



# Arctic youth transcending notions of "culture" and "nature": emancipative discourses of place for cultural sustainability

Reetta Toivanen<sup>1</sup> and Nora Fabritius<sup>2</sup>

This article presents research on contradictory representations of the Arctic and its inhabitants from the point of view of sustainable development. Indigenous peoples are repeatedly presented as connected to nature but outside politics, while business and state stakeholders portray the Arctic as uninhabited and utilizable for extractivism. These depictions diminish the agency of indigenous Sámi in political decision-making, agency that is integral to achieving a sustainable future both for Arctic lands and cultures. Contrary to what older generations fear, research from this decade shows that youth — who are increasingly moving to urban centers — are not necessarily leaving Sámi culture and lands. They are finding new modes of agency by transcending the discursive boundaries of periphery and center, nature and culture.

## Addresses

<sup>1</sup> Helsinki Institute of Sustainability Science (HELSUS), The Centre of Excellence in Law, Identity and the European Narratives, University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 9 (Siltavuorenpenger 1A), 00014, Finland

<sup>2</sup> The Centre of Excellence in Law, Identity and the European Narratives, University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 9 (Siltavuorenpenger 1A), 00014, Finland

Corresponding author: Toivanen, Reetta ([reetta.toivanen@helsinki.fi](mailto:reetta.toivanen@helsinki.fi))

Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability 2020, 43:58–64

This review comes from a themed issue on **Indigenous conceptualizations of 'Sustainability'**

Edited by **Pirjo K Virtanen, Laura Siragusa and Hanna Guttorm**

Received: 14 June 2019; Accepted: 04 February 2020

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2020.02.003>

1877-3435/© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

## Introduction

Based on research in the Barents Sea area from the last decades, this review article highlights differences in constructions of the Arctic as a place of belonging and the relationship between the lands and peoples. Representations by state and business stakeholders, indigenous and environmental organizations, and grassroots actors are placed in comparison. This article asks what the consequences of these imaginaries are in regards to a sustainable future for the Arctic environment and cultures.

Sámi worldviews are grounded in a strong connection to their lands, to nature and to respect and the balance between all beings [1,2<sup>\*\*\*</sup>]. Today, however, the *discourses* of this close relationship are often based on a dichotomous divide between nature and culture, even though this conceptual separation has not historically been evident in the worldviews of many Sámi [2<sup>\*\*\*</sup>]. State and business stakeholders have used this discourse to place indigenous peoples on the outside of culture and thus on the outside of political agency [3<sup>\*\*\*</sup>,4]. At the same time, the Arctic region has recurrently been narrated by national majority literature and by state stakeholders as peripheral and empty of people, but also as a treasure chest from which riches can be extracted [5,6,7<sup>\*\*\*</sup>,3<sup>\*\*\*</sup>]. These narratives of place still silence the local indigenous peoples of the Arctic today.

Contemporary research underlines how crucial it is to include cultural human rights as a core component of sustainable development. Human rights, as they are set forth in international treaties, aim at achieving sustainable and healthy identities through the right to one's own culture and language [8,9]. These rights include the right to one's homelands, natural resources and livelihoods [10]. In order to ensure equity and sustainable wellbeing, minorities should be able to use their languages, develop their cultures and take part in the political and economic life of the state in which they live [8]. In spite of the fact that policy papers since the 1980s have stressed the importance of the involvement of the affected peoples in any development or planning activity, there is still a tendency not to take indigenous voices and rights into account in state and business development projects [3<sup>\*\*\*</sup>].

Using recent research and findings from interviews and ethnographic observation, this article argues that young people use human rights vocabulary to navigate between the expectations of maintaining the Sámi languages and cultures and staying on their traditional homeland, and the very real consequences of a loss of education and employment opportunities. Contrary to what older generations fear, not all young people who move away lose their ties to their homelands or to Sámi culture. Recent research shows that youth are finding new, resourceful ways of expressing and experiencing Sámi identity and expanding its discursive and geographical reach [11,12], thereby transcending the restrictive dichotomies of nature and culture, tradition and modernity, center and periphery [2<sup>\*\*\*</sup>]. Proceeding from these observations, we

argue for the decolonization and de-exoticization of discourses related to the Arctic lands and peoples. This is integral to a sustainable future, both for the Arctic lands and for its peoples.

### Utilitarian discourses on the lands of the Arctic

The Sámi peoples reside in Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Russia. As is the case with many other indigenous peoples [13], stereotypical depictions of Sámi have often presented them as exotic with a special connection to nature [2<sup>6</sup>,6,14]. Sámi are often described as ancient and traditional, set in a binary way against culture, modernity and state politics [3<sup>6</sup>]. Nature does not do politics; it just follows its natural course. Narrations of Sámi history often depict Sámi as dependent on the kindness of the Nordic states, being objects of actions and not active subjects with their own agendas [3<sup>6</sup>,15].

In addition, Arctic lands are often portrayed as empty of peoples, as *terra nullius* [5]. Steinberg, Tasch, and Gerhardt [5] argue that the political tendency to imagine the Circumpolar North as empty has been especially strong at times when interest in the local natural resources has been high. Tervaniemi and Magga [16] suggest that Sámi homelands have been able to be depicted as empty wilderness because semi-nomadic Sámi reindeer herders had limited archeological impact on the lands when the states turned their gaze toward its riches. Even though perhaps not visible to outsiders, the territory has been "culturally marked" by humans for some 10 000 years [17] (for example, by Sámi as *seita* places of worship; on the Finnish Arctic, see Ref. [18]). As Ridanpää [4] writes: "defining of the North exclusively in terms of a binary opposition between nature and culture has implied a multidimensional exercise of power in which culture and civilization have justified their own existence by excluding their opposites." This narrative of the Arctic as "empty" and its people as part of "nature" has several times been compared to the imaginaries of the Orient [19,20], the imaginary that Edward Said [21] famously called "Orientalism." As Bravo and Sörlin [19] argue, "regional labels are often powerful precisely because they are essentialist, ideologically loaded terms that purport to function as straightforward geographical categories," meaning that they more easily go unquestioned than stereotypical depictions of ethnic groups, for example.

The idea of sustainable development has been a central concept for cooperation in the Arctic for over 30 years [22<sup>6</sup>,23]. The trend in global academic and political discourses has been to focus on the triad of economic, environmental, and social sustainability [22<sup>6</sup>]. As Lempinen and Heininen [22<sup>6</sup>] point out, Arctic development has from the start also included an explicit focus on culture. For example, the Nordic Council of Ministers [23] emphasizes five "P"s in its sustainability work:

planet, peoples, prosperity, peace and partnerships. The report underlines "[t]he importance of culture for a sustainable future in the Arctic" [23].

As Toivanen [2<sup>6</sup>; see also Ref. 22<sup>6</sup>] shows, however, there are also examples of a more explicit utilitarian logic in strategic papers issued by the Arctic states during the last years [24<sup>6</sup>,25]. Toivanen uses the example of the expert report *Growth from the North: How can Norway, Sweden and Finland achieve sustainable growth in the Scandinavian Arctic?* [26], ordered by the governments of Finland, Sweden and Norway. As the title of the report implies, agency is given only to the states throughout the work. The sustainability and well-being of Arctic communities is given nothing more than instrumental value. Social unsustainability is depicted as a mere obstacle for the utilization of Arctic resources: without sustainable local communities, the lands cannot be used as "a treasury of resources" by "people and development outside the region."

The utilitarian approach in modern state politics is often portrayed as dichotomous to indigenous peoples' world-views and cosmologies [24<sup>6</sup>]. Because of this binary of indigenous cosmologies and extractivist consumerism, indigenous peoples have also gained a central role in argumentation for nature preservation [27,28]. As is also tangible in the program *Saamelaisten kestävä kehityksen ohjelma* [The Sámi program for sustainable development] issued by the Sámi Parliament in Finland in 2006 [29], Sámi, along with other indigenous peoples, have gained a position as experts of environmental sustainability [14,28"31]. A more recent example is the Sámi Arctic Strategy, issued by the Sámi Council in September 2019 [32], which reflects clear agency in shaping a sustainable future for the Arctic lands. In addition, Sámi youth have initiated several new projects and collaborations for sustainable Arctic development. At the first Arctic Leaders' Youth Summit in Rovaniemi, Finland in November 2019, the young Sámi called for involvement in the development of the Arctic region and recognition in the Arctic Council [33].

Yet, relying on this discourse has not always been mutually emancipatory for environmental and indigenous organizations [6]. The interests of environmental and cultural preservationists clash in cases when indigenous peoples use natural resources in ways that environmental organizations deem unsustainable. Keskitalo [6] argues that when the rights of indigenous peoples to use or govern their own lands are maintained on the basis of traditional entitlements and ancient connections to the land, it puts them in an "argumentative corner," where arguing for the sovereign use of lands in "modern manners" become weakened [see Refs. 30 and 2<sup>6</sup>]. This is the case even though human rights bodies have long ago dismissed the dichotomy between "traditional" and "modern" ([13],

see, for example, the case of Länsman *et al.* versus Finland, UN 1994 [34]). As Valkonen and Valkonen [2<sup>\*\*\*</sup>] contend, the concept of "tradition" should be understood from the point of view of the indigenous peoples themselves and as local knowledge; it is not necessarily a binary to the concept of modernity and change.

All human land use is intertwined with political contexts and power relations; no land use is solely "natural" or "cultural" [13]. All human activity on earth comes with both sustainable and unsustainable practices. As Posey [13], Skutnabb-Kangas [35] and Parsons, Fisher and Nalau [36] argue, however, protecting a diversity of local ecological knowledge is essential for maintaining a broad body of knowledge to turn to for contextualized ecological development solutions. For example, Riseth *et al.* [37] use Sámi traditional ecological knowledge in their study of how climate change affects snow and ice conditions, resulting in fresh insights. Another example is a collaboration that started in 2011 between Skolt Sámi and environmental scientists working to restore the Näätamö watershed (in northernmost Finland) and its salmon population [38<sup>\*\*\*</sup>]. The project had positive outcomes both for community well-being and for the environment. The fact that traditional knowledge is best preserved when transmitted from one generation to the next through practical language use in the environments they have developed [39] (and keep developing) once again underlines the importance of protecting indigenous peoples' rights to independently develop their livelihoods on their lands. Yet, all too seldom is this knowledge included in decision-making in the Arctic [38<sup>\*\*\*</sup>].

### Place and culture in the future of Arctic youth

This article goes on to ask how older and younger indigenous generations in the Arctic narrate the relationship between Arctic lands, nature and the sustainable future of Sámi culture. Interviews with Sámi people living in the Arctic conducted by Reetta Toivanen's research project in 2010<sup>3</sup> 2016<sup>3</sup> show that amidst otherwise diverse and fragmented narratives and discourses, older generations consistently envision the community's youth to be key to the future of Sámi culture. Many of the interviewed argued that the younger generations have acquired more positive attitudes toward Sámi culture, greatly as a result of the persistent local and global human rights movements. They describe it as a joy that the young people are showing interest toward their origins and revitalizing and maintaining Sámi cultures and languages. As one interviewee puts it: "There is a positive development going on" (Interview 014). A younger Skolt Sámi also pointed out how visible the change is: "The youth are kind of having a quite positive attitude [...] Skolt traditional

clothing is trending. They are on everyone now, even if at one point nobody wore them" (Interview 010). Times are changing, and the older generations see youth as key to reversing the tragedy of language loss in the past. When asked whether the positive attitude of the youth is catching on with the older generations, one Sámi woman answers: "Old people are joining and it's kind of the most wonderful of all when you witness that, that old people, the elderly, who have seen all this that has happened for decades, then when you see the children, grandchildren, grand-grandchildren suddenly start to speak Sámi... you can't be anything else than pleased" (Interview 015).

Simultaneously, the older generations express concern for the fact that many young people move from their homelands to urban centers. Young people, and especially young women, in the rural Arctic areas of the Nordic countries are today moving in increasing numbers to bigger urban hubs in order to find work and get an education [40<sup>\*\*\*</sup>42]. This rupture has happened in between the oldest generation and the youngest. Since for ethical reasons Finnish authorities do not keep registers based on ethnicity, there are no exact numbers available [43], but the Finnish Sámi Parliament's statistics indicate that over 70% of Sámi younger than 18 years old live outside the Sámi native region [44]. This raises the question of how Sámi languages and knowledge can be shared between younger and older generations in the future.

Urbanization is something that indigenous locals argue is a cause for concern. They frame the economic and infrastructural changes of society as the cause of this worrying development. One interviewee states: "Well, of course they leave. They have to leave when aiming for higher education, and when they get new jobs there in that place, well, then they stay there" (Interview 039). Leaving is portrayed in this way as forced by the circumstances. The interviewees note that the youth would stay if given the chance: "Young people are interested in their own roots... in a way I believe that every single young Sámi wants to come back to their home region at some point, but unfortunately they have to go study somewhere else" (Interview 016). Sámi culture is constructed as intrinsically bound up with the Sámi homelands and the youth leaving as forced by external circumstances and as representing a threat to the sustainability of Sámi culture.

Moving to urban areas has always been a symbol of assimilation, cultural loss and losing one's roots [41]. When asked what will happen to the young who leave, one interviewee bluntly answered: "Well, there will be this natural process, they will become Finnish" (Interview 041). Another argued: "Like, it is the best situation here in Sámi homeland, like, here the most vibrant reindeer herding exists, here there are youth, there are

<sup>3</sup> Prof. Reetta Toivanen's (University of Helsinki) project *On "Glocal" governance: On the meanings and consequences of the "vernacularization" of Human Rights Concepts* (2011–2016, funded by the Academy of Finland).

children, and young people are joining much more than there in the South” (Interview 021). He continued by adding that a continuation of Sámi lifestyle does not happen “in the South.” Like many other, he constructs “the North” as the place where both Sámi roots and a sustainable Sámi future are situated, with the “South” as its opposite.

How are the young themselves, then, navigating these diverging dichotomies of nature versus culture, North versus South, modernity versus tradition? Great generational differences in approaches to youth mobility and to cultural and linguistic maintenance are not to be unexpected in times of rapid societal change [45,46]. Research on the mobility and urban life of Sámi youth is still sparse. Some studies do, however, indicate that many of the young people who move away from their homelands do not seem to give up their roots or their ties to the lands [11,41,45]. Even though some born outside Sámi homelands may not maintain a direct connection to a specific village, many nonetheless uphold identities that are closely connected to the lands of the Arctic and to nature, while simultaneously expanding Sámi identity and cultural expression in urban settings.

Among the younger Sámi that we interviewed, a strong identification with indigeneity and a deep connection with other indigenous peoples is evident in the way they narrate their identity. When we asked a few young Sámi if “indigeneity” feels tangible to them, they answered that it absolutely does. They described how similar different indigenous peoples around the globe are, how they all have their own languages and “the same experiences of nature, like, the same words, that has to do with it, like, nature people” (Interview 035). The young people we met narrate their identity as tightly connected to land and to nature. This relationship does not seem to become weakened, even for those who move away from their place of birth in the North. One young Sámi woman summarized this in an explicit way:

But, like, for me it’s really important, I have moved an insane amount of times. And still I know that when I go to [my home village] and I put my hand on the land, then I know, that this is it, there my home is. It’s really important for me to have that place, where I know that there they have watched the landscapes a hundred years ago, there they watched them two hundred years ago, there they watched the landscapes a thousand years ago. It’s really important. Like, I define Sáminess through, like, the same what it means to be indigenous; it is the same as being Sámi. It is what is important to me, what I hold valuable, what my values are, what my worldview is. Through that, my Sáminess is built. It’s not built from anything else. And from this I know where the roots are from which I have been raised. (Interview 040)

Current research underlines that indigenous youth in the Arctic often imagine translocational lives for themselves [41,45]. Just as this Sámi woman narrates, moving does not mean a definitive abandonment of Sámi culture. Many still feel a strong connection to indigeneity, to their homelands and to their ancestors in the North. Many envision themselves as living in their place of birth but simultaneously commuting to work in some urban area, or living in an urban area but frequently visiting their homeland and maintaining ties through social media [41,42]. Social media, distant learning, easy traveling and different cultural festivals are supporting young people’s connection to Sámi languages and the formation of shared indigenous identities [11,47].

As Virtanen [48] points out, “Urbanization is a global question for today’s indigenous youth.” Although focusing on indigenous youth in Brazilian Amazonia, a very different context compared to the Barents Sea area, some parallels are recognizable. Also in Brazilian Amazonia, youth are exploring new avenues of agency and translocational lives beyond the dichotomies of the urban and the rural. They are formulating new discourses of emancipation and new narratives for expressing indigeneity and protecting their homelands and culture, a process for which the possibility to study and work beyond the home village seems to be a necessity. In scholarly attempts to decolonize notions of place, similar observations have been made among indigenous urban youth in other places as well (see Greenop on indigenous youth in Queensland, Australia [49]).

## Conclusions

This article is yet another attempt to show why human rights and a sustainable future go hand in hand. Human well-being is surely a widely shared value and a goal as such. However, a vast body of research, as well as international human rights frameworks, underlines that human well-being, sustained by healthy identities and cultures, is key to achieving sustainable development for the environment [22,13,50]. No lasting structures for future sustainable uses of the environment can be upheld without a healthy democratic society in which people live in peace and everyone’s voice is equally heard [13,35]. Regarding Arctic sustainability, Wilson [51] writes: “further research into the Arctic ”space“ and Arctic discourses should pay attention to when and how boundaries of difference are encountered and when and why movement across these boundaries fails or is achieved.” This article shows that representations of places and peoples are integral to a sustainable future, and that the contemporary discourses of the Arctic and its peoples are assigning them largely diverging possibilities to act and get heard. Culture is dependent on sustainable use of Arctic lands, but the Arctic lands are also dependent on the sustainability of the local cultures. In order to achieve healthy cultures and Arctic sustainability, the power to

define what culture, tradition and sustainability entail should be given to the voices of the land itself — the voices of the people of the North.

Thomas Hylland Eriksen [7] writes; “there can be no cultural and political autonomy without ecological self-determination. In the next few decades, the destiny of the North, its landscapes, peoples and ways of life, will not depend on whether or not its inhabitants travel, learn languages, use smartphones or vote in national elections, but rather whether the destruction of the environment can be prevented.” Although many of the young move away from the villages where they were born, they do not necessarily “leave.” The connection to and the future of Arctic lands remains important. As Valkonen and Valkonen [2] write, “Land is what carries Sámi life, and therefore if land is threatened, Sámi culture, life and existence are also threatened.” The fact that current societal structures in which minority cultures and languages are evolving are far more multitudinous and diverse than those in which they took form earlier [52] is something that opens new important topics for future research. The internet enables remote teaching, Face-Time calls, family Skype sessions, and sharing of pictures and videos that enhance the feeling of being “there.” Sámi language is “moving from places to spaces,” as Pietikäinen [53] puts it. The main conclusion of this article is that in between the different discourses that are constructed along dichotomous lines and used to diminish the agency of local indigenous peoples of the Arctic—nature versus culture, North versus South, tradition versus modernity—the younger generation seems to be finding new ways to transcend the binaries and create new modes of agency.

### Funding sources

This work was funded by the Strategic Research Council at the Academy of Finland, project ALL-YOUTH [grant number 3126891] and by the Academy of Finland-funded Centre of Excellence in Law, Identity and the European Narratives [Subproject 3, grant number 312431] and the Academy of Finland-funded project On “Glocal” governance: On the meanings and consequences of the “vernacularization” of Human Rights Concepts [grant number 256143], without any involvement in the content.

### Conflict of interest statement

Nothing declared.

### References and recommended reading

Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review, have been highlighted as:

- of special interest
- of special interest

1. Helander E: **Saamelainen maailmankuva ja luontosuhde [Sámi worldview and relationship to nature]**. In *Beaivvi Manát* "

*Saamelaisten juuret ja nykyaika*. Edited by Seurujärvi-Kari I. Suomen Kirjallisuuden Seura; 2000:171-182.

2. Valkonen J, Valkonen S: **On local knowledge**. In *Knowing from the Indigenous North Sámi Approaches to History, Politics and Belonging*. Edited by Eriksen TH, Valkonen S, Valkonen J. Routledge; 2018  
This article discusses local knowledge and its relation to (Western) scientific knowledge and “knowing imposed from outside” in the context of the North. The chapter brings forth local Sámi conceptualizations of “tradition,” “nature” and “culture” and discusses the concept of place.
3. Toivanen R: **European fantasy of the Arctic region and the rise of indigenous Sámi voices in the global arena**. In *Arctic Triumph: Northern Innovation and Persistence*. Edited by Sellheim N, Zaika YV, Kelman I. Springer International Publishing; 2019:23-40  
This article shows that state and business stakeholders’ approach to the Arctic is often utilitarian and that these approaches tend to exclude indigenous and local voices from politics. However, by using global narratives of minorityness and indigeneity, and a human rights vocabulary, indigenous people have found ways to get their voices heard.
4. Ridanpää J: **Singing acts from the deep North: Critical perspectives on northern exotics, contemporary ethnic music and language preservation in Sámi communities**. *J Cultur Res* 2016, **20**:17-30 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14797585.2015.1134057>.
5. Steinberg PE, Tasch J, Gerhardt H: *Contesting the Arctic: Politics and Imaginaries in the Circumpolar North*. I.B. Tauris; 2015.
6. Keskitalo ECH: *Negotiating the Arctic: The Construction of an International Region*. Routledge; 2004.
7. Eriksen TH: **The paradox of autonomy**. In *Knowing from the Indigenous North Sámi Approaches to History, Politics and Belonging*. Edited by Eriksen TH, Valkonen S, Valkonen J. Routledge; 2018  
This article discusses the paradox of autonomy; in order to gain autonomy from the Arctic states, indigenous peoples in the North have had to formulate their “themselves through the gaze of the other.” Eriksen argues, that “ecological self-determination” is needed in order for cultural and political autonomy to be achieved in the North.
8. Phillipson R, Skutnabb-Kangas T: *Rights to Language: Equity, Power, and Education: Celebrating the 60th Birthday of Tove Skutnabb-Kangas*. L. Erlbaum Associates; 2000.
9. International Society of Ethnobiology: *International Society of Ethnobiology Code of Ethics (with 2008 additions)*. International Society of Ethnobiology; 2006. URL:<http://ethnobiology.net/code-of-ethics/> (Accessed 21 May 2019).
10. Saul B: *Indigenous Peoples Human Rights: International and Regional Jurisprudence*. Hart Publishing; 2016.
11. Karlsdóttir A, Jungsberg L: **Nordic Arctic Youth ” future perspectives**. *Nordregio Working Paper*. Nordregio; 2015.
12. Mathisen L, Carlsson E, Sletterød NA: **Sámi identity and visions of preferred futures: experiences among youth in Finnmark and Trøndelag, Norway**. *Northern Rev* 2017, **45**:113-139.
13. Posey DA: **Introduction: culture and nature ” the inextricable link**. In *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity*. Edited by Posey DA. United Nations Environment Programme, Intermediate Technology Publications; 1999:1-18.
14. Valkonen J, Valkonen S: **Contesting the nature relations of Sámi culture**. *Acta Borealia* 2014, **31**:25-40 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08003831.2014.905010>.
15. Toivanen R: **The Saami people and Nordic civil society**. In *Civil Society in the Baltic Sea Region*. Edited by Götz N, Hackmann J. Ashgate; 2003:205-216 <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315199610>.
16. Tervaniemi S, Magga P: **Belonging to Sápmi ” the Sámi conceptions of home and home Region**. In *Knowing from the Indigenous North ” Sámi Approaches to History, Politics and Belonging*. Edited by Eriksen TH, Valkonen S, Valkonen J. Routledge; 2018:75-90.
17. Thuen T: **Innledning**. In *Samene: Urbefolkning og minoritet [Sámi: Indigenous peoples and minority]*. Edited by Thuen T. Universitetsforlaget; 1980:9-21.

18. Carpelan C: **Inarilaisten arkeologiset vaiheet [The archaeological phases of the people of Inari]**. In *Aanaar, Inarin historia jääkaudesta nykypäivään*. Edited by Lehtola V-P. Inarin kunta; 2003:28-95.
19. Bravo M, Sörlin S: **Preface; narrative and practice ” an introduction**. In *Narrating the Arctic: A Cultural History of Nordic Scientific Practices*. Edited by Bravo M, Sörlin S. Watson Publishing International; 2002:vii-32.
20. Ryall A, Schimanski J, Wærp HH: **Arctic discourses: an introduction**. In *Arctic Discourses*. Edited by Ryall A, Schimanski J, Wærp HH. Cambridge Scholars Publishing; 2010:ix-xxiii.
21. Said EW: *Orientalism*. Vintage Books; 1979.
- 22<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup>. Lempinen H, Heininen L: **Paikallisten elämäntyyliä, alkuperäiskansojen kulttuurit? Kulttuuri ja sen kestävyys arktisten valtioiden strategioissa [Indigenous cultures, local lifestyles? Cultural sustainabilities in the Arctic strategies of the Arctic Council member states]**. *Alue ja ympäristö* 2016, **45**:4-14
- This article offers an analysis of the Arctic strategies of the Arctic council member states with a focus on their approach to culture. The authors conclude that culture is presented as having an instrumental value for the state and that it is primarily indigenous cultures that are considered.
23. Nordic Council of Ministers: *Arktisen alueen Pohjoismainen kumppanuus: Pohjoismaiden ministerineuvoston arktinen yhteistyöohjelma 2018”2021*. Pohjoismaiden ministerineuvosto; 2017 <http://dx.doi.org/10.6027/ANP2017-763>.
- 24<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup>. Stammler F, Ivanova A: **Confrontation, coexistence or co-ignorance? Negotiating human-resource relations in two Russian regions**. *Extr Ind Soc* 2016, **3**:60-72
- This article analyzes different local approaches to extractivist industries through two case studies in Russia. The ”utilitarian logic“ prevails. In some cases, indigenous peoples have managed to uphold a ”partnership logic,“ in which lands and humans are seen as co-dependent. This logic can only be sustained, however, if done on the terms of the extractivists.
25. Arbo P, Iversen A, Knol M, Ringholm T, Sander G: **Arctic futures: conceptualizations and images of a changing Arctic**. *Polar Geogr* 2013, **36**:163-182 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1088937X.2012.724462>.
26. Husebekk A, Andersson M, Penttilä REJ: *Growth from the North: How can Norway, Sweden and Finland Achieve Sustainable Growth in the Scandinavian Arctic? Report of an Independent Expert Group*. Prime Minister’s Office Publications; 2015.
27. Jokinen M: **Heated and frozen forest conflicts: cultural sustainability and forest management in arctic Finland**. In *Forests Under Pressure: Local Responses to Global Issues*. Edited by Katila P, Galloway G, de Jong W, Pacheco P, Mery G. International Union of Forest Research Organizations; 2014:381-399.
28. Schanche A: **Innledning. Naturresurser og miljøverdier i samiske områder: forvaltnings- og forskningsutfordringer [Introduction: Natural resources and environmental values in Sámi territories: challenges in administration and research]**. *Diedut* 2001, **2**:3-19.
29. Sámi Parliament: *Saamelaisten kestävä kehityksen ohjelma 2006 [The Sámi Program for Sustainable Development 2006]*. Sámi Parliament; 2006.
30. Valkonen J: *Lapin luontopolitiikka: Analyysi vuosien 1946”2000 julkisesta keskustelusta [The politics of nature in Lapland: An analysis of the public discussion during the years 1946”2000]*. Tampereen yliopisto; 2003.
31. Pierotti R, Wildcat DR: **Traditional knowledge, culturally-based world-views and Western science**. In *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity*. Edited by Posey A. Intermediate Technology Publications, United Nations Environment Programme; 1999:192-199.
32. Saami Council: *The Sámi Arctic Strategy: Securing Enduring Influence for the Sámi people in the Arctic Through Partnerships, Education And Advocacy*. Saami Council; 2019. URL: [http://www.saamicouncil.net/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Documents/Eara\\_dokumeanttat/FINAL\\_Saami-Arctic-Strategy\\_with\\_attachment.pdf](http://www.saamicouncil.net/fileadmin/user_upload/Documents/Eara_dokumeanttat/FINAL_Saami-Arctic-Strategy_with_attachment.pdf) (Accessed 28 January 2020).
33. Arctic Council: *Stepping Up Youth Engagement in the Arctic Council*. Arctic Council; 2019. URL: <https://arctic-council.org/index.php/en/our-work/2/8-news-and-events/560-stepping-up-youth-engagement-in-the-arctic-council> (Accessed 28 January 2020).
34. United Nations: *Länsman et al. v. Finland, Communication No. 511/1992. United Nations Document CCPR/C/52/D/511/1992*. United Nations; 1992.
35. Skutnabb-Kangas T: **Linguistic diversity and biodiversity the threat from killer languages**. In *The Politics of English as a World Language: New Horizons in Postcolonial Cultural Studies*. Edited by Mair C. Editions Rodopi; 2003:31-52.
36. Parsons M, Fisher K, Nalau J: **Alternative approaches to co-design: insights from indigenous/academic research collaborations**. *Curr Opin Environ Sustain* 2016, **20**:99-105.
37. Riseth JÅ, Tømmervik H, Helander-Renvall E, Labba N, Johansson C, Malnes E, Bjerke JW, Jonsson C, Pohjola V: **Sámi traditional ecological knowledge as a guide to science: snow, ice and reindeer pasture facing climate change**. *Polar Record* 2011, **47**:202-217.
- 38<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup>. Mustonen T, Feodoroff, (with the Skolt Sámi Fishermen of Sevettijärvi) P: **Skolt Sámi and Atlantic Salmon Collaborative Management of Näätämö Watershed, Finland as a case of indigenous evaluation and knowledge in the Eurasian Arctic**. *Indigenous Eva ” New Direct Eval* 2018, **159**:107-119 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ev.20334>
- Presents a novel project of collaboration between Skolt Sámi and scientists for restoring the Näätämö watershed and its salmon population. The project had positive outcomes both for community well-being and for the restoration of the local environment.
39. Helander-Renvall E, Markkula I: *Luonnon monimuotoisuus ja saamelaiset. Biologista monimuotoisuutta koskevan artikla 8(j):n toimeenpanoa tukeva selvitys Suomen Saamelaisalueella*. Ympäristöministeriö; 2011.
40. Moisio J, Gissler M, Haapakorva P, Myllyniemi S: **Lasten ja nuorten muuttoliikkeet tilastoissa [Statistics on the migration of children and youth]**. In *Lapset ja nuoret muuttoliikkeessä ” Nuorten elinolut -vuosikirja 2016*. Edited by Kivijärvi A, Peltola M. Nuorisotutkimusseura; 2016:17-50.
41. Nyseth T, Pedersen P: **Urban Sámi identities in Scandinavia: Hybridities, ambivalences and cultural innovation**. *Acta Borealia* 2014, **31**:131-151 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08003831.2014.967976>.
42. Kloep M, Hendry LB, Glendinning A, Ingebrigtsen J-E, Espnes GA: **Peripheral visions? A cross-cultural study of rural youths’ views on migration**. *Children’s Geographies* 2010, **1**:91-109.
- e:surname>P.PedersenUrban Sámi identities in Scandinavia: Hybridities, ambivalences and cultural innovationActa Borealia31201413115110.1080/08003831.2014.967976.
42. Kloep M, Hendry LB, Glendinning A, Ingebrigtsen J-E, Espnes GA: **Peripheral visions? A cross-cultural study of rural youths’ views on migration**. *Children’s Geographies* 2010, **1**:91-109.
43. Keva J: *Hyvää saamelaisten kansallispäivää*. Tilastokeskus; 2019. URL: <http://www.stat.fi/tietotrendit/blogit/2019/hyvaa-saamelaisten-kansallispavaa/> (Accessed 28 January 2020).
44. Sámi Parliament: *Saamelaisten lukumäärä vuoden 2015 Saamelaiskäräjien vaaleissa*. Sámi Parliament; 2015. URL: <https://dokumentit.solinum.fi/samediggi/?f=Dokumenttipankki%2FTilastoja%2FSaamelaisten%20lk%20vaaleissa> (Accessed 28 January 2020).
45. Pedersen P, Nyseth T: **Urban Sámi and the City as a frame for the development of a new Sámi cultural form in Scandinavia**. In *Proceedings from the First International Conference on Urbanisation in the Arctic*. Edited by Rasmussen OR, Hansen KG, Weber R. *Proceedings from the First International Conference on Urbanisation in the ArcticNordregio: 2013:79-89*.

46. Johansen I: **'But They Call Us the Language Police!' Speaker and ethnic identifying profiles in the process of revitalizing the South Sámi language, culture and ethnic identity.** In *The Indigenous Identity of the South Saami – Historical and Political Perspectives on a Minority within a Minority*. Edited by Hermanstad H, Kolberg A, Nilssen TR, Sem L. Springer; 2019:29–46 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05029-0\\_3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05029-0_3)
- Analyzes different discursive profiles constructed by and for people in the process of revitalizing South Sámi language. The article presents a plurality of voices and actors connected to a language and its revitalization and underlines the need to tailor language and culture revitalization strategies in order for them to be effective.
47. Pietikäinen S, Dlaske K: **Cutting across media spaces and boundaries: the case of a hybrid, indigenous Sámi TV comedy.** *Sociolinguistica* 2013, **27**:87–100 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/soci.2013.27.1.87>.
48. Virtanen PK: *Indigenous Youth in Brazilian Amazonia: Changing Lived Worlds*. Palgrave Macmillan; 2012.
49. Greenop K: **Place meaning, attachment and identity in contemporary indigenous Inala, Queensland.** *Conference paper: Perspectives on Urban Life: Connections and Reconnections, 28th September – 2nd October 2009, Australian National University, Canberra; Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies: 2009.*
50. Allen J, Hopper K, Wexler L, Kral M, Rasmus S, Nystad K: **Mapping resilience pathways of Indigenous youth in five circumpolar communities.** *Transcult Psychiatry* 2014, **51**:601–631.
51. Wilson E: **Arctic unity, Arctic difference: mapping the reach of northern discourses.** *Polar Rec* 2007, **43**:125–133.
52. Toivanen R, Saarikivi J: **Introduction to New and Old Language Diversities.** In *Linguistic Genocide and Language Rights*. Edited by Toivanen R, Saarikivi J. Multilingual Matters; 2016:1–18.
53. Pietikäinen S: **Sámi language mobility: scales and discourses of multilingualism in polycentric environment.** *Int J Sociol Lang* 2010, **2010**:79–101.