughout this study, offering a new lens and acknowledging how Indigenous peoples’ rights and children’s rights complement each other.

2.3 Literature Review

To situate the focus of this study, this chapter focuses on three strands of literature. The first strand encompasses a theoretical debate on the scope of article 12, its meaning for children, and the forms its implementation may take in practice. The second strand engages with child rights perspectives on climate change and environmental issues and shows how they are challenged by scholarship focused on practical observations of article 12 in light of climate mitigation. The third strand links Indigeneity with children’s right to participate. After discussing all three of the strands the thesis’ objective shall be situated within them.

2.3.1 Article 12

The first strand of literature shows how article 12⁵⁵ is subject to an intense academic debate on the scope and meaning of the provision. While the article was adopted unanimously⁵⁶ it still is one of the most controversial provisions in the CRC.⁵⁷

⁵² Scheinin & Åhrén. *Evolution of Indigenous Peoples’ Rights as Human Rights*, p. 16.

⁵³ *ibid.*, p. 10.

⁵⁴ *ibid.*, p. 2.

⁵⁵ While I focus on article 12(1) CRC, previous scholarship does not often make this distinction.

⁵⁶ Stern. *The child’s right to participation. Reality or rhetoric?*, p. 167; Krappmann. *The weight of the child’s view (Article 12 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child)*, p. 510.

⁵⁷ Stern. *The child’s right to participation. Reality or rhetoric?*, p. 188; Lundy. *‘Voice’ is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child*, p. 928; E.K.M. Tisdall. Children and young people’s participation. A critical consideration of Article 12. In *Routledge International Handbook of Children’s Rights Studies*. (Routledge, 2015), p. 196. <https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.4324/9781315769530-13>.

Moreover, it should be noted that article 12 is often intertwined with the concept of participation⁵⁸ and other participatory rights (i.e. freedom of expression or access to information)⁵⁹ as well as it is an overarching principle of the CRC⁶⁰ which makes a clear definition of the article rather intricate. This section introduces three key controversies within this debate.

Controversy 1: the scope of article 12(1)

While General Comment No. 12 highlights parental divorce or separation, alternative care and adoption as matters affecting the child,⁶¹ the range of topics discussed in the academic debate exceeds these significantly. Lückner-Babel argues that article 12 encompasses matters which are demonstrably linked to the child's life.⁶² Oppositely, Heneghan suggests that the article also includes "broader political matters such as climate change."⁶³ Lundy poses that children themselves should define the matters they are affected by⁶⁴ which would open the scope of the article to an infinite extent.

Further, the article's caveats "capability", "age" and "maturity" sparked widespread criticism among scholars arguing that it is not about whether children can form views of mature quality but that they have the right to do so from a very early age on.⁶⁵ This perspective is contrasted by Archard arguing that if we were to take infant's expression

⁵⁸ Krappmann. *The weight of the child's view (Article 12 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child)*, p. 501; L. Lindkvist. Five Problems with Children's Participation Rights. In R. Adami, A. Kaldal & M. Aspán. (eds.). *The Rights of the Child. Legal, Political and Ethical Challenges*. (Brill | Nijhoff, 2023), p. 156. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004511163_016.

⁵⁹ A. Parkes. *Children and International Human Rights Law. The right of the child to be heard*. (Routledge, 2013), p. 39 f.; Tisdall. *Children and young people's participation. A critical consideration of Article 12*, p. 185.

⁶⁰ Lindkvist. *The Child Subject of Human Rights*, p. 213.

⁶¹ E. Donger. Children and Youth in Strategic Climate Litigation: Advancing Rights through Legal Argument and Legal Mobilization. *Transnational Environmental Law*. 11: 2 (2022), p. 269. <https://doi.org/DOI:10.1017/S2047102522000218>.

⁶² M.-F. Lückner-Babel. The Right of the Child to Express Views and to Be Heard: An Attempt to Interpret Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. *International Journal of Children's Rights*. 3: 3 & 4 (1995), p. 395 f.

⁶³ M. Heneghan. Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Children. Where Have We Come from, Where Are We Now and Where to from Here? *International Journal of Children's Rights*. 25 (2017), p. 540. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718182-02502012>.

⁶⁴ Lundy. 'Voice' is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, p. 931.

⁶⁵ *ibid.*, p. 935; Krappmann. *The weight of the child's view (Article 12 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child)*, p. 507; Parkes. *Children and International Human Rights Law. The right of the child to be heard*, p. 32; Heneghan. *Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Children. Where Have We Come from, Where Are We Now and Where to from Here?*, p. 541.

into account “we should attribute opinions to cats and dogs” which highlights that it is not about children being *able* to express views but about whether they are *understood*.⁶⁶ This reflects on Lindkvist’s argument that in practice children’s capability may be determined by their “ability to adapt to outside expectations on behaviour and style of argumentation.”⁶⁷

Controversy 2: the child’s position under article 12(1)

The second controversy centers around the question whether the establishment of article 12 changed the societal position of the child and how the child is conceptualized through the article.

On the one hand, numerous scholars portray the emergence of article 12 as a shift in international law and society arguing that it elevated the child from an object of rights to a legitimate rights subject⁶⁸ with agency.⁶⁹ On the other hand, previous scholarship highlights that article 12 did not change the societal position of children and, as Lindkvist phrased it, that the article “was not intended as a means of reorganizing children as political subjects.”⁷⁰ This is underpinned by scholarship emphasizing the lack of input from children during the drafting of the convention⁷¹ and the lack of

⁶⁶ D. Archard. Hearing the child’s voice: a philosophical account. *Journal of the British Academy*. 8: 4 (2020), p. 9. <https://doi.org/10.5871/jba/008s4.007>.

⁶⁷ Lindkvist. *Five Problems with Children’s Participation Rights*, p. 159.

⁶⁸ Lundy. ‘Voice’ is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, p. 928; Krappmann. *The weight of the child’s view (Article 12 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child)*, p. 502; Parkes. *Children and International Human Rights Law. The right of the child to be heard*, p. 31; R. Sandland. A Clash of Conventions? Participation, Power and the Rights of Disabled Children. *Social Inclusion*. 5: 3 (2017), p. 94 f.

<https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v5i3.955>; Lindkvist. *The Child Subject of Human Rights*, p. 216 ff.; A. Twum-Danso Imoh. Adults in Charge: The Limits of Formal Child Participatory Processes for Societal Transformation. In B. Sandin, J. Josefsson, K. Hanson & S. Balagopalan. (eds.). *The Politics of Children’s Rights and Representation*. (Palgrave Macmillan, 2023), p. 59. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-04480-9_3.

⁶⁹ Lindkvist. *Five Problems with Children’s Participation Rights*, p. 152 f.

⁷⁰ *ibid.*, p. 156.

⁷¹ Henaghan. *Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Children. Where Have We Come from, Where Are We Now and Where to from Here?*, p. 538.

voting rights provisions in the CRC⁷² which, according to Twum-Danso Imoh, stresses the “persisting understanding of children’s rights as being a gift of adults.”⁷³

The question whether the position of children has changed with the emergence of article 12 is deeply linked to the question whether children are seen as human beings or “human becomings.”⁷⁴ The scholarly debate shows that article 12 is, on the one hand, understood to be a necessary preparation for adulthood and citizenship⁷⁵ linking children’s enjoyment of their human rights to their future as adults rather than their current childhood. Incidentally, the assumption, that children need to practice citizenship – while mentioned here as a reason to implement the article – is frequently mentioned as an *obstacle* to take their views into consideration as discussed in the first controversy.

Contrarily, recent child rights scholarship opposes interpretations of children’s rights “as means of stimulating children’s development.”⁷⁶ From this perspective, the article could enable adults to understand children’s *current* realities and improve their “judgement of what is best for them”⁷⁷ while simultaneously enabling children to influence decisions they are affected by.⁷⁸ Accordingly, children’s rights would be linked to childhood rather than to their future.

The disagreement on the motivation behind article 12 is also reflected in a subsequent debate on its relation to article 3 CRC, the best interest principle. While some scholars emphasized the significance of listening to children in order to act on their best interest,⁷⁹ others argued that article 12 cannot be implemented properly if it were to

⁷² Sandland. *A Clash of Conventions? Participation, Power and the Rights of Disabled Children*, p. 95.

⁷³ Twum-Danso Imoh. *Adults in Charge: The Limits of Formal Child Participatory Processes for Societal Transformation*, p. 60.

⁷⁴ Lindkvist. *The Child Subject of Human Rights*, p. 212.

⁷⁵ R.A. Hart. Children’s Participation. From Tokenism to Citizenship (1992), p. 5. <https://participationpool.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Hart-R.-1992-Children-Participation-from-Tokenism-to-Citizenship.pdf>; R. Bosisio. Children’s Right to Be Heard: What Children Think. *International Journal of Children’s Rights*. 20: 1 (2012), p. 144. <https://doi.org/10.1163/157181811X573462>.

⁷⁶ Lindkvist. *The Child Subject of Human Rights*, p. 225.

⁷⁷ Archard. *Hearing the child’s voice: a philosophical account*, p. 11.

⁷⁸ Henaghan. *Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Children. Where Have We Come from, Where Are We Now and Where to from Here?*, p. 550.

⁷⁹ Krappmann. *The weight of the child’s view (Article 12 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child)*, p. 504; Parkes. *Children and International Human Rights Law. The right of the child to be*

interfere with article 3⁸⁰ which suggests that the child's best interest would be determined by an adult no matter the child's perspective on the subject.

Controversy 3: the implementation of article 12

The last controversy focuses on the practical implementation of article 12 and the barriers preventing it.

According to Lundy, implementing article 12 “requires consideration of the implications of four separate factors: Space, Voice, Audience and Influence”⁸¹ enabling children to express their views, be heard and taken into consideration.⁸² Scholarship aimed at tracing the implementation in practical observations of legal proceedings and criminological investigations located the implementation of the article in i.e. the establishment of “more child-friendly proceedings.”⁸³ This is, however, contrasted by scholars arguing that the changed structures “are merely prima facie participatory”⁸⁴ and that they do not signify whether children's views are taken into account⁸⁵ suggesting that audience or impact could not be traced.

Complementarily, previous scholarship offers multiple explanations *why* the implementation of the article appears to be challenging with underlying societal norms placing children below adults because of their cognitive capacities, skills and

heard, p. 44; E. Boshoff. The Best Interest of the Child and Climate Change Adaptation in Sub-Saharan Africa. In M. Addaney, M. G. Nyarko & E. Boshoff. (eds.). *Governance, Human Rights, and Political Transformation in Africa*. (Springer International Publishing, 2020), p. 14.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-27049-0_14.

⁸⁰ Lückner-Babel. *The Right of the Child to Express Views and to Be Heard: An Attempt to Interpret Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child*, p. 394; Tisdall. *Children and young people's participation. A critical consideration of Article 12*, p. 196; S. Shields, A. Longo, M. Strand & E. Morgera. Children's Human Right to Be Heard at the Ocean-climate Nexus. *The International Journal of Marine and Coastal Law*. 38: 3 (2023), p. 557 f.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/15718085-bja10140>.

⁸¹ Lundy. 'Voice' is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, p. 932.

⁸² *ibid.*, p. 933.

⁸³ A. Kaldal. Children's Participation in Legal Proceedings - Conditioned by Adult Views of Children's Capacity and Credibility? In R. Adami, A. Kaldal & M. Aspán. (eds.). *The Rights of the Child. Legal, Political and Ethical Challenges*. (Brill | Nijhoff, 2023), p. 76.

⁸⁴ Parkes. *Children and International Human Rights Law. The right of the child to be heard*, p. 206.

⁸⁵ Kaldal. *Children's Participation in Legal Proceedings - Conditioned by Adult Views of Children's Capacity and Credibility?*, p. 64.

rationality, being the most frequently mentioned one.⁸⁶ Further barriers have been located in children's "personal circumstances,"⁸⁷ a lacking awareness of the article⁸⁸ or general "crises of human rights and democratic life."⁸⁹

2.3.2 Children's right to participate in climate mitigation processes

Land use debates and Gállok in particular are deeply connected to questions of environmental issues and climate change. The second strand of literature focuses on the child's right to participate in decision-making processes related to environmental issues, child rights perspectives on climate change more generally and how those two contradict each other.

Scholarship offering child rights perspectives on climate change commonly portrays children as "the most vulnerable,"⁹⁰ but also as the most burdened by climate change effects.⁹¹ While these assumptions cannot be denied, these perspectives portray the child *only* as the victim of climate change and demonstrate a rights perspective that focuses on provision and protection rights rather than agentic ones. What scholars here

⁸⁶ Stern. *The child's right to participation. Reality or rhetoric?*, p. 152; Lundy. 'Voice' is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, p. 930 f.; Parkes. *Children and International Human Rights Law. The right of the child to be heard*, p. 60; Tisdall. *Children and young people's participation. A critical consideration of Article 12*, p. 186; R. Thorburn Stern. *Implementing Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Participation, Power and Attitudes*. (Brill Nijhoff, 2017), p. 156; R. Adami. Childism - on Adult Resistance to Children's Rights. In R. Adami, A. Kaldal & M. Aspán. (eds.). *The Rights of the Child. Legal, Political and Ethical Challenges*. (Brill | Nijhoff, 2023), p. 138; M. Bekink. The Fundamental Right of Children to Participate in Climate Change Decision-Making Processes: A South African Perspective. *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal*. 27 (2024), p. 4. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17159/1727-3781/2024/v27i0a18350>.

⁸⁷ Parkes. *Children and International Human Rights Law. The right of the child to be heard*, p. 25.

⁸⁸ Lundy. 'Voice' is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, p. 930.

⁸⁹ Lindkvist. *Five Problems with Children's Participation Rights*, p. 161.

⁹⁰ Boshoff. *The Best Interest of the Child and Climate Change Adaptation in Sub-Saharan Africa*, p. 1.

⁹¹ Arts. *A child rights perspective on climate change*, p. 79; Uddin, Philipsborn, Smith, Mutic & Thompson. *A global child health perspective on climate change, migration and human rights*, p. 1; Daly. *Climate Competence: Youth Climate Activism and Its Impact on International Human Rights Law*, p. 1; Bekink. *The Fundamental Right of Children to Participate in Climate Change Decision-Making Processes: A South African Perspective*, p. 3; T. Biswas & T. Hylland Eriksen. Children as environmental actors. A generational perspective on climate activism in an overheated world. In T. Abebe, A. Dar & K. Wells. (eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Childhood Studies and Global Development*. 1. ed. (Routledge, 2024), p. 152. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003155843-15>.

mostly focus on is the right to life,⁹² to physical and mental health and development⁹³ but also the “less visible consequences for children’s rights (...) following extreme climatic events”⁹⁴ such as inter alia conflicts, displacements, family separation and exploitation.⁹⁵ This highlights a paternalistic reading of the CRC in society and to a large extent in academia.

Scholarship engaging with children’s participation in climate mitigation vary between building on and challenging this paternalistic reading. First, while not engaged with article 12 but children’s participation in climate mitigation more generally, Trott argues that children should be empowered to become active in climate action within age-appropriate settings as it would increase their agency⁹⁶ and result in children feeling more capable, prepared and hopeful.⁹⁷ However, this approach is still offering a paternalistic reading of article 12 as it views the latter as dependent on adult cooperation.

Second, several scholars tracing article 12 in use challenge this understanding by emphasizing that children already are agents of change within climate mitigation. Parker et al., for example, argue that children represent “one of the most vocal” groups

⁹² Arts. *A child rights perspective on climate change*, p. 87; E.D. Gibbons. *Climate Change, Children’s Rights, and the Pursuit of Intergenerational Climate Justice. Health and Human Rights Journal*. 16: 1 (2014), p. 20; Bekink. *The Fundamental Right of Children to Participate in Climate Change Decision-Making Processes: A South African Perspective*, p. 3; Biswas & Hylland Eriksen. *Children as environmental actors. A generational perspective on climate activism in an overheated world*, p. 152.

⁹³ Arts. *A child rights perspective on climate change*, p. 85 ff.; Gibbons. *Climate Change, Children’s Rights, and the Pursuit of Intergenerational Climate Justice*, p. 20; E. Desmet & J. Aylwin. Natural resource exploitation and children’s rights. In W. Vandenhoe, E. Desmet, D. Reynaert & S. Lembrechts. (eds.). *Routledge International Handbook of Children’s Rights Studies*. 1. ed. (Routledge, 2015), p. 387. <https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.4324/9781315769530-24>.

⁹⁴ Sanz-Caballero. *Children’s rights in a changing climate: a perspective from the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child*, p. 2.

⁹⁵ *ibid.*; Gibbons. *Climate Change, Children’s Rights, and the Pursuit of Intergenerational Climate Justice*, p. 22 ff.; Desmet & Aylwin. *Natural resource exploitation and children’s rights*, p. 387 ff.

⁹⁶ C.D. Trott. What difference does it make? Exploring the transformative potential of everyday climate crisis activism by children and youth. *Children’s Geographies*. 19: 3 (2021), p. 300 f. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2020.1870663>.

⁹⁷ C.D. Trott. Reshaping our world: Collaborating with children for community-based climate change action. *Action Research*. 17: 1 (2019), p. 45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750319829209>; Trott. *What difference does it make? Exploring the transformative potential of everyday climate crisis activism by children and youth.*, p. 305.

within climate justice movements.⁹⁸ This position has ushered in “an era of postpaternalism” allowing children to *claim* their rights.⁹⁹ However, previous research aiming to observe the implementation of article 12 often focused solely on the “expressing views” and, to some extent, “being heard” elements of the article but neglected the question of impact. Thus, while children are willing to partake and protest what seems wrong,¹⁰⁰ there is no indication of article 12 being taken into consideration which bears the question whether children’s involvement is enabled by the implementation of article 12 or the lack thereof. While children became more active in climate activism, they have been described as lacking influence,¹⁰¹ which, according to Daly, leaves them with no other choice than to protest.¹⁰² This suggests, that children are expressing their views but leaves open whether they are claiming their right to be heard.

Third, scholarship focused on children’s efforts to access article 12 and the barriers they face while trying, complements these findings. Gibbon’s work suggests that “children and young people have consistently tried to influence the Conference of Parties (COP) meetings,” but are very seldomly being heard.¹⁰³ Similarly, Bekink shows how South African children and youths claimed their right to participate in climate mitigation strategies but that their participation is not necessarily in line with the rights provided in the CRC as the latter are frequently neglected in national environmental laws and policies.¹⁰⁴ Additionally, Shields et al., discussing article 12

⁹⁸ Parker, Mestre, Jodoin & Wewerinke-Singh. *When the kids put climate change on trial: youth-focused rights-based climate litigation around the world*, p. 65.

⁹⁹ A. Daly, N. Maharjan, E. Montesinos Calvo-Fernández, L.H. Muller, E.M. Murray, A. O’Sullivan, F. Paz Landeira & K. Reid. Climate Action and the UNCRC: A ‘Postpaternalist’ World Where Children Claim Their Own Rights. *Youth*. No. 4 (2024), p. 1400. <https://doi.org/10.3390/youth4040088>.

¹⁰⁰ Parker, Mestre, Jodoin & Wewerinke-Singh. *When the kids put climate change on trial: youth-focused rights-based climate litigation around the world*, p. 69.

¹⁰¹ Daly. *Climate Competence: Youth Climate Activism and Its Impact on International Human Rights Law*, p. 23; Parker, Mestre, Jodoin & Wewerinke-Singh. *When the kids put climate change on trial: youth-focused rights-based climate litigation around the world*, p. 66.

¹⁰² Daly. *Climate Competence: Youth Climate Activism and Its Impact on International Human Rights Law*, p. 23.

¹⁰³ Gibbons. *Climate Change, Children’s Rights, and the Pursuit of Intergenerational Climate Justice*, p. 23.

¹⁰⁴ Bekink. *The Fundamental Right of Children to Participate in Climate Change Decision-Making Processes: A South African Perspective*, pp. 5 f., 23 ff.

“in the context of the law of the sea”¹⁰⁵ state that the implementation of Article 12 cannot be observed in singular events because “participation of children is a process.”¹⁰⁶ While investigating article 12 beyond the element of expressing views, neither of the above-mentioned studies offered such a lengthy observation on the audience or impact of the child’s voice nor an explanation why it is missing which raises the question whether we have ever seen this right in practice yet.

2.3.3 Indigenous children’s participation

The third strand of literature focuses on Indigenous children’s participation in public decision-making processes and suggests an important connection between the CRC, Indigenous children’s participation rights and how they are claimed by Indigenous children.

This connection could already be seen in the drafting process of the CRC when some Canadian Indigenous children were able to speak in front of the drafting delegates, highlighting the need for a provision protecting Indigenous children’s right to their culture and language.¹⁰⁷ Blanchet-Cohen portrays the CRC as “an opportunity to advocate for an alternative worldview *for, with and by* Indigenous children.”¹⁰⁸ While the interplay of Indigeneity and children’s rights is mostly addressed through article 30 CRC,¹⁰⁹ the child’s right to their own culture, language and religion is, according to Akame¹¹⁰ and Wong,¹¹¹ deeply connected to participatory rights such as article 12 and article 13 CRC which would enable children to receive appropriate and cultural sensitive information and would promote their access to Indigenous rights more

¹⁰⁵ Shields, Longo, Strand & Morgera. *Children’s Human Right to Be Heard at the Ocean-climate Nexus*, p. 548.

¹⁰⁶ *ibid.*, p. 577.

¹⁰⁷ G.V. Bueren. The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. *Journal of Child Law*. 3: 2 (1991), p. 63. <https://heinonline-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/chilflq3&i=69>.

¹⁰⁸ Blanchet-Cohen. *Indigenous children’s rights. Opportunities in appropriation and transformation*, p. 371.

¹⁰⁹ *ibid.*, p. 373; G. Akame. Meaningful Participation or Tokenism?: Sámi Children and Youth in Norway’s Climate and Green Energy Transition. *The International Journal of Children’s Rights*. 33: 3 (2025), p. 676. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718182-33030004>.

¹¹⁰ *ibid.*, p. 677.

¹¹¹ C. Wong. Inclusion of Indigenous Children’s Rights. Informing Water Management in Canada. In C. Fenton-Glynn. (ed.). *Children’s Rights and Sustainable Development. Interpreting the UNCRC for Future Generations*. 1. ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2019), p. 241. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108140348.011>.

generally. Complementarily, Doel-Mackaway argues that the implementation of article 12 for Indigenous children requires, beyond culturally sensitive information for the child, a holistic adoption of a child rights perspective and the cooperation with community leaders.¹¹² Doel-Mackaway's approach thus suggests that whether article 12 is considered in decision-making processes is dependent on the cooperation with adults.

This perspective is contrasted by scholars arguing that Indigenous children are already claiming their right to be heard.¹¹³ The empowerment of children to be involved in decision-making processes, however, "ha[s] not always been welcomed in their own communities" as Blanchet-Cohen suggests.¹¹⁴ Additionally, said empowerment often remains tokenistic, as Akame's research on Sámi children's participation within Norway's 'green transition' shows.¹¹⁵ So, while Indigenous children appear to be vocal in climate justice movements, whether their views "especially those expressed collectively" are heard and considered remains unclear.¹¹⁶

2.3.4 Concluding remarks

There are several learnings from previous literature that should be emphasized. First, article 12, while being part of a widely agreed upon international legal framework, lacks clear-cut instructions and is instead open to multiple interpretations regarding its scope, the way it affects the child's societal position and what its implementation would look like.

These controversies are, secondly, reflected in practical observations of the implementation of article 12 either in regard to climate change or linked to Indigenous children. On the one hand, scholars repeatedly emphasize the lack of implementation of article 12 and the barriers hindering children from enjoying this right fully. On the

¹¹² H. Doel-Mackaway. *Indigenous Children's Rights to Participate in Law and Policy Development*. (Routledge, 2022), pp. 179 ff.

¹¹³ Blanchet-Cohen. *Indigenous children's rights. Opportunities in appropriation and transformation*, p. 379; Akame. *Meaningful Participation or Tokenism?: Sámi Children and Youth in Norway's Climate and Green Energy Transition*, p. 678.

¹¹⁴ Blanchet-Cohen. *Indigenous children's rights. Opportunities in appropriation and transformation*, p. 379.

¹¹⁵ Akame. *Meaningful Participation or Tokenism?: Sámi Children and Youth in Norway's Climate and Green Energy Transition*, p. 675.

¹¹⁶ *ibid.*, pp. 689-694, quotation at p. 689.

other hand, recent scholarship emphasized the child as self-empowered agent claiming this right in climate mitigation activities without adult cooperation. Here, however, it is often only the views expressed that are considered not the articles' elements of being heard and having one's views considered.

I aim to contribute to this debate by looking at the way article 12(1) is practically taken into consideration regarding not only the views expressed by children but the audience and the impact children have in the decision-making process for Gállok. Additionally, by placing attention on the way children's rights in general are referred to in this process, I aim to visualize a child rights perspective on issues of land use linked to questions of environmental issues. Further, regarding the multiplicity of barriers that are assumed to hinder the full implementation of article 12(1), I want to shed light on the differences between the political and the public sphere in the involvement of children and their rights during the process. With that, I hope to contribute to a broader debate on the substance of article 12 and whether taking it into consideration changes the societal position of children.

3. Theoretical Framework

The empirical research of this thesis is led by an interpretive and critical approach centered around children's experiences, unveiling their marginalization and trying to reimagine societal structures that place children below adults.¹¹⁷ This approach, called *childism*, was coined by John Wall and heavily influenced by the agentic perspective on children stemming from childhood studies.¹¹⁸

The term 'childism' has been used within different academic disciplines describing different – if somewhat related – concepts. The term *childism* used here is defined as a critical theoretical approach analogous to *inter alia* feminism aiming at challenging and restructuring fundamental societal norms and relations.¹¹⁹ It is thus deviating from

¹¹⁷ Wall. *From childhood studies to childism: reconstructing the scholarly and social imaginations*, p. 257 ff.; T. Biswas, J. Wall, H. Warming, O. Zehavi, D. Kennedy, K. Murris, W. Kohan, B. Saal & T. Rollo. *Childism and philosophy: A conceptual co-exploration. Policy Futures in Education*. 22: 5 (2024), p. 742. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103231185178>; Wall. *Childism and the Politics of Social Empowerment*, p. 205.

¹¹⁸ Wall. *Childism and the Politics of Social Empowerment*, p. 205.

¹¹⁹ *ibid.*

Hunt's definition of childism as a critical approach to engaging with children's literature by adopting a childish perspective.¹²⁰ More importantly, it is opposing the definition of psychoanalyst Young-Bruehl who defines childism as "prejudice against children" by adults¹²¹ analogous to racism or sexism.¹²² While both Hunt and Young-Bruehl offer a critical perspective on conceptualizations of children and their experiences, they lack the empowering, transformative perspective that childhood studies have produced.

The emergence of childhood studies from sociology, anthropology and history in the 1980s brought a new perspective on children and childhoods to life.¹²³ Childhood studies acknowledge the subjectivity of childhoods and view children as more than "developing adults."¹²⁴ This perspective inspired the establishment of children's rights and a critical engagement with "child-adult relations"¹²⁵ and the marginalization of children.

According to Wall, children's marginalization is particularly evident in their "lack of voting rights" but also, in their exclusion from public participation and expression based on their attributed incompetence and inability.¹²⁶ This perception is called adultism, a longstanding cultural attitude that favors adults and systematically discriminates children.¹²⁷

To overcome these underlying notions of adultism, Wall argues for a threefold "reconstruction of human rights' very concepts and structures."¹²⁸ First, instead of thinking of rights subjects as independent individuals, Wall suggests a new ontology of

¹²⁰ Wall. *From childhood studies to childism: reconstructing the scholarly and social imaginations*, p. 262.

¹²¹ E. Young-Bruehl. Childism—Prejudice against Children. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*. 45: 2 (2009), p. 255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00107530.2009.10745998>.

¹²² Adami. *Childism - on Adult Resistance to Children's Rights*, p. 128; Wall. *From childhood studies to childism: reconstructing the scholarly and social imaginations*, p. 262.

¹²³ J. Qvortrup. Are Children Human Beings or Human Becomings? A critical assessment of outcome thinking. *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali*. 117: 3/4 (2009), p. 633; Wall. *From childhood studies to childism: reconstructing the scholarly and social imaginations*, p. 258.

¹²⁴ Wall. *From childhood studies to childism: reconstructing the scholarly and social imaginations*, p. 258.

¹²⁵ *ibid.*, p. 258 f., quotation at p. 259.

¹²⁶ Wall. *Childism and the Politics of Social Empowerment*, p. 206 ff, quotation at p. 206.

¹²⁷ *ibid.*, p. 207.

¹²⁸ Wall. *Children's rights from a childist perspective. Theorizing social empowerment*, p. 85.

interdependence.¹²⁹ This would acknowledge that adults like children are dependent on each other and strengthen each other by mutual empowerment.¹³⁰ Second, challenging underlying societal assumptions that marginalize children, Wall calls for an epistemology that is based on children's "lived experiences"¹³¹ and knowledge we can gain not about, but *from* children. Lastly, Wall argues for a re-imagining of power structures to overcome societal biases that placed children in the margins¹³² and to achieve everyone's "empowered inclusion."¹³³

Childism according to Wall "places children's voices and experiences at the center of inquiry" to deconstruct their marginalized position in society.¹³⁴ It thus helps to visualize the experiences that otherwise would remain unnoticed. Additionally, in centering children's lived experiences, childism aims to deconstruct but also reconstruct societal relations and the "historically engrained norms of adultism."¹³⁵ It thus helps reimagine political and societal practices through the eyes of children.¹³⁶

Wall's theoretical framework of childism is applied throughout the project as a critical lens in two ways. Firstly, it shapes the definitions used and guides methodological decisions. The collection of materials entails a focus on children's voices to include children's lived experiences as much as possible. Throughout the analysis, attention is placed on these experiences and the marginalization of children's voices. Secondly, however, the approach is not used to systematically structure the findings but to critically evaluate them looking beyond legal frameworks and potential rights violations. This is done by deconstructing the marginalization of children throughout the process and reimagining political structures from the interpretation of children's perspectives on the decision-making procedure. Here, the theoretical framework is used to understand the

¹²⁹ Biswas, Wall, Warming, Zehavi, Kennedy, Murris, Kohan, Saal & Rollo. *Childism and philosophy: A conceptual co-exploration*, p. 743; Wall. *Childism and the Politics of Social Empowerment*, p. 208; Wall. *Children's rights from a childist perspective. Theorizing social empowerment*, p. 86.

¹³⁰ *ibid.*, p. 92.

¹³¹ *ibid.*, pp. 82-87, quotation at p. 82.

¹³² *ibid.*, p. 91.

¹³³ Josefsson and Wall, 2020 in: Wall. *Childism and the Politics of Social Empowerment*, p. 211.

¹³⁴ Biswas, Wall, Warming, Zehavi, Kennedy, Murris, Kohan, Saal & Rollo. *Childism and philosophy: A conceptual co-exploration*, p. 742.

¹³⁵ Wall. *From childhood studies to childism: reconstructing the scholarly and social imaginations*, p. 260.

¹³⁶ *ibid.*

findings against the background of deeper questions regarding children's societal and political position beyond the provisions of the CRC.

Childism was selected as a theoretical framework for this project for three reasons. First, Wall argues that critical researchers from any discipline function "less critically" without a childist perspective.¹³⁷ As this study focuses on the practical implementation of children's rights it would be hard to ignore this approach tailored to the intersection of childhood and critical theory.

Second, childism views the marginalization of children as an intersection of i.e. age, sexuality and colonial positionality and "fails if it is not intersectional."¹³⁸ As Gállok not only touches upon children's right to be heard but upon children's Indigenous rights and upon children's rights to a healthy environment, any theoretical approach taken needs to do justice to the individual intersectional experiences that make up childhoods and narratives.

Third, Wall himself already applied this approach looking at the particularities of Article 12 arguing that the implementation of article 12 for children does not only mean to express views and be heard but to be empowered.¹³⁹ This links back to previous research discussing the elements of article 12 and allows me to apply an already tested critical lens on Gállok and article 12(1).

However, two drawbacks of the approach and the application in this study should be noted. First, some elements of Wall's approach, such as the necessary ontological shift or the reconceptualization of power, remain rather theoretical and written in subjunctive. This suggests that the approach offers a task for a broader academic debate but remains unclear on how these shifts could be performed in practice. Second, while children's perspectives will be included, this study does not include *individual* voices of children. Therefore, the detected lived experiences could entail a variety of perspectives that will not be acknowledged. However, the contextualization of collectively uttered experiences will, at least to some extent, emphasize their differences and orientations.

¹³⁷ *ibid.*, p. 258.

¹³⁸ Wall. *Childism and the Politics of Social Empowerment*, p. 206.

¹³⁹ *ibid.*, p. 210.

4. Methodology

In order to answer the research question and led by Wall's childism approach, the analytical framework is based on a critical policy analysis approach. Before discussing the latter, I want to shed light on my positionality as a qualitative researcher, ethical considerations and discuss the selection of case and material.

4.1 Researcher's Positionality & Ethical Considerations

Based on a constructivist ontology and inspired by Bruno Latour,¹⁴⁰ I view the social world as a constant negotiation of perspectives. Human rights as well as childhoods are, from this perspective, socially constructed but also reflect societal power structures that amplify and marginalize voices within the process.¹⁴¹

Based on this understanding, my methodological choices are led by an epistemology following Moore who argues that "things and people make sense in their contexts."¹⁴² Equally, the grounding epistemology of my perspectives and questions is, following an Habermasian approach, the assumption that language is constitutive to the world surrounding us¹⁴³ and as such eminent whenever questioning or challenging societal power structures. Against the background of this epistemology and ontology, my analytical choices can be situated within critical theoretical approaches and thus within the larger spectrum of qualitative methods.

As a qualitative researcher committed to these critical approaches, I regard it as my duty to also shed light on my person. I am a middle-class white woman committed to the intersectional understanding and the abolition of social marginalizations. Engaging with the marginalized position of children from the position of an adult and a mother, I come with an etic perspective but claim to be an ally. Hence, my approach will be a

¹⁴⁰ B. Latour. *Science in Action. How to follow scientists and engineers through society*. (Harvard University Press, 1987).

¹⁴¹ *ibid.*, p. 15.

¹⁴² H.L. Moore. Global Anxieties: Concept-Metaphors and Pre-Theoretical Commitments in Anthropology. *Anthropological Theory*. 4: 1 (2004), p. 72.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1463499604040848>.

¹⁴³ Habermas, 1987, p. 125 in: L. Prior. Content Analysis. In P. Leavy. (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 2. ed. (Oxford University Press, 2020), p. 545.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190847388.013.25>.

normative one. Additionally, it should be noted that, while I am fluent in both, I am not a native speaker of either English or Swedish. However, the material of the analysis as well as the grounding literature are not available in German and shall thus be read and analyzed in my second and third language.

Relying only on previously existing data I collected, typical ethical considerations touching upon consent, privacy or direct harm¹⁴⁴ appear less pressing. However, the risk of doing reputational damage should always be kept in mind.¹⁴⁵ To mitigate this risk, the findings of the analysis are discussed with peers of different backgrounds.

Quality-criteria such as validity and transparency are considered by making logically justified methodological decisions and documenting the collection and selection of data as well as the analytical process thoroughly.¹⁴⁶ Intercoderreliability can be tested only retrospectively as I worked alone.

4.2 Case Study

The empirical data for this master's thesis is based on a single case study in Sweden, namely the controversial decision-making process between 2013-2022 leading to a processing concession for the mining company Jokkmokk Iron Mines AB in the area Kallak K nr 1.

Sweden is an intriguing case for two reasons. First, Sweden has a special commitment to the CRC. Not only was it one of the most deeply involved state parties in its creation¹⁴⁷ it is also one of only few states which incorporated the latter into domestic

¹⁴⁴ G. Ulrich. Research ethics for human rights researchers. In B. A. Andreassen, H.-O. Sano & S. McNerney-Lankford. (eds.). *Research Methods in Human Rights. A Handbook*. (Edward Elgar Publishing, 2017), p. 198. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781785367793.00017>; A. Traianou. The Centrality of Ethics in Qualitative Practice. In P. Leavy. (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 2. ed. (Oxford University Press, 2020), p. 88 ff. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190847388.013.12>.

¹⁴⁵ *ibid.*, p. 87.

¹⁴⁶ All European Academies (ALLEA). *The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity*. (2023), p. 9. <https://allea.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/European-Code-of-Conduct-Revised-Edition-2023.pdf>.

¹⁴⁷ L. Lindkvist. Rights for the World's Children: Rätta Barnen and the Making of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. *Nordic Journal of Human Rights*. 36: 3 (2018), p. 302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18918131.2018.1522772>; R.T. Stern. Much Ado about Nothing? The Road to the Incorporation of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in Sweden. *The International Journal of Children's Rights*. 27: 2 (2019), p. 271. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718182-02702005>.

law in 2020.¹⁴⁸ Since Sweden has ratified the CRC in 1990 already,¹⁴⁹ this incorporation has no further legal implications within the international arena. However, it does have implications on the way it could be used within domestic courts as well as it puts emphasis on the state's commitment to children's rights and highlights Sweden as an "example of a country where tradition, attitudes and culture appear as 'a non-issue.'"¹⁵⁰ Second, Sweden is and has been ranked highly among EU states and their environmental performance¹⁵¹ and, more importantly, young people are and have been playing a significant role in climate justice movements in Sweden.¹⁵²

The case of Gállok was chosen because it is topical and current, touching upon multiple pressing issues such as the 'green transition', climate change and environmental protection, Indigenous rights and neocolonialism. This has been a particularly intensive and controversial permit process generating a nation-wide debate on a political but also a societal level.¹⁵³ Naturally, the public and the political debate leading to the decision in Gállok was characterized by a multitude of different voices from politicians, experts and civil society as discussed in chapter 2.2. However, while under-eighteens clearly were interested in the project and are affected by the decision, a child rights perspective has not yet been applied to this decision-making process.

Led by a critical policy analysis approach focused on discourses it appears eminent to look at a larger timeframe and not just the decision itself.¹⁵⁴ Thus, the analysis focuses on the entire nine-year decision making process starting with JIMAB's initial

¹⁴⁸ UNICEF. *Barnkonventionen*.

¹⁴⁹ UN Treaty Body Database. Ratification Status for CRC - Convention on the Rights of the Child. https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/TreatyBodyExternal/Treaty.aspx?Treaty=CRC&Lang=en (accessed 2026-05-12).

¹⁵⁰ Thorburn Stern. *Implementing Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Participation, Power and Attitudes*, p. 163.

¹⁵¹ OECD. *OECD Environmental Performance Reviews: Sweden 2025*. (2025). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1787/91dcc109-en>.

¹⁵² see for example: S. Sernhede. FFF School Strikes as Alternative Civic Classroom: Sociomaterial Entanglements, Assemblages, and Spatial Imaginaries. *Postdigital Science and Education*. 7: 3 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-025-00562-z>.

¹⁵³ Persson, Harnesk & Islar. *What local people? Examining the Gállok mining conflict and the rights of the Sámi population in terms of justice and power*, p. 20; de Leeuw. *The comfort of alignment: Mining, green steel, and killjoy desires in Sweden/Sápmi*, p. 7.

¹⁵⁴ van Hulst, Metze, Dewulf, de Vries, van Bommel & van Ostaijen. *Discourse, framing and narrative: three ways of doing critical, interpretive policy analysis*, p. 91.

application for a processing concession in April 2013¹⁵⁵ and ending in June 2022 when the final decision of the government was reviewed by the Supreme Administrative Court.¹⁵⁶ Here, the debate shifted to a legal sphere which will not be included in the analysis due to the scope of the thesis and the focus of the research question.

4.3 Data Collection & Selection

Based on the research question and led by a critical policy analysis approach which will be discussed further below, the material of the analysis shall not represent “a small piece of a conversation” but consists instead of a variety of documents.¹⁵⁷ This allows for a broad understanding of the public as well as the political debate surrounding Gállok and the role children and youths play within each. These documents were complemented by social media contributions of youth-led organizations to highlight and understand the arguments of children and youths regarding Gállok and place attention on their lived experiences as a core part of the childist framework according to Wall.¹⁵⁸ As the voices of children and youths are seldomly raised through newspaper articles and their access to the political arena is restricted, and assuming they seek other ways to connect and be vocal, it appeared natural to trace the voices at a forum where they could be found. Due to the nature of the material the collection and selection process was different for each of the sections.

First, a variety of nationally and locally working youth-led organizations with a clear focus on environmental issues and/or Sámi related questions were considered and selected according to their involvement in the public debate of Gállok. The latter was determined based on the existence of social media contributions on Instagram and Facebook, the most popular social media platforms in Sweden in the years 2013, 2017 and 2022.¹⁵⁹ This selection process narrowed the organizations down to Fridays for

¹⁵⁵ Högsta Förvaltningsdomstolens Dom 3893-22, p. 3.

¹⁵⁶ SVT Nyheter. *Jåhkågasska: "Förhoppning är att det aldrig blir en gruva i Gállok"*. (2022). <https://www.svt.se/nyheter/sapmi/jahkagasska-sameby-forhoppning-ar-att-det-aldrig-blir-en-gruva-i-g-llok> (accessed 2026-04-01).

¹⁵⁷ van Hulst, Metze, Dewulf, de Vries, van Bommel & van Ostaijen. *Discourse, framing and narrative: three ways of doing critical, interpretive policy analysis*, p. 91.

¹⁵⁸ Wall. *Children's rights from a childist perspective. Theorizing social empowerment*, p. 82.

¹⁵⁹ O. Findahl. *Swedes and the Internet 2013*. (.SE (the Internet Infrastructure Foundation), 2013). <https://svenskarnaochinternet.se/app/uploads/2023/10/swedes-and-the-internet-2013.pdf> (accessed 2026-04-01); P. Davidsson & A. Thoresson. *Svenskarna och internet 2017*.

Future Sweden, Fridays for Future Kiruna, Fridays for Future Norrbotten, Sáminuorra, Fältbiologerna, WWF Sweden Youth and Sametingets Ungdomsråd. While membership structure is different in all organizations and younger children are welcomed in some of them, most of them are addressed at older children and young adults.¹⁶⁰ Thus, the ages of their usual members or participants range from six years¹⁶¹ to over 30.¹⁶² Social media contributions were collected on Facebook by using “Gálllok” and “Kallak” in the keyword search and filter according to organization and years. On Instagram pictures showing Sámi related symbols (i.e. flag, traditional clothing), reindeers, signs with relevant text or mines were manually selected. Most results appeared in the years 2013 and 2022. Social media contributions that showed pictures without caption were discarded as well as doublings because of shared posts. All in all, 28 social media posts were taken into account.

Second, the public debate is looked at through a collection of newspaper articles from Sweden’s three largest and most influential daily newspapers *Dagens Nyheter*, *Expressen* and *Aftonbladet*.¹⁶³ Print articles were collected using the database *Svenska tidningar* offered by the National Library of Sweden. Online articles were retrieved from the respective newspaper’s webpage. All articles associated with the keywords “Gálllok” or “Kallak” were first collected and then selected according to their nature. Commentaries, editorials, opinion pieces, reader’s letters and interviews reflecting views from residents in Jokkmokk, politicians, religious institutions, researchers,

Undersökning om svenskarnas internetvanor. (IIS (Internetstiftelsen i Sverige), 2017).
<https://svenskarnaochinternet.se/app/uploads/2023/11/svenskarna-och-internet-2017.pdf>; J. Andersson & F. Blomdahl. *Svenskarna och internet 2022*. (Internet Stiftelsen, 2022).
<https://svenskarnaochinternet.se/app/uploads/2022/10/internetstiftelsen-svenskarna-och-internet-2022.pdf> (accessed 2026-05-24).

¹⁶⁰ J. de Moor, K. Uba, M. Wahlström, M. Wennerhag & M. De Vydt (eds.). *Protest for a future II. Somposition, mobilization and motives of the participants in Fridays For Future climate protests on 20-27 September, 2019, in 19 cities around the world*. (2020).
<https://osf.io/asruw/files/3hcxs> (accessed 2026-05-24); Sáminuorra. Bli medlem.
<https://www.saminuorra.org/bli-medlem-i-saminuorra/> (accessed 2026-05-12);
 Naturskyddsföreningen. Fältbiologerna. <https://www.naturskyddsforeningen.se/engagera-dig/faltbiologerna/> (accessed 2026-05-12); WWF Sweden Youth. Bli en changemaker.
<https://www.wwf.se/wwfswedenyouth/bli-en-changemaker/> (accessed 2026-05-12).

¹⁶¹ Naturskyddsföreningen. *Fältbiologerna*.

¹⁶² de Moor, Uba, Wahlström, Wennerhag & De Vydt (eds.). *Protest for a future II. Somposition, mobilization and motives of the participants in Fridays For Future climate protests on 20-27 September, 2019, in 19 cities around the world*, p. 12.

¹⁶³ Ocast. *Topplista över populära nyhetstidningar i Sverige - Topplistor*. (2026).
<https://ocast.com/se/topplists/nyhetstidningar> (accessed 2026-04-01).

newspaper authors and civil society were included in the analysis while articles serving reporting purposes, focused on culture or art, or on a different thematic using Gállok only illustratively were discarded as well as doublings in print and digital issues. All in all, 37 individual newspaper articles were included in the analysis.

Third, documents representing the political debate were first collected from the Swedish Parliament's online archive applying "Gállok" and "Kallak" in the keyword search. Further documents associated with the government's final decision with the reference number N2017/04553 were collected through the archives of the County Administrative Board Norrbotten, the municipality Jokkmokk, Bergstaten and the Swedish Government Offices. The documents encompass statements, letters, reports, motions, parliamentary questions and answers, protocols and thus voices from politicians of various party affiliation, experts, researchers, religious institutions, residents and civil society organizations. Policy documents that were thematically irrelevant, mentioning Gállok only as an example, showcasing geological maps, statistics, lists, translations,¹⁶⁴ notifications and statements from JIMAB were discarded. All in all, 61 policy documents were included in the analysis. Most documents are of one to three pages length with a few singular exceptions such as the final decision by the government which encompasses 33 pages. Relevant sections of lengthy documents such as parliamentary protocols, were selected by keyword search ("Gállok"/"Kallak").

4.4 Critical Policy Analysis

The chosen material was analyzed applying a critical policy analysis (CPA) inspired by van Hulst¹⁶⁵ and Fischer.¹⁶⁶ This approach allows for a critical perspective beyond legal frameworks as it not only focuses on rights holders' positions within power structures and how they are connected to their ability to access rights but on how these structures are maintained and by whom. Oriented toward social constructivism¹⁶⁷ and

¹⁶⁴ the Swedish version was analyzed to keep the analysis consistent.

¹⁶⁵ van Hulst, Metze, Dewulf, de Vries, van Bommel & van Ostaïen. *Discourse, framing and narrative: three ways of doing critical, interpretive policy analysis*.

¹⁶⁶ Fischer. *In pursuit of usable knowledge: critical policy analysis and the argumentative turn*; Fischer. *Critical Policy Inquiry. Interpreting Knowledge and Arguments*.

¹⁶⁷ *ibid.*, p. 87.

arosen from the ‘argumentative turn’ in the latter half of the 20th century, CPA does not aspire to be a straight-forward and value-free method.¹⁶⁸

While CPA offers a variety of approaches the analysis focuses on discourses because firstly, discourses described as “language in use”¹⁶⁹ acknowledge the significance of both the spoken words and the “socially symbolic meanings”¹⁷⁰ that these words entail. This perspective not only pays tribute to the controversies surrounding the meaning of article 12 but also reflects my ontological and epistemological stance. Secondly, the focus on discourses allows the inclusion of a sociological level aiming “to understand the work discourses do” and the power dynamics they represent and reproduce¹⁷¹ which aligns with my ontological perspective and the aim of childism. As CPA is rather a “mode of thinking”¹⁷² than a fully developed analytical plan, the remainder of this chapter is used to present how the approach was applied in this analysis.

The analysis of the three types of material (social media contributions, newspapers and policy documents) was performed exploratively and inductively in three rounds. The first round aimed at the contextualization of the documents as encouraged by CPA approaches.¹⁷³ This was achieved by focusing on authorship and initial coding of themes and references. First, all documents were assigned to so-called cases. Thus, they were situated not only within the public or political debate or social media contributions but sorted after the voices who were speaking within this debate (i.e. residents, Sámi peoples, children/youth, researchers, politicians, religious institutions, civil society organizations just to name a few). This was not only done to get a broad overview of the voices included in the debates but in order to be able to connect specific arguments and references to groups of authors later on.

¹⁶⁸ Fischer. *In pursuit of usable knowledge: critical policy analysis and the argumentative turn*, p. 55.

¹⁶⁹ van Hulst, Metze, Dewulf, de Vries, van Bommel & van Ostaijen. *Discourse, framing and narrative: three ways of doing critical, interpretive policy analysis*, p. 76 f..

¹⁷⁰ Fischer. *Critical Policy Inquiry. Interpreting Knowledge and Arguments*, p. 105.

¹⁷¹ van Hulst, Metze, Dewulf, de Vries, van Bommel & van Ostaijen. *Discourse, framing and narrative: three ways of doing critical, interpretive policy analysis*, p. 78.

¹⁷² Fischer. *In pursuit of usable knowledge: critical policy analysis and the argumentative turn*, p. 59.

¹⁷³ van Hulst, Metze, Dewulf, de Vries, van Bommel & van Ostaijen. *Discourse, framing and narrative: three ways of doing critical, interpretive policy analysis*, p. 78.

The initial coding of the first round was then conducted using the software program NVivo 15. Codes were assigned within each type of debate separately. The sections coded ranged from parts of sentences to entire paragraphs depending on their content and how much context was essential to understand the code detached from the document. Two kinds of codes were assigned in this initial phase. The first part focused on thematical coding. Here, codes were assigned to sections highlighting specific themes or arguments that were brought forward in the debates. These themes were then paraphrased and summarized into so-called sub-debates (i.e. economy, environment, marginalization, reindeer herding, Indigenous rights). This step was important for a general contextualization of the voices raised but also to later be able to see parallels and what arguments are erased from the debate. Part two of the initial coding phase focused on references to children, their involvement and their rights. Here, codes were assigned to sections that referred to children's voices or actions or even responded to them. However, as this turned out to be rather infrequent, codes were also assigned to references to protests in Jokkmokk that included not necessarily nor likely only children. Codes were also assigned to sections mentioning children's rights. As this again, turned out to be a very limited number of results, I included references that mentioned the future of children or future generations in the coding. The additional focus on the notion of future not only enabled a widened perspective on the debates beyond rights concepts but, as previous scholarship has shown, allows for insights on the societal position of children attributed to them by the adults present in the discourses. All in all, this first round left me with a list of voices that were included in the respective debates, a list of sub-debates within each type of debate and a list of references to children's involvement, their rights and to future generations for each type of debate. To be able to detect power dynamics hidden in the references¹⁷⁴ these codes were rarely summarized but rather used as in-vivo codes to stay close to the original voice.

The second round focused on the extraction and summary of the information collected in the first round. The content of sub-debates was summarized for each type of debate in a Word-document as well as the references to children and children's involvement,

¹⁷⁴ *ibid.*, p. 91.

their rights and future generations. The summaries included references to specific authorship, timing and in-vivo codes whenever appropriate. Some of the references needed background information that was gathered at this stage for an even broader contextualization.

The third round of analysis aimed at zooming out again to be able to deconstruct the underlying power structures which is essential to both the critical theory of childism¹⁷⁵ and the here applied critical policy analysis approach.¹⁷⁶ The summary of the second round was printed out and then looked at from different angles. Who in each of the debates is referring to children and children's involvement and how are these references framed? Who is not only referring to children but engaging with their arguments? Who is mentioning children's rights or future generations and in which contexts are these mentioned at which point in time? Lastly, with the help of a mind map, the thematic sub-debates that were brought up were compared. What arguments were highlighted or discarded during the debates and by whom? The findings of the second round and the conclusions of the third round are essential parts of chapter 5.

4.5 Methodological Limitations

There are three limitations stemming from the methodological choices. First, using a single case study approach, the generalizability of my results is limited. However, the results may suggest a general attitude or structures that could point towards broader implications.

Second, the research question and article 12 in general is focused on children. However, the underlying data of the analysis focuses on children's and youth's voices channeled through youth-led organizations. While the latter range in membership ages, they all address older children or adolescents. It can thus be assumed that expressions of very young children are not included in this study.

Lastly, as I built this project on the childism framework of John Wall, one might criticize that it is a research project not *with* children but *about* them. However, based

¹⁷⁵ Wall. *Childism and the Politics of Social Empowerment*, p. 210.

¹⁷⁶ van Hulst, Metze, Dewulf, de Vries, van Bommel & van Ostaijen. *Discourse, framing and narrative: three ways of doing critical, interpretive policy analysis*, p. 78.

on the research question's focus on existing discourses and because of fundamental ethical considerations, I refrained from engaging with children directly but rather rely on their existing contributions to the debate.

5. Analysis & Findings

In order to answer the question how and to what extent children's rights, particularly their right to be heard and to have their views taken into account, are reflected in political and societal debates on land use in Sápmi in Sweden, this chapter presents the political and the public discourses around the decision-making process for a mining processing concession in Gállok and how children's voices, rights and their futures are referred to within them. These insights are complemented by an investigation of the lived experiences of children regarding Gállok, their rights and futures. The chapter then leads over to a discussion of the results in light of previous literature and the childist framework.

5.1 The Political Debate

When JIMAB's application for a processing concession in Gállok was forwarded to the government, it became part of a political debate between ministries and in parliament. However, within the political sphere it is not merely this debate I am investigating but the political decision-making process leading to the final decision for Gállok as well.

5.1.1 Children's involvement

While Gállok has been discussed on a political and on a societal level, the final decision approving the processing concession was a political one. It is, thus, the political debate that appears most significant for children to be included in if they wanted to have impact in the outcome of the decision-making process.

To understand how children could have been formally or informally involved in the decision-making process for Gállok, it is useful to look at the process itself first. Once Bergstaten forwarded the decision to the government, the Ministry inquired reports of experts as well as statements from civil society organizations, religious institutions,

residents and property owners in Jokkmokk and Sámi-villages, Sametinget and other Sámi-associations evaluating the question of land use in the area. These documents are all directly associated with the final decision. However, the political debate extended all the way into parliament. While the protocols, motions and interpellations documenting the parliaments engagement with Gállok did not necessarily influence the decision-making process, they reflect on the way children and children's rights are talked about in political debates on land use issues such as Gállok.

While the political debate clearly included a variety of voices inside and outside the political sphere, children and youths were not formally included. There are no statements of youth organizations involved or records of children being a part of any political discourse on the matter. This is striking because several voices in parliament claimed that there should be dialogue and consultation with “affected parties”¹⁷⁷ and all those “involved”¹⁷⁸ with Gállok. This could suggest that children are not seen as being affected by the decision.

As there has been no formal inclusion of children in the process, my perspective shifted to the informal ways children could be included by referring to their engagement with Gállok, their views expressed in protest, their arguments, or attempts to get into contact with politicians. However, in neither part of the political debate are the engagement of children and the views they expressed during the process being referred to explicitly. While the protestors against Gállok are mentioned within the parliamentary debate, they are not clearly referred to as adolescents or children. However, the particular protest behaviour Helena Lindahl is referring to, namely “[t]o dig up the road or tie oneself to a tree with a sour dough bread in the hand”¹⁷⁹ suggests that there has been some awareness of the way Gállok has been protested against. Additionally, background research and photographs of the protests suggest that there were people

¹⁷⁷ I. From & Å. Karlsson. *Motion till riksdagen 2019/20:1222*. (Sveriges Riksdag, 2019). <https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/E630E2CE-B16F-43BC-AED4-C80C120F0AE6> (Accessed: 17 May 2026), p. 1. [translated].

¹⁷⁸ Sveriges Riksdag. *Riksdagens protokoll 2013/14:8*. (2013). <https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/62E7FF41-FE61-4BE7-B817-8C5DF4830998> (Accessed: 17 May 2026), p. 62. [translated].

¹⁷⁹ Sveriges Riksdag. *Riksdagens protokoll 2013/14:13*. (2013). <https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/90EBB3E4-13CE-486B-A91C-66E546062472> (Accessed: 17 May 2026), p. 130. [translated].

who entrenched themselves on the road to the concession area and that these people appear rather young.¹⁸⁰ However, as Lindahl is not naming anyone in specific nor the ages of the people referred to, it cannot be argued that this is a critique of children's involvement and the views they expressed. Rather, this statement suggests that while there could be awareness of who is protesting the characteristics of protesters do not matter.

Concludingly, it can be said that children and youths have neither formally nor informally been included in the political debate on Gállok. While their protest was seen, their voices were not heard, their views not taken into account in either parliamentary debates or the final decision of the Ministry which shows that, at least on a political level, article 12(1) has not been taken into consideration when debating and deciding on Gállok.

5.1.2 Children's rights

That children themselves are not included in the decision-making process suggests a failure to enforce article 12(1) on all levels. However, it does not mean that their attributed interests are not taken into consideration which is why it was necessary to widen the perspective on the political debate by looking not for involvement but for references to children's rights and needs.

While rights language has been activated within the political debate throughout the entire process, it mostly highlighted general ideas of international law¹⁸¹ or more or less specific references to Indigenous peoples' rights.¹⁸² While one could argue that

¹⁸⁰ *Norrländska Socialdemokraten (NSD)*. Polisen bröt blockaden. (12/8 2013). <https://www.nsd.se/nyheter/jokkmokk-uppdaterad/artikel/polisen-brot-blockaden/lz3y89gj> (accessed 2026-05-24).

¹⁸¹ F. Österling & L.-O. Sjajin. *Yttrande avseende ansökan om bearbetningskoncession för området Kallak K nr 1 i Jåhkåmåhkke/Jokkmokks kommun, Norrbottens län*. (Sámediggi, 2022). [Government Offices Archives]; J. Wik Karlsson. *Yttrande avseende bearbetningskoncession Kallak nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun, N2017/04553*. (Svenska Samernas Riksförbund, 2022). [Government Offices Archives]; C. Cederberg. *Yttrande*. (Jåhkågasska Tjellde Sameby, 2018). [Government Offices Archives]; L. Svensson & G. Willemsen. *Till Sveriges regering*. (Equumeniakyrkan, 2022). [Government Offices Archives].

¹⁸² M. Blind Berg & J. Wik Karlsson. *Yttrande avseende bearbetningskoncession Kallak nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun, N2017/04553*. (Svenska Samernas Riksförbund, 2022). [Government Offices Archives]; P.-J. Parffa. (Tuorpon Sameby, no date). [Government Offices Archives]; L.-O. Sjajin & A. Walkeapää. *Yttrande vid begäran om komplettering i ärenden om ansökan om bearbetningskoncession för området Kallak K nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun*. (Sámediggi, 2017).

children, assuming one depicts them as human beings, are equally addressed by human rights frameworks of any kind, there is no reference to children's attributed needs or interests here which means their lived experiences, their realities are not touched upon.

However, two statements by Sametinget and Svenska Samernas Riksförbund (SSR) refer to the CRC or article 30.¹⁸³ This suggests an awareness of the CRC among Sámi-associations, of the protection it could provide for their children and for Indigenous peoples in general. Moreover, this reference suggests that SSR and Sametinget acknowledge that Gállok is a matter affecting Sámi children and their possibilities to enjoy their culture.

However, these mentionings are not part of fully developed arguments applying a child rights perspective but are an attempt to "remind the government that they have to act in accordance with all international treaties they have agreed to comply with, such as the Convention on Civil and Political Rights, the Convention on Biological Diversity as well as the Convention on the Rights of the Child."¹⁸⁴

It should also be considered how this reminder continues to be carried forward in the debate. While the statements of both SSR and Sametinget are referred to in the final decision, the references to children's rights disappear. This is striking, as their references to other legal frameworks such as the European Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous

[Government Offices Archives]; Svensson & Willemsen. *Till Sveriges regering.*; Sveriges Riksdag. *Riksdagens protokoll 2013/14:8*; From & Karlsson. *Motion till riksdagen 2019/20:1222.*; Sveriges Riksdag. *Riksdagens protokoll 2021/22:86.* (2022). <https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/CBC6C2BA-3CB8-4D22-9087-3C34DE1EBF2F> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Sveriges Riksdag. *Riksdagens protokoll 2021/22:91.* (2022). <https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/AE70D282-F4D5-4D2A-91E1-A906B0A30F41> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Sveriges Riksdag. *Riksdagens protokoll 2021/22:107.* (2022). <https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/3CEC6C78-274B-4E2C-8C36-8B4A2DFD1232> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Unna Tjerus Sameby. *Yttrande avseende bearbetningskoncession Kallak nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun.* (no date). [Government Offices Archives]; J. Wik Karlsson. *Yttrande avseende ansökan om bearbetningskoncession, N2017/04553.* (Svenska Samernas Riksförbund, 2022). [Government Offices Archives].

¹⁸³ Österling & Sjajin. *Yttrande avseende ansökan om bearbetningskoncession för området Kallak K nr 1 i Jåhkåmåhkke/Jokkmokks kommun, Norrbottens län.*; Wik Karlsson. *Yttrande avseende bearbetningskoncession Kallak nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun, N2017/04553.*

¹⁸⁴ *ibid.*, p. 3 f. [translated].

Peoples, the International Labour Organization Convention 169 (C169) or the ICCPR¹⁸⁵ are picked up by the Ministry.¹⁸⁶

This suggests that it is not only the engagement of children that is tuned out in the political debate, but that any reference to children's rights is silenced as well or at least not taken into consideration. Thus, even though there is awareness of children's rights and how they might be affected by the decision, a child rights perspective is not systematically applied in the decision-making process on Gállok.

5.1.3 Children's future

The investigation of the political debate shows that neither children's engagement nor their rights play a significant role in the decision-making process for Gállok. Arguing, based on previous scholarship, that the way children's futures and childhoods are depicted can provide some insight on the role of children's rights, especially their right to be heard and to have their views taken into account, I broadened the perspective on the political debate investigating how children's future and future generations are referred to.

Children's future and future generations are referred to in two ways in the political discourse. First, future generations are mentioned in the context of being the ones who have to deal with the environmental consequences of the decision for Gállok.¹⁸⁷ These references suggest some awareness among Sámi peoples and politicians of the comprehensiveness of the decision and that it will influence the lives of others that come after them.

¹⁸⁵ Österling & Sjajin. *Yttrande avseende ansökan om bearbetningskoncession för området Kallak K nr 1 i Jåhkåmåhkke/Jokkmokks kommun, Norrbottens län.*; Wik Karlsson. *Yttrande avseende ansökan om bearbetningskoncession, N2017/04553.*

¹⁸⁶ K.-P. Thorwaldsson & F. Gemsjö. *Regeringens beslut.* (Näringsdepartementet, 2022). <https://jokkmokkiron.se/upload/images/dokument/regeringsbeslut-n201704553.pdf> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).

¹⁸⁷ A. Lillemets & V. Mutt. *Motion till riksdagen 2015/16:2183.* (Sveriges Riksdag, 2015). <https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/A45298F6-C22E-42E5-B9FE-0A7292D5DCB3> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Österling & Sjajin. *Yttrande avseende ansökan om bearbetningskoncession för området Kallak K nr 1 i Jåhkåmåhkke/Jokkmokks kommun, Norrbottens län.*; Sveriges Riksdag. *Miljö- och jordbruksutskottets betänkande 2015/16: MJU8.* (2016). <https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/26107997-A190-409A-9BD9-9A82FB98E204> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Wik Karlsson. *Yttrande avseende bearbetningskoncession Kallak nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun, N2017/04553.*

Second, the notion of heritage is used rather frequently as an argument against the mining in Gállok. Reindeer herding and this piece of land should be forwarded to future generations and descendants¹⁸⁸ and will thus ensure a sustainable future for many years to come.¹⁸⁹ Accordingly, a mine in Gállok would mean the end for this piece of land as people can no longer live there and Sámi culture and reindeer herding would not survive.¹⁹⁰ This highlights – without referring to rights concepts – awareness of children potentially not being able to access their own culture if the mining in Gállok was approved.

Moreover, both the reference to consequences and heritage highlight two things. Firstly, children and future generations are acknowledged as being affected. Accordingly, this would call for a realization of article 12(1) and contradicts the idea that there should be dialogue between all affected parties regarding the decision in Gállok as stated above. Secondly, this argumentation highlights that it is not children one is concerned with, but soon-to-be adults. It is not about having the choice to live there, to learn reindeer herding or not, to have a perspective in general. It is about being an heir and keeping up a legacy as a grown-up person. Thus, it can be said that children are depicted as ‘human becomings’ within the political debate and that they are not generalized with adults referring to protests or human rights frameworks but not seen as children in their own right either.

¹⁸⁸ Blind Berg & Wik Karlsson. *Yttrande avseende bearbetningskoncession Kallak nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun, N2017/04553.*; E. Carlsson & E. Lindbäck. *Yttrande angående Jokkmokks IronMines AB:s ansökan om bearbetningskoncession för området Kallak nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun, Norrbottens län ärende N2017/04553.* (2022). [Government Offices Archives]; Österling & Sjajin. *Yttrande avseende ansökan om bearbetningskoncession för området Kallak K nr 1 i Jåhkåmåhkke/Jokkmokks kommun, Norrbottens län*; Wik Karlsson. *Yttrande avseende bearbetningskoncession Kallak nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun, N2017/04553.*

¹⁸⁹ J. Antti. *Yttrande över Regeringskansliets begäran om komplettering gällande ansökan om bearbetningskoncession för Kallak K nr. 1 i Jokkmokks kommun.* (Länsstyrelsen Norrbotten, 2017). [Government Offices Archives]; I. Jansson, S. Sörlin, J. Sandahl. *Jokkmokks framtid finns i bevarad natur – därför säger vi nej till en gruva i Gállok.* (Naturskyddsföreningen). [Government Offices Archives]; L. Länta & C. Cederberg. *Yttrande i anledning av ansökan om bearbetningskoncession, Kallak nr. 1 i Jokkmokks Kommun.* (Jåhkågasska Tjellde Sameby, 2018). [Government Offices Archives].

¹⁹⁰ Carlsson & Lindbäck. *Yttrande angående Jokkmokks IronMines AB:s ansökan om bearbetningskoncession för området Kallak nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun, Norrbottens län ärende N2017/04553.*; Cederberg. *Yttrande.*; T.L. Tuorda, E. Johansson, M. Sjögren. *Yttrande gällande Kallak N.* (Gruvfritt Jokkmokk, 2018). [Government Offices Archives]; Wik Karlsson. *Yttrande avseende bearbetningskoncession Kallak nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun, N2017/04553.*

5.2 The Public Debate

5.2.1 Children's involvement

While the final decision was a political one, Gállok was part of an intense societal debate as well. Thus, the above presented findings are complemented by an analysis of newspaper articles representing a snapshot of the public debate accompanying the decision-making process for Gállok. Even though, the societal discourses cannot be claimed to have had any influence on the final decision for Gállok, they provide some insight on the way children were included in the public sphere.

Similar to the political debate, voices of the public debate highlight protests which children have been engaged in.¹⁹¹ While children and youth are not explicitly named here, the protests they engaged in are acknowledged in several articles as are the arguments presented by protesters. However, it is difficult to see this as an actual reference to children's engagement with Gállok as children are not explicitly named as protesters.

However, there are two ways in which children are explicitly involved in the public debate. First, the material representing the public debate consists inter alia of several opinion pieces and reader's letters that were printed in national newspapers and written by children and youth engaged with Gállok.¹⁹² The most significant piece in this regard is the opinion piece jointly written by Greta Thunberg and Sáminuorra's president Sara-Elvira Kuhmunen published on 2 March 2022 in *Aftonbladet*. This article was co-authored by Sámi resident-associations, residents of Björkholmen, the association *Gruvfritt Jokkmokk* as well as the environmental organizations *Naturskyddsföreningen*, *Skydda skogen* and *Skiftet*.¹⁹³ The fact that adolescents' voices were published in newspapers and that their words were carried by other, non-youth-oriented organizations not only suggests

¹⁹¹ H. Lindqvist. Om samerna vore indiander skulle vi höra. *Aftonbladet*. (26 October 2013), p. 20.; T. Lundberg Tuorda et al. Dagens gruvpolitik är ovärdig Sverige. *Aftonbladet*. (5 September 2013), p. 6.; P. Wolodarski. Jag har också varit ointresserad och okunnig. *Dagens Nyheter*. (19 September 2021), p. 4.

¹⁹² R. Forsberg. S bryr sig inte ett skit om samerna. *Expressen*. (20 March 2022). <https://www.expressen.se/debatt/s-bryr-sig-inte-ett-skit-om-samerna/> (Accessed: 13 May 2026).; S.-E. Kuhmunen et al. Gå inte på att gruvan i Gállok är klimatsmart. *Aftonbladet*. (3 February 2022). <https://www.aftonbladet.se/debatt/a/28gl9B/greta-thunberg-mfl-stoppa-gruvan-i-gallok> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Nårsa. *Stoppa gruvan i Gállok och rädda vår framtid*, p. 27.

¹⁹³ Kuhmunen et al. *Gå inte på att gruvan i Gállok är klimatsmart*.

that children were not per se excluded from the societal debate on Gállok but that they even managed to engage in horizontal cooperations with adults which amplified the views expressed by youths.

Second, going one step further, the involvement of children and youths in the public debate did even generate some responses and did not disappear in a vacuum. The previously mentioned article for example was picked up in a responding opinion piece by Nicholas Arndt, professor emeritus at the University of Grenoble-Alpes and Valentin Troll, petrology professor at Uppsala University who stated that they “support Greta Thunberg in the fight against climate change but view her co-authorship in the opinion piece published in *Aftonbladet* on 3 February as remarkable because the text is filled with errors.”¹⁹⁴

It could be argued that the standing of Thunberg bears a weight in a debate that other children and adolescents may not hold which could lead to the assumption that children’s engagement with Gállok is not per se reacted to, but Greta Thunberg’s engagement is. However, this would be mere speculation without further investigation of Thunberg’s role in the process. As the article was not solely written by Thunberg but included other adolescent co-authors, I understand the reaction as a reaction to views expressed by children.

While it appears that Arndt’s and Troll’s reaction to the article was solely motivated by the necessity to *correct* Thunberg and Kuhmunen which may appear paternalistic, their reaction suggests that the views expressed by at least some children are heard and taken into account. Arndt and Troll are taking the young authors seriously enough to actively engage with their arguments and thereby giving them audience and space within the public debate.

Thus, it can be said, that within the public debate there is some room for children and youths to participate to express their views, be heard and to have their views considered. However, as this is only a snapshot of a public debate, it cannot be determined for whom exactly this room is open and whether smaller children were accounted with the same

¹⁹⁴ N. Arndt & V. Troll. Sverige är mycket lämpligt för gruvdrift. *Aftonbladet*. (21 February 2022). <https://www.aftonbladet.se/debatt/a/mrna6O/forskare-sverige-ar-mycket-lampligt-for-gruvdrift> (Accessed: 17 May 2026). [translated].

spaces and considerations if they tried for it. Thus, it cannot be said that article 12(1) is taken into consideration here, neither can it be denied.

5.2.2 Children's rights

Mirroring the analysis of the political debate, I engaged in a perspectival shift from traces of children's engagement to references to children's rights in order to understand whether and to what extent a child rights perspective found its way into the public debate on Gállok.

While rights language has been activated throughout the entire time, rights concepts were either linked to claims arguing that "Sweden breaks with international conventions"¹⁹⁵ or to Indigenous peoples' rights.¹⁹⁶ As such, rights language remains vague and does not touch upon specific legal frameworks that could suggest a child rights perspective was applied.

However, while not referring to children's rights per se, the public debate reflects on the need for Indigenous peoples in general to be included.¹⁹⁷ In a reader's letter in *Dagens Nyheter* in 2022 it is stressed that "[t]hey can scream as loud as they want. They can cry as many tears as they want. They can continue taking their lives. It still

¹⁹⁵ J. Jonsson, M. Åhrén, A. Gabelic. Ge samebyarna rätt att säga nej till nya gruvor. *Aftonbladet*. (12 October 2013), p. 6. [translated].

¹⁹⁶ P. Bolund & A. Palmstierna. En näringsminister som riskerar jäv skadar Sverige. *Dagens Nyheter*. (29 December 2021). <https://www.dn.se/debatt/en-naringsminister-som-riskerar-jav-skadar-sverige/> (Accessed: 13 May 2026).; A. Broberg. Stoppa diskrimineringen av samer med ny urfolkspolitik. *Dagens Nyheter*. (16 September 2013), p. 6.; Jonsson, Åhrén, Gabelic. Ge samebyarna rätt att säga nej till nya gruvor, p. 6.; A. Lindenfors & J. Westeson. Sverige – ta samernas rättigheter på allvar. *Aftonbladet*. (6 June 2019).

<https://www.aftonbladet.se/debatt/a/J1m397/sverige--ta-samernas-rattigheter-pa-allvar> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; L. Olsson. Låt gruvbolaget betala i förskott för att återställa Kallak. *Dagens Nyheter*. (23 March 2022). <https://www.dn.se/insandare/lat-gruvbolaget-betala-i-forskott-for-att-aterstalla-kallak/> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; O. Palm. Thorwaldssons roll som minister måste ifrågasättas. *Dagens Nyheter*. (19 June 2022).

<https://www.dn.se/insandare/thorwaldssons-roll-som-minister-maste-ifragasattas/> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; J. Sandahl. Ett orkitiskt bejakande gruvnäringens önskemål. *Dagens Nyheter*. (10 January 2020). <https://www.dn.se/debatt/repliker/ett-okritiskt-bejakande-av-gruvnaringens-onskemal/> (Accessed: 13 May 2026).; P. Tidholm. Sverige skänker bort bergets guld. *Dagens Nyheter*. (23 September 2013), pp. 46-47.; P. Tidholm. För socialdemokratin är en gruva fortfarande lika med jobb och glada väljare. *Dagens Nyheter*. (25 March 2022), p. 46.

¹⁹⁷ Jonsson, Åhrén, Gabelic. Ge samebyarna rätt att säga nej till nya gruvor, p. 6.; J.-M. Länta et al. Sverige skänker bort tillgångar i Sameland. *Dagens Nyheter*. (21 August 2013), p. 6.

does not make it into the hallways of power.”¹⁹⁸ This not only highlights the feeling of powerlessness of Indigenous peoples in this case, but it suggests some awareness of who ought to be involved in the decision-making process. Strikingly, children are not part of the voices that are understood as being marginalized in the process which highlights their societal marginalization even more.

Thus, what can be taken from this is that children’s rights, although children themselves appear to have a space to be heard within the public sphere, are not considered when talking about Gállok and about who should be included in the decision-making process.

5.2.3 Children’s future

To get a better understanding of children’s position in society beyond the rights concept it was again the notion of future that was included to widen the perspective. Mirroring the political debate the references to children’s future and future generations are limited to two ideas.

First, voices within the public sphere highlight that “[o]thers will need to take care of what happens in the long run”¹⁹⁹ emphasizing the reality of consequences for the generations to come. This highlights that children and youths are understood to be affected by the decision – at least in the future.

The second idea that is highlighted under the notion of future and future generations is linked to children’s and youths’ prospects. Here, children’s future is used to argue for as well as against the potential mining in Gállok. On the one hand, several voices from inter alia Sámi peoples, readers but also the Swedish discrimination ombudsperson highlight how Gállok would endanger “[t]he knowledge [...] [that] is transferred from generation to generation.”²⁰⁰ On the other hand, the local politician Stefan Andersson

¹⁹⁸ S. Nilsson Lööv. Regeringens ja till gruvan går emot FN:s avrådan. *Dagens Nyheter*. (26 March 2022). <https://www.dn.se/insandare/regeringens-ja-till-gruvan-gar-emot-fns-avradan/> (Accessed: 17 May 2026). [translated].

¹⁹⁹ Palm. *Thorwaldssons roll som minister måste ifrågesättas*. [translated].

²⁰⁰ Länta. *Sverige skänker bort tillgångar i Sameland*, p. 6. [translated]; see also: Broberg. *Stoppa diskrimineringen av samer med ny urfolkspolitik*, p. 6.; E.A. Labba. Jag gråter när jag lyssnar på näringsministern Karl-Petter Thorwaldsson. *Dagens Nyheter*. (22 March 2022). <https://www.dn.se/kultur/elin-anna-labba-jag-grater-nar-jag-lyssnar-pa-naringsministern-karl-petter-thorwaldsson/> (Accessed: 13 May 2026).; Tidholm. *Sverige skänker bort bergets guld*, pp. 46-47.; M. Åkesson. Noterat av DN:s läsare den 24 mars 2022. *Dagens Nyheter*. (24 March 2022).

argued that mining in Gállok “would result in a large amount of job opportunities, the possibility of population growth and the possibility for our children and adolescents to be able to stay in our fantastic municipality if they want to.”²⁰¹

While arguing for the contrary, in light of children’s societal position, both references suggest that children are acknowledged to be affected by the decision for Gállok but that they are not considered as being affected as children but in their position as future adults. This, in turn, bears the question whether the involvement of children within the public debate was based on a societal norm granting children the right to speak and be heard or whether it was coincidental as children are otherwise not acknowledged and their needs are understood as needs of adults of the future.

5.3 The Voice of the Child

5.3.1 Children claiming space

In order to understand the findings within the political and the public debate against the background of children’s lived experiences, their voices, and views, the analysis was complemented by an investigation of youth organizations’ social media contributions and the three newspaper articles authored by youths highlighting the ways in which children and youths attempted to be included in either the political or the public debate. This is not only because it helps understand their commitment to Gállok and their interest in this decision-making process but furthermore, to understand on which levels they could have been heard by different audiences. Thus, the analysis of children’s voices focused on the way they protested and the arguments they used to do so.

It emerges from various announcements on Facebook and Instagram that youth organizations protested Gállok on several levels. There have been a series of street

<https://www.dn.se/insandare/noterat-av-dns-lasare-den-24-mars-2022/> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).

²⁰¹ S. Andersson. Med en gruva kann de unga stanna kvar här. *Aftonbladet*. (29 September 2013), p. 6. [translated].

protests in Gállok,²⁰² Jokkmokk,²⁰³ Stockholm²⁰⁴ and nation wide²⁰⁵ between 2013 and 2022 ranging from climate manifestations,²⁰⁶ over symbolic actions, such as writing protesters names on stones to build barriers with in Gállok²⁰⁷ to actually blocking the roads to the concession area in Gállok.²⁰⁸ In the years 2021 and 2022 the street protests were complemented by different measures of online protest such as encouraging the

²⁰² Fridays For Future Sweden. *Demonstrationen i Jokkmokk*. [Instagram]. (10 February 2022). https://www.instagram.com/tv/CZzsipHDO_t/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Fridays For Future Sweden. *Glad samisk nationaldag*. [Instagram]. (6 February 2022). https://www.instagram.com/p/CZpN50ANl9v/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Fridays For Future Sweden & Sáminuorra. *På fredag lämnas namninsamlingen*. [Instagram]. (9 February 2022). https://www.instagram.com/tv/CZwECYpj5YC/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Fridays For Future Sweden. *Demonstration i Gállok*. [Instagram]. (5 February 2022). https://www.instagram.com/p/CZmnBUGKCVw/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Fältbiologerna. *[Uppskjutet] blixaktion Gállok*. [Instagram]. (24 March 2022). https://www.instagram.com/p/CaXCSTks7V0/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Sametingets Ungdomsråd. *Uttalande*. [Facebook]. (31 July 2013). <https://www.facebook.com/samiyouth/posts/394586027309629> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Sáminuorra. *Sáminuorra har svarat på*. [Instagram]. (7 February 2022). https://www.instagram.com/p/CZrjolMKnao/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Sáminuorra. *Sáminuorra svarar Sven Otto Littorin*. [Facebook]. (7 February 2022). <https://www.facebook.com/saminuorra/posts/pfbid02osZj6kgSVuPtam7TUnknDbRev1DxUGuZVjpxMgzWfnN4x7MQNR4QTkxZQ5R18MWEL> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).

²⁰³ WWF Sweden Youth. *Den här bilden*. [Instagram]. (20 July 2016). https://www.instagram.com/p/BIGMB8lg6mi/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).

²⁰⁴ Fältbiologerna. *Pressmeddelande*. [Instagram]. (24 March 2022). https://www.instagram.com/p/Cbe1xvgsOqa/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).

²⁰⁵ Fridays For Future Kiruna. *Hur kan du vara med*. [Instagram]. (10 February 2022). https://www.instagram.com/p/CZyj5tstYqL/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Fridays For Future Norrbotten. *Nu är det dags igen*. [Facebook]. (24 March 2022). <https://www.facebook.com/fridaysforfuturenorrbotten/posts/pfbid05nW47wk91iiiPTqG182NGycJGWXqRx34WJbRpHHoWuUJmkyqrYfdHsM8kMPS9Wzvl> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).

²⁰⁶ *ibid*.

²⁰⁷ Sáminuorra. *Stöd kampen mot gruvboomen*. [Facebook]. (27 August 2013). <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=544231102316510&set=a.195262959848035> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).

²⁰⁸ Fältbiologerna. *Pressmeddelande*.

sharing of posts,²⁰⁹ the use of specific hashtags such as #standwithsápmi,²¹⁰ and the participation in a “Twitterstorm.”²¹¹

Apart from these acts of protest, numerous social media contributions highlight children’s attempts to enter the public or the political debate. Published newspaper articles authored by children and youths for example were announced through social media posts, highlighting their willingness to be involved in the public debate on Gállok.²¹² Moreover, Samtingets Ungdomsråd’s invitation of the then Minister for Industry Annie Lööf to a meeting in Gállok 2013,²¹³ the open letter to the former Minister for Culture Jeannette Gustafsdotter written by Sáminuorra in 2022,²¹⁴ as well as the active tagging of respective politicians’ social media accounts in decisive posts in 2016 and 2022²¹⁵ suggest that children and youths tried to enter the political debate as well. Additionally, several youth organizations collected signatures under an open

²⁰⁹ Fridays For Future Sweden. *Skriv under*. [Instagram]. (17 January 2022).

https://www.instagram.com/p/CY1-ol5NnbX/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Fältbiologerna. *Delseger för samers rättigheter*. [Instagram]. (4 October 2021). https://www.instagram.com/p/CUnBfYysLxV/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).

²¹⁰ Sáminuorra. *Sáminuorra har svarat på*.

²¹¹ Fridays For Future Sweden. *Twitterstorm*. [Facebook]. (5 February 2022).

<https://www.facebook.com/fridaysforfuture.swe/posts/pfbid0v5jxVcLRXr3EiJMUFsMTAs6An4r3HpviuLSfTtZVxinHXfLESn2XtJJcKSY1jYul> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).

²¹² Fridays For Future Sweden. *Ingen gruva i Gállok*. [Instagram]. (3 February 2022).

https://www.instagram.com/p/CZhdJ8XNf7G/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).

²¹³ Sametingets Ungdomsråd. *Uttalande*.

²¹⁴ Sáminuorra. *Öppet Brev till Sveriges Regering*. [Facebook]. (10 February 2022).

<https://www.facebook.com/saminuorra/posts/pfbid0sG9M41k2qHZAkHetx3tfpUSiS5PQW1jt19YmegrBL8fgYWyW2npsUdS497Ty7CNrl> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).

²¹⁵ Fridays For Future Sweden & Sáminuorra. *På fredag lämnas namninsamlingen*; Fridays For Future Sweden & Sáminuorra. *Idag beslutade regeringen*. [Instagram]. (22 March 2022).

https://www.instagram.com/p/CbZ-w2CNS-M/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Sáminuorra. *Jeanette Gustafsdotter är kulturminister*. [Instagram]. (10 February 2022).

https://www.instagram.com/p/CZzX8yrKj5X/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; WWF Sweden Youth. *Regeringen beslutade den 22 mars*. [Facebook]. (24 March 2022).

<https://www.facebook.com/wwfungdom/posts/pfbid0SbvqqsjWuZNcaESVrQvben2nFhW375iS8JDS1p5y6nKDJNbWSQktHhJPp2Ws2RaPl> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; WWF Sweden Youth.

WWF Sweden Youth säger nej. [Instagram]. (10 February 2022).

https://www.instagram.com/p/CZy-qj0MXjH/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).

letter written by the association *Gruvfritt Jokkmokk*²¹⁶ and personally handed them over to the former Minister Karl-Petter Thorwaldsson in 2022.²¹⁷

This suggests that children were not only interested in the decision for Gállok and expressed their views using various channels but that they tried to reach out to the public and to respective decision-makers to make themselves heard. Moreover, they actively claimed spaces for themselves. Looking at the political debate and how little children and their rights were considered but also looking at the fact that the meeting with Thorwaldsson²¹⁸ was never mentioned and Sametingets Ungdomsråd's invitation of Löf declined²¹⁹ it can be argued that they *had* to claim spaces because none was offered to them.

Beyond the question how children and youths claimed these spaces it is worth looking at some of the arguments they brought forward in more detail as it provides some insight not only on their realities but to some extent even on their underlying motivation.

While the arguments brought forward by youth organizations throughout this project were diverse, they suggest unanimity among children and youths not wanting the mining in Gállok to become reality.

²¹⁶ A.-K. Niia, J. Holgersson & J. Tjäder. Överlämnade 70000 gruvprotester till näringsministern. *SVT Nyheter*. (11/2 2022). <https://www.svt.se/nyheter/sapmi/har-overlamnas-70-000-gruvprotester-till-naringsministern> (accessed 2026-05-24).

²¹⁷ Fridays For Future Kiruna. *Gállok Kallak*. [Instagram]. (25 January 2022). https://www.instagram.com/tv/CZJWroCJzst/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Fridays For Future Kiruna. *Skriv på*. [Instagram]. (30 January 2022).

https://www.instagram.com/p/CZXLq6nNgHB/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Fridays For Future Sweden. *Skriv under*.; Fridays For Future Sweden & Sáminuorra. *På fredag lämnas namninsamlingen*; Fridays For Future Sweden. *Demonstrationen i Jokkmokk*.; Fältbiologerna. *Miljöorganisationer, Amnesty och samiska organisationer*. [Instagram]. (16 January 2022).

https://www.instagram.com/p/CYzVVZeMshY/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; WWF Sweden Youth. *WWF Sweden Youth säger nej*.

²¹⁸ A. Urisman Otto & R. Turesson. Stor protestlista mot Kallakgruvan lämnas till Regeringen. *Dagens Nyheter*. (11/2 2022). <https://www.dn.se/vetenskap/stor-protestlista-mot-kallakgruvan-lamnastill-regeringen/> (accessed 2026-05-24); Niia, Holgersson & Tjäder. *Överlämnade 70000 gruvprotester till näringsministern*.

²¹⁹ T. Sarri. Annie Löf vill inte möta Sametingets ungdomsråd. *Sveriges Radio*. (18/9 2013). <https://www.sverigesradio.se/artikel/5649299> (accessed 2026-05-24).

However, something that sticks out in the way arguments were presented is that it is not always a mere moment of protest, of disagreement but instead showing great interest in the factual debate. In an Instagram post in October 2021 Fältbiologerna, for example, offered alternative solutions to the planned mineral extractions in Gállok stating that “[w]e should focus on alternative solutions for mineral supply, such as urban mining (extracting minerals of forgotten, deprecated infrastructure, i.e. old copper pipes under cities), waste mining (extracting minerals of landfills) and reduced production.”²²⁰ This suggests that children and youth do not only want to be consulted on matters affecting them directly but that they want to contribute to the solution of a societal problem.

This is even underpinned by the observation that youth organizations are not always speaking for themselves but in solidarity with Sámi people or for the greater good. Engaging with article 12, I assumed that what I was looking for is children arguing for *their* needs and *their* future which is true to some extent but not for all arguments. Here it becomes important to distinguish between different youth organizations. While Sámi-associated groups or individuals usually used first person pronouns in their argumentations,²²¹ Fridays for Future is most frequently writing in solidarity with Sámi people and Sámi youth stating that “some of our activists stood with Sámi people in their fight against the mine in Gállok,”²²² showing “solidarity with the Sámi activists who are affected by the decision.”²²³ While this does not only signal a distancing of Fridays for Future youth from the problematic in Gállok, it highlights that children and youth are engaging with a topic not directly relevant to themselves but for the greater good.

The analysis of social media contributions of youth organizations shows that children are not merely trying to be heard but that they actively claim spaces which were not offered to them formally. Additionally, it shows that they use these spaces not for protesting a decision alone but for constructively contributing to the debate. Thus, it appears that what they are trying to claim is not merely the right to be heard and

²²⁰ Fältbiologerna. *Delseger för samers rättigheter*. [translated].

²²¹ Nárša. *Stoppa gruvan i Gállok och rädda vår framtid*, p. 27.; Sametingets Ungdomsråd. *Uttalande*.; Sáminuorra. *Öppet Brev till Sveriges Regering*.

²²² Fridays For Future Sweden. *Glad samisk nationaldag*. [translated].

²²³ Fridays For Future Sweden. *Demonstration i Gállok*. [translated].

consulted on a matter affecting them, it is political and societal space to be involved in decision-making processes child-related or not.

5.3.2 Children's rights

In order to better comprehend children's perspectives, I once again widened the perspective on the way children and youths themselves referred to children's rights within the context of Gállok.

While rights language has been activated among children and youth throughout the entire process, rights references remain vague. However, when arguing that "[they] expect a decision that follows international conventions which Sweden has agreed to comply with,"²²⁴ Sáminuorra shows awareness for international legal frameworks. This is underpinned by several references to national and international provisions for Indigenous peoples.²²⁵

Although no provision such as the CRC is mentioned specifically, the arguments made by youth organizations show awareness of children being rights holders. Sáminuorra stated that "Sámi youth, like all Indigenous peoples in the world, have a right to their culture, their businesses and have a right to self-determination."²²⁶ While this leaves the impression of a generalization of Indigenous peoples of any age, it suggests that children view themselves as being included in broader rights frameworks which are not particularly addressed at children.

²²⁴ Sáminuorra. *Idag gick näringsminister*. [Facebook]. (12 January 2022). <https://www.facebook.com/saminuorra/posts/pfbid02acwkMcViUJuBfxF74QoHTRR2eympkxFzaYQRohrfcX5NMM82AuoF1xKxPyoy9ql> (Accessed: 17 May 2026). [translated].

²²⁵ Forsberg. *S bryr sig inte ett skit om samerna.*; Fridays For Future Kiruna. *Hur kan du vara med.*; Fridays For Future Sweden. *Demonstration i Gállok.*; Fridays For Future Sweden. *Igår meddelade näringsminister*. [Instagram]. (13 January 2022). https://www.instagram.com/p/CYrfr4JtK_W/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).; Fridays for Future Sweden & Sáminuorra. *Idag beslutade regeringen.*; Fältbiologerna. *Delseger för samers rättigheter.*; Fältbiologerna. *Miljöorganisationer, Amnesty och samiska organisationer.*; Fältbiologerna. *Pressmeddelande.*; Kuhmunen et al. *Gå inte på att gruvan i Gállok är klimatsmart.*; Sametingets Ungdomsråd. *Uttalande.*; Sáminuorra. *Öppet Brev till Sveriges Regering.*; WWF Sweden Youth. *Regeringen beslutade den 22 mars.*

²²⁶ Sáminuorra. *Öppet Brev till Sveriges Regering*. [translated].

Thus, it can be said, that children and youths engaged with Gállok, are aware of different rights concepts and acknowledge themselves, even though not reaching the age of majority, as having rights equal to adults.

5.3.3 Children's future

Mirroring the analysis of the political and the public debate, and seeing as the references to children's rights were somewhat limited, I shifted the focus of the investigation of children's voices beyond rights concepts onto the rather abstract notion of children's future and future generations.

Within youth organization's social media contributions on Gállok, the notion of future is very strongly emphasized by children, highlighting that the decision affects their future and that they are the ones who have to deal with the consequences.²²⁷

This suggests that children and youths are aware that the decision has some effect on their lives but only in the future not within their present childhoods. This could be explained with the fact that it is mostly the consequences "a mine leaves behind,"²²⁸ the "environmentally harmful residues"²²⁹ that will be present once the mine is closed and many of the youths speaking are adults.

However, going into more detail, it shows that what Sámi-associated children fear is not merely the consequences they have to deal with after the closing of the mine but the consequences of the potential *opening* of the latter. Sáminuorra pleaded with the Cultural Minister in an Instagram post to "[s]how Sámi youth that they also have a future in Sweden."²³⁰ Fifteen-year-old Ella-Karin stated in a reader's letter in *Dagens Nyheter* "[m]y future and big parts of my heritage, which I am very proud of bearing, will disappear when the mine is build."²³¹ This suggests that children do not only feel affected by the decision but even threatened to some extent.

²²⁷ Nårsa. *Stoppa gruvan i Gállok och rädda vår framtid*, p. 27.; Sáminuorra. *Idag gick näringsminister.*; Sáminuorra. *Sáminuorra svarar Sven Otto Littorin.*; Sáminuorra. *Öppet Brev till Sveriges Regering.*

²²⁸ Sáminuorra. *Sáminuorra svarar Sven Otto Littorin.* [translated].

²²⁹ Fridays For Future Sweden. *Igår meddelade näringsminister.* [translated].

²³⁰ Sáminuorra. *Jeanette Gustafsdotter är kulturminister.* [translated].

²³¹ Nårsa. *Stoppa gruvan i Gállok och rädda vår framtid*, p. 27. [translated].

What this shows is that children consider themselves comprehensively affected by the decision in several ways which explains why they want to get involved and claim spaces within the debate. While the consequences of the opening and the closing of the mine clearly affect them as adults, their references to how it affects them suggests that this is not only a problem of a future adult but a fear of a child at present. This fear in the present can be linked back to the motivation to not only be consulted on the matter but to contribute to a sustainable solution.

6. Discussion

In order to situate and evaluate the findings, this chapter will place attention on the most striking findings regarding the involvement of children and the references to children's rights and futures and set these in relation to previous scholarship and the childism approach.

Children's involvement

While children did try to get into contact with politicians in various ways and did even meet with the Minister once, their engagement is marked by absence in the political debate. This aligns with the observation of Gibbons that children's "concerns are strangely invisible in climate policy dialogues"²³² even though they are expressed loud and clear. Seeing how many other voices were heard and considered during the political decision-making process, this highlights the marginalization of children. The voices of Sámi-associated youth organizations have not even been picked up in the official statements of Sámi-associations that were formally included in the decision-making process leading to the processing concession. While the arguments of children and Sámi peoples in general align to a large extent, this finding is striking in light of Blanchet-Cohen's observation that the Involvement of Indigenous children "ha[s] not always been welcomed in their own communities."²³³ However, why Sámi-associations did not amplify the voices of Sámi children explicitly, whether they are

²³² Gibbons. *Climate Change, Children's Rights, and the Pursuit of Intergenerational Climate Justice*, p. 23.

²³³ Blanchet-Cohen. *Indigenous children's rights. Opportunities in appropriation and transformation*, p. 379.

aware of the child's right to be included or whether they even included children in the writing of these statements cannot be said at this point but would make up for an interesting research endeavor in the future.

Though not to a large extent, the engagement of children with Gállok did not stay unnoticed in the public debate and children repeatedly found a way into newsletters. One significant response received an opinion piece written by Sáminuorra's president Sara-Elvira Kuhmunen and Greta Thunberg. As responses to children's engagement was otherwise limited this finding bears the question why this particular expression of views was responded to and thus clearly heard and amplified to some extent. On the one hand, it could be argued, that as Archard and Lindkvist suggested, Thunberg and Kuhmunen knew a way to communicate with adults and could thus "adapt to outside expectations on behaviour and style of argumentation."²³⁴ On the other hand, Thunberg could be viewed not as a child, but as a public figure which would suggest that the public debate is not necessarily responsive to children per se.

However, that children managed to enter the public debate to some extent suggests that the door to inclusion might be a fingerbreadth more open in the latter. This raises the question whether the underlying societal assumptions feeding into children's marginalization are equally strong within political structures and broader society. Wall emphasizes that it is inter alia "their lack of voting rights" visualizing their societal position.²³⁵ This lack does not only entail a systematic discrimination of children but a powerlessness specifically towards policy makers which becomes even more obvious looking at the political debate on Gállok and the way children's voices were excluded. Arguing that the public sphere is open to the engagement of children in societal debates, the question is whether it would be enough to overcome underlying adultist assumptions, that previous literature portrays as a barrier to the implementation of article 12(1).²³⁶ Is the restructuring of power imbalances between politicians and

²³⁴ Lindkvist. *Five Problems with Children's Participation Rights*, p. 159; see also: Archard. *Hearing the child's voice: a philosophical account*, p. 9.

²³⁵ Wall. *Childism and the Politics of Social Empowerment*, p. 206.

²³⁶ Lundy. 'Voice' is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, p. 930 f.; Tisdall. *Children and young people's participation. A critical consideration of Article 12*, p. 186; Thorburn Stern. *Implementing Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Participation, Power and Attitudes*, p. 165.

children bound to the implementation of article 12(1) or would only children's elevation to full citizenship and belonging to the electorate make that possible?

This idea is underpinned by observations of children's engagement with Gállok within their discourses. While the findings within the political and public debate suggest that article 12(1) is not taken into consideration in Swedish decision-making processes on land use, at least when referring to Lundy's conceptualization of the article,²³⁷ the analysis of children's voices shows that children did not only express their views using multiple ways but that they actively claimed spaces and asked to be heard. Moreover, by not only protesting what they did not agree with but by engaging with the arguments made in the debates, children and youth showed that they wanted to be included and considered.

Regarding previous scholarship, two observations should be highlighted. First, the findings of this study contrast the findings of Trott who emphasized the need of adult-guided opportunities for children to become empowered to engage with environmental issues.²³⁸ However, the findings of this study suggest, that children do not need adult-led empowerment to engage with the issue at hand.

Second, the findings align with the observations of Parker et al., Daly et al. and Donger that children are self-empowered expressing their views in protest rather than waiting for someone to give them access to their right to be heard.²³⁹ This study adds to this observation by not solely looking at children raising their voices in protest or litigation but by placing attention on the extent to which children are heard and included in the debates. Looking at the lack of responses and references to children's expression of their views, the findings suggest that what we see in the engagement of children is not

²³⁷ Lundy. 'Voice' is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, p. 932.

²³⁸ Trott. *What difference does it make? Exploring the transformative potential of everyday climate crisis activism by children and youth.*, p. 300; Trott. *Reshaping our world: Collaborating with children for community-based climate change action*, p. 43.

²³⁹ Daly. *Climate Competence: Youth Climate Activism and Its Impact on International Human Rights Law*, p. 1; Donger. *Children and Youth in Strategic Climate Litigation: Advancing Rights through Legal Argument and Legal Mobilization*, p. 268; Parker, Mestre, Jodoin & Wewerinke-Singh. *When the kids put climate change on trial: youth-focused rights-based climate litigation around the world*, p. 65 ff.; Daly, Maharjan, Montesinos Calvo-Fernández, Muller, Murray, O'Sullivan, Paz Landeira & Reid. *Climate Action and the UNCRC: A 'Postpaternalist' World Where Children Claim Their Own Rights*, p. 1387.

a top-down implementation of article 12(1). Instead, aligning with Daly's suggestion, it can be assumed that children do not have any other option than to protest if they want to be involved²⁴⁰ and in doing so, they claim their right to participate. This suggests that the realization of article 12(1) cannot and should not be reduced to the implementation of the latter.

The findings suggest based on the lived experiences of children that the latter are claiming spaces beyond the provision of article 12(1), namely not being merely taken into consideration but having a seat at the table. This means, I argue, that reimagining power structures it is not simply the implementation of singular rights but an acknowledgement of the bottom-up realization of rights.

Children's rights

Looking at the overall question whether and how a child rights perspective was applied in the decision-making process for Gállok the findings show that there was no explicit reference to children's rights from children themselves or participants in the public debate and hardly any reference to children's rights in the political debate. While rights language was used throughout the entire time in all three fora, it was mostly marked by references to international legal frameworks in general or Indigenous peoples' rights frameworks.

It could be argued that Indigenous children are equally addressed by these conventions as their adult community members, that they are generalized under the umbrella of Indigeneity and that international conventions include all kinds of human rights instruments that would naturally include younger humans. However, seeing as there are provisions exclusively for children and that in the debates surrounding Gállok references to these are lacking or made disappear aligns with Bekink's work showing how the end products of political decision-making processes often do not include a child rights perspective. However, in the absence of a child rights perspective in the discourses surrounding Gállok, two observations are particularly striking.

²⁴⁰ Daly. *Climate Competence: Youth Climate Activism and Its Impact on International Human Rights Law*, p. 23.

First, from a childist perspective it should be noted that, within the political debate several voices of Sámi-associations mentioned a range of specific legal frameworks potentially affected by the decision for Gállok with one of them being the CRC. While their voices and several of the legal frameworks they mentioned i.e. the C169 and the ICCPR are referred to in the government's final decision, the mentioning of the CRC is skipped.

This emphasizes the marginalization of children in the policy-making process but it also reminds of the Latourian idea that during the discourse “situations, localisations, even people start being slowly erased.”²⁴¹ This bears the question whether children, if they *were* included in the policy-making process according to article 12(1), would actually have an impact on the decision which leads to the even broader question whether it is article 12(1) or democratic procedures in general that should be questioned here.

Second, the lack of references to children's rights among children aligns with Lundy's observation that article 12 is marked by “limited awareness.”²⁴² However, that children are not referring to the CRC does not mean they are unaware of their rights nor does it mean that they do not claim their rights. The findings show how children refer frequently to rights concepts in general and view themselves as rights holders and that they are claiming spaces to make themselves heard and participate in a policy-making process beyond the provisions of the CRC. This may suggest that the claiming of rights, here, the right to participate, is not bound to the use of rights language and neither is the realization of these rights. This conclusion is similar to the argument advanced by Emma Sundkvist's dissertation on feminist activism in Egypt showing that rights activism does not need to make use of rights language.²⁴³ This suggests that children

²⁴¹ Latour. *Science in Action. How to follow scientists and engineers through society*, p. 15.

²⁴² Lundy. *'Voice' is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child*, p. 930.

²⁴³ E. Sundkvist. *Human rights as law, language, and space-making: women's rights movement in post-revolutionary Egypt*. . (Human Rights Studies, Department of History, Joint Faculties of Humanities and Theology, Lund University, 2022), pp. 50; 97.
https://lucris.lub.lu.se/ws/portalfiles/porta/116620751/Emma_Sundkvist_WEBB.pdf (accessed 2026-05-21).

are not only aware of themselves being rights holders but that they may claim them without using rights language.

Children's futures

While a child rights perspective was largely absent from the political and public debate, references to children's futures and to future generations were all the more frequent. Two of the findings brought to light by these references shall be briefly discussed below.

First, the analysis shows that children as well as voices participating in either the public or the political debate reflect frequently on the consequences the decision for Gállok would have on children and future generations and how they are the ones that would have to deal with them which suggests that it is generally understood that children are affected by the matter. Not only appears this decision to be considered decisive for children's future by children themselves which, according to Lundy, would suffice for it being a matter applicable for article 12.²⁴⁴ Moreover, it aligns with Heneghan's stance that the article includes matters as broad as climate change and is not limited to matters that necessarily affect the child's daily life.²⁴⁵ While this makes the absence of a child rights perspective and children's limited involvement in the decision-making process for Gállok all the more striking, it also underlines that article 12(1) is, at least in theory, an entry point for children to climate mitigation. Additionally, this entry point is not only justified by children *feeling* affected by land use issues linked to environmental questions, but the findings suggest that article 12(1) would be an entry point for children to climate mitigation even when adults determined what matters affect the child. From a childist perspective, the findings thus suggest that the lacking consideration of article 12(1) goes beyond the question of being affected, it is a question of wanting to allow children to participate. Moreover, the focus on children being affected not in their childhood but in their future adulthood underlines the

²⁴⁴ Lundy. 'Voice' is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, p. 931.

²⁴⁵ Heneghan. Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Children. Where Have We Come from, Where Are We Now and Where to from Here?, p. 540.

prevailing conception of children as “human becomings” rather than children in their own right.

Second, arguments for or against Gállok such as keeping Sámi’s cultural heritage or the prosperity of Jokkmokk’s municipality alive are frequently utilized by highlighting children’s future and future generations. This highlights that, while children and their future appear to play a role on either side, the conceptions of children and childhood are marked by paternalism and the basic understanding that someone other than children themselves knows what is best for them. This aligns with previous literature focused on child rights perspectives on climate change in which children are usually portrayed as vulnerable²⁴⁶ rather than being given the opportunity to gain agency and express their lived experiences which, according to the childist framework, would be crucial to overcome the vulnerability stemming from being placed in the margins.²⁴⁷ This is striking because if the notion of future would be linked to the concept of rights here, it would suggest that children’s best interest is spoken for without their input and that article 3 is in fact in tension with article 12 as the former would appear to trump the latter as argued for by Lücker-Babel.²⁴⁸ This perspective of the child being dependent not only disempowers children to engage but, more profoundly, it neglects the strength of interdependences.²⁴⁹ Would either side have engaged with children’s views and their understanding of a sustainable and prosperous future, the decision for Gállok would not necessarily be a different one. However, it could have led to mutual empowerment through horizontal alliances re-thinking top-down power structures.

²⁴⁶ Boshoff. *The Best Interest of the Child and Climate Change Adaptation in Sub-Saharan Africa*, p. 1.

²⁴⁷ Biswas, Wall, Warming, Zehavi, Kennedy, Murris, Kohan, Saal & Rollo. *Childism and philosophy: A conceptual co-exploration*, p. 743; Wall. *Children’s rights from a childist perspective. Theorizing social empowerment*, p. 82.

²⁴⁸ Lücker-Babel. *The Right of the Child to Express Views and to Be Heard: An Attempt to Interpret Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child*, p. 394.

²⁴⁹ Wall. *Childism and the Politics of Social Empowerment*, p. 209.

7. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to engage with the substance of article 12(1) in an explorative way, to understand how it is visualized in decision-making processes in Sweden and whether and how it intersects with child rights perspectives applied in these processes. Thus, the question to be answered was *How and to what extent are children's rights, particularly their right to be heard and to have their views taken into account, reflected in political and societal debates on land use in Sápmi in Sweden?*

In order to answer this question the nine-year long decision-making process leading to the processing concession for Gállok was looked at from a child rights perspective applying a childist framework and a critical policy analysis of a public and a political discourse as well as of social media contributions of children and youth. Throughout the analysis voices of inter alia politicians, researchers, civil society organizations, Sámi peoples and children were coded, categorized and contrasted in order to find traces of children's rights and to understand the perspectives considered and neglected.

Based on analysis and discussion there are three key findings answering the research question. First, article 12(1) is not systematically taken into consideration when looking at the decision-making processes for Gállok and neither is a child rights perspective. This is striking because the matter discussed is repeatedly described as affecting children. While this cannot be generalized, it bears the question whether children are generally heard when being affected as a group.

Second, while article 12(1) is not taken into consideration here, the analysis shows that children claim their right to be heard and to have their views taken into consideration through the channels of activism they apply. Moreover, they claim to be included in the mitigation process beyond their affectedness by the decision.

Lastly, based on the different ways children's engagement with Gállok is responded to in the political and the public debate and because children are claiming space that article 12(1) would not provide for them, it can be argued that it is political structures rather than societal attitudes or the lacking implementation of article 12(1) that hinders the inclusion of children in policy-making processes.

The strengths of the project can be summarized in four points. First, this study focused on a novel approach on Gállok by applying a child rights perspective. Second, it expands previous research by focusing on a process rather than a singular event to trace the way article 12(1) is taken into consideration. Through the choice of material, it thirdly, allows for a distinction between the application of a child rights perspective in the public and in the political sphere. Lastly, as it includes a focus on all elements of article 12(1), it allows for a holistic investigation of the article, its substance and whether and how it is taken into consideration in Sweden.

However, the analysis points to some limitations of this study as well. First, while I aimed at finding traces of how article 12(1) is taken into consideration, this study cannot visualize any influence of children on the final decision. This could either be because they have no influence or because the method chosen focuses on discourses not causality. Applying a process tracing approach could place attention on the question of influence but would potentially neglect power dynamics and marginalization.

Second, as the data generated by children and youth stems from groups rather than individuals, it is difficult to discuss questions of maturity and barriers regarding individual circumstances when looking at article 12(1). To highlight children's lived experiences on an individual level, this study could be complemented by a longitudinal interview study focused on singular children rather than groups. However, such a study would require extensive time expenditure as well as utmost ethical diligence.

Further, stating that article 12(1) has not been fully implemented in Sweden yet and that a child rights perspective is missing from a debate that clearly affects children bears the questions why it is not taken into consideration, what the obstacles are and why the clearly articulated needs of children are not connected to their rights. How is it, that the effects of the decision on Indigenous peoples are linked to legal frameworks protecting the latter but the effects on children are mentioned apart from any rights concept? And on a rather speculative note, arguing that children are trying to get involved and making themselves heard, what would change if article 12(1) was systematically taken into consideration? What would children's agency and activism look like if it were linked to a potentially paternalistic reading of the article? As these

questions go beyond the scope of this thesis and are partially impossible to answer at this point, they can make up for interesting research endeavors in the future.

However, while it cannot be speculated about if, when and how this right will be truly enjoyable, the outlook that the ratification of the third Optional Protocol to the CRC has been subject of a public inquiry one year after the decision for Gállok was made²⁵⁰ may give today's children some comfort and future children the opportunity to fight against not being heard in policy-making processes they are affected by.

²⁵⁰ A. Linder, C. Carlson & L. Hjort Warlenius. *Förbättrade Möjligheter för barn att utkräva sina rättigheter enligt barnkonventionen*. (2023). https://www.regeringen.se/contentassets/4ebbe056919a49a2bc51109778c7ef8b/sou-2023_40.pdf.

Bibliography

- Adami, R. Childism - on Adult Resistance to Children's Rights. In Adami, R., Kaldal, A. & Aspán, M. (eds.). *The Rights of the Child. Legal, Political and Ethical Challenges*. (Brill | Nijhoff, 2023), pp. 127–147.
- Akame, G. Meaningful Participation or Tokenism?: Sámi Children and Youth in Norway's Climate and Green Energy Transition. *The International Journal of Children's Rights*. 33: 3 (2025): pp. 675–701. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718182-33030004>.
- Al Jazeera*. "The Klondike of ore mining": Fighting for the Sami way of life. (20/2 2019). <https://www.aljazeera.com/gallery/2019/2/20/the-klondike-of-ore-mining-fighting-for-the-sami-way-of-life>.
- All European Academies (ALLEA). *The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity*. (2023). <https://allea.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/European-Code-of-Conduct-Revised-Edition-2023.pdf>.
- Andersson, J. & Blomdahl, F. *Svenskarna och internet 2022*. (Internet Stiftelsen, 2022). <https://svenskarnaochinternet.se/app/uploads/2022/10/internetstiftelsen-svenskarna-och-internet-2022.pdf> (accessed 2026-05-24).
- Archard, D. Hearing the child's voice: a philosophical account. *Journal of the British Academy*. 8: 4 (2020): pp. 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.5871/jba/008s4.007>.
- Arts, K. A child rights perspective on climate change. In Salih, M. (ed.). *Climate Change and Sustainable Development: New Challenges for Poverty Reduction*. (Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 2009), pp. 79–93. <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/lund/detail.action?docID=449315>.
- Bekink, M. The Fundamental Right of Children to Participate in Climate Change Decision-Making Processes: A South African Perspective. *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal*. 27 (2024): pp. 1–40. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17159/1727-3781/2024/v27i0a18350>.
- Biswas, T. & Hylland Eriksen, T. Children as environmental actors. A generational perspective on climate activism in an overheated world. In Abebe, T., Dar, A. & Wells, K. (eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Childhood Studies and Global Development*. 1. ed. (Routledge, 2024). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003155843-15>.
- Biswas, T., Wall, J., Warming, H., Zehavi, O., Kennedy, D., Murriss, K., Kohan, W., Saal, B. & Rollo, T. Childism and philosophy: A conceptual co-exploration. *Policy Futures in Education*. 22: 5 (2024): pp. 741–759. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103231185178>.

- Blanchet-Cohen, N. Indigenous children's rights. Opportunities in appropriation and transformation. In Vandenhoe, W., Desmet, E., Reynaert, D. & Lembrechts, S. (eds.). *Routledge International Handbook of Children's Rights Studies*. 1. ed. (Routledge, 2015), pp. 371–386. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315769530-23>.
- Boffey, D. The age of extinction. Greta Thunberg condemns UK firm's plans for iron mine on Sami land. *The Guardian*. (11/2 2022). <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/feb/11/sami-people-said-no-british-firms-plans-open-pit-mine-divide-sweden-greta-thunberg>.
- Boshoff, E. The Best Interest of the Child and Climate Change Adaptation in Sub-Saharan Africa. In Addaney, M., Nyarko, M. G. & Boshoff, E. (eds.). *Governance, Human Rights, and Political Transformation in Africa*. (Springer International Publishing, 2020), pp. 359–386. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-27049-0_14.
- Bosisio, R. Children's Right to Be Heard: What Children Think. *International Journal of Children's Rights*. 20: 1 (2012): pp. 141–154. <https://doi.org/10.1163/157181811X573462>.
- Bueren, G.V. The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. *Journal of Child Law*. 3: 2 (1991). <https://heinonline-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/chilflq3&i=69>.
- Buhmann, K. Addressing a human rights paradox in the green transition: Guidance for invested mining operations to benefit local communities. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 419 (2023): pp. 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.137903>.
- Cali Tzay, J.F. & Boyd, D.R. *Joint Communication from Special Procedures*. (United Nations Office of the High Commissioner, 2022). <https://crd.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/UN-Communication-SWE-03.02.2022-.pdf>.
- Committee on the Rights of the Child. *Views adopted by the Committee under the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure, concerning communication No. 172/2022*. (Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2025). https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F97%2FD%2F172%2F2022&Lang=en.
- Daly, A. Climate Competence: Youth Climate Activism and Its Impact on International Human Rights Law. *Human Rights Law Review*. 22: 2 (2022): pp. 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hrlr/ngac011>.
- Daly, A., Maharjan, N., Montesinos Calvo-Fernández, E., Muller, L.H., Murray, E.M., O'Sullivan, A., Paz Landeira, F. & Reid, K. Climate Action and the UNCRC: A 'Postpaternalist' World Where Children Claim Their Own Rights. *Youth*. No. 4 (2024): pp. 1387–1404. <https://doi.org/10.3390/youth4040088>.

- Davidsson, P. & Thoresson, A. *Svenskarna och internet 2017. Undersökning om svenskarnas internetvanor*. (IIS (Internetstiftelsen i Sverige), 2017). <https://svenskarnaochinternet.se/app/uploads/2023/11/svenskarna-och-internet-2017.pdf>.
- Desmet, E. & Aylwin, J. Natural resource exploitation and children's rights. In Vandenhoe, W., Desmet, E., Reynaert, D. & Lembrechts, S. (eds.). *Routledge International Handbook of Children's Rights Studies*. 1. ed. (Routledge, 2015), pp. 387–411. <https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.4324/9781315769530-24>.
- Doel-Mackaway, H. *Indigenous Children's Rights to Participate in Law and Policy Development*. (Routledge, 2022).
- Donger, E. Children and Youth in Strategic Climate Litigation: Advancing Rights through Legal Argument and Legal Mobilization. *Transnational Environmental Law*. 11: 2 (2022): pp. 263–289. <https://doi.org/DOI:%2010.1017/S2047102522000218>.
- Engström, T. Gruvstriden sliter isär familjer och samhällen. *Aftonbladet*. (10/12 2020). <https://www.aftonbladet.se/kultur/bokrecensioner/a/JJnpbj/gruvstriden-sliter-isar-familjer-och-samhallen> (accessed 2026-05-24).
- Findahl, O. *Swedes and the Internet 2013*. (.SE (the Internet Infrastructure Foundation), 2013). <https://svenskarnaochinternet.se/app/uploads/2023/10/swedes-and-the-internet-2013.pdf> (accessed 2026-04-01).
- Fischer, F. In pursuit of usable knowledge: critical policy analysis and the argumentative turn. In *Handbook of Critical Policy Studies*. (Edward Elgar Publishing, 2015). <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781783472352.00008>.
- Fischer, F. *Critical Policy Inquiry. Interpreting Knowledge and Arguments*. (Edward Elgar Publishing, 2024).
- Gibbons, E.D. Climate Change, Children's Rights, and the Pursuit of Intergenerational Climate Justice. *Health and Human Rights Journal*. 16: 1 (2014): pp. 19–31.
- Hart, R.A. Children's Participation. From Tokenism to Citizenship (1992). <https://participationpool.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Hart-R.-1992-Children-Participation-from-Tokenism-to-Citizenship.pdf>.
- Henaghan, M. Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Children. Where Have We Come from, Where Are We Now and Where to from Here? *International Journal of Children's Rights*. 25 (2017): pp. 537–552. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718182-02502012>.
- Hivert, A.-F. La Suède dit oui à und projet minier très controversé. *Le Monde*. (24/3 2022). https://www.lemonde.fr/planete/article/2022/03/24/la-suede-dit-oui-a-un-projet-minier-tres-controverse_6118945_3244.html (accessed 2026-05-24).

Högsta Förvaltningsdomstolens Dom 3893-22. (25/6 2024).

van Hulst, M., Metze, T., Dewulf, A., de Vries, J., van Bommel, S. & van Ostaijen, M. Discourse, framing and narrative: three ways of doing critical, interpretive policy analysis. *Critical Policy Studies*. 19: 1 (2025): pp. 74–96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2024.2326936>.

Kaldal, A. Children's Participation in Legal Proceedings - Conditioned by Adult Views of Children's Capacity and Credibility? In Adami, R., Kaldal, A. & Aspán, M. (eds.). *The Rights of the Child. Legal, Political and Ethical Challenges*. (Brill | Nijhoff, 2023).

Krappmann, L. The weight of the child's view (Article 12 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child). *International Journal of Children's Rights*. 18: 4 (2010): pp. 501–513. <https://doi.org/10.1163/157181810X528021>.

Latour, B. *Science in Action. How to follow scientists and engineers through society*. (Harvard University Press, 1987).

Lee, S. Sacchi v. Argentina: Fighting for Indigenous Children's Climate Rights. *UCLA Law Review* (2020). <https://www.uclalawreview.org/sacchi-v-argentina-fighting-for-indigenous-childrens-climate-rights/> (accessed 2026-05-24).

de Leeuw, G. *The comfort of alignment: Mining, green steel, and killjoy desires in Sweden/Sápmi*. (Lund University, 2024). https://lucris.lub.lu.se/ws/portalfiles/portal/170230439/The_comfort_of_alignment_Georgia_de_Leeuw.pdf.

Linder, A., Carlson, C. & Hjort Warlenius, L. *Förbättrade Möjligheter för barn att utkräva sina rättigheter enligt barnkonventionen*. (2023). https://www.regeringen.se/contentassets/4ebbe056919a49a2bc51109778c7ef8b/sou-2023_40.pdf.

Lindkvist, L. Rights for the World's Children: Rädda Barnen and the Making of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. *Nordic Journal of Human Rights*. 36: 3 (2018): pp. 287–303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18918131.2018.1522772>.

Lindkvist, L. The Child Subject of Human Rights. In Celermajer, D. & Lefebvre, A. (eds.). *The Subject of Human Rights*. (Stanford University Press, 2020), pp. 211–227. <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/lund/detail.action?docID=6371984>.

Lindkvist, L. Five Problems with Children's Participation Rights. In Adami, R., Kaldal, A. & Aspán, M. (eds.). *The Rights of the Child. Legal, Political and Ethical Challenges*. (Brill | Nijhoff, 2023), pp. 151–163. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004511163_016.

Lücker-Babel, M.-F. The Right of the Child to Express Views and to Be Heard: An Attempt to Interpret Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. *International Journal of Children's Rights*. 3: 3 & 4 (1995): pp. 391–404.

- Lundy, L. 'Voice' is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *British Educational Research Journal*. 33: 6 (2007): pp. 927–942. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701657033>.
- Mattson, T. *Barnrättsperspektivet i LVU-sammanhang*. (Fritzes, 2015). <https://www.lu.se/lup/publication/b78209e7-27ea-467a-bf11-d9ce1727e4e3> (accessed 2026-05-24).
- de Moor, J., Uba, K., Wahlström, M., Wennerhag, M. & De Vydt, M. (eds.). *Protest for a future II. Somposition, mobilization and motives of the participants in Fridays For Future climate protests on 20-27 September, 2019, in 19 cities around the world*. (2020). <https://osf.io/asruw/files/3hcxs> (accessed 2026-05-24).
- Moore, H.L. Global Anxieties: Concept-Metaphors and Pre-Theoretical Commitments in Anthropology. *Anthropological Theory*. 4: 1 (2004): pp. 71–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1463499604040848>.
- Naturskyddsföreningen. Fältbiologerna. <https://www.naturskyddsforeningen.se/engageradig/faltbiologerna/> (accessed 2026-05-12).
- Niia, A.-K., Holgersson, J. & Tjäder, J. Överlämnade 70000 gruvprotester till näringsministern. *SVT Nyheter*. (11/2 2022). <https://www.svt.se/nyheter/sapmi/har-overlamnas-70-000-gruvprotester-till-naringsministern> (accessed 2026-05-24).
- Norrländska Socialdemokraten (NSD). Polisen bröt blockaden. (12/8 2013). <https://www.nsd.se/nyheter/jokkmokk-uppdaterad/artikel/polisen-brot-blockaden/lz3y89gj> (accessed 2026-05-24).
- Ocast. *Topplista över populära nyhetstidningar i Sverige - Topplistor*. (2026). <https://ocast.com/se/toplists/nyhetstidningar> (accessed 2026-04-01).
- OECD. *OECD Environmental Performance Reviews: Sweden 2025*. (2025). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1787/91dcc109-en>.
- Parker, L., Mestre, J., Jodoin, S. & Wewerinke-Singh, M. When the kids put climate change on trial: youth-focused rights-based climate litigation around the world. *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment*. 13: 1 (2022): pp. 64–89. <https://doi.org/10.4337/jhre.2022.01.03>.
- Parkes, A. *Children and International Human Rights Law. The right of the child to be heard*. (Routledge, 2013).
- Paz Landeira, F. Temporalities in Crisis: Analysing the Sacchi v. Argentina Case and Children's Rights in the Climate Emergency. *Children & Society*. 39: 4 (2025): pp. 854–863. <https://doi.org/10.1111/chso.12955>.
- Persson, S., Harnesk, D. & Islar, M. What local people? Examining the Gállok mining conflict and the rights of the Sámi population in terms of justice and power.

- Geoforum*. 86 (2017): pp. 20–29.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.08.009>.
- Prior, L. Content Analysis. In Leavy, P. (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 2. ed. (Oxford University Press, 2020), pp. 540–568.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190847388.013.25>.
- Qvortrup, J. Are Children Human Beings or Human Becomings? A critical assessment of outcome thinking. *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali*. 117: 3/4 (2009): pp. 631–653.
- Sáminuorra. Bli medlem. <https://www.saminuorra.org/bli-medlem-i-saminuorra/> (accessed 2026-05-12).
- Samiskt informationscentrum. Karta över Sápmi.
<https://samer.se/karta> (accessed 2026-05-12).
- Sandland, R. A Clash of Conventions? Participation, Power and the Rights of Disabled Children. *Social Inclusion*. 5: 3 (2017): pp. 93–103.
<https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v5i3.955>.
- Sanz-Caballero, S. Children’s rights in a changing climate: a perspective from the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics*. 13 (2013): pp. 1–14.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3354/esep00130>.
- Sarri, T. Annie Lööf vill inte möta Sametingets ungdomsråd. *Sveriges Radio*. (18/9 2013). <https://www.sverigesradio.se/artikel/5649299> (accessed 2026-05-24).
- Scheinin, M. & Åhrén, M. Evolution of Indigenous Peoples’ Rights as Human Rights: Contribution of Sámi Rights Cases at UN Human Rights Treaty Bodies. *Nordic Journal of Human Rights*. 44: 1 (2026): pp. 1–20.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/18918131.2026.2639220>.
- Sernhede, S. FFF School Strikes as Alternative Civic Classroom: Sociomaterial Entanglements, Assemblages, and Spatial Imaginaries. *Postdigital Science and Education*. 7: 3 (2025): pp. 1007–1026. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-025-00562-z>.
- Shepherd, V. (Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, 2022). https://indigenous.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/2023-09/INT_CERD_ALE_SWE_9557_E.pdf (accessed 2026-05-24).
- Shields, S., Longo, A., Strand, M. & Morgera, E. Children’s Human Right to Be Heard at the Ocean-climate Nexus. *The International Journal of Marine and Coastal Law*. 38: 3 (2023): pp. 545–580.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/15718085-bja10140>.
- Stern, R. *The child’s right to participation. Reality or rhetoric?* . (Uppsala University, 2006).

- Stern, R.T. Much Ado about Nothing? The Road to the Incorporation of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in Sweden. *The International Journal of Children's Rights*. 27: 2 (2019): pp. 266–305. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718182-02702005>.
- Sundkvist, E. *Human rights as law, language, and space-making: women's rights movement in post-revolutionary Egypt*. . (Human Rights Studies, Department of History, Joint Faculties of Humanities and Theology, Lund University, 2022). https://lucris.lub.lu.se/ws/portalfiles/portal/116620751/Emma_Sundkvist_WEB_B.pdf (accessed 2026-05-21).
- SVT Nyheter. *Jåhkågasska: "Förhoppning är att det aldrig blir en gruva i Gállok"*. (2022). <https://www.svt.se/nyheter/sapmi/jahkagasska-sameby-forhoppning-ar-att-det-aldrig-blir-en-gruva-i-g-llok> (accessed 2026-04-01).
- Thorburn Stern, R. *Implementing Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Participation, Power and Attitudes*. (Brill Nijhoff, 2017).
- Thorwaldsson, K.-P. & Gernsjo, F. *Ansökan om bearbetningskoncession enligt minerallagen (1991:45) för området Kallak K nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun, Norrbottens län. Regeringens beslut*. (Regeringen (Näringsdepartementet), 2022). <https://jokkmokkiron.se/upload/images/dokument/regeringsbeslut-n201704553.pdf> (accessed 2026-05-12).
- Tigre, M.A. & Lichet, V. The CRC Decision in Sacchi v. Argentina. *ASIL insights*. 25: 26 (2021): pp. 1–7.
- Tisdall, E.K.M. Children and young people's participation. A critical consideration of Article 12. In *Routledge International Handbook of Children's Rights Studies*. (Routledge, 2015), pp. 185–200. <https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.4324/9781315769530-13>.
- Traianou, A. The Centrality of Ethics in Qualitative Practice. In Leavy, P. (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 2. ed. (Oxford University Press, 2020), pp. 86–110. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190847388.013.12>.
- Trott, C.D. Reshaping our world: Collaborating with children for community-based climate change action. *Action Research*. 17: 1 (2019): pp. 42–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750319829209>.
- Trott, C.D. What difference does it make? Exploring the transformative potential of everyday climate crisis activism by children and youth. *Children's Geographies*. 19: 3 (2021): pp. 300–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2020.1870663>.
- Twum-Danso Imoh, A. Adults in Charge: The Limites of Formal Child Participatory Processes for Societal Transformation. In Sandin, B., Josefsson, J., Hanson, K. & Balagopalan, S. (eds.). *The Politics of Children's Rights and Representation*. (Palgrave Macmillan, 2023), pp. 59–80. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-04480-9_3.

- Uddin, R., Philipsborn, R., Smith, D., Mutic, A. & Thompson, L.M. A global child health perspective on climate change, migration and human rights. *Current Problems in Pediatric and Adolescent Health Care*. 51: 6 (2021): pp. 1–8. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cppeds.2021.101029>.
- Ulrich, G. Research ethics for human rights researchers. In Andreassen, B. A., Sano, H.-O. & McInerney-Lankford, S. (eds.). *Research Methods in Human Rights. A Handbook*. (Edward Elgar Publishing, 2017), pp. 192–221. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781785367793.00017>.
- UN Treaty Body Database. Ratification Status for CRC - Convention on the Rights of the Child. https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/TreatyBodyExternal/Treaty.aspx?Treaty=CRC&Lang=en (accessed 2026-05-12).
- UNICEF. *Barnkonventionen*. (2026). <https://unicef.se/barnkonventionen> (accessed 2026-04-01).
- Urisman Otto, A. & Turesson, R. Stor protestlista mot Kallakgruvan lämnas till Regeringen. *Dagens Nyheter*. (11/2 2022). <https://www.dn.se/vetenskap/stor-protestlista-mot-kallakgruvan-lamnas-till-regeringen/> (accessed 2026-05-24).
- Wall, J. From childhood studies to childism: reconstructing the scholarly and social imaginations. *Children's Geographies*. 20: 3 (2022): pp. 257–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2019.1668912>.
- Wall, J. Childism and the Politics of Social Empowerment. *Sociedad e Infancias*. 8: 2 (2024): pp. 205–213. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/soci.99146>.
- Wall, J. Children's rights from a childist perspective. Theorizing social empowerment. In Llobet, V., Reynaert, D., Twum-Danso Imoh, A. & Vandenhoe, W. (eds.). *Critical Children's Rights Studies. A Research Companion*. (Routledge, 2025), pp. 82–95. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003510284-6>.
- Wong, C. Inclusion of Indigenous Children's Rights. Informing Water Management in Canada. In Fenton-Glynn, C. (ed.). *Children's Rights and Sustainable Development. Interpreting the UNCRC for Future Generations*. 1. ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2019), pp. 236–258. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108140348.011>.
- World Population Review. Age of Majority by Country 2026. <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/age-of-majority-by-country> (accessed 2026-05-12).
- WWF Sweden Youth. Bli en changemaker. <https://www.wwf.se/wwfswedenyouth/bli-en-changemaker/> (accessed 2026-05-12).
- Young-Bruehl, E. Childism—Prejudice against Children. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*. 45: 2 (2009): pp. 251–265. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00107530.2009.10745998>.

List of Primary Sources

Policy Documents

- Antti, J. *Yttrande över Regeringskansliets begäran om komplettering gällande ansökan om bearbetningskoncession för Kallak K nr. 1 i Jokkmokks kommun.* (Länsstyrelsen Norrbotten, 2017). [Government Offices Archives].
- Blind Berg, M. & Wik Karlsson, J. *Yttrande avseende bearbetningskoncession Kallak nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun, N2017/04553.* (Svenska Samernas Riksförbund, 2022). [Government Offices Archives].
- Carlsson, E. & Lindbäck, E. *Yttrande angående Jokkmokks IronMines AB:s ansökan om bearbetningskoncession för området Kallak nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun, Norrbottens län ärende N2017/04553.* (2022). [Government Offices Archives].
- Cederberg, C. *Yttrande.* (Jåhkågasska Tjellde Sameby, 2018). [Government Offices Archives].
- From, I. & Karlsson, Å. *Motion till riksdagen 2019/20:1222.* (Sveriges Riksdag, 2019). <https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/E630E2CE-B16F-43BC-AED4-C80C120F0AE6> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Jansson, I., Sörlin, S., Sandahl, J. *Jokkmokks framtid finns i bevarad natur – därför säger vi nej till en gruva i Gállok.* (Naturskyddsföreningen). [Government Offices Archives].
- Lillemets, A. & Mutt, V. *Motion till riksdagen 2015/16:2183.* (Sveriges Riksdag, 2015). <https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/A45298F6-C22E-42E5-B9FE-0A7292D5DCB3> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Länta, L. & Cederberg, C. *Yttrande i anledning av ansökan om bearbetningskoncession, Kallak nr. 1 i Jokkmokks Kommun.* (Jåhkågasska Tjellde Sameby, 2018). [Government Offices Archives].
- Parffa, P.-J. *Yttrande.* (Tuorpon Sameby, no date). [Government Offices Archives].
- Sjajin, L.-O. & Walkeapää, A. *Yttrande vid begäran om komplettering i ärenden om ansökan om bearbetningskoncession för området Kallak K nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun.* (Sámediggi, 2017). [Government Offices Archives].
- Svensson, L. & Willemsen, G. *Till Sveriges regering.* (Equmeniakyrkan, 2022). [Government Offices Archives].
- Sveriges Riksdag. *Riksdagens protokoll 2013/14:8.* (2013). <https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/62E7FF41-FE61-4BE7-B817-8C5DF4830998> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).

- Sveriges Riksdag. *Riksdagens protokoll 2013/14:13*. (2013).
<https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/90EBB3E4-13CE-486B-A91C-66E546062472>
 (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Sveriges Riksdag. *Miljö- och jordbruksutskottets betänkande 2015/16: MJU8*. (2016).
<https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/26107997-A190-409A-9BD9-9A82FB98E204>
 (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Sveriges Riksdag. *Riksdagens protokoll 2021/22:86*. (2022).
<https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/CBC6C2BA-3CB8-4D22-9087-3C34DE1EBF2F>
 (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Sveriges Riksdag. *Riksdagens protokoll 2021/22:91*. (2022).
<https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/AE70D282-F4D5-4D2A-91E1-A906B0A30F41>
 (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Sveriges Riksdag. *Riksdagens protokoll 2021/22:107*. (2022).
<https://data.riksdagen.se/fil/3CEC6C78-274B-4E2C-8C36-8B4A2DFD1232>
 (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Thorwaldsson, K.-P. & Gemsjö, F. *Regeringens beslut*. (Näringsdepartementet, 2022).
<https://jokkmokkiron.se/upload/images/dokument/regeringsbeslut-n201704553.pdf> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Tuorda, T.L., Johansson, E., Sjögren, M. *Yttrande gällande Kallak N*. (Gruvfritt Jokkmokk, 2018). [Government Offices Archives].
- Unna Tjerus Sameby. *Yttrande avseende bearbetningskoncession Kallak nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun*. (no date). [Government Offices Archives].
- Wik Karlsson, J. *Yttrande avseende bearbetningskoncession Kallak nr 1 i Jokkmokks kommun, N2017/04553*. (Svenska Samernas Riksförbund, 2022). [Government Offices Archives].
- Wik Karlsson, J. *Yttrande avseende ansökan om bearbetningskoncession, N2017/04553*. (Svenska Samernas Riksförbund, 2022). [Government Offices Archives].
- Österling, F. & Sjajin, L.-O. *Yttrande avseende ansökan om bearbetningskoncession för området Kallak K nr 1 i Jåhkåmåhkke/Jokkmokks kommun, Norrbottens län*. (Sámediggi, 2022). [Government Offices Archives].

Newspaper Articles

- Andersson, S. Med en gruva kann de unga stanna kvar här. *Aftonbladet*. (29 September 2013), p. 6.

- Arndt, N. & Troll, V. Sverige är mycket lämpligt för gruvdrift. *Aftonbladet*. (21 February 2022). <https://www.aftonbladet.se/debatt/a/mrna6O/forskare-sverige-ar-mycket-lampligt-for-gruvdrift> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Bolund, P. & Palmtierna, A. En näringsminister som riskerar jäv skadar Sverige. *Dagens Nyheter*. (29 December 2021). <https://www.dn.se/debatt/en-naringsminister-som-riskerar-jav-skadar-sverige/> (Accessed: 13 May 2026).
- Broberg, A. Stoppa diskrimineringen av samer med ny urfolkspolitik. *Dagens Nyheter*. (16 September 2013), p. 6.
- Forsberg, R. S bryr sig inte ett skit om samerna. *Expressen*. (20 March 2022). <https://www.expressen.se/debatt/s-bryr-sig-inte-ett--skit-om-samerna/> (Accessed: 13 May 2026).
- Jonsson, J., Åhrén, M., Gabelic, A. Ge samebyarna rätt att säga nej till nya gruvor. *Aftonbladet*. (12 October 2013), p. 6.
- Kuhmunen, S.-E., Thunberg, G., Kuhmunen, M., Länta, J.E., Tuorda, T., Isaksson, L., Jannok, S., Nilsson, J., Propst, S., Burnelius, L., Zachari, R. Gå inte på att gruvan i Gállok är klimatsmart. *Aftonbladet*. (3 February 2022). <https://www.aftonbladet.se/debatt/a/28gl9B/greta-thunberg-mfl-stoppa-gruvan-i-gallok> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Labba, E.A. Jag gråter när jag lyssnar på näringsministern Karl-Petter Thorwaldsson. *Dagens Nyheter*. (22 March 2022). <https://www.dn.se/kultur/elin-anna-labba-jag-grater-nar-jag-lyssnar-pa-naringsministern-karl-petter-thorwaldsson/> (Accessed: 13 May 2026).
- Lindenfors, A. & Westeson J. Sverige – ta samernas rättigheter på allvar. *Aftonbladet*. (6 June 2019). <https://www.aftonbladet.se/debatt/a/J1m397/sverige--ta-samernas-rattigheter-pa-allvar> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Lindqvist, H. Om samerna vore indiander skulle vi höra. *Aftonbladet*. (26 October 2013), p. 20.
- Lundberg Tuorda, T., Wanneby, L., Spik, N., Persson, M., Nyström, M. Dagens gruvpolitik är ovärdig Sverige. *Aftonbladet*. (5 September 2013), p. 6.
- Länta, J.-M., Nygård, J., Jonsson, J., Åhrén, M. Sverige skänker bort tillgångar i Sameland. *Dagens Nyheter*. (21 August 2013), p. 6.
- Nilsson Lööv, S. Regeringens ja till gruvan går emot FN:s avrådan. *Dagens Nyheter*. (26 March 2022). <https://www.dn.se/insandare/regeringens-ja-till-gruvan-gar-emot-fns-avradan/> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Nårsa, E.-K. Stoppa gruvan i Gállok och rädda vår framtid. *Dagens Nyheter*. (21 January 2022), p. 27.

- Olsson, L. Låt gruvbolaget betala i förskott för att återställa Kallak. *Dagens Nyheter*. (23 March 2022). <https://www.dn.se/insandare/lat-gruvbolaget-betala-i-forskott-for-att-aterstalla-kallak/> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Palm, O. Thorwaldssons roll som minister måste ifrågesättas. *Dagens Nyheter*. (19 June 2022). <https://www.dn.se/insandare/thorwaldssons-roll-som-minister-maste-ifragasattas/> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Sandahl, J. Ett orkitiskt bejakande gruvnäringens önskemål. *Dagens Nyheter*. (10 January 2020). <https://www.dn.se/debatt/repliker/ett-okritiskt-bejakande-av-gruvnaringens-onskemal/> (Accessed: 13 May 2026).
- Tidholm, P. Sverige skänker bort bergets guld. *Dagens Nyheter*. (23 September 2013), pp. 46-47.
- Tidholm, P. För socialdemokratin är en gruva fortfarande lika med jobb och glada väljare. *Dagens Nyheter*. (25 March 2022), p. 46.
- Wolodarski, P. Jag har också varit ointresserad och okunnig. *Dagens Nyheter*. (19 September 2021), p. 4.
- Åkesson, M. Noterat av DN:s läsare den 24 mars 2022. *Dagens Nyheter*. (24 March 2022). <https://www.dn.se/insandare/noterat-av-dns-lasare-den-24-mars-2022/> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).

Social Media Entries

- Fridays For Future Kiruna. *Gállok Kallak*. [Instagram]. (25 January 2022). https://www.instagram.com/tv/CZJWroCJzst/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Fridays For Future Kiruna. *Skriv på*. [Instagram]. (30 January 2022). https://www.instagram.com/p/CZXLq6nNgHB/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Fridays For Future Kiruna. *Hur kan du vara med*. [Instagram]. (10 February 2022). https://www.instagram.com/p/CZyj5tstYqL/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Fridays For Future Norrbotten. *Nu är det dags igen*. [Facebook]. (24 March 2022). <https://www.facebook.com/fridaysforfuturenorrbotten/posts/pfbid05nW47wk91iiiPTqG182NGycJGWXqRx34WJbRpHHoWuUJmkyqrYfdHsM8kMPS9Wzvl> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Fridays For Future Sweden. *Igår meddelade näringsminister*. [Instagram]. (13 January 2022). https://www.instagram.com/p/CYrfr4JtK_W/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).

- Fridays For Future Sweden. *Skriv under*. [Instagram]. (17 January 2022).
https://www.instagram.com/p/CY1-ol5NnbX/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Fridays For Future Sweden. *Ingen gruva i Gállok*. [Instagram]. (3 February 2022).
https://www.instagram.com/p/CZhdJ8XNf7G/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Fridays For Future Sweden. *Demonstration i Gállok*. [Instagram]. (5 February 2022).
https://www.instagram.com/p/CZmnBUGKCVw/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Fridays For Future Sweden. *Twitterstorm*. [Facebook]. (5 February 2022).
<https://www.facebook.com/fridaysforfuture.swe/posts/pfbid0v5jxVcLRXr3EiJMUFsMTAs6An4r3HpviuLSfTtZVxinHXfLEsn2XtJJcKSY1jYul> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Fridays For Future Sweden. *Glad samisk nationaldag*. [Instagram]. (6 February 2022).
https://www.instagram.com/p/CZpN50ANl9v/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Fridays For Future Sweden. *Demonstrationen i Jokkmokk*. [Instagram]. (10 February 2022).
https://www.instagram.com/tv/CZzsipHDO_t/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Fridays For Future Sweden & Sáminuorra. *På fredag lämnas namninsamlingen*. [Instagram]. (9 February 2022).
https://www.instagram.com/tv/CZwECYpj5YC/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Fridays For Future Sweden & Sáminuorra. *Idag beslutade regeringen*. [Instagram]. (22 March 2022).
https://www.instagram.com/p/CbZ-w2CNS-M/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Fältbiologerna. *Delseger för samers rättigheter*. [Instagram]. (4 October 2021).
https://www.instagram.com/p/CUNbFYysLxV/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Fältbiologerna. *Miljöorganisationer, Amnesty och samiska organisationer*. [Instagram]. (16 January 2022).
https://www.instagram.com/p/CYzVVZeMshY/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Fältbiologerna. *Pressmeddelande*. [Instagram]. (24 March 2022).
https://www.instagram.com/p/Cbe1xvgsOqa/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).

- Fältbiologerna. *[Uppskjutet] blixaktion Gállok*. [Instagram]. (24 March 2022). https://www.instagram.com/p/CaXCSTKs7V0/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Sametingets Ungdomsråd. *Uttalande*. [Facebook]. (31 July 2013). <https://www.facebook.com/samiyouth/posts/394586027309629> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Sáminuorra. *Stöd kampen mot gruvboomen*. [Facebook]. (27 August 2013). <https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=544231102316510&set=a.195262959848035> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Sáminuorra. *Idag gick näringsminister*. [Facebook]. (12 January 2022). <https://www.facebook.com/saminuorra/posts/pfbid02acwkMcViUJuBfxF74QoHTRR2eympkxFzaYQRohrfcX5NMMe82AuoF1xkJxPyoy9ql> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Sáminuorra. *Sáminuorra har svarat på*. [Instagram]. (7 February 2022). https://www.instagram.com/p/CZrjolMKnao/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Sáminuorra. *Sáminuorra svarar Sven Otto Littorin*. [Facebook]. (7 February 2022). <https://www.facebook.com/saminuorra/posts/pfbid02osZj6kgSVuPtam7TUnknDbRev1DxUGuZVjpxMgzWfnN4x7MQNR4QTkxZQ5R18MWEI> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Sáminuorra. *Jeanette Gustafsdotter är kulturminister*. [Instagram]. (10 February 2022). https://www.instagram.com/p/CZzX8yrKj5X/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- Sáminuorra. *Öppet Brev till Sveriges Regering*. [Facebook]. (10 February 2022). <https://www.facebook.com/saminuorra/posts/pfbid0sG9M41k2qHZAkHetx3tfpUSiS5PQW1jt19YmegrBL8fgyWyW2npsUdS497Ty7CNrl> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- WWF Sweden Youth. *Den här bilden*. [Instagram]. (20 July 2016). https://www.instagram.com/p/BIGMB8lg6mi/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- WWF Sweden Youth. *WWF Sweden Youth säger nej*. [Instagram]. (10 February 2022). https://www.instagram.com/p/CZy-qj0MXjH/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRlODBiNWFlZA%3D%3D (Accessed: 17 May 2026).
- WWF Sweden Youth. *Regeringen beslutade den 22 mars*. [Facebook]. (24 March 2022). <https://www.facebook.com/wwfungdom/posts/pfbid0SbvqqsjWuZNcaESVrQvben2nFhW375iS8JDS1p5y6nKDJNbWSQktHhJPp2Ws2RaPl> (Accessed: 17 May 2026).