

Aarhus School of Architecture // Design School Kolding // Royal Danish Academy

New Nordic stereotypes

Pasgaard, Jens Christian; Hemmersam, Peter; Nielsen, Tom

Published in:

Journal of Landscape Architecture (JoLA)

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.1080/18626033.2020.1886505>

Publication date:

2021

Document Version:

Early version, also known as pre-print

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Pasgaard, J. C., Hemmersam, P., & Nielsen, T. (2021). New Nordic stereotypes: In search of alternative design practices for tourism in peripheral landscapes . *Journal of Landscape Architecture (JoLA)*, 15(3), 6-19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/18626033.2020.1886505>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

This article has been accepted for publication in *Journal of Landscape Architecture*, published by Taylor & Francis.

Architecture and Landscape Design for Tourism as Place Creation in Peripheral Nordic Landscapes

Author name(s)

Jens Christian Pasgaard, Peter Hemmersam, Tom Nielsen

Affiliations

Jens Christian Pasgaard, The Aarhus School of Architecture

Peter Hemmersam, The Oslo School of Architecture and Design

Tom Nielsen, The Aarhus School of Architecture

Biographies

Jens Christian Pasgaard is an architect and Associate Professor at the Aarhus School of Architecture. Research interests include urban design, strategic thinking and the phenomenon of tourism. Of particular importance for this study is his PhD thesis on *Tourism and Strategic Planning* (2012) and his contribution to the cross-institutional research project *Rethinking Tourism in a Coastal City—Design for New Engagements* (2016-2019).

Peter Hemmersam is an architect and Professor in Urban Design at the Oslo School of Architecture and Design, and he heads the Oslo Centre for Urban and Landscape Studies. Research interests include city centre retail design, digital cities, periurban landscapes, and Arctic urbanism and landscapes.

Tom Nielsen is an architect and Professor in Urban and Landscape Planning at the Aarhus School of Architecture. He heads the research lab: *Territories, Architecture, Transformation*. Research interests include urban regions, public space design, urban landscapes, and ethics and aesthetics in architecture.

Abstract

The tourism industry in peripheral Nordic regions responds to tourists' expectations relating to visual landscape appreciation and the romantic experience of remoteness. This article addresses the lack of synchronisation between the theoretical complexity of the construction of the 'tourist gaze', as proposed by John Urry, and the design practices related to tourism in peripheral areas. This topic is approached via a theory-based discussion of the Norwegian Tourist Routes project, a celebrated reference used for general application in peripheral landscapes. In addition, two examples of place creation—Cold Hawaii in western Denmark and Birding Destination Varanger in Arctic Norway—are discussed as design practices that are explorative and problem-solving, emerging from local and landscape-specific activities. The article posits that landscape design practices in tourism projects can embrace a more multifaceted dialogue with the local landscape and stakeholders, departing from conventional romantic approaches.

Keywords

Place Creation, Tourist Gaze, Scenic Routes, Cold Hawaii, Biotope

Introduction

Peripheral landscapes in the Nordic countries of Norway and Denmark are, in many cases, seen as problematic concerning social and economic development.¹ In areas with few economic opportunities, tourism is often viewed as part of a solution to create growth or counter economic decline.

Tourism has long been used as a strategic lever for development. The Great Exhibition of 1851 in London's Crystal Palace demonstrated the potential of mass tourism, and, ever since, cities have exploited the economic potential of infrastructural connections and extraordinary attractions.

Today, tourism has become an integral part of many cities' planning and development strategies. Barcelona and Bilbao have been forerunners in using event- and flagship-based strategies, and, for decades, cities around the world have been studying the 'Barcelona model' and the 'Bilbao effect'. Today, even mid-sized cities present advanced, multipronged strategies with many different attractors to provide diverse and layered experiences for locals and a variety of tourists.² Critically, an attraction can be many things. It may be an historical monument, but it may even be ordinary, everyday life under extraordinary circumstances—dark and distasteful sides of cities and their histories, spatial disharmonies and decay or extremely specialised programs or events. More and more cities promote and support heterogeneous assemblages of attractions, mixing subcultures and urban environments. The urban whole—the tangled palette of experiences and engagements—becomes essential, and the beautiful thrives in parallel to, and benefits from, the ugly.

Tourism strategies targeting peripheral landscapes, however, generally operate with a lower density of experiences.³ Authorities and tourism industries often remain stuck in standard destination planning and rely on the scenic qualities of their local and regional landscapes.⁴ To explore alternatives to this situation, this article considers intersecting theoretical advances within the tourism discourse and current landscape architecture based on peripheral tourism development strategies.

First, this article makes two introductory notes on the concept of the 'tourist gaze' and on the idea of touring. Second, it enters a more detailed discussion of one of the most celebrated reference-landscape-based tourism projects in recent years: the Norwegian Scenic Routes. Third, the article discusses two alternative projects based on landscape agency to facilitate a new awareness of architectural- and landscape-driven strategies for place creation in peripheral Nordic landscapes.

The evolution of the concept of the tourist gaze

The concept of the tourist gaze and its evolution are central to this article.⁵ Sociologist John Urry first published his seminal book, *The Tourist Gaze*, in 1990, which initiated a long and complex discourse on tourist consumption and the tourist subject. Urry's conceptualisation of the tourist gaze derived from Foucault's notion of the medical gaze.⁶ However, it is not a learned gaze, like the doctor's, but an institutionalised gaze. It is culturally determined, conceived and developed with professional assistance from the emerging tourism industry, photographers, and the growing number of guidebooks, all promoting 'new ways of seeing'.⁷

According to Urry 'different gazes are "authorised" by different discourses', and 'different discourses imply different socialities'.⁸ Initially, he presented two distinct and fundamental gazes, the 'romantic' and the 'collective' gaze. The romantic gaze is characterised by a private, 'semi-spiritual relationship with the object of the gaze'.⁹ While this gaze typically searches for desolate landscapes free from human disturbance, the collective gaze 'involves conviviality' and large numbers of people that 'indicate that this is *the* place to be'.¹⁰

The first edition of *The Tourist Gaze* prompted comments from tourism theorist Dean MacCannell, who argued that the tourist gaze failed to recognise a so-called 'second gaze', which is constituted by 'the viewing subject, not the object of the gaze, that is "caught, manipulated, captured in the field of vision"'.¹¹ In MacCannell's reading, Urry's tourists—the gazing subjects—were not free. This critique opened a more complex understanding of the relation between tourists and the tourism industry. The industry has the power to capture and affect the tourist's gazes. MacCannell further argued that the so-called 'post-tourists' 'know better and delight in the inauthentic', and that a substantial number of tourists search with a kind of 'second gaze' to see what is beyond the surface and find the invisible.¹² Importantly, MacCannell did not reject Urry's tourist gaze but added layers to the overall idea.

In later writing, Urry introduced three new, distinctive gazes: the ‘spectatorial’, the ‘environmental’, and the ‘anthropological’.¹³ Further, in the second edition of *The Tourist Gaze* (2002), he added the ‘mobilised’ and the ‘mediatised’ gaze, and *The Tourist Gaze 3.0* (2011) included a chapter on ‘embodied gazing’—highlighting that ‘tourists encounter places through a variety of senses’.¹⁴

According to Urry, the distinctiveness of the tourist gaze was lost in postmodern popular culture, and several new, mobile and increasingly changeable tourist gazes surfaced as part of dynamic globalisation processes.¹⁵ In the city, the tourism supply side has been forced to produce ever more complex ‘gaze-interpretations’—spaces that accommodate several, superimposed gazes and multiple, fluctuating, cultural meanings.¹⁶

This urban ‘gaze complexity’ contrasts with contemporary development practices in tourism landscapes, and this article proceeds by addressing this missing synchronisation of theoretical complexity and planning practices in peripheral areas.

Touring—routes and circuits as strategic levers

In recent years, architectural place creation strategies for peripheral landscapes, promoting car-based, pedestrian and bike touring, have emerged. Carefully designed routes that guide tourists to dramatic landscape moments are not new; ‘to be on tour’ and ‘to be touring’ carefully selected vantage points can be traced back to the earliest forms of tourism. However, there is now a new generation of elaborate and design-intensive routes. By activating the aesthetics and the relative remoteness of peripheral landscapes as assets, these projects correspond to what Urry describes as ‘the tourist gaze [that] is directed to features of landscape and townscape which separate them off from everyday experience. Such aspects are viewed because they are taken to be in some sense out of the ordinary.’¹⁷ These projects are based on strategic plans and rely on interventions that, though limited in size, trigger substantial outcomes in visitor numbers

and a mediated presence for these otherwise unseen landscapes. They ‘create place’ through architectural or sculptural interventions and rely on designers to detect, interpret and consolidate landscape characteristics in installations along routes. This place creation is mediated through images and circulated via tourists’ photos, newspaper travel sections, architectural critiques, etc. When successful, images depicting the installations as objects in the landscape also inscribe the gazing subject into the landscape—a crucial part of place creation.

The architectural strategies along touring routes in peripheral regions base the ‘creation’ of attraction on the experience of movement through landscapes, rather than relying on history, cultural heritage or local human resources.¹⁸ In this mode of tourism facilitation, settlements and historic architecture are incorporated, for their charm or ruinous character, as elements of the landscape by including them in a ‘romantic gaze’.

In the following, the article concentrates on one of the most celebrated and most ambitious recent touring projects.

The Norwegian Scenic Routes project

In the 19th century, landscape painters constructed the ‘Nordic’ landscape by framing and selecting views that conveyed a particular understanding of, and emotional engagement with, the landscape—thereby encoding it through a romantic gaze. Simultaneously, tourism and road building were fundamental to, not only how landscapes were ‘produced’, but also how they were ‘consumed’ in the first place. Particularly in Norway, scientists, administrators and wealthy European tourists traversed and described vistas of fjords and valleys.¹⁹

Today, strategies for landscape consumption have reemerged in the Norwegian Scenic Route project, which thematises landscape perception along selected stretches of road in peripheral regions. Design interventions along the routes operate, following MacCannell, as the semiotic

demarcations of 'sights' that produce the tourists' relationship with places.²⁰ The car touring project also conforms with Urry's 'romantic' tourist gaze, as visitors are drawn by the prospect of encountering the landscape 'alone' in their cars.²¹ Thus, the project integrates the construction of landscape through the gaze and the creation of place through architectural interventions in the landscape.

The Norwegian Scenic Route project has been referenced by tourism authorities around the world, including those in Sweden, Iceland and Denmark (see below).²² Therefore, a discussion of the landscape architecture of tourist roads and its implications is relevant at this point, where the project itself has started 'travelling'.²³

The Norwegian Public Roads Administration began the Norwegian Scenic Route project in 1993, and the project is set to complete in 2029. It was inspired by the French Route de Vins [Wine Route] and the German Romantische Straße [Romantic Road] projects, as well as the US National Scenic Byways Program.²⁴ It consists of eighteen stretches of road dispersed over the entire country, particularly in the mountainous and peripheral parts of the country, and it will have a total length of over two thousand kilometres.

The purpose of the project is to develop the local economies, and it has turned into profit for local tourism businesses.²⁵ The project has also served to profile Norway abroad. It has received widespread international media coverage and become part of the government's national branding strategy.²⁶

For this reason, most tourists will be aware of the Scenic Routes before arriving in Norway, which echoes Urry's notion of the tourist gaze as 'visually objectified or captured through photographs, postcards, films, models and so on. These enable the gaze to be endlessly captured'.²⁷ The gaze is established through mediation before the tourists arrive (Fig. 1).

As a result of competitions and direct commissions, there are currently 148 completed designs by Norwegian and international architects, landscape architects and artists along the scenic routes, and the number is projected to grow to 250 by 2029 (Fig. 2).²⁸ The Scenic Route project has promoted Norwegian architecture and landscape architecture abroad and stimulated a new generation of architects and designers.^{29, 30}

Despite this success, the project has also been met with criticism and local resistance. It has been accused of being a case of top-down planning, with little input from local authorities.³¹ Because the project has heavily relied on experts, there has been little room for local opinions on the strategy and aesthetics of specific installations.³² Critics have also complained that the Norwegian Scenic Routes have, for instance, considered little history or cultural heritage, and, at the same time, have excluded more contemporary conceptions of landscape.³³

Referring to MacCannell's theories on the construction of attraction, the signs of the Scenic Routes project (road signs, informational material and design installations) function as indicators of attraction in the landscape.³⁴ By turning landscape into attraction, Janike Kampevd Larsen argues that the project and the installations reinstall a Western aesthetic landscape tradition, encapsulated in the view, which locates the observer outside the observed landscape.³⁵ Indeed, as Raymond Williams contends, referring to the history of Western landscape painting, 'the very idea of landscape implies separation and observation'.³⁶ This separation implies the creation of a detached vantage point from which to observe the perspectival space of landscape, just as in many of the Scenic Routes roadside installations.³⁷

According to Kenneth Olwig, the emergence of scenic notions of landscape corresponds closely with the rise of the modern nation-state.³⁸ Such a perspective provides insight into the Scenic Routes project, which activates landscape as an emotional signifier of national identity—to locals and tourists alike.

Activating landscapes for place creation

The Norwegian Scenic Routes have become a model for a range of spatial interventions in peripheral landscapes, including projects that do not relate to routes and circuits. For instance, in 2015, president of the Danish Association of Landscape Architects, Karen Sejr, proposed that the Norwegian project was relevant to the development of Danish coastal landscapes—arguing that municipalities should focus ‘on more authentic experiences—the real thing’.³⁹

The experience of the authentic is central to the exchange between Urry and MacCannell. Contrary to tourism theories that followed MacCannell’s influential *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (1976), Urry did not accept the premise that ‘the organisation of tourism’ is based on ‘a search for authenticity’.⁴⁰ In this, he aligned with Jean Baudrillard, who stated that ‘in a “hyper-real” context, dominated by simulation and the mixed use of copies and originals, it did not make sense to discuss authenticity’.⁴¹ However, perceptions of authenticity have persisted and evolved parallel to discussions of the tourist gaze, as summarised by Lucy Lippard: ‘On the optimistic side, he [MacCannell] offers the tantalizing possibility that tourism might contribute to the simultaneous “deconstruction of the attraction” and “reconstruction of authentic otherness...as having an intelligence that is not our intelligence”’.⁴² In the multi-faceted dispute about authenticity, this links MacCannell to contemporary discussions of existential authenticity—an activity-based approach that focuses on ‘a state of Being rather than an essentialist, objective quality’.⁴³ This entails an intensified emphasis on design solutions, which are not used to stage and invent experiences, but instead support and advance existing or emerging activities.

In the following, the article discusses two examples of design- and landscape-based place development in Scandinavian peripheries. Both projects depart from activities that build on specific landscape affordances and engage groups of people linked with these activities.

They are examples of an embodied landscape gaze and a particular form of place creation that also engages local communities. Critically, the reading of landscape represented by these practices is not primarily visual but, rather, relates to the potential for landscape engagement. Understood in this way, these projects are examples of what Jillian M. Rickly-Boyd et al. call ‘existential authenticity’—demonstrating that ‘from the materiality of landscape to the imaginative, landscape is the medium with which tourists interact as they perform place’.⁴⁴ Both projects were conceived with local actors and developed organically before receiving support from larger strategic bodies targeting peripheral landscape development.

Example 1: Cold Hawaii

Klitmøller, on the Danish west coast, is one of the most isolated villages in Denmark. It is still an active fishing community, but it went into economic decline after all the larger cutters were relocated in the late 1960s. In the late 1970s, a group of surfers found that the sleepy fishing community had some of the best surfing waters in Europe. They called it ‘Cold Hawaii’ and slowly started to settle permanently.

Cold Hawaii is an example of landscape-based place-creation. It is significant because it was developed by a group of people, who, from the very beginning, transgressed the definition of local/tourist. The surfers’ exploration of the landscape using surfboards is quite different from the conventional aesthetic and visual romantic gaze, and community change here derived from a changed ‘gaze’ on the water; the water was transformed, in the viewers’ eyes, from a fishing resource to a recreational affordance.

Today the Cold Hawaii initiative is integrated into the development strategies of the local municipality. After decades of struggles between surfers and fishers over the waves, a masterplan was developed in 2007 to handle conflicts over limited space and infrastructure. Cold Hawaii has also been integrated into two strategic development programmes for peripheral

Danish regions run by the philanthropic Realdania Foundation.⁴⁵ The first programme ‘Land of Opportunities’ (Mulighedernes Land), running from 2007 to 2012, was a partnership with the local municipality and stakeholders, which financed new facilities along the coastline servicing surfers, fishermen and other beach users (Fig. 3). Inspired by Land of Opportunities, Realdania initiated another programme called ‘Place Matters’ (Stedet tæller), running from 2011 to 2016, with the overall ambition of finding innovative ways to develop rural districts and villages in Denmark.⁴⁶

Place Matters was inspired by the Norwegian Scenic Route project but had a scope that extended beyond tourism-based development. It differed from the Norwegian project by having a clear intention that the interventions should be inscribed in local political planning agendas, aligned with other projects, and that the locals should be involved.⁴⁷

Today, Klitmøller is a village with growing resident and visitor numbers. New housing is being built and tourist revenue is increasing due to the village’s surf schools and other facilities. An interesting spin-off from the Cold Hawaii project is that the municipality is currently expanding its strategic planning to the hinterland, through a project called Cold Hawaii Inland.⁴⁸

Example 2: Biotope

Biotope is an architectural practice established by Tormod Amundsen and Elin Taranger in Vardø, an island east of mainland Norway. They initially focused on providing shelters for birdwatchers in the Arctic environment, designing simple but elegant wooden shelters that were carefully located in the landscape according to intimate local knowledge about bird behaviour (Fig. 4).⁴⁹ This approach led to their involvement in a feasibility study on landscape-related, regional tourism development, Birding Destination Varanger.⁵⁰ This project, in turn, led to the involvement of multiple local partners and businesses and has contributed to attracting international tourists. Biotope has put Vardø and the Varanger region on the map of the

international birding community, and these interventions have received widespread media attention. In recent years, the architectural practice has expanded its activities beyond the region to design bird watching sites in several other countries.

Biotope is one of several arts and architectural practices engaged in place-making in the region, where communities have been shrinking for years as fishing boats have moved elsewhere.⁵¹ Such practices have actively engaged with the agency of landscape and worked towards creating place awareness among locals by, for instance, engaging in elementary school teaching and by organising a yearly birding festival.

Biotope is an example of a ‘new indigenous architecture’ in the Arctic that engages placemaking in ways that contrast the top-down Scenic Routes project.⁵² At the same time, several of the birdwatching shelters have been included in the National Scenic Routes project on the Varanger Peninsula. While their mode of activating local ecological resources cannot easily be encompassed by a conventional ‘romantic touristic gaze’, they engage with viewing landscape from privileged positions—although using technology and powerful telephoto lenses.⁵³ The practice has resulted in a changed landscape ‘gaze’ on the Varanger Peninsula, which emphasises ecosystems and engenders new and transformed reciprocal action with tourism development strategies. In this case, this has happened by engaging a group of expert-tourists (birders), who engage with landscape in particular and alternative ways.

Peripheral place creation

Tourism is intimately tied to places, and facilitating tourism may be seen as placemaking, at the same time as the touristic practices themselves constitute a continuous (re)production of place. In this way, conventional architectural conceptions of place, and place attachment in a phenomenological sense of ‘dwelling’, are challenged by tourism, since the tourist is, by

definition, from elsewhere.⁵⁴

However, here it is important to state that the 'tourist' is a questionable concept.⁵⁵ The surfers and the birders are experts, who escape the local/visitor distinction. The determination of what a tourist is becomes less important compared to the phenomenon of 'tourism behaviour'.⁵⁶

Tourism relates to the powerful narrative of 'loss of place' in the contemporary society of mobility.⁵⁷ Jørgen Ole Bærenholdt and Brynhild Granås, following Doreen Massey, argue that a sense of place is enacted in an expanded network of social relations, which seem suitable for addressing tourism as 'a large proportion of those relations, experiences and understandings [of place]...constructed on a far larger scale than what we happen to define for that moment as the place itself'.⁵⁸ Place creation is not the sole prerogative of local populations, but, rather, it occurs in encounters with alternative landscape readings and involve people from elsewhere. Both the surf-community connected to Cold Hawaii and the birding community linked to the Biotope projects are examples of globally connected interest groups.

Following John A. Agnew, place is constituted on various levels: in a physical sense, referring to a 'sense of place', but also to any 'locale' of social interaction.⁵⁹ Architects have seen the physical construction of architecture as place creation in various ways. Christian Norberg-Schulz argued from a phenomenological perspective that 'the task of the architect is to create meaningful places, whereby he helps man to dwell'.⁶⁰ Later, architectural design as place branding entered the toolbox of strategic urban planning, as exemplified by the Bilbao Guggenheim project. Professor in urbanism, Karl Otto Ellefsen, claims that in the Scenic Routes project, the architect, as an expert, is 'guided by ambitions to create place. By this I mean the project is intended to realise a potential that has always existed, but one that few have seen and few have utilised.'⁶¹ The architectural installations of the Scenic Routes not only facilitate movement; they also create movement through the unique agency of architecture, which can

manifest existing place dimensions in the landscape by insisting on ‘quality’. The tourist, and his or her, gaze is absent from this model, and its insistence on the designer’s expert capacity for place creation departs from the two alternative practices mentioned above. In these projects, expertise resides in experts with different local and global connections, and placemaking involves local, but also international, communities.

Professor in landscape architecture, Ellen Braae, argues that ‘quality’ is not easy to achieve, and ideally, locating a design in the landscape should make it possible to see the framed and ‘curated’ qualities of the landscape and simultaneously perceive the landscape in its totality—with oneself and the object within the landscape. In these instances, the architectural object adds new dimensions to the landscape. Braae also argues that there is an imminent risk in ‘placemaking-by-object-placing’ projects—that the object reduces the experience of the landscape by domesticating it.⁶²

Additionally, Braae warns that ‘what is fantastic in one context, does not automatically transfer into another’.⁶³ This question of sameness, or universal aesthetics across place development projects, has been critically addressed after Place Matters projects were realised. Tourism researcher Peter Kvistgaard has found that the designs were dominated by similarity and aesthetics catering to the upper-middle-class, rather than articulating place-specific potentials.⁶⁴ Responding to this claim, Realdania programme director, Stine Jacobi, explained that all projects were selected through competitions involving local actors, and that the COR-TEN steel and concrete aesthetics reflect the climatic conditions of the coastal regions. Jacobi, however, acknowledges that there is some ‘zeitgeist’ across the designs (Fig. 5).⁶⁵

Conclusion

Discussions of the tourist gaze have developed over recent decades, opening a multitude of understandings of the relation between cities, landscapes and tourism. At the same time, the

concept of the ‘tourist’ has been deconstructed and expanded. Some of these insights are useful when critically assessing different design approaches to tourism-related development and placemaking in Nordic peripheral regions.

The Norwegian Tourist Route project has been very successful as part of a national tourism strategy, attracting tourists and promoting local architecture. Its focus on architectural quality, defined through top-down procedures, has, nevertheless, produced a designed uniformity and a ‘flat’ understanding of the landscapes and their potential for multiple readings and experiences. This can be understood through the concept of the romantic tourist gaze.

Alternative approaches, found in Cold Hawaii and Birding Destination Varanger, engage in more complex relations to the local landscapes, and the landscape users escape traditional categorisation as tourists or locals. These projects are not defined by singular gazes, but enable further development of strategies that are more inclusive to a multitude of actors and tourism-related businesses in peripheral regions. As practices, they open up the possibility of several shifting and overlapping gazes, and possibly also more place-sensitive ways of engaging local contexts through tourism.

The article has indicated several intersecting issues of landscapes and tourism that should be further explored. These include querying the narrative of ‘being at the edge of the world’, found both at the Danish West Coast as well as in Arctic Norway, and whether such peripheral communities, and their landscapes, provide different conditions for developing place-based tourism, a topic which has yet to be identified and articulated within the tourism discourse.

Numbered figures / Plate titles, captions and sources

Figure 1

Caption: A selection of architectural interventions, which are part of the Norwegian Scenic

Route project. All these interventions facilitate a spectacular view easily communicated in visual representations.

Figure 2

Caption: Map of Norwegian Scenic Route projects. The eighteen routes were selected to present a variety of landscapes to tourists, and each route has a distinct profile. The project is manifested in the form of informational material, maps and road signs, but also of a series of architectural installations by the roadside, such as scenic viewpoints, lay-bys and rest areas.

Figure 3

Caption: Klitmøller at the Danish Westcoast. The strategic campaign ‘Place Matters’ funded several small, architectural interventions, including a ramp from the main parking lot, which provides a view of the surfers engaging the water-landscape.

Figure 4

Caption: The Steilnes bird hide (Vardø, Norway, 2012) is carefully located in relation to view, microclimate and bird behaviour. Design: Biotop (photo: T. Amundsen).

Figure 5

Caption: Sameness—a selection of projects sharing characteristics and supporting the romantic gaze. Even though the projects are realised by a broad range of architects/artists, the projects and their place-specific architecture have a certain detectable uniformity or universal approach—internally, in the projects in Norway and Denmark, but also between the countries. Similar themes include platforms hanging over cliffs and water, the material combination of COR-TEN steel and cast-in-situ concrete, concrete ramps, and the reuse of heritage buildings through new, inbuilt elements.

Notes

¹ See, for instance: Anne Tietjen, *Towards an Urbanism of Entanglement—Site Explorations in Polarised Danish Urban Landscapes* (Aarhus: Arkitektskolen Aarhus, 2011).

² Jens Christian Pasgaard, ‘Tourism and Strategic Planning’, PhD dissertation (The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts Schools of Architecture, Design and Conservation: School of Architecture, 2012).

³ Tom Nielsen, ‘The Polymorphic, Multilayered and Networked Urbanised Territory’, *Geografisk Tidsskrift—Danish Journal of Geography* 115/2 (2015), 88-104.

⁴ For standard destination planning approaches see, for instance: Manuel Baud-Bovy and Fred H. Lawson, *Tourism and Recreational Development: Handbook of Physical Planning* (The Architectural Press, CBI Pub. Co., 1976); Clare A. Gunn, *Vacationscape: Developing Tourist Areas*, 3rd ed. (Taylor & Francis, 1997 (original 1976)).

⁵ John Urry, *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies* (London: Sage, 1990). For discussion on the evolution of the concept of the tourist gaze see, for instance: Pasgaard, *Tourism and Strategic Planning*, op cit. (note 2), 10-40.

⁶ Michel Foucault, *The Birth of the Clinic* (Tavistock Publications Limited, 1973).

⁷ John Urry, *The Tourist Gaze—Second Edition* (London: Sage, 2002), 4 and 149.

⁸ Carol Crawshaw and John Urry, ‘Tourism and the Photographic Eye’, in: Chris Rojek and John Urry (eds.), *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory* (London: Routledge, 1997), 176-195.

⁹ Urry, *The Tourist Gaze*, op. cit. (note 7), 150.

¹⁰ Ibid., 150.

¹¹ Dean MacCannell, ‘Tourist Agency’, *Tourist Studies* 1 (2001), 23-38: 30. (Here, MacCannell is quoting the French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan).

¹² Ibid., 24. On the term ‘post-tourist’, see M. Feifer, *Going Places* (London: Macmillan, 1985) and Melanie Smith, Nicola Macleod and Margaret Hart Robertson, *Key Concepts in Tourist Studies* (London: Sage, 2010), 129-133.

¹³ John Urry, ‘The Tourist Gaze “Revisited”’, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36/2 (1992), 172-186.

¹⁴ John Urry and Jonas Larsen, *The Tourist Gaze 3.0* (London: Sage Publications, 2011).

¹⁵ On the loss of distinctiveness, see: Urry, *The Tourist Gaze*, op. cit. (note 7), 91.

¹⁶ Pasgaard, *Tourism and Strategic Planning*, op. cit. (note 2), 42.

¹⁷ Urry, *The Tourist Gaze*, op. cit. (note 7), 3.

¹⁸ Regarding ‘creation’ of attraction see: Dean MacCannell, *The Tourist* (Berlin: Schocken Books, 1976).

¹⁹ Mari Hvattum, Brita Brenna, Beate Elvebakk and Janike Kampevold Larsen (eds.), *Routes, Roads and Landscapes* (London: Ashgate, 2011).

²⁰ MacCannell, *The Tourist*, op. cit. (note 18).

²¹ Jens Kristian Steen Jacobsen, ‘Roaming Romantics: Solitude-Seeking and Self-Centredness in Scenic Sightseeing’, *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 4/1 (2004), 5-23.

²² Hans Antonson and Jens Kristian Steen Jacobsen, ‘Tourism Development Strategy or Just Brown Signage? Comparing Road Administration Policies and Designation Procedures for Official Tourism Routes in Two Scandinavian Countries’, *Land Use Policy* 36 (January 2014), 342-350. See also emerging tourism infrastructure projects, such as ‘The Nordic Ways’, funded by The Icelandic Design Fund. The project is briefly described at: <http://thenordicways.com>, accessed 15 January 2019.

²³ Patsy Healey and Robert Upton (eds), *Crossing Borders: International Exchange and Planning Practices* (Routledge, 2010).

²⁴ Jan Andresen, ‘A National Attraction Comes to Life’, in: Silja Lena Løken, Thor Arvid Dyrerud and Jan Neste (eds), *National Tourist Routes in Norway* (Oslo: Forlaget Press, 2017),

13–17; Antonson and Jacobsen, ‘Tourism Development Strategy or Just Brown Signage?’, op. cit. (note 22).

²⁵ Prosjektdirektiv, *Satsingsområdet Nasjonale Turistvegar 2002–2015* (Oslo: Vegdirektoratet, 2004); Menon Economics, *Effektmåling av Nasjonale turistveger. Lokaløkonomiske effekter av de nasjonale turistvegene Rondane og Varanger* (Menon, 2017).

²⁶ See media coverage at: <https://www.nasjonaleturistveger.no/en/about-us/media-coverage>, accessed 15 January 2019.

²⁷ Urry, *The Tourist Gaze*, op. cit. (note 7), 3.

²⁸ Statens Vegvesen, *2017/2018 Turistvegarbeidet, Annual Report* (Oslo: Statens Vegvesen [Norwegian Public Roads Administration], 2018).

²⁹ Nina Berre, ‘Architecture and Design—Added Value Along Tourist Routes’, in: Hege Lysholm and Nina Berre (eds.), *Detour: Architecture and Design Along 18 National Tourist Routes in Norway* (Oslo: Statens Vegvesen [Norwegian Public Roads Administration] and Norsk Form [Norwegian Centre for Architecture], 2008), 28-31. See also: Karl Otto Ellefsen, ‘Detoured Installations: The Policies and Architecture of the Norwegian National Tourist Routes Project’, *Architectural Design* 85/2 (2015), 64-75.

³⁰ By 2017, the project had been exhibited in 33 international locations. The project and individual installations have received numerous design and tourism awards. See: <https://www.nasjonaleturistveger.no/no/om-oss/Utstillinger>, accessed 15 January 2019, and <https://www.nasjonaleturistveger.no/en/about-us/prizes-and-awards>, accessed 15 January 2019.

³¹ Ellefsen, ‘Detoured Installations’, op. cit. (note 29), 64-75; Antonson and Jacobsen, ‘Tourism Development Strategy or Just Brown Signage?’, op. cit. (note 22); see also: Alana Iles and Bruce Prideaux, ‘The Savannah Way: Developing a Successful Touring Route’, in: Dean Carson and Bruce Prideaux (eds.), *Drive Tourism—Trends and Emerging Markets*, Vol. 17 (London: Routledge, 2011), 311-22.

³² Karl Otto Ellefsen, ‘Architecture and Design—Added Value Along Tourist Routes’, in: Hege Lysholm and Nina Berre (eds.), *Detour: Architecture and Design Along 18 National Tourist*

Routes in Norway (Oslo: Statens Vegvesen [Norwegian Public Roads Administration] and Norsk Form [Norwegian Centre for Architecture], 2008), 14-21.

³³ Antonson and Jacobsen, 'Tourism Development Strategy or Just Brown Signage?', op. cit. (note 22).

³⁴ MacCannell, *The Tourist*, op. cit. (note 18).

³⁵ Janike Kampeveld Larsen, 'Curating Views, The Norwegian Tourist Route Project', in: Mari Hvattum, Brita Brenna, Beate Elvebakk and Janike Kampeveld Larsen (eds.), *Routes, Roads and Landscapes* (London: Ashgate, 2011), 179-190; Janike Kampeveld Larsen, 'Global Tourism Practices as Living Heritage: Viewing the Norwegian Tourist Route Project', *Future Anterior* 9/1 (2012), 66-87; Janike Kampeveld Larsen, 'Geologic Presence in a Twenty-First Century Scenic Garden', in: John Dixon Hunt (ed.), *Studies in the History of Gardens and Designed Landscapes* (London: Taylor and Francis, 2014), 85-100. See also:

Tore Edvard Bergaust and Kristin Evjen, 'Nasjonale Turistveger—Nasjonalromantikk i Moderne Innpakning', *Plan: Tidsskrift for Samfunnsplanlegging, Byplan og Regional Utvikling* 3/4 (2010); Jens Kristian Steen Jacobsen, 'Nasjonale turistveger på rett veg inn i fremtiden?', *Plan: Tidsskrift for Samfunnsplanlegging, Byplan og Regional Utvikling* 1 (2010), 48-51.

³⁶ Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City*. (London: Chatto and Windus, 1985), 126.

³⁷ John Wylie, *Landscape* (Abingdon/New York: Routledge, 2007).

³⁸ Kenneth Olwig, *Landscape, Nature and the Body Politic*. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002); see also Don Mitchell, 'Cultural Landscapes: Just Landscapes or Landscapes of Justice?', *Progress in Human Geography* 27/6 (2003), 787-96.

³⁹ Karen Sejr, 'Den nye kystlov er forfejlet', *The Association of Danish Landscape Architects*, Contribution to the debate on coastal development in Denmark, http://www.landskabsarkitekter.dk/aktuelt/den_nye_kystlov_er_forfejlet, accessed 15 January 2019.

⁴⁰ Urry, *The Tourist Gaze*, op. cit. (note 7), 12.

⁴¹ Jean Baudrillard, *Simulacre and Simulation*, S. F. Glaser (trans.) (University of Michigan Press, 1994 (original 1981)).

⁴² Lucy R. Lippard, 'Foreword: Looking On', in: Dean MacCannell, *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (University of California Press, 1999 (original 1976)), ix-xiii: xiii.

⁴³ Jillian M. Rickly-Boyd, 'Existential Authenticity: Place Matters.' *Tourism Geographies* 15/4 (2013), 680-686; see also: Jørgen Dehs, *Det Autentiske: Fortællinger om Nutidens Kunstbegreb* (Forlaget Vandkunsten, 2012).

⁴⁴ Jillian M. Rickly-Boyd, Daniel C. Knudsen, Lisa C. Braverman and Michelle M. Metro-Roland, *Tourism, Performance, and Place: A Geographic Perspective* (New York: Taylor & Francis, 2014), 3.

⁴⁵ See description at: <https://realdania.dk>, accessed 15 January 2019.

⁴⁶ Bark Rådgivning A/S and Realdania, *Stedet Tæller: Perspektiver og Erfaringer* [Place Matters: Perspectives and Experiences] (Copenhagen: Realdania, 2017). See also project description at: <http://www.stedet-taeller.dk/>, accessed 15 January 2019.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ See project description at:

<http://www.thisted.dk/Borger/NaturMiljoe/AktuelleProjekter/CHI.aspx>, accessed 15 January 2019.

⁴⁹ See office description at: <http://www.biotope.no/>, accessed 15 January 2019.

⁵⁰ See: <http://www.biotope.no/2012/10/birding-destination-varanger-pro-nature.html>, accessed 15 January 2019.

⁵¹ Janike Kampevold Larsen and Peter Hemmersam, 'Landscapes on Hold—The Norwegian and Russian Barents Sea Coast in the New North', in: Kevin Maier and Sarah Jaquette Ray (eds), *Critical Norths: Space, Theory, Nature* (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press, 2017), 171-190.

⁵² Peter Hemmersam, 'Arctic Architectures', *Polar Record* 52/4 (2016), 412-422.

⁵³ Larsen and Hemmersam, 'Landscapes on Hold', op. cit. (note 51).

-
- ⁵⁴ Rickly-Boyd et al., *Tourism, Performance, and Place*, op. cit. (note 44).
- ⁵⁵ The Danish sociologist Henrik Dahl has made a short and illustrative description of the absurdity of the present definition. See: Henrik Dahl, *Turisters Kulturforbrug: Pilotstudie til Baggrund for Spydspidsprojekt* (Wonderful Copenhagen, 2004), 4.
- ⁵⁶ Pasgaard, *Tourism and Strategic Planning*, op. cit. (note 2), 10-12.
- ⁵⁷ Yi-Fu Tuan, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977); Edward Relph, *Place and Placelessness* (London: Pion, 1976); Marc Augé, *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity* (London: Verso, 1995).
- ⁵⁸ Jørgen Ole Bærenholdt and Brynhild Granås (eds.) *Mobility and Place: Enacting Northern European Peripheries* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008); Doreen Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 154.
- ⁵⁹ John A. Agnew, *Place and Politics: The Geographical Mediation of State and Society* (Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1987).
- ⁶⁰ Christian Norberg-Schulz, *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture* (London: Academy Editions, 1980).
- ⁶¹ Ellefsen, ‘Architecture and Design—Added Value Along Tourist Routes’, op. cit. (note 35), 14-21: 16.
- ⁶² Ellen Braae ‘Stedernes landskab’, in: Signe Marie Rohde and Christian Andersen (eds.) *Steder i landskabet* (Copenhagen: Realdania, 2012), 10-11: 11.
- ⁶³ Ibid., 10 (authors’ translation).
- ⁶⁴ Peter Kvistgaard, ‘Æstetik og Magt i Dansk Turisme’, [blog entry] <https://www.turisme.nu/aestetik-og-magt-i-dansk-turisme/>, accessed 15 January 2019.
- ⁶⁵ Stine Lea Jacobi, ‘Vi Udvikler Særlige Steder—Alt Andet end “Sameness”’, [blog entry] <https://www.turisme.nu/vi-udvikler-saerlige-steder-alt-andet-end-sameness/>, accessed 15 January 2019.

