



<http://www.diva-portal.org>

Postprint

This is the accepted version of a paper published in *Sport in Society: Cultures, Media, Politics, Commerce*. This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Andersen Eikje, C., Horgen, A., Arnegård, J. (2019)

The organizing and regulation of mountain guiding in Scandinavia 1820–2016, with a glance at the Alps

Sport in Society: Cultures, Media, Politics, Commerce, 22(4, SI): 555-572

<https://doi.org/10.1080/17430437.2017.1389041>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:gih:diva-5119>

The organizing and regulation of mountain guiding in Scandinavia 1820-2016, with a glance at the Alps

Cleng Andersen Eikje^a, André Horgen^a and Johan Arnegård^b

^aDepartment of Sports, Physical Education and Outdoor Studies, University College of Southeast Norway, Bø, Norway; ^bThe Swedish School of Sport and Health Sciences (GIH), Stockholm, Sweden

Abstract

In this article, we study how mountain guiding was organized and regulated in Scandinavia and the Alps between 1820 and 2015 and focus on the most important differences and similarities in Scandinavia, and between Scandinavia and the Alps. We conclude that Switzerland and Chamonix (France) represent two different systems in the Alps during the nineteenth century. However, through the emergence of national and international guide unions the regulation of mountain guiding in the Alps today appears unified, with a close connection between national regulation and mountain guide unions. In Scandinavia, Norway and Sweden historically had similar practices organizing and regulating mountain guiding, where a relatively strong layman tradition emerged during the 1960s and 1970s. In 2008, legal decisions led Sweden to change its system to match the Alp model, while Norway held on to the layman tradition. This leaves mountain guiding in Norway as a distinctly less regulated field than in France, and Switzerland, as in Sweden.

Introduction

In 1821, the world's first mountain guide union was established as La Compagnie des Guides de Chamonix (Compagnie) in Val de Chamonix, France. Only seven years later, in 1828, Norway got its first officially regulated mountain guide service to cross the Jostedal glacier. Today France and Norway have two distinctly different ways of organizing mountain guiding. France has a regulated system whereby only guides from the National Union of Mountain Guides (Le Syndicat National des Guides de Montagne (SNGM)), together with other unions that are members of the International Federation of Mountain Guides Association (IFMGA), have access. Additionally, other countries in the Alps, like Switzerland, have a similar system.

Norway has chosen a different path with less regulation and no monopoly. Sweden had a similar system as Norway for many years. However, in 2008, Swedish authorities regulated mountain guiding. The Association of Swedish Mountain Guides (Svenska Bergsguideorganisationen), a member of IFMGA, now has full authority over the profession.

Up until 2008, the contours of a Scandinavian model existed in the mountain guiding system, perhaps as an expression of Scandinavian exceptionalism. This changed with a stroke of a pen from Swedish authorities. However, in Norway the old system continued and continues today, despite the ambitions of Norwegian guide unions seeking to change the system ever since the 1970s. The less regulated system in Norway is paradoxical in the face of a high level of governmental regulations generally observed in other areas of the Norwegian society. Our research seeks to understand why this is the case.

Through a comparative historical perspective, we study the organizing and regulation of mountain guiding in Scandinavia, with a glance at the situation in the Alps. This highly empirical approach is important to be able to explain how today's differences came to be. The comparison will focus on highlighting differences and similarities on how mountain guiding was organized and regulated, both between and within regions (Melve, 2009). In addition, we will use power theory as an analytic tool to better understand how the differences and similarities have developed. The analysis is based on Steven Luke's division of power exercise in three levels. On level one, we find the direct and often formal power exercised in concrete processes such as decision-making. On the second level, we find the agenda power, the defining power, and the normative. On the third level, we find the discursive power (Foucault, 2006) where somebody realizes their will through differently influencing what others want and mean. This is a more subtle power that largely rests on signs, symbols and expressions (Lukes, 1974).

Neither Scandinavia nor the countries contiguous with the Alps are homogeneous. To highlight this factor, we have included additional comparisons of both Norway and Sweden and France and Switzerland. We chose Norway and Sweden because they have the two largest mountaineering communities in Scandinavia, France because of Chamonix's position as the capital of mountaineering in Europe, and Switzerland because the Swiss system was inspirational to the early Norwegian regulation of mountain guiding. Chamonix has been under both French and Sardinian rule throughout our period of study. For this reason, we refer to Chamonix in the early period and to France in the later period. When comparing different regions and nations, the question of how these may have affected each other becomes

relevant. By examining mountaineering and mountain guiding as transnational phenomena using the tools of transnational history, we have to some extent been able to detect historical relationships between mountaineering communities in the different countries, as well as how they have affected the development of different systems for organizing and regulating mountain guiding (Saunier, 2013). Our historical perspective, from 1820 to 2015, covers the entire period of modern mountaineering. This gives us the opportunity to identify different ways to organize and regulate mountain guiding over a period of 200 years. The research questions probed in this article are:

How was mountain guiding organized and regulated in Scandinavia and the Alps between 1820 and 2015?

What were the most important differences and similarities in Scandinavia, and between Scandinavia and the Alps?

In the article, we distinguish between mountain guiding as organized and regulated by the authorities, the tourist associations, and the guide unions. In some cases the organizing and regulation is a result of cooperation between the institutions on a local, regional, national, and/or international level. In English, a distinction is often made between mountain guides who handle alpinism, and mountain leaders who take care of trekking (non-climbing environment). In the French language, there is a similar distinction when they talk about, respectively, “Guide de haute Montagne” and “Accompagnateur en moyenne Montagne”. This distinction is a quite modern one, and is therefore problematic in a historical context. In this article, we will use a wider definition of the term mountain guide to include both alpinism and trekking, as was the case earlier.

Throughout the article, we describe many different organizations. Often terms such as association, club, “verband”, union, syndicate, or “compagnie” were used in their names. Regardless of the names of organizations, we distinguish more precisely between associations and unions. Here we understand “association” as a group of people who share an interest, activity, or purpose in common. In addition, we understand “union” as an alliance or confederation of people for mutual interest or benefit linked to a certain profession, closely related to a labor union. In cases when the term “organization” is used, it covers both associations and unions.

The Alps

In 1821, enough aspiring mountaineers were visiting Chamonix to create a constant demand for mountain guides, leading to the establishment of the Compagnie as what was probably the first guide union in the world (Fleming, 2000; p. 96; Colonel, 2009, p. 21). From the 1850's, the start of the Golden Age of Alpinism, mountaineering became a pursuit worthwhile in itself, and increasing numbers of climbers visited the Alps for the purpose of mountaineering (Unsworth, 1992, p. 138; Fleming, 2000, p. 164; Modica, 2016). The idea of mountaineering was maintained by alpine clubs (associations) in England (1857), Austria (1862), Italy and Switzerland (1863), Germany (1869) and France (1874): “[...] all of them [...] devoted to the idea of mountain sportsmanship” (Kirchner, 1950, p. 214).

Chamonix and France

In Chamonix, the guides themselves established the Compagnie on their own initiative. From a power perspective, this was an example of agenda power in the absence of formal power exercised by the authorities. The Compagnie was organized like a guild or a union, wherein the members worked together to obtain benefits. There was a system of rotation that allocated assignments among the guides. Members paid a professional tax to cover the employment of a head guide and to finance an insurance scheme. The Compagnie also stated that a fixed, predetermined number of guides and porters were to accompany the travellers on the different routes to prevent work overload. To protect their members from competition, the Compagnie only let men born in the Chamonix and Argentière valley become members. Thereby a range of guides from other areas was excluded. This protection scheme lasted until 1930, when Roger Frisson-Roche, born in Paris, was admitted in the Compagnie because of his exceptional climbing skills (Colonel, 2009, pp. 21-23, 81, 115-117; Hansen, 2013, pp. 156-158). Through the Compagnie, local government kept oversight on every person providing guiding from Chamonix. The Compagnie's guide office probably represented an efficient system for providing guide services in town. This service was definitely needed as before the Compagnie was established, travellers and mountaineers complained often about chaotic conditions when trying to hire a guide. To a certain extent, the local government also had some control over the services provided by the Compagnie through their right to appoint the head guides (Hansen, 2013, pp. 156-158). This shows that formal power exercised by the authorities was not altogether absent.

The Compagnie did not use guide courses to educate their members; instead, the aspirant guides worked together with experienced guides in an apprenticeship. They developed their professional qualifications first as porters, then as guides. Their first mountain guide course took place in 1936 (Colonel, 2009, pp. 81, 115-117). Although ending the tradition that had been almost solely reliant on apprenticeships, the Compagnie continued to recruit and train their own professionals. This differed from the practice in Switzerland, as we will discuss later. A new national private school in France facilitated the mountain guide course from 1936: L'École Nationale du Ski Français. The school changed its name in 1943 to L'École Nationale de Ski et d'Alpinisme (ENSA). Since 1946, it has been the only recognized school for mountain guides in France. In 2010, they merged with le Centre National du Ski Nordique in Prémanon to become L'École Nationale des Sports de Montagne, today located in Chamonix and Prémanon. The school educates and certifies mountain guides according to international standards (ENSA, 2017).

In 1946 the Compagnie and other unions formed a union on a national level, Le Syndicat National des Guides de Montagne, or a National Union of Mountain Guides (SNGM). SNGM's first headquarters were located in Chamonix, and their first president was Armand Charlet, member of the Compagnie. Two years later, mountain guiding was for the first time regulated by national laws in France (SNGM, 2017). It took 127 years from the Compagnie was established until direct and formal power through legislation was exercised by the French government. In the meantime, the Compagnie had set its agenda and exercised defining and normative power for a long time, establishing hegemony. The Compagnie's position and authority in the Chamonix valley had over the years become undisputed, resting upon signs, symbols, and expressions, which probably lay the foundation of a discursive power. This more subtle power probably influenced on the opinion of the authorities regarding the system, and made it irrelevant to question it. In 1965 the SNGM, together with sister unions from Switzerland, Italy and Austria, founded the Union, Internationale des Association de Guides de Montagne (UIAGM) and International Vereinigung der Bergführerverbände (IVBV), hereafter designated UIAGM/IVBV (Ibid).

Switzerland

During the Golden Age of Alpinism, the number of travelers and mountaineers visiting the Swiss-Alps increased significantly. In the Swiss Confederation, cantons have a far-reaching

sovereignty and are responsible for healthcare, welfare, law enforcement, public education, and taxation, and in 1856, cantonal authorities in Bern started to regulate mountain guiding, followed by the cantonal authorities in Valais a year later. This was done through a set of rules called the *Reglement für die Bergführer und Träger* in Bern, and *Reglement für die Führer-Gesellschaften* in Valais. Through these regulations, Swiss cantonal authorities took control of the profession of mountain guiding (Hungerbühler, 2013, pp. 77-78). Unlike the French authorities, Swiss authorities exercised direct and formal power through legislation at a relatively early stage. Unions like the Compagnie never had the chance to set the agenda and establish hegemony in the absence of a proactive government.

To be rewarded with a Bergführer patent, guides had to meet a minimum age of 18/20, have a good reputation, and pass a theoretical test on local knowledge. Guides had liability for clients and their assets. In addition, they had to follow a set of rules or face penalties for violations. The penalty could be a fine, revocation of approval, or even imprisonment. While working as mountain guides they had to carry a *Bergführerbuch*. This book contained information about the guide, their official approval, rules for the mountain guide service, and an overview of the standardized fees. It also contained empty pages for client feedback on the guides' performances. This became a model for other cantons, which also introduced similar regulations: Glarud (1875), Wandt (1882), Uri (1888), Graubünden (1902) and Obenwald (1905) (Hungerbühler, 2013, pp. 77-84).

In 1863, the Schweitzer Alpen-Club was established. After a while, this new association also showed interest in regulation of the mountain guide profession. Early in the 1870's Schweitzer Alpen-Club published *Gerundzüge zu einem Reglement für Bergführer und Träger* and the text *Einige Regeln und Winke über die Aufgabe und das Verhalten der Bergführer*. These functioned as additional unofficial regulations put forward by the clients themselves. Local Schweitzer Alpen-Club associations also began to arrange mountain guide courses, which cantonal authorities never did (Ibid, p. 82). The early Swiss regulation of mountain guiding was a cooperation between public authorities and the private association Schweitzer Alpen-Club. As we can see, there was a distinct difference between the 19th-century systems as they originated in Switzerland and Chamonix, respectively: the Swiss model was largely controlled by the cantonal authorities, tourists, and mountaineers themselves, and guides in cooperation with the local town mainly controlled the Chamonix model. From a power perspective, we can observe a Swiss model based on authority's direct and formal power, combined with agenda/normative power exercised by tourists and

mountaineers. On the other hand, we have a French model where the Compagnie established hegemony long before French authorities intervened.

In 1899, the Schweitzer Alpen-Club standardized its guiding courses. Soon after, these courses were a part of the official regulations and became a requirement for entering the mountain guiding profession (Ibid, p. 94). Again, a distinct difference was evident between the Swiss and the Chamonix models in terms of recruitment and training of guides. In Switzerland the tourist associations arranged training. In Chamonix, as we have seen, guides and their union controlled the training.

A number of different local guide unions operated in Switzerland. From around 1900, they were organized on a cantonal level. In 1942, Schweizer Bergführerverband was established on a national level. The initial members were Bern, Wallis, and Graubünden. Shortly afterward, SBV formed its own guidelines for mountain guide courses, and presented these to Schweitzer Alpen-Club and the cantons (Ibid, p. 96). This shows that national Schweizer Bergführerverband challenged the earlier model of mountain guiding, being controlled by Schweitzer Alpen-Club and the cantons as it claimed national governing status over mountain guiding. In 1990, the education of Schweizer Bergführerverband guides was federally approved and, as mentioned, Schweizer Bergführerverband joined with sister unions to found the UIAGM/IVBV in 1965 (Ibid, pp. 84-94). As in Chamonix, we observe this overall trend toward national and international organizing and regulation of the mountain guide profession.

International unions

During the 1990's, the international union UIAGM/IVBV also got an English name, International Federation of Mountain Guides Associations (IFMGA), and turned into IVBV/UIAGM/IFMGA (Einang, 2007, p. 86), just IFMGA hereafter. Through the IFMGA the organization and regulating of mountain guiding in the Alps have become more unified. The IFMGA today have 24 national organizations as members, including non-European countries like Nepal and Ecuador. Their main objectives are concentrated on gaining control over the field of mountain guiding, mainly through obtaining power to determine the educational standards for international mountain guides (IFMGA, 2017). Countries that use IFMGA standards to regulate mountain guiding also accept foreign IFMGA guides. Through the IFMGA the Chamonix model, where unions largely controlled the profession, have prevailed. IFMGA control the national association through their intake procedures. Especially

interesting here is that national organizations have to aim to strengthen the position of IFMGA guides towards local government. This has, as we will see later, become the core of the conflict between the Norwegian IFMGA member union and other mountaineering organizations in Norway.

Similar unions have been used to organize mountain guides working in non-climbing environments, called “mountain leaders” in English. Mountain leaders in France formed a national union in 1979 called the Syndicat National des Accompagnateurs en Montagne. Lines were drawn towards the profession of mountain guide, but a potential conflict arose. At least at the outset, IFMGA was concerned with the new competition, clearly showing its trade-union mindset.

The “mountain leaders” start to come up already at that time and the associations are asked to observe this new “sector” precisely. If this new “trend” should be successful and if we are not able to control this movement, we could get in trouble because this would mean a certain danger for our profession (Kalt, 1992, p. 4).

In Switzerland, the mountain leaders were later to organize themselves than in France. In 1996, they formed the Association Suisse des Accompagnateurs en Montagne (ASAM). On an international level, the European Mountain Leader Commission was formed in 1989. In 1992 representatives from Belgium, France, Great Britain, Ireland, Italy, and Spain met to ratify a “Community Standard for Conditions of Access to and Practice of the Profession of European Mountain Leader”, clearly seeking to protect their profession. The organization took a more international standpoint in 2004 and changed its name to Union of International Mountain Leader Associations (UIMLA), also including national unions from Andorra, Poland, Spain, and Switzerland (UIMLA, 2017). The UIMLA are built according to the same template as the IFMGA, seeking to represent their profession on an international level. The IFMGA and UIMLA today have a more clarified view of each other's identities, but there is still a certain ongoing struggle for territory. The IFMGA and UIMLA represent both a professionalization of the mountain guide profession, especially through educational standards (Cousquer & Beams, 2013). The unions are also central to making mountain guiding transnational, working as a distinct formation facilitating circulation of standards and practices.

The Alps today

Organization and regulation of mountain guiding in the Alps today is largely done in the same fashion in different countries. National mountain guide unions work together under the international umbrella of IFMGA and UIMLA. Their training and qualifications have mostly been acknowledged by the state in their respective countries. Mountain guiding in France is regulated by *Code du sport* and *Code de l'éducation*. To work in the field of alpinism, you have to be qualified as an IFMGA mountain guide. Mountain leaders have the right to work in the mountains when the techniques of alpinism are not required.

In 2014, mountain guiding became a regulated profession in Switzerland through Loi fédérale sur les guides de montagne et les organisateurs d'autres activités à risque. Since then, to work as a mountain guide in Switzerland, you need to have a license from the responsible cantonal authority. To obtain a license, you must be an IFMGA guide or have a diploma recognized by the Swiss Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation (Schweizer Bergführerverband, 2014). Since 2014, Association Suisse des Accompagnateurs en Montagne has had a monopoly on educating and certifying mountain leaders through the state certificate as "Accompagnateur de randonnée" (ASAM, 2017).

In 2016, EU established a system with European Professional Cards (EPC). This electronic card makes it easier to recognise the holder's professional qualifications throughout the EU. As one out of five professions, mountain guiding is among the first professions to be included in this system. This is because mountain climbing is a season-based profession that involves mobility between different countries. The guides need to apply to get the EPC, which lasts for one year at a time. The IFMGA guide training meets all standards, and they can all expect to get their application granted (europa.eu, 2017). This strengthens the trend of unifying organizing and regulation of the Mountain Guide profession, not least in the Alps.

Scandinavia

In Scandinavia, mountain exploration and early tourism goes back to the late 18th and early 19th centuries, when travellers, mainly foreign natural scientists and Englishmen on a "Grand Tour", had begun visiting the fjords of Norway, some high Norwegian waterfalls, remote valleys, and mountainous areas in both Sweden and Norway.

Norway

The British mountaineer William Cecil Slingsby's conquest of the third highest mountain in Norway, Store Skagastølstind in 1876, marked the beginning of the Golden Age of Alpinism in Norway. Another scenic place these early travellers visited was the Jostedal glacier, the biggest glacier on mainland Europe. There had been local travellers across this glacier plateau since about the 15th century. During the 1820's, we know that local farmers offered guidance across the plateau for travellers from outside the local community. In 1826, an initiative emerged with the governor of the county Nordre Bergnehus Amt to organize a mountain guide service across the glacier. The main argument for this initiative submitted by local officials was safety, but also a desire to regulate the price of the guide service (Horgen, 1999, p. 125). In 1828, the initiative resulted in a royal resolution establishing a professional mountain guide service, organized by the county, for the Jostedal glacier. In a democratic, constitutional monarchy like Norway, royal resolutions were common when new laws were enacted. Two guides were employed, one on each side of the glacier. Local young men serving in the armed forces should assist them if needed (Ibid, p. 129). From a power perspective, this is a very early and probably unique Scandinavian example of authorities exercising direct and formal power through legislation in the field of mountain guiding.

The type of county-regulated mountain guide service was never extended to other mountain areas in Norway, although not because no mountain guiding was taking place. We know, for example, that the local farmer Ola Røysheim started offering mountain guiding to the highest mountain of Norway, Galdhøpiggen in 1858, without any intervention from the county (Engen, 2000). Likewise, other non-regulated guide services were offered at the glacier Folgefonna, the third largest glacier in Norway. Even though it had a similar history of visitation and use as the Jostedal glacier, and both glaciers are in the same county under the same governor, there was no attempt to regulate the local mountain guides here. It seems that the county did not have interest in regulating mountain guiding unless local officials requested it, probably because the unregulated guide services proved satisfactory (Eikje, 2015, p. 32). Nevertheless, the county-regulated guide services at the Jostedal glacier, although small, represent an early officially-regulated mountain guide service in Norway.

In 1868, as mountain tourism increased in Norway, the Norwegian Tourist Association (Den Norske Turistforening (DNT)) was established. In the beginning, this new association focused on building cabins, preparing trails, and publishing annual yearbooks. Not until the 1880s did they take any initiative when it came to mountain guiding. In 1890, DNT was ready to

establish their own mountain guide service, Patentførervesen, with fifteen guides in different mountain areas of southern Norway. During the same year, their secretary approached the county regulating mountain guiding at the Jostedal's glacier, and asked if the county's mountain guide service could be a part of this new Patentførervesen. The county accepted, and in 1890 the county's three mountain guides started to work for DNT in addition to the fifteen others. Local authorities in Norway showed little interest in regulating mountain guiding. They let a private association take over their own guides, thereby privatizing mountain guiding in Norway (Horgen, 1999, p. 152). This was the end of the Norwegian authority's hegemony through legislation in the field of mountain guiding in Norway. Up to this day, the initiative remains in private, volunteer hands.

The rules and regulations DNT used for their guides had many similarities to those of Switzerland (Bjørne-Larsen, 2000, p. 76). They used many of the same rules of good behavior, both for the guides and their clients. DNT guides also carried a personal guidebook, similar to the *Bergführerbuch*. This was not a coincidence. In the years before 1890, DNT acquired information about the organization and regulating of mountain guiding in the Alps through at least three channels. First, they sent a representative to the IV International Alpen Congress in Salzburg in 1882, hosted by the German-Austrian Alpine Club. As a result, they published an overview of the Austrian model for organizing mountain guiding in DNT's yearbook. Second, many foreign climbers with experience visited Norway because of climbing with guides in the Alps. One of these, the Danish mountaineer Carl Hall, argued for an organization of mountain guiding in Norway after a Chamonix-like model. His proposal included a guide union where the DNT was involved, but the guides held the majority of seats on its board. Third, DNT wrote to Schweizer Alpen-Club and got an overview of the Swiss model that they soon after introduced, only without training courses and exams because of a lack of resources (Eikje, 2015, pp. 46-60). This shows that mountaineering and mountain guiding were distinctly transnational practices. Travellers worked as agents for the circulation of ideas and practices, both on their own initiative, and through the role of being an emissary for the DNT. The tourist and alpine clubs worked as a circuit to enhance this circulation. DNT was aware of international models of mountain guiding on the continent. Nonetheless, they had a Norwegian approach of not involving government in the process, but keeping the matter of organizing and regulating mountain guiding a strictly private undertaking through the DNT. From a power perspective, we see that power now lies in the hands of a private organization that represents the tourists.

The climber Carl Hall had proposed forming a guide union, but the DNT chose to organize their guide services through their own board. Were the guides satisfied with this solution? Sometimes negotiations between guides and their employers could be difficult, especially when it came to terms and conditions regulated by their contracts (Horgen, 1999, p. 147). On the other hand, before the 1960s we know of only one initiative from local guides in Norway to organize themselves. In 1909, the local Bødal glacier guide union (Bødal breførarlag) was established in the relatively small valley of Bødal, offering guide services with its own rates and rules on the Bødal-glacier, which is a branch of the Jostedal glacier. The Bødal glacier guide union was established because of a conflict with DNT about how many of the local guides were to be a part of DNT's Patentførervesen (Bjørne-Larsen, 2000, pp. 74-78, 86-89; Eikje, 2015, pp. 71-72).

In 1908 the Norwegian Alpine Club (Norsk Tindeklubb) was established. DNT, together with the Norwegian Alpine Club, arranged climbing courses for DNT mountain guides in 1912 and 1914. Later courses were arranged by DNT in 1935, 1937, and 1947. Through the process of forming the curriculum for these courses, the instructors partially relied on the study of international literature on the subject, especially the instruction manual of the German-Austrian Alpine Club. This is another example of how the world of mountaineering was highly transnational (Eikje, 2015, pp. 88-93).

Layman tradition

During the 1950s and 1960s, the DNT's Patentførervesen gradually faded away, and by the 1970s the last DNT guides had stopped providing guiding. This probably had to do with a change of strategy within the association. DNT held their last glacier guide course in 1959. Instead of recruiting and educating new guides, they started educating the tourists. DNT arranged glacier courses from 1958, and along with other associations organized climbing courses from 1963 (Hagen, 1992, pp. 34, 44, 54). This new way of thinking is probably the foundation of what we can call "the layman tradition" in Norwegian mountaineering, which means that every Norwegian mountaineer should be able to take care of themselves in the mountains. The foundation of the layman tradition might be explained by the background of the Norwegian tradition of peoples' "right of free access to nature" (Allemansretten), and through the link between *friluftsliv* and national identity. *Friluftsliv* can be understood as a form of outdoor recreation that developed into a broad, popular movement in Norway throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. Surveys today show that over 90% of the population is pursuing some form of *friluftsliv* in Norway (Drevo, 2014). The old tradition of "right of

free access to nature” gives people the right to travel freely, regardless of ownership, in Norwegian nature. The Outdoor Recreation Act formalized this right in 1957. According to Tordsson (2003), outdoor activities were linked to various political projects in Norwegian society during this period. Of particular relevance is the “national project” around the 1900s, where the mountains, the mountain farmer and the tradition of skiing, amongst others, were selected as symbols of Norwegian identity. The link between *friluftsliv* and national identity is characterized by a significant Norwegian philosophy in which mastering a wide range of outdoor skills like skiing became closely related to “being a Norwegian” (Ibid). From around 1960, it was probably established as a symbolic and discursive power, which, by referring to the ideas of the Norwegian *friluftsliv* tradition, was used as references to frame the space of understanding and opportunities. The power of the central actors was largely legitimized through traditional ruling, which legitimized itself by pointing to the layman tradition.

Institutionalization

By the late 1960’s, new institutions within Norwegian mountaineering and *friluftsliv* were established. The public Norwegian School of Sport Science (Norges Idrettshøgskole) in Oslo set up a teaching program for outdoor teachers/tutors in 1968. The same year, the private Norwegian Alpine Center (Norsk Alpincenter) was founded in the valley of Hemsedal. Both institutions came to play an important role within Norwegian mountaineering and *friluftsliv* during the years to come. Already during the founding year, Nils Faarlund, the founder of the Norwegian Alpine Center and a lecturer at Norwegian School of Sport Science, pointed out several problems with Norwegian mountaineering that he thought demanded a quick solution. First, dissemination and training was of extreme importance for safety and well-being in the mountains, and this task had to be a priority. Second, the establishment of institutions was needed to cover this important task. Third, institutions capable of educating and authorizing mountain guides in high-mountain skiing and mountaineering were needed. Finally, the authorities needed to introduce laws to prohibit so-called “piracy guiding” (Norsk Alpincenter, 1968, p. 19). More or less because of these objectives, the Norwegian Association of Mountain Guides and Climbing Instructors (Norsk forening for Fjellførere og Klatreinstruktører) was established in 1968 (Norsk Forening for Fjellførere og Klatreinstruktører, 1968, p. 5). This new organization was probably the first initiative towards a national union of mountain guides in Norway. The connection this union had with the Norwegian Alpine Center was strong, with Faarlund as one of the founders (Ibid, p. 17). A

year later, they applied for membership in IFMGA but were not accepted because of technicalities (Norsk Alpincenter, 1969, p. 29; Einang, 2007, p. 82; Kalt, 1992).

In 1971, the organizing spirit rose again, and the union changed its name to the Norwegian Mountain Guide Association (Norsk fjellførerforening). At this stage, they started authorizing instructors and mountain guides in high-mountain skiing and climbing. The Norwegian Alpine Center offered instruction and courses (Høgfjellskolen Norsk Alpincenter, 1971, p. 37; Einang, 2007, p. 82). On a national level, the Norwegian Mountain Guide Association participated in several meetings with different mountaineering-related associations in 1974. One of the matters they discussed was what kind of competence one should demand from those who offered mountain guiding and mountaineering courses (Høgfjellskolen Norsk Alpincenter, 1974, p. 37). Because of continuing conflicts and other difficulties, the Norwegian Mountain Guide Association faded out during and after 1974 (Einang, 2007, p. 83). However, the idea of establishing a Norwegian mountain guide union with alliances abroad was not dead (Ibid, p. 82). Faarlund and others established a third union in 1978, the Norwegian Mountain Guides (Norske Tindevglederere (NORTIND)). Instead of trying to involve everyone with an interest in Norwegian mountaineering, this union was more exclusive and strictly directed towards membership of IFMGA. To be as prepared as possible for applying for membership, NORTIND copied the statute of *Verband Deutscher Berg- und Schiführer* (Ibid, p. 85). Even so, more refusals followed in 1978 and again in 1980, as far as we know because of technicalities. Nevertheless, in 1982, NORTIND finally got their IFMGA membership (Ibid, p. 86; Kalt, 1992).

Norwegian Mountaineering Forum

The idea of cooperation between mountaineering organizations in Norway was picked up again by DNT in 1988. In 1990, this resulted in the foundation of the Norwegian Mountaineering Forum (Norsk Fjellsportforum) (Hagen, 1992, pp. 60, 61). Five years later, in 1995, the forum had overcome a wide range of disagreements and worked out a national standard for all member organizations offering mountaineering courses (Dahl, 2009, p. 57). The disagreement was based, among other things, on polarization related to a Norwegian mountain guiding system that was independent, decentralized, less regulated and based on volunteering and freedom, a system preferred by DNT and most of the other members, versus an inter-European mountain guiding system based on professionalization, hegemonic standardization, and centralized control supported by NORTIND (Ibid, p. 55). The Norwegian government, represented by the Authorities of Products and Electricity, later the Norwegian

Directorate for Civil Protection (Produkt og elektrisitetsilsynet, senere Direktoratet for Samfunnssikkerhet og beredskap), recognized Norwegian mountaineering forum's national standard as sufficient when it came to accommodating the demands for safety in organized mountaineering in Norway (Ibid, p. 56). The Norwegian government wanted private organizations to be able to regulate the field of mountain guiding without demanding alignment of the system with a European model. Here we can observe a form of power exercise from the authorities that implements legislation, assigning significant responsibility to the service provider.

Despite the establishment of a national standard in 1995, conflicts between Norwegian mountaineering organizations continued (Dahl, 2009). In 1992, the Norwegian Climbing Association (Norges Klatreforbund) was established (Grimeland, 2004, p. 222). This new association was seen by some of the other organizations as a competitor, on the outside of the Norwegian Mountaineering Forum (Dahl, 2009, p. 63). In 1996, there was a plan to transform the Norwegian Mountaineering Forum into an official Mountaineering Council of Norway, including the Norwegian Climbing Association, and to finally unify Norwegian mountaineering (Dahl, 2009, p. 67). However, the Norwegian Climbing Association resisted. The core of the conflict was the role of NORTIND as a union more than an association, with their membership in IFMGA played in the Norwegian Mountaineering Forum. As we have seen, a precondition for joining the IFMGA was that the national organization has to have the aim that the training and the profession of the IFMGA mountain guide are recognized by the government (IFMGA, 2017). The Norwegian Climbing Association and most of the other members of the Norwegian Mountaineering Forum wanted full-scale cooperation with the national standard. This was impossible to accept by NORTIND because they were obliged not to incorporate closely with so-called volunteer or amateur associations because of their membership in IFMGA.

At the same time, NORTIND stated that Norway through EU regulations eventually would have to adapt to the same system as in the Alps, where only IFMGA guides could guide paying customers (Dahl, 2009, p. 73; Aarhus, 2012). This EU regulation could have changed the game. Norway, not being a EU member but bound to many of the Union's laws through the European Economic Area agreement. Norway's independent mountain guiding and mountaineering practices could have been challenged, not unlike how EU food production regulations changed agriculture: set uniform standards, narrowed consumer options, and

reduced national differences. Nevertheless, the Norwegian authorities took no further steps towards regulation, and no EU regulation manifested itself.

Through 1998 and 1999, the Norwegian Mountaineering Forum was reorganized as the Norwegian Climbing Association finally became a member of the Forum, and the national standard was revised. NORTINDS union role and their membership in IFMGA was from time to time an issue. In the following years, dialogue and conflict within the Norwegian Mountaineering Forum continued and continues, based on the same old disagreements described above (Dahl, 2009, pp. 84, 96).

Regulations today

In Norway, the legal responsibility for assessing a mountain guide's qualifications rests on the provider of the guide services. Norwegian Law on Control of Products and Consumer Services states that all providers of consumer services are subject to a general duty of care (Klima- og miljødepartementet, 2009). It states that the provider of customer services should exercise caution and take reasonable measures to prevent consumer service causing damage to health. Furthermore, mountain guiding is subject to health, safety and environment (HSE) regulations on systematic health, environment, and safety work in enterprises which claims that service providers have to identify the risk of the service they are offering, and provide sufficient measures through routines of internal control (Arbeids- og sosialdepartementet, 2013). The Norwegian Directorate for Civil Protection (Direktoratet for Samfunnssikkerhet og beredskap) administers these laws. The laws mentioned above are all in general terms, to cover a variety of services. The only guidelines made specifically for mountain guiding and similar activities is the Norwegian Directorate for Civil Protection's guide on how to meet the requirements of internal control by using a Risk and Vulnerability Analysis (Direktoratet for samfunnssikkerhet og beredskap, 2007).

Only two outdoor activities are subject to specific regulations in Norway: sports diving and rafting. The regulations of these two activities are thus limited and closely related to the Law on Control of Products and Consumer Services. Both activities are required to use guides or instructors who have "the necessary expertise". There are no specific requirements in terms of certification. The responsibility of assessing the guides' and instructors' qualifications rests on the service provider (Justis- og beredskapsdepartementet 2003a; Justis- og beredskapsdepartementet 2003b). Again, in Norwegian mountaineering and *friluftsliv*, it is an exercise of a form of power by the authorities that implements legislation, thus assigning significant responsibility to the service provider.

Sweden

While the British mountaineer Slingsby climbed the Norwegian mountain Store Skagastølstind in 1876, a Frenchman Charles Rabot and two local guides climbed the highest mountain in Sweden, Kebnekaise, in 1883. Two years later, in 1885, the Swedish Tourist Association (Den Svenska Turistförening (STF)) was established, inspired by the Norwegian DNT (Sehlin, 1998, pp. 35-36). The Swedish Alpine Club (Svenska Fjällklubben) was founded in 1927 (Hellström-Boström, 1997, pp. 74, 98). Many Swedish mountaineers had started their careers in the Norwegian mountains, and were probably inspired by what was going on in the neighbouring country. Sweden, like Norway, has a tradition of peoples' "right of free access to nature". The Swedish tradition of *friluftsliv* as a broad, popular movement also has many similarities to the Norwegian tradition.

After a time, the STF engaged their own mountain guides, *Fjällförare*, many of them Sami locals (Sehlin, 1986, p. 132). In 1919, they offered the first mountain guide course in Sweden. Like Norway and Switzerland, the tourist associations and alpine clubs led the efforts to strengthen mountain guiding. STF also arranged a glacier guide course in 1928, led by mountaineers from the Swedish Alpine Club. STF and The Swedish Alpine Club did not continue to offer a mountaineering guide course like this one; additionally, as it happened later on in Norway, the focus changed from educating mountain guides to educating independent mountaineers. STF and The Swedish Alpine Club arranged alpine-climbing-courses regularly from 1936. These courses were taken over by the Swedish Climbing Association (Svenska Klätterförbundet (SKF)) when it was established in 1973 (Hellström-Boström, 1997, pp. 173-178).

Compared to Norway, the formation of STF and the Swedish Alpine Club in Sweden came at a relatively late stage. However, the Swedish associations soon caught up when it came to organizing mountain guide courses. The Swedish associations were in fact ahead of the Norwegians, arranging glacier and climbing courses and educating independent mountaineers. Furthermore, the Swedish Climbing Association was established long before its Norwegian sister association, the Norwegian Climbing Association. This indicates that Sweden in many respects established a similar layman tradition as that of Norway.

The union of Swedish Mountain Guides (Svenska Bergsguideorganisationen (SBO)) was established in 1990 after a period of two years of planning and preparation with a number of meetings and assemblies with the main body of Swedes involved in layman guiding within

high-mountain skiing and mountaineering. All had been in favour of the importance and need of professional training, and establishment of an institution that would authorize mountain guides for the safety and wellbeing of future clients. However there were different opinions on how to go about it all. Nevertheless, from the very start, SBO looked to IFMGA standards in order to know how to design their mountain guide-courses. Their goal was to achieve membership within IFMGA as soon as possible. So in order to ensure that level of standard contact was taken with professional IFMGA instructors from British Mountain guides.

Later on, after intensive exchanges of opinions and arguments, most agreed that everybody involved, “old or new”, had to undergo the same professional training from the beginning, in order to ensure equal standards and professional quality and conduct. Later on, this showed to be very crucial for the professionalizing process as well as to install respect and authority for SBO as the only official organisation and system of mountain guide training in Sweden, as well as a successful application process for membership within IFMGA. SBO got their international membership of IFMGA in 1997, fifteen years after their Norwegian sister-union, NORTIND, but only seven years after it was formed.

Initially STF opposed that there was a need for a professional guide training and an organization such as SBO, and was very reluctant to contribute toward this. Nor was the Swedish Climbing Association, very supportive in the beginning. The attitude was: Who needs a guide? Thus, a clear indication of how strong the layman tradition was in Sweden. Nevertheless, the very same year as SBO was established, the Swedish Climbing Association started planning an effort of structuring and certifying their rock-climbing instructors on a non-professional club basis. In this effort the Swedish Climbing Association later on wanted to use the same IFMGA instructors from the British Mountain Guides as SBO were using. Eventually it all resulted in a very close and fruitful collaboration between the Swedish Climbing Association and SBO from 1991. Interestingly, after some negotiations and constructive dialogs, both STF and the Swedish Climbing Association became part of the board of directors within SBO.

SBO has since been encouraged by the IFMGA to also offer their training to candidates from Denmark, Finland and Iceland. These countries were considered not to have a mountaineering community of adequate size to become members of IFMGA on their own. Therefore, SBO also grant membership to guides from these countries (Arnegård, 2012).

Sweden turns to IFMGA

In Sweden, the Environmental Protection Agency (Naturvårdsverket) is responsible for coordination, information, training, and development related to mountain safety. This responsibility has been overseen by the Mountain Safety Council of Sweden (Fjällsäkerhetsrådet), consisting of 18 public and private organizations with expertise and experience in mountain safety, among them SBO. Since 2005, they have fixed an educational standard (fjälledarnormen) for mountain leaders qualified to lead trips not involving mountaineering (Fjällsäkerhetsrådet, 2017). This work has also resulted in the formation of the association of Swedish Mountain Leader Trainers (Föreningen för svenska fjälledarutbildare) who furthermore are members of the international mountain leader association UIMLA. A similar initiative from a governmental agency has not been taken in Norway, where the work of the private Norwegian Mountaineering Forum has been looked upon as sufficient. To some extent, this shows that Swedish authorities are more eager to control mountain guiding than Norwegian authorities.

Until 2008, Norway and Sweden in many ways used the same system when it came to associations, laws, and regulations related to mountaineering and mountain guiding. However, on September 6, 2001, a 25-year-old man died as a result of an accident on a glacier course arranged by STF on the Tarfala glacier near Kebnekaise in northern Sweden. The man was accidentally roped around his neck during a rescue drill (Östermann, 2001). The accident got some media attention in Sweden, and the victim's dependents tried to make a Swedish court open a lawsuit. The Swedish Consumer Authorities (Konsumentverket) started to look into the case in 2005, engaging several public and private organizations in discussions on how companies should run business when offering mountaineering services (Konsumentverket 2017; www.utsidan.se 2017). Following a 2006 hearing, the conclusion emerged in 2008: companies should make sure that the leaders of the activity were certified mountain guides with the IFMGA (Konsumentverket, 2017). This leaves SBO with a monopoly on mountain guiding on glaciers, high mountain (alpine) terrain and where there is particular risk of falls (present when the terrain is of such a character and slope angle that persons travelling on it need to use both hands and feet in order to do so, and when a fall could result in serious or fatal injuries) (Larsson & Forsman, 2008). The regulation model from the Alps was thereby imported and institutionalized in Scandinavia.

If we look into other areas of outdoor safety management in Norway and Sweden, the Swedish “turn” is not unexpected. Swedish authorities had, since the 1970s when

Scandinavian *friluftsliv* gradually became more and more institutionalized, been more willing to intervene in outdoor safety management than were Norwegian authorities, despite their layman tradition. As an example, this difference materialized in different ways of marking mountain trails. In Sweden, long metal poles with a red X on top were drilled into the ground. In Norway, simple cairns of rocks marked with a painted red T were built. In the 1960s and 70s, the Swedish strategy of improving safety for mountain skiers was to hand out a safety package, including radio communications equipment, whereas in Norway private associations organized campaigns to promote “common-sense rules” for travelling in the mountains (Høgfjellskolen Norsk Alpincenter, 1980, p. 8). This Norwegian approach can be seen as a striking continuation of the earlier layman tradition that expects individuals to be competent and responsible for themselves in the outdoors. The Swedish approach can be understood as a violation of their layman tradition. Alternatively, the explanation may be that the layman tradition, after all, never had achieved the same status in Sweden as in Norway. If we compare Norwegian and Swedish mountaineering from a power perspective, we see that both countries regulate business through legislation, but that Sweden has chosen a more detailed regulation compared to Norway. In Norway, we see a continuation of the layman tradition, unlike in Sweden where that tradition to some extent has been weakened in favour of the Alp-model.

Concluding remarks

In the Alps, Switzerland and Chamonix represented two different systems in the nineteenth century. As we have seen, the guides in Chamonix largely organized themselves through a guide union, backed up by local government, and established hegemony. In Switzerland, the Alpine Club in cooperation with cantonal authorities were in control. However, through the emergence of national and international guide unions, the organized guides themselves took control over the regulation of their profession, especially by defining education standards, and advancing these to the national government. The regulation of mountain guiding in the Alps today appears unified, with a close connection between national regulation and mountain guide unions represented in the IFMGA and UIMLA. These organizations work as an effective circuit for circulation of practices, making mountain guiding a highly transnational practice. In the Alps, the power is divided between the authorities and a very few organizations. These organizations are very much in a monopoly situation where they have a lot of power and influence.

Local authorities in Norway got involved in regulating mountain guiding at an early stage, then withdrew and left guide regulation to the Norwegian Tourist Association. We have shown how DNT from circulations of ideas and practices, through a circuit of sister organizations in the Alps, designed a system mainly based on the original Swiss model, in which tourist associations were central to organizing mountain guiding, thereby contributing to forming mountaineering and mountain guiding a transnational practice already in the second half of the 1800s. As this system faded away, a layman tradition got a strong foothold in Norway, and associations rooted in that tradition became an influential power in Norwegian mountaineering. Probably, the idea of a Norwegian *friluftsliv* and layman tradition worked as a symbolic and discursive power that, by referring to tradition, was used to achieve hegemony. In addition, we have revealed how the mountain guide union has worked tirelessly towards an introduction of the modern Alp model in Norway for decades without success. In Norway, as in the Alps, power is divided between the authorities and organizations. However, the Norwegian authorities only provide basic guidelines in their legislation. The Norwegian organizations are multiple and are assigned significant responsibility as service providers. This leaves mountain guiding in Norway as a distinctly less regulated field than in France and Switzerland, despite the high level of governmental regulation we can observe in other areas of Norwegian society.

Norway and Sweden have quite similar histories of mountain guide organizing and regulating up until 2008. As in Norway, a relatively strong layman tradition emerged during the 1960s and 70s in Sweden. Until 2008, the contours of a Scandinavian model with less governmental regulation and more private initiative prevailed, compared to France and Switzerland. Later on, legal decisions led Sweden to change its system, while Norway retained the layman tradition. Sweden imported the regulatory model known in the Alps and gave SBO, as an IFMGA member, a monopoly situation similar to IFMGA and UIMLA in France and Switzerland.

References

- Aarhus, R. (2012). *Friluftsliv, kompetanse og verdier - eit interesseperspektiv på debatten "profesjonskamp til fjells"*. Mastergradsavhandling i kroppsøving, idrett og friluftsliv. Bø: Høgskolen i Telemark.
- Arbeids- og sosialdepartementet. (2013). Forskrift om systematisk helse-, miljø- og sikkerhetsarbeid i virksomheter.
- Arnegård, J. (2012). SBO History.
- Arnegård, J. (n.d.). SBO history.
- ASAM. (2017). *Brevet fédéral*. Retrieved June 30, 2017, from <http://www.randonnee.ch/fr/Formation/Brevet-federal/>
- Bjørne-Larsen, S. (2000). Breførerne viser veien. In P. R. Lauritzen, *På tur i Breheimen. DNT årbok*. (pp. 74-78, 86-89). Oslo: DNT.
- Colonel, M. (2009). *The Compagnie des Guides de Chamonix, a History*. Chamonix: Mario Colonel Editions.
- Cousquer, G., & Beams, S. (2013). Professionalism in mountain tourism and the claim to professional status of the International Mountain Leader. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, pp. 185-215.
- Dahl, L. (2009). *Makt og avmakt. Et blick på Norsk Fjellsportsforums historie og interessedspill*. Masteroppgave i kroppsøving, idrett og friluftsliv. Bø: Høgskolen i Telemark.
- Direktoratet for samfunnssikkerhet og beredskap. (2007). *Temaveiledning i risikoanalyse*. Tønsberg: Direktoratet for samfunnssikkerhet og beredskap.
- Drevo, B. K. (2014). *Friluftsliv i Norge anno 2014 - Status og utfordringer*. Lillehammer: Norwegian Institute of Nature Research.
- Eikje, C. (2015). *De første fjellførerne. Fremveksten av førervesenet i Norge 1820-1940, med sideblikk til Alpene*. Bergen: University of Bergen.
- Einang, O. (2007). Nils, IVBV og NORTIND. In A. M. Sookermany, & J. W. Eriksen, *Veglederen. Et festskrift til Nils Faarlund* (pp. 80-89). Oslo: Aschehoug.

- Engen, A. (2000). De tidlige fjellturismen i Sjudalen. In A. Engen, P. R. Lauritzen, & M. Øvsteng, *Sjudalen, frå fangst til fritid*. Bokprosjekt Sjudalen 2000.
- ENSA. (2017). *L'ENSA en quelques dates*. Retrieved Januar 27, 2017, from http://www.ensa.sports.gouv.fr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=501:l-ensa-en-quelques-dates&catid=91&Itemid=92&showall=&limitstart=
- europa.eu. (2017). *European Professional Card - EPC*. Retrieved 08 18, 2017, from http://europa.eu/youreurope/citizens/work/professional-qualifications/european-professional-card/index_en.htm
- Fjällsäkerhetsrådet. (2017). *Fjällsäkerhetsrådets grundläggande norm för utbildning och examination till fjälledare*. Retrieved 08 18, 2017, from <http://www.fjallsakerhetsradet.se/fjallsakerhetsradet/fjalledarnormen/>
- Fleming, F. (2000). *Killing Dragons. The Conquest of the Alps*. London: Granta Books: Granta Books.
- Foucault, M. (2006). *Tingenes orden*. Oslo: Spartacus.
- Grimeland, G. (2004). *En historie om klatring i Norge 1900-2000*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Hagen, N. U. (1992). *Fra Slingsby til bregruppen*. Oslo: Den Norske Turistforening.
- Hansen, P. H. (2013). *The Summits of Modern Man*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.
- Hellström-Boström, E. (1997). *Svensk klättring Pionjärerna*. Sollentuna: Alpina Förlaget.
- Horgen, A. (1999). *Ferdselen på Jostedalsbreen 1740 - 1940*. Bø: Høgskolen i Telemark.
- Hungerbühler, A. (2013). *"KÖNIGE DER ALPEN" Zur Kultur des Bergführerberufs*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Høgfjellskolen Norsk Alpincenter. (1971). Nytt fra fjellet. *Mestre fjellet, nr 1*, 36-39.
- Høgfjellskolen Norsk Alpincenter. (1972). Nytt fra fjellet. *Mestre fjellet, nr 1-2*, 29-30.
- Høgfjellskolen Norsk Alpincenter. (1974). Nytt fra fjellivet. *Mestre fjellet, nr 18*, 36-39.
- Høgfjellskolen Norsk Alpincenter. (1980). Sikkerhet i fjellet. 10 års jubileumsseminar ved Norges Høgfjellskole 1978 . *Mestre fjellet nr. 29*, 5-11.

- IFMGA. (2017). *How to become a member of UIAGM*. Retrieved Januar 25, 2017, from <http://www.ivbv.info/en/members/become-a-member.html>
- IFMGA. (2017). *Who is IFMGA?* Retrieved 08 10, 2017, from <http://www.ivbv.info/en/ifmga/about-us.html>
- Justis- og beredskapsdepartementet. (2003a, November 6). *Lovdata.no*. Retrieved Februar 7, 2017, from Forskrift om sikkerhet ved rafting: <https://lovdata.no/dokument/SF/forskrift/1994-09-19-994?q=Forskrift+om+sikkerhet+ved+rafting>
- Justis- og beredskapsdepartementet. (2003b, November 6). *Forskrift om tryggleiken ved sportsdykking*. Retrieved Februar 7, 2017, from Lovdata.no: <https://lovdata.no/dokument/SF/forskrift/1994-11-10-1134>
- Kalt, X. (1992). *ivbv.info*. Retrieved 3 31, 2017, from Some historical dates about the IFMGA: http://www.ivbv.info/fileadmin/user_upload/Menupunkt_IVBV/Geschichte/13_Geschichte_IVBV_e.pdf
- Kirchner, W. (1950). Mind, Mountain, and History. *Journal of the History of Ideas. Vol. 11. No. 4. University of Pennsylvania Press*.
- Klima- og miljødepartementet. (2009). Lov om kontroll med produkter og forbrukertjenester.
- Konsumentverket. (2017, Januar 20). *Konsumentverket.se*. Retrieved from Konsumentverkets allmänna råd om glaciärsäkerhet: <http://publikationer.konsumentverket.se/sv/produkter-och-tjanster/resor-och-turism/kovfs-2008-5-konsumentverkets-allmanna-rad-om-glaciarsakerhet.html>
- Larsson, G., & Forsman, U. (2008). *The Swedish Consumer Agency's general guidelines concerning glacier safety*. Stockholm: The Swedish Consumer Agency.
- Lukes, S. (1974). *Power. A Radical View*. London: British Sociological Association.
- Melve, L. (2009). Komparativ historie: ei utfordring for historiefaget? *Historisk tidsskrift*, pp. 61-80.
- Modica, G. (2016). *1865: The Golden Age of Mountaineering*. Chamonix: Guérin, éditions Paulsen.

- Norsk Alpincenter. (1968). Tumult eller trivsel i norske fjell - aktuelle problemer i norsk fjellliv. *Mester fjellet*, 19.
- Norsk Alpincenter. (1969). Nytt fra fjellet. *Mestre fjellet*, nr 3-4, 28-31.
- Norsk forening for Fjellfører og Klatreinstruktører. (1969). NFFKs krav til fjellfører og klatreinstruktører. *Mestre fjellet*, nr 2, 17-18.
- Norsk Forening for Fjellførere og Klatreinstruktører. (1968). Norsk Forening for Fjellførere og Klatreinstruktører - NFFK og striden mellom tro og viten. *Mestre fjellet*, nr. 2, 5-6.
- Sandell, K., & Sörlin, S. (. (2000). *Friluftshistoria. Från "Härdande friluftslif" till ekoturism och miljöpedagogik*. Stockholm: Carlsson Bokförlaget.
- Saunier, P.-Y. (2013). *Transnational History*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schweizer Bergführerverband. (2014). *Introduction to Swiss legislation on high-risk activities. Fact sheet for colleagues from abroad*. Retrieved Januar 25, 2017, from http://www.4000plus.ch/fileadmin/user_upload/Gesetz/SBV_Merkblatt_e.pdf
- Sehlin, H. (1986). *Svenska Turistföreningen 100år*. Stockholm: Svenska Turistföreningen.
- Sehlin, H. (1998). *Känn ditt land. STF:s roll i den svenska turismens historia*. Stockholm: Svenska Turistföreningen.
- SNGM. (2017). *Historique*. Retrieved Januar 27, 2017, from <http://www.sngm.com/index.php/qui-sommes-nous/historique>
- SNGM. (2017). *Rôle du SNGM*. Retrieved Januar 26, 2015, from <http://www.sngm.com/index.php/qui-sommes-nous/role-du-sngm>
- Svenska bergsguideorganisationen. (2017). *Bergsguideyrket*. Retrieved Januar 25, 2017, from <https://www.sbo.nu/cm/sidor/bergsguideyrket/>
- Svenska bergsguideorganisationen. (2017). *Om Svenska bergsguideorganisationen*. Retrieved Januar 25, 2017, from <https://www.sbo.nu/cm/sidor/om-sbo/>
- Tordsson, B. (2003). *Å svare på naturens åpne tiltale. En undersøkelse av meningsdimensjoner i norsk friluftsliv på 1900-tallet og en drøftelse av friluftsliv som sosiokulturelt fenomen*. Oslo: Norges Idrettshøgskole, Institutt for samfunnsfag.

UIMLA. (2017). *A brief history*. Retrieved juni 15, 2017, from
<http://www.uimla.org/cms/index.php?id=43>

Unsworth, W. (1992). *Encyclopedia of Mountaineering*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

www.utsidan.se. (2017, Januar 20). *Utsidan.se*. Retrieved from Konsumentverket:
http://www.utsidan.se/listresult.htm?_words=konsumentverket&skip1=0

Östermann, H. (2001, September 7). *Aftonbladet.se*. Retrieved from 25-åring dog efter fall i
gläncierspricka. : <http://www.aftonbladet.se/nyheter/article10230501.ab>