

YOUTH AND THE MOUNTAINS

Student Papers on Sustainable Mountain Development

Volume VIII
2020



Youth and the Mountains

Student Essays on Sustainable Mountain Development

Youth and the Mountains is a journal composed of student articles on sustainable mountain development. The journal is supported by the Department of History and Political Science, in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences at Utah Valley University (UVU). The Journal is an undergraduate publication with the aim of providing a forum for undergraduate students to share research and encourage active pursuit of quality academic scholarship. Students who have questions about the Journal, or those wishing to make a contribution (IE: filling staff positions or submitting a manuscript for review), should contact the Editor-in-Chief, Dallas Karren by e-mail at: YouthMT@uvu.edu with the subject line of JOURNAL SUBMISSION. If you would like to see previous issues go to: <http://www.uvu.edu/hps/student/youthjournal.html>

Table of Contents

Introductions

Editor Notes: Mr. Dallas Karren, Editor-in-Chief	Pg 6
Managing Editor's Notes: Mr. Carlos Alarco	Pg 8

Section I ***Official Documents***

Excerpt from the United Nations Secretary General's Report on Sustainable Mountain Development A/74/209 from July 22, 2019 about UIMF	Pg 10
Written statement E/CN.6/2020/NGO/91 at the 63rd session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women from November 30, 2019	Pg 11
Preamble for the 68th United Nations Civil Society Conference Outcome Statement, Salt Lake City, Utah, United States of America, 26-28 August 2019	Pg 15

Section II ***Sustainable Mountain Development Topics in Utah***

"The Omission of an Article Relating to Mining in the Utah State Constitution" By Antony Jackson	Pg 17
"Research Analysis on the History and Impact of Land Conservation Bills in the U.S. and Utah" By Megan Davis	Pg 33

Section III ***Sustainable Mountain Development Issues Worldwide***

"Sustainable Development Goals for Norway: Prosperity, Planet, People" by Andrew Tschirki	Pg 46
"Reconciliation in Georgia: Utilizing SDG 16 to Promote Peacebuilding and Governance in South Ossetia and Abkhazia" By Samuel Elzinga	Pg 60

“World Diplomacy and Sustainable Mountain
Development: A Study of Kyrgyzstan”

By Sarah Michaelis

Pg 74

“Sustainable Mountain Development in Lebanon:
Tourism and the Lebanese Mountain Trail”

By Jonathan Downs

Pg 87

“The Tarahumara People” By Jocelyn Lujan

Pg 99

Editorial Board

Editor-in-Chief:

Mr. Dallas Karren, Utah Valley University

Managing Editor:

Mr. Carlos Alarco, Utah Valley University

Associate Editors:

Dr. Baldomero Lago, Utah Valley University

Dr. Jay DeSart, Utah Valley University

Dr. Baktybek Abdrisaev, Utah Valley University

Dr. Rusty Butler, Russian Academy of Natural Sciences

Ms. Amy Barnett, Utah Valley University

Content Editors:

Mrs. Heather Hamilton, Utah Valley University

Ms. Jessica Murphy, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

Mr. William Crist, Utah Valley University

Editors Notes

Dear Reader,

Presented before you is the 2020 issue of the Youth and the Mountains journal, which contains the works of undergraduate students at Utah Valley University (UVU). These works provide in-depth analysis of mountain communities, which are some of the most neglected and impoverished regions of the world, and advocate for Sustainable Mountain Development (SMD) in the State of Utah and globally. Student efforts are aimed at aiding these communities that are highly susceptible to modern challenges such as climate change yet still need to be brought into the focus of the United Nations (UN) 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Students at UVU were able to research various topics and address real-world problems facing mountain communities. As a collective effort, they supported the promotion and advancement of SMD through a student-engaged model and the implementation of Target 6.6, Target 15.1 and Target 15.4 with focus on SMD among the UN's seventeen Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The journal's editorial team is also composed of students experienced and dedicated to SMD advocacy.

Our journal was first inaugurated in 2013 as an effort of UVU students to promote SMD during the Third Global Meeting of the Mountain Partnership in Erzurum, Turkey. The current issue continues those traditions and engages students in SMD advocacy through academic research.

The first section of this issue titled Official Documents, contains an excerpt from the United Nations Secretary General on SMD A/74/209 from July 22, 2019 on Utah International Mountain Forum (UIMF), a coalition of student clubs at UVU involvement in Sustainable Mountain Development. Another document in this section includes the written statement prepared by UVU students and distributed as an official UN document by the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences and Utah China Friendship Improvement Sharing Hands Development and Commerce, two non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) at the 63rd Commission on the Status of Women (CSW63) in New York City,

March 2019. It highlights the UVU model of student engaged learning to advocate for SMD and requests the UN ECOSOC for the inclusion of mountain women and girls in the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The third official document in this section is the Preamble for the 68th United Nations Civil Society Conference Outcome Statement. The UN conference was held in Salt Lake City, Utah on 26-28 August 2019. The document includes language about the importance for the mountain communities to be in the focus of the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This language was adopted in the document thanks to UVU student-members of the UIMF.

The second section consists of student publications that encompass various perspectives of SMD within the state of Utah. These papers examine local and regional topics such as a comparative evaluation of state constitutions in the west; the omission of mining rights in Utah; land management of state parks by the Department of Natural Resources; and the oversight of Utah's natural resources.

The third section focuses on the implementation of UN SDGs in mountain countries such as Norway and Kyrgyzstan. Two papers assess current status and challenges in implementing sustainable development for indigenous people and communities in Lebanon and the Tarahumara people in Chihuahua, Mexico. The last paper explores challenges of reconciliation and peacebuilding in mountainous Georgia with its breakaway territories such as South Ossetia and Abkhazia.

We are pleased to assert our appreciation to the editorial team and students for their devotion to the SMD promotion and their additions to this issue. It compels us also to thank the university faculty for their time and efforts as advising mentors in the process. We welcome the inclusion of Ms. Jessica Murphy as a Content Editor from the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. This marks the first time we have had a student on the board from an academic institution outside of Utah; a milestone in the history of the journal.

We highly anticipate the release of this issue to the public and look forward to future joint collaboration for the benefit of mountain communities on the local, regional, and international levels within the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Mr. Dallas Karren, Editor-in-Chief

Dear Reader,

The Youth and the Mountains journal is an opportunity for students to engage in research about sustainable mountain development using the thriving mountainous communities as a basis for case studies. It promotes the sharing of knowledge across boundaries to better educate and inform the reader about what is happening in the mountain regions of the world today. The journal promotes research and engaged learning through participation in campus events like International Mountain Day. Through the student essays we can begin understand that the complex issues that face people that live in similar regions to our own.

Working on the Youth and the Mountains journal has been an opportunity for me to increase my understanding of the importance of engaged learning on a college campus. I look forward to working on future editions of the journal to further promote the Sustainable Development Goals and engaged student learning.

Carlos Alarco, Managing Editor

Section I

Official Documents



General Assembly

Distr.: General
22 July 2019

Original: English

Seventy-fourth session

Item 19 (I) of the provisional agenda*

Sustainable development

Sustainable mountain development

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

Covering 27 per cent of the world's surface, mountains are key ecosystems that provide humanity with essential goods and services such as water, food, biodiversity and energy. However, mountain ecosystems are vulnerable to natural disasters, climate-related events and unsustainable resource use. Mountains are home to about 1.1 billion people who are among the world's poorest: half of rural mountain dwellers face food insecurity. Access to services and infrastructure is lower in the highlands than in other areas. Mountain communities are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of natural hazards because of their high dependence on agriculture (encompassing crops, livestock, fisheries, aquaculture and forestry) as their primary source of livelihood. Alone or in combination, these factors make living in mountain areas increasingly difficult and they are often adverse drivers that compel people to migrate. Identifying new and sustainable livelihood opportunities and adopting practices that build the resilience of people and environments in mountain areas is an urgent requirement for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. The present report includes some recommendations on actions to accelerate progress towards sustainable mountain development.

41.

42. The Utah International Mountain Forum helped to raise global awareness of issues affecting mountain women at the sixty-second session of the Commission on the Status of Women, held at United Nations Headquarters in March 2018. Also at that session, the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences, the Mountain Institute and Utah China Friendship Improvement Sharing Hands Development and Commerce, all Mountain Partnership members, submitted a joint statement.

* A/74/150.





Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
30 November 2019

Original: English

Commission on the Status of Women

Sixty-fourth session

9–20 March 2020

Follow-up to the Fourth World Conference on Women and
to the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly
entitled “Women 2000: gender equality, development and
peace for the twenty-first century”

Statement submitted by Russian Academy of Natural Sciences, and Utah China Friendship Improvement Sharing Hands Development and Commerce, non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council*

The Secretary-General has received the following statement, which is being circulated in accordance with paragraphs 36 and 37 of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31.

* The present statement is issued without formal editing.



Statement

Mountain women and girls must be in the focus of 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

We urge the sixty fourth session of the Commission on the Status of Women to ensure sustainable development for families, women and girls who live in mountain areas of the world. The Commission has as a priority theme the implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action.

The model that we developed with our collaborative partners at Utah Valley University through the Utah International Mountain Forum for inclusive student-engaged learning, advocates for mountain communities. It can be adopted by academic institutions worldwide, especially in mountain regions. This model can provide students with skills similar to those described below, and bring genuine change to mountain communities, families, women and girls worldwide by jointly advocating for the implementation of mountain targets. Also, this model demonstrates the ability of students, including non-traditional learners to contribute broad-range initiatives to the implementation of the three mountain targets on local, national and international levels.

Although three mountain targets have been designated among the Sustainable Development Goals to address the place of mountain communities in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, these communities still remain among the poorest and most neglected in the world. A study conducted in 2015 by the Food and Agriculture Organization found that 39 per cent of developing countries' mountain populations are vulnerable to food insecurity—or roughly 329 million people. Modern challenges, such as climate change and migration, make their situation even worse.

The Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action does not specifically mention mountain women and girls. However, it includes actions critical to empower such vulnerable groups, in particular through education. As a result, those actions also ensure the success of the advocacy of mountain targets' implementation by student members of the Utah International Mountain Forum. For example, sub-chapter 4-60, paragraph (a) urges the inclusion of academic institutions and others in aiding rural and indigenous women; sub-chapter 4-82 speaks of the creation of non-formal, vocational, and gender-specific curricula for girls and women in the educational system, especially nontraditional women; sub-chapter 4-258, paragraph (b) subpart (ii) asks for the development of methodologies on the impact on women of environmental and natural resource degradation, stemming from issues such as global warming and natural disasters; and sub-chapter 4-88, paragraph (c) mentions the creation of flexible education, training and retraining programs for life-long learning that facilitate the transition between women's activities at all stages of their lives.

As our collaborative partner the Utah International Mountain Forum serves as a core of the co-curricular student engaged learning model developed at Utah Valley University since 2011. Utah Valley University is the largest academic institution in the state of Utah currently enrolling almost 42,000 students. Over 30 percent of the student body are non-traditional learners who, in addition to their education, must work full- or part-time in support of a spouse or family, and can range between 25- to 75-years of age. Established as a vocational training school in 1941, Utah Valley University today addresses the needs of local communities along the Wasatch mountain range through a dual mission as a community college, combined with the rigor and seriousness of a four-year teaching institution.

The model collaboratively developed at the school inclusively involves students across campus, including nontraditional learners with local community stakeholders

in implementation of mountain targets in the mountainous State of Utah and globally. It consists of four parts:

- 1) Students are given a problem to solve (which is the advocacy of the UN mountain targets)
- 2) students must work together as a group to learn how to solve the problem
- 3) faculty and stakeholders serve them as mentors, and
- 4) students are responsible for their own learning during the process of solving a problem.

As part of the advocacy campaign, students learn and share experiences about major achievements and challenges in sustainable development in Utah with mountain communities elsewhere. In addition, they encourage peers and local communities to contribute to sustaining the livelihoods of mountain communities globally.

The model allows one generation of students to gain professional skills, opportunities for networking, exchanging best practices, and international recognition through implementing mountain targets at local, national and global levels. Under the model, students collaborate with all stakeholders in the implementation of a broad range of initiatives, for example, they raise funds for advocacy campaigns, manage logistics, develop agendas, reach out to United Nations officials, diplomats, representatives of non-governmental organizations, experts, scholars, write statements, host parallel and side events, and publish the results of their activities.

During 2013-2015, through this model, students advocated for the adoption of mountain targets at sessions of the United Nations Open Working Groups on Sustainable Development Goals: Target 6.6, by 2030, to protect and restore water related ecosystems, including mountains, forests, wetlands, rivers, aquifers and lakes; target 15.1, by 2030, to ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements, and; target 15.4, by 2030, to ensure the conservation of mountain ecosystems, including their biodiversity, in order to enhance their capacity to provide benefits that are essential for sustainable development.

The model allowed coalition members for the first time to successfully host on their own the fourth International Women of the Mountains conference on October 7-9, 2015. The conference was held under the umbrella of the United Nations Mountain Partnership at Utah Valley University campus in Orem, Utah. The organizing committee of the conference was comprised of more than 70 students, including nontraditional learners, from Utah Valley University, Brigham Young University and the University of Utah.

The United Nations Secretary General's Report on Sustainable Mountain Development [A/71/256](#) of July 29, 2016 highlighted the students' advocacy of gender agendas by hosting the conference and adopting the outcome document, which contained the following observations:

- (a) Sustainable Development Goal 5 could be achieved through strong support for improving women's rights and welfare, including women's full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life
- (b) successful implementation of target 6.6 could be achieved by supporting the vital role that women play in the protection of the environment and water sources, particularly as custodians of traditional knowledge that builds resilience and allows for adaptation to climate change, and

(c) with respect to target 15.1, women playing a critical role in joint planning as promoters of innovation, development and cooperation for the common benefit.

Since 2016, as our collaborative partner the Utah International Mountain Forum has advocated for the implementation of mountain targets at several forums of the United Nations Economic and Social Council on sustainable development, including the fifty second session of the Commission on Social Development; the sixty second and sixty third sessions of the Commission on the Status of Women, and; the 2018 High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development. During these forums, students, including nontraditional students, prepared written statements and hosted parallel and side events. Students also learned how to work with Member States in order to include language about the mountain targets and communities in the final documents of those forums.

Students were able to include language about mountain communities for the first time in the final document of the sixty eighth United Nations Civil Society Conference, held in Salt Lake City, Utah on August 26-28, 2019. The Preamble of the Conference's Outcome Document stated the importance of the interdependence of rural and urban prosperity, as well as the need to address the specific conditions of mountainous areas and small island developing states. To secure the adoption of the necessary language in the Outcome document, students worked together with officials from the United Nations Department of Global Communications, United Nations Global Compact, mountain nations such as the Kyrgyz Republic, both of the collaborative non-governmental organizations, and academic partners such as the Global University System and Project Work Groups. At the conference, students also hosted a workshop and an exhibition about the student engaged learning model to advocate for mountain women and targets at the United Nations.

During the sixty fourth session of the Commission on the Status of Women, our delegation will be comprised of students from Utah Valley University, Brigham Young University, and Utah State University. Delegation members will report their experiences in implementing Sustainable Development Goal 5 on gender equality in Utah and elsewhere in interaction with Sustainable Development Goal 2 on food security, Sustainable Development Goal 13 on climate action, Sustainable Development Goal 6 on water, Sustainable Development Goal 7 on energy, Sustainable Development Goal 4 on quality education, and Sustainable Development Goal 12 on responsible consumption and waste management. It will also provide them an opportunity to conduct the advocacy campaign jointly with mountainous nations accredited to the United Nations. They could both learn and share experiences in mountain targets implementation with the newly created Group of Friends of Mountainous Countries: Afghanistan, Andorra, Austria, Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Canada, Georgia, Greece, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Morocco, Nepal, Switzerland, Tajikistan and Turkey.

The model implements Sustainable Development Goal 5 on gender equality in interaction with target 4.7 about ensuring that all learners acquire knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship, and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development.

As one of the steps, that is, commemorating the twenty fifth anniversary of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, we urge in particular mountainous Member States to report in national reviews during the sixty fourth session of the Commission on the Status of Women about their actions to bring mountain communities, families and women in the focus of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.



— THE 68TH —
**UNITED NATIONS
CIVIL SOCIETY
CONFERENCE**

**“Building Inclusive and Sustainable Cities and Communities”
68th United Nations Civil Society Conference
Salt Lake City, Utah, United States of America
26-28 August 2019**

We, as members of civil society, adopt this document to advance the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, building on the education and global citizenship focus of Gyeongju (2016) and the concept of people-centered multilateralism we developed in New York (2018). This year, we concentrate specifically on Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 11: “to make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable by 2030.” We underscore the need to understand cities and communities as central to the achievement of all SDGs and not only SDG11. We highlight the importance of inclusivity, peace, family, education, youth, and the empowerment of women and girls. Further, we explore the ethical development of the economy, infrastructure, and technology needed to support balanced, sustainable communities. We recognize the interdependence of rural and urban prosperity, as well as the need to address the specific conditions of mountainous areas and small island developing States. We also highlight the need for collaboration of governments, civil society, and the United Nations in this work and stress the urgent need for climate action. For each of these, we affirm our beliefs and shared values, urge others to partner with us, and commit ourselves to actions that uplift the human spirit, create humane cities in which people can flourish, and enhance the quality of life and dignity for all. Without recognition of the challenges to our quest for sustainable and inclusive communities, we will accomplish nothing.

Section II

Sustainable Mountain Development Topics in Utah

The Omission of an Article Relating to Mining in the Utah State Constitution

By: Antony Jackson

Antony Jackson is currently a junior at Utah Valley University studying political science and political theory emphasis with a minor in constitutional studies. He is an Eric Zachary Wood Teaching and Research Assistant at UVU's Center for Constitutional Studies. As a Wood Assistant, Antony works on the Quill Project under Dr. Nicholas Cole of Pembroke College, Oxford University. Antony plans to study constitutional law after graduating from UVU and is interested in researching state constitutions and their history.

In 1894 the United States Senate and House of Representatives passed “AN ACT to enable the People of Utah to form a Constitution and State Government”. This allowed and directed representatives of the counties within the Utah territory to meet and create a constitution. (Maddox et al. e4951).¹ The ratification of the constitution led to Statehood for Utah. During the debates that took place in the 1895 Utah State Constitutional Convention, there were a handful of key topics and articles that held more importance. One of the most interesting topics and articles introduced and discussed extensively during the convention is one that does not make it into the final version of the Constitution, mining. Mining in Utah has an interesting history. The state has been and continues to be one of the nation's largest producers of mined metals (Raymer 81-82).

This paper will demonstrate why an article on mines and mining introduced during the convention's debates is omitted from the 1895 Utah State Constitution's final text. An examination of other states, near Utah, will be used to indicate that an article on mining was not uncommon. The history of mining, related to broader political and social issues in Utah, is the next area discussed in this paper. Using the Quill Project Platform², the debates of the convention itself will be examined. While other factors play a role in determining why an article on mining was rejected, in the end, the convention decided the issue. Using the Quill Project² platform, the debates and discussions surrounding the article introduced and debated extensively in the convention will be ex-

amined. This will show the reasons the article was omitted in the end.

While less substantive, examining other constitutions for the inclusion of an article related to mining must be the first topic of discussion. This is because if something is omitted the first question to ask is “should it have been included in the first place?” By examining other state constitutions, we can see that the inclusion of such an article was common in similar cases and the reason for its omission is worth examining. Perhaps the states that are most worth examining are neighboring states.

The Wyoming State Constitution is the first case that will be discussed in this paper. Wyoming is in the same region as Utah as its neighbor to the northeast. Wyoming also became a state just six years before Utah did, in 1890 (Hebard 46). This is very significant because that means that Wyoming was a territory during the California gold rush and the rise of mining in Utah (which will be discussed in greater detail later in this paper). Because of this, the framers of the Wyoming State Constitution were likely aware of the issues in Utah. They also possibly had their own related issues that were either caused or affected by the events that transpired in Utah.

In the Wyoming State Constitution, Article 9 is a constitutional article with multiple sections of provisions regarding mines and mining. These provisions are very broad as constitutional provisions tend to be. The original article contained nine sections that allowed for the state legislature to oversee and inspect the mines through a state inspector, to regulate them as is necessary, establish foundational safety principles to be followed and establish a school of mines (Wyoming State Constitution).

Colorado is another neighbor of Utah that also contains a section on mining. Article XVI is entitled Mining and Irrigation. The provisions within this article are very similar to that of Wyoming’s constitutional provisions on the topic. The ratification of the Colorado State Constitution was also during a similar time, though not quite as close as Wyoming, being ratified in 1876 (Colorado State Constitution).

The Arizona State Constitution was not ratified until 1910, fifteen years after the Utah State Constitution was ratified (Arizona State Con-

stitution). However, it also contained an article dedicated to mines and mining. This article has since been amended in 1992, but only the date of election for the mining inspector has been changed (Arizona State Constitution Art. 19).

It is to be noted that out of the states that immediately border the state of Utah, neither Idaho nor Nevada contain entire articles devoted to mining. The Idaho State Constitution, ratified in 1890, includes brief notes about mining in Article XV: Water Rights Section 3 (Idaho State Constitution). Unlike the provisions in the articles of other states, this section does not create constitutional provisions on mining or mines but creates provisions for water rights regarding mines. The Nevada State Constitution, ratified in 1864, also merely mentions mining in Article 10: Taxation. Sections 1 and 5 likewise do not create provisions regarding mining but provisions on taxation with regards to mines and mining (Nevada State Constitution).

While a worthwhile discussion could be had about why certain states in this area included or did not include articles on mining, the purpose of this paper is to focus on the absence of an article relating to mines and mining from the Utah State Constitution. As mentioned previously, the sole purpose for the observation of some other state constitutions is to see if an investigation into the absence of such an article is justified at all. Of course, this justification can be used to justify the discussion into states such as Idaho and Nevada. Perhaps a later examination of these states or the states that do include them should be done. This paper will keep its focus simply on the topic of mining in Utah. Based on the observations of the constitutions of the neighboring states the author would argue that the reasoning behind an omission of an article on mines and mining in the Utah State Constitution is worth examining.³

Some might argue contrary to the opinion of the author. Some might argue that research into the omission from the Utah State Constitution is not justified. The basis for this argument is that only three out of the five neighboring states include an article. This is barely a majority and as such it does not necessarily follow that such an article should appear in the Utah State Constitution. It must be admitted that a three out of a five does not necessitate the inclusion of an article relating to mines and mining. What does make the omission more interesting is that along

with the fact that there is a reason it should show, there is significant evidence that shows how important mining was in the history of Utah leading to the 1895 Utah State Constitutional Convention. Secondly, as has been noted and will be examined thoroughly later, there is an article on mines and mining that is originally introduced and debated significantly yet, for some reason, it is not rejected and not included in the final constitution. This occurred despite both the importance and the precedents of neighboring states with large mining industries that could have influenced them to include the article.

The history of mining in the territory of Utah is particularly interesting to examine. It should be noted that even in contemporary history mining is very important in Utah. The Kennecott Canyon in Bingham, Utah is the world's largest mine and produces a wide variety of metals such as copper, gold, and silver, amongst many others. In 1960 the world's largest deposits of beryllium, which is a metal lighter than aluminum and used in nuclear reactors, were discovered in the state (Metalliferous Resources of Utah 1-2, 4). However, in territorial Utah, mining was important because it had economic, religious, and political implications from the time the Mormon settlers arrived.

For this essay there are two major periods that the history of territorial Utah can be divided into with regards to the mining in the territory. The first period that will be discussed is from the arrival of the Mormons in Utah in 1847 to the arrival of General Patrick E. Connor in 1862. The second period will be from General Connor's arrival to the Utah State Constitutional Convention in 1895.

In 1844 Joseph Smith Jr., the founder, leader, and prophet of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, also known as Mormons, was murdered. Brigham Young became his successor. Amid increasing religious discrimination in Illinois, Brigham Young decided to take his people and head west to the Rocky Mountains. There were few inhabitants other than Native American tribes scattered through the area. The isolation provided in the settled land would allow the Mormons to escape the persecution they were facing in the east. They arrived in what is now the Salt Lake Valley in 1848 and decided that the valley would be the location of their settlement (Pruitt).

The first major discovery of ore and minerals that could be

mined was in 1848, the year the Mormons arrived. Erastus Bingham and his sons Thomas and Sanford were ranchers in the Oquirrh Mountains when they discovered some ore. While they were often busy with other important tasks, they “also engaged in prospecting for gold and silver” (Fox 42). It should be noted that these men were closely associated with Brigham Young, so he quickly learned of the situation. This discovery happened during the same time as the California Gold Rush. Young feared what would happen if Utah also experienced a Gold Rush and the effects it would have on the Mormon settlers. In particular he feared the moral corruption that would likely result from a rush for gold (43). While worrying about the negative moral effects of a potential gold rush, Young also thought that the Mormon people needed to emphasize agricultural concerns. This was especially true because in early years following the settlement of the Mormons in the Salt Lake Valley there was a constant inflow of settlers both from the eastern states and abroad in an attempt to unite as a faith (John R. Murphy 2). Young not only told the people to focus on agriculture, but he condemned any Mormon who would go off to mine, saying “go and be damned” (Fox 43). Young was even more vicious in his attack on “Gentiles” or non-Mormons coming to Utah to mine, saying if he found one, he would “out that man’s throat” (44).

Despite his vocal opposition to gold mining, it should be noted that Young was not against all types of mining. While he was against mining of precious metals such as gold and silver, he recognized that other metals were needed. Iron and coal were mined in large quantities as they were needed for the small communities within the territory to develop (Krahulec 189). These efforts to limit the mining of precious ore and focus on agricultural issues allowed the Mormon settlers to build up their communities during their early settling. At the same time, the focus on agriculture left the mines of gold and silver to sit and not be taken advantage of by the Mormon people. As will be discussed later in this paper this would prove to be a significant issue in the Mormon-Gentile relationship.

While there were a few other events relating to mining that took place during Utah’s early settlement years, the most significant was the arrival of General Patrick E. Connor. As mentioned previously, Connor came to Utah in 1862. Connor and his regiment were stationed in the Salt Lake Valley to protect the territory from Native Americans. They

were also charged to watch the Mormons as it was feared they could join the confederacy (189). General Connor and his men resented Mormons. The soldiers no doubt held anti-Mormon and discriminatory beliefs that probably were at the forefront of this resentment. Many men also despised the fact that they had to watch the Mormons instead of being involved directly in the civil war. However, there was also a cultural difference that seemed to make the soldiers dislike the Mormons. After ten days in the Salt Lake Valley, Connor would say about Mormons that they were “a community of traitors, murderers, fanatics, and whores” (Fox 17).

After his arrival, General Connor would send out patrols, as is common in frontier settlements. When some of these patrols began to find ore, more patrols were dispatched for the task of prospecting the ore and finding more (John R. Murphy 1-2). In 1863, a large silver mine was found in Bingham Canyon. This mine would eventually become the largest mine in the world, known today as the Kennecott Copper Mine (46-47). As a result of the discovery by his men, General Connor created the first mining district in the Utah territory that same year (48-49).

The creation of the first mining district was not simply an economic decision. There is almost no doubt General Connor and the soldiers serving under him saw the opportunity to profit directly from the mining industry. To General Connor, this was also an opportunity to deal with the Mormon population and their political power in the area. In a correspondence, General Connor described his goal and mentioned two ways to deal with the “Mormon problem”. The first method he mentioned was “by an adequate military force, acting under martial law and punishing with a strong hand every infraction of law or loyalty”, though even he would admit that martial law might be too extreme. The second was “by inviting into the Territory large numbers of Gentiles to live among and dwell with the people” (52-54). This would dilute the political power that the Mormon church had in the state, with an eventual goal of creating a Gentile majority to completely destroy their power. Connor decided to act on his second plan. First, he had his soldiers, many of whom were from California and who were previously involved in the California Gold Rush, start prospecting and mining for ore. He reasoned that as these individuals had success, it would become apparent that there were large quantities of ore throughout the territory. As

this happened, word would spread, more and more outsiders would arrive in Utah seeking their fortune (Krahulec 189). Those that would arrive would likely be non-Mormons. At that point Connor's plan to drown out the Mormon political power in the region would be complete. It is clear in hindsight that Connor's plan was unsuccessful as Utah is still sixty-two percent Mormon. As a result of General Connor's efforts, there was a significant increase in mining up to the 1895 State Convention ("New Figures Show Lower Percentage of Mormons in Utah's Biggest County"). While bringing non-Mormons into the state, Connor also drove up the importance of mining in the territory.

Up to this point, it has been shown that it would not have been unusual for an article on mining to have been included in the state's constitution. This conclusion leads us to see if, in Utah itself, mining was an important enough issue to have made it into the state constitution. After observation of state history with regards to mining, it is clear that mining was not only important for the potential economic reasons, but it was also important as it affected religious and political parts of society. The author of this paper concludes that based on this evidence, it would make sense to include an article on mining. As there is not any such article, the debates of the 1895 Utah State Constitution will now be observed to see why no article was included.

The committee that was put in charge of drafted an article relating to mines and mining was created by Resolution 11A on March 8th. The committee consisted of Thomas Kearns, W. F. James, R. Mackintosh, Samuel H. Hill, George B. Squires, D. B. Stover, George Ryan, James C. Peterson, W. F. Sharp, J. D. Peters, O. F. Whitney, F. S. Richards. Thomas Kearns was assigned to be the chairman of this committee (Maddox et al. e5756). Kearns was a rich miner who made a large portion of his fortune in the discovery of the "Silver King" mine (Miriam B. Murphy). Some of the other individuals who were on the committee were involved directly in mining in the state of Utah. Others from different backgrounds were supposed to provide differing views on the subject during debates. Unfortunately, records of the debates that went on within any of the committees at the 1895 Utah State Constitutional Convention do not exist in modern day archives. It can be speculated that the articles included in other state constitutions regarding mines and mining were likely among the primary documents used to create the article, as was common in the Utah Convention. This is slightly dif-

ferent from most of the other articles which are primarily based on documents called “files” which were sent to each committee and which may or may not have referenced other state constitutions. Once these files got to the committees, they were then discussed by the members and organized into an article that became the final version to be worked on by the committee. From there the article would be sent to the Committee of the Whole for further changes, with a possibility for it to be sent back to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Despite the lack of records from the committees during the Utah Constitutional Convention, the article the committee created would have been available as the document that first appeared elsewhere in the convention being the same as the final version of the original document created in the committee. This is important because after debating the article for a while, the text would have been agreed upon should be read by both an expert committee and for a while, by the convention. When the draft article was sent from the Committee on Mines and Mining it would not have headed straight to the convention. Instead it would have gone to a committee made up of all the delegates in the convention, in order to debate the article and make proper changes. This committee is called the Committee of the Whole and is where much of the important discussions would have happened before the final draft was placed into the constitution. The article the committee created was first discussed in the Committee of the Whole on April 24, 1895. The text of the first draft of Article XIX⁴ is as follows:

“Section I. There shall be established and maintained the office of inspector of coal mines, the duties and salary of which shall be prescribed by law. Then said office shall be established, the Governor shall, with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint thereto a person proven in the manner provided by law to be competent and practical, whose term of office shall be two years.

Section II. The legislature shall provide by law for enforcing safe development, ventilation, drainage and working of all coal mines operated in this state.

Section III. The necessary use of land for rights of way for tunnels, flumes, pipes, ditches, roads, trainways or dumps for the drainage or working of mines, as a means to the development of the mineral resources of the state, is hereby declared a public use, and subject to the control and regulation of the state.” (Maddox et al. s3285, e75691).

The text is similar in many ways to the text contained within other articles of other constitutions discussed above. After it was introduced into the Committee of the Whole the article would have been discussed and amended. In the Quill Project platform, April 24th can be found by searching the session number “s3285”.

After reading the first two sections only a single amendment is proposed. This amendment instructs Section 1 be amended to say, “There shall be established and maintained the office of inspector of mines”, omitting the word “coal” to describe what kind of mines the inspector would be in charge of (Maddox et al. e75637). This amendment was presented by Mr. Joseph Williams. Thomas Kearns, the president of the Committee on Mines and Mining, disagreed saying that the inspector was purposefully put in charge of coal mines only because of “the danger of life that surrounded the coal mines that they thought was necessary to have a mine inspector for” (e75638). This amendment would go on to be rejected before moving on to the reading of Section 3 of the article. So that means Sections 1 and 2 of Article XIX were left as originally created when the Committee on Mines and Mining sent them to the Committee of the Whole.

Unlike the first two sections of Article XIX, Section 3 was something that seemed to be a little more controversial and brought about quite a bit more discussion than did the previous sections. The first motion made regarding this section was made by Thomas Maloney and would amend the article by completely removing Section 3. He claimed “[t]hat same question was passed upon by this Convention, and the judgment of this Convention was that private property could not be subjected to private uses” (Maddox et al. e75687). By this, Maloney meant that they had previously decided⁵ that the government would not be able to take away private property to give to another private entity, it could only be able to be taken for public usage. Charles Hart would agree and argue in favor of striking out the section, as allowing it to stay would essentially give mines and mining a benefit that would not be provided to industries such as agriculture, saying “I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that we should give mining any greater preference in this State”.

After these two opening arguments for the striking out of Article XIX Section 3, an intense debate began over this particular section.

Much of the debate was based on the same type of argument that Mr. Hart gave, while others discussed the principle of public usage from a more theoretical sphere. Many who were against the striking out of the article wanted to be clear that they were not trying to give mining any preference over agriculture. Their argument was that the agricultural interests should have the same type of constitutional guarantee that Section 3 provided for mining. Kearns argued that striking this section out of the constitution was not safe. He would argue, with many others supporting him, that mining was one of the most important parts of the economy of Utah and that it would continue to become more important. He used Nebraska as an example, which left out some article that contained the same guarantees as Section 3. Without the protection this would have caused the court to decide that the different rights of way and other use of private land for developing the state's natural resources to be outside of "public use" as discussed in eminent domain. Because of this the Nebraskan mines, once a very important part of their economy, was crippled. Kearns argued that this is why something like mines and mining needs this particular protection, so as not to end up like Nebraska (Maddox et al. e75690).

In the middle of what reads to be a heated debate about the complete striking out of Section 3, two amendments are suggested. These two amendments were likely added as a way to get those who thought that Section 3 would give undue preference to mining over agriculture. George Squires offered the first amendment, which was to change the line in the section from "as a means to the development of the mineral resources of the state" to make it "as a means to the development of the mineral and agricultural resources of the state" The second amendment simply added to the previous amendment "for manufacturing purposes" after "agricultural resources". It may be argued that both of these amendments were a step in the right direction, but as it was, neither were discussed at all. Instead, two more amendments were added that would try to include agriculture, but with different legal wording to make sure the text would be as accurate as it was appropriate. In the end, it was decided that the last amendment offered, which was suggested by William Howard, would be the one with the most ideal wording.

The Howard amendment to Article XIX does an excellent job adding in the grievances presented by those who feared agricultural resources not being held to the same privilege as mining. The text Howard

proposed says:

“The necessary use of land for rights of way for tunnels, flumes, pipes, ditches, canals, reservoirs, roads, tram-ways, or dumps, for the development of the farming or mineral resources of the State, is hereby declared to be a public use, and subject to the control and regulation of the State” (Maddox et al. e75695).

The debate then resumed, this time including not only the options to strike out or let it remain, but also with the Howard amendment, hoping to be the middle ground that most people would find fair. Mr. Hart again argued in favor against striking out the section. He claimed the proposed amendment was “crude and imperfect”, meaning that there was no way anyone, no matter how intelligent they were, could develop a clause that would hold up in the manner it was meant to in court. However, for the most part the arguments were the same as they were previously. Those in favor of striking out the article would refer to the fact they already decided that the state should not have the power to take away private land and give it to another private entity (Maddox et al. e75730).

Perhaps the most powerful argument for the striking out of this section is presented in a relatively short piece by John Bowdle. Bowdle argues with reference to the United States Constitution. He claims that the Federal Constitution was the supreme law of the land and “guaranteed unto men their property, and this Constitutional Convention cannot say to them, ‘We take that and declare it to be a public use’” (Maddox et al. e75897). Unlike those who simply thought that there should not be preference given to the mining industry, the many people who argued alongside Mr. Hart would not be so easily persuaded. Mr. Kearns would argue that the debate was between those who were less practical⁶ who fought for some theoretical principle, versus those who were “practical men”. He claimed there was no “practical man... who opposes this section” and would likely argue that Mr. Hart was one of those “less practical” men (Maddox et al. e75690). After hearing many arguments from both sides, a vote was called on Mr. Howard’s proposed amendment to change the text to include provisions protecting agricultural entities. This attempt at compromise barely failed to pass, losing with forty delegates voting for it, and forty-three against it. The failure of this amendment led to the committee voting on the striking out of the Arti-

cle XIX Section 3. With fifty people voting to strike the section out and only thirty-two voting to keep it in, the section was struck out.

Immediately after Section 3 was struck out, a motion to strike Sections 1 and 2 was made and carried. Striking out Section 3 is surprising because there are no recorded debates that discuss why the delegates decided to omit the entire article. However, the evidence suggests that those who did support the article did not want to continue to support it without the protections provided within Sections 1 and 2. By striking out Section 3, Kearns and other people with mining interests were not able to secure what they thought was beneficial to the mines and mining industries. While Sections 1 and 2 had some importance, without the significantly more important Section 3, Article XIX was not worth being its own unique part of the Utah Constitution. This evidence indicates that other interests were found to be more important to the Utah Constitution. The first interest that was valued above mining was protection of private property. Those at the convention decided that the authority of the state government to take land away from private entities would be limited so that said property would be for “public use”. They did not think that any special privileges should be afforded for mining. A fair number thought if it was afforded to both the agricultural and mining interests, but still limited, it would be sufficiently broad enough to help those entities but still narrow enough that other entities would have the same privilege. In the end, a broader constitutional idea was preferred by the majority of the convention, no privilege or exception should be made.

In conclusion there are multiple reasons Article XIX was not included in the final Utah Constitution of 1895. Perhaps the most significant reason is because what would have been Section 3 of the Article was widely considered by the delegates of the Convention to go against the established idea of why property could only be taken by the State for public use. The general rule that was established before the discussion of this particular section was that the State cannot take private property for use by a different private entity. This means that regardless of the situation private property rights could not be set aside, even if an economic powerhouse of an industry, such as mining, wanted it. It also appears that Section 3 was the meat of Article XIX, and so removing the one section caused the entire Article to be unnecessary in the eyes of the delegates. Based on the debates from the Utah Convention it would

be interesting to compare other State Constitutions to see why similar articles were included or not.

1. The number in this citation refers to an event number in the Quill Project platform. The platform uses events and sessions instead of pages. More about the Quill Project will be explained.
2. The Quill Project is a digital humanities platform that allows the discussions and debates involved in the creation of negotiated texts to be examined in a way that is more accessible than a simple review of the records themselves. It was developed by Dr. Nicholas Cole of Pembroke College, Oxford University. The platform and additional information can be found at Quillproject.net.
3. It should be noted that one of the reasons the author feels confident enough to conclude that this topic is worth debating is based on the fact that it appears in more than half of the neighboring state's constitutions, secondary and in addition to the argument in this section is that there is an article introduced, and, as will be discussed later, was discussed quite extensively in the Utah Convention. This was mentioned earlier but should be kept in mind throughout this paper to provide some extra context.
4. In Quill, Article XIX is called Article 19 without the Roman numerals.
5. The principle that private property should only be used for public use and not include giving private property to other private entities was discussed during the debates in the Committee of the Whole on March 25 and March 26. In The Quill Project these days can be found in sessions s613 and s607.
6. Kearns would actually refer to these people as those whose "profession is the courts" (Maddox et al. e75690).

Works Cited

Arizona State Constitution. https://ballotpedia.org/Arizona_Constitution.

Arizona State Constitution. Art. 19. <https://www.azleg.gov/constitution/?article=19>.

Colorado State Constitution. Art. XVI. https://ballotpedia.org/Colorado_Constitution.

Fox, William, "Patrick Edward Connor, "Father" of Utah Mining" (1966). All Theses and Dissertations. 4693. <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5695&context=etd>

Hebard, Grace Raymond. Government of Wyoming: The History, Constitution and Administration of Affairs. C.F. Weber & Co., 1917.

Idaho State Constitution. Art. XV. https://ballotpedia.org/Article_XV,_Idaho_Constitution.

Krahulec, Kenneth A. "History and Production of the West Mountain (Bingham) Mining District, Utah." Jan. 1997, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ken_Krahulec/publication/275275387_History_and_production_of_the_West_Mountain_Bingham_mining_district_Utah/links/5536d5b50cf268fd001876f1/History-and-production-of-the-West-Mountain-Bingham-mining-district-Utah.pdf.

Maddox, Danielle, Christopher Vizcardo, Samuel Corry, Erica Croft, John Cummings, Ashton Earl, Edward Goebel, Antony Jackson, Mary Nelson, Matt Rands, Carl Scott, Mark Wait, Utah State Constitutional Convention 1895, Quill Project at Pembroke College (Oxford, 2019).

Metalliferous Resources of Utah. Metalliferous Resources of Utah, Department of Natural Resources. https://ugspub.nr.utah.gov/publications/public_information/pi-57.pdf

Murphy, John R. The Mineral Resources of the Territory of Utah: With Mining Statistics and Maps. Trübner, 1872.

Murphy, Miriam B. "KEARNS, THOMAS." Utah History Encyclope-

dia,www.uen.org/utah_history_encyclopedia/k/KEARNS_THOMAS.shtml.

Nevada State Constitution. <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Const/NVConst.html>.

“New Figures Show Lower Percentage of Mormons in Utah’s Biggest County.” *BostonGlobe.com*, *The Boston Globe*, 16 Dec. 2018,www.bostonglobe.com/news/nation/2018/12/16/new-figures-show-fewer-mormons-utah-biggest-county/yU7IHb9Qsz9GcDRJVwQ2aI/story.html.

Pruitt, Sarah. “Why the Mormons Settled in Utah.” *History.com*, A&E Television Networks, 15 June 2018, www.history.com/news/why-the-mormons-settled-in-utah.

Raymer, Robert G. “Early Mining in Utah.” *Pacific Historical Review*, vol. 8, no. 1, Mar. 1939, pp. 81–88., doi:10.2307/3633613. Wyoming State Constitution. Art. 9. https://ballotpedia.org/Wyoming_Constitution.

Research Analysis on the History and Impact of Land Conservation Bills in the U.S. and Utah

By: Megan Davis

Megan Davis is a Utah girl at heart. She was born and raised in a small rural Utah town known as Nephi, UT. While growing up in Utah, Megan gained a love for the mountains and the beautiful, national and State parks surrounding her. Megan is currently a junior at Utah Valley University (UVU) and is majoring in Political Science and minoring in Constitutional Studies. While attending UVU, Megan was introduced to the Utah International Mountain Forum (UIMF) and has been very involved since joining. As a UIMF member, she served as the UNA-USA liaison and the Director of Public Relations for the club. She also has had many opportunities to meet with foreign dignitaries and even spoke at the 63rd Commission on the Status of Women at the U.N. in New York City. Through UIMF and UVU, Megan has been able to gain professional and business skills on a local and international level. After graduating from UVU, Megan plans to attend and graduate from law school with a J.D. law degree specializing in constitutional and international law.

The 121-year-old mountainous and economically prosperous state of Utah has been widely known for its diverse wildlife, popular mountain ski resorts, and national parks for decades. There are currently 59 national parks in the United States and five of them, known as the Mighty 5, are located in the great state of Utah. Utah is also home to 43 state parks that attract millions of tourists every year. On November 19, 1919, President Woodrow Wilson signed a bill into law that established Zion National Park as the first national park. Since the signing of that piece of legislation, millions of tourists and Utah residents enjoy the natural beauty that the park provides.

Impact of the Founding of The Utah Department of Natural Resources

In 1996, The Utah Department of Natural Resources (DNR) was founded. The DNR's main responsibilities include the management of Utah's minerals, land, and wildlife. The DNR is one of Utah's largest

agencies. Managing and protecting the state's abundant natural resources helps ensure a high quality of life for residents and visitors. The primary function of the DNR is to protect Utah's natural resources through active management. This is aided by engaging state, county, and local officials, collaborating with community members, organizations, and groups, and coordinating with our federal partners. At the DNR, there is a coalition of seven different divisions. Those seven divisions include: Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands; Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining; Division of Parks and Recreation; Division of Water Sources; Division of Water Rights; Division of Wildlife Resources; Utah Geological Survey. Utah's DNR oversees 43 state parks, 23 lakes or reservoirs, and over 3,400 campgrounds. With so many recreational sites, the DNR is in charge of setting guidelines to ensure the safety of over 4 million visitors annually as well as managing the natural resources and wildlife in the state. Besides the management of Utah's recreational areas, the DNR's responsibilities also include managing our demanding oil and water needs. With Utah's population expected to double within the next 30 to 40 years, the DNR is trying to find ways to better manage the state's very limited water supply. To expand the existing water supply, regional and local water projects are financed. These measures are aimed at supporting Utah's expanding population. Without these initiatives, Utah would stagnate in growth. The DNR not only makes sure we have an abundance of available resources, but they also promote safe methods used to extract them. Companies that develop coal, oil, and natural gas are required to use responsible drilling methods that protect the environment and preserve resources. Also, the DNR advocates decreased dependence on these energy resources to all Utahns.

The importance of the Department of Natural Resources is often overlooked and taken for granted. The DNR's promotion of environmentally responsible and sustainable use of Utah's natural resources are what help keep Utah communities thriving and growing. For this and for its efforts to sustain the naturally beautiful environment of Utah, the DNR has received national recognition.

Under the DNR, the Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands is responsible for keeping forests healthy by responding to wildland fires and managing sovereign lands in Utah. The Division's responsibility is to prevent, suppress, and prepare for wildfires on state and private land so the lands, wildlife, and communities don't suffer huge losses. The

maintenance of forests also includes removing invasive species that can pose threats to indigenous species. An example of the work done by the DNR is the reclaiming of over 1,300 acres of wetlands in the Great Salt Lake from invasive plants.

As a regulatory agency, the Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining oversees and manages four distinct programs, including Coal, Mineral Mining, Oil and Gas, and Abandoned Mine Reclamation. The Division of Oil, Gas, and Minings' responsibility is to regulate the exploration and development of coal, oil and gas, and other minerals in a manner that encourages responsible reclamation and development that prevents waste, protects correlative rights, human health, safety and the environment, while also protecting the interests of the state and its citizens. As the industry of oil, gas, and mining evolves, the Division is committed to the future of that industry in Utah and will continue to ensure responsible and sustainable resource development.

The responsibility of the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation is to enhance the quality of life of all Utah residents by preserving and providing natural, cultural, and recreational resources for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations. The Division manages museums, heritage sites, and 43 state parks in Utah. The Division also manages the state's Off-Highway Vehicle, (OHV) and boating programs. Under the Division, Utah State Parks administers and enforces Utah's boating laws and provides access, safety, education, and search and rescue. The Division's OHV program includes education, trail maintenance, grants, user compliance and enforcement, and search and rescue. The Utah Division of Parks and Recreation is designed to preserve and maintain high-quality experiences while also providing resources that allow people to recreate safely.

The Utah Division of Water Rights administers the appropriation and distribution of the state's valuable water resources, both surface and underground. It is responsible for being a transparent public office of record that provides information about water rights, except for information related to water rights ownership. The mission of the Division of Water Rights is to provide order and certainty in the beneficial use of Utah's water. The Division administers the state's surface and groundwater through appropriation, distribution, and adjudication. The Division also regulates dam safety, stream alterations, water

well drilling, and other programs and is directed by the Utah State Engineer. The state engineer's responsibility is to manage the state's water resources, providing citizens an opportunity to make beneficial use of the resource while protecting prior rights and the welfare of the public. New uses of water or a change in existing use must be approved by the State Engineer before the undertaking. Once a use is authorized, the Division monitors development to assure the use occurs before a permanent or perfected water right certificate is issued. Where many users are competing for water from the same source, the state engineer appoints a commissioner to oversee the day-to-day distribution of water.

The Utah Division of Water Resources is the water resources authority for the state and is committed to identifying and implementing water management, conservation, and development strategies to satisfy the state's future water needs. The Division supports a Utah-based water-saving initiative called Slow the Flow, which has made a goal to reduce per capita water use by at least 25 percent statewide by 2025. This goal is being achieved by implementing several strategies that include education and regulation. For over 60 years, the Division has been involved in the planning, design, and construction of water projects throughout Utah. With legislature appropriated funds, Water Resources oversees three funding programs that help this process. The Revolving Construction Fund provides resources for building rural drinking water systems, well development, and construction of irrigation systems. The Cities Water Loan Fund provides financial help for cities, towns, and districts to construct municipal water projects. The Conservation and Development Fund helps fund large construction projects like dams and large municipal irrigation and drinking water systems.

The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) serves the people of Utah by managing, sustaining, and enhancing the state's wildlife populations and by conserving wildlife habitats. The DWR also oversees hunting and fishing opportunities statewide. Utah has a very rich history of hunting and fishing. Keeping with this tradition the DWR promotes sustainable use by keeping species from being over-hunted or over-fished to allow future generations to hunt and fish the species that we currently have. By working to preserve Utah's important hunting and fishing heritage in a way that benefits wildlife and Utah citizens alike. DWR consistently performs wildlife transplants for turkeys, sage-grouse, bison, bighorn sheep, mountain goats, pronghorn, and river ot-

ters. Ongoing work is being done to protect sensitive species such as native cutthroat trout, in an effort to prevent federal listing under the Endangered Species Act. Popular fisheries are regularly stocked with hundreds of thousands of pounds of fish raised in DWR hatcheries. The DWR's innovative habitat program leads North America in restoration efforts. Through Utah's Watershed Restoration Initiative and with the help of over 100 partners, the state has restored and rehabilitated nearly 1.5 million acres of land statewide. Additionally and as previously mentioned, Utah has reclaimed over 1,300 acres of Great Salt Lake wetlands by controlling phragmites, an invasive plant.

The Utah Geological Survey consists of five geological programs, including Energy & Minerals, Geologic Hazards, Geologic Information & Outreach, Geologic Mapping, and Groundwater & Paleontology. The responsibility of all five programs is to provide timely scientific information about Utah's geologic environment, resources, and hazards. The Energy and Minerals Program characterizes and quantifies Utah's energy and mineral resources. It manages the Utah Core Research Center which maintains computerized databases and other files on Utah's past and present resource development activities. The research center responds to requests for information about the state's energy and mineral resources from individuals, government agencies, and industry. The responsibility of the Geologic Mapping Program is to promote a better understanding of Utah's geology and hazards by creating maps of the state at 1:100,000 and 1:24,000 scales (digital and print). These geologic maps are then provided to geologists, government officials, industry representatives, and the public. The Geological Information and Outreach Program provides information on Utah's geology to the public, educators, industry, and decision-makers. They also operate the Natural Resources Map & Bookstore and the Department of Natural Resources Library, and they provide resources, field trips, and workshops to teachers. The Geologic Hazards program responds to requests from government agencies for geologic hazards, investigations, and report reviews. They also help protect Utah's public health and safety by investigating and mapping hazards; responding to emergencies; compiling small- and large-scale geologic hazard maps and providing technical services. The responsibility of the Groundwater and Paleontology Program is to provide the state government and public with detailed paleontological studies on ground-water resources. They also issue permits for fossil excavations and direct paleontological training programs.

Land Conservation Bills: State vs Federal Legislation Edition

Ever since 1890, with the passing of the legislation that established the Sequoia, Yosemite, and General Grant National Parks in California, the U.S. Congress has worked to pass bills that encourage land conservation and sustainability. In 1892 In San Francisco, John Muir and a group of associates met to found the Sierra Club, which is modeled on the Appalachian Mountain Club and explicitly dedicated to the preservation of wilderness. Then in 1894, Congress passed an Act to protect the birds and animals in Yellowstone National Park which is known as the National Park Protective Act. Within that bill, Congress members established that the purpose of National Parks is to protect wildlife and land and should not be used for hunting.

There are occasional times when the Federal government passes bills to help states who don't have powers designated to help find solutions to their internal problems. After the Stock Market crashed in 1929, Franklin D. Roosevelt created the New Deal or "First 100 Days Effort" to pull the United States out of the ongoing Great Depression. When Executive Order 6106 was signed by Roosevelt, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) was created. This government-sponsored work program interested thousands of potential workers in Utah looking to earn \$30 a month. At the time, there were over 16 million unemployed Americans across the country, and in Utah alone, the unemployment percentage rate was a disturbing 36%, the record high. On May 4, 1933, in Salt Lake City, the first enrollment of the CCC began with 225 men selected out of the 4,000 that applied. These CCC workers performed hundreds of jobs in Utah like working on roads, building construction, flood-control projects, forest replantation, and dozens of other tasks. During the 10 year CCC experience in Utah, more than 3.2 million trees were planted. The preliminary work on several large dams, including Deer Creek and Pineview, was completed and 309 small reservoirs were built. Along the Wasatch Front, hillsides were terraced and diversion dams were built to prevent flooding. Many campgrounds were improved and ranger stations were built with many of them still in use today. Experimental terracing methods were implemented in Bountiful that have now become the standard for flood and erosion control in mountain terrain. As a result of CCC efforts, a road was built from Escalante to Boulder so mules were no longer needed to make the trip. Life for CCC workers was better

than they had ever known, despite the hard work, and the life of Utah's public and private lands have prospered to this day because of the policies set by FDR in the early 1930s.

There are many times when state and federal governments work together, but there are also many times when they don't. Most recently, the U.S. Senate passed a bill in February 2019 that combined more than 100 pieces of legislation designating over 3-million acres of land and wilderness for environmental protection and permanently reauthorizing a federal program to pay for conservation measures. This was not only a major accomplishment in U.S. bipartisanship, something that is increasingly uncommon these days, but also a major accomplishment of state and federal governments working together to pass a bill that benefits both parties. The Majority Leader, Senator Mitch McConnell, after it was passed, said, "It touches every state, features the input of a wide coalition of our colleagues, and has earned the support of a broad, diverse coalition of many advocates for public lands, economic development, and conservation. Representative Raúl Grijalva, the Arizona Democrat who heads the House Natural Resources Committee had this to say.

"The necessary use of land for rights of way for tunnels, flumes, pipes, ditches, canals, reservoirs, roads, tram-ways, or dumps, for the development of the farming or mineral resources of the State, is hereby declared to be a public use, and subject to the control and regulation of the State" (Maddox et al. e75695).

He further stated, "It's one of the biggest bipartisan wins for this country I've ever seen in Congress." Many lovers of public lands, environmentalists, and political lovers are very ecstatic about its passage. One of the major accomplishments of the bill is that it protects 724,628 acres of wilderness in Southern Utah landscape that environmentalists have been trying for decades to preserve—namely, through America's Red Rock Wilderness Act, a sweeping lands protection bill that was first introduced in 1989 and has yet to garner enough bipartisan support to come to a vote.

The Natural Resources Management Act's Impact on Utah. Good or Bad?

As concern for conserving public lands and mountains in Utah

arises, many policies and bills are currently and continually being introduced and passed every year in Congress and state legislatures. The Natural Resources Management Act, passed in February 2019, is a bipartisan public lands package that comprises over 100 individual bills. This bill also does some great things for Utah, specifically. It gives 80 acres of land to the Bureau of Land Management to Hyde Park for the construction of an underground water tank and trailhead. It also gives 2.61 acres of Forest Service land to Juab County and helps celebrate the upcoming anniversary of the completion of the First Transcontinental Railroad by redesignating the Golden Spike National Historic Site as the Golden Spike National Historical Park. At the national level, the bill makes it easier for hunters and fishermen to enjoy public lands. It also includes the Good Samaritan Search and Recovery Act, which requires the Interior Department and Forest Service to grant expedited access to volunteers helping with search and recovery efforts on federal lands. Within the 100 combined bills are the Emery County Public Land Management Act and the Endangered Fish Recovery Programs Extension Act, both sponsored by Representative John Curtis from the 3rd Congressional District in Utah. The Emery County bill establishes the 336,467-acre San Rafael Swell Western Heritage and Historic Mining National Conservation Area, designates nearly 578,000 acres of wilderness, exchanges nearly 100,000 acres of state trust lands in these conservation districts for federal land elsewhere, and establishes the 2,543-acre Jurassic National Monument at Cleveland-Lloyd. It also expanded the Goblin Valley State Park by 9,350 acres, provided 640 acres to the town of Emery for a park and another 640 acres to the Emery County sheriff for a substation, plus 1,400 acres for the Huntington Airport, and 65 acres for the information center at Buckhorn Wash.

Many argue that the Emery County bill picks up where Representatives Rob Bishop and Jason Chaffetz's unsuccessful Public Lands Initiative bill left off. These two U.S. House of Representatives' co-sponsored bills would protect part of the Bears Ears region while opening other swaths of land for oil and gas development. The newly reformed bills sponsored by Representative Curtis resolve public land fights in a county that holds a wealth of coal and other mineral deposits, dinosaur fossils, wild rivers, wilderness, and areas popular for outdoor recreation, including rock climbing, canyoneering, motorsports, and horseback riding. Even though there is much to like about the recently passed Natural Resources Land Management Act, there are also many critics of

the bill. Critics range from Utah locals to Utah's very own U.S. Senator, Mike Lee. Scott Groene, executive director of the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance (SUWA), stated, "This bill represents a big step backward for wilderness, emphasizing motorized recreation over conservation and leaving more than 900,000 acres of wilderness-quality lands without protection." Another critic, Utah's Sierra Club director, Ashley Soltysiak, said:

It [the bill] promotes development opportunities that will degrade and devalue these spectacular landscapes, under the guise of a conservation bill. As the rollbacks and concerted attacks on our public lands continue, this bill is simply another attempt to shortchange Utah's public lands and sacrifice our wild spaces.

Though it is preserving quite a lot of land, it is not preserving a lot of wilderness land that needs it the most and is emphasizing motorized recreation in those areas. The other side argues against this bill because federal protections are unpopular with people who currently mine for minerals, graze cattle, and recreate in remote space. These groups say with the passage of this bill, they lose privileges that they have enjoyed for generations.

Unlike Senator Mitt Romney who was in favor of this bill, Senator Mike Lee recently wrote in his op-ed some of his criticisms for the Natural Resources Management Act. Many were ecstatic about the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) being permanently re-funded for the next 7 years, however, Senator Lee wrote differently.

The legislation permanently reauthorizes the Land and Water Conservation Fund, an admirably intended program enacted to preserve access to recreation opportunities on public lands. When the program was first passed in 1964 it promised to direct 60 percent of its funds to states and 40 percent to federal purposes. Sadly, this is not how the program has been implemented, just 25 percent of all LWCF have been given to states while 61 percent of the funds have been spent on federal land acquisition. Worse, the LWCF keeps on buying new federal lands without securing any method for maintaining the land they already own. According to a 2017 Congressional Research Service report, the maintenance backlog on federal land is up to \$18.6 billion, including significant backlogs at Arches,

Bryce Canyon, Capitol Reef, Canyonlands, and Zion National Parks. When the federal government fails to maintain the lands it owns, ill-kept roads and trails make it harder for citizens to enjoy our national treasures and wildfires become more likely.

Though the bill does designate another 1.3 billion acres of land for wilderness, it is a highly restrictive designation and limits far more activities than is necessary for protecting this land. It limits all commercial activity, all infrastructure development, and any travel by car or bicycle. In a state like Utah, where the federal government owns more than two-thirds of the land, these designations have big consequences. Civilians have to go to the federal government instead of their state or local government and ask for permission to do virtually anything to the land which covers almost all of Utah's Emery County. The last criticism Mike Lee mentioned in his op-ed is that this legislation does nothing to address a continuing problem that Utah faces: the Antiquities Act. The Antiquities Act was originally intended to give the president the power to protect specific historic and cultural monuments by implementing severe restrictions on select federal lands. According to the original law, these "National Monuments" were supposed to include only the "smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected." This is not how the law has been implemented. Instead, past presidents have abused the law by designating millions of acres of land for monument protection. These vanity projects have the potential and high risk to hit local communities hard. For example, when President Clinton created the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, many local ranchers lost their right to build fences, secure water resources, and maintain roads for their herds. Many families were forced to reduce their herds, sometimes by half. The main criticism for this currently passed legislation that Senator Lee and many others, especially federalism proponents, hold is that it takes too much power away from the state and local Utah communities and gives it back to federal politicians in Washington D.C. Many believe that land conservation is a job that needs to be taken care of by locals and state representatives, not federal representatives who oversee the entire country. They believe it becomes too corrupted and uncontrolled when it gets into the hands of those individuals.

Works Cited

<https://wildlife.utah.gov>

<https://naturalresources.utah.gov>

“American Antiquities Act of 1906” National Park Service, June 22, 2017, <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/legal/american-antiquities-act-of-1906.htm>

Becktol, Wendy “5 Big Takeaways of the Lands Conservation Bill Congress Passed” The Sierra Club, February 27th, 2019 <https://www.sierraclub.org/sierra/5-big-takeaways-lands-conservation-bill-congress-passed>

Virginia Cramer, Anne Hawke, and Jen Ujifusa, Conservation Groups Blast Sen. Hatch, Rep. Curtis on New San Rafael Swell Bill” Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance (SUWA), May 9th, 2018 <https://suwa.org/conservation-groups-blast-sen-hatch-rep-curtis-new-san-rafael-swell-bill> Congressional Research Service, “CRS Annual Report Fiscal Year 2017” Library of Congress, 2017 https://www.loc.gov/crsinfo/about/crs17_annrpt.pdf

Rep. Curtis, John R. [R-UT-3], “H.R.5727: Emery County Public Land Management Act of 2018” House of Representatives Committee Report, May 9th, 2018 <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/5727/text?format=txt>

Rep. Curtis, John R. [R-UT-3], “H.R.4465: Endangered Fish Recovery Programs Extension Act of 2017” House of Representatives Committee Report, November 11th, 2017 <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/4465>

Department of Heritage and Arts, “Civilian Conservation Corps in Utah” Mountain West Digital Library <https://mwdl.org/collections/CivilianConservationCorpsinUtah.php>

Eilperin, Juliet and Grandoni, Dino, “The Senate just passed the decade’s biggest public lands package. Here’s what’s in it.” The Washington Post, February 12th, 2019

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/2019/02/12/senate-just-passed-decades-biggest-public-lands-package-heres-whats-it/>
Sen. Heller, Dean [R-NV], “Good Samaritan Search and Recovery Act”
Senate Committee Report, May 18th, 2017 <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/senate-bill/1181>
History.com Editors and Associated Staff, “Civilian Conservation Corps” History, October 17th, 2018
<https://www.history.com/topics/great-depression/civilian-conservation-corps>

Mike Lee, “Public Lands” Senator Lee Op-Eds,
<https://www.lee.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/issue-lands>

Mike Lee, “This bill is not the right move for Utah lands” Senator Lee Op-Eds, February 22, 2019
<https://www.lee.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2019/2/this-bill-is-not-the-right-move-for-utah-lands>

Brian Maffly, “Utah public-lands bill that would protect 1 million acres, establish a Jurassic National Monument is drawing fire from conservation groups” Salt Lake Tribune, May 9th, 2018 <https://www.sltrib.com/news/environment/2018/05/09/newly-introduced-utah-public-lands-bill-would-protect-1-million-acres-but-is-already-drawing-fire-from-conservation-groups/>

Peterson, Tim “Rob Bishop’s Utah Public Lands Initiative Defeated” Grand Canyon Trust, December 9th, 2016
<https://www.grandcanyontrust.org/blog/rob-bishop-utah-public-lands-initiative-defeated>

“Yellowstone National Park Protection Act (1872)” National Park Service
<https://www.nps.gov/yell/learn/management/yellowstoneprotection-act1872.htm>

Section III

Sustainable Mountain Development Issues Worldwide

Sustainable Development Goals in Norway: Prosperity, Planet, People

By: Andrew Tschirki

Andrew Tschirki is a senior at Utah Valley University studying Political Science with a global politics emphasis. His particular area of interest is East Asian politics and development. He has minors in both Languages and Chinese Studies. Andrew hopes to become a published researcher in his studies in Japanese and Chinese history and linguistics.

INTRODUCTION

Through its ability to turn natural resources such as water and oil into electricity and funding for the entire nation, Norway remains the apex when it comes to linking sustainable development, earth-friendly production, and prosperity. Through the discovery of massive oil fields, along with efficient and realistic labor and ideas, a \$1 trillion USD sovereign fund has been established. Running water through the use of hydroelectric plants produces 95% of the country's electricity. The country is a global leader in developing, maintaining, and using sustainable energy. Through the lense of the goals for the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Norway's progress in these areas will be analyzed. (United Nations). Additionally, with regard to the specific goals for people and prosperity, the status of the indigenous Sami people will be analyzed. Through this process, the progress and realization of these goals for Norway can be determined, and measures for further progress will be suggested. Despite all of the fantastic innovations listed above, the ethnic minority Sami people still struggle to reap the benefits of Norway's development and remain far behind the average Norwegian in terms of quality of life and healthcare. As a stylistic note, I will use specific goals directly from the United Nations 2030 Sustainable Development Goals as thematic section headings, giving an overview of what will be discussed. The different areas in these quotations will be discussed as they pertain to Norway, being a participatory member of the United Nations. The complete list of goals will be found in the notes section.

PLANET

“We are determined to protect the planet from degradation, including through sustainable consumption and production, sustainably managing its natural resources and taking urgent action on climate change, so that it can support the needs of the present and future generations.” (1.2).

PROSPERITY

“We are determined to ensure that all human beings can enjoy prosperous and fulfilling lives and that economic, social, and technological progress occurs in harmony with nature.” (1.3).

Oil

These are the specific United Nations goals regarding the planet and prosperity for the year 2030. While not specific in detail, it outlines that participating nations agree to protect the planet supporting the needs of present and future generations, understanding that each country has different strengths and challenges. Norway is exemplary at supporting present generations while building a sustainable future. Sitting on massive oil fields that are still being discovered, Norway remains one of the largest oil producers in the world, producing 2% of the world's oil on the market. Oil remains about 18% of Norway's GDP and about 62% of its exports. (European Commission). In this age of sustainable development and renewable energy resources, one might think that such a reliance on oil for economic stability would prohibit the country from achieving sustainable development goals. For Norway, this is not the case. While it is true that the country is producing oil on a massive scale, it also maintains ambitious sustainable development goals. By the year 2030, which happens to also be the year of the United Nations Agenda for Sustainable Development, the state-run oil company Equinor has announced that they will attempt to be carbon-neutral. (Rassenfoss). Simply, this means that the company desires to have no net greenhouse gas emissions, while still producing about half as much oil and gas as they do currently. Part of this plan includes cutting 5 million tons of carbon dioxide emissions per year. Additionally, beyond the year 2030, the company anticipates cutting emissions by 70% by the year 2040, and to near zero by 2050. (The Local Norway). In order to achieve such ambi-

tious goals, the company plans to convert power for the plants to electric grids, such as from offshore wind. This will be discussed at a later point. All of these measures stated are in an effort to, by following the protocol set out in the 2015 Paris Agreement, limit global warming to 2.0 degrees celsius. These are surely ambitious goals, but given Norway's record for sustainable development innovation, they are certainly possible.

Despite these goals to decrease emissions, there are still oil fields being discovered. A giant new oil field in the North Sea, the Johan Sverdrup field, offers to provide Norway \$100 billion over the next fifty years. This may seem like another negative for sustainable development, but it is just the opposite. Upon finding Norwegian oil in 1969, the government established a sovereign trust fund where the returns on oil are placed. An official statement includes phrasing that aligns with the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: "The aim of the oil fund is to ensure responsible and long-term management of revenue from Norway's oil and gas resources in the North Sea so that this wealth benefits both current and future generations." The key here is the benefits to both current and future generations. This fund currently holds around \$1 trillion USD, which is enough for \$200,000 per Norwegian citizen. It is anticipated that this money be held and allowed to increase until the day Norway no longer produces oil. (The Economist; Norges Bank Investment Management). Essentially, Norway has realized that the world will not use oil forever, however, the current world, Norway aside, and the world for the foreseeable future are still oil-dependent. Therefore, it feels it is its place to develop oil in the name of the future of the country and its people to thrive in a post-oil world. In order to limit the ecological and environmental effects, however, the country has established the aforementioned ambitious goals to cut out carbon emissions completely by 2050. Therefore, it is possible to live in the moment with eyes on the future. Not only is it possible, but it is the only way for truly sustainable development to occur. All of these steps additionally fulfill the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development goal for prosperity in that these changes are all being made in harmony with nature for the prosperity of mankind.

Hydropower Electricity

Forty percent of Norway's land area is found 600m above sea level. (Graabak et al. 2). This fact, coupled with Norway's low tempera-

ture-induced heavy precipitation with low evaporation rates mean that the country has plentiful amounts of water stored in lakes established during the Ice Age. Norway, taking advantage of these strategic blessings of providence, uses electricity produced almost exclusively from hydropower plants. Ninety-eight percent of the energy used in Norway comes from renewable energy sources, with 95% of all energy used in the country coming from hydropower plants and dams. (Ministry of Petroleum and Energy). Other sources of renewable energy that won't be discussed in detail are wind power and thermal power. Currently, wind power is being used to create floating wind farms to further generate power for oil platforms in the Norwegian Sea. Furthermore, an additional \$10 billion USD from the sovereign fund stated above has been authorized to be used in developing more renewable energy projects, particularly in wind and solar power. (Lee).

The average age of a hydropower plant in Norway is around 50 years, causing the country to renew and revamp many plants. Since the beginning of the 21st century, the trend has been to build new micro-hydropower plants throughout the country, these being much more efficient and provide a larger benefit to local regions and communities throughout the Norwegian mountains with site specific technology. From the year 2005, there have been 25 hydropower plants built annually, culminating in a total of 1,660 plants throughout the nation. (Lia, et al. 37).

Not all hydropower plant and dam building projects are welcomed by everybody. In a famous case referred to as the Alta Dam Controversy in 1978, the Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate established plans to build a power plant and dam. They planned to locate the dam on the Alta River in northern Norway. The problem, however, was that the government had planned to build this dam on a river that the local Sami population had traditionally used for wild salmon fishing for generations. The region was also widely used for reindeer herding. Essentially, the construction of such a massive project would displace Sami villages and end these activities, disrupting the livelihoods of many indigenous Sami people. Many of the Sami people organized coalitions in opposition to the construction. This opposition attracted countless people from around the world, where the protestors would block machinery and tie themselves to objects on the construction site, performing a hunger strike. Despite these efforts, a few years

later in 1982, the supreme court of Norway ruled that the government had the right to build the power plant and dam, which was then completed five years later in 1987. (Callahan). This incident, though to the Sami people was considered unsuccessful, drew much attention to the rights of indigenous people and their role in modern society. This dispute eventually resulted in the Finnmark Act of 2005.

PEOPLE

“We are determined to end poverty and hunger, in all their forms and dimensions, and to ensure that all human beings can fulfill their potential in dignity and equality and in a healthy environment.” (1.1).

Sami People

The United Nations Sustainable Development goal regarding “people” as quoted above illustrates the intent of participating nations to ensure rights, dignity, and equality to all. How this relates to Norway, particularly to the native Sami people, will be discussed next. Beginning with the Finnmark Act of 2005, the Norwegian government officially gave about 95% of the land in Finnmark county to the local inhabitants of the county. The county which is largely composed of Sami people is located in northeastern Norway. The official purpose of this act is to:

...facilitate the management of land and natural resources in the county of Finnmark in a balanced and ecologically sustainable manner for the benefit of the residents of the county and particularly as a basis for Sami culture, reindeer husbandry, use of non-cultivated areas, commercial activity and social life. (Environmental Rights Database).

The act further declares that the Sami people have acquired rights to the land through prolonged use and inhabitation of the land. Without much pain or loss, the Norwegian government officially recognizes that the land in Finnmark county belongs to the inhabitants of the county. This is extremely significant in recognizing indigenous people and their rights and succession of land ownership. This transition seems to appear to allow the indigenous people to be sovereign people who are able to, according to the goals established by the UN for people, “...fulfill their potential in dignity and equality and in a healthy environ-

ment.”

Despite acts, laws, or treaties enacted by the government or international organizations to recognize indigenous peoples' rights and lands, oftentimes the status quo remains unchanged. This largely happens due to the fact that the government rarely negotiates with the indigenous people themselves, often because it is extremely difficult to legitimize and settle indigenous peoples' claims to land. Many countries, including Norway, are attempting to settle these land claims, though it can be hypothesized that beyond looking out for and protecting indigenous people, it can be inefficient for a central government to rule over remote areas of land. Essentially, governments may deem it to be more efficient for local governments to regulate the land and the people. (Carstens, 105). This is due to the fact that in extreme northern and arctic territories, the Norwegian people, as well as Russian, Canadians, Swede, and Americans in their respective territories, never fully colonized those regions. Norwegian countries have focused heavily on southern colonization, manipulating the resources in the southern ends of the country, and have traditionally left the more remote, marginal territories alone. When the Norwegian government has interfered in the north, particularly in terms of reindeer herding, the results have damaged its legitimacy and hurt the industry and region. (Sandberg, 270). Herein lies the reason that Sami people are largely independent by nature and have been given the right, and even the responsibility based on their history, to herd reindeer. The Sami people have been given rights to land ownership and to govern themselves through the establishment of the Sami Parliament. Whether or not the Norwegian government is sincere in these efforts to include and strengthen the Sami people is unclear. The Sami people have maintained their land for thousands of years and the Norwegian government has recognized that as a sound basis for their claim of indigenous lands. This goes in line with the UN goal of establishing equality for all people, with this sense of equality being found in land ownership rights. However, indigenous people like the Sami are not exclusively found in Norway; therefore, there is a need to establish the same standard across national boundaries. Transborder boundaries remain an extensive issue for the implementation of land ownership rights as well as social rights to indigenous people across the world. (Broderstad, 893).

Despite the Sami peoples' claims to their own land, another

problem that exists is global warming which is a direct threat to the Sami peoples' livelihoods as well as their land rights. With increasingly warm winters, less snow falls. Recently, rain often falls instead of snow. Significantly, rain falls much more commonly in northern Norway. Once the rain comes to the ground it quickly freezes due to the cold climate. This poses a legitimate problem to the Sami people with reindeer herding. The reindeer traditionally are able to eat roots of plants through the snow and survive, however, their teeth are not able to dig through the ice. Considering these problems, there could be a mass reindeer extinction in Norway that takes place over the next few years.. The Sami people are doing what they can to help the reindeer survive and have food sources, however, there is little they can do for sustained periods of time. (Nilsen). In order for true sustainable development to take place for the Sami people, there needs to be innovation for the survival of the reindeer. Thus the survival of the Sami people. Many believe that sustainable development is equatable to modernization of all civilizations and societies, but this is not true. It is using modern techniques and innovation to allow people across the world to live in sustainable methods, and one of the most sustainable methods is the way that indigenous people already live: one with the environment. Therefore, for sustainable development to truly occur, the modern world must pair with the Sami people to figure out this problem of a very high likelihood of reindeer extinction. Again, referencing the UN goals above, the goal is to allow everybody to live equally and in harmony with nature.

Another problem that the Sami people must encounter when it comes to global warming is the discovery and opening of oil fields in the Barents Sea. As more oil is found and drilled, more labor will be needed to work. There are thousands of people moving into northern Norway to work for these oil companies. Not only is Norway involved, but regional politics are at play as well. As the Arctic ocean's ice continues to melt, regional rival Russia, as well as across-the-world rival China are looking to claim Arctic territory. This all could potentially put the Norwegian people, and specifically the Sami people and their livelihoods at risk; that is assuming they still have a livelihood post reindeer extinction. All of these risks for the Sami people must be addressed and their rights must be protected by regional, national, and international governments and organizations.

Another problem the Sami people have to face lies in the Nor-

wegian healthcare system. For many indigenous people, Sami included, the national healthcare system remains an image of colonization. In some communities, Sami people and Norwegian people go to a doctor or clinic at the same rates, regardless of ethnic differences. However, for some Sami people who primarily use the Sami language, they often times feel discrimination at school and in medical settings, thus leading to receiving medical assistance less than their Norwegian counterparts. It can be observed that ethnolinguistic problems are still relevant for many of the traditional Sami people. For Sami people that have integrated with Norwegian society, however, there is no difference in the quality or frequency of obtaining healthcare. (Turi et al.) However, to be in line with UN Goals for Sustainable Development, all people must be valued and given equal opportunity. For traditional Sami people, having the opportunity simply is not enough, but there is a need for society to accept them and without forcing integration, simply allow them certain rights such as education and healthcare, regardless of being an indigenous ethnic minority.

PLANET

“We are determined to protect the planet from degradation, including through sustainable consumption and production, sustainably managing its natural resources and taking urgent action on climate change, so that it can support the needs of the present and future generations.” (I.2).

Local and National Governance Of Mountain Communities

Generally speaking, mountain areas are viewed as extremely vital yet vulnerable areas for resources, yet they are rarely seen widely as areas worth investing in for development. Norwegian legislators, however, have been very influential in protecting Norway's mountain resources and ecosystems. Some of these policies include protecting lands and making nature reserves for wild reindeer in south central Norway. Mountain municipalities cover 39% of Norway's landmass, with 30% of this land being protected. However, the effort of the government in protecting these lands comes at a price for the local mountain people. The government has established a decentralized method for protecting these areas, placing more of the weight of administration on local authorities which are largely composed of mayors and other local officials.

However, despite some of these changes, the central government still maintains much of the power and the final say when plans are objected to in these problems (Skjeggedal et al.)

The Norwegian government through the Planning and Building Act essentially holds a monopoly on all development, including for conservation reasons. As previously stated, municipal governments are “given” the authority to make plans for and zone their own municipal lands. The government, however, through the Planning and Building Act has the power to object to any regional and municipal decision, therefore somewhat nullifying regional efforts at region-specific development. This is considered by the Norwegian mountain people to be an intervention in regional autonomy. One unnamed municipal authority is quoted as saying, “Why does the Norwegian Environment Agency and the County Governor believe that local people will over-consume and destroy nature? I have never understood why.... It is this that creates the distrust.” (Skjeggedal et al.) Another claims that there is a lack of honesty, communication, and trust. He argues that the rules made by the administering bodies are the problems in mountain communities and not the other way around. In fact, mountain people are more widely concerned with sustainable mountain development. The Norwegian people widely want sustainable development by economic growth as well as by environmental protection, however, when specific and widely understood and revered goals and policies are not in place, it is next to impossible to efficiently achieve goals.¹⁹

Conclusion

As seen, Norway has many excellent features regarding sustainable development and environmental protection policies. They realize that much of the world is still dependent on oil, therefore they drill oil. The government then places the money in a sovereign fund to be able to sustain a post-oil Norway. This is directly in line with the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in building a prosperous and sustainable future for the generations to come. As oil continues to sell, the sovereign fund will have more money. This is simple economics. The country itself, however, does not rely on oil as a resource for their own consumption; the country uses 98% of its energy from renewable resources, the largest being hydropower. The country is rich in rainfall, snowmelt, lakes and rivers. It has over a thousand hydropower plants,

including micro hydropower plants to provide energy for the entire nation, including remote areas and peoples. It is energy and resource efficient. The country additionally is building floating wind farms and even has oil fields running solely off of renewable energy. In these ways, the country is a model for the rest of the world to look at as they implement goals looking towards 2030. All of this modern innovation, however, does play a problem with the indigenous Sami people in northern Norway. Despite their new found land ownership rights awarded from the Norwegian government, their land is at risk from immigration, global warming, and potential future oil and land disputes, both domestically and internationally. Their livelihoods are threatened and lifestyles are ever changing to become modern. More well integrated Sami fit in well with Norwegian culture though there is still the problem of discrimination towards more traditional Sami people. If the world truly wants to create a world for all, we must accept indigenous people and their ways of life as valid; oftentimes their way of living promotes sustainable development more than the “modern” way of living does. Furthermore, mountain communities, their people and their livelihoods must be valued for their regional and specific agricultural and environmental expertise. It is extremely inefficient when a national government controls nearly every aspect of regional ecological and political decisions regarding conservation and development. Regional people and their authorities often know what are the best solutions in their communities, therefore there must be more trust between the national and regional levels. We must also be willing to help them to adapt into a future where they have a larger role and influence on regional politics and development. In order to have a welcoming future for all, everyone and their culture and values must be valued and used to create a future for generations to live prosperously. These are the United Nations’ goals in action.

I. UNITED NATIONS 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

I.1 People

We are determined to end poverty and hunger, in all their forms and dimensions, and to ensure that all human beings can fulfil their potential in dignity and equality and in a healthy environment.

I.2 Planet

We are determined to protect the planet from degradation, including through sustainable consumption and production, sustainably managing its natural resources and taking urgent action on climate change, so that it can support the needs of the present and future generations.

I.3 Prosperity

We are determined to ensure that all human beings can enjoy prosperous and fulfilling lives and that economic, social and technological progress occurs in harmony with nature.

I.4 Peace

We are determined to foster peaceful, just and inclusive societies which are free from fear and violence. There can be no sustainable development without peace and no peace without sustainable development.

I.5 Partnership

We are determined to mobilize the means required to implement this Agenda through a revitalised Global Partnership for Sustainable Development, based on a spirit of strengthened global solidarity, focussed in particular on the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable and with the participation of all countries, all stakeholders and all people.

The interlinkages and integrated nature of the Sustainable Development Goals are of crucial importance in ensuring that the purpose of the new Agenda is realised. If we realize our ambitions across the full extent of the Agenda, the lives of all will be profoundly improved and our world will be transformed for the better.

Works Cited

- Broderstad, Else Grete. "The Promises and Challenges of Indigenous Self-Determination: The Sami Case." *International Journal*, vol. 66, no. 4, 2011, pp. 893–907. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/23104400. Accessed 11 Oct. 2020.
- Callahan, Sophia. "The Alta Dam Controversy." *The Alta Dam Controversy | Environment & Society Portal*, 1979, www.environmentandsociety.org/tools/keywords/alta-dam-controversy.
- Carstens, Margret. "Sami Land Rights: the Anaya Report and the Nordic Sami Convention." *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2016, pp. 75–116.
- Energy, Ministry of Petroleum and. "Renewable Energy Production in Norway." *Government.no, Ministry of Petroleum and Energy*, 2016, www.regjeringen.no/en/topics/energy/renewable-energy/renewable-energy-production-in-norway/id2343462/.
- "European Commission Directorate-General for Trade." *Norway - Trade - European Commission*, ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/countries-and-regions/countries/norway/.
- "The Fund." *The Fund*, Norges Bank Investment Management, 2020, www.nbim.no/en/.
- Graabak, Ingeborg, et al. "Norway as a Battery for the Future European Power System—Impacts on the Hydropower System." *Energies*, vol. 10, no. 12, 2017, p. 2054., doi:10.3390/en10122054.
- Lee, Andrew. "Norway's Oil & Gas-Fuelled Wealth Fund 'Plans \$11bn Wind and Solar Spree'." *Recharge*, 2020, www.rechargenews.com/transition/norways-oil-gas-fuelled-wealth-fund-plans-11bn-wind-and-solar-spree/2-1-766351.
- Lia, Leif, et al. "The Current Status of Hydropower Development and Dam Construction in Norway." *Hydropower & Dams*, no. 3, 2015, pp. 37–43.
- Nilsen, Thomas. "Starvation Death Looms as Huge Amount of Snow

Piles up over Icy Crust.” The Independent Barents Observer, 22 Mar. 2020, thebarentsobserver.com/en/ecology/2020/03/starvation-death-looms-reindeer-huge-amount-snow-pile-over-icy-crust.

“Norway’s Equinor Sets Green Goals but Activists Unimpressed.” The Local Norway, 2020, www.thelocal.no/20200206/norways-equinor-sets-green-goals-but-activists-unimpressed.

“Norway’s Finnmark Act.” Environmental Rights Database, Environmental Rights Database, environmentalrightsdatabase.org/norways-finnmark-act/.

Overvåg, Kjell, et al. “Management of Mountain Areas in Norway and the Persistence of Local–National Conflicts.” *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, vol. 59, no. 7, 2015, pp. 1186–1204., doi:10.1080/09640568.2015.1062747.

Rassenfoss, Stephen. “Equinor Plans to Eliminate Norwegian Carbon Emissions.” Society of Petroleum Engineers (SPE), 8 Oct. 2020, pubs.spe.org/en/jpt/jpt-article-detail/?art=6441.

Sandberg, Audun. “Collective Rights in a Modernizing North – on Institutionalizing Sámi and Local Rights to Land and Water in Northern Norway.” *International Journal of the Commons*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2008, pp. 269–287. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/26518205. Accessed 11 Oct. 2020.

Skjeggedal, Terje, et al. “Land-Use Planning in Norwegian Mountain Areas: Local Development or Nature Protection?” *European Planning Studies*, vol. 24, no. 2, 2015, pp. 344–363., doi:10.1080/09654313.2015.1048187.

“Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development .. Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform.” United Nations, United Nations, sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld.

Turi, Anne Lene, et al. “Health Service Use in Indigenous Sami and Non-Indigenous Youth in North Norway: A Population Based Survey.” *BMC Public Health*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2009, doi:10.1186/1471-2458-9-378.

“Why Every Norwegian Ecowarrior Has 200,000 Petrodollars.” The Economist, The Economist Newspaper, 2020, www.economist.com/europe/2020/02/08/why-every-norwegian-ecowarrior-has-200000-pet

rodollars.

Reconciliation in Georgia: Utilizing SDG 16 to Promote Peacebuilding and Governance in South Ossetia and Abkhazia

By: Samuel Elzinga

Samuel Elzinga is a current junior at Utah Valley University studying political science, national security, and Russian. Samuel has participated in a variety of UN initiatives, including presenting at the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development in July of 2018 and the 2018 International Day of the Mountains Celebration in December 2018. Samuel is currently on the youth committee for the UN-DGC NGO conference that will be held in Salt Lake City in August of 2019. Samuel has published in a variety of academic journals on campus and hopes to pursue a career relating to South and Central Asian international security affairs.

Introduction

Georgia's national motto is *dzala ertobashia*, which translates to "strength is in unity." This motto is particularly prudent when considering this small, mountainous country in the Southern Caucasus has roughly nine major ethnic groups within its internationally defined borders, each with their own languages, cultures, and traditions (The World Factbook: Georgia). National unity within Georgia has not always come easily. Since independence from the Soviet Union in 1991, Georgia has faced economic crises, an international war with the Russian Federation, a bloodless revolution, and multiple internal conflicts, all interspersed with political conflict. Political unity in a country as diverse as Georgia is incredibly difficult and is further exacerbated by the fact that South Ossetia and Abkhazia, two autonomous regions in Georgia, boast *de facto* independence from the country with their sovereignty recognized by Russia, Nicaragua, Nauru, Syria, and Venezuela, with no hope in sight that these two regions will rescind their "independence" and join with Georgia again. Georgia's inability to reconcile with South Ossetia and Abkhazia, who are separatist ethnic minorities, will hinder its ability to further sustainably develop as a nation.

The Land of Prometheus: Ethnic Diversity and Tension in the Caucasus Prior to the USSR

Some of the first mentions of the Caucasian region dates back to the myth of Prometheus, the god responsible for giving humans fire. According to the myth, Prometheus “was punished by being chained to the icy peaks” of the Caucasus (De Waal). The region is extremely austere, hosting Europe’s tallest mountain, Elbrus, in its borders. During the Arabian conquest, the Caucasus was known as djabal al-alsun, meaning the mountain of languages. The name given by the Arabs is an accurate assessment of the ethno-linguistic diversity of the mountains. In the Greater Caucasian region, there are 28 different linguistic groups spread between roughly fifteen million people, with each group sharing their own unique traditions and way of life (Caucasian Peoples). With these many different ethnic groups, developing a unified government originating from a native Caucasian people has been difficult throughout history.

Over the course of thousands of years, the Caucasus as a regions were seldom unified under a ruler originating from one of the native populations and largely only experienced unity when under the rule of a conquering state, such as the Arabs, Turks, or Russians, according to Ronald Suny, author of *The Making of the Georgian Nation*. Some of the few notable exceptions to this prior to the Russian conquest of the Caucasus in the 19th century are the Georgian Kingdom of the Middle Ages and one of its successor states, Kartli-Kakheti (Hille 2010). These kingdoms encompassed regions of the Caucasus that spanned multiple ethnic groups who were able to live in relative peace with one another. The only other time a unified Caucasian state existed was after the fall of the Russian empire and before the Soviet Union reconquered the mountains. This state, known as the Transcaucasian Democratic Federative Republic, was only in existence for a little over a month, meaning little governance was actually done in this period of time. However, all ethnic groups in the Caucasus were under the rule of a population native to the Caucasus (the Georgians) and lived in an unstable peace for a short time. The Transcaucasian Democratic Federative Republic was formed at the insistence of Turkey, who demanded that the confederation remain independent as per the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. The Federation had no desire to remain independent, with “[t]he reason they

complied with Turkey's wishes," being because "Turkey at that time had a strong military presence and continued an uninterrupted advance on Transcaucasian territory," according to Hille. The Transcaucasian Democratic Federative Republic remained independent until 1918, when ethnic tensions would once again divide the confederation into three successor states: Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan.

These states, once again, were short lived, and only lasted a few years until the Bolsheviks reconquered them (Hille, 2010). The Soviet Union, in order to quell each ethnic group developing any further nationalism, created the Transcaucasian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic. Some degree of local autonomy remained for the former republics, though a Georgian Bolshevik party boss remained at the head of the republic (Suny, *The Making of the Georgian Nation*). However, this Soviet Republic would not last and disintegrated into Armenian SSR, Georgian SSR, and Azerbaijan SSR in 1936. Ethnic divisions, especially in mountain regions, have always been troublesome, as shown by this brief history of the Caucasian republics in the USSR. Each group in the Caucasus is fiercely independent from one another, developing their own methods of economic sustenance and political development. These separate traditions have "often provide[d] a sounder, more enduring basis for conservation and development" for each ethnic groups' communities than ethnic majority-controlled governments exerting their will on other independent minorities (Price et al. *Key Issues for Mountain Areas*). Unfortunately, minorities in Georgia have historically demanded more independence than the government in Tbilisi is willing to give, which in turn has created simmering ethnic tension in the region for decades.

Roots of Modern Ethnic Conflict in Georgia

Modern ethnic conflict in Georgia can be easily traced to the breakup of the Transcaucasian Democratic Federative Republic and short-lived formation of Georgia. The country was able to quickly receive international recognition for its territory, despite territorial disputes between Armenia and other bordering nations that challenged this from time to time (Hille, 2010). However, ethnic tensions with South Ossetians, Abkhazians, and Ajarians residing in the newly formed country flared. These different ethnic groups revolted against the capital in search for their own interests. As Frederick Starr notes in *Key Issues for*

Mountain Areas, “the main source of conflict in mountain regions has been the effort of emerging states to extend their power over mountain people,” which was certainly the case with these first modern instances of ethnic tensions in Georgia.

Though Dr. Starr only explicitly mentions the Northern Caucasus as a conflict that “arose from this process,” it is appropriate to recognize a major cause of ethnic conflict in Georgia can be traced to Tbilisi extending its centralized power to remote, mountainous regions of the country. South Ossetians, Abkhazians, and Ajarians all occupy areas dominated by mountains. Viewing the map below, the distribution of revolting ethnic groups becomes clearer. Abkhazians occupy the northwest, Ajarians occupy the Southwest, and South Ossetians occupy the north of Georgia. Comparatively, the capital, Tbilisi, is at a lower altitude and removed from these minority groups, as shown by the map below.

Surprisingly, ethnic tensions did not flare up frequently in the Soviet Union. However, at this time, roughly six million ethnic minorities faced internal deportation, with entire ethnicities in the Northern Caucasus being sent to Central Asia for being “anti-Soviet,” (Rosefielde, Red Holocaust). The Meskhetian Turks were the only group from Georgia that faced these horrific policies, but dozens of other ethnic minorities in the Caucasus faced deportations, such as the Chechens, Ingush, and Kalmyks. The appearance of peace among the Ossetians, Abkhaz, Ajarians, and Georgians is accurately described by Aidan Russel, Associate Professor of International History at the Graduate Institute of Geneva, who wrote that “there is nothing alien or incomprehensible... in the obedience to oppressive power witnessed in those who did not attempt open resistance to their killers.” In the case of the peoples of Georgia, perhaps witnessing the internal deportation and subsequent killing of those who resided near them compelled them into an unstable harmony with those around them. Another, perhaps more likely reason behind the peoples of Georgia largely being spared during the internal deportation was Josef Stalin, the leader of the Soviet Union at the time, being originally from Georgia. A final likely explanation for why ethnic strife did not occur during the Soviet period was the recognized autonomy of South Ossetia and Abkhazia. Regardless, under the Soviet Union’s control, each ethnic minority lived in relative peace with one another. This peace, unfortunately, would not continue following

the dissolution of the USSR.

1991 and Onward: Building the Georgian State

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Georgia once again found itself independent. With its modern-day borders in place, the reformed country was once again met with the challenge of a plethora of ethnic groups vying for varying degrees of self-determination. Unfortunately, for every ethnic group hoping for an increase in autonomy under the new government, no such autonomy would be granted. Georgian nationalism had been building since the 1980s which was only fueled by attempts from the USSR to stamp it out, according to a Princeton Report on ethnic conflict in Georgia. Georgian became the only official language of the region in 1989, and as soon as Georgia officially broke away from the Soviet Union via referendum in 1991, the citizenry elected Zviad Gamsakhurdia, an ardent nationalist, to lead the country. Gamsakhurdia's election to lead Georgia

provide[d] the background against which these tensions escalated into full-scale violent conflict: Abkhaz and South Ossetians wanted to preserve, and remain within, the Soviet Union considering their survival as ethno-cultural communities distinct from the Georgian majority to be in acute danger in an independent Georgian state (Wolff, Georgia).

Shortly following Gamsakhurdia's election, conflict broke out between Abkhazia and Georgia, which resulted in a civil war lasting from 1992 to 1993 and the ethnic cleansing of Georgians from Abkhazia. Once again, Dr. Starr's analysis of a state trying to exert power in the distant, mountainous regions of their country rings true. Georgia electing a nationalist leader who appeared primarily focused on the promotion of his ethnic group's language, traditions, and culture is the antithesis of proper governance in a multiethnic, mountainous country. It is no surprise conflict erupted and has continued intermittently to this day.

Following the civil war, however, there appeared to be steps for developing a sustainable peace in Georgia from both a domestic and international political perspective. The most important development regarding ethnic relations in Georgia following the civil war was the ratification of the new constitution of Georgia in 1995, which gave cer-

tain privileges and rights to the regions of South Ossetia, Abkhazia, and Ajaria (Constitution of Georgia). The Georgian constitution recognizes Abkhazia and South Ossetia in Article 1 section 1 of their constitution but refer to each autonomous republic differently. Abkhazia is referred to as the Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of Abkhazia, with South Ossetia referred to as the Former Autonomous Region of South Ossetia. Ajaria is not recognized in this article or section but is referred to as an autonomous region later. Ajaria and Abkhazia received special political representation in Georgia's legislative body, but not South Ossetia. Georgia's attempt to manage the political representation of Ajaria, South Ossetia, and Abkhazia appears to be haphazard and varies depending on the region.

Approaching political rights in a varied manner, though not necessarily a standard manner of addressing political rights, can actually work better for mountain communities. It is argued in Key Issues for Mountain Areas that “political recognition [of mountain peoples] must include precise measures... safeguarding the cultural identities of those who live there.” A varied approach, which the government of Georgia took, is then appropriate in order to build a multiethnic, mountainous state sustainably. However, peace did not last, and in 2004, the newly elected Mikhail Saakashvili began centralizing power and making the “restoration of full sovereignty across the entire territory of Georgia,” also known as quashing self-determination movements in Georgia's autonomous regions, a priority for the government (Wolff, Georgia).

Saakashvili's approach saw the decreased autonomy of Ajaria and the soft invasion of South Ossetia under the pretenses of closing down black markets. His government's policies in 2004 “contributed to further polarization and radicalization on all sides, increasing the frequency and intensity of clashes along the ceasefire line up until the full-scale war in August 2008,” according to Wolff. The 2008 invasion of Georgia by the Russian Federation has led to the occupation of South Ossetia and Abkhazia by Russia, an outcome these autonomous regions of Georgia are content with, as they receive de facto independence from Georgia and are protected by the more powerful Russia. The Georgian government in Tbilisi, however, views the “independence” as Russia occupying their sovereign territory (Tabachnik 2019). As it currently stands, there are no plans for Russia to relinquish its influence over Abkhazia and South Ossetia and the current situation is identified as a

“frozen conflict.”

Sustainable Development Goal 16 and its Implications for Peacebuilding in Georgia

The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are largely associated with sustainable development in regard to environmental and economic sustainability, and have a goal specifically focused on sustainable solutions to conflict. According to the United Nations, SDG 16 actively seeks “ending violence, promoting the rule of law, strengthening institutions and increasing access to justice” to help stop depriving “millions of their security, rights... opportunities and... the delivery of public services and broader economic development.” SDG 16 was under review at the United Nations High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development in 2019. Unfortunately, Georgia did not present a voluntary national review that year to address its progress on SDG 16, but based on 2016 reports and its anticipated 2020 VNR, Georgia’s current stance on SDG 16 can be properly articulated.

Looking at the first Voluntary National Review given in 2016, indicators within SDG 16 are highlighted throughout the report. The 2016 VNR highlights how Georgia’s 2030 Agenda states that “there is no security without sustainable development, but also no development without security.” This quote is directly in reference to Russia’s occupation of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. The people residing in Abkhazia and South Ossetia, at least from the perspective of the Georgians, “have been deprived of the ability to benefit from the benefits of our transformation, while their rights and liberties are substantially restricted, with no international monitoring on the ground” (Government of Georgia, 2016). This claim is correct. Abkhazia has questionable electoral results every five years, and as of right now, South Ossetia is still a major hub of smuggling and black-market goods.

These concerns in Abkhazia and South Ossetia directly relate to SDG 16 targets 16.2 - End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children. 16.3 - Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all. 16.4 - By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime. 16.5 - Substantially reduce corruption and bribery

in all their forms, 16.7 - Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels, 16.10 - Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements, and 16.A - Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime.

Georgia's other concern is directly related to the internally displaced people who left Abkhazia and South Ossetia following the conflicts in the regions, citing that

hundreds of thousands of internally displaced persons and refugees from the two Georgian regions of Abkhazia and Tskhinvali region/South Ossetia, continue to be deprived of their right to return to their homes in safety and dignity – the issue that is of immense importance as we jointly pledge to leave no one behind (Government of Georgia, 2016).

Once again, this claim is correct and justified from the position of Georgia. In the 1990s, Abkhazia was cited with committing ethnic cleansing of Georgians within its borders, and South Ossetia was cited as recently as 2012 with the ethnic cleansing of Georgians in their territory. The ethnic cleansing, in turn, caused the mass migration of ethnic Georgians out of their homes and into the territory of Georgia proper. Ethnic cleansing and this claim by Georgia can most easily be fit under SDG target 16.3.

Georgia is particularly proud of its development as a state since the fall of the Soviet Union, despite its setbacks with Abkhazia and South Ossetia. Its economy has grown, civic participation is up, and quality of life in the country has gotten better. To specifically address the challenges surrounding Abkhazia and South Ossetia, the “government of Georgia makes every effort to support all forms of interaction between Abkhazia and the Tskhinvali region/South Ossetia and the rest of Georgia through facilitation of platforms for promoting social inclusion and trust building between societies separated by dividing occupation lines” (Government of Georgia, 2016). This is done as best as possible through NGOs, which have been cited as very robust in a report published by the United Nations University. The government of Georgia is also working to better promote human rights in all of its states, which focuses on judicial sector development, anti-corruption measures, and the rights of

minorities. Unfortunately, no specific policies are mentioned in regard to protecting the rights of minorities. Though SDG target 16.B has specifically outlined promoting and enforcing “non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development” as a core tenet of fully implementing its goal, Georgia has not formally provided any substantive measures to address the feelings of disenfranchisement and desire for self-determination among its ethnic minorities who reside in de facto independent states.

Economic Impact of the Conflict

One of the most telling economic impacts of the breakaway of Abkhazia and South Ossetia was the closure of critical infrastructure to the breakaway regions. In Abkhazia, the government of Georgia has enacted the following measures to cripple the economy of Abkhazia: permanent closure of the Sukhumi seaport except for emergency cases, not to apply to the International Civil Aviation Organization so the Sukhumi airport cannot receive the proper credentials for international flights, and blocked the Trans-Caucasian railway (Gegeshidze, 2008). The only exception to these restrictions is the Inguri power station, which is on the border of both Georgia and Abkhazia.

These restrictions, coupled with severely limited international recognition, has hurt the economy of Abkhazia. According to Inal Ardzinba, the President of the World Economy Association at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow, “[d]espite 20 years as a capitalist country, it has not managed to develop modern market institutions,” which has in turn made the “gap between institutional and absolute indicators in Abkhazia... [potentially] the highest in the world.” Abkhazia’s economy is dependent on tourism and exports, both of which are difficult to develop with limited international recognition and isolation imposed by Georgia. Logically, therefore, Abkhazia’s largest trading partner is Russia, according to the only report by the Abkhazia State Customs Committee. Turkey is Abkhazia’s other main trading partner, making up 36% of Abkhazia’s total exports. Abkhazia only exports to Russia and Turkey, with exports consisting mainly of agricultural and natural resource products. Exporting to Turkey is logistically difficult with the closure of the Sukhumi port, making Russia the only trading partner that is easily accessed.

Russia further has entrenched itself in Abkhazia's economy and government by funding the majority of the government's budget for 2020. According to an Abkhazia watchdog organization, Abkhazia's "[o]wn revenues of the republican budget amount to 3,368,855.60 thousand RUB," whereas "financial assistance from Russia - 4,746,629.70 thousand RUB (including financial assistance of 3 264 629,7 thousand RUB for socio-economic development and 1 500 000 thousand RUB – for investment program implementation)," (GFSIS). In past years, Russia has funded large sections of Abkhazia's budget as well, creating concerns that Russia is trying to force the integration of Abkhazia into Russia economically.

Clearly, the practices of the Abkhazian government are not sustainable. In the unlikely instance that Abkhazia decides to rejoin with Georgia under the constitutional agreement granting Abkhazia autonomy under Georgia, their economy could become more sustainable for long term, domestically-funded growth. Right now, their economy can't develop, and if current trends continue, Abkhazia will become more economically dependent on Russia for assistance. Funding in the form of developmental aid from Western governments and intergovernmental institutions does not focus on economic development in order to adhere to sanctions imposed by the Commonwealth of Independent States. Instead, developmental aid from elsewhere is focused on capacity and confidence building with the hope that increased governance will help the struggling government. Unfortunately, the aid seems to not make any difference.

South Ossetia's economy is in even worse shape than Abkhazia. Landlocked and bordered solely by Georgia and Russia, the landlocked de facto state has an estimated GDP of 0.1 Million USD (Investrso). Additionally, the government is heavily reliant on Russia for funding. The only solution to South Ossetia's challenges would require some sort of mediation with Georgia to help the region, but like Abkhazia, mediation and reconciliation seem unlikely.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Georgia sits at a crossroads regarding sustainable mountain development and peacebuilding. In its current state, if the government continues with its status quo of calling out the Russian Federation for

occupying its territory and offering no programmatic plan for Abkhazia and South Ossetia to have their desire for greater autonomy addressed. Though Georgia has their constitution written in a way that provides autonomy to Abkhazia, Ajaria, and South Ossetia, in practice these regions have not had the promised degree of autonomy they sought. Looking at Dr. Starr's words, the central government in Tbilisi exerted too much power over these mountainous, unique regions, which in turn fueled conflict. If the Georgian government wants to develop a sustainable solution and peace with Abkhazia and South Ossetia, they will need to develop a positive dialogue with the governments of these regions, not discredit them as illegitimate. Telling mountain people their needs and how to best manage their homelands is a poor way to develop good rapport with these different ethnic groups, especially ones that have been at odds with one another for centuries. Providing autonomy, their own government style, and a greater say in how national policies will impact their people is an excellent start to repairing relations with South Ossetia and Abkhazia. Unfortunately, until the Georgian government is willing to give up its zero-sum game and all or nothing approach to negotiating with Russia and its occupied territory, little progress can be made. There is a chance at sustainable peace in Georgia, but at the moment, that peace is out of reach. It will take greater efforts to realize it.

Works Cited

Author, No. "Interview with Aslan Bzhania, De-Facto Leader of Abkhazia." GeorgianJournal. Accessed June 6, 2020. <https://www.georgianjournal.ge/politics/36493-interview-with-aslan-bzhania-de-facto-leader-of-abkhazia.html>.

"Валовой Внутренний Продукт." investrso.su. Accessed June 6, 2020. <http://investrso.su/ekonomika/valovoj-vnutrennij-produkt>.

The Constitution of Georgia ; The organec law of Georgia on the Constitutional Court of Georgia; Law of Georgia on constitutional legal proceedings ; The decisions, The constitution of Georgia ; The organec law of Georgia on the Constitutional Court of Georgia ; Law of Georgia on constitutional legal proceedings ; The decisions § (1998).

De Waal, Thomas. The Caucasus : An Introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uvu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=336213&site=eds-live>.

"Frozen Conflicts." The Economist. The Economist Newspaper. Accessed June 6, 2020.
<https://www.economist.com/news/2008/11/19/frozen-conflicts>.

Gegeshidze, AuthorsArchil, Archil Gegeshidze, Catherine Barnes, Celia McKeon, Aaron Griffiths, Teresa Whitfield, Alvaro de Soto, et al. "Incentives, Sanctions and Conditionality," February 1, 2008. <http://www.c-r.org/accord/incentives-sanctions-and-conditionality/isolation-abkhazia-failed-policy-or-opportunity>.

"Georgia Map - Physical Map of Georgia." Physical Map of Georgia - Ezilon Maps. Accessed June 6, 2020. <https://www.ezilon.com/maps/europe/georgia-physical-maps.html>.

"Goal 16 ∴ Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform." United Nations. United Nations. Accessed June 6, 2020. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg16>.

Hille, Charlotte Mathilde Louise. 2010. State Building and Conflict Res-

olution in the Caucasus. Eurasian Studies Library. Historical, Political and Social Studies of Slavic and Islamic Cultures in the Eurasian Region. Leiden [the Netherlands]: Brill. <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uvu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=338674&site=eds-live>.

Maxim Tabachnik (2019) Defining the nation in Russia's buffer zone: the politics of citizenship by birth on territory (jussoli) in Moldova, Azerbaijan, and Georgia, *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 35:3, 223-239, DOI: 10.1080/1060586X.2018.1542868

"Much of the Abkhazian Budget for 2020 Will Be Russia Financed." GF-SIS. Accessed June 6, 2020. <http://kremlin-roadmap.gfsis.org/news/display/375>. Price, Martin Francis. *Key Issues for Mountain Areas*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2004.

Rosefielde, Steven. *Red Holocaust*. London: Routledge, 2010.
Russell, Aidan. "Obedience and selective genocide in Burundi." *Africa: The Journal of the International African Institute* 85, no. 3 (2015): 437-456. <https://www.muse.jhu.edu/article/587831>.

"Socio-Economic System of Abkhazia and Problems of Its Development." *International Alert*. Accessed June 6, 2020. <https://www.international-alert.org/blog/socio-economic-development-english-o>.

Suny, Ronald Grigor. *The Making of the Georgian Nation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007.

Voluntary National Review: Georgia, *Voluntary National Review: Georgia* § (2016).

Weinberger, Sharon. "Black Hole on the Black Sea." *Foreign Policy*, May 5, 2010. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2010/05/05/black-hole-on-the-black-sea/>.

Wolff, Stefan. "Georgia: Abkhazia and South Ossetia | The Princeton Encyclopedia of Self-Determination." Princeton University. The Trustees of Princeton University. Accessed June 6, 2020. <https://pesd.princeton.edu/node/706>.

The World Factbook: Georgia. (2018, February 01). Retrieved June 06,

2020, from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-fact-book/geos/gg.html>

World Diplomacy and Sustainable Mountain Development: A Study of Kyrgyzstan

By: Sarah Michaelis

Sarah Michaelis is a senior at Utah Valley University studying political science with an emphasis in global politics. Sarah has a background in project management, surveying, and user experience. She also has experience with non-profit work in China and Russia and studied in Central Asia. Sarah plans on using her technical background and political science education to pursue a service-oriented career.

By studying Kyrgyzstan's recent history and development, we can see how much the country has changed in the past few decades since gaining its independence. The government's foreign diplomacy has evolved to the point that the country is actively participating in the international community through partnerships with intergovernmental organizations such as the United Nations (UN), building friendly relations with other nations, and engaging in the global economy. Kyrgyzstan is unique in that they are a very mountainous country. The importance of their mountain communities is observed in the way the country promotes sustainable mountain development (SMD) as part of the UN Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development. Not only does Kyrgyzstan promote sustainable development within their own country, but also leverages international relations and diplomacy to promote SMD on a global scale. Kyrgyzstan's foreign relations impact SMD in many ways and we can learn from their example to build a more sustainable livelihood.

History of Kyrgyzstan

Historically, the Kyrgyz people were nomadic and resided in mountain communities. Before Central Asia was divided into five separate countries, the area was home to many communities of nomads. These societies were able to settle in an area to use the land for farming, hunting, or feeding their animals, then pack up their homes and move to the next available region (Bunn, 2011). Their mobile lifestyle was

passed from generation to generation, shaping the culture and heritage of Central Asia. Their culture was shaped by their sense of community as well as their deep connection to the environment. Over time, the people of Central Asia experienced conflict and war with their neighbors and were eventually taken over by the Soviet Union during the early 20th century, forcing the people to live in sedentary communities rather than their previous nomadic tribes (Zhdonko, 1996). Kyrgyzstan has experienced many changes throughout its history, but we can still see aspects of cultural heritage and values in their society and government today.

History of Kyrgyzstan's International Relations

Until the early 1990s, Kyrgyzstan was a part of the Soviet Union. As Kyrgyzstan was not a completely independent nation, its government and international relations were mostly decided by the Soviet Union's central government. During that time, ideology was created by central institutions of the Communist Party and distributed among the Soviet states (Murzakulova and Schoeberlein, 2009). The Kyrgyz people experienced difficulties in establishing their own national identity because of the variety of ethnic groups within the country and changing the national language to Russian instead of their traditional Kyrgyz (Signor and Allworth, 2019). This left very little room for the Kyrgyz people to establish their own political institutions. The Kyrgyz people resisted Soviet rule in the 20th century and yearned for their own national identity (2019). This push for autonomy led to establishing the Kirgiz Soviet Socialist Republic in the 1930s. This did not ease the tension between Kyrgyzstan and Russia, nor did it curb their desire for complete independence from the Soviet Union (2019). In the late 20th century, Kyrgyzstan worked towards economic progress and modernization, eager to become an independent state. In 1991, they were declared independent of the Soviet Union (2019).

The Kyrgyz government was very active and made significant progress during the 1990s after breaking their ties with the Soviet Union. Former President Askar Akayev spent significant time and effort on traveling the world and building coalitions with different leaders (Pike, 2013). Within the first four years of Kyrgyzstan's independence, they were formally recognized as an independent country by 120 nations and they had diplomatic relations with sixty-one of those nations (2013). Kyrgyz-

stan quickly became a part of many international organizations such as the United Nations, the World Bank, and others (2013). Of the countries in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), Kyrgyzstan was the largest per capita recipient of foreign aid at the time, mostly due to the president's actions (2013). Even though it was becoming a part of the international community at large, most of Kyrgyzstan's foreign policy concerns at the time were related to other Central Asian countries.

After the fall of the Soviet Union, Kyrgyzstan tried to maintain relations with other former Soviet countries, but these relationships were not always friendly. Given the close proximity and shared history, many post-Soviet countries already had friendly relations and cooperation. The Central Asia countries in particular have a common heritage and many ethnic groups are represented in Kyrgyzstan. Unfortunately, this shared history and presence of different ethnic groups within one country has also been a cause of contention. Many Uzbek people live in Southern Kyrgyzstan and have an influence on the area and economy, which has been a source of anger and violence for Kyrgyz people in the area (Pike, 2013). Kyrgyzstan has also experienced rocky relations with Tajikistan throughout the years regarding border security (2013). The borders drawn by the Soviet Union and the history of ethnic violence in the area has led to occasional contention as well as positive international relations.

Fostering strong international relations and using diplomacy as a tool for development was crucial for Kyrgyzstan after declaring independence. The country is too small and not developed enough yet to be economically viable without assistance (Pike, 2013). Akayev fostered relationships with China and other nearby countries to establish a free market trade system, and the Kyrgyz government signed an agreement with Russia to ensure economic cooperation (Baiyzbekov, 2016). Akayev turned to building relationships and seeking outside help in order to develop their country's economy (Pike, 2013). The government's efforts to build up the economy through foreign aid and international trade lead to significant external debt and economic downturn (Morozova, 2009). In the early 2000s, Kyrgyzstan was seen as a failing state and their economic weakness led to social and political instability (2009).

Despite the early attempts of the Kyrgyz government to find their place in the international community, corruption and violent rev-

olutions have made it difficult to continue developing the country's foreign diplomacy. Akayev was accused of corruption and removed from office (Signor and Allworth, 2019). His removal from office also ended his travels to befriend other governments. In 2005, the election of president Kurmanbek Bakiyev brought even more corruption and the use of authoritarian practices (2019). The unfair practices of the government at the time drove the people to push back against their government through demonstrations that turned violent. This history of corruption and violence has, to a certain extent, damaged the country's reputation.

Current Diplomatic System

When looking at the current state of Kyrgyzstan's foreign relations and diplomatic system, we can see that it is a young country that is still developing, but the government has made progress to promote democracy and cooperation with foreign governments. Currently, its government is seen as a "weak autocracy" and "managed democracy," and as the country slowly becomes more liberal, it is becoming more of a player in the global community. Since the changes to the constitution in 2010, Kyrgyzstan has been working toward democratization and establishing political, economic, and cultural ties with neighboring countries, global powers, and intergovernmental organizations (Baiyzbekov, 2016). With regard to world politics, the tendency is to establish political and economic alliances, which we can see with Kyrgyzstan's current international relations. Kyrgyzstan's convenient location and its abundant natural resources can be leveraged to strengthen alliances.

Kyrgyzstan is at an advantage because of its geographic location and often finds itself involved in geopolitical strategic competition among global superpowers. Since the country declared independence in the 1990s, Russia and the U.S. have been involved in Kyrgyz foreign affairs (2016). Russia still has a lot of political and cultural influence in Kyrgyzstan. The two countries have strong bilateral economic relations. The former and current presidents of Kyrgyzstan have worked closely with the Russian government on economic policy and strategy (2016). In the early 2000s, the two countries signed a "declaration of eternal friendship, cooperation, and partnership" to solidify the importance of their bilateral cooperation (2016). While the Russia-Kyrgyz partnership resulted in the signing of a free-trade agreement and an improved import-export relationship, Russia lost its prior dominant economic role to

China.

Relations between Kyrgyzstan and the U.S. started off very positive, with the U.S. being one of the first countries to recognize Kyrgyzstan as an independent country and provide humanitarian aid to help the country develop in 1991 (2016). Their relationship changed slightly after the 9/11 attacks when the U.S. decided to pursue its war on terror and opened more military bases in Central Asia. We can see evidence of an unstable relationship in the recent decision of the Trump administration's "travel ban" that prohibits Kyrgyz people from obtaining certain American visas (Kanno-Youngs, 2020). However, the U.S. still has great economic and social influence in Kyrgyzstan. Many U.S.-supported non-governmental organizations assist with development projects and higher education (Baiyzbekov, 2016). Even though the relationship between these two countries is not always positive, they still strive to cooperate.

Involvement and competition from powerful foreign countries can have positive and negative impacts on the development of Kyrgyzstan. Involvement of these great powers can be very beneficial for a young country in order to develop a strong economy as a pillar of true independence. However, the strong involvement of great powers during times of political instability can make the Kyrgyz government and economy somewhat reliant on these other more powerful countries. One of the biggest hurdles for Kyrgyzstan's international relations and diplomacy is to overcome their own internal instability so they do not become dependent on other governments to be politically and economically secure.

Mountain Development in Kyrgyzstan

Now that we have an understanding of Kyrgyzstan's government and international relations, we can look at one of its biggest resources and source of livelihood—the mountains. The majority of the country is mountainous with mountains covering 90 percent of the country, and a large portion of the population lives and works in these regions (Batjargal et al., 2012). Kyrgyzstan is one of several countries within the Tian Shan and Pamir-Alay mountain ranges (Pandey and Misnikov, 2001). As previously mentioned, the Kyrgyz people were nomadic and felt a great connection to the mountains. Even today, roughly two-thirds of the pop-

ulation live and work in rural mountain areas, and much of the nation's economy relies on mountain resources and labor (Signor and Allworth, 2019). Considering how many people live in mountainous areas and how many natural resources are found in these areas, we can see that SMD is critical for Kyrgyzstan's environment, people, and even their foreign relations. This is why Kyrgyzstan was one of the co-sponsors of the Resolution at the UN General Assembly to observe 2002 as the UN International Year of Mountains (IYM). Kyrgyzstan is also a member of and contributes to the efforts of the Mountain Partnership, a subunit of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO-UN), a voluntary alliance of institutions that implements SMD activities globally.

SMD encompasses a wide variety of issues and topics related to physical, economic, and social wellbeing. Of these, the major ones related to sustainable development in Kyrgyzstan are water, agriculture, and preserving cultural heritage. While there is still a lot of progress to be made in all these areas, we can see how the government and mountain communities are working towards more sustainable solutions. SMD is more than just making changes to improve one's own country, it is also an international effort that requires cooperation and diplomacy. Landscapes and environmental issues do not recognize borders. Mountain ranges—especially the mountains in Central Asia—are large and span across several countries. This requires countries in mountainous regions to work together to preserve their ecosystems and share natural resources. There are many ways in which Kyrgyzstan uses international cooperation and diplomacy to promote sustainable mountain development for the benefit of itself and neighboring countries.

Promoting SMD Globally

The biggest step that Kyrgyzstan has taken to address SMD in the international arena is through the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit. Kyrgyzstan directed the attention of the international community to the importance of mountain development and promoted the United Nations IYM in 1998 (Batjargal et al., 2012). Shortly after, in the fall 2002, Kyrgyzstan hosted the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit, where they formed the Bishkek Mountain Platform and reinforced the Mountain Partnership. The Mountain Partnership continues to advocate for sustainable mountain development worldwide (Aidaraliev et al., 2002). The concept of sustainable mountain development was very new at the

time and bringing together many different nations to talk about how they can improve mountain areas was the start to positive, active change for mountain people and their environments. These efforts of a seemingly small country have made big strides in bringing attention to the importance of mountain communities while promoting sustainable development.

Using Diplomacy to Promote Mountain Development

Sustainable development in mountain regions is immensely important because these areas contain very fragile, vulnerable ecosystems and a large portion of the world's population relies on mountain resources. The mountain ranges of Central Asia contain valuable resources needed for the livelihoods of mountain people and lowland communities. One of the most valuable mountain resources is water. About 90 percent of Central Asia relies on water from mountains—more specifically the water supply from glaciers and watersheds (Pandey and Misnikov, 2001). This is more than just drinking water. The water from the mountains also provides irrigation for agriculture and livestock, generating energy from dams (2001). Issues related to water in the mountains can influence the lives in the entire Central Asia region.

The issue of managing water supplies in mountain regions demonstrates the importance of using diplomacy to promote sustainable mountain development. Due to their geographic proximity and shared history, the countries of Central Asia must cooperate to share certain resources such as water that flows from glaciers in the Kyrgyz mountains to lowland communities in Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan (Batjargal et al., 2012). With rising temperatures, affecting the climate in fragile, high altitude areas, the capacity to store water is shrinking and this requires strategic water storage solutions. If the rivers coming from the mountains are dammed to store water, that may reduce the water supply to other countries. To avoid causing widespread water shortages in surrounding countries, Kyrgyzstan's government must collaborate with neighboring countries to come up with a plan that is sustainable for the entire region.

There are many ways in which regional cooperation is used to solve issues of water supply and storage. One method in which diplomacy and international cooperation were used to promote water sup-

plies in mountain regions was through the Establishment of the Central Asian Regional Glaciological Center under UNESCO (Batjargal et al., 2012). This project was started in Kazakhstan with the intention of monitoring snowfall and glacial runoff in the mountains (Severskiy, 2008). It would track patterns and changes to the climate in the region to help understand how much water was stored in mountains and how much flowed to lowland regions (2008).

While this program is useful in developing plans to help water storage, the long-term solution to water issues in mountain regions is to try slowing the effects of climate change. The countries of Central Asia show a willingness to agree on more green policies to address climate change. To take collaborative action to fight climate change, a ministerial conference in Berlin launched the “Green Central Asia” initiative to encourage networking among nations to pursue stability and climate security (Gotev, 2020). So far, the talks focus on regional cooperation and green economy projects. This type of international cooperation is important in addressing environmental threats because these issues cannot be contained by borders; these issues affect everyone, regardless of nationality.

In addition to physical development in mountain regions, we must also take into consideration the importance of human development. Mountain history and culture are important resources kept alive by the people in the region. They try to preserve their heritage and live separately from modern, urban cities (Pandey and Misnikov, 2001). Living in rural mountainous areas is very difficult, and as people focus more on developing urban areas, mountain people are left at a disadvantage. The lack of human development in these areas makes life in mountains unsustainable, forcing people to migrate to lowland areas. Without people living in highland communities, the land will lose their caretakers and the communities will lose the protectors of their cultural heritage. These resources, as well as many others, demonstrate the importance of mountain communities and why we should care about protecting and sustaining the livelihoods of mountain people.

The main factors to consider when trying to measure and improve human development are health, education, and the income of the population (Aidaraliev et al., 2002). Separation from the attention of the capital and the convenience of a lowland community can put mountain

people at a distinct disadvantage. In a country where there are many people living in rural, high altitude areas that are far from the capital, people need to rely more on their immediate community and local governments for development and cooperation (Pandey and Misnikov, 2001). Teaching communities to rely on themselves to develop and mobilize their own resources can help improve the environment in rural areas and strengthen local economies (2001). Promoting human development for mountain people will improve directly, their livelihoods, and indirectly, the livelihoods of lowland communities.

When creating programs and policies for mountain communities, we also need to consider the different ways of life for mountain people. Almost every mountain community has its own unique culture and way of living. The relative isolation of living in the mountains keeps people separated from modern changes to society, preserving the traditions, culture, and heritage of mountain people (Aidaraliev et al., 2002). As such, the programs and policies for sustainable development that work in urban areas will not be as effective or realistic when applied to mountain communities. Because of this isolation, the fragility of their ecosystem, and the overall differences in culture, mountain communities rarely become a “center for economic activity” (2002). The lack of economic groups and resources from their country’s capital can lead to disproportionate levels of poverty, migration, broken social links, and conflicts (2002).

Promoting sustainable development and human development can improve the quality of life for mountain people. Improving the livelihoods and development of mountain people became a priority for Kyrgyzstan, and then the international community, in the 1990s when the concept of sustainable mountain development was first introduced. In 1997, the National Strategy of Sustainable Human Development in the Kyrgyz Republic recognized that poverty, isolation, and the lower quality of education in mountain areas was a “national threat” and the government started actively trying to fix the problem (2002). In 1998, a national center was established to work on developing mountain regions with the help of scientific centers, agencies, and other institutions to solve problems related to mountain regions (2002). The IYM under the UN in 2002 was an excellent platform to promote this new agenda and these ideas quickly spread beyond just Kyrgyzstan. Human development in mountain areas across the world is now seen with the help of

government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and local communities.

United Nations Sustainable Development Goals

The efforts made by the Kyrgyz government to pursue sustainable mountain development meet the standards of many of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The practical implementation for Kyrgyzstan's mountain development would apply under three special targets under SDG 6, ensuring sustainable management of water, and SDG 15, on preserving diverse forms of life on land. Issues related to water and SDG 13 to combat climate change should be addressed together because of how much climate change impacts water supplies. As stated in UN SDG 6, there are "...threats to water security and the increasing frequency and severity of droughts and floods resulting from climate change" (Sustainable Development Goals, 2015). We cannot create a long-term solution to water issues without taking action to fight climate change. The countries of Central Asia are working together to achieve both of these goals through their initiatives to monitor water supply and flow from mountains and their Green Central Asia initiative.

With regard to human development, Kyrgyzstan is pursuing goals related to SDGs 4 and 10. SDG 4 seeks to "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education....," which we can see in Kyrgyzstan's efforts to improve the quality of education for mountain people (2015). The Kyrgyz government acknowledged that low-quality education is an actual threat to the country's development. Making an effort to educate people in rural areas will improve not only the development of said rural communities, but also the country as a whole. The better educated people are, the better they are able to serve and improve their communities. Having a lower quality of education can also negatively impact Kyrgyzstan's future opportunities to be a global influence. Along with the programs to improve the livelihoods of mountain people, we can see efforts made towards SDG 10, which focuses on reducing inequality within and among countries. We can see inequality in Kyrgyzstan between people living in urban, metropolitan areas and people living in rural, mountainous areas. Giving more attention to mountain people and helping sustain their way of life can bridge the gap between lowland and highland communities. Additionally, providing a quality education for everyone in the country helps promote equality for the Kyrgyz people, and

make Kyrgyzstan equal with other developed, educated countries.

Kyrgyzstan is also demonstrating a desire to pursue SDG 17: “strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development” (2015). This is evident in the country’s desire to build stronger international relations and use diplomacy to promote their goals. Sustainable development is about so much more than just one country’s agenda. In order to actually preserve the environment and communities, there needs to be international cooperation. Kyrgyzstan provides many examples of how to use mechanisms such as diplomacy and regional and international agreements to achieve their objectives.

Conclusion

Kyrgyzstan’s desire to use foreign relations to promote its sustainable mountain development agenda demonstrates how an independent state can contribute to building a more sustainable livelihood on an international scale. The country had a difficult start after the fall of the Soviet Union and dealing with widespread corruption. But people of Kyrgyzstan have been able to work through some of their initial problems to build a more democratic nation with support from other countries. The progress in building strong international relations with neighboring countries has proven to be useful in pursuing Kyrgyzstan’s sustainable mountain development goals. Regional agreements and cooperation help to protect the mountain environment and support from intergovernmental organizations promote human development in these regions as well.

Aidaraliev, A. et al. (2002). Human Development in Mountain Regions of Kyrgyzstan. United National Development Program. <http://www.undp.kg/publications>

Baiyzbekov, Azamat, “The Eurasian Agenda: The International Relations of Kyrgyzstan” (2016). Master’s Theses. 214. <https://repository.usfca.edu/thes/214>

Batjargal, E. et al. (2012). Sustainable Mountain Development in Central Asia. University of Central Asia: Mountain Societies Research Centre. <https://ucentralasia.org/Content/Downloads/web-CAF-Central-Asia-Mountains.pdf>

Gotev, Georgi “Germany launches ‘Green Central Asia’ initiative” Jan. 28, 2020, Retrieved from: <https://www.euractiv.com/section/central-asia/news/germany-launches-green-central-asia-initiative/>

Kanno-Youngs, Zonlan “Trump Administration Adds Six Countries to Travel Ban” January 31, 2020, Retrieved from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/31/us/politics/trump-travel-ban.html?searchResultPosition=2>

Morozova, I. (2009). External powers’ influence upon the reform and political elites in present Kyrgyzstan. *Caucasian Review of International Affairs*, 1, 86.

Murzakulova, A., & Schoeberlein, J. (2009). The Invention of Legitimacy: Struggles in Kyrgyzstan to Craft an Effective Nation-State Ideology. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 61(7), 1229–1248. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uvu.edu/10.1080/09668130903068756>

Pandey, K. and Misnikov, Y. (2001). Decentralization and Community Development: Strengthening Local Participation in the Mountain Villages of Kyrgyzstan. *Mountain Research and Development*, 21(3), 226–230.

Pike, J. (2013). Kyrgyzstan- Central Asian Neighbors. Global Security Retrieved from: <https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/central->

asia/kyrgyz-forrel-neighbors.htm

Pike, J. (2013). Kyrgyz Republic- Foreign Relations. Global Security Retrieved from: <https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/centralasia/kyrgyz-forrel.htm>

Severskiy, I. (2008). Establishment of Central Asian Regional Glaciological Center under the auspices of UNESCO. Kazakh National Academy of Science. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000159448>

Signor, D. and Allworth, A. (2019). Kyrgyzstan. Encyclopedia Britannica, Retrieved from: <https://www.britannica.com/place/Kyrgyzstan>

Sustainable Development Goals (2015). Sustainable Development Goals Knowledge Platform. Retrieved from: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/?menu=1300>

Sustainable Mountain Development in Lebanon: Tourism and the Lebanese Mountain Trail

By: Jonathan Downs

Jonathan Downs is a junior at Utah Valley University studying political science (global politics), national security, and languages (French and German). His interest lies in the Middle East - North Africa region. He enjoys public diplomacy and has shown this through his co-drafting of a UN-published document (see page 10) on mountain women and his organization of various events, including a forum discussing the strategic partnership between the Utah National Guard and the Government of Morocco. In addition to this published work on Lebanon, he is active in his research on Berber nationalism in Morocco. Outside of academics Jon is actively involved on campus as president of the volleyball team. Jon plans to pursue a career in the Foreign Service.

Sustainable Mountain Development (SMD) has become a more widespread initiative started by the UN during the Rio Earth Summit in 1992. Since then, mountainous countries have implemented various mechanisms to protect ecosystems, rural mountain communities, and reduce poverty in order to focus on sustainable development that will benefit future generations. Lebanon, a small, mountainous country adjacent to the Mediterranean Sea, has implemented ecotourism through the Lebanese Mountain Trail (LMT). How has this ecotourism initiative in the mountains of Lebanon impacted mountain communities and biodiversity? Is the initiative sustainable? After closely examining the conditions of the LMT and the various actors at play, one can see that the LMT has been an effective mechanism of SMD through its preservation of Lebanese biodiversity and its economic support for mountain communities. With it being the success that it is, the LMT could use its best practice measures to be implemented in other mountain communities seeking to sustainably develop through ecotourism mechanism.

Chapter 13: Sustainable Mountain Development

It is important to first define Sustainable Mountain Develop-

ment and establish the basis for which goals have been implemented worldwide before we evaluate Lebanon's success in approaching and solving them. "Sustainable Mountain Development" was first addressed in Chapter 13 of Agenda 21 during The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED, also known as Rio Earth Summit) in 1992. Agenda 21 focuses on sustainable development issues, while this chapter "Managing Fragile Ecosystems: Sustainable Mountain Development," focuses on the unique importance of mountain areas and the need to focus on sustainable development in these fragile ecosystems. Chapter 13 for the first time was able to bring to light these key principles:

13.1. Mountains are an important source of water, energy and biological diversity. Furthermore, they are a source of such key resources as minerals, forest products and agricultural products and of recreation. As a major ecosystem representing the complex and interrelated ecology of our planet, mountain environments are essential to the survival of the global ecosystem. Mountain ecosystems are, however, rapidly changing. They are susceptible to accelerated soil erosion, landslides and rapid loss of habitat and genetic diversity. On the human side, there is widespread poverty among mountain inhabitants and loss of indigenous knowledge. As a result, most global mountain areas are experiencing environmental degradation. Hence, the proper management of mountain resources and socio-economic development of the people deserves immediate action.

13.2. About 10 percent of the world's population depends on mountain resources. A much larger percentage draws on other mountain resources, including and especially water. Mountains are a storehouse of biological diversity and endangered species.

13.3. Two programme areas are included in this chapter to further elaborate the problem of fragile ecosystems with regard to all mountains of the world. These are:

- (a) Generating and strengthening knowledge about the ecology and sustainable development of mountain ecosystems;
- (b) Promoting integrated watershed development and alternative livelihood opportunities.

Chapter 13 is crucial to sustainable mountain development progress. This document institutionalized the reliance of mountains on the globe

and created frameworks for implementation through financing, scientific research, human resource management, and capacity-building. Through these frameworks, countries such as Lebanon had international support and international expertise to address sustainable development in their country.

Sustainable Mountain Development in Lebanon

Lebanon is a country located along the Mediterranean coast and bordered by Syria to the north and east, and Israel to the west. Familiar to the region, Lebanon has seen its own political unrest with civil war and sectarian divides conflicting the countries for decades. Although the current political landscape is less hostile, Lebanon still ranks high on the Transparency International's Corruption List at 137 out of 180 countries. (Lebanon). Further, 68% of Lebanese think "most or all government officials are involved in corruption" (Martinez et al. 12). Corruption levels and distrust in government limit the ability of the government to enact meaningful sustainable mountain development initiatives and will remain a large barrier to meaningful development in the coming years.

Examining the geography of the country, "Lebanon's beauty is illuminated by its geography, its narrow coastal plane and two parallel north/south mountains (the mountains of Lebanon and anti-Lebanon). The fertile Bekaa Valley, with its Litani and Orontes Rivers, separates these mountains and nourishes the terrain" ("Geography & Climate"). The majority of the country is connected to the mountain regions that run through the country. Mountains are vital to this country and thus SMD is an important aspect of their sustainable development.

Lebanon adopted Agenda 21 and placed the Ministry of Agriculture in charge of Chapter 13. However, most SMD initiatives have been carried out by NGOs or The United States Agency for International Development (USAID). Lebanon's focus on Chapter 13 is more directly tied to rural development and natural resource management. This is still no major focus on mountains in particular, rather there are different approaches that address needs such as water resource management, deforestation, etc. that are directly tied to SMD. This is a major weakness in Lebanon's sustainability efforts. A more encompassing approach, rather than ad hoc efforts in various government agencies and minis-

tries, would allow the country to have a more sustained and collaborative approach that could directly address the many needs of mountain communities and mountain development.

Lebanon and the greater Middle East are especially vulnerable to future climatic changes that will affect their mountain regions. A Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation report found that:

climate change impacts predicted for the Middle East and North Africa are far-reaching and include an increase by 2.2 to 5.1 °C of the mean annual temperature in the southern and eastern Mediterranean; a decrease in river flows; long-term salinization of inland aquifers; the loss of vast amounts of farmland suitable for rainfed agriculture; a decrease in the yields of major food crops; extinction of countless wild species (Ariza et al. 57).

As the report showed, mountains will face increasing difficulties with climate change. Lebanon needs to begin addressing these future problems in order to mitigate future conflict from these results. A more collaborative approach that focuses on mountain communities is a crucial step to addressing these problems.

One challenge common among mountain countries is that mountains primarily represent rural regions. Experiencing specific challenges in building infrastructure, harsh environments, and limited agricultural output ability, mountain communities largely remain less developed and are economically poorer. To many, mountains are seen as little more than raw materials. This limits the ability mountain communities have in raising economic resources to support sustainable mountain development.

Additionally, for Lebanon, sectarian divide and government conflicts have caused the majority of the successes from sustainable mountain development to be through NGOs, USAID, and other non-state actors using locals to implement goals. Although one would hope the government will increase support in these efforts, it is important to appreciate the success the non-state actors have had. It shows that community efforts without government oversight can have success and could be implemented in other mountain regions where the government does not have a vested interest or cannot economically support

SMD initiatives. Although FAO-UN has reported that “there are some social, economic, and cultural incentives for farmers in mountain areas to undertake conservation” (“Lebanon Country Profile” 29). SMD initiatives have seen more through NGO and schools in collaboration with local communities to address “reforestation and public awareness activities” (29).

Mountains in Lebanon are at risk of exploitation of resources, deforestation, loss of biodiversity, and migration of mountain communities to lowland areas, further exacerbating urban difficulties in the country. Recently, the British newspaper, *The Independent*, published an article highlighting the destruction of mountains in pursuit of urban sprawl. Quarries were digging “millions of tons of sand and rocks” to make way for high-rise apartment buildings. The article highlights the plight in Lebanon, “the destruction of Lebanon’s mountains has attracted little interest in the local press and none outside” (Fisk 2018). In other words, there is little publicity to bring awareness of the mountain troubles. The risks faced by mountain communities cannot be addressed if most Lebanese do not know the problem even exists. One solution to address this problem could be found in the Lebanese Mountain Trail (LMT). The Lebanese Mountain Trail is a hiking trail that traverses the country, extending from Aandqet in the north to Marjaayoun in the south. It covers more than 292 miles and goes through more than 76 towns and villages. The trail is designed so that you can hike the entire trail with adequate places to stop to sleep or choose specific sections along the trail. (“Lebanon Trail”) The United States Agency for International Development has “supported the development and promotion of rural and ecological tourism destinations in Lebanon since 2003” (“Sustainable Rural”). Funding was provided through an initial grant of “\$3.3 million to implement the LMT over a two-year period” (“Lebanon Trail”). Internationally, the trail has gained widespread publicity in recent years. National Geographic, Lonely Planet, *The Guardian*, sectionhiker.com, worldtrailsnetwork.org, afar.com, theculturetrip.com and many others have publicized the trail and highlighted its beauty and cultural heritage.

Although it has become immensely popular, does that mean that the Lebanese Mountain Trail is an effective mechanism for sustainable tourism and sustainable mountain development? To evaluate its effectiveness in addressing sustainable mountain development, we will use

the four major components of sustainable mountain tourism suggested by Wendy Brewer Lama and Nikhat Sattar (Price et al.). The Four Major Components of Sustainable Mountain Tourism are:

1. Tourism should be one, and not the only, means of livelihood and economic development in diversified mountain economies.
2. The benefits and opportunities arising from mountain tourism must flow consistently and in adequate proportions to mountain peoples.
3. The impacts of tourism on biodiversity and cultural diversity must be well documented, minimized, and managed, and a portion of tourism revenue reinvested in conservation and restoration of bioresources, cultural heritage, and sacred sites.
4. Mountain peoples must play an active and responsible role in planning and carrying out mountain tourism, supported by other stakeholders and networks, by government policies and actions, and by technical and capacity-building assistance. (112).

One success in the LMT is that it was planned and initiated at the local level and brought in multiple stakeholders. “We worked in close partnership with all relevant stakeholders, in particular community-based organizations, local tour operators, trail municipalities, and government agencies (in particular the Ministries of Tourism and Environment and the Lebanese Army’s Directorate of Geographic Affairs)” (“Lebanon Trail”). This multi-faceted approach helped because it allows those who are directly affected by the tourism-the local community- to have an impact on the way the trail would function.

Another component that helped in its success was modeling after an already successful trail to learn best practices, and then from there cater to the local, specificity needs. One of the creators of the LMT, Joseph Karam notes that “one day, in the summer of 2002, it struck me that the mountains of Lebanon, with their unique natural and cultural heritage, could be the home of a wonderful long-distance hiking trail similar to the Appalachian Trail. The LMT idea was hence born” (“Lebanon Trail”). Modeling after the established Appalachian trail in the eastern United States, they “received guidance from the Appalachian Trail Conservancy, the United States Forest Service, and the International Ecotourism Society” (Laylin). The founders, Joseph Karam and Karim El-Jisr were able to learn best practices in managing a trail of

this nature and how to connect it to rural communities to support local economies.

Let us examine the effectiveness of the Lebanese Mountain Trail through the four major components. The first component addresses that tourism should not be the only economic opportunity in mountain communities. This component is important because although “tourism... provides income to mountain dwellers from the sale of handicrafts, carpets, and other local products” handicrafts cannot sustain a livelihood (Ariza et al. 56). The LMT also benefits communities economically through tour guides, “adoption” of trails, and membership to the LMT Association (LMTA). However, Lebanon can still improve in this area.

Component two indicates that the opportunity and benefits of tourism must benefit the local communities. This is something that the LMT does very well and has been part of the basis from the trail’s founding. The entire focus of the LMT has been protecting the environment and protecting the livelihood of mountain communities. “The LMTA has trained the guides you hire in each village that take trekkers along each stage” (Gould). Each section’s guide provides local expertise and unique insight on the cultural aspects that dot the diverse country. The trail traverses Shi’a, Sunni, Druze, Maronite, and Christian communities.

Component three notes the importance of revenue reinvesting in preservation and conservation. The LMT does this through its education program. Their education program aims to (1) develop activities to promote behavior change on the trail (2) define LMT topics for students’ thesis and (3) develop publications to incorporate “trial to Every Classroom” in education institutions. (“Lebanon Trail”). Further, biodiversity is tracked and there are limits to the amount of travelers allowed on a portion of the trail on a given day (through the issuance of permits). However, very little has been done to see what potential impact tourism brings to changing the ways of the communities who live there. It has however sought to “map cultural and heritage sites on the LMT to improve their conservation” (“Lebanon Trail”). It is important to note as well that although tourism brings economic benefit to the area, it also “puts additional stress on water resources, increases environmental degradation and in some instances causes cultural perturbations by

violating local customs” (Ariza et al. 56). With this in mind, the LMT has sought to address some of these issues but must do more.

Component four again highlights the importance of the local communities, in coordination with other stakeholders and governments. The LMT does well to address the needs of the community and various stakeholders. Through its collaborative approach it has brought together “approximately 50 municipalities and 10 NGOs in trail-side communities” (“Sustainable Rural”). However, it has seen little success with government coordination. The trail was initially funded through USAID and private donors, and other initiatives have been funded by NGOs and other actors. The LMT has and will continue to push for greater governmental support, specifically in legal measures that would protect the mountain regions from development. Villeneuve et al. (Price et al.) additionally suggest specific aspects of sustainable mountain development initiatives that are necessary to their effectiveness. The Lebanese Mountain Trail is successful in incorporating these suggestions into their efforts, namely:

(1) Creating policies and institutions that attempt to meet the needs of local populations. (196) The LMT has collaborated with NGOs and trailside community partners. As written under “Conservation and development of economic opportunities on the LMT,” the LMT Association has created “...an effective and active partnership, collaboration and coordination with the trailside communities, namely the municipalities, the youth clubs and the environmental activists and associations” (“Lebanon Trail”).

(2) Preserving mountain ecosystems and the cultural identity of their population (196). The LMT preserves both culture and the ecosystem because the tourism it generates is for the natural beauty and to learn more about the unique mountain cultures. Users of the trail are able to enjoy the natural beauty around them while hiking, and then through the connections with the mountain communities they stay in lodging that is hosted by local communities. This has helped with protecting the unique biodiversity in Lebanon. Further, the communities are able to share about their culture, and additionally control the responsible management of resources, since travelers do not need to provide for their necessities, such as firewood, that is normally necessary when camping.

(3) Enhancing the indigenous knowledge and traditional tech-

niques (196) Conservation efforts to maintain the LMT use “LMTA and the local stakeholders in the target area, through networking and sharing experiences in nature and trail conservation” (“Lebanon Trail”).

(4) Mountain-community participation in the decision-making process (197) USAID grant funding of the LMT project “engaged approximately 50 municipalities and 10 NGOs in trail-side communities who now are invested in ensuring its sustainability as a protected national treasure” (“Sustainable Rural”).

(5) Improving the living conditions of mountain populations (197) The LMT has “...provided training for local guides, established multiple guesthouses” (“Sustainable Rural”) which has provided economic security for mountain peoples and helped to improve their impoverished conditions.

In summary, the LMT has helped preserve the culture of the mountain communities, provided economic incentive for mountain sustainability, preserved biodiversity, and implemented sustainable mountain development highlighted in Chapter 13 of the Agenda 21. The positive impact of the trail is plentiful. However, one major concern looms. “Like many natural areas in Lebanon, [the LMT] is constantly under threat by unregulated development” In essence, the impactful NGO and local initiative can only go so far. Without legal frameworks to protect the natural environment, development will continue to push farther into the mountains and near the trail. This degradation may cause the LMT to lose what made it popular in the first place—a chance to return to the beauty of the mountains and approach the nature and cultural heritage of Lebanon.

The LMT has been a success in sustainable mountain development and benefits stakeholders in rural mountain communities as well as conservation efforts. With its success it could become a guideline for best practices in other mountain regions. Although individual specificities will vary, mountain tourism relies on its natural beauty which is present in all mountain regions. Unique cultural history will also be a draw to any tourism initiatives. Tourism, responsibly managed, will give communities an economic alternative to agriculture, logging, mining, etc. The LMT is an example of how multiple actors can work together to preserve and protect both the ecosystem and the mountain livelihood. The LMT could now follow the suggestion of Villeneuve et al. (Price et

al.) and disseminate “the successful results of sustainable mountain development” (198) that the LMT exemplifies to “...all the decision makers and actors concerned” (198). This will allow others to recreate similar projects that can benefit their mountain communities and ecosystems.

Works Cited

Ariza C., Maselli D. and Kohler T. 2013. Mountains: Our Life, Our Future. Progress and Perspectives on Sustainable Mountain Development from Rio 1992 to Rio 2012 and Beyond. Bern, Switzerland: Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Centre for Development and Environment (CDE). 90 pp.

Fisk, R. (2018, June 8). 'Lebanon's mountains are being wiped from the map by a growing mafia - so why doesn't anyone care?'. Retrieved from <https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/lebanon-mountains-environmental-destruction-quarrying-construction-industry-beirut-why-a8388006.html>

Geography & Climate. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.lebanonconsulatela.org/about-lebanon/geography-climate.html>

Gould, K. (2013, April 26). Walking the Lebanon Mountain Trail. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/travel/2013/apr/26/lebanon-mountain-trail-walking-holiday>

Laylin, T. (2012, January 23). Lebanon's 275 Mile Mountain Trail is a World Class Hiking Destination. Retrieved from <https://www.greenprophet.com/2012/01/lebanon-mountain-trail/>

Lebanon. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.transparency.org/country/LBN>

Lebanon Country Profile Johannesburg Summit 2002, Lebanon Country Profile Johannesburg Summit 2002 (2002).

Lebanon Trail. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.lebanontrail.org/#!/home>

Martinez, R., Kukutschka, B., & Vrushi, J. (2019). Global Corruption Barometer Middle East & North Africa 2019: Citizens' Views And Experiences Of Corruption. Transparency International.

Price, M. F., Jansky, L., & Iatsenia, A. A. (2004). Key issues for mountain areas. New York:

United Nations University Press.

Sustainable Rural and Ecological Tourism. (2013, March 21). Retrieved from <https://www.usaid.gov/lebanon/sustainable-rural-and-ecological-tourism>

The Tarahumara People

By: Jocelyn Lujan

Jocelyn Lujan graduated from Utah Valley University in the Spring of 2019. Jocelyn majored in Political Science with an emphasis in International Relations. She also had the great opportunity to participate in UVU's Model United Nations course. Jocelyn interned in the Utah State Legislature, U.S. Senate, and other various political and legal fields. She is currently working for a nonprofit that works collaboratively with Local Churches, Community Providers, and Adventist Agencies to plan, develop, implement, and evaluate community-based ministry and sustainable outreach programs throughout the States of Utah and Nevada. Jocelyn is pursuing her Juris Doctor degree knowing the more diverse the profession becomes, the more she can empower communities in need.

History

The Tarahumara

The Rarámuri, also known as the Tarahumara, are a group of indigenous people of the Americas living in the state of Chihuahua, Mexico. They are one of the largest indigenous tribes in North America and are renowned for their long-distance running abilities and their lifestyle. Their main language comes from the Uto-Aztecan family. The beautiful language is unfortunately dying since Spanish, the official language, is more widely adopted throughout Mexico. The tribal population is estimated around 100,000 people who still practice traditional lifestyles and inhabit natural shelters such as caves, cliff overhangs, and homes made of wood or stone. While agriculture comprises the majority of the local economy, many of the Tarahumaras still practice transhumance, raising cattle and other livestock.

The word Rarámuri means “runners on foot” or “those who run fast” in their native language. They have developed a tradition of long-distance running up to 200 miles in one session over two days through the rough canyon country. They rely on their skills for communication, transportation, and hunting. “[W]alking and running long distances are necessary parts of life for the Tarahumara” (Culture and

History, 2019).

The Tarahumara often hunt with bow and arrows, but are also known for their ability to run down deer and wild turkeys. Anthropologist Jonathan F. Cassel describes the Tarahumara hunting abilities: “the Tarahumara literally run the birds to death in what is referred to as persistent hunting. Forced into a rapid series of takeoffs, without sufficient rest periods between, the heavy-bodied bird does not have the strength to fly or run away from the hunter.”

The main crops harvested are maize, beans, greens, squash, and tobacco. . Meat constitutes less than five percent of their diet. Rather, they depend on beans for their protein. Around 70 percent of their diet involves corn. (Culture and History, 2019)

Resistance to the Spanish Inquisition

When the Spaniards arrived in the 16th century, the Tarahumaras retreated to high sierras and canyons such as the Copper Canyon in the Sierra Madre Occidental. This is why the Tarahumara were never fully conquered or fully converted by the Jesuit missionaries. However, the Tarahumara developed a hybridized Christian and shamanistic religion over time.

Missions were established during the 17th century to expand territory, enslave the people, colonize the land, and encourage conversion to Catholicism. The Tarahumara waged war against the Spanish, leading to a split of the tribe into two groups and pushing them deeper to the highlands of the Copper Canyon. Some were integrated and baptized in the Christian population and others followed Teporaca, the leader who attempted to drive the Spaniards out of the tribal land. Ultimately, the Tarahumara lost the war. This area is now known as the Sierra Tarahumara.

For the last 400 years, multiple cultures have influenced the Tarahumara — the conquistadors and the missionaries were only the beginning. “Today’s Tarahumara has adopted many elements of Mexican material culture, and continually encounters the demands of ethnic tourism and a booming narcotics industry” (Culture and History, 2019). Many times their lives are at stake and they are left with no other option

but to “modernize” their living style.

When Mexico won its independence from Spain in 1821, their government continued to encourage citizens to move further into the Chihuahua territory, resulting in the Tarahumara retreating further into the Copper Canyon. To this day, the Mexican government, miners, tourists, and drug wars have plagued the indigenous peoples.

During the 1870s, the Tarahumara were exploited as a cheap labor source for mining and other upland timber industry, causing the indigenous people to once again retreat even further into the canyons. Many Tarahumara were still “Mexicanized.”

Western influences introduced fast food such as potato chips, Coca Cola, and beer to the traditional corn and beans diet. These items are bought from selling “folk art” such as textiles, wood carvings, and dolls to tourists. The traditional cotton clothing styles are also slowly being replaced by denim jeans and other modern styles.

Mexico's Profile

According to the Central Intelligence Agency website, Mexico is saturated with different types of civilizations such as the Olmec, Toltec, Teotihuacan, Maya, and Aztec. It was conquered and colonized by Spain, but Mexico achieved independence in the early 19th century. Andres Manuel Lopez Obrador, former mayor of Mexico City, is the sitting president.

Mexico has faced myriad challenges since gaining independence, most recently “the global financial crisis in late 2008 [which] caused a massive economic downturn” (CIA, 2019). This exacerbated existing economic and social concerns such as low wages, underemployment, inequitable income distribution, and few advancement opportunities for the largely indigenous population. The Tarahumara face even more challenges than regular citizens, especially considering their remote location.

One of the bigger transnational issues stated by the CIA are refugees and internally displaced persons. Over 55,000 Venezuelans have claimed asylum or have received alternative legal stay in Mexico (CIA,

2019). There are also over 338,000 internally displaced peoples affected by drug cartel violence, as well as violence between and within the indigenous groups (CIA 2019).

The Copper Canyon

The Copper Canyon, where the Tarahumara reside, is one of a dozen massive canyons in this part of the Sierra Madre. In fact, “several of them are deeper than the Grand Canyon” (Gorney, 2008). Mexico varies in climate from tropical to desert and is home to rugged mountains with low coastal plains and high plateaus.

The Copper Canyon is located south of Tucson, Arizona with incredible photographic opportunities of nature and the indigenous, colorful Tarahumara. Prominent along the canyon cliffs are the homes built in caves and on rock outcroppings. The Canyon comprises six different canyons and is four times the size of the Grand Canyon, which provides a great deal of safety to the tribe. “[T]his expansive canyon has provided refuge for the Tarahumara for over ten thousand years” (Stolte, 2007). They sought refuge in the past, and still to this day, from the overreaching government, the society which attempts to conform them to modernity, and the harsh climate.

These mountainous regions have a moderate temperature from October to November and March to April. Drought is a more serious problem from April through June, with very little rainfall until July when the rainy season begins. The indigenous group benefits from this climate, but it also comes with more migratory issues that can lead them to seek refuge from the climate further into the canyon. Due to an increase in population, there are many threats to the Tarahumara region. Roads, government funding for “tourist-friendly” atmospheres, agriculture, illegal logging, and the narcotics cartels heavily affect the ecosystem and the Tarahumara livelihoods.

Tarahumara

With the Tarahumara being the main inhabitants, acceptance of the long-debated changes to the canyon has long been overlooked. Living in mountainous areas exposes the tribe to a variety of threats. Debates and dialogue are held, but only at locations far from where the

Tarahumara reside. Improving the lives and maintaining the cultures of the mountain peoples should be a priority not only for the State of Chihuahua, but at the national level as well. The main vision would be a place in which sustainable mountain development for the Tarahumara receives greater public and private sector attention, with commitment and investments.

Why is protecting and supporting indigenous tribes and their traditional way of life important? Mountainous peoples are among the world's poorest and hungriest people in developing countries. Deforestation and badly managed tourism can endanger livelihoods and increase desertification, which threatens biodiversity. Oftentimes, the mountainous people possess the most knowledge and best practices in enhancing and managing mountain ecosystems, but often their voices are silenced (Mountain Partnership, 2015).

The different efforts in creating sustainable mountain development from local government to the United Nations level will be reviewed in-depth. The purpose of this essay is to analyze what, if anything, is being done at all levels of government to create and maintain a healthy, sustainable living condition for the mountainous population and what more can be done.

Current Living Conditions

The Copper Canyon seems a spectacular and daunting wilderness for those unfamiliar with the territory. For the Tarahumara, it is their homeland in which they have beaten their trails to the furthest corners of the landscape, learning its secrets and making a living from the steep and stony ground. William L. Merrill, curator of anthropology at the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of Natural History states, "[t]hey remain the most traditional of all native peoples in North America" (Roberts, 1998). Of the estimated 70,000 Tarahumara, around 50,000 live in hamlets and farmsteads scattered around the canyon. Before the arrival of the Spaniards, their homeland was twice as large (Roberts, 1998).

During the warmer months, they spend their time in different areas than in the colder months. During the winter, they have no choice but to move to their second homes inside rock shelters in order for their

sheep and goats to survive. Livestock introduced by the Spanish transformed the Tarahumara economy and way of life. They seldom milk their cows or goats and rarely slaughter them for food. The livestock is valued for their ability to fertilize everywhere from small fields to high mountains.

One of the biggest challenges to the lifestyle of the Tarahumara is tourism, often referred to as “a two-edged sword” (Merrill). Tourism is valued because it gives a market for craftsmanship, food, and other goods. At the same time, it oppresses the people and treats them like a centerpiece of exhibition instead of focusing attention on actual life that needs to be valued and respected.

Toxic tourism

As previously noted, the Tarahumara have grappled with oppressive policies from locals and the government for decades. The tribe continues to be a lower priority for the government. According to Mexican tourism officials, the Tarahumara are major beneficiaries of government-sponsored tourism. The indigenous group views it differently, as specific projects and studies to provide access to clean water or health services, for example, have made little headway.

Although many visitors seek out the remote mountains and canyons to enjoy what the Tarahumara and others describe as the “magical experiences,” the megaproyecto, this is a potential threat to their survival – along with the current gold-mining, the illegal logging, and drug trafficking gangs, and the intrusions of mestizo ranchers (Barry, 2015).

The government-sponsored megaproject has been in the works since the mid-1990s. “New roads, a large airport, and an adventure park located on the scenic rim of the Barrancas Copper Canyon are now open; still to come are luxury hotels, a golf course, and an aqueduct that will pump water to the tourist complex” (Barry, 2015). The World Bank funded the project, with promises that it would vastly improve living conditions for the tribe. Because of the vibrant culture, the colorful dress, and primitive living conditions, the Tarahumara were simply a centerpiece of the exhibition for the official plans. They were treated as pawns to lure more tourism.

This is not to say that the project was a failure. By some measures, the project was very successful. With exceptional views, wider and deeper than the Grand Canyon, tourism is booming and the benefits are now being questioned by the indigenous groups. “Many of which depended economically on the sale of their baskets and other crafts...but the indigenous now claim that the project is a ‘white elephant’ trampling their rights” (Barry, 2015). The confluence of different parties has exacerbated agrarian conflicts, which has resulted in the deterioration of the collective rights not only of the Tarahumara, but other indigenous peoples such as the Odami, Tepehuan, Pima, and Warijio (Making Space for Peace, 2017).

It is important to note and remember the lack of studies done about advocacy for Tarahumara lives. When planning industrialization, they must be treated with respect and consulted with to make sure the minority is being represented. These plans create a healthier relationship and sustainable development not only for the country, but for the Tarahumara way of life. A planning goal should be to ensure that both parties are major beneficiaries.

Women Vulnerabilities

Money is usually not a driving force in the Tarahumara economy; a continued bartering system is what helps the Tarahumara acquire many goods and services. “[W]hen individuals need help on their land, workers are “hired” to perform whatever tasks are needed in a service called a Tesguinada” (Culture and History, 2019). In return for the help, the employer provides food and tesguino, a corn-based drink that is prized by the Tarahumara.

This co-optive labor is used various times for whatever items may be needed. “[N]o Tarahumara will think twice to loan goods or services to another individual in the community” (Culture and History, 2019). This concept is so fundamentally ingrained in the Tarahumara culture that the refusal of help will result in excommunication from the community and thus, all individuals seem to have similar social standing.

This work is necessary for survival, but they lack a certain intrinsic moral merit. Women may open their palm in the populated city for

what they call Korima, which usually implies that it is an obligation to distribute wealth for the benefit of everyone (Gorney, 2008).

Children join their mothers on the city streets to beg for Korima. Oftentimes, this can lead to a negative viewpoint on the Tarahumara and seclude them to be “outsiders” (Chopel, 2014). As a result, this deepens the trust issues between non-indigenous people and the Tarahumara. What does this mean for women? The state of health for women is burdened by several maternal health problems. They are one of the few women left that still often give birth alone and outdoors. Currently, little is known about these minority women and their health status due to the clash of cultures. A study done by Alison M. Chopel assessed the state of reproductive health outcomes, risks, beliefs, and behavior in the Tarahumara population. Through focus groups, interviews, exploration, observation in households, surveys, and investigation of influential factors, Chopel was able to find quantitative results.

The speculation of the severe health problems within the indigenous women was confirmed by finding issues that contribute to participant’s perceptions of “susceptibility to and severity of the problem, their reproductive health beliefs and behaviors, and barriers to behavior change” (Chopel, 2014). In other words, because of their culture, way of life, and the divide between societies, there is a large number of disparities in biomedical knowledge, lack of trust between health providers and patients, and structural issues that were briefly talked about in the previous sections of this research. For example, there is very little access to medical assistance, education, and a place for the communities to come together and interact with one another, which is crucial if there is to be a relationship between both parties.

In short, Chopel highly recommends, through the found data, to identify the lessons applicable to similar situations where cultural minorities suffer health inequalities, especially in women. “This study underscores the importance of needs and assets assessment, as it reveals unique contextual factors that must be taken into account in intervention design” (Chopel, 2014). These collaborative partnerships between community members and leaders have proven invaluable in research and sustainable development. This conclusion extends not only to community members, but to both governmental and non-governmental groups attempting to improve the health of this population and drafting

health policies targeting minority groups.

Local Government Relations with the Indigenous Population Local

After decades of interaction with the Tarahumara, it is surprising that officials and inspectors still have a small accurate conception of the indigenous group. “Moral and cultural issues, in the minds of many SEP employees, overshadowed the structural and economic causes of Tarahumara poverty” (Marak, 427). When meetings have been arranged between Tarahumara officials to address theft of land and resources by mestizos and whites, the government officials only saw the problem as a low priority.

The Mexican government has also been under an extreme amount of pressure to open land for the tourist industry and gain control of drug traffickers. Several developmental infrastructure projects targeting highway, hotel, and business development were created in partnership between the federal and local governments in hopes of decreasing drug trade.

Some environmental issues currently facing the government involve the scarcity of hazardous waste disposal facilities, freshwater resources, pollution, deforestation, and desertification, per the Central Intelligence Agency. The government considers all of these national security issues which directly affect the Tarahumara and only continue to worsen the living conditions.

The Mexican Commission of Solidary and Defense of Human Rights produced a report in 2000 noting the lack of connection and communication by the government on how lumber production affects the ecosystem. Very few studies have been done and the indigenous people are too afraid to involve themselves in environmental activism due to past retaliations such as the murder of Isidro Baldenegro, a Tarahumara leader.

According to Oscar Lopez in an article of Newsweek Global, Baldenegro’s murder was the impetus for major grassroots efforts to protect ancient forests from illegal logging and raising awareness about the effects of organized crime. “Mexico’s Center for Environmental Rights (CEMDA) released a report that documented 63 attacks against environ-

mental activists in 2015 and 2016. However, this only included cases reported on by the media, so the number could be much higher” (Lopez, 2017). The future of the community seems uncertain after so many years of violence and intimidation.

Due to lack of water and crops, famine continued to spread making it too cold and the living conditions worse. According to Ahi-man, Garrido the article Explaining food insecurity around indigenous households of the Sierra Tarahumara in the Mexican state of Chihuahua, about 50 percent of marginalized groups do not have access to clean water sources and sanitation facilities due to lack of government intervention, lack of communication between leaders, and illegal activity from deforestation and organized crime. Logging is not just a state-run operation, but also practiced illegally by loggers and drug lords who use the forests to grow marijuana or opium. Usually, the drug cartels have ties with the logging companies that weigh heavily on the Tarahumara. Members are exploited for their long-distance running talents and forced to run illegal drugs into the U.S.

Although there have been multiple attempts to grow trust, the Tarahumara still do not feel as though they are a prioritized, protected group. The Tarahumara continue to deal with logging, drug cartels, exploitation, intimidation, and lack of interest by the government, and they deserve a more sustainable lifestyle with autonomy. It is recommended that the government increase communication and provide access to basic services to underrepresented families.

Mexico’s Government for Sustainable Development

The Tarahumara and Mexico

The Mexican government has always shown an interest in working with the Tarahumara and other native tribes. Many native tribes had almost been eliminated through warfare or assimilation. According to Penn State College of Earth and Mineral Sciences, in 1825, the government of Mexico, through the law of Colonization, “called for the distribution of cultivated land around depopulated towns to native people without charge” (e-ed). Few of the Tarahumara wanted to take advantage of this new law and few desired to return to the land they had abandoned after Spanish rule. Since then, there have been only minimal ef-

forts to ensure the protection and sustainable growth for the indigenous community.

It is now obvious that through their act of seeking refuge in the Sierra Mountains they isolated themselves, which contributed to their current poverty level. This has left them vulnerable to attacks and threats. Julian Carrillo, an environmental human rights defender, was caught in one of these attacks and the state of Mexico has failed to find the parties responsible for his death. Carrillo's death was not the final act of various threats and harassment to those who defend ancestral territory in the Sierra Tarahumara. "The government must adopt without delay a comprehensive public policy that addresses the structural causes that give rise to the dangers facing human rights defenders. Defending the territory and the environment should not be a death sentence" stated Tania Reneaum, executive director of Amnesty International Mexico. The measures that the government took were simply not enough. The measures that the government took to protect Carrillo, including satellite phones and police escorts while he traveled, were not enough to protect him.

The Mexican government has put a significant amount of pressure on the Tarahumara to transition to a new economic development strategy to combat illegal activity. This new strategy will implement police presence in efforts of stopping or severely limiting the drug trade. However, "this development would involve substantial alteration to Tarahumara homelands and would inevitably cause a clash of cultures" (Culture and History, 2019). This manifests an ever-changing future for the Tarahumara population. However, it is unclear based on current research as to how the tribe would react to these changes. Nevertheless, there should be efforts to ensure they do not become a forgotten population and the community needs to discuss in-depth transformational research strategies for sustainable development economically, socially, and educationally.

The Mexican government should place greater urgency and consult with civil society and human rights defenders to develop a public policy that ensures other ancestral land defenders, activists, and community members can live and work in the country in safety. It would be the first step in the Mexican government's continuing efforts of sustainable development that can have a trickle effect on the state and local

governments.

United Nations Efforts for Sustainable Development

The United Nations formulated an agenda called the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to be achieved by 2030. All nations, stakeholders, and partner organizations are collaboratively working to implement this new plan. “We are resolved to free the human race from the tyranny of poverty and want to heal and secure our planet” (UN, 2019). This agenda includes 17 Sustainable Development Goals and 169 targets that have demonstrated ambition for this new universal agenda. Mexico is currently experiencing immense challenges to sustainable development. Especially for indigenous mountain populations. Particularly for the Tarahumara, they experience an enormous amount of disparities of opportunity, wealth, natural disasters, droughts, violence, displacement, freshwater scarcity, and lack of social development.

Protection and Conservation of Mountainous Areas

Within the plan, in which Mexico is encouraged to participate, the protection and restoration of water-related ecosystems, including mountains, forests, wetlands, and rivers are within Goal 6, Section 6.6. and under Goal 15. Section 15.3 specifically ensures conservation efforts also focus on mountain ecosystems.

Indigenous Peoples

Within the Agenda, particular goals aim toward indigenous peoples. “People who are vulnerable must be empowered” (Declaration 23). Providing inclusive and equitable quality education on all levels no matter race, sex, age, and ethnicity is in section 25. Goal 2, Section 2.3, highlights the importance of agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food reducers, particularly in women, family farmers, and indigenous peoples. Goal 4, Section 4.5 states how governments should ensure the elimination of gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education for all vulnerable populations.

Mexico and The SDGs

Mexico has taken many initiatives to implement the SDGs with

a long-term vision. There is evidence that the government is in constant dialogue with the private sector and other communication channels to establish working communities in strategic areas. The academic and scientific community began to reflect on proposals for sustainability policies and has contributed to the development. Despite all of the progress, there are still major challenges associated with ensuring the effective participation of all different actors and the guarantee that all parties are included.

In the Voluntary National Review for the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development Vision in Mexico, there is very little information given about the goals of the mountainous population. “The fundamental role of forests, mountains, rivers, lakes, and aquifers in the water cycle in guaranteeing water quality and availability must be recognized” (49 box 1, emphasis added). This queue is connected to SDG 15: to ensure by 2033, the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial freshwater ecosystems and their serves, in particular, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under an international agreement.

There are many differences between all states in Chihuahua. This highlights the importance of state and municipal governments working together to have the capacity to detect areas of opportunity and focus policies that work in accordance with the Goals and the laws of the federal government. “The central axis of this Agenda is ‘leaving no one behind’. To achieve this...it is essential to have a subnational vision” (167). This means the progress towards the SDGs will be most effective when the ambitious are not only at the national level, but also the smaller communities, including the mountainous population.

Works Cited

ADRIANA GOMEZ LICON. (n.d.). Tarahumara Indians face food crisis while aid from Mexican government lags. Canadian Press, The. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uvu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=n5h&AN=MYO252230296612&site=eds-live>

Barry, T. (2015). Toxic Tourism. *Boston Review*, 40(4), 6. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uvu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=prf&AN=103674836&site=eds-live>

Chopel, A. M. (2014). Reproductive health in indigenous Chihuahua: giving birth 'alone like the goat.' *Ethnicity & Health*, 19(3), 270–296. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uvu.edu/10.1080/13557858.2013.771150>

Culture and History. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.mpm.edu/research-collections/anthropology/online-collections-research/tarahumara/culture-and-history>

Gorney, C. (2008). A People Apart. *National Geographic*, 214(5), 78. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uvu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=f6h&AN=34859240&site=eds-live>

Lopez, O. (2017). "Climate of Terror." *Newsweek Global*, 168(11), 18. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uvu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=f6h&AN=121997594&site=eds-live>

Making Space for Peace. (2017). Retrieved from <https://pbi-mexico.org/news/2018-07/sierra-tarahumara-defending-territory-contexts-violence>

Marak, A. M. (2003). The Failed Assimilation of the Tarahumara in Postrevolutionary Mexico. *Journal of the Southwest*, 45(3), 411–435. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uvu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hia&AN=46249866&site=eds-live>

MOUNTAIN PARTNERSHIP. (2018). Food and Agriculture Organization. Retrieved from <http://www.fao.org/mountain-partnership/about/brochures/en/>

Mexico: State failed to prevent the killing of Julián Carrillo. (n.d.). Re-

trieved from <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2019/01/mexico-state-protection-measures-were-not-enough-to-prevent-the-killing-of-environmental-defender-julian-carrillo/>

Roberts, D., & Fobes, N. (1998). In the land of the long-distance runners. *Smithsonian*, 29(2), 42. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uvu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=f6h&AN=524303&site=eds-live>

Severance, P. (1993). The legend of the Tarahumara. *Runner's World*, 28(12), 74. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uvu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=f6h&AN=9311157530&site=eds-live>

Stolte, J. (2007). The Tarahumaras of Mexico's Copper Canyon. *PSA Journal*, (6), 22. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uvu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsggo&AN=edsgcl.165577741&site=eds-live>

The Tarahumaras. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.e-education.psu.edu/geog571/node/295>

The World Factbook: Mexico. (2018, February 01). Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/mx.html>

Un. (2019). Protecting the Sierra Tarahumara, a biodiversity hot spot. Retrieved from <https://www.unenvironment.org/news-and-stories/story/protecting-sierra-tarahumara-biodiversity-hot-spot>

