1. Relevance to the call for proposals

By “Indigenous religion” we mean a globalizing discourse, consisting of notions of an indigenous we and a flexible, but fairly standardized, vocabulary of assumed similarities: harmony with nature, healing and holism, antiquity and spirituality, shamanism and animism. Several scholars have referred to the increasing importance of such a formation, but we know little of usages and implications on local indigenous grounds; of who uses it, for which purposes and with what results; of who opposes it, for which reasons; of who has access to it, through which channels; and of how usage and content become recognizable as “indigenous”—to indigenous people and those who relate to them.

This project is an attempt to address this gap in research on indigenous religion(s). It will be based on a comparative, bottom-up design, which will unify our collective research on specific indigenous traditions from diverse regions, placing these traditions and our analyses of them in a comparative framework. We will be concerned with the relationship between different levels and scales. How are hyper-local articulations of identity recast and refocused as indigenous representatives announce and enact religious claims and practices on global stages? In which ways does Indigenous religion (in the singular) impact established indigenous religions (in the plural)? How is Indigenous religion articulated through local attempts to reclaim and recover past traditions and religions?

The primary task of this project, then, is the comparative analysis of indigenous religions in the midst of active processes of “up-scaling” from the local to the global. Our next level of analysis will be to focus upon Indigenous religion on the global stage, exploring moments of cultural exchange and articulation when indigenous religious representatives converse with one another (as well as with public audiences and the media) in religious idioms that are maximally articulated in terms of latitudinal reach.

How is it they come to recognize the common indigeneity and shared religious sentiments of their indigenous counterparts from considerably diverse backgrounds and experiences? How, in other words, do indigenous traditions (plural, local) receive articulation and reception once scaled up to meet the expectations and constraints of global institutional and discursive frames? At this level of analysis, we will investigate the common expressions, practices, and comportments that enable Indigenous religion (now singular and global) to function as a language and action of recognition, translation, mediation, performance and survivance.

2. Aspects relating to the research project

2.1 Background and status of knowledge

The word “indigenous” describes “work in process”, James Clifford has noted (2013:13). This is work performed through global networks and on local grounds, and it involves struggles against dominant regimes, the reclaiming and renewal of heritage, and reconnections with lost lands. A growing body of anthropological scholarship is currently trying to make sense of these developments—of the resurgences of indigenous societies in an increasingly interconnected world (Alia 2010, Cadena and Starn 2007, Graham and Penny 2014, Niezen 2009, 2003). Clifford notes as significant among recent developments the emergence of “a new public persona and globalizing voice [...] : *présence indigène*, operating on multiple scales (local, national, and transnational), and including projects such as language renewal, protection of sacred sites, national agendas and symbols and transnational activism (Clifford 2013:15). *Indigènitude*, Clifford claims, “is sustained through media-disseminated images, including a shared symbolic repertoire (‘the sacred’, ‘Mother Earth’, ‘shamanism’, ‘sovereignty’, the wisdom of ‘elders’, stewardship of ‘the land’”) (ibid:16).
Several other scholars have made similar references to notions of a religious dimension of indigenism and a connected symbolic vocabulary and repertoire. Some concern specific transnational contact zones, such as U.N.-meetings (Karlsen 2003), tourism (Stausberg 2011), the World Music- and Indigenous film industries (Hilder 2010, Kraft 2014, Christensen 2013), the environmental movement (Pedersen 1995, Rønnow 2011, Beyer 2003, 2006, Brosious 1997), and indigenous festivals (Fonneland 2012). Others deal with nation building (Chidester 2012; Kraft 2010, 2009) and legal procedures on national and international levels (Niezen 2003, 2009, 2010, 2012, Johnson 2007). Ronald Niezen in one article refers to “Indigenous religion” as a new and “global form of religiosity […] associated with those defined in international law as “indigenous peoples” (2012:131). Niezen’s main concern is the development of a global indigenous identity. Indigenous religion is connected to these grounds, “as a conceptual and performative secondary elaboration of the indigenous people’s concept” (2012). Yet other scholars discuss how academia has played and plays a critical role in the (re)creation and dissemination of these emerging discourses and practices (Cox 2007; Tafjord 2013; Chidester 2014).

Together these studies indicate the widespread reach of discourses on indigenous religion(s), particularly on global or transnational levels, as well as hinting towards some of their main locations (U.N. forums, tourism, festivals, music, academia, etc). They also, again primarily on the global level, indicate possible rationales and interests behind these developments, including the use of religion as resources (legal, political, economic, etc.).

The lack of broader systematic studies of these matters is at the same time indicative of the current status of indigenous religions in scholarly literature. Simply stated, the literature on religious studies, on the whole, remains thin and under-theorized with regard to indigenous traditions, especially in the contemporary moment. Work in indigenous studies and anthropology is considerably better in terms of engaging the lived realities of globalizing indigenous discourse, but scant attention has been granted to religious language and action.

Our aim is to respond to this gap in the literature on indigenous religion(s), by conducting a comparative and bottom-up investigation, based on in-depth studies of indigenous religious traditions from a variety of regions, which will be explored within the frames of an interconnected world.

### 2.2 Research questions, analytical approaches and methods

The overall aim of the project is to investigate and compare indigenous religion(s) on local and global sites, as well as to explore the relationships between them, thereby providing research-based knowledge of developments that have potentially global reach. The research questions are:

- How do different indigenous people and the people who interact with them understand, translate, articulate, negotiate and oppose the category “Indigenous religion”?
- Who uses it, for what purposes, in which contexts and on which scales (global/local, public/private)?
- What are the media and the trajectories connecting the global and the local?
- What are the logics and sensibilities involved in the recognition of certain articulations and performances as “indigenous” and “religious”?

Answers to these questions presuppose case studies that are geographically diverse, studied bottom–up, and held together by a conceptually tight and comparative frame. Our analytical design is intended to secure such premises without sacrificing analytical depth. It consists of five Work Packages, four of them devoted to the exploration of carefully selected focus areas.
(translations, performance, media and technologies, and sovereignty). These four WPs will frame and structure our case studies empirically, theoretically and methodologically, thus ensuring that common routes of enquiry will be followed, and allowing for comparative measures during research, as well as in published results. A fifth WP has been devoted to ongoing critical reflections and to an integrative comparative study, which will be based on the data collected and produced in the sites of our work: Sápmi, North America, Nigeria, Ghana, India, Costa Rica and Panama. In addition, two PhD students will be hired, focusing on a geographical area to be later announced, and one or more of our thematic WPs.

Our focus areas (WPs 1–4) have been selected on the basis of what we believe are the key dynamics with regard to indigenous religion making, on global and local levels. **Translation** is the basic intellectual move required when different groups of people encounter one another, and so it is the basic intellectual move that scholars make when they study religions, and that indigenous people—and others as well—also make when they construct a global indigeneity. Given that translation is never a completely satisfactory endeavor, it is important to reflect critically on the problems and possibilities that translation presents both to scholars and to the construction of a global indigeneity. **Performance** in a variety of forms—story-telling, music, ritual and drama, dance, and so on—has been widely recognized as a primary manner for engaging in cultural-religious activity that has been especially characteristic of indigenous traditions; we will be concerned with the place of these performative traditions in contemporary indigenous life, and in regard to what they contribute to a global indigeneity. **Contemporary media** provide both the avenues for enhanced awareness of a global indigeneity as well as new instruments that indigenous people employ in engaging in cultural-religious activity/doing cultural-religious work; instruments that, as elements of modernity, would seem to be at odds with indigeneity, but which indigenous people have themselves embraced. Finally, inasmuch as indigenous people are generally identified in distinction to another group of people—colonizers, the mainstream, dominant society—one of the most crucial issues they face is the issue of **sovereignty**, whether in fully politicized form (Hawaii, Sami, etc.) or in the form of establishing their own agency with a broader, dominant society (for instance Rathavas).

**WP1. Translating Indigenous religion(s)**

This WP explores translations as practices on local grounds and in global networks, and as conditions contained in and by both new and long established systems of classification. Translation is crucial to any attempt to communicate about, understand, and analyze indigenous religions and cultures that is not simply local, and it is the definitive move in the construction of a global indigeneity.

Translation speaks in particular ways to the connections between our work as scholars and the communicative practices of the people we study. It also speaks to already established systems of translation, many of them shaped by scholarly studies from the past, and by former generations of missionaries, travellers and colonial administrators.

Basic to our project will be attempts to detect and identify the comparison involved when items from a particular tradition are judged as similar, identical to or different from items in other indigenous traditions or pan-indigenous vocabularies. As in all forms of comparison, this implies processes of translation, from one language into another, and from certain categories and taxonomies into others, including categories originate in scholarly discourses. “The shaman” is an example of the complexities often involved in such translations over time and across space. This concept originated on local Siberian grounds, was later translated into academic vocabularies by anthropologists and historians of religions, later returned to Siberia as an –ism (Rydving 2011), and was spread further to neo-paganism and indigenous peoples elsewhere. Presently, it is gaining ground as a conventional (in the
sense of broadly used and recognizable term for indigenous religious specialists. In the case of “the shaman”, as in translation in general, we are dealing with processes that are “profoundly dialogic […], without closure or guarantee [… and,] continuously ‘carried across,’ transformed and reinvented in practice” (Clifford 2013:48).

Our exploration of translation(s) will include the historical tracing of particular translations, attempts to identify translational traditions and boundaries against translatability, and pursuit to understand the mechanisms and logics involved in historical and current examples. Materials include linguistic and other symbolic styles and media, such as music, bodies, body art, dance, rituals, dress, and greeting gestures.

To trace the development of a pan-indigenous religious vocabulary will be particularly important. Such a vocabulary has been referred to by scholars as widespread on the level of transnational contact zones. Has it entered the religious vocabularies of the Naga, Rathva, and other indigenous people in India, and the Bribri in Costa Rica and Panama? If so, in which contexts, on which scales, and for which purposes? Further, granted that these vocabularies are known and articulated, how did they get there, and what are the translations involved in accepting and integrating them in local vocabularies? If they are contested or rejected, then the question is why? Can other religious vocabularies be identified? Can we speak today of an “indigenous soundscape”, recognizable not only to Samis and Hawaiians, but also to people (indigenous and others) in India and Africa? How does film and art become recognizable as “indigenous”? Can similar dynamics be connected to gender? What are the translational codes and codings involved in these and other processes of synchronization?

**Responsible:** Greg Alles and Bjørn Ola Tafjord (with Siv Ellen Kraft, Greg Johnson, Rosalind Hackett, Arkotong Longkumer, Afe Adogame, and the PhD students).

**WP2. Performing indigenous religion(s)**
Performances of indigeneity have been described as crucial in global politics, and for expressing and constituting indigenous identity (Graham and Penny 2014). This WP explores the ways in which indigenous religion(s) interact(s) with identity claims and formations.

Performance involves acts and utterances—high key and low key—and allows for studies of strategic agency and reflexivity, as well as aesthetic and multi-sensual appeals and dimensions—on, off and back-stage (Goffman 1956). Of particular importance to our project will be the emergent, work in process-character of “the indigenous” and indigenous religion(s). We will explore performances as:

- “sites of persuasion”, that is, arenas in which indigenous people present their values to themselves and others (Morphy 2006);
- “creative encounters” (Hannerz 1996), ranging from demonstrations to festivals and court room proceedings and providing incentives for exploring lost or forgotten traditions, as well as opportunities for living, learning and becoming along the lines of the scripts enacted;
- “sites of negotiation and conflict” (Johnson 2008), arenas in which competing claims are brought forth, and indigenous people contest one another over the terms of their traditions (old and new).

Sites to be explored include festivals and tourism; art, music, dance and film; protests and demonstrations; political meetings and legal settings. Some of these may overlap in practice with “indigenous festivals” attracting tourists in addition to locals, and offering music, art and dance, along with sacred claims and performances of indigeneity. How is indigenous identity performed in settings like the Hornbill festival in Nagaland and the Riddu Riddu festival in Sápmi, and what are the religious elements and dimensions involved? What are the gendered
aspects and implications of performances in these and the other settings we explore? In which ways are performances used to reinforce, challenge or negotiate new and old femininities and masculinities?

What Jeffrey Shandler has termed “postvernacularity” offers a possible approach to these processes and dynamics. Developed in connection to the “second life” of Yiddish, post-vernacular languages are referred to as performative: “their significance inhering as much in the very fact that they are being used as in the content of their utterance” (Clifford 2013:278). Can indigenous religion(s) be defined as post-vernacular in this sense, as a “second life” of various local and global traditions? Alongside “imagining a community” this would indicate the performance of community, based on (1) “languages of nativeness” (ibid:278), rather than specific native languages, and on (2) “language” in the broad sense of communicative acts and utterances.

**Responsible:** Arkotong Longkumer (with Greg Johnson, Rosalind Hacket, Greg Alles, Bjørn Ola Tafjord, Afe Adogame, and the PhD students)

**WP3. Mediating Indigenous religion(s)**

This WP explores the role of media (new and old) and communication technologies in regard to how indigenous religion(s) is/are communicated, distributed and formatted across time and space, for instance by means of travelling, print, TV and radio, Internet and new social media.

Communication technologies are basic to the flow of ideas, people and things to be explored in this project. Differences in the availability of such technologies (including which one are available and to which degrees) are similarly crucial conditions for the expected developments. The Norwegian Sami inhabit a world that is not only permeated by communication technologies, but one which provides everyday news updates on indigenous peoples, everyday opportunities for hearing and seeing indigenous world music (on the radio, Youtube, etc.), and broad access to the seemingly infinite variety of websites devoted to indigenous issues. In contrast, many Bribris and Kabekirs in Costa Rica live in areas without roads and electricity. Their connections to global indigenous arenas are therefore much more limited, and more dependent on individual entrepreneurs.

The mapping of local mediascapes will be a prerequisite for all the research to be conducted in our project. Basic to this WP will be indigenous public spheres, including what has been referred to as the New Media Nation (Alia 2010), and the question of who controls media images and processes of mediation. Stereotypical and degrading images of indigenous peoples (and their religions) are common in large parts of the world, and thus continue to frame discourses. However, indigenous people have increasingly and creatively taken into usage the opportunities offered by new media technologies. The New Media Nation, Valeria Alia argues, “is linked to the explosion of indigenous news media, information technology, film, music, and other artistic and cultural developments” (2010:7). It exists “outside of the control of any particular nation state, and enables its creators and users to network and engage in transcultural and transnational lobbying, and access information that might otherwise be inaccessible within state borders” (ibid:7-8). On local and national levels, similarly, “indigenous media” (radio, television, print, film, video, websites etc.) are used to articulate the past and create memories for the future (Ginsburg 1991, 2002), as well as preserve languages and support identity formation.

**Responsible:** Rosalind Hackett and Afe Adogame (with Siv Ellen Kraft, Greg Alles, Greg Johnson, Bjørn Ola Tafjord, Arkotong Longkumer, and the PhD students)

**WP4. Sovereignty and indigenous religion(s)**

In this WP we explore the relationship between sovereignty and indigenous religion(s), focusing particularly on processes of nation building within existing nation states and the
global discourse of human rights. In what ways are indigenous religion(s) used to negotiate the terrain of sovereignty as it relates to notions of belonging?

Central background issues include specific histories of colonization, decolonialization, nation building and cultural/religious revivals, as well as how—more broadly—indigenous peoples position themselves with respect to the nation states that they live in. Processes of colonialization have often included missionary activities, sometimes closely connected to state-supported programs for assimilation, and resulting in the suppression of “traditional religions”, although in highly different ways and with most variable results. World-wide processes of indigenous revitalization movements often include the revitalization of “traditional religions”, whether in the form of cultural heritage, attempts to bring to new life ancient religious traditions, or through the indigenizing of the religions they currently ascribe to. Among the Sami, for instance, the pre-Christian religion has become increasingly important as a source of national identity symbols and tourism, as well as for the indigenization of Christianity and of New Age and neo-shamanic milieus. At the same time pre-Christian religion has remained controversial, particularly among conservative Christians. How does this compare to what is going on in Nigeria and among the Naga in India?

Feminism has in nation building contexts often been controversial, and may—due to the numerous challenges that indigenous communities are facing—be particularly contentious (Green 2007). To what extent have feminist ideologies appeared in the settings we explore, and to what extent are they connected to global networks? Granted, moreover, that we may today speak of “indigenous feminism”, how does this relate to Indigenous religion?

Legislation constitutes an area of particular relevance. Research by Johnson provides examples of repatriation in Hawaii as a if not the main arena for exploring, articulating and performing Hawaiian religion (Johnson 2007, 2014). Legislation also shapes developments through the establishment of universally applicable categories. Both national and international legislation has, for instance, singled out “sacred landscapes” for protection, due to their assumed importance to indigenous people. How are indigenous religions and cultures impacted by these types of legislation, and the taxonomies that come with them? The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) is crucial in this context, as a site and source of Indigenous religion discourse that is generating various feedback loops among indigenous communities, as they seek to harness its possibilities, and a range of nation states, as they try to assess the degree to which UNDRIP interfaces with or goes beyond existing laws and policies. Some of the most actionable aspects of UNDRIP hinge on religious issues, or are issues wherein religious claims (to land, resources, ancestors, etc.) may create leverage or be regarded as evidence.

Responsible: Greg Johnson (with Rosalind Hacket, Siv Ellen Kraft, Greg Alles, Bjørn Ola Tafjord, Arkotong Longkumer, Afe Adogame, and the PhD students)

WP5. Comparative analysis
WP5 contains two main activities. The first one involves critical discussions of basic methodological and analytical problems, including—as the two most important—comparison and reflexivity. Historiographical studies have shown how crucial academic contributions have been to the formation and maintenance of the underlying taxonomies used to classify and present particular peoples and religions as “indigenous” (Chidester 2014; Cox 2007; Geertz 2004; Smith 1998). Much of what we set out to study in this project has been facilitated and legitimated by academic work. This makes it all the more critical to create spaces and strategies for continuous questioning of how our own approaches and outputs may replicate, feed back into, and otherwise come to play parts in our empirical and disciplinary fields of study.

The second main activity of WP5 involves our collective efforts to conduct a
comparative study within the overall frames of the project and structured by WPs 1–4. The results will be disseminated in a concluding book. Our aim is to summarize, systematize and theorize on a more general level, and to explore whether, to what extent, and with which geographical variations overarching traits, patterns and tendencies may be identified. In what ways will these comparative analyses in their theoretical and regional richness provide innovative and original discussions on indigenous religions as a global discourse? There are risk factors in this part of the project, connected both to its position as a first of its kind study, to methodological challenges (particularly in regard to comparison), and to the rich and diverse empirical material involved. The main arguments for feasibility are 1) a highly experienced and tightly integrated core group, and 2) time devoted to the further refinement of conceptual and methodological frameworks, and thereby for fruitful, sound and sensitive comparisons.

**Responsible:** Siv Ellen Kraft (with Afe Adogame, Rosalind Hackett, Greg Johnson, Greg Alles, Bjørn Ola Tafjord, Arkotong Longkumer, and the PhD students)

**Methods and overarching theoretical perspectives**

All our case studies will be based on multi-sited fieldworks, including ethnographic methods (fieldwork, observation, interviews), along with textual analyses. Fieldwork locations include highly diverse societies and cultures, from the small scale communities of the Bribri and the Kábe (Kabekir) in the mountains and rainforests of Talamanca, Costa Rica, to the equally small scale, but technologically highly developed communities of Sami people in the Arctic North. Fieldwork sites differ, similarly, from court rooms, to festivals and local communities. All core group members have extensive fieldwork experience and longstanding relations with the people with whom they will be working. We are accordingly in a position to reflect upon what the central arenas for exploring our research questions may be. For instance, the court system and legal procedures have been enormously important for revitalization of Hawaiian religion, as well as for conflicts and negotiations concerning indigenous religion(s). Among the Sami, the cultural sector (festivals, museums, art, film and music) holds a similar position of a space where articulations and controversies are most likely to take place.

Indigenous locations have been selected on account of 1) the diversity they offer, and 2) the expertise of the core members. The core members are internationally leading scholars, who are not only experts on particular indigenous religions, but who have during recent years become interested in and started research along the lines of this project, thus allowing for a fruitful employment of resources. The overall project design combines approaches that are methodologically close (striving to remain in contact with the people studied) and theoretically distant (grounded in critical religious studies). Following Johnson (2008), we will explore the potential of articulation theory in the tradition of Stuart Hall (1986) and James Clifford (2013). Articulation theories, as developed by these scholars, emphasize “the emergent and contingent character of identity constructions without denying the historical and cultural substrata and sediments that underlie them” (Johnson 2008:245). Culture and tradition is seen as continually constituted in the present, and as constituted by competing truth claims. In Johnson’s words: “Theories of articulation are attentive to how a plurality of voices sometimes harmonize and sometimes argue, how diverse speakers link various tropes and images from more or less common sources to announce competing claims” (ibid:247). They thus encourage a search for the generative dynamics of culture and tradition, and for truth claiming rather than “truth”, “authenticity”, and “inventions”.

Network approaches will be used to trace connections, nodes, transactions and translations, starting from both local and global levels, covering both private and public settings, and various media. Following a methodology suggested by Vasquez (2008), we will
explore how conduits are configured, who the key actors are (mediators, translators, entrepreneurs), what kinds of media are involved, which contact zones are available and accessible, and what precisely is flowing through the trajectories established.

3.0 Project Management, Organization and dissemination of results
The project is based at the Department of History and Religious Studies, UiT – The Arctic University of Norway, and is led by Prof. Siv Ellen Kraft in cooperation with Ass. Prof. Bjørn Ola Tafjord (UiT), Prof. Greg Alles (McDaniel College, USA), Ass. Prof. Arkotong Lonkumer (Edinburgh University, UK), Ass. Prof. Greg Johnson (University of Colorado at Boulder, USA), Ass. Prof. Afe Adogame (Edinburgh University, UK), Prof. Rosalind Hackett (University of Tennessee). Two PhD students (funded by the project) will be included in the group and will take part in core group activities.

The project organization has been designed to (a) integrate case studies and give a practical form to international cooperation, (b) communicate with stakeholders, (c) and create synergies on local levels. All core group members have extensive knowledge of the fields in which they will be working, including the global connections of which they are part. They are thus well positioned to take their ongoing work to a next, collaborate level. **Five workshops** will support such up-scaling. Previous meetings of the core group members have convinced us that our international mix (in terms of our backgrounds and geographical areas of expertise) as such encourages comparativism and helps open up our respective data. We will explore further this potential through collaboration that includes presentations of and critical input to on-going research; time set off for the raising of critical points and self-reflexive steps; writing seminars in which ideas and drafts will be made, shared and discussed critically. The latter will be particularly important to three shared publications. These are (1) one anthology, based on contributions from core group members and selected invitations; (2) one special issue of *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* or *Numen. International Review for the History of Religions* (of which Alles is co-editor); and (3) one concluding book, co-written by members of the core-group (for a more detailed dissemination and communication plan, see Grant application form). **Workshop locations and communication with stakeholders:** Four workshops will be located in universities that host indigenous research centers (UiT. The Arctic University of Norway; Obafemi Awolowo University at Ile-Ife, Nigeria; Nagaland University, Lumami, India; and the University of Colorado, USA). At least one day during the workshops will involve meetings with these centers (staff, scholars, students). We will thus be able to present and receive feedback on preliminary results and create/strengthen interdisciplinary networks. **Local groups and networks:** Core group members will initiate local research groups and networks. In this way, we will expand the project’s empirical and reflective resources and facilitate and support local research milieus, particularly in regard to internationalization. The largest of the local groups will be based on an already established research group in Tromsø (initiated by Kraft and Tafjord in 2012) and will consist of an interdisciplinary group of 14 senior researchers, most of them focusing on indigenous issues in Sápmi and Latin America. Master students from Religious Studies, Latin American studies, and SESAM will be encouraged to choose for their thesis a topic within the frames of our project and take part in the local research group’s activities. Adogame and Longkumer will organize a local group at the University of Edinburgh, and Alles will in cooperation with Drs. Lidia Guzy and James Kapalo organize a local group at The Marginalised and Endangered Worldviews Study Centre at University College Cork, Ireland, and in cooperation with Ülo Valk one at the University of Tartu, Estonia. Kraft will spend a sabbatical year (Fall 2017–Spring 2018) at the partner institution at the University of Colorado and will thus be able to work closely with Johnson and help connect SESAM in Tromsø with a recently established indigenous center at Boulder. Alles will spend one
semester in Tromsø as a guest researcher (spring 2017), and will thereby be able to work closely with Kraft and Tafjord, and help connect the local groups in Tromsø, Cork and Tartu. Tafjord collaborated closely with Longkumer and Adogame during a sabbatical (one year, 2013-2014) at Edinburgh University.

### 3.1 Budget
The total budget goes up to the maximum frame of 9 million. This includes two PhD students, fieldwork expenses for all core group members, yearly workshops, extensive scholarly exchange, and one international conference. See registration form for further details.

### 3.2 Key perspectives and compliance with strategic documents
UiT – The Arctic University of Norway has comparative advantages in respect to Sami and Indigenous studies, as a home to a Sami research center and what is today the largest Nordic research milieu on Sami and indigenous issues. Sami studies are prioritized in the University’s strategic plans on all levels and constitute a particular area of responsibility on the national university level. **3.2 Environmental impact:** Not applicable. **3.3 Ethical issues:** All participants are experienced fieldworkers with longstanding relations among the people they will be working with. All will aim to maintain high ethical standards, addressing research ethics recurrently during consultations, and paying close attention to indigenous methodologies, i.e., to context specific ways of doing respectful and useful research taught to us by the people with whom we work. The project will comply with the privacy regulations set up by NESH and NSD in Norway. **3.4 Gender issues:** The project leader is female, and the (extended) research group is gender balanced. Researchers will be sensitive to gender issues during their fieldwork and in their analyses.
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