Touring in the Arctic

Maher, Pat; Jóhannesson, Gunnar Þór; Kvidal-Rovik, Trine; Müller, Dieter; Rantala, Outi

5 Touring in the Arctic

Shades of gray toward a sustainable future

*Patrick T. Maher, Gunnar Thór Jóhannesson,
Trine Kvidal-Røvik, Dieter K. Müller,
& Outi Rantala*

Introduction

Throughout this chapter, we will use the lens of the "destination" to look at the way tourism has developed, and continues to develop, in the Arctic. In Canada this includes Yukon, Northwest Territories and Nunavut, Iceland as a whole nation, Northern Norway (the counties of Troms and Finnmark, plus the county of Nordland), Sweden (Norrbotten Västerbotten county and in some cases the region of Swedish Lapland) and Finnish Lapland. Over time, these destinations have seen some tremendous changes in tourism, as shown by the numbers in Tables 5.1 and 5.2; alongside other Arctic jurisdictions:

In tourism studies, we often talk about destinations, but as Morgan, Pritchard, and Pride (2011, p. 4) acknowledge, destination is a concept which is "variously used by marketers and professionals (as a geopolitical system with its own Destination Management Organizations) and by sociologists and geographers (as a socio-cultural construction)." In line with this description, a place only becomes a destination through the narratives and images communicated by its tourism promotion material (Morgan et al., 2011).

Tourism and the production of place images have become an important aspect of modern societies and the image of the Arctic matters to the overall sustainability of tourism in Northern areas. That is, sustainable societies, based on regional resources, require that tourism "is balanced with the development of inclusive and democratic places for people living in the Arctic" (Rantala et al., 2019, p. 19).

Understanding the image of the Arctic, rests on an understanding of how place meanings are created. Place can be understood as a commodity to be consumed, and representations tied to place are important to this consumption (Andersson, 2010; Urry, 1995). Thus, tourism is not necessarily that different from other industrial sectors—the consumption is simply taking away experiences, perhaps with tangibles such as photographs and other souvenirs, versus physically removing trees or minerals.

What a place is, and how a place comes to be seen, will depend on a variety of conditions, "ranging from local institutional contexts and interactions, to

Table 5.1 Early 2000s, estimated Arctic tourist numbers (data from 2001-2010; modified from Maher, 2013)

Country/Region/Province	Tourist Numbers (Estimates)	Sources/Notes
USA (Alaska)	• 1,631,500	• Summer 2006 data for all out-of-state visitors
Canada		
• Yukon	• 8049	• 2004 data – covers only the Northern Yukon tourism region
• Northwest Territories	• 62,045	• 2006-2007 data for all non-resident travellers to the entire territory
• Nunavut	• 9,323	• 2006, summer only
Greenland	• 33,000 (air arrivals) • 22,051 (cruise arrivals)	• Data reported in 2011
Iceland	• 277,900	• Data reported in 2002
Svalbard (Norway)	• 29,813	• AECO personal communication, August 2010; 2009 cruise visitors arriving from overseas
Norway (Finnmark county)	• 2,420,959	• Data from 2002
Sweden (Norrbotten county)	• 1,700,000	• Data from 2001 tourist overnight stays
Finland (Finnish Lapland)	• 2,117, 000	• 2006 data for the number of registered tourist overnights
Russia	• Estimated at a few tens of thousands and growing steadily	• Actual data difficult to obtain

specific situations concerning economic and social life as well as narratives and symbols available" (Granås, 2009, p. 119). Places compete in attracting residents, businesses, and visitors, and as Morgan, Pritchard, and Pride (2011, p. 3) state, "A place with a positive reputation finds it easier to vie for attention, resources, people, jobs, and money; a positive place reputation builds place competitiveness and cements a place as somewhere worth visiting."

Of particular relevance to tourism, place images create expectations and demands among potential customers and collaborators, which the local businesses and communities must relate to. At the same time, representations (while potentially produced with intentions such as creating attractive destination brands) are also key to inhabitants—their sense of place and identification as a local to a certain area. Amundsen (2012, p. 140) points out that, "tensions between definitions of what should be offered to tourists and

Table 5.2 Most recent, estimated Arctic tourist numbers (updated from Maher, 2017)

Country/Region/Province	Tourist Numbers (Estimates)	Sources/Notes
USA (Alaska)	• 2,242,900	• https://www.commerce.alaska.gov (Accessed March 2019); November 2018 report for October 2016-September 2017 data for all out-of-state visitors
Canada		
• Yukon	• 334,000	• http://www.tc.gov.yk.ca (Accessed March 2019); 2017 estimated total overnight visits to the entire territory
• Northwest Territories	• 112,530	• http://www.iti.gov.nt.ca (Accessed March 2019); 2017-2018 total visitors (leisure and business) to the entire territory
• Nunavut	• 16,750	• http://nunavuttourism.com; 2015 exit strategy – non-resident visitors
Greenland	• 90,025	• http://www.tourismstat.gl (Accessed March 2019); 2017 Greenland Tourism Statistics Report
Iceland	• 2,224,074	• http://www.ferdamalastofa.is (Accessed March 2019) 2017 international visitors to Iceland (via flights and ferries)
Svalbard (Norway)	• 158,248	• https://en.visitsvalbard.com (Accessed March 2019); 2018 Visit Svalbard statistics for overnight stays in Longyearbyen
Norway (Nord Norge)	• 2,794,973	• Innovation Norway, 2017 report (available from https://assets.simpleviewcms.com/simpleview/image/upload/v1/clients/norway/Key_Figures_2017_pages_9b3f82d5-43f4-4fe9-968c-7a85a36704b2.pdf); 2017 data for all foreign overnight stays and overnight stays from domestic tourists from other regions
Sweden (Swedish Lapland)	• 2,947,969	• 2018 total guest nights (Accessed August 2019 from https://www.swedishlaplandvisitorsboard.com/en/the-destination/statistics/)
Finland (Finnish Lapland)	• 3,100,000	• https://yle.fi/uutiset/osasto/news/record_number_of_tourists_visit_finnish_lapland_in_2019/11186729 (Accessed January 2020); 2019 data for the number of registered tourist overnights
Russia	• 500,000	• Tzekina (2014)

how local places should develop thus involves a range of perspectives and actors and it is likely that this continues to be a source of dispute."

   This speaks to a dynamic that is important to address when discussing overall sustainability of Arctic societies; and across societies in different regions. Tourism scholars situated in the northern areas around the world are asking how tourism can be developed so that it "strengthens communities and makes them better places to live in," something which further "begs the question of how to find the balance between economic, social and environmental sustainability" (Rantala et al., 2019, p. 40), the essence of a

green economy, which when tied to the marine environment, as much of the Arctic is, is also a blue economic approach.

An important success criterion for the tourism industry will be to provide the right experience to the right visitor. For this to happen, the image of the Arctic alongside realities of small communities must be addressed. Many regional actors assume that the publicity of a place will lead to increased number of tourists, investors or inhabitants (Falkheimer, 2006), and this may not always be the right trajectory. So how are Arctic places positioned at the moment? As a green option for development, versus yet another exploitative/non-renewable one. The next section of this chapter will outline the background contexts against which tourism is overlaid in each of the five nations (and sub-regions).

Background

Canada

Canada's Arctic, specifically the jurisdictions of Yukon, Northwest Territories and Nunavut, together cover over 3.5 million km². This is roughly 40% of Canada's landmass; yet the total population is less than 1% of the total Canadian population (115,000). As a result, the diversity of tourism products is extensive due to shear geography, yet the capacity to develop a broad sector is limited. Much of the tourism in Yukon has historically been linked to travelers transiting the Alaska Highway, with United States travelers being the primary supply as they make their way from the southern States to their Northern frontier. Yukon has a strong history of Indigenous presence in its tourism industry (see Hull, de la Barre, & Maher, 2017), which also extends to the creative success of non-Indigenous cultural tourism. In the Northwest Territories, hunting and fishing has long been the draw; alongside paddling journeys and more recently the sparkle of viewing the Aurora Borealis and diamond mines. Nunavut, which until 1999 was a part of the Northwest Territories, has no external road access, and thus has seen increased access by expedition cruise ships and as such a far larger dependence on marine tourism (see Johnston, Dawson, & Maher, 2017). Nunavut was created through a land claim process and as a result is heavily invested in tourism that shares a variety of Inuit traditional activities, such as carving, kayaking, dogsledding, drum dancing, etc.

Iceland

Iceland has a long history as a destination for travelers and explorers, but only during the last decades of the twentieth century has tourism started to develop at an exponential pace (compare Tables 5.1 and 5.2). The population of this cold-water island state is less than 360,000; of which approximately 60% lives in the capital region of Reykjavík, on the southwest corner of the island (Statistics Iceland, 2020). Iceland barely touches the Arctic Circle,

yet it is very much part of the same popular imagery surrounding other circumpolar destinations. The travelogues of many explorers and adventurers who visited Iceland in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries described the island as a place of natural wonders, a narrative that was further boosted by its "island-ness,"—the sense of distance, isolation, separateness, tradition, and "otherness" (Jóhannesson, Huijbens, & Sharpley, 2010). This image is still partly sustained today in Iceland's marketing material for tourism.

Norway

Northern Norway, which consists of the counties of Troms Finnmark, and Nordland makes up a large area of Norway's mainland (35%), but the population is only approximately 486,000 people (less than 10% of Norway's overall population). Statistics shows the importance of tourism as an industry in Northern Norway. In 2018, the industry supported NOK 19.3 billion in economic activity, and employed 17,242 people. At those levels, the industry accounted for 7.1% of 2018 employment in Northern Norway. In comparison, the employment shares or other primary industries (including fish processing) was 6.2% and other industries such as petroleum development and mining was 5.7% (NHO, 2019). Importantly, at the same time as visitor numbers are increasing, expectations of professionalism among industry players are increasing.

Recently, public attention has also begun to focus on the growth in winter tourism in the region, which a recent national tourism strategy describes as the most significant change in tourism over the last few years (Innovation Norway, 2021). This has clearly changed "the conditions for the tourism industry and influenced social life in the villages and towns most strongly affected by this increase" (Rantala et al., 2019, p. 21). Even though the Summer season is the biggest season for tourism in Northern Norway, there is an important increase in Winter tourism, a growth linked with long-term initiatives to develop the region into a. year-round destination for international tourism (Innovation Norway, 2021). Winter has increased its "market share" of total international visits throughout the year from 9 to 30% over the last decade, and in 2016/2017 more British and Asian visitors came to Northern Norway during the Winter than during the Summer season (NHO, 2017).

Sweden

The Swedish North is historically the home region of the Indigenous Sami; however, in the nineteenth century, the state and industry identified the area as a rich source of natural resources, such as timber and minerals (Sörlin, 1988). At the turn of that century, tourism was identified as a part of the industrial mix of the region (Müller, Byström, Stjernström, & Svensson, 2019). Yet it was not developed into a core industry until recently.

For 100+ years, tourism functioned as an alternative and complementary livelihood during bust periods in the traditional natural resource industry

cycle (Müller, 2013a). Today, tourism in the Swedish North is experiencing a boom period. In this context, new products and new seasons have emerged meeting the increasingly global demand for northern tourism. In the footprints of the Icehotel, established in the early 1990s, more winter tourism products are being developed; including dog-sled tours and aurora borealis chasing Thus, commercial overnight stays during the winter season are growing almost twice as much as during summer (Tillväxtverket, 2018).

Despite the steadily growing figures, tourism in the Swedish North is still small-scale compared to many other parts of the world. The region has only 520,000 inhabitants or 5% of the Swedish population. Within the region, approximately a third of the guest nights are related to international tourists (Tillväxtverket, 2018). A majority of these guest nights occur in Umeå and Luleå, the two counties' coastal capital cities, where a majority of the small population is concentrated. In the inland areas, particularly places accessible by airplane, there is some positive development. Kiruna, the home municipality of the Icehotel, and the primary spots for aurora observations, takes a dominant position (Müller, 2011).

Finland

Finnish Lapland is often regarded as a peripheral area of Finland, since it covers 30% of the area of Finland, but only 3% of the Finnish population lives in Lapland. The area is seen as rich in material resources for forestry and mining, but also rich in exotic imaginaries for the tourism industry. The current reliance on these traditional industrial sectors brings turnover and employment to the county, but the tourism sector has steadily increased its importance during the last three decades. When considering the local community perspectives, highlighting peripherality, exoticness and resource-richness seems too straightforward. We are currently witnessing an overwhelming human influence upon the Earth (for example, Crutzen, 2002) —and in line with that the need to bring up alternative perspectives in the era of environmental crises. It should be highlighted that Lapland has biodiversity rich areas, know-how on multiple uses of the forests—e.g. superfood companies, and lively creative industries. Thus, the vision of the county of Lapland is to be the world's cleanest county in 2040, based on "Arcticness," openness and smartness. The vision is to be achieved by applying sustainable practices and smart technologies into the use of the resources—accompanied by a high level of digitalisation (Hyry et al., 2017).

Policy and development

As can be seen in the background context, there are many similarities between these Arctic tourism destinations. They rely on a few unique factors: large landscapes (at different scales) that attract visitors because they are so different to the tourists' regular city landscapes; very small populations; peripheral constraints (perceived or real); and historical narratives of

exoticism and marginalisation. This next section will examine some policies and development trajectories across borders. Common themes include the dependence on transport (specifically aviation), seasonality, the role of the periphery against the core, sustainability of the system, access and environmental protections, and the realities of the workforce.

Aviation

In Iceland, aviation is the precondition for large scale tourism on the island. Soon after World War II, two Icelandic airlines started to operate international flights and established route networks connecting the island to Europe and North America. These companies later merged under the name Icelandair. Icelandair, continued to develop a hub and spoke system, making effective use of the location of Iceland in the middle of the North Atlantic, connecting various destinations in Europe and North America. Icelandair has been the major driver of tourism development in the country and still holds a key position in that regard. Other Icelandic-based airlines have operated for some periods, but have struggled to survive. Most recently, WOW air, established in 2011 went bankrupt in spring 2019. It had operated with a similar hub and spoke system as Icelandair. Many international airlines have also operated routes to and from Iceland in recent years, especially during the high season (22 additional airlines during summer 2019).

On a far smaller scale, airlines are a critical piece of the tourism infrastructure for many areas of Arctic Canada. Nunavut relies on airlines to bring visitors to the territory, with no road access linking it to the rest of the country; and the linkages of small regional (largely domestic) airlines across the three territories is a necessity. These airlines have been owned and/or managed by the territories themselves and specific Indigenous groups, more so than the major airline players (Air Canada and WestJet), thus they have unique community connections and expectations.

Although aviation is critical to some destinations, in other areas there is the recognition that we need to move beyond the development of flight connections and airports. In Finnish Lapland, the focus is now on regional accessibility by train. This links to the impacts of tourism being recognised, and actors such as the Responsible tourism network of Lapland, having more visibility than in the past.

Seasonality

The most recent tourism strategy for Finnish Lapland highlights year-long sustainability (Sievers, 2020), and in doing so prioritises tourism development that increases the amount of tourism during the snowless seasons. One reason for focusing on snowless seasons is the aim to balance the impacts of tourism on the local environments and societies away from the busy winter season.

While tourism originally developed in the summer in Finnish Lapland, since 1980s the winter has been the high season. There were plans already afoot in the 1950s to build a "Christmas land" in Rovaniemi, but it was not until mid-1980s that the plans were actualised and the Santa's Village Christmas tourism destination was built at the Arctic Circle (Ilola, Hakkarainen, & García-Rosell, 2014). The winter season continues to be the most important season in most of Lapland, with the month of December being the most popular, both in terms of overnight stays and passenger traffic. The lowest number of overnight stays in 2017 was in May, with 63,000, whereas in December there were 465,000 overnight stays registered. The months from January to April form the second peak season after Christmas tourism, and the summer and autumn months from June to September the third season. According to a survey conducted among entrepreneurs from northern Finland, northern Norway and northern Sweden, tourism entrepreneurs see May as the most problematic period for developing tourism and autumn season as the most potential one for the development of year-around tourism (Rantala et al., 2019, p. 25).

In Iceland, tourism is easily characterised by seasonality. More than 90% of all tourists enter the country via Keflavík international airport, close to the capital Reykjavík; and during the summer months of June, July and August. There is some growth in tourist arrivals during the winter, but this is an interesting trend in light of the often uncertain and harsh weather conditions at that time. Although it has led to considerably less seasonality, particularly in the capital region and along the south coast of the island, i.e. the areas most easily accessible during wintertime. A new challenge is now the significant regional differences in tourism within the country, which is not likely to change in foreseeable future.

Tourism in Northern Norway has also been characterised by seasonality, and while this might work well for some businesses in Northern Norway, for instance "Indigenous entrepreneurs, who may rely on seasonal engagement in tourism to make the entrepreneurship fit into the annual life cycle of their Indigenous community" (Rantala et al., 2019, p. 33), particularly reindeer herding. It also brings about some challenges as well, with year-round tourism said to better enable "larger companies to deal with environmental issues, and to recruit competent staff, who demand full-time position" (Rantala et al., 2019, p. 32).

Returning to Finnish Lapland, the strong seasonality of tourism has negatively impacted local communities and environments due to the pressure of a single high peak (Rantala et al., 2019). There are new practices being developed to mitigate the impacts of a peak season; i.e., in Rovaniemi a social worker has been hired—since 2013—to work with foreign tourists in the regional hospital from November to April. The social worker enables hospital employees to concentrate on serving local people and also enables hospital to get payment back from their services (previously local tax money has been used to take care of tourists in the hospital). Seasonality

has also strengthened the image of tourism work as low-skilled and precarious (Rantala et al., 2019), which has led to labor shortages during the high season. At the same time, the seasonal nature of tourism has enabled communities "to take a break" from tourists and formed a basis for lifestyle entrepreneurship (Rantala et al., 2019). This is present in Canada's Yukon too, with lifestyle entrepreneurs working on their own time. A particular example is how dog sledding kennels can focus on their racing and training at some times of the year, and tourism endeavors at others.

Peripherality

Paulgaard (2008, p. 56) puts it well when she says, "the branding of the place and the people within the field of tourism represents the local culture in accordance with the hierarchical understanding of the distinction between centre and periphery." Müller (2015, p. 149) adds that "while the periphery position *can* represent a practical challenge of distance, it is not necessarily the physical distance that can be seen as the challenge, but rather the symbolic distance embedded in such a center-periphery construct." Müller (2015, p. 149) expands that to point out,

> "it should be noted that the Arctic is not a remote destination. It is in fact surrounded by major demand markets in North America and Europe, and is in fact much closer to these markets than other popular destinations like Southeast Asia and Australia. Hence, it is not the physical distance that makes the area remote, but rather the cognitive perception of a different climate and ecosystem. Still, traveling in the Arctic can be expensive, but this is a consequence of limited market demand rather than physical distance."

Tourism in Northern Sweden has been promoted as an opportunity to create employment and stabilise communities in rural and northern peripheries (Müller & Brouder, 2014). Many tourism stakeholders in the North embrace this message (Lundmark & Müller, 2010). Governments promote the numerous national parks and nature reserves in the North as resources for tourism development and obviously, tourism is seen as an industry that can support a transition to a more environmentally friendly use of northern resources, too.

However, not everybody in the tourism industry embraces this idea. Instead, some stakeholders see nature protection and the regulations that follow along as a threat to business (Lundmark & Stjernström, 2009; Müller, 2013b). This applies not least when motorised transportation is included in the products. Furthermore, nature protection does not seem to have the promised positive impacts on employment (Byström & Müller, 2014; Lundmark, Fredman, & Sandell, 2010). A similar discussion takes place in Canada, where many parks and protected areas have been created in the Arctic—in the past due to a lack

of population, and a center-based desire to protect a system of ecosystems. Nowadays, protection is a recognition of Indigenous land claims and overall stewardship (see Maher, 2012). Some Indigenous Sami entrepreneurs consider tourism as integrated part of their traditional activities and use the income from tourism to support their reindeer herding (Leu, 2019).

In Finnish Lapland, previous tourism strategies categorised different areas into strong tourism centers, and this categorisation was used for directing investments (Hakkarainen & Tuulentie, 2008; Regional Council of Lapland, 2007). This has led into tourism, which is driven by tourism centers (small cities) that are then complemented by peripherical attractions (Hakkarainen, 2017). In Arctic Canada, this is similar to the situation in each territory; hubs such as Whitehorse and Yellowknife act as the conduits to attractions elsewhere in the territories. Again, it is driven in part by aviation infrastructure, as noted earlier.

In Northern Norway, tourism growth is also unevenly distributed; Nordland County has considerably higher tourist numbers than the rest of Northern Norway. Finnmark County to the north east has tourism numbers that are less than half of those of Nordland. In Nordland, the summer season is a peak season, while in Troms County, located in the middle of the region, the summer and winter seasons have more equal numbers, and the development from 2012 to 2018 led to higher numbers during winter. In the town of Tromsø, the number of international commercial overnight stays during the Winter season increased from 18.000 in 2008 to 200.000 in 2018, and AirBnB comes on top of this (Jakobsen & Engebretsen, 2019). In the same period, the growth in winter tourism in the most northern part of the region was much more limited. With such different structures of the communities, we could perhaps say there is no "one size fits all" when it comes to tourism development in northern Norway.

In the past, there have also been one-sided media accounts that re-create the myths of Northern Norwegians, versus those in the south near Oslo and Bergen as "naïve and natural, living among the fjords and the fish" (Paulgaard, 2008, p. 51), and this has been claimed as the reason why young people cease to identify with the northern places in which they live. Speaking to this issue, Guneriussen (2008, p. 233) says,

> "this region has been considered a backward, poor, weakly-developed and mostly pre-modern periphery in Norway, in need of state subsidies and regional development programmes in order to become 'modern'. Such a negative labelling of the region has been typical and not only by 'outsiders' (particularly representatives from national political, economic and cultural centres). It has also been an important part of the northerner's self-understanding or self-image. People in the north have habitually considered themselves subordinate in many respects. They felt that the modern centre in the south, with all its advanced technology, culture and economic power represented a higher level of development."

Similarly, Kraft (2008, p. 222), stated that "Northern Norway has traditionally been constructed according to a north-south axis, with 'south' as the centre of power and decision-making, and 'north' as a suppressed and exploited backyard. Related to this perspective of subordination and victimization, the people of the north have been imagined thorough a primitivist discourse, in contrast to a presumed modern, Western identity."

Despite these controversies, there seems to be a general agreement among stakeholders that tourism should continue to develop as an industry that contributes to sustain communities and labor markets in such peripheral regions. A recent government commission in Northern Sweden outlined ideas that clearly set tourism in the context of a green economy (SOU, 2017). In this context, a more sustainable transportation system including the availability of public transport in peripheral areas is among the proposed actions. This is remarkable considering the low population density; but could be a model to assist the ongoing core-periphery tension in many of the regions discussed here. Furthermore, since many of the tourism entrepreneurs in the region (Swedish Lapland) have been attracted to the region by outdoor activities and the related lifestyles themselves, they engage in adapting their activities to become environmentally friendly and sustain the resource base of their lifestyle and business (Carson, Carson, & Eimermann, 2018).

Sustainability

The focus on sustainability and on the need to balance the tourism sector's activities can be seen as a tremendous dilemma, resulting from the strong increase of the tourism industry during the last few decades, and the impacts of this increase. In Finnish Lapland there are some estimates that the actual number of the overnight stays may be 2.5 or 3 times larger than the 3.1 million reported because many visitors spend nights in private rental cabins and in AirBnB accommodations that are not being registered. Airbnb accommodations have increased rapidly during the last years. In Rovaniemi—the capital city of Lapland, there were a total of 136 AirBnB accommodations listed in March 2016, while in November 2017 they reached 500, and at the beginning of 2019 the number rose to almost 900. In comparison that is 14.4 AirBnB locations per 1,000 inhabitants in Rovaniemi, while the same number in the far larger capital city of Helsinki is 4.2 per 1,000 inhabitants (Retrieved January 13, 2020 from https://shareabletourism.com). This issue is considerable threat to sustainability in Iceland too, particularly Reykjavik.

The extensive increase of AirBnB accommodations and sharing economy has caused conflicts in the development of tourism—especially in Rovaniemi region. These conflicts include, e.g., the lack of clarity of rules and regulations regarding AirBnB accommodation in the city. However, the sharing economy—and especially the trend toward "living like a local" —has enabled the inclusion of new responsible areas into the agenda of tourism development

in Finnish Lapland (Haanpää, Hakkarainen, & Harju-Myllyaho, 2018). The same situation, although under smaller circumstances, can be seen in Arctic Canada and Norway. Visitors may get stretched by the limited accommodation options available, and while they wish to have a "local" experience that causes tensions around commodification and country food security.

The workforce

In Iceland, tourism exports account for approximately 40% of foreign currency income and provides 8.7% of GDP in 2017 (Mælaborð ferðaþjónustunnar, 2019). Approximately 33.000 people or 16% of the labor force work in tourism, of which one third is migrant workers. Development has been driven by entrepreneurs operating within a weak organisational and regulation framework. The sector has been characterised by a few large firms and an abundance of micro and nano-sized companies.

The importance of tourism in the regional economy of Finnish Lapland is also significant, as the share of tourism in GDP was 5.7%, while Finland's national average was 2.5% (House of Lapland, 2020). In 2017, Lapland accounted for over 4,000 person-years of work in the tourism sector; up to 7,000 people when including also the seasonal workforce (House of Lapland, 2020). The turnover of the tourism industry was 630 million euros in year 2017, with 16% growth from the previous year.

With different county- and municipality-level strategies, development plans, and visions, the tourism sector is often expected to bring employment and income to peripherical communities. People in these communities are expected to develop different kinds of tourism related services and innovations—without offering them concrete tools (Hakkarainen, 2017). Hence, tourism does not inevitably bring the means "to save" the peripheral areas from outmigration, but little by little tourism has formed as one way to enhance employment in the villages in Finnish Lapland—for example by combining tourism work to reindeer husbandry, mining, car-testing, or agriculture (Hakkarainen, 2017). By combining different sources of livelihood, the seasonal nature of tourism has been mitigated for local conditions

Growth in tourism leads to increased use of the region's areas and services that are also used by locals. This places much stronger demands on strategic and comprehensive planning from both the authorities, the companies, and other actors in the tourism industry. Growth has led to an increased use of nature and public areas. In Northern Norway, tourism businesses and the communities are experiencing a paradoxical situation:

> "On the one hand the infrastructure presently available is too limited for further growth during the high season, while on the other hand because of the limited infrastructure, it is not viable to run tourism the whole year round"
>
> *(Rantala et al., 2019, pp. 38–39).*

Some international and regional organisations have raised concern for these potential impacts on the natural environment, wildlife, local residents, and Indigenous population, in the wake of the increased tourism in the region (Chen & Chen, 2016). One specific aspect of some of these discussions, deals with the Norwegian *allemannsretten*/"right to roam," which has relevance in terms of pressure on nature in northern areas. Even though public access rights have been at the core of discussions regarding use of land for tourism, "public interest in access has largely prevailed because at the heart of the Nordic conception of citizenship is a deeply embedded tradition of outdoors sporting and recreational activity, as embodied in a cultural sensibility towards *friluftsliv* (a simple life in nature) and *idrett* (purposeful outdoor sporting activity), underpinned by the notion of *allemannsretten*" (McNeish & Olivier, 2017, p. 290). If this issue remains unaddressed in tourism, it will potentially undermine the sustainable development of Northern communities in both Norway and Sweden.

Also, the core of Arctic tourism is made up by many small companies and lifestyle entrepreneurs that offer experiences and services for visitors. These small companies are often "based on lifestyle entrepreneurships that are strongly embedded in places, environments and communities" (Rantala et al., 2019, p. 30). In order for tourism industry to grow, and become increasingly professionalised, larger companies might be beneficial, however limited growth in tourism may be a better solution to the region, following the concept of carrying capacity that determines the optimal number of visitors to be hosted at given time and space (Chen & Chen, 2016).

Next steps

Across the destinations included in this chapter, it can be seen that tourism holds wide-ranging opportunities, as well as considerable impacts within society. In a relatively short period, 2000 onwards, there has been a change from consumption of resources to a service-based economy.

For example, in Iceland, the national economy, which has historically fluctuated in tandem with environmental conditions of the sea for fishing and market conditions for aluminum now sees tourism as one more pillar for the economy. Though tourism is also marked by fluctuations and volatility as recent downturn reflects. Iceland is a nature-tourist destination, with more than 90% of visitors saying that the natural environment of the country gave them the idea to travel to Iceland (Óladóttir, 2019). So it may be particularly prone to negative dialogue on overcrowding and environmental damage, except that overall, tourists state they are happy with their visit (Ferðamálastofa, 2019). In fact, the main source of complaints in Iceland is about pricing and expenses.

This is the dilemma for many destinations; cheap flights, packaged accommodation, and the negative impacts of tourism associated with over-tourism (see Jóhannesson & Lund, 2019); versus true sustainability and

responsibility. Travel choices are at an impasse. Today, sustainability is a global imperative, across all sectors and society as a whole. Blue and green economics dictate where we should be headed in Canada and the Nordic states. Long-term sustainable development of tourism in the Arctic relies on engaging in community development and caring for local environments (Rantala et al., 2019). There is a need to consider how to achieve a market mix that minimises travel emissions and pays respect to the planetary resource limitations in the Anthropocene (Gren & Huijbens, 2014).

Globalisation implies a spatial expansion of the tourism system that now increasingly includes long-haul travel to reach the destination, while the time spent at the destination seems to decline. The related emissions do not match the idea of a tourism industry that sells experiences of unspoiled nature and aspires to become part of a sustainable future.

For a number of years, scholars have challenged the image of Arctic places; in Northern Norway, the notion of being peripheral and wild has been challenged; implying that Northern Norway is about to become a new, vital and "dynamic area" in the nation, in Europe and even in a global context (Guneriussen, 2008, p. 233), but "myths are not easily deconstructed, even though they may not correspond to people's experiences in their daily life" (Paulgaard, 2008, p. 53). Also, the myths may not be negative for all, "the construction of a centre and periphery as asymmetrical counter-concepts has both positive and negative connotations" (Paulgaard, 2008, p. 52).

It is still a perceived reality that one needs to be "in touch with wilderness" in order to become "a healthy, natural human being" (Guneriussen, 2008, p. 242) and the "Arctic magic" is something that is seen to appeal to "modern actors who long for something extraordinary" (Guneriussen, 2008, p. 242). This is a tool for tourism in the Arctic to capitalise on. The North "has come to be conceived as something very attractive when viewed from within a modern and highly urbanized culture" (Guneriussen, 2008, p. 242) and "wilderness has become a prime attractor for various forms of tourism—a spectacle for modern spectators, something good and authentic with which to make contact" (Guneriussen, 2008, p. 242).

DMO's such as Visit Norway, discuss being attracted by the Midnight Sun, fishing opportunities, and picturesque landscapes; seduced by the Northern Lights and snow-related activities in the winter, such as husky rides and visiting ice hotels (Chen & Chen, 2016). This can be said of nearly all the regions covered in this chapter; then does it become superficial or even fake? Perhaps it can also be beneficial to the sustainability discourse; the next steps are "stay home" if you live in one of these areas, or is it "rather urgent that the Arctic government[s] and host communities contemplate the consequences of global warming on future tourism development and put forward appropriate policies and regulations to better anticipate and respond to ongoing climate transformations" (Chen & Chen, 2016, p. 5). Again, this is a balance of how one sees ongoing tourism development as part of blue or green economies or is it the antithesis of such.

In order to apply sustainable practices on development to tourism, wider discussion is needed regarding the future aims and directions; that move beyond simply increasing tourism. The strong increase of tourism has already had diverse implications—such as a need to hire extra personnel in a hospital, a need to invest more on the infrastructure of recreational areas that are used based on everyman's rights, and need to clarify regulations and rules related to sharing tourism between core centers and peripheral spaces, in all seasons.

Acknowledgments

References

Amundsen, H. (2012). Differing discourses of development in the Arctic: The case of nature-based tourism in Northern Norway. *The Northern Review*, *35*(Spring 2012), 125–146.

Andersson, M. (2010). Provincial globalization: The local struggle of place-making. *Culture unbound*, *2*, 193–215.

Byström, J., & Müller, D. K. (2014). Tourism labor market impacts of National Parks: The case of Swedish Lapland. *Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftsgeographie*, *58*(2-3), 73–84.

Carson, D. A., Carson, D. B., & Eimermann, M. (2018). International winter tourism entrepreneurs in northern Sweden: Understanding migration, lifestyle, and business motivations. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, *18*(2), 183–198.

Chen, J. S., & Chen, Y.-L. (2016). Tourism stakeholders' perceptions of service gaps in Arctic destinations: Lessons from Norway's Finnmark region. *Journal of outdoor recreation and tourism*, *16*, 1–6.

Crutzen, P. J. (2002). Geology of Mankind: The anthropocene. *Nature*, *415*(6867), 23.

Falkheimer, J. (2006). When place images collide. Place branding and news journalism. *Geographies of communication. The spatial turn in media studies* (pp. 125–138). Nordicom.

Ferðamálastofa. (2019). Ferðaþjónusta í tölum - Ágúst 2019. https://www.ferdamalastofa.is/static/files/ferdamalastofa/talnaefni/ferdatjonusta-i-tolum/2019/agust-2019-isl.pdf

Granås, B. (2009). Constructing the unique: Communicating the extreme dynamics of place marketing. In T. Nyseth & A. Viken (Eds.), *Place reinvention: Northern perspectives* (pp. 111–126). Ashgate.

Gren, M., & Huijbens, E. H. (2014). Tourism and the anthropocene. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, *14*(1), 6–22.

Guneriussen, W. (2008). Modernity re-enchanted: Making a "Magic" region. In J. O. Bærenholdt, & B. Granås (Eds.), *Mobility and place: Enacting Northern European peripheries* (pp. 233–244). Hampshire, Burlington: Ashgate.

Haanpää, M., Hakkarainen, M., & Harju-Myllyaho, A. (2018). Katsaus yhteiskun-nalliseen yrittäjyyteen matkailussa: Osallisuuden mahdollisuudet pohjoisen urbaaneissa paikallisyhteisöissä. *Finnish Journal of Tourism Research*, *14*(2), 44–58.

Hakkarainen, M., & Tuulentie, S. (2008). Tourism's role in rural development of Finnish Lapland: Interpreting national and regional strategy documents. *Fennia*, *186*(1), 3–13.

Hakkarainen, M. (2017). *Matkailutyön ehdot syrjäisessä kylässä.* Acta Universitatis Lapponiensis 357.

House of Lapland (2020). *Industry Brief: Tourism*. https://www.lapland.fi/business/tourism-industry-in-lapland/

Hull, J., de la Barre, S., & Maher, P. T. (2017). Peripheral geographies of creativity: The case for aboriginal tourism in Canada's Yukon territory. In A. Viken & D. Müller (Eds.), *Tourism and Indigeneity in the Arctic* (pp. 157–181). Channel View.

Hyry, M. et al. (2017). Lappisopimus. *Regional Council of Lapland Publications A47/2017.* http://www.lappi.fi/c/document_library/get_file?folderId=3589265&name=DLFE-32814.pdf

Ilola, H., Hakkarainen, M., & García-Rosell, J.-C. (2014). Johdanto Rovaniemen jou-lumatkailuun. In Ilola H., Hakkarainen, M. & García-Rosell, J.-C. (Eds.), *Joulu ainainen? Näkökulmia Rovaniemen joulumatkailuun* (pp. 10–22). Matkailualan tutkimus- ja koulutusinstituutin julkaisuja, The Lapland University Consortium.

Innovation Norway (2021). National Tourism Strategy 2030. https://assets.simpleviewcms.com/simpleview/image/upload/v1/clients/norway/Nasjonal_Reiselivsstrategi_engelsk_red_c59e62a4-6fd0-4a2e-aea1-5e1c6586ebc6.pdf

Jakobsen, E. W., Engebretsen, B. E. (2019). Ringvirkningsanalyse av reiselivet i Tromsø. Menon Economics Report 26.04.19. https://www.menon.no/wp-content/uploads/2019-127-Troms%C3%B8-2.pdf

Johnston, M. E., Dawson, J., & Maher, P. T. (2017). Strategic development chal-lenges in marine tourism in Nunavut. *Resources*, *6*(3). http://www.mdpi.com/journal/resources/special_issues/polar_tourism

Jóhannesson, G. T., Huijbens, E., & Sharpley, R. (2010). Icelandic Tourism: Past directions – future challenges. *Tourism Geographies*, *12*(2), 278–301.

Jóhannesson, G. T., & Lund, K. A. (2019). Beyond overtourism: Studying the entan-glements of society and tourism in Iceland. In C. Milano, J. M. Cheer, & M. Novelli (Eds.), *Overtourism: Excesses, discontents and measures in travel and tour-ism* (pp. 91–106). CABI.

Kraft, S. E. (2008). Place-making through mega-events. In J. O. Bærenholdt & B. Granås (Eds.), *Mobility and place: Enacting Northern European peripheries* (pp. 219–232). Ashgate.

Leu, T. C. (2019). Tourism as a livelihood diversification strategy among Sámi indig-enous people in Northern Sweden. *Acta Borealia*, *36*(1), 75–92.

Lundmark, L. J., Fredman, P., & Sandell, K. (2010). National parks and protected areas and the role for employment in tourism and forest sectors: A Swedish case. *Ecology and Society*, *15*(1), 19.

Lundmark, L., & Müller, D. K. (2010). The supply of nature-based tourism activi-ties in Sweden. *Tourism*, *58*(4), 379–393.

Lundmark, L., & Stjernström, O. (2009). Environmental protection: An instrument for regional development? National ambitions versus local realities in the case of tourism. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, *9*(4), 387–405.

Maher, P. T. (2012). Expedition cruise visits to protected areas in the Canadian Arctic: Issues of sustainability and change for an emerging market. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, *60*(1), 55–70.

Maher, P. T. (2013). Looking back, venturing forward: Challenges for academia, community and industry in polar tourism research. In D.K. Müller, L. Lundmark, & R.H. Lemelin (Eds.), *New issues in polar tourism: Communities, environments, politics* (pp. 19–36). Springer.

Maher, P. T. (2017). *Tourism futures in the Arctic*. In K. Latola & H. Savela (Eds.), *The interconnected Arctic*. (pp. 213–220). Springer.

Mælaborð ferðaþjónustunnar. (2019). *Hagstærðir*. https://www.maelabordferdath-jonustunnar.is/is/hagstaerdir-1/hagstaerdir

McNeish, W., & Olivier, S. (2017). Contracting the right to roam. In K. Spracklen, B. Lashua, E. Sharpe, & S. Swain (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of leisure theory* (pp. 289–307). Springer.

Morgan, N., Pritchard, A., & Pride, R. (2011). *Destination brands: Managing place reputation*. Elsevier.

Müller, D. K. (2011). Tourism development in Europe's "last wilderness": An assessment of nature-based tourism in Swedish Lapland. In A.A. Grenier & D.K. Müller (Eds.), *Polar tourism: A tool for regional development* (pp. 129–153). Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Müller, D. K. (2013a). Hibernating economic decline? Tourism and labour market change in Europe's northern periphery. In G. Visser & S. Ferreira (Eds.), *Tourism and crisis* (pp. 123–138). Routledge.

Müller, D. K. (2013b). National parks for tourism development in sub-Arctic areas? Curse or blessing – the case of a proposed national park in Northern Sweden. In D.K. Müller, L. Lundmark & R.H. Lemelin (Eds.), *New issues in polar tourism: Communities, environments, politics* (pp. 189–203). Springer.

Müller, D. K. (2015). Issues in Arctic tourism. In B. Evengård, J. Nymand Larsen, & O. Paasche (Eds.), *The new Arctic* (pp. 147–158). Springer.

Müller, D. K., & Brouder, P. (2014). Dynamic development or destined to decline? The case of Arctic tourism businesses and local labor markets in Jokkmokk, Sweden. In A. Viken & B. Granås (Eds.), *Destination development in tourism: Turns and tactics* (pp. 227–244). Ashgate.

Müller, D. K., Byström, J., Stjernström, O., & Svensson, D. (2019). Making "wilderness" in a northern natural resource periphery. In E.C.H. Keskitalo (Ed.), *The politics of Arctic resources: Change and continuity in the" old North" of Northern Europe* (pp. 99–111). Routledge.

NHO. (2019). Nordnorsk Reiselivsstatistikk 2018. *Tromsø*. https://indd.adobe.com/view/78f'bc36d-5c8b-4de1-a8f5-84b82f6ae92f

Óladóttir, O.Þ (2019). *Erlendir ferðamenn á Íslandi 2018 - Lýðfræði, ferðahegðun og viðhorf*. Ferðamálastofa.

Paulgaard, G. (2008). Re-centering periphery: Negotiating identities in time and space. In J. O. Bærenholdt & B. Granås (Eds.), *Mobility and place: Enacting Northern European peripheries* (pp. 49–59).

Rantala, O., de la Barre, S., Granås, B., Jóhannesson, G.Þ, Müller, D. K., Saarinen, J. … Niskala, M. (2019). *Arctic tourism in times of change: Seasonality*. TemaNord, 2019,528.

Regional Council of Lapland, (2007). *Lapin matkailustrategia 2007-2010 (Lapland Tourism Strategy 2007-2010)*.

Statistics Iceland. (2020). *Mannfjöldaþróun 2019 (Demographic development 2019)*. Accessed at https://hagstofa.is/utgafur/utgafa/mannfjoldi/mannfjoldathroun-2019/

Sievers, K. (2020). *Lapin matkailustrategia 2020-2023 (Lapland Tourism Strategy 2020-2023)*.

Sörlin, S. (1988). *Framtidslandet: Debatten om Norrland och naturresurserna under det industriella genombrottet*. Carlssons.

Tillväxtverket (2018). *Fakta om svensk turism 2018*.

Urry, J. (1995). *Consuming places*. Routledge.