Introduction: Indigenousness and Urbanization

Mikkel Berg-Nordlie, Astri Dankertsen and Marte S. Winsvold

From the Arctic to Australia, from the Americas to Asia, Indigenous peoples are experiencing a demographic shift towards increased urbanity. The cities that Indigenous people move to, tend to be culturally and politically dominated by non-Indigenous peoples. Sometimes these urban areas are located outside the Indigenous peoples' traditional lands — but also towns and cities built on Indigenous lands are often dominant-group strongholds, as historical processes of colonization and marginalization have pushed Indigenous peoples and their cultures away from the centres and into the geographical margins (UNHABITAT 2010, Peters and Andersen 2013).

What happens to Indigenous individuals involved in this demographic shift? Do they suffer loss of ethnic identity, language, and culture, and weakened social ties with their ethnic community? If not, how do they manage to preserve their identity, language, and culture under urban circumstances? Do urbanized Indigenous individuals retain their connections to rural areas, or is contact with the rural cultural strongholds severed? What role do new communication technologies have in facilitating contact between urbanized Indigenous individuals, and in maintaining urban–rural ties? What processes occur between urban Indigenous people, on the one hand, and, on the other, urban authorities unaccustomed to dealing with Indigenous issues? What is the role of state-based actors in urban Indigenous

governance? How do Indigenous people organize to facilitate the survival of their culture and identity in urban settings?

This book was written as part of the research project *NUORGÁV—An Urban Future for Sápmi?* in which researchers examined different aspects of the urbanization of an Indigenous nation whose lands and populations has been split between several states — the Sámi nation, which is divided between Norway, Sweden, Russia, and Finland. The project focused on political processes and identity formation processes that could improve the conditions for the ethnic survival of Indigenous Sámi under urban conditions. The chapters compare various aspects of Sámi urbanization in Norway, the country with the largest Sámi population, with the experiences of Sámi in other states, and with Indigenous peoples elsewhere.

The chapter at hand consists of three parts. In the first part, we give an introduction to Indigenous urbanization and Indigeneity. We begin by discussing Indigenous urban life and urbanization, and then provide an introduction to colonization and Indigeneity and the link between these two concepts. In the second part, we give an overview of the theoretical and methodological perspectives of the book. In the theoretical section, we focus on postcolonial and Indigenous perspectives, perspectives on space and Indigeneity, racism and racialization of the Sámi, culture and identities, and Indigenous governance. In the methodological part, we present the research project *NUORGÁV—An Urban Future for Sápmi* and its design, discuss the methods that we have used, some ethical issues, and the positionality and reflexivity of the researchers. In the third part, we give a summary of the chapters and introduce the authors of the books and their academic, as well as relevant personal and political, backgrounds.

Urbanization, Indigeneity and colonization

Urbanization, Urbanity, and Urban Indigenous Life

"Urbanization" may refer to a demographic process in which a population becomes increasingly concentrated in areas categorized as urban rather than rural, but it may also refer to the spread of *urbanity*—cultural traits referred to as "urban"— among populations of both rural and urban areas. This distinction between urbanization and urbanity is what makes it possible to speak of some rural-settled Indigenous individuals who are thoroughly imbued with urban values as "urbanites without a city" (Willerslev 2010: 190). "Urbanization" may also be used to refer to the creation of urban settlements in previously rural areas.

When discussing "Indigenous urbanization," this book refers to a demographic phenomenon in which Indigenous populations concentrate in urban areas—either because of Indigenous migration to urban areas, or because areas where Indigenous people live become urbanized. That said, the main focus is not on the demographic phenomenon of urbanization as such, but on central aspects of the *urban Indigenous life* that develops due to Indigenous urbanization.

Urbanization is often discussed as resulting from both *pull* factors and *push* factors: people are pushed from the countryside by the erosion or destruction of conditions for continuing traditional economic activities, by limited access to work or education, cultural services, welfare services, or modern technology—and pulled to urban areas because of better access there. The push–pull effect described here can be seen as a form of *compulsion* (Davies 2014, 591–592): people are not technically forced to urbanize, but socio-economic conditions make it difficult not to urbanize. That rural areas lack access to the above-mentioned goods and necessities, and that access to these goods has become concentrated in urban areas, is a result of decisions that have been made by others—politicians and capital-owners—who tend to live in urban areas, and who are generally not part of the Indigenous minority population.

The Indigenous peoples of the world live in countries where rural communities have differing degrees of power vis-à-vis state and market forces, and the degrees and types of "push and pull" experienced by Indigenous peoples also vary greatly. This can be observed even in the case of relatively similar countries, such as Andersen and Peters' (2013) comparison of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the USA (Andersen and Peters 2013, 378–379; Peters and Andersen 2013a, 169; 2013b, 307; Snipp 2013, 176–177).[1]

If we place the push-mechanisms that drive Indigenous populations to urbanize on a scale from "hard push" to "soft push," the very hardest type is forced removal of Indigenous populations from rural areas. Such removals may occur in the more limited form of removing that population's access to areas with important resources, thereby strengthening their economic compulsion to leave their rural communities, or in the form of wholesale removal of Indigenous communities from smaller to larger settlements. As noted in Chapter 1 and 4, the latter type of "hard push" has been practiced most harshly against the Sámi of the Soviet Union. Official programs aimed at facilitating urbanization are another type of "driver" for Indigenous urbanization. Sometimes these programs emphasize greater Indigenous access to social services and education (Peters and Andersen 2013c, 24); or they may be more bluntly assimilationist (Peters and Andersen 2013b, 307; 2013d, 232–233; Snipp 2013¨, 176–177).

Urbanization may also be driven by rapid population growth in rural areas where concentrations of Indigenous peoples live—sometimes as a result of earlier pushes of Indigenous people *to* rural areas (Peters and Andersen 2013c, 24). Another push–pull effect concerning the urbanization of Indigenous people is the push of racism in rural areas, combined with the pull of hopes that discrimination will be less severe in areas characterized by urbanity and multiculturalism (Peters and Andersen 2013d, 234). Many Indigenous individuals furthermore (just like many members of the general population) experience the cultural "pull" of cities[2] as places where self-realization seems more readily achievable than

in rural areas, that may be more culturally conservative. Similarly, the wider range of cultural experiences in urban areas may also exert a pull on rural Indigenous individuals.

Until now, we have been committing something of a sin when it comes to discussing urban Indigenous life: we have made it appear as if urban Indigenous life is a recent phenomenon—which is indeed a common assumption, rooted in what Norris et al. (2013, 29) call "a long historical tradition in Western thought that holds urban and Aboriginal cultures to be incompatible." In fact, many Indigenous peoples have a long urban history. Many readers probably know of the ancient city-centered civilizations of South and Central America, but also in North America some Indigenous nations were organized into permanent towns, even large cities (Snipp 2013, 174–176). Through disease, warfare and other aspects of colonization, many of these urban areas were depopulated. Concerning Asia, we may mention the Newar people, the Indigenous inhabitants of Nepal's Kathmandu Valley, who founded the valley's old cities and still live there in great numbers (Berg-Nordlie and Schou 2011; Onta 2006). Some Indigenous groups that did not build their own urban settlements prior to subjugation nevertheless have a long history of settlement in colonist-founded urban areas. This includes many Indigenous North American groups, who had a significant early presence in such cities, but were eventually pushed out. From that perspective, many North American Indigenous groups are now *re*-urbanizing (McCreary et al 2019; Peters and Andersen 2013c, 24; Snipp 2013, 174–177, 89–91; Tomiak et al 2019, 15-16).

Nevertheless, it is largely correct to depict urban areas as overwhelmingly characterized by the dominant ethnos and its culture. Cities are centers of economic and political power; therefore, they tend to be places where members of the dominant ethnos congregate. This often holds true also when the cities in question are located deep within the homelands of Indigenous peoples. During the urbanization of Indigenous territories, Indigenous people and their cultures have frequently been pushed to the social and

geographical margins, with the new urban centers becoming dominant-group strongholds on Indigenous land. It is to such dominant-group controlled areas that Indigenous peoples have been migrating *en masse* during the last century. During the 1900s, the Indigenous populations of several states shifted from having a rural majority to an urban one.[3] As explored for example in the anthologies of Axelsson and Sköld (2011) and Peters and Anderson (2013), quantitative data on Indigenous peoples are riddled with methodological problems (see also Chapter 1 of this book), but the available data clearly indicate a demographic shift. In addition to the movement of people from rural to urban areas, re-emergent Indigenous identities among urban people of Indigenouas heritage also contribute to the current growth of the urban Indigenous populations (Axelsson et al. 2011, 298; Norris et al. 2013, 30).

Colonialism and Indigeneity

To understand the specific context that urban Indigeneity exists within, it is important to understand urbanization in relation to colonialism. There is no universally recognized definition of the term "Indigenous," but a frequently cited definition is found in ILO Convention 169 "On Indigenous and Tribal Peoples" (ILO 169). The Convention essentially defines a people as "Indigenous" if it self-defines as such, if it is descended from a population that inhabited (part of) a state's area prior to the establishment of the present-day state borders, and has retained some of its "social, economic, cultural and political institutions" ("institutions" here defined broadly: e.g. language can be a cultural institution). According to this definition, it is not essential for an Indigenous people to be autochthonous, in the sense that they trace their earliest history back to their current homeland, or even that the people has historical primacy in the area, i.e. that their presence in the area predates that of other peoples currently living there. What the ILO definition emphasizes is a certain historical experience: an Indigenous people is a group which, after settling in their current homeland, were

subjugated by a state dominated by another ethnos, that incorporated their lands and population (See also Axelsson and Sköld 2011, 2–14, Berg-Nordlie et al. 2015, 9–11; deCosta 2015).

The resulting category includes ethnic groups that are very different. Some are economically and socially among the most marginalized groups in the world, whereas others live in affluent welfare states but nevertheless face challenges to the survival of their language, culture, and identity. The peoples in question also live under a range of different state–minority and majority–minority relations (Berg-Nordlie et al. 2015, 2–11; Selle et al. 2013, 712–713). On the other hand, the world's Indigenous peoples share fundamental similarities. They have all had a presence in their current homelands since before the arrival of the states that now control them, and yet they all live in societies that are dominated by another people in terms of language, culture, and ultimately political power. They have all experienced attacks on their languages, cultures and identities—some also on their physical existence. They live in states that are geared towards expressing the culture and interests of another people, and find themselves forced into constant uphill struggles to preserve and rebuild their cultures within those societies.

States' definitions of Indigenousness exhibit substantial variation, as can be observed in e.g. deCosta's (2015) review of practices. This variation is observable both in terms of which *peoples* are considered Indigenous, and which *people* are considered Indigenous. In the latter case, i.e. when we are talking about which specific individuals the state sees as being part of an Indigenous people, the "subjective criterion" tends to be a core element—people should not be labelled as belonging to an Indigenous nation against their will, self-identification is necessary. Most often, this is not held to be enough, however. Some states have regulations that, in practice, make full recognition as Indigenous dependent on the approval of Indigenous institutions (deCosta 2015, 28, 31–33, 35). This can be seen as a way

of ensuring Indigenous communities' self-governance over who joins their ethnic collective: if a non-Indigenous body had the right to approve or deny members of an Indigenous nation, that would arguably violate the principle of Indigenous self-determination (Aikio and Åhrén 2014; Junka-Aikio 2014). Nevertheless, the principle of community recognition puts considerable power in the hands of those already recognized as part of the community, and that is not without risks. Dominant groups within the community of Indigenous-status individuals may, in practice, reinforce their own dominance by preventing individuals from non-dominant groups from joining the formal ethnic collective. The issue is particularly salient when it comes to the status of the descendants of Indigenous persons who assimilated into the majority culture, but who now wish to reclaim their Indigenous identity (Beach 2007, 2; Berg-Nordlie et al. 2015, 15–18; deCosta 2015, 52–53; Joona 2012; Laakso 2016).

In this case, questions of dominance and power may become difficult to answer. On the one hand, descendants of assimilated Indigenous individuals may be seen as a non-dominant group within the Indigenous population, particularly if they face obstacles in trying to attain full formal recognition as part of the nation. On the other hand, in the wider, majority-dominated society, such individuals may well be more empowered than their less assimilated kin—for example, due to their greater familiarity with the cultural codes of the dominant group, larger personal networks within that group, and a greater degree of shared values with the state-controlling ethnos. Some may see such "returnees" as a non-dominant group within the Indigenous nation that deserves to be accepted, whereas others may see them as representing the colonization of Indigenous spaces by majority-cultural individuals. If the "returnees" are recognized as having Indigenous rights that give them access to limited resources—such as natural resources, votes, or funding—a situation may also occur in which those who already have Indigenous status may consider that the "returnees" threaten the resource base for Indigenous cultural survival (Åhrén 2008).

Official definitions of Indigenousness also tend to include objective criteria. If mere self-identification was deemed adequate for registration as Indigenous, that would risk making the category "Indigenous" meaningless, perhaps enabling the dominant group to take over an Indigenous nation's political structures from within. Objective criteria tend to emphasize genealogical descent from a population considered as autochthons or as possessing historical primacy, but they may also include various "arbitrary cultural standards" (deCosta 2015, 52)—for example, that a people must be geographically isolated and small-numbered, or be somehow lacking in what is considered by the dominant group to be cultural "sophistication," for example, having livelihoods based on certain traditional agricultural activities (deCosta 2015, 52–56). Within such "arbitrary" criteria, we may observe traces of the dominant-group authorities' traditional view of the Indigenous peoples as "alien nations" encountered on the path of expansion through peripheral areas. Skolovskiy (2011, 241) describes the modern category of Indigenousness as a direct descendant of the "savage slot," i.e. the category reserved for peoples who had, in the view of the colonizers, proven incapable of resisting the expansion of the colonial authorities, and hence were considered as lesser peoples.

These issues regarding the definition of Indigenousness are clearly relevant for the phenomenon of Indigenous urbanization. If Indigenousness is associated with rurality in discourse and in political practice, it can prove challenging to maintain one's Indigenous identity in an urban context, and to make urban municipalities and provinces understand that they need to develop Indigenous policies. Moreover, cities are arenas where different groups and types of Indigenous people meet—including those who descend from assimilated people, and those who were born into the culture. In the interplay between different Indigenous groups, both problems and potentials arise, as this book will show.

Theoretical and methodological perspectives in the book

Theoretical Perspectives

Given the interdisciplinary approach of NUORGÁV project and the resultant book, and the project's involving researchers from different academic backgrounds in the study of a common field, the chapters of this book are written in ways that reflect our different points of departure and theoretical perspectives. In this section of the introductory chapter, we will describe some of the theoretical approaches that have inspired the various authors of this book.

Colonialism and resistance are recurring issues that the book deals with. We are inspired by postcolonial (Said 1978; Mulinari et al. 2009) and Indigenous perspectives (Kuokkanen 2000; Smith 2012) that discuss how colonialism can be understood in relation to Indigenous people in general, and the Sámi in particular. Being Indigenous is a result of having experienced colonialism. Some readers may ponder if the concept of colonialism is applicable to the situation of the Sámi, since it is more often associated with people outside Europe. The mental image many have of the Nordic states, where most Sámi live, may also be difficult to unite with a colonialism: these states have, to varying degrees, successfully cultivated images that associate them with development aid, peace building, and international cooperation. This image hides some uncomfortable truths about the states' past and present – the internal colonization and assimilation of the Indigenous Sámi people; assimilationist and even eugenic policies towards national minority groups; the participation of the states and certain of their citizens in slave trade and colonialism elsewhere in the world; and colonial complicity through economic, political, cultural and scientific ties to the rest of Europe (Mulinari et al. 2009).

Another aspect of the colonization of Sápmi is that it happened very gradually, with no clear "year zero" where the dominant group entered Indigenous land—in contrast to many

other colonies in the world. We will describe further in Chapter 1 how the gradual colonization of Sápmi took place, how it was done in different ways in the four different countries, and how it went through different phases. The concept of colonialism is in itself somewhat ambiguous, since colonialism can be separated into two different distinct forms that often coexist together: *Classic colonialism* has been defined as an occupation of territories and external domination over a native population, where the main goal is exploitation of resources of people in the established colonies. However, colonialism can also take form in what often is defined as *settler colonialism*, where the goal is control over land and access to territories, and where elimination of the Indigenous if often a part of this process of taking control (Veracini 2010; Kuokkanen 2020). Colonialism in this form must, according to Patrick Wolfe (2006), be understood as a structure, not an event, where the colonial state strives for elimination of the Indigenous people. While this elimination can involve physical genocide, but it can also involve elimination of the existence of the colonized through erasure of their culture, language, institutions, policies, knowledge, religion, ontology and even history. This is a form of colonialism that seeks to destroy the colonized through erasure not predominantly of their physical bodies, but to erase their existence as a people, to replace their society with that of the colonizers. It is these forms of structural elimination attempts at the hands of the dominant peoples and their states, that the history of Sápmi is full of. As we will show in this book, these structures continue to influence how the Sámi society and Sámi individuals is seen and see themselves today.

Nordic race biology research (ca. 1830s-1940s) involved measuring bodies, skulls and skeletons of Sámi individuals—using methods that constitute clear violations of present ethical standards regarding consent. Sámi graves were robbed, and Sámi people were subjected to research that was aimed at proving their "racial inferiority" without their being informed, pressured to participate against their will, or even forced by use of violence. This is

still a painful memory in some Sámi communities even today, and an experience that is relevant for the relationship between academia and the Sámi even today (Kyllingstad 2014, Guvsám 2019, Heikki 2010, Måsø et al2020).

This "research" was also complicit in constructing the image of a hierarchy of races in the world, with the disastrous consequences this was to have (Kyllingstad 2014). As the Australian Aboriginal scholar Aileen Moreton-Robinson (2004) points out, representations of Indigenous people are still influenced by ideas about the "other", the "uncivilized", the "unwhite" - which includes stereotypes about Indigenous people as "treacherous, lazy, drunken, childish, cunning, dirty, ignoble, noble, primitive, backward, unscrupulous, untrustworthy and savage" (Moreton-Robinson 2004, 76). This list matches typical negative stereotypes about Sámi people. Such pseudoscientific studies legitimized an ideology that "naturalized" the European control over non-western societies. In the Nordic states, there was a focus between the mid-1800s and the mid-1900s on the distinction between "the Nordic master race" and the more "primitive Sámi race" (Kyllingstad 2012; 2014). In this period, chauvinistic attitudes – what one informant referred to as "popular social Darwinism" – became common in the populace. In Russia, while racism was not at all part of the official Soviet ideology, ideas about different human "races" had reached the Russian population prior to the Revolution and remained part of the popular consciousness. Such ideas are carried on in contemporary Russia, where speaking of "races" as an objectively existing phenomenon is arguably more socially accepted than in the contemporary Nordic states.[4] We see here how colonial structures also interact with ideas and ideologies related to race, where dominance over Indigenous people are reinforced by racialization and racism, something that is also still relevant for Sámi societies (Dankertsen 2019, see also Chapter 4).

When looking at the treatment that the Sámi have received from the majority populations' states during the last couple of hundred years, the essence of it is that the Sámi

have not been treated like “white people” —up to and including being categorized as a separate and inferior “race” by majority-population politicians, academics, and parts of the general populace. That which is known in international literature as “passing”, censoring oneself to avoid racism, has been a common practice among the Sámi. Compared to other Indigenous groups, the Sámi people are by appearance relatively similarly looking to the majority population, and have even been referred to as “The White Indians of Scandinavia” (Gaski 1993). However, whether the Sámi people should be referred to as “white” or “non-white” is a complex issue (Nyyssönen 2007). Firstly, what it is to be physically “white”, if we understand this as having the stereotypical physical features associated with the dominant ethnic group, is not the same in different parts of the world. While most Sámi would pass as “white” in, for example, the US, there still exists a pervasive idea in Northern Europe about what a typical Sámi physiognomy looks like. This idea is particularly strong in areas where a substantial part of the population have Sámi ancestry (Eidheim 1969). In several such areas, anti-Sámi policy and racism struck hard, leading many families to adopt “passing” behavior in earlier generations, with residual shame and aggression towards visible Sáminess as a consequence—and hence, in areas where many have Sámi ancestry, it may cause negative attention and discrimination to look like a “typical Sámi.” Sámi individuals can be socially “white-coded”, i.e. seen as majority Norwegians, in other parts of Norway (such as the capital) – and yet in other parts of the country the same individuals can be immediately recognized as having stereotypical Sámi features, and suffer negative consequences for this. While the racism against the Sámi and the way they are racialized certainly have changed, some elements are still present and continue to shape the relations between the Sámi and their dominant neighbors (Dankertsen 2018).

In the context of Indigenous urbanization, the settler colonial logic of elimination (Wolfe 2006) can be identified in how Sámi historic presence has often been written out of

the history of the cities, how Sámi culture in the city often is experienced as “out of place” (Gjerpe 2013, Dankertsen 2018), and how urban governance may produce “Indigenous invisibility” by official documents, political discourse, and political decisions simply not relating to the urban area’s Sámi past and present. While urbanity is often associated with tolerance for other cultures (Bauman 2000), the specific associations that Indigeneity has in relation to rurality and “authenticity”, makes urban Indigeneity be perceived as somewhat “out of place” and even controversial, which as we shall see sometimes lead to conflict.

The book’s chapters thus also draw on theories of space and place, inspired by Doreen Massey’s (1994) argument that we actively make places, and our ideas of the places are influenced by the society we live in, the power structures that influence how we understand the place. In this way, places can be understood as a socio-material co-creation of space, where both physical, material, social and cultural realities interact. While places are often presented as static, Massey (1994) argues that places are always defined in terms of multiple meaning, as temporally and spatially in flux, always changing. Even so, places are often defined in terms of inclusion and exclusion, where certain bodies are defined as a part of the place, and others are not. One can therefore talk about how spatiality also is connected to inequality.

The resistance to colonization, to the elimination of Sámi language and culture, is also a theme in the book. While this resistance can be done in everyday life, it is also linked to organization and governance. Perspectives on governance and organization are central to this book, since the growing focus on Sámi urbanity also has been followed by an urgent need for Sámi governance (se Chapter 1 and 4 for details). In chapter 4, the concepts "specialization”, “politicization”, and “partisanization” are discussed and used to analyze processes in which Indigenous activists have attempted to establish Sámi spaces in majority-dominated urban

areas, and the different types of Indigenous NGOs and arenas that have been established through these processes.

The analysis of Indigenous organizing is inspired by network governance theory, which discusses the phenomenon of interaction and networking between state-based actors and non-state actors, among others with a focus on power distribution and representativity (Berg-Nordlie 2017; Josefsen 2015; Torfing & Sørensen 2014; Vabo & Røiseland, 2008). In the context of Indigenous urbanization, networking and conflict between different actors in politics and organization is a core shaper of urban Indigenous life. The interaction of various Indigenous NGOs, Indigenous representative organs that may or may not be state based, urban municipalities, counties, state agencies, and private business shape the foundations for Indigenous existence in the cities. (Berg-Nordlie 2018). In this book, we find an examination of how the existence of different types of urban Indigenous NGOs, and different governance structures for urban indigenous affairs, impact the extent to which different types of urban Indigenous people—and rural Indigenous people—are serviced by urban Indigenous arenas. The book specifically compares urban Indigenous governance in a Nordic state and Russia. When comparing politics in Russia and a "Western" state, one risks the criticism that such a comparison may be of little value because politics in Russia and "the West" are too different. This critical position has itself come under criticism (Davies et al 2016; Kropp 2018; Berg-Nordlie et al. 2018).

One argument against this criticism is that the concept of "Western states" is much too broad, that states counted as "Western" also have many different political systems and practices, not all of which are as inclusive and democratic as one may want to believe. Informal politics, corruption, and non-democratic decision-making are also found in states generally considered as "Western". Secondly, day-to-day administration and politics in Russia are not generally so dissimilar from that in other states as to make comparison impossible.

Several studies have analyzed interrelations between state-based and non-state actors in Russia taking as their point of departure network governance theory, a perspective that is considered particularly suitable for Northern and Western Europe (for example, Aasland et al 2016; Berg-Nordlie and Tkach 2016; Holm-Hansen and Berg-Nordlie 2018; Kropp and Schuhmann 2018; Myhre and Berg-Nordlie 2016; Aasland et al 2016), and they have found that this theoretical "toolbox" yields interesting results also when used on Russia. It is the position taken here that Russian politics, like those of all states, have their special characteristics, but Russia is not such a special case as to defy comparison with democracies in Western Europe. For this reason, we feel quite safe comparing experiences of urban Sámi governance in Russia and Norway.

Two other concepts that we deal with in different ways throughout the book, are culture and identities. In the book, we want to describe the heterogeneity and complexity of urban Sámi life. The history of the different cities in the book is different, both because of regional and national differences, which are explored further in Chapter 1. The people we have interviewed have different backgrounds both socially, culturally and linguistically. Because of this complexity, many cities become almost a "microcosmoses" of Sápmi, something that several of our informants describe as inspiring and fun. However, the city also involves being in a minority situation, far away from the communities where the Indigenous culture is in a more dominant position. This means that they have to deal with stereotypes and lack of knowledge about their culture and language, and this sometimes can be quite exhausting. While some of the stereotypes might be connected to racism and discrimination, it might also be connected to false notions of authenticity and what Sámi culture "really" is. This is in line with other research on urban Indigenous communities, where ideas about where Indigenous people really belong, i.e. not in urban areas, creates a situation where urban Indigenous individuals becomes experienced as alien (Andersen and Peters 2013). The focus

on “authenticity” when discussing Indigenous people can, as Rauna Kuokkanen (2000) argues, suggest racist notions that the cultures of Indigenous peoples, as opposed to the cultures of the dominant peoples, are static cultures rather than living cultures in constant motion. The tendency that Indigenous cultures are denied development and change, creates a situation where Indigenous people becomes frozen in time and space, where especially urban Indigeneity is presented as something “inauthentic”. The dualistic notion of cultures, where some are denied change, while others are not, creates a hierarchy where Indigenous people are defined by outsiders and their stereotypes, rather than being allowed to develop their own culture and society in line with their own lives and needs.

This perspective on culture and tradition also has implications for our perspective on identities (see Chapter 3). Inspired by Stuart Hall (1990), we argue that identities are just as much a matter of becoming, as a matter of being. Being a Sámi in the city involves just as much a negotiation and imagination of the future of both one’s one future and Sápmi’s future, as a continuation of the past. As the title of our book suggest, this process of trying to imagine a future for Sápmi in the city, and the challenges and opportunities that this involve, is an issue that we discuss in many different ways in this book.

Methods and methodology

The book departs from the aforementioned *NUORGÁV* project, which was conducted between 2014 and 2019. Data gathering and analysis for this book has mainly taken place within that time period, although the authors also draw on experience and results from their earlier, contemporaneous, and to a little extent also later projects. The empirical data for is based on the study of both national-level events and processes in four different states, and studies of different cities within these states. The great differences between the cases we study have made us able to perform structured comparison between the different urban areas and countries (George & Bennet 2005). Our methodological perspective is inspired by extended

case method, where we have applied a reflexive approach "in order to extract the general from the unique, to move from the 'micro' to the 'macro' and to connect the present to the past in anticipation of the future, all by building on preexisting theory" (Burawoy 1998, 2000). We have used this because we wanted to study the cases from a comparative perspective, where we wanted to explore how the macro level – the political, the colonial and Indigenous – can be integrated in analysis of experiences of individuals on the micro level. This perspective represents a break with empirical traditions where theory is reconstructed on the basis on empirical data that represent 'anomalies' in relation to existing theory in the field (Vassenden 2008, Burawoy 1998). The reflexive process between theory and empirical data, the macro and the micro, enables analysis that can combine the focus on colonial power structures with the experiences of Sámi in their everyday life.

We are also inspired by postcolonial (Said 1978), decolonial and Indigenous (Smith 2012) perspectives on research and methodology, in line with the theoretical perspectives that we use, where a central objective is to "talk back" to science and its historically taken-for-granted assumptions about "objectivity" and "neutrality", showing its position in a global system influenced by imperialism, colonialism. power relations and "regimes of truth". As the Māori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012) reminds us of, Indigenous people have historically been excluded from science, apart from being those who are "being studied". For the colonized, "research" has often been a "dirty" word, associated with painful memories and distrust, excluding Indigenous ways of knowing and being.

We have earlier noted that the authors hail from different academic backgrounds (history, political science, sociology). In addition to differences in regard to the academic backgrounds of the researchers, the authors also differently positioned in relation to the Indigenous group that the book concerns. The book refers to the Sámi in the third person, but most of the editors and contributors are themselves Sámi. Such an insider-position in relation

to the group under study may provide some methodological benefits that are not as easily accessible for non-insiders—such as increased trust and accessibility from informants, knowledge of how and where to get in touch with possible informants, shared knowledges between informant and researcher that decrease the chances of culture-based misunderstandings. The insider-position also provides an Indigenous academic perspective on the affairs of Indigenous people. There is not, of course, any single and Indigenous perspective on Indigenous issues, or any single Sámi perspective on Sámi issues: All communities contain within them a broad span of perspectives. We nevertheless hold that when researchers have a connection to the group under study—such as personal identity, culture, and social inclusion—this makes it more likely that the focus and analysis of the researchers will be recognized as familiar to the group under study. That the group under study should recognize itself in the research on them, is something we hold to be ethically of value. This is particularly true in cases where the group under study have a history of being suppressed and marginalized by others—including by non-insider academics. Such is the case when it comes Indigenous people in general, and also specifically the Sámi. The questions, interpretations, and conclusions of non-Indigenous researchers may be quite different from the ones provided by Indigenous researchers (Berg 2004; Olsen 2016, 29-30). We consider that the involvement of Indigenous researchers in a project reduces the risk of ending up with focuses and interpretations that are experienced as alien to the Indigenous group under study, or even detrimental to their well-being.

The book's author list also includes people who are not part of the Sámi ethnic group, and their perspective is also considered an important part of the whole. An outsider's perspective is valuable both when the society under study is that of a dominant people or that of an Indigenous people—for example, non-embeddedness in the social world and culture of the group under study may make a researcher ask questions about things that members of the

group take for granted, which can produce novel research that is of value for the group itself; and while some informants may trust one of their own more than an outsider, other informants may find it difficult to open up to someone who may be experienced as being too well integrated into their community, so that the presence of an outsider may in some cases be a welcome opportunity for members of the group to talk about issues that are experienced as difficult to talk openly about within the group. In the study of Indigenous peoples, the outsiders' perspective has, however, not been a healthy supplement as much as it has been the dominant perspective. When it comes to the Sámi people, particularly the North Sámi of Norway, this situation has changed in the latter decades, since many individuals from the group have stepped into academia and produced research that has significantly colored the academic discourses on their own people. For other subunits of the Sámi nation, particularly the Sámi of Russia, their own voice remains the supplement and not the dominant voice in the academic narratives about their group (Berg-Nordlie 2017).

Neither insiders nor outsiders have a neutral position when writing about a group. In both cases, there are preconceived ideas and attitudes that are likely to color focus and analysis—this is unavoidable (Berg-Nordlie 2017: 54–58; Olsen 2016: 29–30, 32–35, 42). Likewise, both insider and outsider researchers may have relevant social and identity-based connections that one should be transparent about. As for researchers positioned on the inside, their research interests and the basic way they understand the world which again informs their analysis of society, may be colored by their positioning within the group – their gender, subgroup identity, class, language, political ideology, connections to social, cultural, and political groups etc. Self-reflection and transparency regarding one's own position is healthy both when authors from dominant ethnic groups study their own society, and when people from marginalized groups study their own society. For that reason, we will at the end of this introductory chapter provide a brief (alphabetic) presentation of the book's authors with a

focus on this. In regard to those of the authors who are Sámi, some subgroup affiliations are mentioned. Sámi subgroups will be discussed in Chapter 1, which constitutes an introduction to the Sámi nation. The authors' connections to concrete organizations mentioned in various chapters will be noted both here and within those chapters, for transparency's sake.

The NUORGÁV project was financed by Norwegian Research Council and the Programme for Sámi Research SAMISK II, a program that had as its main objective to "enhance the quantity and scientific merit of Sámi research." (Norwegian Research Council 2017, 5). The Sámi programs in the Norwegian Research council has also since the beginning focused on recruiting "more native Sámi researchers and establish networks and national research schools for Sámi research" (Norwegian Research Council 2018, 5). These formulations reflect the Indigenization of Sámi research. There has been a shift from earlier times, when most researchers that did research in Sámi societies, where non-Sámi, to a situation where it is often held that researchers ideally should be Sámi in order to do "good" research. This shift reflects the international development as well, like Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012) describes, where the has been a development in Indigenous research from a situation where research traditionally have been done by outsiders, with little or no involvement from the Indigenous communities themselves, to a situation where more and more Indigenous people themselves are researchers, and where this community of researchers to a greater extent than before is organized also through institutions built on Indigenous perspectives and Indigenous scholars themselves. An example of this in Sápmi is the Sámi University of Applied Sciences (Sámi Allaskuvla) in Kautokeino (Guovdageaidnu)

According to the Sámi scholar Vigdis Stordahl (2008), researchers without Sámi background have often been advised not to do research in the Sámi society, while Sámi researchers have been criticized for not doing "the right" research. Stordahl (2008) argues that this "double bind" situation is caused by difficulties separating the different levels of

research, that is on one hand knowledge, research paradigms and methodology, and on the other Sámi politics (Stordahl 2008). However, as Kuokkanen (2007) points out, it is important to remember that Indigenous perspectives in research also has to reflect on the fact that research usually is done within academic institutions, and a global research community, where the academic structures reproduce certain systems of thought and knowledge that rarely reflects Indigenous worldviews. According to Kuokkanen (2007), even Indigenous scholars are a part of this system that reproduce the colonial power structures, because they often are trained and work within a system that is based on certain values, norms and economic structures that is embedded in global colonial structures that marginalized Indigenous knowledge and societies.

In the NUORGÁV project, the connection to the Indigenous community was further strengthened by holding three meetings where representatives of Indigenous organizations were presented with project ideas and findings, to discuss, comment critically, and give advice. The last of these meetings was an open, two-day conference ("An Urban Future for Sápmi?" in Trondheim, 2017) where representatives of the Sámi community were specially invited to participate and to open the proceedings on each day – on the first day, the conference was opened by representatives of the local urban Indigenous student organization Saemien Studeenth Tråantesne, on the second day by the President of the Sámediggi of Norway. We consider that the advice and discussions with representatives of the Indigenous community have strengthened our research both ethically and methodologically and provided us with a more scientifically valuable outcome. We underscore that advisory groups and external individuals have had no veto rights over the organization or outcome of research, and that the content of this book is the responsibility of the researchers and the researchers only.

We have interviewed both Sámi that have grown up in the city, and Sámi that have moved to the city for education, work or other reasons. Several of the interviewees have many

roles and positions. Informants were approached through a combination of general calls for interview participation, and utilization of the researchers' network in Sámi society. Interviews have been conducted with Sámi living in urban areas—both those who take part in organizing urban Indigenous spaces and those who only use their services—and with non-Sámi who are involved in the politics and administration regarding such spaces. Informants were approached through a combination of general calls for interview participation, and utilization of the researchers' network in Sámi society. Members of the advisory group also facilitated contact with some informants. Other informants came into the project through snowballing – e.g. they were mentioned by early interviewees as people that it would be beneficial for the project to talk to later, contacted by researchers, and agreed to participate. Interviews were generally performed by the researchers on-location in various urban areas, but some interviews were also text-based, done over email or messenger services.

Interviewees were informed about the origins and goals of the project, that their quotes would be anonymized, and told that they could at any point withdraw their participation and retract their interviews up until the moment of publication. These are ethical practices in any case, but one should perhaps be particularly aware of the need to clearly communicate to the informant that they control their own information and have complete power to withdraw their participation, when the informants are members of marginalized and discriminated groups - even if the authors themselves do belong to said group. A few of our informants were minors, and interviews with this category of people demands particular measures to ensure informed consent. Consent was in such cases obtained both by the guardians and the informants themselves, prior to the interviews. Researchers made sure to explain the research project in such a way that both guardians and minors would be well-informed about the intentions and consequences. We, as researchers, have a responsibility to conduct research in such a way that it does not have harmful consequences for the young participants, while at the same time

ensuring that young people are given a voice in issues that are important to them. Young people also have a right to be heard, on their own terms (Alderson & Morrow 2004). Several interviews used in this project, contained testimonies about racism and discrimination, and accounts about other difficult experiences that the interviewees have undergone during their lifetime. To ensure privacy, interviews were anonymized before they were shared with other researchers in the team, and in addition certain particularly personal passages which were unique enough for the informant to be identifiable, particularly by researchers that are themselves part of Sámi society, were omitted entirely before the interviews were passed on to other researches on the team.

When talking to informants, the researchers used semi-structured interview guides. In the interviews with the administrative employees (non-Sámi and Sámi), we focused on how they facilitated development in the city regarding Sámi language and culture, and how they cooperated with Sámi organizations and other relevant Sámi circles and individuals. In the interviews with Sámi who were not administrative employees, which naturally constitutes the large majority of our interviews, we have focused on their experiences related to being Sámi in the city, how they experience the encounters with other people in the city, if they are active in any organizations or activities, how they relate to the local government and stakeholders in the city they live in, and if they feel that they are a part of decision-making and local democracy.

In addition, we have participated in meetings, concerts, informal encounters with Sámi and other relevant activities. We have also followed relevant pages, groups and people in social media. Regarding some of these activities, those of us who are Sámi would likely have been doing them in any case, or were in fact already doing them, as part of our Sámi lives. When we have been present on these arenas specifically as researchers, to collect information, we have made sure that those responsible for the arenas (event organizers, group admins etc)

are aware of that, and have done our best to make sure that those present know about our role in the situation. For our research purposes, we have also included news articles, letters to the editors in relevant newspapers and media in general. We have also analyzed web pages, founding documents, articles of association, minutes of meetings, documents from municipal council meetings, and other relevant documents.

Introduction to the chapters and the authors

The Chapters

The task of **this introduction** has been to present and discuss some basic concepts as regards our study of Indigenous urbanization, provide the reader with necessary information about the authors, and introduce the other chapters of the book. The remainder of the chapter will be dedicated to a brief introduction of the book's other chapters.

In **Chapter 1**, historians Mikkel Berg-Nordlie and Anna Afanasyeva give a brief introduction to the Sámi nation and its homeland Sápmi, with a focus on the historical interrelationship between Indigenous people and state, and various ways in which the Sámi are subdivided—both the nation's subethnic groups, and the administrative structures through which the states have divided the Sámi and Sápmi. The chapter is mainly based on studying existing literature and relevant documents, and it is also to some extent informed by field work to examine the workings and significance of various administrative systems.

In **Chapter 2**, Berg-Nordlie and Afanasyeva present the various historical processes of urbanization in Nordic Sápmi and Russian Sápmi. This chapter also discusses the extent to which we may say anything about the Sámi in quantitative terms. While this book is focused on qualitative research on Sámi urbanization, the fundamental fact of urbanization as defined here is nevertheless demographic change, and hence a phenomenon that is studied quantitatively. The chapter provides some indicators of the extent to which the Sámi are urbanized, and which localities in the North European states should be considered the focal

points for Sámi urbanization. The chapter is based on studies of existing historical research literature on Sámi history and urbanization history in the four states that have divided Sápmi between them, and studies of available quantitative data regarding the Sámi of the four states.

In **Chapter 3**, sociologist Astri Dankertsen explores the construction and negotiation of urban Sámi identities, mainly with use of the data from interviews with urban Sámi youth in Norway and Sweden. She focuses on differences and similarities between the two states and the different cities. Chapter 3's findings are from fieldwork conducted by the author and Christina Åhrén among young Sámi in Norway and Sweden, both within and outside of Sápmi, mainly during the period 2015–2018.

In **Chapter 4,** Berg-Nordlie, Afanasyeva, and Dankertsen account for how and why Sámi in Norway and Russia have organized to create urban Indigenous spaces for the expression and preservation of Indigenous language and culture in urban areas, and address the urban aspect of modern Sámi organization history. Chapter 4's findings is based on interviews conducted in both states during the period 2009–2019, mostly as part of the NUORGÁV project, in addition to document studies, media studies, and the study of existing literature.

In **Chapter 5**, sociologist Chris Andersen discusses Sámi urbanization in light of the global Indigenous experience. What are the similarities and differences between Sámi urbanization and urban life, and that of Indigenous peoples elsewhere? And what can we learn from these differences and similarities?

In **Chapter 6,** the editors of this volume—Berg-Nordlie, Dankertsen and Winsvold – provide a conclusive discussion to the book, by returning to some key questions regarding Sámi and other Indigenous demographics, identity, and politics that have been addressed throughout the book. Does the Indigenous nation of Sápmi have an urban future? And if it

does, what does that future entail for Sámi language, culture, identity, and traditional industries?

The **Appendixes** present (**A**) a list detailing the Sámi names of cities and other localities mentioned in the book, and (**B**) a guide to the book's Cyrillic–Latin transcription system. Cyrillic is the writing system used for Russian, and the Sámi languages in Russia.

The Authors

Anna Afanasyeva holds a PhD in humanities with specialization in history, an M.A. degree in indigenous studies from UiT-The Arctic University of Norway (UiT), and an M.A. equivalent in pedagogy from the Murmansk State Arctic University (MAGU). She defended her PhD dissertation entitled "Boarding School Education of the Sámi People in Soviet Union (1935–1989): Experiences of Three Generations" at UiT in 2019. She currently works in the Working group on Research and Education at UiT and teaches as an invited scholar at various B.A. and M.A. courses at the Sámi University of Applied Sciences in Kautokeino. Anna Afanasyeva is a Kildin Sami from the Kola Peninsula. She has been taking active part in the ethnopolitical and cultural life of the Kola Sami. She is the founder and was the first chairman of the Kola Sami youth association *Sam' Nuraš* (2006-2010). She has previously been working as Indigenous Peoples Adviser at the office of the Barents Euro-Arctic Council (BEAC) at the International Barents Secretariat, and has been involved in the number of important international projects on indigenous cooperation across the Northern borders, e.g. "The Kola Sámi Documentation Project (KDSP)" (DOBES language program), "Skolt Sámi culture across borders" (Ä´vv Skolt Sámi Museum) and "Indigee 2–Indigenous Entrepreneurship project" (IBS - International Barents Secretariat).

Chris Andersen is the dean of the Faculty of Native Studies at the University of Alberta. He became a faculty member of the Faculty in 2000 and received his PhD in 2005 from the UoA

Department of Sociology. In 2014, he was awarded Full Professorship. He is the former Director of the Rupertsland Centre for Métis Research and additionally served as the Interim Institutional Co-Lead of Indigenous Initiatives for the University of Alberta from February, 2018 to August, 2019. Dr. Andersen is the author of two books including, with Maggie Walter, *Indigenous Statistics: A Quantitative Indigenous Methodology* (Left Coast Press, 2013) and "*Métis": Race, Recognition and the Struggle for Indigenous Peoplehood* (UBC Press, 2014). In 2015, the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association awarded "Métis" the "2014 Prize for Best Subsequent Book in Native American and Indigenous Studies" and in 2016, it was shortlisted for the 2015 Canada Prize. With Jean O'Brien, he also co-edited the recently published Sources and Methods in Indigenous Studies (Taylor & Francis, 2017). Andersen was a founding member of the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association Executive Council, is a member of Statistics Canada's Advisory Committee on Social Conditions and is editor of the journal *Aboriginal Policy Studies*. In 2014, he was named as an inaugural Member of the Royal Society of Canada's College of New Scholars, Artists and Scientists**.**

Mikkel Berg-Nordlie is an historian who wrote his PhD at the University of Tromsø (UiT – Arctic University of Norway) on the history of Russian Sámi representation in Russian politics and pan-Sámi networking, and holds an M.A. in peace- and conflict studies from the University of Oslo. He works at the NIBR Institute for Urban and Regional Research at the Oslo Metropolitan University (NIBR-OsloMet). He is responsible for Sámi history articles in the Great Norwegian Encyclopedia (SNL) and a member of Norway's Expert Group for Sámi Statistics. He co-wrote the book *Bridging Divides: Ethno-Political Leadership Among the Russian Sámi* together with Indra Overland (Berghahn, 2013), was editor of *Indigenous Politics: Institutions, Representation, Mobilization* (ECPR, 2015) together with Jo Saglie and

Ann Sullivan, and edited *Governance in Russian Regions: A Policy Comparison* (Pallgrave MacMillan, 2018) together with Sabine Kropp, Jørn Holm-Hansen, Johannes Schumann, and Aadne Aasland. Berg-Nordlie is a North Sámi whose family background is from, among others, the Kvalsund (Fálesnuorri) district of Finnmark County. He grew up partly in the South Sámi area (Helgeland), and partly in the North Sámi area (Tromsø/Romsa), and currently lives in the Norwegian capital Oslo. Berg-Nordlie has learnt the North Sámi language, and speaks it daily in his family. He currently leads the Oslo and Surrounding Area Sámi Parents' Network and the Socialist Left Party's Sámi Policy Council.

Astri Dankertsen holds a PhD in sociology, and an M.A. in social anthropology. Dankertsen is Associate Professor in Sociology at Nord University in Norway and is currently the head of The Division for Environmental Studies, International Relations, Northern Studies and Social Security. Dankertsen has her Sámi background from the North Sámi area in Norway, with a father from Loppa (Láhppi) in Finnmark County. She grew up in Oslo, something that might explain her enthusiasm for Sámi urbanity throughout her career. She is currently the leader of Sálto Sámesiebrre (Sámi organization for the Salten district), a local organization under the Norwegian Sámi Association (NSR), and also holds a position as a deputy representative of the national board of the Norwegian Sámi Association. She also represents the Red Party in Bodø City Council.

Marte Winsvold has a PhD in political science from the University of Oslo. She works at the Institute for Social Research in Oslo, and her research interests centres on political participation and the interface between civil society and formal government structures. In particular, Winsvold has been interested in the participation of under-represented groups in formal political processes and the conditions for adequate representation. Winsvold grew up

in Oslo has no Sámi background. She was recruited to the study of Sámi urbanity out of her research interest in civil society and network governance.

Reference List

Aasland, Aadne, Mikkel Berg-Nordlie, and Elena Bogdanova. 2016. “Encouraged but Controlled: Governance Networks in Russian Regions.” *East European Politics* 32 (2): 148–169.

Åhrén, Christina. 2008. *Är jag en riktig same?: en etnologisk studie av unga samers identitetsarbete*. Doctoral thesis, Umeå University.

Aikio, Antti, and Mattias Åhrén. 2014. “A reply to calls for an extension of the definition of Sámi in Finland.” *Arctic Review on Law and Politics* 5(1): 123–143.

Alderson, Priscilla & Morrow, Virginia. 2004. *Ethics, social research and consulting with children and young people*. London: Barnardos.

Andersen, Chris, and Evelyn Peters. 2013. “Conclusion: Indigenizing Modernity or Modernizing Indigeneity?”, in Evelyn Peters and Chris Andersen (eds), *Indigenous in the City. Contemporary identities and cultural innovation*. Vancouver/Toronto: UBC Press, pp. 377-387.

Axelsson, Per, Peter Sköld, John P Ziker, and David G. Anderson. 2011. “Epilogue: From Indigenous Demographics to an Indgenous Demography”, in Per Axelsson and Peter Sköld

(eds), *Indigenous peoples and demography*. *The complex Relation between Identity and Statistics.* Oxford: Berghahn, pp. 295-308.

Axelsson, Per, and Peter Sköld. 2011. “Introduction”, in Per Axelsson and Peter Sköld (eds), *Indigenous peoples and demography*. *The complex Relation between Identity and Statistics.* Oxford: Berghahn, pp. 1-14.

Bauman, Z. (2000) *Liquid modernity.* Cambridge: Polity press.

Beach, Hugh. 2007. “Self-determining the Self: Aspects of Saami Identity Management in Sweden.” *Acta Borealia* 24(1): 1-25.

Berg, Bård A. (2000) *Mot en korporativ reindrift. Samisk reindrift i Norge i det 20. århundre – eksemplifisert gjennom studier av reindriften på Helgeland.* Phd thesis. *Dieđut* 3/2000. Guovdageaidnu: Sámi Instituhtta

Berg-Nordlie, Mikkel, and Arild Schou. 2011. “Who are Indigenous – And How Should it Matter? Discourses on Indigenous Rights in Norway and Nepal.” *Ethnopolitics Papers* 13.

Berg-Nordlie, Mikkel, Jo Saglie, and Ann Sullivan. 2015. “Introduction: Perspectives on Indigenous Politics”, in Mikkel Berg-Nordlie, Jo Saglie and Ann Sullivan (eds), *Indigenous politics. Institutions, representation, mobilization*. Colchester: ECPR Press, pp. 1-24

Berg-Nordlie, Mikkel. 2017. *Fighting to be Heard – in Russia and in Sápmi Russian Sámi representation in Russian and pan-Sámi politics, 1992 – 2014*. PhD Dissertation. Tromsø: UiT – Arctic University of Norway.

Berg-Nordlie, Mikkel, Jørn Holm-Hansen, and Sabine Kropp. 2018. "The Russian state as network manager: a theoretical framework", in S. Kropp, A. Aasland, M. Berg-Nordlie, J. Holm-Hansen, and J. Schuhmann (eds), *Governance in Russian Regions*. Palgrave, pp. 7-42.

Berg-Nordlie, Mikkel, and Olga Tkach. 2016. "'You are responsible for your people.' The role of Diaspora leaders in the governance of immigrant integration in Russia." *The Journal of Post-Soviet Democratization* 24(2):173-198.

Burawoy, Michael 1998. "The extended case method". *Sociological Theory*, 16, pp. 4–33.

Burawoy, Michael 2000. "Introduction: Reaching for the global", in M. Burawoy, J.A. Blum, S. George, Z. Gille, T. Gowan, L. Harvey, M. Klawiter, S.H. Lopez, S. Ó Riain, S. & M.Thayer, *Global Ethnography. Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World* (pp. 1–40). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dankertsen, Astri. 2018. "Samisk ungdom og norske byer – kulturer i endring", in B.Skorstad, E.Pettersen & G.Wollan (eds.) *Vårt lille Land - Små samfunn, store utfordringer.* pp. 61-89. Stamsund: Orkana forlag.

Dankertsen, Astri. 2019. "'I felt so white: Sámi racialization, indigeneity, and shades of whiteness." *NAIS Journal of the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association*, 6(2), pp.110-137.

Davies, Jonathan S. 2014 "Coercive Cities: Reflections on the Dark Side of Urban Power in the 21st Century." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 36(2), pp. 590-599.

Davies, Jonathan S., Aadne Aasland, and Jan Tore Berghei. 2016. "Hiearchies and Netšorks in the Governance of Russia." PSA BLOG. Retrieved 19 March 2020 from https://www.psa.ac.uk/psa/news/hierarchies-and-networks-governance-russia.

deCosta, Ravi: "States definitions of Indigenous Peoples: A survey of practices", in Mikkel Berg-Nordlie, Jo Saglie and Ann Sullivan (eds), *Indigenous politics. Institutions, representation, mobilization*. Colchester: ECPR Press, pp. 25-60

Gaski, Harald. 1993. "The Sami People: The 'White Indians' of Scandinavia", *American Indian culture and research journal* 17(1):115-128.

George, Alexander L. and Andrew Bennett, Andrew. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Gjerpe, Kajsa Kemi. 2013. *The Best of Both Worlds: Conceptualising an Urban Sámi Identity.* Master thesis, Master of Philosophy in Indigenous Studies, University of Tromsø.

Guvsám, Berit Kristine Andersen. 2019. *Hærvvás. En undersøkelse av vevde sjal fra Tysfjord kommune*. Master thesis, Sámi University of Applied Sciences.

Hall, Stuart. 1990. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora", in Jonathan Rutherford (ed.), *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, pp. 222–237.

Heikki, Jörgen. 2010. "Skallmätninger och gravplundringar upp till ytan." *Sameradion och STV Sápmi*. Retreived on 29. January 2021 from https://sverigesradio.se/artikel/3621632

Holm-Hansen, Jørn, and Mikkel Berg-Nordlie. 2018. "Climate Change Adaptation: Governance in a Fragmented and Unsettled Policy Area", in S. Kropp, A. Aasland, M. Berg-Nordlie, J. Holm-Hansen, and J. Schuhmann (eds), *Governance in Russian Regions*. Palgrave, pp. 105-129.

Junka-Aikio, Laura. 2014. "Can the Sámi speak Now? Deconstructive research ethos and the debate on who is a Sámi in Finland." *Cultural Studies* 30(2), pp. 1-29.

Joona, Tanja. 2012. *The ILO Convention No. 169 in a Nordic Context with Comparative Analysis: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. PhD Dissertation, Rovaniemi: Juridica Lapponica 37, 2012.

Josefsen, Eva (2015) *Selvbestemmelse og samstyring. En studie av Sametingets plass i politiske prosesser i Norge.* PhD thesis, Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Pedagogics, University of Tromsø Arctic University of Norway

Kropp, Sabine and Johannes Schuhmann. 2018. “Imitation and Enforced Cooperation: State and Civil Society in Ethnic Conflict Management”, in S. Kropp, A. Aasland, M. Berg-Nordlie, J. Holm-Hansen, and J. Schuhmann (eds), *Governance in Russian Regions*. Palgrave, pp. 155-188.

Kukutai, Tahu. 2013. “The Structure of Urban Māori Identities”, in Peters, Evelyn and Chris Andersen (eds.) *Indigenous in the City. Contemporary identities and cultural innovation*. Vancouver/Toronto: UBC Press, pp. 311-333.

Kuokkanen, Rauna. 2000. “Towards an Indigenous Paradigm.” *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 20 (2): 411–436.

Rauna Kuokkanen, Rauna. 2007. *Reshaping the University: Responsibility, Indigenous Epistemes, and the Logic of the Gift.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Kuokkanen, Rauna. 2020. “The Deatnu Agreement: A Contemporary Wall of Settler Colonialism.” *Settler Colonial Studies*, pp. 1-21.

Kyllingstad, Jon Røyne. 2012. “Norwegian Physical Anthropology and the Idea of a Nordic Master Race.” *Current Anthropology*. 53. 10.1086/662332.

Kyllingstad, Jon Røyne. 2014. *Measuring the Master Race: Physical Anthropology in Norway 1890-1945*. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.

Kropp, Sabine. 2018. “Preface”, in S. Kropp, A. Aasland, M. Berg-Nordlie, J. Holm-Hansen, and J. Schuhmann (eds), *Governance in Russian Regions*. Palgrave, pp. 1-6

Laakso, Ari Martin. 2016. “Critical Review: Antti Aikio and Mattias Åhrén (2014). A Reply to Calls for an Extension of the Definition of Sámi in Finland”. *Arctic Review on Law and Politics* 5(1): 123–143.

Massey, D. (1994). *Space, place, and gender.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

McCreary, Tyler in dialogue with Andersen, Chris; Gaudry, Adam; and Brenda MacDougall. 2019. “Urban Métis Communities”, in Dorries Heather, Robert Henry, David Hugill, Tyler McCreary, and Julie Tomiak (eds), *Settler City Limits: Indigenous resurgence and colonial violence in the Urban Prarie West.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Måsø, Jan Rune, Anders Boine Verstad, Knut Jarnes, and Harald K. Jansson. 2020. “Hodeskallejegerne.” *NRK Sápmi.* Retreived at 29. January 2021 at https://www.nrk.no/sapmi/xl/raseforskere-jaktet-pa-hodeskaller-_-na-vil-ingar-ha-hjem-tippoldemoren-1.15031837#intro-authors--expand

Minde, H. (2005a) “The challenge of indigenism: the struggle for Sami land rights and selfgovernment in Norway 1960-1990”, in Jentoft, S., H. Minde & R. Nielsen (eds)(2005) *Indigenous Peoples. Resource Management and Global*

Rights. Delft: Eburon

Minde, H. (2005b) “The Alta case: from the local to the global and back again”, in Cant, G., A. Goodall & J. Inns (eds) *Discourses and Silences: Indigenous Peoples, Risks and Resistance.* Christchurch: Wyatt and Wilson Print.

Moreton-Robinson, Aileen. 2004. “Whiteness, epistemology and Indigenous representation”, in Aileen Moreton-Robinson (ed.) *Whitening race. Essays in social and cultural criticism*. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, pp. 75-88.

Mulinari, Diana, Keskinen, Suvi, Irni, Sari and Tuori, Salla 2009. “Introduction: Postcolonialism and the Nordic Models of Welfare and Gender”, in S. Keskinen, S. Tuori, S. Irni and D. Mulinari (eds) *Complying with Colonialism. Gender, Race and Ethnicity in the Nordic Region*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 1-16

Myhre, Marthe Handå, and Mikkel Berg-Nordlie. 2016. “The state cannot help them all. Russian media discourse on the inclusion of non-state actors in governance”. *East European Politics* 32 (2), pp. 192-214.

Norris, Mary Jane, Stewart Clatworthy, and Evelyn Peters. 2013. “The Urbanization of Indigenous Populations in Canada. A Half Century in Review”, in Evelyn Peters and Chris Andersen (eds), *Indigenous in the City. Contemporary identities and cultural innovation.* Vancouver/Toronto: UBC Press, pp. 29-45.

Norwegian Research Council. 2018. *Work programme 2017–2027 Programme for Sámi Research III (SAMISK III)* Online URL: https://www.forskningsradet.no/contentassets/4f4551cf88a3486a89202e8032d439ab/samisk-work-programme.pdf (read 17.1.2020)

Nyyssönen, Jukka. 2007. *"Everybody recognized that we were not white". Sami identity politics in Finland, 1945-1990.* PhD thesis, UiT – Arctic University of Tromsø.

Olsen, Torjer A. 2016. "Responsibility, reciprocity and respect. On the ethics of (self-) representation and advocacy in Indigenous studies", in Anna-Lill Drugge (ed), *Ethics in Indigenous Research. Past Experiences — Future Challenges.* Ubmeje/Umeå: UmU Tryckservice, pp. 25-44.

Onta, Pratyoush. 2006. "The growth of the adivasi janajati movement in Nepal after 1990: The non-political institutional agents", *Studies in Nepali History and Society*, 112, pp. 303-354.

Peters, Evelyn and Chris Andersen (eds). 2013. *Indigenous in the City. Contemporary identities and cultural innovation.* Vancouver/Toronto: UBC Press.

Peters, Evelyn and Chris Andersen. 2013a. "American Indian Urbanization in the United States: Background", in Evelyn Peters, and Chris Andersen (eds), *Indigenous in the City. Contemporary identities and cultural innovation.* Vancouver/Toronto: UBC Press, pp. 167-172.

Peters, Evelyn and Chris Andersen. 2013b. “Mãori urbanization in New Zealand: Background”, in Evelyn Peters, and Chris Andersen’ (eds), *Indigenous in the City. Contemporary identities and cultural innovation.* Vancouver/Toronto: UBC Press, pp 305-310.

Peters, Evelyn and Chris Andersen. 2013c. “Aboriginal urbanization in Canada: Background”, in Evelyn Peters and Chris Andersen (eds), *Indigenous in the City. Contemporary identities and cultural innovation.* Vancouver/Toronto: UBC Press, pp. 21-28.

Peters, Evelyn and Chris Andersen. 2013d. “Aboriginal urbanization in Australia: Background”, in Evelyn Peters and Chris Andersen (eds), *Indigenous in the City. Contemporary identities and cultural innovation.* Vancouver/Toronto: UBC Press, pp. 231-236.

Said, Edward 1978. *Orientalism.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Selle, Per, Anne Julie Semb, and Kristin Strømsnes. 2013. “Citizenship identity among Norwegian Sami in core Sami areas.” *Citizenship Studies* (1)17, pp. 712–727.

Snipp, C. Matthew. 2013. “American Indians and Alaska Natives in Urban Environments”, in Evelyn Peters, and Chris Andersen (eds.) *Indigenous in the City. Contemporary identities and cultural innovation*. Vancouver/Toronto: UBC Press, pp. 173-192.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* Second edition. London: Zed Books.

Sokolovsky, Sergey V. 2011. “Russian Legal Concepts and the Demography of Indigenous Peoples”, in Per Axelsson and Peter Sköld (eds), *Indigenous peoples and demography*. *The complex Relation between Identity and Statistics.* Oxford: Berghahn

Stordahl, Vigdis 2008: “Nation building through knowledge building: the discourse of Sami higher education and research in Norway” in Henry Minde (ed.) *Indigenous Peoples, Self-Determination, Knowledge, Indigeneity.* Eburon: Delft.

Taylor, John. 2013. “Indigenous urbanization in Australia: Patterns and processes of ethnogenesis”, in Evelyn Peters, and Chris Andersen (eds.) *Indigenous in the City. Contemporary identities and cultural innovation*. Vancouver/Toronto: UBC Press, pp. 237-255

Tomiak, Julie, Tyler McCreary, David Hugill, Robert Henry, and Heather Dorries. 2019. “Settler City Limits”. in Dorries Heather, Robert Henry, David Hugill, Tyler McCreary, and Julie Tomiak (eds), *Settler City Limits: Indigenous resurgence and colonial violence in the Urban Prarie West.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Torfing, J. & E. Sørensen 2014. “The European debate on governance networks: towards a newand viable paradigm?” *Policy and Society* 33 (4), pp. 329-344

UNHABITAT. 2010. *Urban indigenous peoples and migration: A review of policies, programmes and practices. United Nations Housing Rights Programme*. Report No. 8.

Nairobi: UN-HABITAT/OHCHR. Retrieved 4 February 2020 from https://issuu.com/unhabitat/docs/www.unhabitat.org.

Vabo, S. I. & A. Røiseland. 2008. "Governance på norsk. Samstyring som empirisk og analytisk fenomen." *Norsk statsvitenskapelig tidsskrift* 24 (1/2), pp. 86-101

Vassenden, A. 2008. "Om å innlemme makronivået i mikrososiologiske studier. En sammenlikning av 'grounded theory' og 'extended case method'." *Sosiologisk tidsskrift* 4 (16), pp. 447-463

Veracini, L. (2010). *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Willerslev, Rane. 2010. "'Urbanites without a city': Three Generations of Siberian Yukaghir Women", *Acta Borealia* 27(2): 189-207.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native", *Journal of Genocide Research,* 8 (4): 387–409.

[1] Despite major differences, all four are states that developed from overseas Anglophone colonies during roughly the same period and have colonist-descendant majorities.

[2] In this book, urban settlements with more than 50,000 residents are referred to as "cities." On the global scale of things, 50,000 may seem a very low bar for the word "city" to be used, but Northern Europe is a rather thinly populated part of the world, so it fits well in that context. In the northern part

of this region, it is not uncommon to refer to any settlement with a population higher than about 5,000 as a "city," but we have chosen the label "town" for settlements with between 10,000 and 50,000 inhabitants, "small town" for settlements with between 5,000 and 10,000 residents, and "village" for settlements between 5,000 and 1,000 residents, while smaller settlements than these will be referred to as "hamlets."

[3] To take the countries analyzed in Peters and Andersen 2013 (eds.) as examples: in Canada, the percentage of indigenous populations living in urban areas went from 6.7% (1951) to 53.2% (2006), in the USA from ca. 10% (1930) to ca. 66–68% (2000), in Australia from 44% (1971) to 76% (2006), and in New Zealand from 7% (1936) to 84% (2006) (P-A 2013 Canada Background 23–24; Norris, Clatworthy and Peters 2013: 30; Snipp 2013: 176–180; Taylor 2013: 238–239; Kukutai 2013: 311–315). The Australian "leap" seems smaller, but here the start year was set at a rather late point. According to Taylor (2013: 238), Australian indigenous demographic data before 1971 are so unreliable that this year was utilized as the "year zero" of his comparison.

[4] Although it should be noted in this regard that this is not only a Nordic-Russian difference: There are also parts of the Anglo-American world where usage of the term "race" to describe ethnicity remains common and accepted, in stark contrast to the contemporary norms in the Nordic states.