

UDC [338.48(=511.1):572.028](47+57)(48)(045)

DOI: 10.17238/issn2221-2698.2019.34.44

Indigenous tourism and the Barents Euro-Arctic Region (BEAR) *

© Kjell OLSEN, PhD in Social Anthropology, Professor

E-mail: kjell.o.olsen@uit.no

UiT — The Arctic University of Norway, Campus Alta, Norway

Abstract. In this article, it is argued that indigenous tourism must be understood as shaped by European ideas of the Other, as well as a more recent development in global politics. Such broad and increasingly global structures frame those heterogeneous populations that are labeled and label themselves indigenous. Furthermore, the current situation of these peoples is also shaped by their relationships to surrounding majorities and nation states. Therefore, definitions of indigenous tourism should rather be built on minorities' degree of control of tourism activities than by ideas of emblematic cultural features. The growth in the tourism industry in many parts of the Barents Euro-Arctic Region also represents an opportunity for representing and maintaining cultural features among minorities. Nevertheless, minorities might also face challenges by being relegated to a position in the tourism industry where other more powerful actors define a rather narrow field of what indigenous tourism is. This article is based on literary studies of contemporary research on indigeneity, tourism, and Sámi tourism and draws upon the author's extensive previous research on Sámi tourism in Norway.

Keywords: *indigenous peoples, the Barents Euro-Arctic Region, tourism, Sámi, authenticity.*

Introduction. The Other in a Western tradition

We are saying we are a distinct people, a nation of people, and we must have a special right within Canada. We are distinct in that it will not be easy for us to be brought into your system because we are different. We have our own system, our own way of life, our own culture and traditions. We have our own languages, our own laws, and a system of justice (Robert Andre, Arctic Red River) [1, Brody H., p. vii]

As claimed by Robert Andre, indigenous peoples are different, but from whom are they different and how is this difference ontologically constructed? One can assume that this form of a difference does not originate from a distinct tradition among people settled around Arctic Red River themselves. Even if they have had ideas of differences among those people settled in this area. Nevertheless, these ideas of difference presented above is a result of the colonial encounter between European colonizers and those multitudes of populations from the 16th century should become the colonized. The great voyages of the Europeans in the 16th century and their often-violent encounters with new populations around the world — and their following subordination — necessitated an ontological reorientation in Western thought.

Put very shortly and crudely, this reorientation caused a necessary classification of the, for the Europeans, unknown peoples, relied on the antiquated ideas of the Barbarians as a contrast to the civilized. In this case, the European civilization thereby legitimized their domination. In the eyes of colonizers, the encountered peoples lack a familiar societal organization and the material

* For citation:

Olsen K. Indigenous tourism and the Barents Euro-Arctic Region (BEAR). *Arktika i Sever* [Arctic and North], 2019, no. 34, pp. 35–45. DOI: 10.17238/issn2221-2698.2019.34.44

— as well as the intangible European culture, also made it possible to evoke the idea of the Noble Savage; a state where the man lived at ease in the Garden of Eden. This duality; the Barbarian and the Noble Savage was paired with new European ideas of human evolution, from a child-like origin to a mature civilization that added to the possibility of regarding some humans as the Other. These ideas of radical difference are still around in indigenous tourism and shape tourists' motivation as well as putting demands on the peoples visited. Both the idea of the Barbarian and the Noble Savage that might exist simultaneously demands a kind of radical alterity among those labeled indigenous.

Indigenous as a political concept

As stated above, indigenous is a concept that in Western thought is used on populations that have a way of living, a culture, which contrasts with what is regarded as modern ways of life. In this way, "indigenous peoples" in popular everyday use, is a term that is applied to what from a various modern point of views is seen as traditional ways of living. This use of the concept "indigenous" connects the concept to other concepts such as traditional, tribal, primitive, pre-modern or aboriginal, all concepts that have been in use on peoples that appear as radically different from what appears as modernity. Since the 1950s "indigenous" has also been used as a political concept. The UN organization, the International Labour Organisation's (ILO) convention C169 — Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169) is meant to secure the rights of indigenous populations living inside the border of a nation state. In the ILO 169 convention article 1, indigenous is defined in the following way:

1. This Convention applies to:

- (a) tribal peoples in independent countries whose social, cultural and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations;
- (b) peoples in independent countries who are regarded as indigenous on account of their descent from the population which inhabited the country, or a geographical region to which the country belongs, at the time of conquest or colonization or the establishment of present state boundaries and who, irrespective of their legal status, retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural and political institutions.¹

Indigenous has proved to be a concept that is difficult to define in legal and scholarly terms. Hence, certain characteristics that being cultural distinct from the majority population in the nation-state, with important exceptions in Latin America where indigenous peoples sometimes make up the majority, have occupied areas that have been conquered or colonized by other groups culturally different from the original inhabitants, and self-identification as indigenous and being recognized as such by other indigenous populations. An attempt was made by Erica-Irene

¹ C169 — Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169). URL: http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_CODE:C169 (Accessed: 12 January 2019).

Daes in 1997 to become the foundation for the common use of the concept in international contexts. Daes emphasizes four aspects:

- (a) Priority in time, concerning the occupation and use of a specific territory;
- (b) The voluntary perpetuation of cultural distinctiveness, which may include the aspects of language, social organization, religion, and spiritual values, modes of production, laws, and institutions;
- (c) Self-identification, as well as recognition by other groups, or by State authorities, as a distinct collectivity; and
- (d) An experience of subjugation, marginalization, dispossession, exclusion or discrimination, whether or not these conditions persist.²

As we see, indigenous is not an easy political concept, and it covers a huge number of different peoples that do not have much in common except regarding themselves and being regarded by others, as indigenous [2, Joonas J.]. It might also be said about the indigenous population in the BEAR that the Barents Euro-Arctic Council estimates to a rather vague approximation of 85,000 Sámi in Finland, Norway, Sweden and Russia, and 7,000 Nenets and 6,000 Veps in Russia.³ Nevertheless, the international work for indigenous rights also has an impact in the Barents Euro-Arctic Region. The cooperation between Sámi in four different countries, the Nenets and the Veps within the Barents Euro-Arctic Regional Council, was initiated in 1993. From 1995 the Working Group of Indigenous Peoples (WGIP) was established permanently. In many ways, this indigenous cooperation in the BEAR is founded because of a global indigenous movement that adapts to changing political contexts. The complexity of the concept of indigenous is additionally complicated by the common sense use of indigenous that in a long-standing Western-European tradition, usually attaches the concept to all populations that appear as traditional and radically different from what we regard as modern.

Therefore, the latter emphasis on radical difference, a traditional appearance and being a minority and not the state-bearing group of a nation, is much of what makes up the foundation for attaching the label Indigenous Tourism. In this way, the motivation for indigenous tourism can be understood by general theories in tourism research. For example, Dean MacCannell in his seminal work *The Tourist* ascribes the motivation for tourism in the alienating forces of modernity that by its differentiating processes creates a longing for authenticity, something that modern man does not find in her or his own life. "Modern man is condemned to look elsewhere, everywhere, for his authenticity, to see if he can catch a glimpse of it reflected in the simplicity, poverty, chastity or purity of others" [3, MacCannell D., p. 41]. Consequently, the assumed simplicity of people regarded as traditional, and less developed than the modern tourist becomes worth seeing. Analogous, John Urry in his influential book *The Tourist Gaze* downplays a search for authenticity, but rather ascribes the motivation for tourism in a longing for difference, a contrast to one's ordinary

² Daes E.-I. Working Group on Indigenous Populations — Working Paper — Digest [1997] AUIndigLawRpr 22; (1997) 2(1) Australian Indigenous Law Reporter 162. URL: <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/AILR/1997/22.html#Heading4> (Accessed: 13 January 2019).

³ Indigenous peoples in the Barents region. URL: <https://www.barentscooperation.org/en/About/Indigenous-Peoples> (Accessed: 13 January 2019).

life: “It, therefore, seems incorrect that a search for authenticity is the basis for the organization of tourism. Rather, one key feature would seem to be that there is a difference between one’s normal place of residence/work and the object of the tourist gaze. Now it may be that seeking for what we take to be authentic elements is an important component here, but that is because there is in some sense a contrast with everyday experiences” [4, Urry J., p. 12].

Nevertheless, our Western-European ideas of the Other, the indigenous, fulfills a notion of difference from our regular everyday experiences as well as being considered as having a more authentic life than modern man.

The Norwegian Sámi in the tourism industry

The Nenets, Vespians, and Sámi, the indigenous peoples inside what now is the BEAR have just as many differences as similarities, both compared with each other as well as internally. What they have in common is as minorities inside the frames of changing state formations, their culture and history have been shaped by the changing policies of the different states where they are located [5, Pietikäinen S. et. al.]. As Pietikäinen et al. puts it: “For indigenous and minority people living in the North Calotte area, the consequences of these redefinitions were drastic, as the new borders did not follow the settled, long-existing divisions of language communities or local livelihoods “[5, Pietikäinen s, et al., p. 4].

A precursor for tourism in Europe was the exhibition of exotic peoples in major European cities. Briefly describing some Norwegian Sámi’s involvement in this industry might also explain some of the ideas that lurk behind our concept of indigenous tourism. Early on the Sámi acquired an image as ‘the last nomads of Europe.’ Several scientific expeditions in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries studied them and made descriptions of their way of life. The Sámi also played an early role in the flourishing trade of exhibiting ‘primitive’ peoples all over Europe. In 1822 William Bullock exhibited a Sámi family in the Egyptian Hall in London. The Southern Sámi family were put on display, together with live reindeer, and became a quite popular attraction [6, Altick R., p. 273]. It was probably the start of a tradition of exhibiting living Sámi that continued at least until 1930, when thirty-two Norwegian, Swedish, and Finnish Sámi toured Germany during the summer and autumn of that year. On this tour, they brought with them a fully equipped Sámi camp, dogs and fifty reindeer [7, Hætta O.].

For the 1822 exhibit, Kirshenblatt-Gimblett writes, ‘[t]he Laplanders had been brought to care for the reindeer, who, it was hoped, could be introduced into England, but when this proved impractical, the Laplanders were recycled as ethnographic exhibits’ [8, Kirshenblatt-Gimblett B., p. 45]. In this recycling, the Sámi had to adapt to an ethnographic tradition. Already Bullock’s first exhibit introduced a persistent tradition that also became a feature of the Lapp camps set up to serve the growing tourism in Northern Norway in the last part of the nineteenth century. This was a tradition that probably paid more attention to an ethnographic tradition than to the Sámi performers’ ideas of entertainment. In the poster made for the exhibit in the Egyptian Hall, there is a

marked difference between the 'primitive' objects and the modern spectators. Framed by a tableau of the sublime natural beauty of Northern Norway — an area that the exhibited Holm family had probably never visited, the exhibited Sámi make a striking contrast to the visiting Londoners. Their nomadic-style shelter, their clothing, and the exhibited utensils present a sharp contrast to the modern way of life at the time.

The poster is attractive in several ways. Firstly, it exhibits the Sámi in a way that is still common today. Most of the features found in the poster advertising the 1822 London exhibit can be found in tourist brochures today. Only two elements are seldom found in contemporary images of the Sámi. One of the features that have vanished are the spectators, who have disappeared from contemporary pictures in the tourism industry. The second is the reindeer sledge, which is no longer such a prominent marker. The tremendous sense of speed this transport gave at that time no longer makes an impression.

Secondly, the poster relates to the tradition of regarding 'the Other' as a Noble Savage, people who are closer to a pre-modern state of innocence of humanity.

Mathisen [9, Mathisen S., p. 8] points out that the way the Sámi were exhibited in the Egyptian Hall was rooted in a European scholarly tradition. According to Altick [6, Altick, R., p. 273], Bullock engaged the author Thomas Dibdin to make a 'play' that the Sámi would perform in. In his autobiography Dibdin describes his 'actors':

... a little, greasy, round man who looked like an oil barrel [...] his correspondingly beautiful wife, in dimensions like a half anker [wine cask]; and their son, about the height of a Dutch cheese, with a hat on: this trio sang, danced, played the fiddle, and displayed their several accomplishments so as to puzzle me amazingly on this point — how I could turn them to any stage account. However, the piece was written: my leader, Mr. Erskine,[], composed overture, songs, melodramatic music, dances, etc. — the scenes were painted; the dances rehearsed at the Haymarket, [...]; all the dresses made from authorities furnished and models kindly lent by Mr. Bullock; and when all subordinate matters were arranged, the performers were summoned the hear me read the piece of "The Laplanders," at my apartment in the Surrey Theatre [10, Dibdin T., pp. 195–196].

The Laplanders never showed up at Mr. Dibdin's apartment because '... eight of the reindeers had run themselves out of breath' [10, Dibdin T., p. 196]. While waiting for new reindeer, 'the little round man, wife, and child were, in the meantime, to drive their rapid sledge around the spacious plains of the Egyptian-hall' [10, Dibdin T., p. 197]. It became what probably was the first exhibit of Sámi outside the Northern area.

Even if Dibdin did not manage to set up his play in full scale, as Mathisen [9, Mathisen S., p. 8] writes, the Sámi's ideas of entertainment were turned down, probably in favor of a more proper ethnographic account compiled by Dibdin. Still song, dance and playing the fiddle do not have a part in Sámi attractions. Dibdin's idea of how the Sámi could become a stage play endures and is also found in indigenous tourism today even if there have been changes.

From the start of tourism in Northern Norway in the second half of the nineteenth century, the Sámi were integrated as attractions. Typical of this exposure were the so-called Lapp Camps

set up by reindeer-herders summering in the pastures on the coast. The reindeer-herders became the Sámi marker in tourism, and only seldom did the settled coastal Sámi enter this occupation. It may be explained by the fact that tourism fitted nicely as a niche for the reindeer-herders, who could produce handicraft during the winter and sell it to the tourists in the summer months spent on the coast. Another explanation is that the semi-nomadic herders fit the idea of the Noble Savage much better than the coastal Sámi. The multicultural coastal areas did not show such a radical difference, and Norwegian authorities usually considered the coastal Sámi culture to be vanishing [11, Olsen K.]. That some parts of indigenous culture are emphasized in tourism might be explained by the ideas that connect indigeneity to traditions. Nevertheless, as embedded in different nation-states' national political traditions, the difference in contemporary rights, the general type of tourism in the area, and the groups own agency creates discrepancies in how indigenous populations might be represented [12, Keskitalo E. & Nuttall M.; 11, Olsen K.; 13, Kelly-Holmes H. & Pietikäinen S.].

Even if indigenous peoples are regarded as potential tourist attractions because of their supposed traditional way of living, this opposition between tradition and modernity cannot always be upheld when integrated into modern state formations like those found in the BEAR. An analysis of Sámi tourist brochures in Norway reveals that Sámi people are portrayed as modern in fields like outdoor life and sports like snowmobile competitions. A third field in which the dichotomy is no longer upheld is in artistic expression [14, Olsen K.]. It seems that some fields enable 'others' to express their version of modernity without contesting the necessary difference between tourists and themselves [13, Kelly-Holmes & Pietikäinen S.; 14, Olsen K.; 15, Pietikäinen S.]. As Thuen [16, Thuen T., p. 262] argues, when he considers the possibility of developing what will be regarded as a modern Sámi cultural expression, this is most probably in the realm of art.

Still, the main impression is given by tourist brochures — and in this case, booklets published by regional and local authorities where contemporary Sámi culture is most prominent — is that the old tradition of representing the Sámi as radically different continues. It may partly explain the impression received by visiting tourists, who regard the Sámi as traditional and characterized by markers such as reindeer, reindeer-herding, nomadic lifestyle, indigenesness, a different culture and way of living, traditions, traditional costume, the landscape and nature [17, Viken A., p. 29]. It is not to say that such features do not play a part in modern Sámi culture. A picture of an old lady with a dog and reindeer standing in the wilderness is both a tourist cliché and a part of modern Sámi society.

It was pointed out by a Sámi student, who simultaneously could see 'the othering' of the Sámi as a people and that this was part of the everyday life of her aunt portrayed in such a picture. For many Sámi there is no dichotomy between what, from an outsider's perspective, can be apprehended as belonging to the two distinct categories of tradition and modernity. From an insider perspective, this all exists in the present within the framework of a Sámi contemporary modern culture. As others point out, autoethnography and cultural displays are typically heterogeneous,

on the receiving end as well as from the perspective of the insider. In the case of pictures, knowledge of regional and local differences in Sámi costume can give a lot of information even without knowledge of the persons portrayed or the purpose of such representations. For the tourist audience, such pictures probably fulfill their idea of traditional people even if most locals will notice contemporaries.

Indigenous tourism — definitions

Maybe the most influential definition of indigenous tourism is made by Hinch and Butler who claims that indigenous tourism can be understood as: "Tourism activity in which indigenous people are directly involved either through control and/or by having their culture serve as the essence of the attraction" [18, Butler R. & Hinch T., p. 9]. In this definition, it is possible to integrate the politico-juridical definition of indigenous peoples as well as self-recognition and the recognition by others.

Additionally, by introducing control as an essential element, it is also possible to bring indigenous tourism out of the trap the Holm family were set in 1822. It implies that tourist product sold by indigenous peoples can be sold as indigenous products even if they — like the Holm family's singing, dancing and playing the fiddle — do not fit in with European ideas of what is the real indigenous, and usually traditional, culture.

		INDIGENOUS CONTROL	
		<i>Low Degree of Control</i>	<i>High Degree of Control</i>
INDIGENOUS THEME	<i>Indigenous Theme Present</i>	A Culture Dispossessed	B Culture Controlled
	<i>Indigenous Theme Absent</i>	C Non-Indigenous Tourism	D Diversified Indigenous

Fig 1. Indigenous theme representation and control.

The model provided by Hinch and Butler [18, Butler R. & Hinch T., p. 10] makes it possible to place indigenous tourism products in different relations to the two parameters *Degree of Control* and *Indigenous Theme*. Category A, *Culture Dispossessed*, relates to those situations where artifacts and/or cultural performances are exhibited by companies with no relations to the indigenous population whose culture is under the display. Like in Bullock's exhibit in London in 1822. In Northern Scandinavia, Sámi culture has for a long time been used on such displays without the consent of the Sámi. E.g., the use of images of Sámis in traditional clothing with reindeer or at a campfire in a Lavvou, are standard views in advertising. However, the acceptance of such use of

Sámi culture in tourism without the approval of Sámi might differ in different countries [19, Rout-sala H.]. It is a matter that relates to indigenous control, and the political acknowledgment of the use of culture. E.g., in Norway, it would be inappropriate for Norwegians to dress up in traditional Sámi costume in a tourism context, and occasions, where companies have used features of Sámi traditional clothing in events, have been thoroughly criticized. Category B, *Culture Controlled*, points to those occasions where Sámi people themselves present cultural elements in their own companies. The sale stalls along the roads set up by Sámi reindeer herders have a long tradition in Norway and is an example of such use of *Indigenous Themes* and *Indigenous Control*. The C, *Non-Indigenous Tourism*, covers those occasions where no indigenous theme is present, and the control is by non-indigenous. While the last, D, *Diversified Indigenous*, will include for example a hotel or a transport company run by a Sámi owner.

This definition raises, in my opinion, at least three problems. First, it is a problem to say who is Sámi and who is not! Among the Sámi in the different countries we will find people that according to national laws are excluded from enrolment in the Electoral roles for the different Sámi Parliaments, but still claim to be Sámi [2, Joona J.]. Secondly, many Sámi who could register have not done that, and further demonstrates the problem of delimiting an indigenous population and thereby the question of who should be in control. Thirdly and finally, the issue of *Indigenous Theme* seems to imply that it is the agreement of a single indigenous culture. The reality is that there often are several local traditions that sometimes are difficult to delimit to a unique tradition. Often, as in the case of the exhibit in London in 1822, what appears as The Indigenous Theme is often imposed from outside in historical processes.

To additionally complicate this by a socio-geographic dimension, in many small communities in the BEAR indigenous people who run a small tourism business will cooperate and/or compete with non-indigenous neighbors who run rather identical businesses. One way of getting rid of the problem of delimiting who is what and who is not in ethnical terms might be to apply definitions of indigenous tourism like finding among Māori organizations in New Zealand. Increasingly Māori tourism has been defined as tourism in terms of what is contemporary Māori tradition. E.g., in the guidelines for teachers using Māori business as an example from the New Zealand Ministry of Education:

Māori businesses are businesses or enterprises that are:

- owned by Māori, and/or
- fully or substantially controlled by Māori, and/or
- operated according to traditional and/or contemporary Māori culture and values.

Some Māori companies are owner-operated, and some employ people of Māori descent. Others may employ people of diverse ethnicities.⁴ In this way, the relevant stakeholders define what are the principles for how an indigenous tourism business should be run, and thereby opens up for inclusion those companies in the area who obey the principles.

⁴ Māori business. URL: <http://seniorsecondary.tki.org.nz/Social-sciences/Business-studies/Maori-business#values> (Accessed: 13 January 2019).

The problem of authenticity

As explained at the beginning of this chapter; tourism theory often ascribes the motivation for Indigenous Tourism to the differences these peoples are assumed to represent in contrast to modern man. What has been argued is that this position as The Other is a historical construct in Western-European thought that lumps many different peoples into a single category. This category has additionally been reinforced by becoming a political-juridical concept for political rights that have been important for the development of a sense of commonness among these peoples. By being recognized as indigenous, and regarding themselves as indigenous, people from the northern area face many of the same problems in tourism as other indigenous populations around the world.

One of these is the matter of authenticity. Western-European thinking has regarded such peoples as traditional and pre-modern, and it is often in this respect that they become tourist attractions. Many indigenous peoples, and the Sámi in Northern Scandinavia have been fully integrated into the modern nation-states, and seldom demonstrate the radical differences from modern life that tourist often looks for. It creates danger of that only those elements that are supposed to be old and pre-modern — what is regarded as authentic Sámi — are what we consider as the Sámi element in tourism. It is not a view found only among tourists. In a study of the Sámis, who have mainly become tourist attractions in themselves — primarily elder women in the interior of Finnmark who wear traditional costume in their everyday life — Gaino [20, Gaino L.] demonstrates how the respondents in this category are well aware of the touristic quest for authenticity, or rather expressed as the real culture. This is an understanding gained from both their everyday life as well as their own practice as tourists. Several of the respondents pointed out that the tourists' interest in Sámi culture had for them been a point of pride in their youth when a Sámi identity was more stigmatized than today. They also criticized the use of what they regarded as fake Sámi culture and stressed the need to promote what they felt was the real traditional Sámi culture.

Tourism as a source of pride and as something that demands authenticity is a common feature of Indigenous Tourism. What is the problem is that indigenous peoples are contemporaries, and many of them live lives that on the surface do not seem to differ from the majority population. It often restrains what is developed as Indigenous Tourism and leads to discussions about what is traditional or not. Rather than discussions of the past it seems more fertile to bring indigenous ways of doing things into contemporary businesses that on the surface seem to belong to a non-indigenous sphere.

Conclusion

In this article, I have argued that indigenous tourism must be understood as shaped by European ideas of the Other, as well as a more recent development in global politics. Such broad and increasingly global structures frame those heterogeneous populations that are labeled and label themselves indigenous. Even if indigenous increasingly has become a political concept, the Euro-

pean cultural ideas of indigenous as linked to being culturally different and more traditional than the modern cultures of the tourist, still flourish in the tourism industry. Thus, being in danger of relegating indigenous minorities to certain product niches in contemporary tourism. In this article, it has been demonstrated that this view on indigenous peoples as being radically different from the modern, as in the case of the Sámi, has a long tradition in Europe.

Furthermore, the current situation of these peoples is also shaped by their relationships to surrounding majorities and nation states. Until the early nineteenth century, the area that is now the BEAR was, from the perspective of the current majority communities, a political undefined area. The borders between the state formations in the area were respectively laid down in 1751 and 1826, and Finland became a part of the Russian empire in 1809. One drastic consequence of these redefinitions was that the most western settled Siida of the four Skolt Sámi siidas, became Norwegians despite their Orthodox belief and historical connection to Russia, thereby becoming a minority in Norway as well as among Norwegian Sámi. In this way, the political changes in what is now the BEAR, have added to the heterogeneity among the indigenous populations in the area. How borders were laid down, national policies for assimilation as well as policies that pointed out who should remain traditional Nobel Savages, are all historical facts that add to the heterogeneity that has always existed. Nevertheless, the global recognition of indigenous rights and new political structures framing the BEAR will probably increase the different indigenous peoples' possibilities for shaping their position in the global industry of tourism.

Finally, what seems to be a booming tourism industry many parts in BEAR where increasingly new tourism markets have become interested in the North and the Arctic, might give some opportunities as well as challenges for indigenous peoples. The most obvious is the potential for economic growth and new jobs in an industry where indigenous cultures can present a cultural difference that is interesting for many of the visitors. Indigenous peoples might also seize the opportunity of developing new products, that fits into modern tourism were doing things had become more important than previously when 'the tourist gaze' was more prominent. Nevertheless, the growth in tourism also creates some challenges since most tourists coming to BEAR do not regard the indigenous peoples as the main attractions that make them come to the area. Natural phenomenon like the Aurora Borealis, the Midnight sun, and the Arctic nature are among those attractions that are most prominent and make that the tourism industry use new areas and, at least seasonally, are crowding certain places. A result might be a competition on land use and problems for local communities, where indigenous peoples' interests might lose in competition with powerful economic interests and the tourist industry. But still, at the time of writing, there are few places in the BEAR that such a development is dominant.

References

1. Brody H. *Living Arctic: Hunters of the Canadian North*. Douglas and McIntyre, Vancouver, 1987.
2. Joonas J. The draft Nordic Saami convention and the indigenous population in Finland. In: Banks, N. & Koivurova T. (eds) *The Proposed Nordic Saami Convention. National and International Dimensions of Indigenous Property Rights*, 2013, Hart Publishing, Oxford, pp. 229–253.
3. MacCannell D. *The Tourist. A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1999.
4. Urry J. *The Tourist Gaze. Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. SAGE Publications, London, 1990.
5. Pietikäinen S., Huss L., Laihiala-Kankainen S., Aikio-Puoskari U. & Lane P. Regulating multilingualism in the North Calotte: The case of Kven, Meänkieli and Sámi languages', *Acta Borealia* 27 (1), 2010, pp. 1–23.
6. Altick R.D. *The Shows of London*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass, 1978.
7. Hætta O.M. *Triumfslekta, Áidejávri fjellstue og Mikkel Triumfs tragiske skjebne*. HiF-Rapport, 2003.
8. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett B. *Destination Culture. Tourism, Museums and Heritage*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1998.
9. Mathisen S.R. Representasjoner av kulturell forskjell. Fortelling, makt og autoritet i utstillinger av samisk kultur. *Tidsskrift for Kulturforskning*, 2004, 3(1), pp. 5–25.
10. Dibdin T. *The Reminiscences of Thomas Dibdin*. AMS Press, New York, 1827 [1970].
11. Olsen K. The touristic construction of the "emblematic" Sámi. *Acta Borealia*, 2003, 20 (1), pp. 3–20.
12. Keskitalo E.C.H. & Nuttall M. Globalisation of the "Arctic". In: Evensgård B., Larsen J.N. & Paasche Ø. (eds). *The New Arctic*, 2015, pp. 175–187.
13. Kelly-Holmes H. & Pietikäinen S. Commodifying Sámi culture in an indigenous tourism site, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 14 (4), 2014, pp. 518–538.
14. Olsen K. Urfolksturisme — en reise i tid eller rom? *Norsk Antropologisk Tidsskrift*, 2008, 19 (1), pp. 20–37.
15. Pietikäinen S. Multilingual dynamics in Sámiland: Rhizomatic discourses on changing language, *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 19 (2), 2015, pp. 206–225.
16. Thuen T. *Quest for Equity. Norway and the Saami Challenge*. ISER, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, 1995.
17. Viken A. Turismens essensialiserende effect — samisk kultur i lys av tiltakende turisme. In: Mathisen S.R. (ed.) *Kulturens Materialisering: Identitet og Uttrykk*, Høyskoleforlaget, Kristiansand, 2000, pp. 25–52.
18. Butler R., Hinch T. *Tourism and Indigenous Peoples*. Taylor & Francis, London, 1996.
19. Ruotsala H. Does sense of place still exist? *Journal of Ethnology and Folkloristics*, 2008, 1 (2), pp. 43–54.
20. Gaino L.B.B. *Samene som Turistattraksjon*. MPhil thesis, Finnmark University College, 2005.