HERITAGE AND DIVERSITY

- An analysis of responses by Norwegian heritage management to challenges of place identity and globalization

Kaja Hannedatter Sontum

Master's thesis in Archaeology

Spring 2015

Acknowledgements

Contents

List of abbreviations

AHD	The authorized heritage discourse
CDA	Critical discourse analysis
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
CoE	The Council of Europe
UNIDROIT	The International Institute for the Unification of Private Law
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites
ILO	International Labour Organization
NTNU	Norwegian University of Science and Technology
NIKU	Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research

List of tables

1.0. Introduction

The overall aim of this Master's thesis is to address questions of how understandings of concepts such as identity and heritage are affected in a world of modern globalization. As a process, globalization has a long history. In this dissertation the meaning is limited to the contemporary accelerated globalization, "the intense and instantaneous time-space compression created by the movement of objects, meanings and people across regions and intercontinental space" (Held et al. 1999:16; see also Isar et al. 2011:1). The focus will be on the movement of people, demographic changes within the nation-state and the challenges that emerge in the interplay between cultural heritage, place identity and globalization. The responses of the Norwegian public heritage management to these challenges, as they are manifested in seven selected texts, will be examined in a discourse analysis.

In Norway, archaeology is strongly connected to the idea of the nation-state, a trait shared with many European countries. Thereby, historically as well as in practice, law and conventions, archaeological heritage is in various ways included in the idea of a national cultural heritage and in the construction of a national identity. When Norway emerged as an independent state in 1905, after centuries of union with Denmark and Sweden, archaeology was instrumental in creating a national history (Prescott 2013:59-60). Even in our time of modern globalization, place identity continues to be important. It provides security – a feeling of belonging. When meeting a new person, one of the first things we ask is often "where are you from"? We do this to find a reference point for whom that person is. The enduring importance of place identity arguably continues to privilege the national at the expense of other scales (Ashworth et al. 2007:56-57; Prescott 2013: 64). However, the national level of place identity is increasingly being challenged by other concepts of belonging connected to local and regional perceptions of heritage, the claims of minority groups and indigenous people and the idea of universal values, expressed through concepts such as Europeanness and World Heritage (Ashworth et al. 2007:54-55).

The people of Norway is no longer a homogenous group, if it ever was. Although immigrants always have constituted a part of the population, the scale of the immigration over the last 35-40 years has been far greater, and with a different composition than earlier times (MD 2005:63). Today, an increasing number of the population consists of a diverse group of immigrants, and so-called second and third generations of immigrants, with a background that connects them neither with nation-building, nor indigenous rights and claims. For heritage management, this means that for up to a generation ago the sector related to a population with

largely shared perceptions about their historical roots and identity, while today there exist a heterogeneous population outside the dominant ethnic and national history (Prescott 2013: 60-61).

The more culturally diverse a society becomes, the more insight and dedication is required of the heritage management to act in an inclusive rather than an exclusive manner (Högberg 2013:56-57). The nation-state remains the dominant political unit and reference point of origin, and a main purpose of the heritage sector continuous to be to help generate a perception of 'identity' (Prescott 2013:60). However, this perceived connection between place identity and heritage increasingly distinguishes between different population groups within the nation. How does the heritage sector deal with this paradox? This question is related to the question of how a government can establish and maintain a minimum of shared values and a sense of unity in a population, that can legitimize both the existence and organization of the state, when many aspects of national identity and national heritage are no longer relevant for all members of society (Holtorf 2009: 674-676). The issue also relates to archaeology's basic legitimacy, which has previously been questioned by several scholars. How do we engage in research of the past without the reference frame of the 'identity paradigm' (Solli 1996:86-89; Østigård 2001:14)? Would heritage management still have public support if it were to be completely freed from appealing to national identity (Prescott 2013:62)? Are there more relevant stories to tell in today's globalized world (Holtorf 2009:679; Prescott 2013:64; Rosenberg 2006:19-20)?

1.1. Departure point

A point of departure for the following analysis is the recognition of identity as something continuously produced, reproduced, challenged and changed through various processes, including geographical mobility (Ashworth et al. 2007:5; Hoven et al. 2005:155). It is largely developed through the process of 'othering', which means that identity is not positively defined in terms of what it consist of, but negatively in terms of what it is not (Hoven et al. 2005:155). Constructed 'collectivities' such as the nation need to be located at constructed places. Thus specific place identities are created to legitimize a groups' belonging to a defined physical space (Ashworth et al. 2007:54-58). Place and time are related through the medium of heritage, as heritage is a key factor in creating representations of place as a core attribute of identity (Ashworth and Graham 2005a:3). Heritage is used as 'proof' of past, tradition and belonging, and therefore proof also of rights to place, representation and a political voice (Isar et al. 2011:9). When a place identity is created, the place, which is attributed, becomes partly

enclosed; other place identities are subsequently excluded. Thus, establishing a place identity is partly a process of exclusion, of shutting out (Huingen and Meijering 2005:21). As Ashworth and Graham (2005a:3) puts is: "In defining the discourses of inclusion and exclusion that constitute identity, people call upon an affinity with places or, at least, with representations of place, which, in turn, are used to legitimate their claim to those places".

1.2. Research question and aim

The research question of this dissertation is: *To what extent does heritage management in Norway respond to the current situation of increasing cultural diversity, and in what ways are such responses reflected in status and planning documents in the public sector?* The following analysis will address the discourse of the public heritage management of Norway as it is established in a selection of plans of action and reports. The aim is to address a broad selection of statements, to examine how the heritage management respond to the forces of globalization, how these responses are expressed through language, and what consequences this entails in terms of how people view themselves and others in a culturally diverse society. In other words, the object is to examine how the forces of globalization are inflecting the discourse of the Norwegian heritage management, when people from elsewhere come to reside inside the nation. The analysis will be conducted on the basis of three specific concepts: *culture*, *identity* and *diversity*. How are the terms defined? What characterises the relationship between them, and between them and the other signs and articulations of the discourse? What kind of social consequences does this entail?

1.3. Delimitations and the role of theory

The focus of this thesis is overarching policy documents and reports published by the public bodies that deal with heritage management in Norway. The heritage management as public sector authority is connected with Norway's political organs at all levels (cf. section 2.2), and the selected documents affect all heritage institutions, voluntary organizations and private owners of cultural heritage. They draw up the political goals and general guidelines, the strategies, aims and agenda of the management. As the aim of the analysis is to understand the current situation and future plans, I have chosen to focus less on identifying trends over time and more on values and definitions presented in recent documents. Consequently, the selected texts are all published after the year 2000. As the demographic changes are greatest in urban

areas, particularity in Oslo and the central eastern region of Norway (Statistics Norway 2015), a criterion for the selection of texts has also been that they directly or indirectly deal with these geographic areas.

The fact that I wanted to look at the institutional public heritage management and the official heritage policies, lead to the specific choice of using some key elements of *critical discourse analysis* (CDA). The use of a 'political language', which seems objective and factual, motivates to look at the presented 'truths' from a critical standpoint. This type of analysis emphasizes power and the unmasking of power structures. A point of departure is the recognition of our realities and ideas as socially constructed, and expressed through our use of language: The way we express ourselves verbally through writing and speaking plays an active role in the production, reproduction and changing of our identities, our relationships and our perception of the world (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:9). Thus "…the ways by which we create, discuss, talk about and assess heritage issues do matter" (Waterton et al. 2006:342): When depicting reality in one way rather than another, boundaries between what is perceives as true and false are created. Some forms of actions become natural, while others become unthinkable (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:150-151). It follows that the written expressions of the heritage management have specific social consequences. Archaeology and the heritage management is in a position of power: Through selection and de-selection of the stories that are relevant in the present, how they are communicated and expressed, how the selected and deselected are managed and organized, certain notions of culture, identity and heritage are supported (Högberg 2013:8-9; Eikrem 2005:22-23; Isar et al. 2011:19).

CDA have been used by scholars such as Emma Waterton (e.g. Waterton et al. 2006; Waterton 2010) and Laurajane Smith (e.g. Waterton et al. 2006; Smith 2006; Smith 2012) as a tool to examine the ways in which institutional discourses steer our perceptions of heritage. Smith (2006:4) has linked what she calls the *authorized heritage discourse* (AHD), the dominant western discourse on heritage, to structures of power and the reproduction of socially constructed 'truths' and knowledge that can support specific interests and ideologies, like a national agenda (cf. section 3.2). CDA have been criticised for being accompanied by certain preconceived interpretations about texts, the social situations in which they are located and the power structures in play that may not actually reflect the complex realities on the ground (e.g. Widdowson 2005:103, 1995:169; Blommaert 2001:15). Marie Louise Stig Sørensen (2009:176) underpins the importance of the researcher being led by material, not theoretical or methodological presumptions. Consequently, the following analysis will draw

on elements of the discourse theory of Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (2001) and the methodology of Jonathan Potter and Margaret Wetherell's (1987) conversation analysis.

According to Laclau and Mouffe (2001:112) a discourse is established when meaning is crystallised around what they call *nodal points*; privileged signifiers that fix the meaning of a signifying chain. Potter and Wetherell (1987:167) present coding as one of ten steps in the analysis of discourse. Coding is applied as a means to extract the relevant parts of a specific selection of texts. These coding's are provisional and always qualitative, no discourse analyst would code their material for the sake of counting them up in a quantitative analysis. The categories used in the process of coding are fundamentally related to the research question of interest. In this case, the categories are the three nodal points *identity*, *diversity* and *culture*. Further, I will make use of several terms that relate to these three signifiers (cf. section 5.5). The objective is to let the material lead the way in an exploration of the complex tensions, issues and questions that arise in the interplay between heritage, place identity and modern globalization.

1.4. Thesis structure

In the first chapter the research question, aim and focus of this dissertation have been presented. Some of the basis and framework for the following analysis have also been introduced. The next chapter will give a brief outline of the Norwegian Cultural Heritage Act (1978) and the main actors in today's heritage management. The uses of heritage in Norway as a 'plural society' will be addressed. As to illustrate how this thesis is part of a greater discourse, and establish a basis for analysis and discussion, a selection of previous research on heritage, place identity and cultural diversity will be presented in chapter 3. Chapter 4 gives an account of the theoretical framework of the analysis. In order to enable analysis of the selected texts, my methodological approach and course of action is presented in chapter 5. This chapter will also give an overview of the texts, the basis on which they are selected and the analytical questions that will be used as a shared foundation for comparison. In chapter 6 the texts are presented and specific themes identified through a coding. These themes will object for a second level of analysis and discussion in chapter 7, based on the analytical questions presented in chapter 5 (cf. section 5.4). Some aspects of the findings will be discussed further in chapter 8, where I will draw on previous research to elucidate the results of the two levels of analysis.

2.0. Heritage management in Norway

The history of today's heritage management extends back to the middle of the 19th century, and is connected to the rebuilding of the nation after 1814, when Norway became independent of Denmark and entered into union with Sweden. In 1905 Norway became a self-governing state and adopted its first cultural heritage act. Since then there has been major changes in both organization and legislation. The path to today's management system has been long and winding and the result has in many ways been a self-grown management. Thus, it has become considerably more complicated and less straightforward than the rest of the environmental management (Gaukstad 2005:130).

2.1. Laws and regulations

On the 9th of June 1978 the *Cultural Heritage Act* that still functions today was enacted, a result of the merging of *Fornminneloven* from 1951 and *Bygningsfredningsloven* from 1920. The fundamental distinction between automatically protected heritage and heritage that may be protected according to special resolutions is a central feature that shows how today's law is a product of these two previous acts (Bjerck 2005:33). The purpose statement of the Cultural Heritage Act (1978:Chapter I, §1) asserts how the objective of the law is to protect *kulturminner* [cultural memories] and *kulturmiljøer* [cultural environments] "in all their variety and detail, both as part of our cultural heritage and identity, and as an element in the overall environment and resource management". It is a national responsibility to safeguard these resources "as scientific source material and as an enduring basis for the experience of present and future generations and for their self-awareness, enjoyment and activities".

The Norwegian term *kulturminne* makes for some difficulty of translation, as the term has no equivalent in the English language. The term is here translated verbatim as *cultural memory*. However, the concept of cultural memory should not be seen as directly corresponding to the Norwegian *kulturminne*. Within the archaeological discipline, cultural (or social) memory have been understood as intangible aspects of information transmitted between generations in the form of learned cultural knowledge, the preservation of this knowledge in artefacts, and the construction of a past to serve the interests and needs of the present, often based on the re-interpretation of monuments or landscapes (e.g. Porr 2010:88; Van Dyke and Alcock 2003:3). Within the discourse of Norwegian heritage management *kulturminne* is used as the material remains of the remote and recent past (for definition, see RA 2015). The term is in the Cultural Heritage Act (1978: Chapter I, §2) defined as "all traces

of human activity in our physical environment, including places associated with historical events, beliefs and traditions". In the official English version "kulturminner" is replaced with "archaeological and historical monuments and sites".

The provisions on automatically protected heritage are embodied in § 4 of the second chapter of the Cultural Heritage Act. Automatically protected heritage is here defined as cultural memories from before 1537, Sami cultural memories older than 100 years, standing structures from the period 1537-1649 and cultural memories on Svalbard predating 1945 (Cultural Heritage Act 1978:Chapter II, § 4). Even though the law gives opportunity to list heritage that is not automatically protected as protected, this option is used in limited extend. A considerable part of the material heritage is thus not included, and is in need of other kinds of protection, for example through regulations by means of the *Planning and Building Act* (Holme 2005a:12-13). The main goal of this act is to coordinate the actions of the government, the county councils and the municipalities and to provide a basis for decision-making in questions of use and protection of resources (Planning and Building Act 2008: Chapter I, § 1-1).

In addition to its national laws and regulations, Norway has ratified several international conventions that concern cultural heritage and cultural landscapes (for extensive list, see Appendix 1). As this falls outside the scope of this thesis, the details of these conventions will not be elaborated. However, a relevant point to make is how new perceptions are challenging the idea of a national heritage: with concepts such as Europeanness and World Heritage, institutions like UNESCO, CoE and UNIDROIT offer alternative understandings of belonging and identity.

2.2. The main actors of today's heritage sector

Today's heritage management is a political priority and part of a sectorial environmental management. As public authority the management is connected with Norway's political organs at all levels. The Ministry of Climate and Environment function as the government's political secretariat within the field. The Directorate for Cultural Heritage is connected with the Ministry and the government as professional secretariat, advisory organ and directorate for the executive practice within the state borders (Gaukstad and Holme 2005:138-140). The research obligations of the directorate were separated as NIKU in 1994 (Gaukstad 2005:134). The county councils act as independent political organs that safeguard some state functions regionally. They manage automatically protected heritage in their region and have authority to

grant dispensations in regards to listed heritage protected through special resolutions. The Sami Parliament of Norway deals with all Sami heritage within the state borders (Gaukstad and Holme 2005:140-143).

The Museum of Cultural History in Oslo, the University museum of Bergen, NTNU University Museum in Trondheim, Tromsø University Museum and the Museum of Archaeology in Stavanger are regional state museums, which manage and maintain the automatically protected heritage in their geographical area. They carry out archaeological excavations when dispensations for this have been given, and register and secure finds. They are also central to the educational and research activities of the universities. The maritime archaeological museums seek out, excavates, register and preserve automatically protected heritage under water (Gaukstad and Holme 2005:143-144).

Officially, the municipalities have no authority or formal responsibility according to The Cultural Heritage Act (1978). The exception is Oslo municipality, which is both a county council and a primary municipality. Here the authority by internal delegation is given to the Cultural Heritage Management Office. However, the municipalities are central partners for the other institutions of the management. They also have environmental obligations and authority when drawing up their plans of action. The Planning and Building Act (2008) is the most important tool in this respect (Gaukstad and Holme 2005:144-145; Holme and Guribye 2005:230). In addition to public management, the private owners of heritage take on administrative responsibility. They do day-to-day maintenance of listed buildings and cultural landscapes, and manage automatically protected heritage. Also, the voluntary organizations do important work, and in many instances take responsibility where the public management fails to do so (Holme 2005b:11).

2.3. Uses of heritage in Norway

In Norway the concept of linking heritage to identity, generating myths of origin and stories of the independent development of the country, people and culture, has been a successful conduct for the nation-state and for the heritage management (Prescott 2013:61). But the people of Norway are no longer a homogeneous group, if it ever was. On January 1st 2015, 13 per cent of the population consisted of immigrants. This in addition to the so-called second and third generation of immigrants, a somewhat debated classification, and here defined as the children and children's children of immigrants. Norwegian-born with two immigrant parents accounts for 2,6 per cent of the population. Immigrants live in all Norwegian

municipalities, but the majority resides in Oslo, both in relative terms and absolute figures. Immigrants and Norwegian-born with two immigrant parents constitute 32 per cent of the capital's entire population (Statistics Norway 2015). How are the uses of heritage affected by these demographic changes?

Gregory Ashworth, Brian Graham and John Tunbridge (2007:8) use the term *plural society*, by which they mean that most societies are marked by cultural diversity. They present a typology of different forms of social and political reactions to diversity, and how heritage is used within these policies (Ashworth et al. 2007: 71-87). These models presuppose an understanding of culture as something with defined boundaries, belonging to a specific group of people. Of course the typology is highly simplified and none of the models represent the complexity of the real social world. Also, variations of more than one model can co-exist in the same time and place, and they are subject to a process of almost continuous change (Ashworth et al. 2007:86). Still, the perspective may provide a way of recognizing the different uses of heritage in Norway, and serve as a backdrop for the following analysis.

Surely, the nation-state of Norway and the use of heritage within its borders have gone through different phases where we can find characteristics from more than one model in each phase. In present day Norway, one may recognise several aspects of what Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge (2007:79) calls the core + models. The existence of a consensual core identity is central to these societies. In addition there are added a number of distinctive minority groups. The minorities accept the core culture and its values as having primacy due to numerical, historical or political dominance. Norway has a core national identity, to which other cultural identities of different types and origins are added: The Sami, the national minorities, and other minority groups with immigrant backgrounds. The national minorities of Norway are the Scandinavian Romani, people of Finnish descent in Northern Norway called Kvens or Norwegian Finns, Roma, Jews and a small Finnish community called the Forest Finns. The ratified bi-national and international treaties, which impose obligations upon Norway with regard to cultural and ethnic minorities within their borders, are usually concerned with the national minorities and indigenous people like the Sami (Ashworth et al. 2007:141-142; for conventions, see Appendix 1).

Heritage has multiple roles in Norway as a core + society. It is used as a medium for constructing and maintaining the leading culture and as an instrument for preserving of the integrity of the core. It is used to promote the values and norms of the core, and to prevent fragmentation of society. But it is also adapted to hold a core enhancement role by promoting the heritage of the minorities to the core population. Heritage is used in the pursuit of social

cohesion by encouraging mutual knowledge or participation between the core and the add-ons (Ashworth et al. 2007:81-82).

Ien Ang (2011:87) notes how the admission of the irreducibility of cultural difference and diversity within nation-states has led to the adoption of more self-consciously pluralist understandings of the past: "An undertaking to broaden the scope of national history to make space for the role of migrants and other minority groups". The attention paid to the heritage of migrants and ethnic minorities, is a form of heritage pluralisation that can be seen as driven by politics of inclusion, designed to insert notions of difference and diversity into the cultural self-perception of the nation-state. Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge (2007:162) argue that encouraging inclusion may lead towards assimilation: The minority cultures may lose their internal coherence, and pass through a transitory phase in a process of cultural and practical integration. A partial adoption by the core is unlikely to leave either core or add-on unchanged. Also, the cultural additions may increase to include new groups, and the interactions and connections between the additions and the core is likely to change over time.

Torgrim Sneve Guttormsen (2013a:82) argues that the Norwegian memory tradition can be seen in the light of a two-sided debate. On the one hand it is critical towards a national self-glorifying identity project. However, on the other hand, it seeks a renewed national program that takes into account the reality of globalization and advocates values of diversity and inclusion. He defines the latter as a new kind of nationalism. Further, he remarks, globalization and commercialization may lead to cultivation of local characteristics and history as something distinctive. This has, according to Guttormsen (2013a:80), led to a late modern regional romanticism. On a general basis, he states that increasing patriotism may appear when a society, in certain periods more than others, is characterized by social stress and cultural struggles to create frameworks and support for its existence (Guttormsen 2013a:64).

2.4. The threat of 'the other'

Questions of cultural diversity and how the forces of globalization are setting its mark on society is part of on-going media debates. In Norway people of the general public, but also politicians and other public figures, are outspokenly concerned about national unity and local cohesion within cultural heterogeneous areas. Discussions abound with expressions like "Norwegian cultural heritage" and "national heritage", but it is apparently hard to grasp what "Norwegian culture" really is. The leader of The Progress Party (Fremskrittspartiet), Siv

Jensen, was asked this very question before parliamentary elections in 2013. When she finally replied, her response was: "Norwegian culture is defined by our long-time background and history that might accentuate Norway and Norwegians more than one will find similar characteristics in other countries" (Siv Jensen, quoted in Sandvik and Myklebust 2013, translation by author).

In 2013 The Progress Party appointed a committee to develop the party's immigration and integration policy in context of the upcoming parliamentary elections. It was called *Bærekraftutvalget*, directly translated as *The Sustainability Committee*, because they supposedly where to argue for a "cultural sustainable immigration": "Norway has the right to maintain its cultural uniqueness. Multiculturalism does not mean that Norway should abandon their inherited traditions to adapt to immigrant values and traditions" (Fremskrittspartiets Bærekraftutvalg 2013:4, translation by author). In their report the term integration is used numerous times and a positive relationship between a functional integration and a cultural integration is assumed. One of the reasons why Norway has failed to achieve an effective integration policy is, according to the committee, "undoubtedly related to record high immigration numbers and the immigration of individuals with cultural backgrounds that greatly differs from the Norwegian" (Fremskrittspartiets Bærekraftutvalg 2013:28, translation by author).

These are singular statements from one political party. However, more than a few people shared the concerns and The Progress Party got 16,3 per cent of the votes in the parliamentary election in 2013, giving them 29 parliamentary mandates (KRD 2013a). Minorities' right to maintain their culture and their values is in media debates countered by the fear of the fragmentation of society. In many of these debates Norwegian cultural heritage is presented as something that needs protection, not from development projects, climate change, looting or vandalism, but from dilution in context of modern globalization and migration. The importance of keeping the essence of 'Norwegianness' unchanged and protected is emphasized (e.g. Andersen and Gjedde 2010). On the other hand, we find a more constructionist standpoint, where Norwegian culture is perceived as a constructed and continually changing idea (e.g. Tybring-Gjedde and Tajik 2013; Bjørkøy 2013). Thus, integration is perceived as a two way street, a movement in which all parties give and take in a process of change (Högberg 2013:46). From this, it would seem clear that how the heritage management define and talk about concepts such as identity, diversity and culture have social consequences.

3.0. Research status

Before addressing the theoretical framework and methodological approaches of this dissertation, a brief outline of previous research is in place. Heritage and identity have been abundantly discussed from the perspective of different disciplines. It is not my intention to give a complete picture of the existing debates; the bibliography alone would be interminable. I have limited the scope of this chapter to give some basis for the following analysis and discussion of the selected texts. Consequently, the research presented focus specifically on the challenges emerging in context of increasing cultural diversity within the nation-state.

3.1. National place identity and increasing diversity

Numerous researchers have discussed the relationship between representations of the past and the establishment and maintenance of a national identity (e.g. Eikrem 2005:21; Østigård 2001; Ashworth et al. 2007:54-58; Graham et al. 2000:183; Smith 2006:48-49; Anderson 1991:204-206; Díaz-Andreu and Champion 1996; Ang 2011:83; Huigen and Meijering 2005:22). Much of the success and strength of the national place identity lies in the feeling of belonging and common history (Ashworth et al. 2007:6): The imagined community of the nation is conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship (Anderson 1991:6-7). The ideology generally presumes the relationship between identity and heritage to be one of equivalence. National identity and national heritage should ideally mirror one another. In this regard, a nation is a territorially bounded entity, comprising one people, one culture and one history (Ang 2011:82). Paradoxically, when nation-states rhetorically invoke notions of heritage, they lay claim to 'patrimony' that was very often created before they themselves came into being and by members of societies that no longer exist. "What is more, this patrimony is valorized because it is taken to be universal, 'the sacred heritage of humanity'. But instead of becoming a true global public good, it becomes the 'cultural property' of a national (or sub-national) unit" (Isar et al. 2011:3).

Conflicts and war, climate change and economic opportunity have led to demographic changes in the nation-states of the western world. Within the context of modern globalization questions are arising about what kind of impact the new cultural diversity have on the idea of national unity and identity, and about the effects of globalization on the discourses and practices of heritage (see e.g. Comer 2013:69; Holtorf 2009:676; Isar et al. 2011; Ashworth et al. 2007): "As people from elsewhere come to reside inside the nation and retain connection with other parts of the world, what constitutes as the national culture – and who has the right

to define it – becomes unsettled and contestable" (Ang 2011:82). The increasing diversity and fragmentation of society and the search for policies to respond to this diversity, simultaneously, and perhaps contradictory, as we want to foster uniformity, gives the cultural heritage new types of tasks and responsibilities that are not always easily reconciled with each other (Ashworth et al. 2007:1). New approaches to prehistory, new narratives and new, shared global experiences have been put forward as means to create feelings of belonging (see e.g. Holtorf 2009: 679; Prescott 2013: 64; Rosenberg 2006:19-20). Christopher Prescott (2013:61-62) suggests that the goal perhaps should be to recognize globalization and urbanization as processes that undermine the fundamental importance of cultural identities as an inclusive and exclusive principle. An alternative may be to present knowledge concerning the complex road to modern society and to tell stories relevant in today's globalized world.

It is difficult to understand why a part of the population, associated with a long history in a given geographical area, should have more to say about the contemporary management and value of heritage, than another part of the population that has arrived rather recently (Holtorf 2009: 679). Thus, we may ask whether the traditional identity narrative is ready for revision (Prescott 2013:61). Brit Solli (1996:88-89) refers to how Salman Rushdie once said that people are born not with roots, but with feet. She argues that the 'identity paradigm' has been important to legitimize cultural heritage preservation and management, but in today's global cultural context, it is more meaningful to emphasize things like the 'otherness and amazement' of the past, than to assert a false kinship and belonging. Instead of generating an identity based on the notion of 'our ancestors', a new paradigm should encompass values such as identity and belonging based on ancient anthropological and ecological diversity. When dealing with heritage and identity, the focus should be on movement, not place, because culture need not be anchored in a specific geographical area to exist in the modern globalised world.

Similarly, Ang (2011:91-92) advocate moving from 'roots' to 'routes' in our understanding of identity. In her article *Unsettling the National: Heritage and Diaspora* she discuss the tensions, issues and questions that emerge in context of globalization and national place identity. Literally meaning 'the scattering of seeds', the term diaspora is often used with reference to the history of forced dispersion of the Jewish people, but has since the late twentieth century increasingly also been applied in a more generalized way to refer to all kinds of people who have a history of dispersion or migration (Ang 2011:82-83). The questions that emerge when bringing these concepts together trouble the intimate relationship that presumably exists between identity, memory and heritage: "A diasporic perspective

cracks open the nationalist narrative of seamless national unity, highlighting the fact that nations today inevitably harbor populations with multiple pasts, bringing memories and identities into circulation that often transcend or undercut the homogenizing image of nationhood and national heritage" (Ang 2011:82-83). In our modern world, diasporic subjects can affirm their collective identities thorough transnational connections, not only with those 'back home', but also with other diaspora beyond the boundaries of the nation-state. In short, diasporic identities are not rooted in a singular place, but are forged in and through movement between places: "…they always hover in a movement between home and away, attachment and detachment, identification and disidentification" (Ang 2011:86). Once diasporas are more complexly conceived as something transgressive, transnational and multi-local, essentialist notions of identity and heritage rooted in place can give way to more fluid and hybrid notions of identity shaped by mobility and flux (Ang 2011:92).

Solli (2011:48) has since her expressed plea for the replacement of the traditional identity paradigm, partly changed her standpoint and criticize an absolute constructionist view of identity. She stresses how migration and modern globalization has meant that many feel like strangers in society. Absolute constructivism robs people of a sense of an original core identity, she argues. Solli has moved from a constructionist approach to identity as something that is constantly produced, reproduced and changed, to advocate for the human need for a more essentialist notion of identity that can be associated with kinship and belonging.

3.2. The Authorized Heritage Discourse

Laurajane Smith (e.g. 2004, 2006) and Emma Waterton (e.g. 2010) have been part of a debate dealing with the definition, value and political use of heritage. They especially emphasize the power structures of the institutional heritage management. In *Uses of heritage*, Smith (2006:4) presents the concept of AHD: "The dominant Western discourse about heritage, that works to naturalize a range of assumptions about the nature and meaning of heritage". The AHD is a professional discourse that privileges expert values and knowledge about the past and its material manifestations, and dominates and regulates professional heritage practices. "This discourse stresses the importance of nationalism and national identity, and champions an ancient, idealized and inevitably relict past for the assumed universal rights of future generations" (Waterton et al. 2006:341).

Recent initiatives and policy agendas aimed at combating social exclusion, racism and impositions of dominant interpretations of heritage globally have challenged the authorized

discourse (Waterton et al. 2006:341-342). This has given rise to changes in international conceptualization of heritage value, leading to the UNESCO's declaration in 2003 that intangible cultural products are also part of heritage (Carman and Sørensen 2009:22). However, extending how heritage is typified to recognise the diversity of society, does not in itself challenge power relations and control over the process by which it is defined and managed (Pendlebury et al. 2004:23). Smith (2006:37-38) claims that policies and debates often tend to be assimilationist and top down in nature, rather than bottom up, substantive challenges to the AHD. They are often framed in terms of how excluded groups may be recruited into existing practices. "…This creates a conceptual framework that heritage practitioners must simply add the excluded and assimilate them into the fold rather than challenge underlying preconceptions". Any attempts at engaging with community or stakeholder groups must take into account the power relations that underlie the dominant heritage discourse, as these may inadvertently work to discourage the equitable participation of those groups whose understandings of the nature of heritage are excluded from that discourse (Waterton et al. 2006:340).

In *Politics, Policy and the Discourses of Heritage in Britain* Waterton (2010:3-4) deal with the ways heritage has become homogenized within the policy processes in Britain. She looks at how (and if) the AHD reasserts its power and claims on the definition of heritage, and argues that one way in which this is achieved is through hidden power, or the ways in which power-holders are forced to utilize less visible mechanisms for wielding and exerting power. The British heritage discourse reflects an "agenda of inclusion". Social inclusion within the heritage sector has come to be perceived as another term to describe the need to engage with and attract those audiences that traditionally have been underrepresented. This is a union often drawn upon to legitimize that these groups, all of which translate as different in some way from the white middle and upper classes, require the proactive attention of heritage professional to foster inclusion (Waterton 2010:11-14). "Within this conceptual space, the AHD has masked its ideological underpinnings and utilized the tropes 'diversity' and 'integration' to realign inclusion policies around targeting specific, underrepresented social groups" (Waterton 2010:13). This is done without ever examining the ways in which heritage is defined within the authorized discourse. Social inclusion has thus become a process that is inevitably destructive and exclusionary. The emphasis on inclusion actually skates considerably closer to assimilation then in does anything else, she argues (Waterton 2010:14).

In their article *The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: The Burra Charter and Social Inclusion* Emma Waterton, Laurajane Smith and Gary Campbell (2006)

discuss the responses to the active criticism of a range of commentators who have questioned the authorized view of heritage as they are manifested in *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance* (ICOMOS 1979). They question if efforts shown to promote perceptions of inclusion and diversity will have any success at all, when still part of the discourse that view heritage in a certain way:

> … while it is important to acknowledge that the revision of the Burra Charter forms part of an attempt to incorporate changing attitudes to community inclusion, participation and consultation, this attempt remains largely unsuccessful. One of the primary reasons for this is that of discourse, and the uncritical acceptance of a dominant or authorized approach to heritage (Waterton et al. 2006:342).

They argue that the attempt of diversity, multivocalism and pluralism is countered by the fundamental authorial tone of the document (Waterton et al. 2006:346-347):

> With our analysis of the Burra Charter, part of what is at issue is the tension that emerges when calls for greater inclusion and plurality are placed within a context already dominated by the firmly established and authoritative discourse of the expert. The paradox, of course, revolves around attempting to loosen controls and create equitable dialogue, but doing so through a discourse that is by its very nature dialogically restricted. (…) Essentially, the problem is one of contradiction. Contemporary calls for community participation and the inclusion of diverse associative values and meanings do not sit comfortably within the overall tone of the document when placed together with traditional notions of authority and expertise.

Smith (2006:13) and Waterton (2010:4-5) both advocate a constructionist perception of heritage as a cultural and social process. They contest the definition of heritage as something material, something found, that embodies some universal essential value or meaning: "There is no such thing as heritage" (Smith 2006:13). Instead heritage should be understood as something created and produced in, and as a resource for, the present. "Heritage is not a fixed, unchanging thing, but something that is constructed, created, constituted and reflected by discourses" (Waterton 2010:4). This concept will be addressed further in the next chapter, which will account for the theoretical perspective forming the framework for the following analysis.

4.0. Theoretical framework

In this chapter, some aspects of constructionist theory will be discussed. The distinction between constructionism and constructivism will be outlined, and the definition of tangible and intangible heritage will be addressed. I argue that these are constructed classifications based on the different qualities of the heritage phenomenon. Heritage is simultaneously both real and constructed; there need not be a clash between construction and reality (Hacking 1999:29; Witmore 2011:75).

4.1. Social constructionism

There is no single feature that is adequate to identify a social constructionist position, but many of the approaches share some common characteristics. Constructionists are often concerned with questions of power and control. The point of unmasking is to liberate the oppressed, to show how categories of knowledge are used in power relationships (Hacking 1999:58). Ian Hacking (1999:6) notes how constructionists work generally are critical of the status quo. Constructionist observations about X tend to hold that: X need not have existed, or need not be at all as it is. X or X as it is at present, is not determined by the nature of things, it is not inevitable. Often they go further by stating that X is quite bad as it is and that we would be much better off if X were done away with, or at least radically transformed. People begin to argue that X is socially constructed precisely when they find that in present affairs, X is taken for granted and appear to be inevitable (Hacking 1999:12). Where an essentialist holds that one´s race is an essential element of one's being, a constructionist would in contrast claim that race, or the idea of race, is constructed. Essentialism is thus the strongest version of inevitability (Hacking 1999:16-18).

However, what exactly is it that is constructed? Hacking (1999:28) notes how there are many examples of multileveled references of the X in "the social construction of X": "What about the construction of Homosexual Culture? Are we being told about how the idea of there being such a culture, was constructed, or are we being told that the culture itself was constructed? In this case a social construction thesis will refer to both the idea of the culture and to the culture, if only because some idea of homosexual culture is at present part of homosexual culture". Similarly, it could be argued that the idea of a national heritage and place identity is a present part of the Norwegian culture itself.

4.2. Constructionism or constructivism?

The distinction between constructivism and constructionism is worth noticing. Social constructionism has been criticised, especially within the natural sciences, where a belief in true, provable facts is fundamental (Hacking 1999:63). Among others, Søren Kjørup (2001:5) is critical towards a universal constructionism, the claim that "everything is constructed": Can one 'truth' be just as good as another? Radical versions of social constructionism seem to assert something like this, he writes. Kjørup (2001) use Vivian Burr's (1995) book *An Introduction to Social Constructionism* as his primary target. Burr (1995:81) claims that there exist no truths, only numerous constructions of the world. Because there is no truth, all perspectives must theoretically be accorded equal status and must be equally valid. Kjørup (2001:5) sees this kind of argument as both morally and politically concerning and philosophically unsustainable. If truths do not exist, then we have of course no obligation to strive to identify them. Constructivism, on the other hand, can on a general basis be said to be the perception that the reality we experience and acknowledge, in greater or lesser extent, is formed or created trough the way we think and speak of it, through our ways to describe, depict and explain it, thus through our language and signs, through our concepts and social conventions (Kjørup 2001:7).

As Kjørup, I am critical towards a universal constructionism. However, most constructionism is not universal. Indeed, as Hacking (1999:24) puts it, "what would be the point of arguing that danger, or the woman refugee, is socially constructed, if you thought that everything is socially constructed?" For example, child abuse is definitely real, children are being mistreated in the world, but the idea or the concept of child abuse is a social construction. There need not be a clash between construction and reality. Something can be both constructed and real at the same time (Hacking 1999:29).

Hacking (1999:102) suggests new ways to think about questions "posed by the ideas of social construction - and reality": "One of the defects of social construction talk is that it suggests a one-way street", he writes (Hacking 1999:116). Society constructs X, which do not really exist as described, or would not exist unless so described. He introduces the idea of an interactive kind to "make plain that we have a two-way street, or rather a labyrinth of interlocking alleys" (Hacking 1999:116). As humans, we experience ourselves as being persons of various kinds. This awareness may be on an individual level, but more commonly it is shared and developed within a group of people. "Some classifications, when known by people or by those around them, and put to work in institutions, change the way which individuals experience themselves, and even lead people to evolve their feelings and

behaviour in part because they are so classified". The kind interacts with those classified, and vice-versa, people interact with the classification (Hacking 1999:103-104).

4.3. Intangible vs. tangible: a conflict between constructionism and essentialism?

In recent years, one of the prominent questions of the heritage discourse has been what heritage really is (and perhaps just as much, what it is not). Is all heritage constructed through social processes, or do heritage objects possess their own characteristics or 'essences' that exist outside human social structures? It has been argued that there is no such thing as heritage, it is altogether a socially and culturally constructed concept and in this sense intangible (Smith 2006:3; Ashworth et al. 2007:40-41). Others argue that this idea is based on an asymmetry where the material world is treated as secondary to a cultural or social first instance (Olsen 2003:87; Olsen 2007: 579-580; Pétursdóttir 2013:47-48; González-Ruibal 2008:252-253; Webmoor and Witmore 2008:54). The basis for this asymmetry is an understanding of 'the cultural', or 'the social', as something that exists prior to, and independent of, the material world. Societies and cultures, with their variations and differences, approach the material world in unique ways and causes variations in the material manifestations. Man is the subject, the actor, and the material world is automatically objectified (Olsen 2012:208; Webmoor and Witmore 2008:54).

Within the public management, heritage cannot be viewed solely as an abstract concept. The need to define it at something more substantial emerges. Smith (2006:299-308; 2011:73) warns us that an essentialist understanding of heritage may lead to a hierarchy in which certain groups are not entitled to the same rights as others and where heritage is used to legitimize social, cultural and political power structures. On the other hand a consequences of a universal constructivist perception would be that the concept could accommodate anything and everything and thus that the idea of a common human heritage as a collective value is undermined (Solli (2011:47).

Christopher Witmore (2011:75) calls into question how fruitful it is that essentialism and constructionism is being set up as opposites in the cultural heritage discourse. I largely agree with his definition of cultural heritage as something both real and constructed. Heritage can be an object, a landscape, a place, but also, and simultaneously, a process by which we assign objects and places meaning, values and tasks based on present interests. The tangible and intangible constitutes different aspects of the 'heritage phenomenon'.

To say that our realities are socially constructed is not to say that the world does not exist, or does not affect us, but that our ways of confronting it, dealing with it and defining it are social constructions (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:17). The material world is not 'just there' as a backdrop for our social activities, it contributes with something that does not come from us. In other words, we are responding to something, not only creating something (Solli 2011:47). This is not to say that it affects each of us in the same way, that our responses are the same, or that our perceptions could not change. Heritage objects do not have essences, which can be translated to universal principles of value. Heritage and the value of heritage is not a given, absolute or eternal. It is constructed and re-constructed in the present. (Smith 2011:73).

Through language we crate representations of the world, which never only mirrors an already exiting reality – the representations are helping to create it (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:17). Iver B. Neumann (2001:33) describes these representations as "socially reproduced facts". They are objects and phenomena as they appear to us, and they constantly have to be re-presented to remain valid. Identity based on perceptions of common heritage, history and ancestry is a constructed idea. It can also be said to be what Hacking (1999:103-104) calls an interactive kind, in that the idea interact with people and their behaviour. However, the idea is also subject to questioning and change. My view is not that of a universal constructionism, but rather one of constructivism as described by Kjørup (2001:7): Knowledge or recognition is *always* something produced by humans, with their historical and cultural specific understandings and experiences. But even if numerous constructions of the world and numerous versions of events exist, this does not mean that we are obligated to give them all equal status and value (Kjørup 2001:20-21).

So, what consequences does this view entail for the following analysis? The cultural heritage sector is in a position of power as one of the actors that are involved in the processes that produce and support specific understandings of heritage and its relationship with concepts like identity, diversity and culture. Some of these understandings can appear as objective truths. These 'truths' have specific social consequences, like the inclusion or exclusion of other interactive kinds, actions and alternative ways of thinking. The ways in which the management talks about heritage shapes collective perceptions of 'us' and 'them', and therefor influence the ways in which individuals and groups perceive and interact with one another. However, this also allows for the possibility of change. Within this framework the following examination of the selected texts will be carried out in form of a discourse analysis.

5.0. Methodological approach and course of action

Greatly simplified a discourse can be said to be a certain way to talk about and understand the world, or a part of it. Thus, discourse analysis aims to elucidate how the world, or any part thereof, is presented and what kind of social consequences this entails. Discourse analysis is not a single, distinctive approach, but a number of interdisciplinary theoretical directions and methods, which can be used in a number of different ways (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:9). It is not the ambition of the current work to carry out a complete discourse analysis. The aim is rather to make use of some aspects of the presented directions to extract information from the selected texts. The analysis and following discussion will draw on elements of Norman Fairclough's (1989; 1992; 1995) critical discourse analysis (CDA), the discourse theory of Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (2001) and the methodology of Jonathan Potter and Margaret Wetherell's (1987) conversation analysis.

5.1. Critical discourse analysis

In CDA the discursive practices contribute to the creation and reproduction of different power relationships between social groups. Social and political domination are reproduced through text and speech (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:75). In *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* Fairclough (1995:7) defines discourse as "use of language seen as a form of social practice", and discourse analysis as "analysis of how texts work within sociocultural practise". He emphasizes the connection between language, power and ideology. Power is conceptualized both in terms of asymmetries between participants in discursive events, and in terms of unequal capacity to control how texts are produced, distributed and consumed in a particular context (Fairclough 1995:1-2). "The power to control discourses is seen as the power to sustain particular discursive practices with particular ideological investments in dominance over other alternative (including oppositional) practices" (Fairclough 1995:2).

A central aspect of Fairclough's approach is that discourse is perceived as a social practice that is both constituent and constituted. It reproduces and change knowledge, identities and social relationships, at the same time as it is subject to other social practises and structures with both discursive and non-discursive elements (e.g. Fairclough 1989:22-25; 1992:71-73; 1995:131). The central goal is to map the connections between the use of language and social practice. The focus is on the role of the discursive practises in the maintenance of the social order and in social change. Each communicative event is working

as a form of social practise, in that it reproduces or challenges the order of the discourse (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:82).

CDA have been criticised for not incorporating a systematic and consistent methodological approach (e.g. Widdowson 2005:97; Verschueren 2012:3-4; Stubbs 1997:10; Toolan 1997:99). Michael Stubbs (1997:10) argues that in general, the methods that have been used have not been sound enough to justify the results that are supposedly obtained, with the consequence that the interpretations and explanations must be regarded as suspect. He argues that varieties of language use are defined, not by individual characteristics, but by clusters of co-occurring features. In his view this entails the use of quantitative and probabilistic methods of text and corpus analysis; the statistical analysis and hypothesis testing on a large and structured set of texts, checking occurrences or validating linguistic rules within a specific language territory (e.g. Stubbs 1996).

Ruth Breeze (2011:505) notes that Stubbs' background in corpus linguistics would tend to bias him in favor of studies based on large samples of text, particularly contrastive studies that are designed to bring out the distinctive features of different genres or registers, using statistical methods to establish significance. However, she states, this is far from being the only way to study language data:

> It would certainly be wrong to rule out qualitative approaches to textual analysis, since it is clear that these offer a viable alternative to quantitative methodology, which also has many flaws and inconsistencies. Similarly, it would be wrong to discard the findings of CDA simply because they have not been obtained in this way. Close, qualitative analysis of a small sample of text might be the only way of analyzing certain types of discourse, for example, the discourse of a particular politician or party (Breeze 2011:505).

The material of this dissertation consists of a relatively small sample of texts. This makes it problematic to undertake a quantitative analysis, as it is not appropriate to claim statistical significance from such a small sample. Thus, I agree with Breeze in her argument. However, I find some shortcomings in the CDA approach when it comes to the analysis of the selected texts, as it does not provide any guidelines for a systematic examination to identify finely nuanced and repeating themes. In this regard, I find a combination of elements of different methodological approaches to be the most fruitful. Consequently, the following textual examination will draw on Laclau and Mouffe's (2001) concept of *nodal points* (cf. section 5.2) and Potter and Wetherell's (1987) *coding analysis* (cf. section 5.5).

5.2. Discourse theory and nodal points

The general idea of discourse theory is that social phenomena are virtually newer finished or total. Meaning can never be conclusively fixed, and this gives room for constant battles of the definition of society and identity, battles which outcome have social consequences (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:34). Laclau and Mouffe (2001:112) define discourse as the stabilisation of meaning within a specific domain. "Any discourse is constituted as an attempt to dominate the field of discursivity, to arrest the flow of differences, to construct a centre". The signs in a discourse are viewed as knots in a web. Their meaning is fixed by their being different from each other in certain ways, and by their relationship with each other. The discourse is established when meaning is crystallised around *nodal points*; privileged signifiers that fix the meaning of a signifying chain (Laclau and Mouffe 2001:112).

When discourse is established as a totality, where the meaning of each sign is fixed through relationships with other signs, this entails the exclusion of other possible meanings that the sings could have had and other ways in which they could have been related to each other. The discourse strives to remove all ambiguities, but will never be fully successful in doing this because the meanings that are excluded always threatens to destabilise it. Because of this potential of ambiguity, every oral or written expression is to a certain extend a new formation. Concrete articulations reproduce or challenge the current discourses when fixing meaning in a specific way. Even if they draw on previous fixations of meaning, and thus previous discourses, the articulations are never just a repetition of something already established. Discourse is thus merely a temporary closing of the structure of signs; it fixates meaning in a certain way, but this does not mean that it will be stable forever (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:37-40).

The discourse theoretical concept of nodal points and social battles of definition will in the following analysis be seen in context of CDA`s focus on power structures and language-use in the reproduction or challenging of discourses. A combination of nodal points and coding analysis will be applied to identify key themes, which will be subject for a more detailed analysis and discussion based on a set of analytical questions (cf. section 5.4).

5.3. Criteria for selection of texts

A discourse analysis will always involve the selection of material, a delineation of the discourse. This selection does not happen solely in accordance with the questions and aims of the analysis but also, and fundamentally, with the researcher and the social and historical

world the researcher inhabits. The delineation of a discourse can be seen as an analytical operation, and thus as something constructed by the researcher, rather than something that already exists, ready to be uncovered (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:149-150). The following analysis does not presume to be generating objective knowledge. Several other texts and discourses could have been relevant in an examination of the issues and challenges that arise at the interplay between place identity, heritage and globalization. However, the analysis may still shed light on some aspects of these challenges, and how the heritage management relate to these.

The search for material started with a survey of the Internet pages of the different institutions, which all had their own document pages. From reading the different documents, it was found that the argumentation and the definition of specific terms and concepts was based on previous texts, the majority of which consisted of political and public documents and reports on public studies, in addition to national and international laws and conventions. By this method, I pinpointed the texts that in a significant way characterize the discourse.

The texts were selected on the following basis:

1) **Type and genre:** A starting point for the selection of texts was that they represent a specific type of discourse, which can be termed 'political', and a specific genre, which can be termed policy document. This type and genre entail a certain way of using language, and the texts are part of the greater political discourse of Norway.

2) **Aim:** In addition to the research status and the theory and method presented, the texts are selected on the basis of the aim of the analysis. The texts are all policy documents that deal with heritage management. They put forward perceptions of the value, meaning and definition of heritage. They also address concepts of heritage, place and identity in a culturally diverse society, and as such, are expressions of how the heritage management respond to the current demographic changes.

3) **Demography and geography:** As the demographic changes are most prominent in urban areas, particularity in Oslo and the central eastern region of Norway (Statistics Norway 2015), a criterion in text selection has been that they directly or indirectly deal with these geographic areas.

4) **Timeframe:** As the aim of the analysis is to understand the current situation and future plans, I have chosen not to focus on identifying trends over time. Consequently, the selected texts are all published after the year 2000.

5) **Management/research:** The distinction between research and management is central

to the Norwegian heritage sector (Gaukstad 2005:134). The focus of this dissertation is the overarching policies of the institutional management, rather than actors dealing with research and dissemination of heritage. Hence, documents published by the archaeological state museums or NIKU are not included.

6) **Levels of management:** As the aim is to examine the responses of the heritage management to challenges of globalization and place identity through an analysis of selected statements, and how these statements may differ in relation to the level of management, a criterion for the selection of texts have been that all key levels are represented: national, regional and local.

The final material consists of texts published by, respectively, the Cultural Heritage Committee, the Ministry of Environment, the Directorate for Cultural Heritage, Akershus County Council and the Cultural Heritage Management Office of Oslo (see table 1).

Table 1: Overview of selected texts

Institution	Text	Type of text
The Cultural Heritage Committee	*NOU 2002:1 – Fortid former fremtid: Utfordringer i en ny kulturminnepolitikk.*	Report
The Ministry of Environment	*St. meld. nr. 16 (2004-2006) – Leve med kulturminner.*	White paper
	St. meld. nr. 35,(2012-2013) – Framtid med fotfeste. Kulturminnepolitikken.	White paper
The Directorate for Cultural Heritage	*Rapport fra Riksantikvarens arbeid med minoriteters kulturminner 2003-2006.*	Report
	Strategisk plan for forvaltningen av arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer 2010-2020.	Plan of action
Akershus County Council	*Spor for framtiden – Fylkesdelplan for kulturminner og kulturmiljøer i Akershus 2007-2018.*	Plan of action
Oslo municipality, The Cultural Heritage Management Office	*Bystyremelding 4/2003 – Kulturminnevern i Oslo.*	Report to the City Council

5.4. Analytical questions

The object of this dissertation is to examine how the forces of globalization are inflecting the discourse of the Norwegian heritage management. The selected text are seen as manifestations of how the different levels of management respond to the current situation of increasing cultural diversity, what definitions and values that form the basis for these reactions and how the responses are expressed through language. Thus, they will be examined on the basis of two overreaching questions related to the current aim.

1) What interests, values and 'truths' are produced, reproduced or challenged?
2) What specific social consequences does this entail?

These are major and encompassing questions. To be able to elucidate the research question of this thesis, the analysis requires a more explicit focus point. Thus, the survey will be based on three specific concepts: *mangfold* [diversity], *kultur* [culture] and *identitet* [identity], and the relationships and tensions that arise in the interplay between these signs.

Diversity

In the Norwegian dictionary *Bokmålsordboka: Definisjons- og rettskrivningsordbok* the term *mangfold* [diversity] is defined as "a great amount of something", "something which is composed of many different parts" or "to contain great variation" (Wangensteen 2005:632, translation by author). The term itself gives no specific definition of what this variation consists of. Thus, when the heritage management use the term as a signifier for a specific reality, it is relevant to ask what meaning it obtains in the context of its use and its relationship with other signs. To examine how diversity is defined in the heritage management discourse it is necessary to look at how the term is used in connection with the word *kultur* [culture].

Culture

The concept of culture have been defined and understood in countless different ways. Within the archaeological discipline, cultural identity has a long history as subject of debate (for references, see next section on identity). Social anthropologist Fredrik Barth (2002:24) notes how culture has become an all-encompassing description of human behaviour, something that makes its use problematic when making theoretical statements because they often seem to

end up contradictory:

> Culture is received tradition, but also emergent and in flux. Culture is shared but also distributed among members of society. Culture is associated with distinct societies, but also shows continuous variations. Culture is a complex whole, but it also consists of shreds and patches. Lastly, culture is a depiction of a life-way, but also a directive force on human action.

Culture is according to Barth (2002:26) an aggregate construction "covering and combining many diverse phenomena". Two different conceptions of culture as presented by Thomas Hylland Eriksen (2001:60) will here be emphasized, the two resulting in different perceptions of identity and diversity. Eriksen notes that (1) culture may be defined as "the customs, values and behaviours transmitted, albeit in slightly modified form, from generation to generation" and, (2) that it may also be defined as "that which makes the communication between people possible; it is the thought patterns, habits and experiences that people have in common, which mean they can understand each other" (Eriksen 2001:60, translation by author).

Within the first definition culture is seen as connected with the past through history and tradition. It is often perceived as something with clear boundaries, separated from other cultures. Within the second definition the focus is on the present and the possibility of mutual understanding. Culture is linked directly with interaction between people and gives the individual the possibility to be a part of many different cultures This definition is constructivist, in that culture is understood as dynamic and continuously created and changed (Eriksen 2001:61).

Neither of the views necessarily excludes the other. In some contexts one of the perceptions may be fruitful, while in others a different definition may be more rewarding. What kind of perceptions of culture is voiced in the Norwegian heritage management discourse as it is established in the selected texts and what kind of consequences does this entail for the understandings of identity and diversity?

Identity

The culture perspective that forms the basis for our understanding of identity has consequences for how we view others and ourselves. If a cultural community based on a common past and connected to current administrative and geographical boundaries defines people, then cultural background and origins signify belonging. It follows that people who see themselves as ethnic Norwegians share a culture with those who lived in Norway in the past (Eriksen 2001:61). This is fundamental for an essentialist view of identity and ideas of a multicultural society. Identity becomes a static element, something fixed and constant that we

carry with us as a core, and which influence our actions and understandings. The attitude implies an emphasis on differences (Högberg 2013:55-56).

If in contrast mutual understanding is emphasized and culture is understood as that which makes it possible for people to communicate, a dynamic aspect of social life, the distinction between 'us' and 'them' is challenged. With a constructivist view, identity is observed as something in constant motion, which changes through different social processes. From such a perspective it becomes valid to argue that people who see themselves as ethnic Norwegians have more in common with people from an immigrant background who lives there today, than people who lived in the geographical area in the past. Who 'we' are, will be situational, and not historical determined (Eriksen 2001:61).

Since the early 1980s it has been argued that the understanding of identity based on ethnicity, culture and nation is a social construct (e.g. Anderson 1991 [1983]; Shennan 1989; Graves-Brown et al. 1996). A number of archaeologists have developed a critically approach to the traditional identity discourse (e.g. Solli 1996, 1997; Østigård 2001, 2009; Guttormsen 2013a; Smith 2006; Waterton et al. 2006; Eikrem 2005) and over the last decade questions of cultural identity have been discussed in relation to concepts such as globalization, human rights, diversity, plurality, diaspora and cosmopolitanism (e.g. Biehl and Prescott 2013; Holtorf 2009; Comer 2013; Isar et al. 2011; Ashworth et al. 2007; Lydon 2009; Rosenberg 2006; Ang 2011; Benavides 2009). Some have opposed to what they see as the total de-construction of an essential sense of belonging (e.g. Solli 2011:48). My intention is to examine how identity is defined in the heritage management discourse as it is established in the selected texts: Is identity depicted as fixed and stable or something constantly evolving? Are the ideas of identity based on perceptions of 'roots' or 'routes', on place or movement, on present or past? How is the identity concept specified: Is identity related to nationality or other concepts of community, to individuals or to groups?

5.5. Coding analysis

The selected texts deal with many aspects and challenges of the heritage management that are outside the scope of this dissertation. Hence, it is necessary to extract the information relevant for answering the analytical questions presented in the previous section. Jonathan Potter and Margaret Wetherell (1987:167) present coding as one of ten steps in the analysis of discourse. Their focus is mainly conversation analysis, primarily conducted through interviews, but the methodology of coding is also applicable to the source material of this dissertation. At this

stage the aim is to squeeze an unwieldy body of discourse into manageable chunks. As coding has the pragmatic goal of collecting together instances for examination, it should be done as inclusively as possible: borderline instances, which seem only vaguely related, should be included at the first instant.

The categories used in the process of coding are fundamentally related to the research question of interest. In this case, the categories are the three nodal points presented above: *identity*, *diversity* and *culture*. Furthermore, several terms will be used that in different ways relate to these three signs:

Terms that relate to the three nodal points, which will be used in the process of coding: *Flerkulturell*, *multikulturell* [multicultural], *globalisering* [globalization], *nasjonal* [national], *endring* [change], *utveksling* [exchange], *sted* [place], *selvforståelse* [self-perception], *etnisitet* [ethnicity], *minoritet* [minority], *majoritet* [majority], *immigrant* [immigrant], *gruppe* [group], *opphav, opprinnelse* [origin], *tilhørighet* [belonging], *bakgrunn* [background], *samfunn* [community].

I will also make use of possessive adjectives like *vår* [our] and *deres* [their] where they are connected to terms like *kultur* [culture], *kulturarv* [cultural heritage] or *kulturminne* [cultural memory].

In the following chapter, the selected texts will be presented and coding analysis will be applied to identify relevant excerpts and themes. These will be objects for a second level of analysis and discussion in chapter 7, which will draw on the analytical questions presented in section 5.4. In chapter 8, the results of the two analytical levels will be condensed and discussed in light of previous research.

6.0. Presentation of texts and identification of themes

In the following, the selected texts will here be presented in chronological order and under thematic headings. The information relevant for answering the analytical questions presented in chapter 5 (cf. section 5.4) have been extracted through the use of coding analysis. The use of quotes will be substantial and specific words and phrases are highlighted using italics to emphasize certain articulations and relationships between symbols, which will be discussed further in chapter 7 and 8. Since the original texts are in Norwegian, the quotes are all translated (for the original versions of quotes, see Appendix 2). As concepts and terms are functioning within a context that gives them certain social and political loading, there is always a risk of losing or changing the contextual significance. Best efforts have been made to make the translations as accurate as possible, to give an exact an account of the rhetoric content of the texts and to make sure that fundamental meaning has not been lost in translation.

6.1. A vision for a new national heritage policy

> Kulturminnekomiteen (2000) - *NOU 2002:1 – Fortid former fremtid: Utfordringer i en ny kulturminnepolitikk*: Report on the evaluation conducted by The Cultural Heritage Committee, appointed by royal decree on April 9, 1999, on the contemporary cultural heritage policy. The report was submitted to The Ministry of Environment on December 21, 2001. **299 pages.**

Table 2: Number of times the terms *mangfold* [diversity] and *identitet* [identity] are used in connection with the term *kultur* [culture] in *NOU 2002:1 – Fortid former fremtid: Utfordringer i en ny kulturminnepolitikk*

Term	Times of use	Times of use in connection with the term culture
Diversity	68	13
Identity	13	5

The basis for the appointment of The Cultural Heritage Committee was the Parliament's consideration of the White Paper *St. meld. nr. 58 (1996–1997) Miljøvernpolitikk for en bærekraftig utvikling – Dugnad for framtida*. The parliamentary majority held that the current heritage policy was not sufficient for securing "our common heritage for future generations", and that there was "a need for a thorough assessment of the objectives, strategies and instruments of the policies and practises" (KU 2000:4).

In their report, the committee (or the majority of the committee[1]) presents a vision for the future heritage policy. Cultural memories and environments should be regarded as "sources of experience, development and value creation" (KU 2000:9). A number of goals are put forward. The importance of emphasizing cultural variety and diversity is listed as the first of these. Attention is also given to the need to provide the possibility for differentiated protection and regional variations, to allow for open and flexible value assessments that take into account the historical, social and cultural contexts, to increase emphasis on the dissemination of, and access to, cultural heritage and to emphasize processes with broad participation and local support (KU 2000:9).

The terms *kulturarv* [heritage] and *kulturminne* [cultural memory] are used interchangeably. *Kulturminne* [cultural memory] and *kulturmiljø* [cultural environment] are defined as all traces of human activity, from the distant and recent past. Locations and landscapes, which are related to events, tales, legends and traditions, also fall under this definition (KU 2000:19). Thus, the focus of the report is the material expressions of the past. The value of this past in an increasingly globalized world is emphasized: "It [the past in form of cultural memories and environments] may signify something lasting and something connected to *place*, in a society that is constantly changing and that is becoming increasingly *globalized*" (KU 2000:20-21). "The extensive *globalization* of today's world makes it important that the *diversity* of cultural heritage is being applied in a conscious and constructive way, as a bridge between *groups, countries and regions*" (KU 2000:205). "Cultural memories and cultural environments give people anchoring in their existence. They are sources of common knowledge and experience. They affirm that *the past is present*" (KU 2000:21). "They are important for the understanding of *ourselves* and *others*" (KU 2000:26).

The committee discuss the challenges that arise in the meet between different and incompatible value perspectives. Managing cultural heritage is about managing a wide range of values, which do not always coincide (KU 2000:27). "Which values are perceived as important to individuals and groups depends on many factors, such as background, interests, knowledge and experiences" (KU 2000:23). The term *mangfold* [diversity] is used a number of times, both referring to the material heritage itself, and to the concept of culture (see table 2). An inclusive heritage policy is put forward as a main goal. It is stated that "cultural

---

[1] Two of the members of the committee, Elin Schanche and Christian Sulheim, did not want to accede to the recommendations of the committee's majority. In their view the committee did not make a thorough enough investigation of the heritage policy. In their opinion, the committee did not have an adequate scientific basis for drawing sound and well-reasoned conclusions. Their dissenting comment is included in its entirety in chapter 15 of the report.

memories and environments shows a *historical, cultural and material diversity*" (KU 2000:30) and; "to give different groups of the population a sense of *belonging* and *cultural identity*, it is important that the cultural heritage reflects as complete a picture of history as possible. *Cultural* variety and *diversity* should be emphasized when drawing up the heritage policy" (KU 2000:31).

The identity value of heritage is not directly connected with the nation-state. However, the term *nasjonal* [national] is related to the economic value of heritage: "The intrinsic value of cultural heritage is a significant part of the national wealth. An important part of the cultural heritage policy is to manage this wealth and ensure that the values do not deteriorate" (KU 2000:36). The term *nasjonalverdi* [national value] is used a number of times, but is not clearly defined. The committee does however suggest a possible approach for valuating heritage that involves some emphasis on the national: "One approach is to imagine that *valuable heritage* disappeared. What would be the consequences if all burial mounds and rock carvings vanished? Can we imagine Norway without important *national symbols* like the Royal Palace, Eidsvollbygningen or Stiklestad?" (KU 2000:133).

Under the header "The national minorities and challenges of a multicultural society", the committee discuss the heritage of cultural minorities within the state borders. The committee refers to how the ratification of the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* (Council of Europe 1995) and the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* (Council of Europe 1992) give the state responsibility to support measures designed to preserve, protect, strengthen and develop the culture of national minorities and minority languages (KU 2000:46). Thus, Norwegian authorities have an obligation to safeguard the heritage and cultural traditions of these minorities. Other immigrant groups are briefly referred to in this section: "Common for these groups is that the larger society has done very little to secure *their* heritage. The same is true for heritage created by groups with immigrant background during the last 30 years" (KU 2000:46). The committee stresses the importance of formulating national goals and policies that confront these challenges: "It is important that national minorities themselves are invited to be involved in deciding what measures should be prioritized, and how they should be designed. The national minority organizations play an important role in this work… Questions of *cultural diversity* should be more strongly integrated in heritage work…" (KU 2000:46).

The committee draws attention to how heritage can function as a counter force to feelings of strangeness and division: Heritage can help us see that 'the others' is not a threatening outside factor:

They [the physical remains from the ancient past] reflect cultural variations and historical changes all the way back to times when life conditions, technology, community and religion was totally different from today; back to a time long before the nation-state of Norway existed. They confirm the presence of 'the unknown', of other ways of life and different worldviews. The recognition of the foreign and strange, not solely as something that comes from the outside, but something that people are encompassed by, and in a manner also part of, can help generate a greater understanding and tolerance of cultural differences (KU 2000:21).

The stress of the new cultural diversity on the local communities is also noted: "Increased communication and moving across borders results in new impulses and increasing *cultural diversity*, but this can also lead to *place-distinctiveness* gradually becoming indistinguishable. To raise awareness of how cultural heritage is a source for enhanced quality of life and wellbeing is a challenge" (KU 2000:38). Heritage as a commercial resource for the local communities is emphasized: "Many local communities have a conscious relationship with *their* cultural history. It is used purposefully and *proudly* in various contexts… The demonstration of a conscious policy in this area will often give the municipality an advantage in the *competition* for new *commercial establishments or population*" (KU 2000:52). The committee advocate local engagement and authority in heritage work:

For people to enjoy and engage with cultural memories, they must find that they have significance for themselves or that they provide a sense of *belonging* and *identity*. History must be told and understood. By giving municipalities greater influence over *their own* cultural heritage, and greater authority in local projects, the heritage policy can more easily be locally anchored (KU 2000:32).

6.2. Heritage and the identity of the capital

Byantikvaren i Oslo (2003) - *Bystyremelding 4/2003 – Kulturminnevern i Oslo*: The City Government of Oslo requested The Cultural Heritage Management Office to prepare this report to the City Council on heritage management. The City Government adopted the report August 8, 2003. It was processed by the City Council February 2, 2004. **77 pages.**

Table 3: Number of times the terms *mangfold* [diversity] and *identitet* [identity] are used in connection with the term *kultur* [culture] in *Bystyremelding 4/2003 – Kulturminnevern i Oslo*

Term	Times of use	Times of use in connection with the term culture
Diversity	14	1
Identity	18	0

The report address *faste kulturminner* [immovable cultural memories], the physical traces of human activity in the landscape, and states: "The protection of movable cultural objects and intangible heritage is first and foremost the responsibility of the museums and related to the

cultural sector, while the protection of immovable cultural memories is strongly connected to the environmenal management" (BAO 2003:11). The Cultural Heritage Management Office states that they, with the release of the report to the City Council, "wish to make the overall strategy for heritage management in Oslo known and available, and thus contribute to the development of a city that has the conservation and experience of its history as a central premise" (BAO 2003:3). The report, which is a first of its kind, establishes the political and professional platform for cultural heritage work in the municipality. The City Government formulates the main goal of the heritage management as follows: "The overarching priorities of the heritage management should be linked to important historical elements in the physical environment, so that the time-depth of Oslo is experienced – a historical expression – which is the 1000-year-old city and its prehistory worthy" BAO 2003:7). Further it states:

> Taking care of *our* cultural memories has become increasingly important over the last decades. Cultural memories document the history of the city in an essential way. They provide identity and the frameworks and inspiration for further development. We need historical anchoring, and the cultural memories that surrounds us is references to *our* past. This gives us confidence and experiences - an increased quality of life. The significance of cultural memories as a source of *identity* and as an environmental factor is likely to be strengthened in future (BAO 2003:9).

The identity value of heritage is strongly emphasized in the report, with special focus on local place identity: "The *city's identity* is strongly connected with its cultural memories, and our history and knowledge of the past provides a solid foundation for further development. The City Government will safeguard these values for the good of the individual and the community" (BAO 2003:7). "Compared with many other capitals in Europe, Oslo has valuable characteristics. It is the responsibility of the heritage management to help ensure that these values are safeguarded for the enrichment and the *identity of the city, the country and our collective history"* (BAO 2003:9). The commercial value of this inherited identity is also highlighted: "Several of the European cities that currently are experiencing the greatest economic success, also have a strong focus on cultural heritage, aesthetics and urban environmental development" (BAO 2003:36). It is argued that Oslo should "*exploit* and lift up its *identity* through a stronger *profiling* of its distinctive and characteristic cultural memories and environments" (BAO 2003:37).

The connection between heritage as an environmental factor and quality of life is stressed:

> The overall goal of environmental protection is to ensure living organisms a sound chance for survival and development. Breaches and changes in living conditions often cause major damage. The following questions are therefore crucial also for cultural heritage: Where and when does the intolerable, alienating violations of contexts that inflict harm to individuals and society occur? This is both a question of physical and biological circumstances and social and cultural conditions. What kind of life

horizons should be represented as opportunities in the city? This is a question of *diversity* in contrast to uniformity and monotony (BAO 2003:13).

The term *mangfold* [diversity] is used several times in the text (see table 3), but for the most part as an adjective that refers to the city itself, or to the heritage of the city: "Oslo, as the capital, stands out as the most *diverse* city in Norway" (BAO 2003:9). The need for a collective memory to bring stability to a diverse community is emphasized:

> …the functioning city must, at any given moment, draw lines between stimulating *diversity* and unnecessary variation, between destructive chaos and necessary order. To function, residents must be able to orient themselves in the social, cultural and physical cityscape. This orientation depends on tangible characteristics and landmarks recognized by generation after generation, on the basis of the *collective memory*. Both the physical form and the symbolic content has significance for this memory (BAO 2003:16-17).

The term diversity is used one time in relation to the term culture: "Democracy is in turn a precondition for the social and *cultural diversity* that characterizes the European cultural sphere and the diversity of impulses that cities represent" (BAO 2003:16).

Local commitment and engagement with heritage is promoted: "Love and pride of the city is perhaps the most important foundation for heritage management. Meanwhile, heritage is one of the best sources for generating just such *love and pride*". At the same time, it is emphasised that "heritage management must be developed on the basis of knowledge-based valuations". One of the most important responsibilities of the heritage management is therefor to "convey its knowledge and decisions to all residents of the city; particularly to new residents who have not taken part in the passing on of historical lines and contexts from one generation to another" (BAO 2003:48). Professionalism in the decision making of the management is highlighted. It is acknowledged that these decisions are not objective as such. Even if "a significant feature of the heritage management is that much of the starting point for decisions is based on professional judgment, this judgment changes over time in line with the general social and historical changes" (BAO 2003:42).

One of the goals presented in the text is that "the heritage management should represent everyone's history" (BAO 2003:14). Everyone should be included in the narrative: Under the heading "Heritage management, for whom?" it is stated, "modern heritage management is 'for all' - everyone's story is significant. Heritage is a shared responsibility and concern, and as a resource it is not reserved for any exclusive group. This is important not least in a *multicultural* perspective, which is becoming increasingly evident in our society. This perspective also means that the heritage of immigrants eventually will become an important topic" (BAO 2003:13). The heritage of immigrants is not discussed further.

6.3. National heritage policy: Cultural self-perception and exchange

Miljøverndepartementet (2005) - *St. meld. nr. 16 (2004–2005) Leve med kulturminner*: White paper containing the heritage policy recommendations of the Ministry of Environment, approved by government February 25, 2005 (Kjell Magne Bondevik's Second Government, October19, 2001 - October 17, 2005). **95 pages.**

Table 4: Number of times the terms *mangfold* [diversity] and *identitet* [identity] are used in connection with the term *kultur* [culture] in *St. meld. nr. 16 (2004-2005) Leve med kulturminner*

Term	Times of use	Times of use in connection with the term culture
Diversity	39	19
Identity	8	0

In this white paper, the government presents their heritage policy towards year 2020. The paper is formed on the basis of the report *NOU 2002:1 – Fortid former fremtid: Utfordringer i en ny kulturminnepolitikk* (KU 2000, cf. section 6.1): "This evaluation includes formulations of the value perspectives, goals and strategies of a new heritage policy" (MD 2005:9). The Ministry note how it has been 18 years since the last white paper concerning heritage policy: "The white paper *St. meld. nr. 39 (1986-87) Bygnings- og fornminnevernet* laid the foundation for the *decentralized* heritage management on the regional level with the county councils, and from 1994 with the Sami heritage management" (MD 2005:9). The ministry also refers to the white paper *St. meld. nr. 58 (1996-97) Miljøvernpolitikk for en bærekraftig utvikling – Dugnad for framtida* "where the heritage management sector is presented as part of the overall environmental policy" (MD 2005:9).

The Ministry notes how "the term cultural heritage encompasses a wide range of tangible and intangible relics of the past. Intangible heritage refers here to for example oral traditions and expressions, including language, performing arts, social practices, rituals and festivals, knowledge and skills related to nature and traditional crafts" (MD 2005:5-6). The meaning of the term heritage is in the document limited to physical structures and sites, unless otherwise specified (MD 2005:6).

The relationship between heritage and belonging is strongly emphasized: "Heritage is a resource of knowledge and experiences that may give groups and individuals a sense of *belonging*, self-perception, self-development and wellbeing" (MD 2005:5). "Archaeological cultural memories and environments that are associated with particular events, beliefs and traditions, often have great value as sources of feelings of *belonging and identity*" (MD 2005:26). The ministry especially stresses how heritage can provide feelings of belonging

within a specific cultural group: "This sense of *belonging* and confidence in *one's own culture* is important, not least in order to meet with *other people's culture* with respect" (MD 2005:6). Culture is not seen as existing in a vacuum. The exchange of impulses between different cultures are highlighted:

> Norway has always received significant cultural impulses from the outside. People have at all times been inspired by foreign cultural expressions and given them a local interpretation. Much of the *cultural heritage of the country* is the result of an exchange of knowledge and traditions with people from *other cultures and nations*. In a world where countries and cultures are brought closer together, cultural heritage becomes increasingly important for cultural *self-perception* and *exchange* (MD 2005:6).

The term *mangfold* [diversity] is used a number of times, both referring to the material traces from the past in form of cultural memories and environments, and to the concept of culture (see table 4):

> In a world where countries and cultures are brought closer together, heritage is becoming increasingly important for people's view of themselves and their own standing point. At the same time, internationalization means that the heritage of the individual states is becoming a global concern. To be able to cooperate internationally, it is necessary to respect both *one's own and other people's culture*, and to be conscious of the value of *cultural diversity* (MD 2005:87).

Cultural diversity is put forward as a central value when the ministry quotes the *UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity* (UNESCO 2001): "…cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature. In this sense, it is the common heritage of humanity and should be recognized and affirmed for the benefit of present and future generations" (MD 2005:5).

On of the main focus points of the heritage policy is stated to be the heritage of minority groups in the multicultural Norway:

> All times have seen people moving in and out of the geographical area that today constitutes the state of Norway. This is also reflected in the heritage of the country. However, the scale of the immigration over the last 35 years has been far greater and with a different composition, than earlier. Norway has become a society with great *diversity* in terms of *cultures*, religions and platforms of value. *This diversity is made up of people with different origins, language, traditions and customs.* Especially immigrants of non-Western countries present society with new possibilities and challenges. In addition to the task of safe guarding the *Norwegian heritage*, heritage management in the *multicultural* Norway is about documenting, communicating and protecting heritage connected to the Sami, the national minorities and the new minority groups – the immigrants of the last 35 years (MD 2005:63).

The Ministry refers to the Norwegian ratification of the *Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* (Council of Europe 1995), and how the state is obliged to facilitate the protection and development of the heritage of the national minorities. The Ministry emphasizes the importance of dialog and cooperation with the different minority groups in heritage work (MD 2005:63-64).

The identity value of heritage is not explicitly dealt with in connection to national concepts in the text. However, where the text concerns local communities the value of identity and belonging is underlined. Emphasis is also put on economic and commercial value: "Heritage represents resources that may have a big influence on the development of vibrant local communities and commercial expansion" (MD 2005:45). The Ministry use the small city of Moss as an example where the use of local cultural heritage has been one of the leading factors for development, fruitful marketing and economic growth, in addition to generating a new place identity (MD 2005:47).

6.4. Integration of minority heritage in management work

<u>Riksantikvaren (2006) - *Rapport fra Riksantikvarens arbeid med minoritetenes kulturminner 2003-2006:*</u> Report on the work conducted by The Directorate for Cultural Heritage on the heritage of minority groups in Norway from 2003-2006. **28 pages.**

Table 5: Number of times the terms *mangfold* [diversity] and *identitet* [identity] are used in connection with the term *kultur* [culture] in *Rapport fra Riksantikvarens arbeid med minoriteters kulturminner 2003-2006*

Term	Times of use	Times of use in connection with the term culture
Diversity	3	1
Identity	2	1

It is the expressed whish of The Directorate for Cultural Heritage to ensure a greater focus on the heritage of minority groups in their day-to-day work. Therefore, a group was appointed which main objective was "to map the need for the identification and protection of heritage associated with national minorities and other minorities" (RA 2006:4). The national minorities were prioritized, as "the formal status of these groups made it natural to start here" (RA 2006:5). The report is based on work conducted from 2003 to 2006, and the functions, experiences and recommendations of the workgroup are presented (RA 2006:3).

The terms *kulturarv* [heritage] and *kulturminne* [cultural memory] are used interchangeably. The terms are not clearly defined, but presented as the material traces of the past that is associated with the specific groups. For example, when dealing with the Romani heritage it is stated that there are relatively few immovable cultural memories connected with this group: "Buildings or other structures are not what makes the Romani/Tater a *distinct culture*. They were – and still are in some regards, a traveling people who have placed little

emphasis on architecture" (RA 2006:8). Thus, the workgroup "have emphasized the various Romani/Tater meeting places for trading, socializing and accommodation as important cultural memories" (RA 2006:9). As for the Jewish heritage it is stated that "synagogues … is perhaps the most important cultural memories of the Jewish minority, although other buildings around the country also testify Jewish labour and enterprise (RA 2006:11).

The need for a strengthened protection of minority heritage is highlighted and it is argued that this work should be a natural and integrated part of the overall heritage management (RA 2006:3). "Such integration will however not happen by itself overnight, but will only be possible through extensive mutual insight and understanding between the greater society and the minority groups. A substantial effort over the next few years is needed if we are to correct the past negligence of national minority heritage" (RA 2006:3).

The workgroup found that there is relatively little attention paid to minority heritage at the regional level of management. The Directorate for Cultural Heritage's work on the field has at times seemed like a catalyst for further reflections. Regional and local management are in need of expertise on the field. It is stated that this is something the Directorate for Cultural Heritage will follow up in the time to come (RA 2006:7). "If we look a little forward in time, it is assumed that the work with minority heritage will be an integrated part of the everyday heritage management" (RA 2006:21).

The workgroup notes how the various minority communities have very different experiences with how the state has handled their interests throughout history: "… from brutal repression and persecution, to invisibility and neglect" (RA 2006:5):

> As a representative of a government agency, we further acknowledge that in meeting with many communities we could easily appear as representatives for the greater society, with all the negative connotations that this could entail. A confidence-building approach – through dialogue and exchange of knowledge - was therefore a crucial precondition for our work to succeed (RA 2006:5).

The group emphasises how a good dialogue presupposes an exchange of attitudes and beliefs. The minorities' understandings and definitions of heritage may diverge from that of the wider society. In their work the group has "largely wanted to emphasise the views of the minorities" (RA 2006:5). But they also put forward their work as a responsibility that goes beyond the specific minority groups in question: "The workgroup have been conscious of the fact that as representatives of the greater society it is necessary to proceed with caution and humility. At the same time the *community task* of highlighting minority heritage must be safeguarded" (RA 2006:7).

The group stresses that people always have been wandering, and how "in earlier times there were no national boundaries that put formal obstacles for such a journey. Concepts such as immigration and emigration, as well as mobility became increasingly important in our part of the world after the formation of the nation-states" (RA 2006:4). Historically, immigrants have always constituted a part of the Norwegian population. "These have mainly come from neighbouring counties, or other countries within Europe and have gradually become a part of the majority population" (RA 2006:17). The immigration over the last 20-30 years of people from countries outside our own continent has made Norway increasingly multicultural (RA 2006:4). These immigrants have in recent decades put their mark on the cityscape in most major cities in Norway. The physical traces are itemised as "the so-called immigrant stores", "religious institutions and buildings", "the so-called ethnic restaurants", and "asylum reception centres" (RA 2006:18-19).

The workgroup have found it difficult to address new minorities in a comprising manner within the timeframe. This is due to the size and diversity of the group. It is recognized that within many immigrant communities, heritage may be perceived as less relevant than other issues. The fact that for many heritage may not be not a priority is presented as a challenge that the management should strive to counter: "… it is important that this work is given time" (RA 2006:19). The goal is to put heritage on the agenda of the different groups: "The meetings have initiated processes within the different milieus, which in the long run may lead to greater attention and awareness of *the group's own heritage*" (RA 2006:6).

6.5. Regional heritage: Belonging and pride

<u>Akershus fylkeskommune (2007) - *Spor for framtiden – Fylkesdelplan for kulturminner og kulturmiljøer i Akershus 2007-2018*:</u> Sector plan for heritage management, concerning the period 2007-2018, adopted by Akershus County Council June 14, 2007. **134 pages.**

Table 6: Number of times the terms *mangfold* [diversity] and *identitet* [identity] are used in connection with the term *kultur* [culture] in *Spor for framtiden – Fylkesdelplan for kulturminner og kulturmiljøer i Akershus 2007-2018*

Term	Times of use	Times of use in connection with the term culture
Diversity	22	0
Identity	19	0

This plan of action contains the aims, goals, measures and guidelines of the heritage management of Akershus County Council in the period 2007-2018. The plan is meant to be a strategic document and a tool for the future heritage management in Akershus. It is also a follow-up of the white paper *St. meld. nr. 16 (2004–2005) Leve med kulturminner* (MD 2005, cf. section 6.3). In the preface it is stated that "we hope this plan will be a reliable starting point for assigning responsibility at the appropriate level, and a tool for the successful interaction between the county, the municipalities and the voluntary heritage management" (AFK 2007:1).

The county council defines *kulturminner* [cultural memories] as all traces of human activity in our physical environment. *Kulturmiljøer* [cultural environments] are milieus where cultural memories are part of a larger entity or context. *Kulturlandskaper* [cultural landscapes] are culturally influenced landscapes, and the term is mostly used in connection with agriculture. *Kulturarv* [cultural heritage] is defined as a generic term for cultural memories, cultural environments and cultural landscapes (AFK 2007:6). The focus of the plan is the material expressions of the past in form of immovable cultural memories. This professional delimitation is stated to be a consequence of regional responsibilities. Thus, the plan does not address movable cultural objects, or intangible heritage, "like music, stories and place names" (AFK 2007:13-14). The term *mangfold* [diversity] is used several times (see table 6), in reference to the diversity of the tangible heritage of the region.

Heritage as a source of identity, belonging and pride is greatly emphasized: "First and foremost, they [cultural memories] are important because they are resources for valuable experiences, because they convey history and because they provide a sense of *belonging* and *pride*" (AFK 2007:1). "Through the sector plan for cultural memories and environments, we want to show the diversity and distinctiveness of the heritage of Akershus, and not least what the municipalities and the county can be *proud* of!" (AFK 2007:5). "Cultural memories may strengthen the character and qualities of local communities, and provide a sense of *belonging* for both old residents and newcomers." (AFK 2007:5). "In a county that is changing rapidly, and with a constant inflow of new residents, heritage may provide a sense of *belonging*, and give local communities a clearer *place identity*" (AFK 2007:13). The main goal for the future heritage policy of Akershus is stated to be "to protect and use cultural memories and environments as a positive resource, and thereby contribute to *cultural* understanding, *identity* and *belonging*, well-being and value creation. (AFK 2007:7). The economic and commercial value of heritage is stressed: "By building on their historical *identity*, they [the towns of

Akershus] can develop as distinctive, exciting and individual places. This will inspire *businesses and developers,* residents and users. (…) To compete in an increasingly global development, the *cultivation and profiling of a distinctive character may be instrumental*" (AFK 2007:25).

Identity and belonging connected with place and the local community is especially accentuated: "In working with public health, attention is among other things given to measures to enhance senses of *belonging* to *place. Identity, belonging* and well-being is connected to *humans as part of a community*, and in this context, the community where they reside, their home community (AFK 2007:23). Further, emphasis is put on how heritage can function to bind people together as a unified group:

> A number of people belong to families who have resided in the county for generations. For these the development of the area, and the constant inflow of new people to the community are not unproblematic. Knowledge of local history may help newcomers to better understand their new home place and the people living there. Knowledge of the history of the *place* and the preservation of heritage may strengthen senses of *belonging* to the local community and the spirit of *unity* between people. The stories that are told become historical memories shared by the people of *the local community.* … The landscape around us has great significance for our well-being, and is an important part of our *common identity* (AFK 2007:23-24).

The heritage of immigrants is addressed briefly in relation to recent history: "Heritage from the past century is a part of the history and *place identity* of the younger generation and newcomers with different *cultural backgrounds*. Also for future generations it is important to protect this heritage" (AFK 2007:36). The need for inclusion is stressed: "For new residents to find their place, it is important that they, as bearers of their own stories, are given the opportunity to tell who they are and *where they come from*. From the moment the newcomers arrive, they become part of the *place*. In this way all residents are participating in creating the history" (AFK 2007:39). Local involvement is advocated: "With great local knowledge, enthusiasm and *patriotism*, we have a good starting point for dissemination of heritage (AFK 2007:39).

The heritage of the region is grouped into 15 themes in the text. It is stressed that these themes are link to specific buildings, constructions and sites. One of the categories is "Det flerkulturelle Akershus" [The multicultural Akershus]. Five points are listed under this category: (1) the multicultural heritage in Akershus, immigration history before and now, (2) exchange of cultural expressions, and how this has affected society and the use of public space (e.g. restaurants, convenience stores owned by immigrants, houses of worship) (3) meeting places within multicultural environments (4) five national minorities of Norway - Scandinavian Romani, Kvens, Roma, Jews and Forest Finns and (5) 200 other minorities,

including all immigrants from neighbouring countries and from so-called non-Western countries (AFK 2007:86). These points are not discussed any further in the document.

In the section called *Handlingsprogram* [Program of action], one of 49 measures deals specifically with cultural diversity. It states that work should be done "to promote valuable relationships, tolerance and interaction between people with different *cultural backgrounds*", and that this should be achieved through "arranging meetings, theme nights, lectures, open days etc. in relation to heritage sites or cultural environments" (AFK 2007:55). Local history societies and museums in collaboration with the county council, the municipalities, the schools and the newcomers to the area are identified as actors responsible for these measures (AFK 2007:55).

6.6. A professional, knowledge-based heritage management

Riksantikvaren (2011) - *Strategisk plan for forvaltning av arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer 2011-2020:* This overarching strategic document covers all management related tasks in connection with archeological heritage that lays within the responsibility of the Directorate for Cultural Heritage as professional secretariat. **21 pages.**

Table 7: Number of times the terms *mangfold* [diversity] and *identitet* [identity] are used in connection with the term *kultur* [culture] in *Strategisk plan for forvaltning av arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer 2011-2020*

Term	Times of use	Times of use in connection with the term culture
Diversity	2	0
Identity	1	0

This strategic document was commissioned on behalf of the Ministry of Environment, as a follow-up of the aims and measures presented in previous releases, including the report *NOU 2002:1 – Fortid former fremtid: Utfordringer i en ny kulturminnepolitikk* (KU 2000, cf. section 6.1) and the white paper *St. meld. nr. 16 (2004–2005) Leve med kulturminner* (MD 2005, cf. section 6.3). The Directorate for Cultural Heritage (2011:3) put forward their overall goal of their management of archaeological heritage towards the year 2020: "Archaeological cultural memories and environments should be managed and communicated as unique sources of knowledge of ancient societies, and as a basis for new insight, experience and usage". Three secondary objectives are presented, and under each of these three key areas are identified. The secondary objectives are as following: That the securing of archaeological

cultural heritage is to be based on sound data, uniform criteria and justifiable methods: that the management of archaeological heritage is to be evident and characterized by dialogue and appropriate resource use, and: that public interest and sense of responsibility for archaeological sites and cultural environments are strengthened.

When defining archaeological heritage the Directorate for Cultural Heritage (2011:4) refers to article 1, points 2 and 3 of the *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage* (Council of Europe 1992), which states:

2. To this end shall be considered to be elements of the archaeological heritage all remains and objects and any other traces of mankind from past epochs

      i.   the preservation and study of which help to retrace the history of mankind and its relation with the natural environment

      ii.   for which excavations or discoveries and other methods of research into mankind and the related environment are the main sources of information; and

      iii.   which are located in any area within the jurisdiction of the Parties

3. The archaeological heritage shall include structures, constructions, groups of buildings, developed sites, moveable objects, monuments of other kinds as well as their context, whether situated on land or under water.

Further, the Directorate refers to how the purpose of the convention is "to protect archaeological heritage as a source of common European history and *identity*, and as a tool for scientific and historical research" (RA 2011:6). They also refer to the *Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society* (Council of Europe 2005), which underlines that all cultural groups have the right to their own heritage, and that this heritage shall be secured and preserved (RA 2011:6).

The value of archaeological cultural memories is accentuated: "They contribute positively to the development of vibrant local communities, *providing places with uniqueness and distinctiveness*, they are sources of experience and resources for value creation" (RA 2011:5). Further it is stated: "For approximately 12,000 years there have lived people in Norway who has left physical traces. These specific traces, the relationship between them, and places related to faith and tradition represent irreplaceable sources of knowledge about previous generations life and labour. For most of our history we have no other source of material that can give us such insight" (RA 2011:5).

Neither cultural diversity nor identity is accentuated in any greater extent (see table 7). The term *flerkulturell* [multicultural] is used once, and then with particular emphasis on the national minorities: "It is also an expressed goal that the diversity of cultural heritage in

today's *multicultural society* shall be secured. This requires an increased awareness and greater emphasis on the heritage of the *national minorities*" (RA 2011:10). This is not discussed any further.

The Directorate stresses how the call for predictability in the heritage management leads to the demand of as uniform valuations as possible, and thus a national set of criteria for the assessment of archaeological sites and cultural environments. "To ensure local characteristics and regional differences, such a set of criteria should be both including and dynamic. This must also be seen in conjunction with assessments of national interests, and how to ensure a representative selection of archaeological sites and cultural environments" (RA 2011:10). The need for a professional, knowledge-based management is emphasized: "The development of new *knowledge* is essential for keeping the *professional management* updated at any time and to exercise specialist *judgment* in management proceedings" (RA 2011:16). "A clear management and sensible use of resources must be based on *knowledge* about archaeological heritage, acquaintance with how the management sector works and how resources are used. Updated knowledge is essential for a constructive dialogue within the administration and between governmental and academic sectors, other agents, and the general public" (RA 2011:16).

6.7. National heritage policy: Identity and stability in a fast changing society

Miljøverndepartementet (2013) - *Meld. St. 35 (2012-2013) Framtid med forfeste – Kulturminnepolitikken:* White paper containing heritage policy recommendations from the Ministry of Environment, approved by government April 26, 2013 (Jens Stoltenberg's Second Government, October 17, 2005 - October 16, 2013). **76 pages.**

Table 8: Number of times the terms *mangfold* [diversity] and *identitet* [identity] are used in connection with the term *kultur* [culture] in *Meld. St. 35 (2012-2013) Framtid med fotfeste - Kulturminnepolitikken*

Term	Times of use	Times of use in connection with the term culture
Diversity	11	3
Identity	8	1

In 2008-2009, The Office of the Auditor General conducted a performance audit on the Ministry of Environment's follow up on in the white paper *St. meld. nr. 16 (2004–2005) Leve med kulturminner* (MD 2005, cf. section 6.3). They concluded that it was a substantial

possibility that the goals presented would not be reached by the deadline in 2020 (MD 2013:11). Thus, the government prepared a new white paper on the cultural heritage policy: "The paper contains a status update per January 2013, and clarifies the challenges standing in the way of reaching the adopted objectives…" (MD 2013:11).

The ministry notes how the term heritage is used to describe both tangible and intangible aspects, "…and includes both the material traces from the past in their physical environment, as well as oral traditions, customs, rituals and skills related to traditional crafts" (MD 2013:7). Where not otherwise specified, the meaning of the term is in the document limited to material objects in their physical environment, including places that are related to events, beliefs and traditions. The importance of safeguarding a varied and representative selection of cultural memories is emphasised: "It is important to ensure that the cultural memories most representative for different styles, different architecture, different industries, social strata and ethnic groups are protected" (MD 2013:7).

The identity value of heritage is referred to a number of times. This value is associated with local communities: "Cultural memories represent sources for environmental, cultural, social and economic value. They are important for *individual identity,* as well as people's well-being and *self-perception*. They give *places* uniqueness and distinctiveness" (MD 2013:5). "Cultural memories are important environmental resources. They have significance for people's *identity* and well-being. They provide *places* uniqueness and individuality, and they are basis for *local community development* and other forms of value creation" (MD 2013:41). "Cultural value creation implies increased knowledge and awareness of *local* cultural and natural heritage, character, traditions, storytelling and symbols, which provide a basis for promotion and development of *place identity and pride*" (MD 2013:42).

The identity value is not explicitly connected to national concepts. The term *nasjonalverdi* [national value] is used, but not clearly defined, other than that the criteria's that have formed the basis for assessments traditionally have been art historical or architectural. The ministry hold that that the category also should include other kinds of buildings, constructions and areas that plays a role in "our history", for example "…thing sites from after the reformation, battles grounds, buildings or constructions related to historically important people and events, or to the development of democracy" (MD 2013:37).

The ministry address the heritage of immigrant groups. The heritage of Norway reflects a constantly changing society, but in the last 40 years "immigration has been more extensive and with a different composition than previously. This has, and still is, putting its mark on society, both in terms of language, traditions and customs, but also in terms of

physical traces in the landscape." The importance of entering into dialog with the groups in question is emphasized: "Minority groups are different and have various needs and wishes related to the preservation of *their* own heritage. This creates some challenges for heritage management in its efforts to ensure *representativeness*. It is important to achieve a fruitful cooperation with the individual groups" (MD 2013:53-54)

The ministry refer to how, since 2003, The Directorate for Cultural Heritage have worked with a systematic review of the heritage of the national minorities, where the goal has been to get an overview of, and safeguard a representative selection. The project was completed in 2006 resulting in the report *Rapport fra Riksantikvarens arbeid med minoritetenes kulturminner 2003-2006* (RA 2006, cf. section 6.4). The documentation and securing of minority heritage by the museums since the late 1990's is also mentioned: "A network has been established dealing specifically with diversity, to strengthen the work with minorities and cultural diversity within the Norwegian museums, by creating meeting places, exchange experiences and implement projects" (MD 2013:54).

The ministry point out immigration as one of the present and future challenges of the heritage sector:

> The first immigrants [who came to the area which today constitutes Norway] are nameless, but nevertheless, they have left physical traces in landscapes, towns and cities, and given rise to places that are associated with legends or traditions. Their traces are sources of knowledge of *our* history…. We know that the future will see increased immigration, which will lead to population growth and changes in settlement patterns. This will put major pressure on the land and infrastructure around the main cities" (MD 2013:7).

It is estimated that the areas around Oslo will receive 500,000 new residents by 2040 (MD 2013:8), and that heritage may play an important role in generating identity, belonging and stability in context of demographic changes (MD 2013:10):

> The 500 000 new residents that are expected to move into the eastern area, will not all come from other parts of Norway, but just as well from Mumbai or Tallinn. Therefore it is important to help create a sense of *belonging*, understanding and insight into the *Norwegian community*. It is important that all are included in the *narrative*. Then heritage and knowledge of the past may contribute to *understanding*, *identity* and *stability* in a fast changing society.

Several themes have been identified in the preceding and the information relevant in context of the aim of this dissertation has been extracted through the use of coding analysis. In the following chapter, the presented excerpts and themes will be addressed in a second level of analysis.

7.0. Responses to challenges of place identity and globalization

The quotes presented in the previous chapter where made by going through the texts and identifying the use of the nodal points *identity, diversity* and *culture*, as well as related terms and concepts. Pertinent themes were identified and excerpts relevant for answering the analytical questions posted in chapter 5 (cf. section 5.4) were selected. The following analysis will address these questions under thematic headings.

7.1. Tangible or intangible heritage

Tangible and intangible are terms that are used to describe different aspects of the phenomenon of heritage, so that the different institutions can make definitions in accordance with their aims and responsibilities. The expressed focus of the seven texts is heritage as something material, which easily can be managed and protected in form of *kulturminner* [cultural memories], *kulturmiljøer* [cultural environments] and *kulturlandskaper* [cultural landscapes]. The definition of *kulturminne* [cultural memories] is correlated to the definition presented in the Cultural Heritage Act (1978: Chapter I, §1), where it is described as "all traces of human activity in our physical environment, including places associated with historical events, beliefs and traditions". The Directorate for Cultural Heritage (RA 2011:6) and The Ministry of Environment (MD 2005:5-6) refers to the purpose statement of the act, which states that cultural memories and cultural environments "shall be protected in all their variety and detail, both as *part of our cultural heritage and identity* and as an element in the overall environment and resource management".

The Cultural Heritage Management Office (BAO 2003:11) presents sector based authority and responsibilities as reasons for the exclusive focus on tangible heritage: "The protection of movable cultural objects and intangible heritage is first and foremost the responsibility of the museums and related to the cultural sector, while the protection of immovable cultural memories is strongly connected to the environmental management". Similarly, Akershus County Council presents institutional obligations as the basis for their focus on the material aspect of heritage. This professional delimitation is stated to be a consequence of regional responsibilities, "which include the protection and management of immovable cultural memories" (AFK 2007:13). Thus, they do not address the protection and management of movable heritage objects, or intangible heritage, "like music, stories and place names" (AFK 2007:14).

The texts all have an expressed focus on the tangible elements of heritage. However, intangible values of heritage are also greatly emphasized: Cultural memories and cultural environments "provide people *anchoring* in their existence. They are a source of common *knowledge* and *experience*" (KU 2000:21). "… that may give groups and individuals a sense of *belonging*, *self-perception*, *self-development* and *wellbeing*" (MD 2005:5). "… they *convey history* and … provide a sense of *belonging* and *pride*" (AFK 2007:1). "They contribute positively to the development of vibrant local communities, *providing places with uniqueness and distinctiveness*, they are sources of *experience* and resources for *value creation*" (RA 2011:5). "…Heritage and knowledge of the past may contribute to *understanding*, *identity* and *stability* in a fast changing society" (MD 2013:10). "Can we imagine Norway without important *national symbols* like the Royal Palace, Eidsvollbygningen or Stiklestad?" (KU 2000:36). Belonging, identity, knowledge, experience, symbolism, distinctiveness, stability, understanding; these are all values which are constructed around the objects the heritage management aim to protect. They are intangible aspects of heritage, even if they are presented as something emerging from physical objects and landscapes. This shows how the tangible and intangible aspects of the phenomenon of heritage cannot really be separated.

7.2. Essentialist perception of heritage

The Cultural Heritage Committee (KU 2000:26) notes how people valuate heritage in different ways, and that one of the challenging responsibilities of the heritage institutions is to manage a wide range of values, which do not always coincide: "Which values are perceived as important to individuals and groups depends on many factors, such as background, interests, knowledge and experiences" (KU 2000:23). In their work with minority heritage, the Directorate for Cultural Heritage (KU 2006:5) notes that "a good dialogue presupposes an exchange of attitudes and beliefs, where the minorities' understandings and definitions of heritage may diverge from that of the wider society".

The fact that different groups may define and value heritage in different ways is here highlighted, but contesting perceptions of what constitutes heritage is not addressed in any of the seven texts presented. The fundamental understanding of heritage as something found, rather than something created in the present, and something that embodies certain intrinsic essential values, is supported: "The intrinsic value of cultural heritage is a significant part of the national wealth. An important part of the cultural heritage policy is to manage this wealth and ensure that the values do not deteriorate" (KU 2000:36). The need for a professional

knowledge-based management to protect a representative and diverse selection of cultural memories, which will be kept safe for the greater good of the community and future generations, is emphasized: "It is important to ensure that the cultural memories most representative for different styles, different architecture, different industries and social strata and ethnic groups are protected" (MD 2013:7).

7.3. Identity, heritage and place

The relationship between heritage and identity, belonging and self-perception is strongly emphasized in the seven texts: "To give different groups of the population a sense of *belonging* and *cultural identity*, it is important that the cultural heritage reflects as complete a picture of history as possible" (KU 2000:31). "The main goal for the future heritage policy of Akershus is to protect and use cultural heritage as a positive resource, and thereby contribute to *cultural understanding*, *identity* and *belonging*, well-being and value creation" (AFK 2007:7). "Archaeological cultural memories and environments that are associated with particular events, beliefs and traditions, often have great value as sources of feelings of *belonging* and *identity*" (MD 2005:26).

The relationship between heritage and place is highlighted: "Cultural memories are important environmental resources. They have significance for people's *identity* and well-being. They provide *places* uniqueness and individuality, and they are basis for *local community development* and other forms of value creation" (MD 2013:41). Place identity is not explicitly associated with the nation-state, but instead connected to local communities: "For people to enjoy and engage with cultural memories, they must find that they have significance for them or that they provide a sense of *belonging* and *identity*. (…) By giving municipalities greater influence over *their own* cultural heritage, and greater authority over local projects, the heritage policy can more easily be locally anchored" (KU 2000:32). "Cultural value creation implies increased knowledge and awareness of *local* cultural and natural heritage, character, traditions, story telling and symbols, which provide a basis for promotion and development of *place identity* and *pride*" (MD 2013:42). "Many local communities have a conscious relationship with *their cultural history*. It is *used* purposefully and *proudly* in various contexts" (KU 2000:52).

In their sector plan for cultural heritage, Akershus County Council (AFK 2007:23) states: "In working with public health, attention is, among other things, given to measures to enhance senses of *belonging to place*. *Identity, belonging* and well-being is connected to

humans as *part of a community*, and in this context, the community where they reside, their home community". Further emphasis is put on how heritage can function to bind people together as a unified group, with a shared place identity:

> Knowledge of the history of the place and preservation of heritage can strengthen senses of *belonging to the local community* and the spirit of *unity* between people. The stories that are told become historical memories shared by the people of the local community. The landscape around us has great significance for our well-being, and is an important part of our *common identity* (AFK 2007:23-24).

Demographic changes within the local community makes the relationship between heritage and place identity even more important: "In a county that is changing rapidly and with a constant inflow of new residents, heritage may provide a sense of *belonging*, and give local communities a clearer *place identity*" (AFK 2007:13). Similarly, The Cultural Heritage Committee (KU 2000:38) refers to movement of people and cultural diversity as something straining the uniqueness of places: "Increased communication and *moving* across borders results in new impulses and increasing *cultural diversity*, but this can also lead to *place-distinctiveness* gradually becoming indistinguishable". Modern globalization is presented as a process which accentuates the relationship between heritage and place: "It [the past in form of cultural memories and environments] may signify something lasting and something connected to *place*, in a society that is constantly changing and that is becoming increasingly *globalized"* (KU 2000:21).

The commercial value for the local communities of the relationship between heritage and place identity is noted: "Heritage represents resources that may have a big influence on the development of living *local communities* and *commercial expansion*" (MD 2005:45). "They [cultural memories] provide *places* uniqueness and individuality, and they are basis for *local community development* and other forms of value creation" (MD 2013:41). The Cultural Heritage Management Office (BAO 2003:37) argues that Oslo "should *exploit* and lift up its *identity* through a stronger *profiling* of its distinctive and characteristic cultural memories and environments". Akershus County Council (AFK 2007:25) notes: "By building on their historical *identity*, they [the towns of Akershus] can develop as distinctive, exciting and individual *places*. This will inspire *businesses* and *developers*, residents and users. (…) To compete in an increasingly global development, the cultivation and *profiling* of a distinctive character may be instrumental".

7.4. Identity and culture; 'roots' or 'routes'?
The quotes presented above affirm how the identity value of heritage is greatly emphasised on

all levels of the public heritage management. One of the analytical questions posted in chapter 6 was: What kind of perceptions of culture can be found in the Norwegian heritage management discourse as it is established in the selected texts, and what kind of consequences does this entail for the understandings of identity and diversity? In the following section this question will be addressed.

The Ministry of Environment (MD 2005:6) emphasize how heritage can provide feelings of belonging within a specific cultural group: "This sense of *belonging* and confidence in *one's own culture* is important, not least in order to meet with *other people's culture* with respect". The Ministry (MD 2005:63) highlights the importance of protecting minority heritage: "In addition to the task of safeguarding the *Norwegian heritage*, heritage management in the *multicultural* Norway is about documenting, communicating and protecting heritage connected with the Sami, the national minorities and the new minority groups – the immigrants of the last 35 years". When addressing the heritage of the national minorities the Cultural Heritage Committee (KU 2000:46) states: "Common for these groups is that the larger society has done very little to secure *their* heritage". Similarly, the Directorate for Cultural Heritage (RA 2011:10) emphasizes the importance of safeguarding the diverse heritage of a multicultural society: "It is also an expressed goal that the diversity of cultural heritage in today's *multicultural* society shall be secured. This requires an increased awareness and greater emphasis on the *heritage of the national minorities*".

Cultural heritage is here presented as something that belongs to someone. It is *our* heritage or *their* heritage, the minority's heritage or Norwegian heritage. When using articulations like "one's own culture" and "other people's culture", terms like "multicultural" and possessive adjectives like *our* and *their* in relation to heritage, it reflects an understanding of culture as something with clear boundaries, separated from other cultures. This understanding is in line with the first definition presented in chapter 6: Culture is viewed as something belonging to a specific group who are united by a common heritage, a shared past, that provides a cultural identity and a sense of belonging within the group. This sense of belonging is seen as giving rise to respect and understanding in meeting with other cultures. Different cultural groups are perceived as add-ons to a national core culture, thus making Norway a multicultural society.

Culture is not seen as existing in a vacuum. The exchange of traditions, expressions and impulses between different cultures are highlighted:

> Norway has always received significant cultural impulses from the outside. People have at all times been inspired by foreign cultural expressions and given them a local interpretation. Much of the *cultural heritage of the country* is the result of an *exchange* of knowledge and traditions with *people from other*

cultures and nations. In a world where countries and *cultures* are brought closer together, cultural heritage becomes increasingly important for cultural self-perception and *exchange* (MD 2005:6).

To tell the stories of cultural change and exchange in the past may help us to understand 'the foreign' not as something threatening that comes from the outside, but something we are all part of. This gives basis for tolerance and respect of differences, and lessens fear of 'the other':

> They [the physical remains from the ancient past] reflect cultural variations and historical changes all the way back to times when life conditions, technology, community and religion was totally different from today; back to a time long before the nation-state of Norway existed. They confirm the presence of 'the unknown', of other ways of life and different worldviews. The recognition of the foreign and strange not solely as something that comes from the outside, but something that people are encompassed by, and in a manner also part of, can help generate a greater understanding and tolerance of cultural differences (KU 2000:21).

The texts clearly reflects a perception of identity as connected to place, rather than movement; as something stable and connected to a shared cultural past, rather than something constantly changing through different social processes, including geographical mobility. In other words, the identity perspective reflected in the text is one of 'roots' rather then 'routes' (e.g. Ang 2011). When encouraging the use of heritage for generating identity, self-perception and feelings of belonging within a cultural group, someone is effectively included while others are excluded, thus affecting perceptions of 'them' and 'us'. This understanding of identity emphasizes differences, and is in line with an essentialist thinking: People have essences, a core identity they carry with them in the face of other cultural identities. In accordance with Hacking's (1999:103-104) thinking of interactive kind the heritage management discourse, as it is here manifested in the seven texts, upholds a classification of people as various kinds. These kinds are based on the experience of belonging to a group, and the classifications effect how we experience ourselves and others and how we interact with other classified groups and individuals, on the basis of feelings of companionship or strangeness and otherness.

The discourse reflects how a main goal of the heritage managements is to generate a perception of identity and belonging. Meanwhile, diversity and inclusion is presented as equally important considerations: "To give different groups of the population a sense of *belonging* and *cultural identity*, it is important that the cultural heritage reflects as complete a picture of history as possible. *Cultural* variety and *diversity* should be emphasized when drawing up the heritage policy". To have a sense of identity we need the concept of 'the other': This oppositional contrast is the basis for the construction of group identity (Hoven et al. 2005:155). The Norwegian heritage management are using the concept of diversity to bring in this 'otherness': We are all different, but can reconcile in our diversity.

53

7.5. Diversity and inclusion

The texts show an expressed emphasis on diversity, and the term is used both for describing the variation within the physical material from the past and to emphasize the cultural diversity of the Norwegian population. The Cultural Heritage Committee (KU 2000:30) states that "heritage shows a historical, cultural and material diversity" and that "the diversity of heritage mirrors variations in time and space, variations in cultural and social context and a wide range of physical structures and material objects". The Ministry of Environment (MD 2005:87) underline the value of cultural diversity in a globalized world:

> In a world where countries and cultures are brought closer together, heritage is becoming increasingly important for people's view of themselves and their own standing point. At the same time, internationalization means that the heritage of the individual states is becoming a global concern. To be able to cooperate internationally, it is necessary to respect both *one's own and other people's culture*, and to be conscious of the value of *cultural diversity*.

Different cultural groups, but also the individual within those groups, make up the diversity of the Norwegian population: "Norway has become a society with great *diversity* in terms of *cultures*, religions and platforms of value. *This diversity is made up of people* with different origins, language, traditions and customs (MD 2005:63).

All of these groups and individuals should be embraced within a multivocal narrative of the past and tangible heritage that represent the diversity of the population should be safeguarded: "It is important that all are included in the *narrative*. Then heritage and knowledge of the past can contribute to understanding, *identity* and stability in a fast changing society (MD 2013:10). "The heritage management should represent *everyone's history*" (BAO 2003:14). "For new residents to find their place, it is important that they, as bearers of their own stories, are given the opportunity to tell who they are and where they come from. From the moment the newcomers arrive, they become part of the place. In this way all residents are participating in *creating history*" (AFK 2007:39). "Modern heritage management is 'for all'– *everyone's story is significant*" (BAO 2013:13). The Directorate for Cultural Heritage notes how various minority communities have very different experiences with how the state has handled their interests throughout history: "… from brutal repression and persecution, to invisibility and neglect" (RA 2006:5). "An substantial effort over the next few years is necessary if we are to correct the past negligence of the national minority heritage" (RA 2006:3).

This expressed conviction about the importance of including previously excluded groups in the narrative of the past, and thereby in the community of the present, through management work, is evident in the discourse as a whole. The responsibility of protecting and

communicating the heritage of minority groups is strongly emphasized. Thus, minority heritage has to be clearly defined as something that can be protected within the existing systems of management. In their work with the heritage of minority groups the Directorate for Cultural Heritage (RA 2006:5) emphasizes dialog and exchange of knowledge:

> As a representative of a government agency, we further acknowledge that in meeting with many communities we could easily appear as representatives for the greater society, with all the negative connotations that this could entail. A confidence-building approach – through *dialogue and exchange of knowledge* - was therefore a crucial precondition for our work to succeed.

The workgroup underlines that "a good dialogue presupposes an exchange of *attitudes* and *beliefs*, where the minorities' *understandings and definitions of heritage* may diverge from that of the wider society" (RA 2006:5). In their work they have "largely wanted to emphasise the views of the minorities" (RA 2006:5). But they also put forward their responsibilities as something that goes beyond the specific minority groups in question: "The workgroup have been conscious of the fact that as representatives of the greater society it is necessary to proceed with caution and humility. At the same time the *community task* of highlighting minority heritage must be safeguarded" (RA 2006:7). Smilarly, the Ministry of Environment (MD 2013:54) notes the challenges that emerges when different groups have divergent perceptions of heritage, and the need for dialog and inclusion: "Minority groups are different and have *various needs and wishes* related to the preservation of *their* own heritage. This entails some challenges for heritage management in its efforts to ensure *representativeness*. It is important to achieve a fruitful *cooperation* with the individual groups".

The Directorate and the Ministry highlights the importance of including the views and wishes of the minorities in heritage work. But the role of the professional heritage management as a social actor, and their community task, which is to safeguard a representative and diverse selection of minority heritage, is emphasized. Divergent perceptions of heritage represent challenges in this work. This reflects a tension between a wish to include different value perspectives, and the professional heritage management's responsibility to protect the material objects defined as heritage for the 'greater good' of society.

7.6. Tension between unity and diversity

The Cultural Heritage Management Office of Oslo (2003:16-17) notes a tension between unity and diversity when stating:

> …the functioning city must at any given moment draw lines *between stimulating diversity and unnecessary variation, between destructive chaos and necessary order.* To function, residents must be able to orient themselves in the social, cultural and physical cityscape. This orientation depends on tangible characteristics and landmarks recognized by generation after generation, on the basis of the *collective memory*. Both the physically form and the symbolic content has significance for this memory.

The need for unity in a diverse society is emphasised here, and the quote reflects a fundamental tension in the discourse as it is established in the seven selected texts: On one hand, we have the expressed value of diversity. The management aims to include different and diverse perspectives, and make the narrative of the past more multivocal in terms of including the heritage of previously excluded groups, and by telling stories of cultural diversity, change and exchange. On the other hand, we find that this inclusion does not involve any real debate on the definition of heritage. Tangible heritage is depicted as something that has intrinsic value. This value, which is found, not created, bring people together as a unified group with a common identity, a common collective memory, and it is the community task of the professional heritage management, as the knowledgeable authority, to safeguard these values. Hence, this tension is formed of, on one hand, a constructionist perception of heritage as something that can be defined and valued in different ways, and, on the other hand, the essentialist perception of culture, where the intrinsic value of heritage is seen as directly connected with an essential identity.

7.7. Differences between levels

In the preceding sections of this chapter some common characteristics of the discourse as a whole have been addressed. The texts also show some notable distinctions between the different levels of management. In this section some of these distinctions will be identified.

Compared with the other texts, the documents produced at the highest national level, represented by the Ministry of Environment and the Cultural Heritage Committee, reflects a particular strong emphasis on inclusion and the need for taking into account the challenges of modern globalization and a culturally diverse society: "To be able to cooperate internationally, it is necessary to respect both one's own and other people's culture, and to be conscious of the value of *cultural diversity"* (MD 2005:87). The Cultural Heritage Committee (KU 2000:9), list the importance of emphasizing cultural variety and diversity as the first of their goals for the future national heritage policy. Their report states: "The extensive *globalization* of today's world makes it important that the *diversity* of cultural heritage is being applied in a conscious and constructive way, as a bridge between groups, countries and regions" (KU 2000:205). As we have seen, modern globalization is presented as a process

which accentuates the relationship between heritage and place: "It [the past in form of cultural memories and environments] may signify something lasting and something connected to *place*, in a society that is constantly changing and that is becoming increasingly *globalized*" (KU 2000:21). The importance of inclusion, making all groups of the population feel as part of a unity, is greatly emphasised: "It is important that everyone is *included* in the narrative. Then heritage and knowledge of the past can contribute to understanding, *identity* and stability in a *fast changing society* (MD 2013:10). "The 500 000 new residents that are expected to move into the eastern area, will not all come from other parts of Norway, but just as well from Mumbai or Tallinn. Therefore it is important to help create a sense of *belonging*, understanding and insight into the *Norwegian community*" (MD 2013:10). "To give different groups of the population a sense of *belonging* and *cultural identity*, it is important that the cultural heritage reflects as complete a picture of the history as possible. Cultural variety and *diversity* should be emphasized when drawing up the heritage policy" (KU 2000:31).

Compared with the other documents, the texts of the regional and local heritage management, represented by Akershus County Council (AFK 2007) and the Cultural Heritage Management Office of Oslo (BAO 2003), reflects a particularly patriotic view of the relationship between heritage and place identity. Akerhus County Council use the terms *stolthet* [pride] and *patriotisme* [patriotism] in reference to the value of heritage: "First and foremost, they [cultural memories] are important because they are resources for valuable experiences, because they convey history and because they provide a sense of *belonging* and *pride*" (AFK 2007:1). "Knowledge of the history of the *place* and the preservation of heritage may strengthen senses of *belonging* to the local *community* and the spirit of *unity* between people (AFK 2007:23-24). "Through the sector plan for cultural memories and environments, we want to show the diversity and distinctiveness of the heritage of Akershus, and not least what the municipalities and the county can be *proud* of!" (AFK 2007:5). "With great local knowledge, enthusiasm and *patriotism*, we have a good starting point for the dissemination of heritage (AFK 2007:39). The Cultural Heritage Management Office of Oslo (BAO 2003:48) also refers to this local patriotic pride: "Love and *pride* of the city is perhaps the most important foundation for heritage management. Meanwhile, *heritage is one of the very best sources for generating just such love and pride*". "Compared with many other capitals in Europe, Oslo has valuable characteristics. It is the responsibility of the heritage management to help ensure that these values are safeguarded for the enrichment and the *identity of the city, the country and our collective history*" (BAO 2003:9).

The Directorate for Cultural Heritage (RA 2011:16) underlines the need for a professional knowledge-based heritage management. This is also highlighted at other levels: The Cultural Heritage Management Office (BAO 2003:48) stresses that "heritage management must be developed on the basis of *knowledge-based valuations*". One of the most important responsibilities of the heritage management is therefor to "convey its *knowledge and decisions* to all residents of the city; particularly to new residents who have not taken part in passing on of historical lines and contexts from one generation to another". It is acknowledged that the judgements of the management are not objective as such. Even if "a significant feature of the heritage management is that much of the starting point for decisions is based on *professional judgment*, this judgment *changes over time* in line with the general social and historical changes" (BAO 2003:42).

Even though the importance of professional knowledge as basis for decision-making is emphasised in the discourse as a whole, this consideration seem to be more instantiated in the texts produced by the Directorate for Cultural Heritage. In the strategic document *Strategisk plan for forvaltning av arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer 2011-2020* the Directorate point out how the need for predictability in the heritage management leads to the demand for as uniform valuations as possible, and thus a national set of criteria for the assessment of archaeological sites and cultural environments (RA 2011:3) "To ensure local characteristics and regional differences, such a set of *criteria* should be both including and dynamic. This must also be seen in conjunction with *assessments* of national interests, and how to ensure a representative selection of archaeological sites and cultural environments" (RA 2011:10). The Directorate highlight the need for knowledge-based judgments: "The development of new *knowledge* is essential for keeping the *professional management* updated at any time and to exercise *specialist judgment* in management proceedings" (RA 2011:16). The objectivity of this knowledge is not discussed. Also, in their work with the cultural minorities of Norway, the Directorate (RA 2006:7) emphasizes their responsibility as a professional management organ to safeguard the heritage of these groups, not just for the minorities themselves, but for the greater good of society: "The workgroup have been conscious of the fact that as representatives of the greater society it is necessary to proceed with caution and humility. At the same time the *community task* of highlighting minority heritage must be safeguarded". The goal is to integrate the work with minority heritage in the day-to-day function of the management: "If we look a little forward in time, it is assumed that the work with minority heritage will be an *integrated* part of the everyday heritage management" (RA 2006:21).

From these notable distinctions, the texts can be divided into three groups (see table 9), the Ministry of Environment and the Cultural Heritage Committee forming one (A), the Directorate for Cultural Heritage represents the second (B) and Akershus County Council and the Cultural Heritage Management Office of Oslo the third (C).

Table 9: Texts divided into three groups with key terms, showing distinctions in emphasis placed by the different institutions.

Group	Institution	Text	Key terms
A	• The Ministry of Environment • The Cultural Heritage Committee	• *St. meld. nr. 16 (2004-2006) – Leve med kulturminner. St. meld. nr. 35,(2012-2013) – Framtid med fotfeste. Kulturminnepolitikken.* • *NOU 2002:1 – Fortid former fremtid: Utfordringer i en ny kulturminnepolitikk.*	Diversity, inclusion, change, exchange, globalization, identity, belonging, multicultural
B	• The Directorate for Cultural Heritage	• *Strategisk plan for forvaltningen av arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer 2010-2020.* • *Rapport fra Riksantikvarens arbeid med minoriteters kulturminner 2003-2006.*	Knowledge, professional, judgment, assessment, specialist
C	• Akershus County Council • The Cultural Heritage Management Office of Oslo	• *Spor for framtiden – Fylkesdelplan for kulturminner og kulturmiljøer i Akershus 2007-2018.* • *Bystyremelding 4/2003 – Kulturminnevern i Oslo.*	Pride, patriotism, love, identity, belonging, place, community, unity

7.8. Summary

The analytical questions posted in chapter 5 laid the foundation for the preceding analysis. It has been discussed how identity is profoundly connected to group identity: to the local community or to cultural groups. Belonging to a *place*, and to a c*ulture*, is presented as a key value of heritage. Further, it has been shown how the discourse as a whole reflect an understanding of culture, identity and diversity based on an essentials thinking rather that one of constructionism, one of 'roots' rather than 'routes'. Culture is perceived as something with clear boundaries and something belonging to specific groups with a common heritage; a shared past. This has social consequences, as it implies an emphasis on differences: The distinction between 'us' and 'them' is affirmed. Importantly, the discussion has identified what can be termed a fundamental tension between the role of heritage as unifier, and the expressed focus on diversity. The management aim to make the narrative of the past more multivocal and inclusive, but – there are no indications that this inclusion involve any real contestation of the essentialist definition of heritage as something with intrinsic value. It seems that the management is trying to figure out how to balance the somewhat contradictory relationship between the traditional identity value perspective, which is founded upon the relationship between heritage, identity and place, and the need to take into account modern globalization and the cultural diversity of modern society. The following chapter will draw on the results of the analysis in a further discussion.

8.0. Inclusion, diversity and the identity paradigm

This chapter will condense the results of the preceding analysis in a critical discussion of the Norwegian heritage management discourse as a *discourse of inclusion and diversity*. The seven texts will be considered as part of a greater political discourse where *decentralization* and *regionalization* are key terms. It will be argued that the expressed emphasis on values of inclusion and diversity are effectively contradicted by the exclusion of divergent perceptions of heritage, culture and identity. Moreover, that the discourse is still framed within the traditional identity paradigm, although the perception of belonging to place is connected to the local community rather than the nation-state.

8.1. Inclusion in 'the authorized heritage discourse'

The analysis of the seven selected texts shows how an expressed aim of the management is to make the narrative of the past more multivocal, by including the heritage of previously excluded groups, and by telling stories of cultural diversity, change and exchange. It has become clear that the emphasis on inclusion and diversity is most evident in the texts produced at the highest national level. Both the Cultural Heritage Committee (KU 2000:46) and the Ministry of Environment (MD 2005:5; MD 2013:54) refers to international conventions to highlight the importance of emphasizing inclusion and diversity in heritage policies and practices. Thereby, the Norwegian heritage management discourse is connected with the international heritage discourse (Guttormsen 2013b:352; Mydland and Grahn 2011:582).

Guttormsen (2013b:352) notes how the Norwegian paradigm of diversity conveys ideals based on universal human rights, a humane ethics that concern both individual freedom and opportunities for expression and interpersonal ties. Human rights constitute a normative guideline for creating a sense of community that transcends boundaries between people and countries, but the diversity paradigm also allows for a multicultural national sense of identity. This can be recognized as a renewed national program that takes into account the reality of globalization (Guttormsen 2013a:82; see also Rekdal 2003; Einarsen 2005). The focus is still on generating identity and unity, but the new narrative should embrace all of the diverse cultural identities of the nation.

However, the effort to include all groups of the population is based on the premises of the existing management and a specific understanding of heritage: All should be included in the narrative, but the framework for this narrative is already set. In this context, the narrative

of the Norwegian core society defines the heritage of immigrant groups. The heritage management discourse reflects a kind of assimilation of the cultural expressions of the minorities into the narrative of the core culture. Similarly, Ang (2011:87) notes how the admission of the irreducibility of cultural difference and diversity within nation-states has led to the adoption of more self-consciously pluralist understandings of the past: "Often this involves a revisionist rewriting of the authorized heritage discourse to incorporate a more multicultural national narrative", she states. "If this involves a positive pluralizing of the past, this more inclusive past is still framed within a *national* history – the history of the nation of residence (the 'host' nation)".

In accordance to Fairclough's (1995:2) CDA, the power to control a discourse is the power to sustain particular discursive practices with particular ideological investments in dominance over other practices. According to Laclau and Mouffe (2001:112) a discourse is established when meaning is crystallised around nodal points; privileged signifiers that fix the meaning of a signifying chain. This is accomplished through exclusion of other possible meanings that the signs could have had, and other ways in which they could have been related to each other. A discourse is thus a reduction of possibilities. Concrete articulations reproduce or challenge the current discourses when fixing the meaning in a specific way (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:37-40). The analysis of the seven texts shows how tangible heritage is defined as something with an essential intrinsic value. This excludes alternative or oppositional perceptions. The expressed inclusive means and aims of the management are effectively contradicted by the exclusion of divergent understandings of heritage. Thus, the analysis shows that, rather than challenging or rewriting, the Norwegian heritage management discourse are re-producing aspects of the AHD.

Waterton (2010:5) and Smith (2006:13) advocates a constructionist perception of heritage: In perceiving heritage as the subject of discourse and as a process rather than an entity, it follows that it is multi-sensual, multi-imaginative and multi-discursive, thus challenges the dominant attempts to define heritage as a particular material assemblage (Waterton 2010:5). A radical universal constructionist perception of heritage would mean that all heritage is constructed, and thus that everything (or nothing) could be heritage (Solli 2011:45). Consequently, the authorized 'heritage experts' are bereaved of their defining power (Smith 2006:11-12; 2011:72). Thus, if we look at the seven texts from the perspective of CDA, it can be argued that an essentialist perception of heritage is serving to uphold the authority of the heritage management.

Knowledge as the basis for professional judgements is emphasised on all levels of the

discourse, but especially in the texts produced by the Directorate for Cultural Heritage (RA 2006; 2011). As the Directorate is connected with the Ministry of Climate and Environment and the government as professional secretariat, advisory organ and directorate for the executive practice within the state borders, this focus seems natural as it supports the need for an authorized heritage management. Similarly, Leidulf Mydland and Wera Grahn (2011:573) notes how the Directorate is constructed as expert body and steward of the tangible Norwegian heritage, while the public in general is constructed as passive recipients of expert knowledge and values that is framed by the AHD. This reflects a gap between the governmental management policy, which stresses the importance of democracy and local participation, and the practice of the most important Norwegian organ for heritage management (Mydland and Grahn 2011:582-583).

Smith's (2006:4) argues that the AHD is linked to structures of power and the reproduction of socially constructed 'truths' and knowledge that can support specific interests and ideologies, like a national agenda. As we have seen, some articulations on the highest national level seems to associate the nation-state with specific heritage, making Norwegians a cultural group with a shared past (cf. section 7.4). Other cultural groups are presented as add-ons to the Norwegian core culture, making for a multicultural society: "In addition to the task of safeguarding the *Norwegian heritage*, heritage management in the *multicultural* Norway is about documenting, communicating and protecting heritage connected with the Sami, the national minorities and the new minority groups – the immigrants of the last 35 years" (MD 2005:63). However, the analysis of the seven texts shows how the relationship between place identity and heritage is not expressly connected with the imagined community of the nation, but instead related to local perceptions of belonging. In the next section, it will be shown how this correlates with Norwegian decentralization policies.

8.2. Decentralization and regional romanticism

The heritage management discourse as it is established in the seven selected texts can be seen in the context of the overall regional and local policies of Norway. The texts are part of a political discourse in which *decentralization* and *regionalization* are key terms. The goal of establishing a heritage management with greater local anchoring and control laid the basis for a formalized regional management, through the delegation of authority under the Cultural Heritage Act to the county councils in 1990 (Guttormsen 2013b:272). *Meld. St. 13 (2012-2013) Ta heile Noreg i bruk: Distrikts- og regionalpolitikken* is the most recent Norwegian

white paper dealing with district and regional politics. Some form of the term *desentralisert* [decentralized] is used 21 times in the document. It states that "a living and *decentralized* democracy with high participation is fundamental in order to meet social challenges in a constructive way" (KRD 2013b:43). In the white paper, the Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development greatly advocate the use of heritage in commercial value creation: "The combination of breath-taking scenery and diverse cultural memories and environments constitute an important foundation for value creation… This poses advantages *municipalities* and *local communities* must take advantage of in *commercial development*" (KRD 2013b:109). "Many smaller labour markets are located in areas with important natural and cultural memory values. These are *resources for growth and development*" (KRD 2013b:107). The preceding analysis shows how this political ideology is reflected in the heritage management discourse. The encouragement of local commercial development on the basis of heritage and place identity is evident at all levels. In the competition for new commercial enterprises and population, local communities are urged to exploit and lift up their identity through a profiling of 'their' distinctive and characteristic heritage.

Guttormsen (2014a:161-162) distinguishes between *regionalization* and *regionalism* Regionalization is a top down movement, where regional heritage policy is understood as a state controlled political strategy, to create greater local anchoring, responsibility and authority in heritage management. Regionalism, on the other hand, is seen as a bottom up movement where the internal forces of the region use the relationship between heritage and place to gain greater influence within the nation. This entails a politicization of heritage management: The heritage sector has become subject to regional and local political processes, something which have led to an increased commercialization of heritage and the cultivation of local characteristics and history as something distinctive (Guttormsen 2013b:272-273; 2013a:79). Regionalism is thus about the construction of a heroic, patriotic and romantic past, a 'regional romanticism', which is used in the pursuit of financial profits and political interests (Guttormsen 2013a:80, 2013b:357, 2014a:53; Gansum 1999:21-22).

A national self-glorifying identity project is not promoted in any of the seven texts. However, feelings of belonging to sub-national place identities are encouraged. Østigård (2009:23) notes how political regions, regardless of scale, needs ideologies that create identities. Through the creation of identity and belonging to place, a sense of home, prevailing regional and local policies are legitimized. Other researchers have also noted how local uses of heritage frequently promote an essentialist identity paradigm based on the existence of a mythical local community and a vision of a distinctive past (e.g. Anico 2009). As shown, the

texts that represent the regional and local heritage management in form of Akershus County Council (AFK 2007) and the Cultural Heritage Management Office of Oslo (BAO 2003) reflect a particular strong emphasis on patriotic feelings of belonging, identity and pride. Where the texts produced at the highest national levels reflect how they are part of a *discourse of inclusion and diversity* and a *regionalization and decentralisation discourse*, the regional and local levels of the discourse reflect a kind of *regionalism,* where local patriotism is used in the pursuit of commercial interests.

Usually, there will be a dynamic relationship between regionalization and regionalism as the political processes may complement each other. However, regional political interest may deviate from the national equality ideals, and it has been noted how this may compromise overall national objectives (Guttormsen 2014b:174; Keller 2006; Rømming 1999). In this context, the national aim of inclusion and diversity based on an multicultural thinking, may be undermined when the regional and local levels of heritage management is set within a patriotic identity building framework and used to support regional or local political and commercial interest. Østigård (2009:23-24) argues that the identity paradigm of today's regional politics builds on the same premises' as the national-romantic perceptive of the past. The results of the analysis here conducted is consistent with his statement: The political ideologies of regionalization and regionalism builds on the same identity paradigm as the national frame of reference, and heritage continues to be an including and excluding element of this paradigm. However, as Guttormsen (2014b:176) points out, the strength of the regional heritage practices lies in the possibility of working closely with the local population and their wants and needs, and may thus be a medium that takes into account these considerations. In other words, in the regionalized heritage management lays the possibility of inclusion and multivocal heritage perspectives.

8.3. The need for reflection on 'truths'

When conducting research and management work the need for defining reality emerges. The fictive reality that the past is given through our archaeological explanations, have to be viewed as real for it to be meaningful within the discipline. It seems pointless to describe a past we do not believe in (Svestad 2003:274). Even if numerous constructions of the world and numerous versions of events exist, this does not mean that we are obligated to give them all equal status and value (Kjørup 2001:20-21). However, we have to recognise that the definitions and meanings we construct are never conclusively fixed, and how this gives room

for constant battles of definition, battles which outcome have social consequences (Jørgensen and Phillips 1999:34). As archaeologists and heritage workers, we need to be aware of how we are drawn into contemporary political strategies. How we define and talk about 'reality' may be instrumental in validations of political ideologies and interest, and we have to be constantly mindful and critical of the way our 'truths' are being constructed and used. In other words, we have to be conscious of the power that we possess in our selection and de-selection of the stories that are relevant in the present, how they are communicated and expressed and how the selected and deselected are managed and organized (Högberg 2013: 8-9; Eikrem 2005: 22-23; Isar et al. 2011:19).

Perceptions of the relationship between heritage and identity have great social significance. To disentangle the two concepts seem like an unmanageable task as they are closely bound and in many ways different aspects of the same phenomenon. Also, to deny people a sense of self, based on an understanding of the past, is not necessarily desirable. In chapter 3 (cf. section 3.1), I presented Solli's (2011:48) arguments of how an absolute constructivism robs people of a sense of an original core identity. She underlines how migration and modern globalization has meant that many feel like strangers in society. However, I agree with Göran Rosenberg (2006:19-20) when he notes how this condition paradoxically also unites more and more people through the shared experience of a world where we are all becoming more dependent on each other. For the first time in history we can speak of global collective experiences, and thus the real possibility of a global human community. The diverse community's collective memory must, at least partly, be based on common global experiences, instead of national (or sub-national), ethnic and cultural boundaries. Archaeologists, historians and museum workers must underpin such a collective global memory, Rosenberg (2006:20) argues.

By presenting knowledge concerning the complexity and diversity of the past and draw connections where people traditionally have seen boundaries, identity may be defined on basis of an understanding of the past that tells us how we are all part of bigger world. As archaeologist we must accept that our research and fieldwork carries ethical responsibilities within the society we work. As Lynn Meskell (2002:280-281) puts it: "Identity issues in archaeology – be they studies of class inequality, gender bias, sexual specificity, politics and nation, heritage representation, or even fundamental topics like selfhood, embodiment, and being – have the capacity to connect our field with other disciplines in academe but more importantly with the wider community at large".

8.4. Final remarks

In this Mater's thesis I have looked closely at a selection of status and planning documents of the Norwegian heritage management as a public sector. The aim was to examine the responses of the different heritage institutions to challenges of globalization and place identity, how these responses are expressed through language, and what consequences this entails in terms of how people view themselves and others. We have seen how a fundamental tension between the role of heritage as unifier and the expressed focus on diversity permeates the discourse. The management aim to make the narrative of the past more multivocal and inclusive by emphasizing the value of cultural diversity, but this inclusion does not involve any real contestation of essentialist definitions of heritage, identity and culture. I have argued that the expressed inclusive means and aims of the management are effectively contradicted by the exclusion of divergent understandings of heritage.

The strong emphasis on local place identity, identified through two levels of analysis, was something I did not foresee when I started my work with this dissertation. Local communities are urged to exploit and lift up their identity through profiling of 'their' distinctive and characteristic heritage. Patriotic feelings of pride and belonging, and the commercial and political values of this inherited identity are emphasised. Thus, the concept of identity based on a shared past continues to be used as an inclusive and exclusive principle. Little previous research has focused on this development (see Guttormsen 2013a, 2013b:356-360, 2014a, 2014b; Østigård 2009), and it has here been seen in context of the overall regional and local politics of Norway.

The objective of the preceding analysis was to elucidate some of the responses by the institutional Norwegian heritage management to the current situation of increasing cultural diversity and demographic changes. However, the intention has not been to reach any simple solutions to these challenges. The conclusions that have been drawn take us a step further towards a better understanding of these complex issues. Nonetheless, the study of how heritage is defined, used and communicated in context of modern globalization is in need of future research, in order to construct a more detailed and varied picture. Strengthened international cooperation and the inclusion of knowledge and data from relevant disciplines in other countries, which have worked more directly with these issues over a longer period of time, would be beneficial for future research.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

KU   Kulturminneutvalget (The Cultural Heritage Committee)

MD   Miljøverndepartementet (The Ministry of Environment)

KRD   Kommunal- og regionaldepartementet (The Ministry of Local Government and

Regional Development)

RA   Riksantikvaren (The Directorate for Cultural Heritage)

AFK   Akershus fylkeskommune (Akershus County Council)

BAO   Byantikvaren i Oslo (The Cultural Heritage Management Office of Oslo)

Political documents

AFK
2007   Spor for framtiden: Fylkesdelplan for kulturminner og kulturmiljøer i Akershus 2007-2018. Electronic document, http://www.akershus.no/ansvarsomrader/planlegging/regional-planlegging/regionale-planer/?article_id=20102, accessed April 15, 2015. Published by *Akershus fylkeskommune.*

BAO
2003   Bystyremelding 4/2003: Kulturminnevern i Oslo. Electronic document, no longer available online, accessed April 4, 2014. Published by *Oslo kommune, Byantikvaren.*

Fremskrittspartiets bærekraftutvalg
2013   Bærekraftig innvandring. Electronic document, http://fil.nrk.no/contentfile/web/nyheter/valg/2013/pdf/baerekraftutvalgets_rapport.pdf , accessed April 15, 2005. Published by *Norsk rikskringkasting (NRK).*

KRD
2013a Landsoversikt – Stortingsvalget. Electronic document, https://www.regjeringen.no/html/kmd/valgresultat/2013/bs5.html, accessed April 22, 2015. Published by *Kommunal- og regionaldepartementet.*

2013b Meld. St. 13 (2012–2013) Melding til Stortinget: Ta heile Noreg i bruk: Distrikts- og regionalpolitikken. Electronic document, https://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dokumenter/meld-st-13-20122013/id715615/?docId=STM201220130013000DDDEPIS&ch=1&q= , accessed April 15, 2015. Published by *Kommunal- og regionaldepartementet.*

KU

2000 NOU 2002:1 – Fortid former fremtid: Utfordringer i en ny kulturminnepolitikk. Electronic document, https://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dokumenter/nou-2002-1/id380082/, accessed April 15, 2015. Published by *Statens forvaltningstjeneste, Informasjonsforvaltning.*

MD

2005 St.meld. nr. 16 (2004–2005) Leve med kulturminner. Electronic document, *https://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-16-2004-2005-/id406291/,* accessed April 15, 2015. Published by *Miljøverndepartementet.*

2013 *Meld. St. 35 (2012–2013) Melding til Stortinget: Framtid med fotfeste – Kulturminnepolitikken.* Electronic document https://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dokumenter/meld-st-35-20122013/id725021/, accessed April 15, 2015. Published by *Miljøverndepartementet.*

RA

2006 Rapport fra Riksantikvarens arbeid med minoritetenes kulturminner 2003-2006. Electronic document, http://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/175629/1/minoritetenes_kulturmi nner_rapport.pdf, accessed April 15, 2015. Published by *Riksantikvaren.*

2011 Strategisk plan for forvaltning av arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer 2011-2020. Electronic document, http://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/176217/1/arkeologiske_kulturmi nner_strategisk_plan.pdf, accessed April 15, 2015. Published by *Riksantikvaren.*

2015 Ordforklaringer (bokmål). Electronic document, http://www.riksantikvaren.no/Veiledning/Ordforklaringer-bokmaal, accessed April 28, 2015. Published by *Riksantikvaren.*

Books and articles

Andersen, K. and T. Gjedde

2010 Drøm fra Disneyland. Electronic document, http://www.aftenposten.no/meninger/kronikker/article3783373.ece#.VGolYChAqss, accessed April 15, 2015. Published by *Aftenposten.*

Anderson, B.

1991 *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* 2nd edition. Verso, London.

Ang, I.

2011 Unsettling the National: Heritage and Diaspora. In *Heritage, memory and identity*, edited by H. Anheier and Y. R. Isar, pp. 82-94. The Cultures and Globalization Series 4. Sage, London.

Anico, M.
2009   Representing identities at local municipal museums: Cultural forums or identity bunkers? In *Heritage and identity: Engagement and demission in the contemporary world*, edited by M. Anico and E. Peralta, pp. 63-75. Museum Meanings series. Routledge, London.

Ashworth, G. J. and B. Graham
2005   Chapter 1: Senses of Place, Senses of Time and Heritage. In *Senses of place: senses of time*, edited by G. J. Ashworth and B. Graham, pp. 3-12. Ashgate, Aldershot.

Ashworth, G. J., B. Graham and J. E. Tunbridge
2007   *Pluralising pasts: Heritage, identity and place in multicultural societies*. Pluto, London.

Barth, F.
2002   Toward a richer description and analysis of cultural phenomena. In *Anthropology beyond culture*, edited by G. Fox and B. J. King. Berg, Oxford.

Benavides, O.H.
2009   Translation Ecuadorian Modernities: Pre-Hispanic Archaeology and the Reproduction of Global Difference. In *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies*, edited by L. Meskell, pp. 228-248. Duke University Press, Durham.

Bjerck, H.
2005   Kulturminner fra oldtid og middelalder. In *Kulturminnevern: Lov, forvaltning, håndhevelse, Bind 1*, edited by J. Holme, pp. 32-55. 2nd edition. Økokrims skriftserie 12 (2001). Økokrim, Oslo.

Bjørkøy, V.
2013   Hva er norsk kultur? Jeg vet ikke hva jeg skal verne om, og hva som er så farlig? Electronic document, http://www.aftenposten.no/meninger/debatt/Hva-er-norsk-kultur-7319672.html#.UkGJCIa-18E, accessed April 15, 2015. Published by *Aftenposten*.

Blommaert, J.
2001   Context is/as critique. *Critique of Anthropology* 21:13-32.

Breeze, R.
2011   Critical discourse analysis and its critics. *Pragmatics* 21(4):493-525.

Burr, V.
1995   *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*. Routledge, London.

Carman, J. and M. L. S. Sørensen
2009   Heritage studies: An outline. I *Heritage studies: Methods and approaches*, edited by M. L. S. Sørensen og J. Carman, ss. 11-28. Routledge, London.

Comer, D. C.

2013 Ch. 9: Archaeology, minorities, identity and citizenship in the United States. In *Heritage in the context of globalization: Europe and the Americas*, edited by P. F. Biehl and C. Prescott, pp. 69-76. Springer Briefs in Archaeology Vol. 8. Springer, New York.

Díaz-Andreu, M. and T. Champion (editors)

1996 *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe.* Routledge Library Editions: Archaeology. Routledge, London.

Eikrem, K.

2005 1905-2005: Har arkeologien framleis ein nasjonal agenda? *Primitive Tider* 8: 21-32.

Einarsen, H. P.

2005 *Mellom undringshjem og kamparenaer: Museer og den flerkulturelle virkeligheten.* ABM skrift No. 12. ABM-utvikling, Oslo.

Eriksen, T. H.

2001 Kultur, kommunikasjon og makt, In *Flerkulturell forståelse*, edited by T. H. Eriksen, pp. 57-72. Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.

Fairclough, N.

1989 *Language and power*. Longman, London.

1992 *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press, Cambridge.

1995 *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. Longman, Harlow.

Gansum, T.

1999 Regionen – det forestilte fellesskap: Refleksjoner rundt regionsbegrepet. In *Fiender og forbundsfeller: Regional kontakt gjennom historien. Karmøyseminaret 1999*, edited by av M. S. Vea and H. R. Naley, pp. 13–24. Vikingfestivalen, Karmøy kommune, Koperøy.

Gaukstad, E.

2005 Fra antikvarisk interesse til en egen forvaltning. In *Kulturminnevern: Lov, forvaltning, håndhevelse, Bind 1*, edited by Jørn Holme, pp. 130-135. 2nd ed. Økokrims skriftserie 12 (2001). Økokrim, Oslo.

Gaukstad, E. and J. Holme

2005 Hovedaktørene i kulturminneforvaltningen. In *Kulturminnevern: Lov, forvaltning, håndhevelse, Bind 1*, edited by J. Holme, pp. 136-147. 2nd ed. Økokrims skriftserie 12 (2001). Økokrim, Oslo.

González-Ruibal, A.

2008 Time to destroy: An archaeology of supermodernity. *Current Anthropology*, 49(2): 247-279.

Graham, B., G.J. Ashworth and J.E. Tunbridge

2000 *A geography of heritage: Power, culture and economy*. Arnold, London.

Guttormsen, T. S.

2013a   Bruken av en heroisk fortid i lokalt minnearbeid: Vikinghelten Harald Hårfagre. In *Å lage kulturminner - hvordan kulturarv forstås, formes og forvaltes*, edited by G. Swensen, pp. 59-92. Novus, Oslo.

2013b   Arkeologi i all offentlighet: Arkeologihistorie i Norge belyst ved fortidens veier som historie- og minnekunnskap. Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Historical Studies, Faculty of Arts, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg.

2014a   Branding local heritage and popularising a remote past: The example of Haugesund in Western Norway. *AP Online Journal in Public Archaeology* 1:45–60.

2014b   Bruken av Borreparken i regionale kulturarvsstrategier i Vestfold. In *VIKING Norsk arkeologisk årbok,* Volume LXXVII, pp. 159-180. Norwegian Archaeological Society, Oslo.

Hacking, I.

1999   *The Social Construction of What*? Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Held, D., A. McGrew, D. Goldblatt and J. Perraton

1999   *Global transformations: politics, economics and culture*. Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Holme, J.

2005a   Generelt om loven. In *Kulturminnevern: Lov, forvaltning, håndhevelse. Bind 2: Kulturminneloven med kommentarer*, edited by J. Holme, pp. 10-23. 2nd ed. Økokrims skriftserie 12 (2001). Økokrim, Oslo.

2005b   Bokens målsetting. In *Kulturminnevern: Lov, forvaltning, håndhevelse. Bind 1*, edited by J. Holme, pp. 10-12. 2nd ed. Økokrims skriftserie 12 (2001). Økokrim, Oslo.

Holme. J. and R. Guribye

2005   Innledning. In *Kulturminnevern: Lov, forvaltning, håndhevelse. Bind 1*, edited by Jørn Holme, pp. 230-232. 2nd ed. Økokrims skriftserie 12 (2001). Økokrim, Oslo.

Holtorf, C.

2009   A European perspective on indigenous and immigrant archaeologies. *World Archaeology* 41(4): 672-681.

Hoven, B. V., L. Meijering and P.P. Huigen

2005   Escaping times and places: An artist community in germany. In *Senses of Place: Senses of Time*, edited by G. J. Ashworth and B. Graham, pp. 155-164. Ashgate, Aldershot.

Huigen, P.P. and L. Meijering

2005   Making place: A story of De Venen. In *Senses of place: senses of time*, edited by G. J. Ashworth and B. Graham, pp. 19-30. Ashgate, Aldershot.

Högberg, A.
2013   *Mångfaldsfrågor i kulturmiljövården: Tankar, kunskaper och processer*. Nordic Academic Press, Lund.

Isar, Y. R., D. Viejo-Rose and H. K. Anheier
2011   Introduction. In *Heritage, memory and identity*, edited by H. Anheier and Y. R. Isar, pp. 82-94. The Cultures and Globalization Series 4, Sage, London.

Graves-Brown, P., S. Jones and C. Gamble
1996   *Cultural identity and archaeology: the construction of European communities*. Routledge, London.

Jørgensen, M. W. and L. Phillips
1999   *Diskursanalyse som teori og metode*. Roskilde Universitetsforlag, Fredriksberg.

Keller, C.
2006   80-årenes arkeologi: Fra norsk løve til fransk puddel. *Nicolay arkeologisk tidsskrift* 100:17–23.

Kjørup, S.
2001   Den ubegrundede skepsis: en kritisk diskussion af socialkonstruktionismens filosofiske grundlag. *Sosiologi i Dag*, 31(2):5-22.

Laclau, E. and C. Mouffe
2001   *Hegemony and socialist strategy : towards a radical democratic politics*. 2nd edition. Verso, London.

Lydon, J.
2009   Young and Free: The Australian Past in a Global Future. In *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies*, edited by L. Meskell, pp. 28-47. Duke University Press, Durham.

Meskell, L.
2002   The intersections of identity and politics. Annual Review of Anthropology, 31:279-301.

Mydland, L. and Wera G.
2012   Identifying heritage values in local communities. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18(6):564-587.

Neumann, I. B.
2001   *Mening, materialitet, makt: En innføring i diskursanalyse*. Fagbokforlaget, Bergen.

Olsen, B. J.

2003   Material culture after text: re-membering things. *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 36(2): 87-104.

2007   Keeping things at arm's length: a genealogy of asymmetry. *World Archaeology*, 39(4): 579-588

2012   Symmetrical Archaeology. In *Archaeological Theory Today*, edited by I. Hodder, pp. 208-228. 2nd edition. Polity, Cambridge.

Pendlebury, J., T. Townshend and R. Gilroy

2004   The conservation of English cultural built heritage: A force for social inclusion? *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 10(1):11-31.

Pétursdóttir, T.

2013   Concrete matters: Ruins of modernity and the things called heritage. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 13(1):31-53.

Porr, M.

2010   Palaeolithic Art as Cultural Memory: a Case Study of the Aurignacian Art of Southwest Germany. Cambridge Archaeological Journal, 20:87-108.

Potter, J. and M. Wetherell

1987   Chapter 8: How to Analyse Discourse. In *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour,* pp. 158-176. Sage, London.

Prescott, C.

2013   Ch. 8: Heritage and the new immigrant minorities, a catalyst of relevance of contemporary archaeology? In *Heritage in the context of globalization: Europe and the Americas*, edited by P. F. Biehl and C. Prescott, pp. 59-65. Springer Briefs in Archaeology Vol. 8. Springer, New York.

Rekdal, P.B.

2003   En ny nasjonsbygging? *Museumsnytt* 2:18-20.

Rosenberg, G.

2006   Mångfald som minne och möjlighet. In *Arkeologi och mångkultur: Rapport från Svenskt arkeologmöte,* edited by M. Burström, pp. 11-21. Södertörns högskola, Huddinge.

Rømming, E.

1999   Desentralisering,   regionalmakt   og   lokale   maktstrukturer: Makt-   og demokratiutredningens   rapportserie,   rapport   nr.   5.   Electronic   document, http://www.sv.uio.no/mutr/publikasjoner/rapporter/rapp1999/rapport5.html,   accessed April 15, 2015. Published by *University of Oslo.*

Sandvik, S. and B. Myklebust

2013   Siv   Jensen   sliter   med   å   definere   norsk   kultur.   Electronic   document, http://www.nrk.no/valg2013/sliter-med-a-definere-norsk-kultur-1.11195742,   accessed April 15, 2015. Published by *Norsk rikskringkasting (NRK).*

Shennan, S.

1989   Introduction: archaeological approaches to cultural identity. In *Archaeological approaches to cultural identity*, edited by S. Shennan, pp. 1-32. One world archaeology vol. 10. Unwin Hyman, London.

Smith, L.

2004   *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*. Routledge, London.

2006   *Uses of Heritage*. Routledge, London.

2011   Comments on Brit Solli: 'Some Reflections on Heritage and Archaeology in the Anthropocene'. Look! It's a Collection of Rocks! *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, 44(1): 71-74.

2012   Discourses of heritage: Implications for archaeological community practice. Electronic document, http://nuevomundo.revues.org/64148, accessed April 15, 2015. Published by *Nuevo Mundo/Mundos Nuevos*.

Solli, B.

1996   Fortiden er et annet sted: Om arkeologi og kulturminnevern, røtter og føtter. *Norsk Antropologisk Tidsskrift* 2:79-90.

1997   Forankring fryder? *Ottar* 3:15-20.

2011   Some Reflections on Heritage and Archaeology in the Anthropocene. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 44(1): 40-54.

Statistics Norway

2015   Immigrants and Norwegian-born to immigrant parents, 1 January 2015. Electronic document, http://www.ssb.no/en/befolkning/statistikker/innvbef, accessed April 15, 2015. Published by *Statistics Norway*.

Stubbs, M.

1996   *Text and corpus analysis: Compute-assisted studies of language and institutions*. Language in Society Series. Blackwell, London.

1997   Whorf's children: Critical comments on critical discourse analysis. In *Evolving Models of Language: Papers from the Annual Meeting of the British Association for Applied Linguistics Held at the University of Wales, Swansea, September 1996*, edited by A. Ryan, and A. Wray, pp. 100-116. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.

Svestad, A.

2003   Finn din egen filosof: Konfrontasjoner og kontradiksjoner i den arkeologiske teoridebatten. Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Archaeology and Social Anthropology, Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education, University of Tromsø, Tromsø.

Sørensen, M. L. S.
2009   Between the lines and in the margins: Interviewing people about attitudes to heritage and identity. In *Heritage studies: Approaches and methods*, edited by M. L. S. Sørensen and J. Carman, pp. 164-177. Routledge, London.

Toolan, M.
1997   What is critical discourse analysis and why are people saying such terrible things about it? *Language and Literature* 6(2):83-102.

Tybring-Gjedde, C. and H. Tajik
2013   Skriftlig spørsmål fra Christian Tybring-Gjedde (FrP) til kulturministeren. Electronic document, https://www.stortinget.no/no/Saker-og-publikasjoner/Sporsmal/Skriftlige-sporsmal-og-svar/Skriftlig-sporsmal/?qid=55722, accessed April 15, 2015. Published by *Stortinget*.

Van Dyke, R.M. and S.E. Alcock
2003   Archaeologies of memory: An introduction. In *Archaeologies of memory*, edited by R.M. Van Dyke and S.E. Alcock, pp. 1-14. Blackwell, Malden.

Verschueren, J.
2012   *Ideology in language use: Pragmatic guidelines for empirical research*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Waterton, E.
2010   *Politics, policy and the discourses of heritage in Britain*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Waterton E., L. Smith and G. Campell
2006   The utility of discourse analysis to heritage studies: The Burra charter and social inclusion. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12(4):339-355.

Webmoor, T. and C. L. Witmore
2008   Things are Us! A Commentary on Human/Things Relations under the Banner of a 'Social' Archaeology. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 40(1): 53-70.

Widdowson, H. G.
2005   *Text, context, pretext: Critical issues in discourse analysis*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Witmore, C. L.
2011   Comments on Brit Solli: 'Some Reflections on Heritage and Archaeology in the Anthropocene': Growing Beyond Leviathan: Archaeology and the Anthropocene. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 44(1): 74-78.

Østigård, T.
2001   *Norge uten nordmenn*. Spartacus, Oslo.

2009   Nasjonal og regional identitet eller kulturell kompleksitet: Forståelser av irrelevante og unike kulturminner. *Primitive Tider* 11:19-29.

Wangensteen, B. (editor)
2005   *Bokmålsordboka: Definisjons- og rettskrivningsordbok*, p. 632, "Mangfold". Compiled by University of Oslo, Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies and The Language Council of Norway. 3ʳᵈ edition. Kunnskapsforlaget, Oslo.

Laws and conventions

Council of Europe
1992   European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. Electronic document, http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/148.htm, accessed April 15, 2015.

1992   European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage. Electronic document, http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/143.htm, accessed April 15, 2015.

1995   Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. Electronic document, http://conventions.coe.int/treaty/en/Treaties/Html/157.htm, accessed April 15, 2015.

2005   Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society. Electronic document, http://www.conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/199.htm, accessed April 15, 2015.

Cultural Heritage Act
1978   Lov av 9. juni 1978 nr. 50 om kulturminner. Grøndahl & Søn, Oslo. English version available as electronic document, https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/cultural-heritage-act/id173106/, accessed April 15, 2015.

ICOMOS
1979   The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance. Electronic document, http://australia.icomos.org/publications/charters/, accessed April 15, 2015.

Planning and Building Act
2008   Lov av 27. juni 2008 nr. 71 Lov om planlegging og byggesaksbehandling. Electronic document, https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2008-06-27-71?q=plan+og+bygningsloven, accessed April 15, 2015.

UNESCO
2001   Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity. Electronic document, http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13179&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html, accessed April 15, 2015.

Appendix 1

International heritage conventions ratified by Norway

- 1954 UNESCO, *Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict,* ratified by Norway in 1961
- 1969 CoE, *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage,* adopted by the Council of Europe in 1969, revised 1992, ratified by Norway in 1995
- 1970 UNESCO *Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property,* ratified by Norway in 2007
- 1972 UNESCO, *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage,* ratified by Norway in 1977
- 1995 UNIDROIT, *Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects*, ratified by Norway in 2001
- 2000 CoE, *European Landscape Convention,* ratified by Norway in 2001.
- 2003 UNESCO, *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, ratified by Norway in 2007
- 2005 CoE, *Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*, ratified by Norway in 2008.

International conventions affecting heritage of cultural minorities

- 1966 UN, *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, (see Article 27), ratified by Norway in 1972.
- 1989 ILO, *Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention*, ratified by Norway in 1990
- 1992 UN, *Convention on Biological Diversity* (see Article 8), ratified by Norway in 1993
- 1995 CoE, *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities,* ratified by Norway in 1999
- 2005 UNESCO, *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions,* ratified by Norway in 2007

Appendix 2

Original versions of translated quotes and excerpts

Sandvik, S. and B. Myklebust (2013) *Siv Jensen sliter med å definere norsk kultur*

"Norsk kultur er definert ut fra vår mangeårige bakgrunn og historie som kanskje fremhever Norge og nordmenn mer enn man vil finne tilsvarende trekk av i andre land, svarte hun til slutt" (Sandvik, S. and B. Myklebust 2013)

Fremskrittspartiets Bærekraftutvalg (2013) - *Bærekraftig innvandring:*

"Men det er ikke bare det økonomiske perspektivet som er vesentlig. Fremskrittspartiets Bærekraftutvalg ønsker samtidig en innvandring som er kulturelt og verdimessig bærekraftig. Norge har rett til å opprettholde sitt kulturelle særpreg. Flerkultur betyr ikke at Norge skal gi slipp på sine nedarvede tradisjoner for å tilpasse oss innvandrede verdier og tradisjoner. Bærekraftutvalget mener tvert om at alle i Norge skal bestrebe seg på å tilpasse seg våre grunnleggende frihetsverdier, slik som demokrati, pluralisme, likestilling, likeverd, ytringsfrihet, religiøs frihet, valgfrihet, trygghet og personvern, og bli fullverdige deltakere i det folkelige fellesskapet med respekt og ærbødighet for nasjonen Norge" (Fremskrittspartiets Bærekraftutvalg 2013:4).

Kulturminnekomiteen (2000) - *NOU 2002:1 – Fortid former fremtid: Utfordringer i en ny kulturminnepolitikk*:

"Bakgrunnen for oppnevningen av kulturminneutvalget var Stortingets behandling våren 1998 av St.meld. nr. 58 (1996–97) Miljøvernpolitikk for en bærekraftig utvikling – Dugnad for framtida . Stortingsflertallet la til grunn at dagens kulturminnepolitikk ikke var tilstrekkelig for å sikre vår felles kulturarv for kommende generasjoner. De mente det var behov for en grundig vurdering av mål, strategier og virkemidler" (KU 2000:4)

"Med visjonen «Kulturminner og kulturmiljøer – kilder til opplevelse, utvikling og verdiskaping» og fem klart definerte mål, ønsker utvalgets flertall å legge grunnlaget for en kulturminnepolitikk som gir bedre vern og bedre bruk av mangfoldet av kulturminner og kulturmiljøer ved – å legge vekt på kulturell variasjon og mangfold – å gi muligheter for et differensiert vern og for regionale variasjoner – å gi rom for åpne og fleksible verdivurderinger som tar hensyn til historiske, sosiale og kulturelle sammenhenger – å legge økt vekt på formidling av og tilgjengelighet til kulturminner og kulturmiljøer – å legge vekt på prosesser med bred deltakelse og lokal forankring – å rette større oppmerksomhet mot kulturminner og kulturmiljøer som kunnskaps- og opplevelsesressurser – å legge vekt på miljømessige sammenhenger, inkludert sammenhengen mellom natur og kultur – å legge til rette for en tilpassing mellom vernets formål og eieres, rettighetshaveres og brukeres interesser, inkludert videreføring og utvikling av næringsvirksomhet – å foreta en markant større økonomisk satsing og en rettferdig fordeling av omkostningene ved fredning og vern, og – å gjennomføre lovendringer og organisatoriske endringer for å oppnå dette" (KU 2000:9).

"Alle de spor menneskers liv og virksomhet har etterlatt seg i omgivelsene er kulturminner og kulturmiljøer, enten de tilhører en fjern eller en nær fortid" (KU 2000:19).

Kanskje representerer fortiden, med sitt materielle uttrykk i form av kulturmiljøer, kulturminner og store og små gjenstander, noe varig og stedlig i et samfunn som er i stadig endring og som blir stadig mer globalisert. Kulturminnene og kulturmiljøene gir menneskene forankring i tilværelsen. De er en felles kunnskaps- og erfaringsbank. De viser at fortiden er til stede i nåtiden. Vi kan dele dem med andre og slik kan de bidra til det sosiale og kulturelle fellesskapet. Mange kulturminner knytter seg til bestemte personer, slekter eller grupper, andre mer til bruken av naturen, til bosetting, arbeid og familieliv, til håndverksferdigheter, sosiale forskjeller og konflikter, til religionsutøvelse og kulturell utveksling. De byr på ulike muligheter for opplevelse og identifisering langt utover den spesifikke historien som knytter seg til dem. Folk legger ulike ting i dem og oppfatter dem på forskjellige måter, avhengig av eget utgangspunkt og egne erfaringer. Den nære fortiden er ofte den som betyr mest for den enkelte. Da kan ofte avstanden til arkeologiske kulturminner bli for stor. På den andre siden er det få ting som pirrer nysgjerrigheten og fantasien mer enn det å bli kjent med hemmelighetene som en tilsynelatende unnselig boplass kan avsløre om de menneskene som en gang levde der og om

livsvilkårene og samfunnet deres. Sporene fra de eldste tidene har stor verdi. De viser kulturelle variasjoner og historiske endringer helt tilbake til tider da livsvilkår, teknologi, samfunnsliv og religion var totalt forskjellig fra i dag; tilbake til en tid lenge før nasjonalstaten Norge fantes. De dokumenterer nærværet av «det ukjente», av andre levemåter og verdensanskuelser. Bevisstheten om at det fremmede ikke bare er noe som kommer utenfra, men noe menneskene er omgitt av og på en måte også er en del av, kan bidra til å skape større forståelse og toleranse for kulturelle ulikheter. Kulturminner og kulturmiljøer er møteplasser mellom fortiden, nåtiden og framtiden. De er en del av det fysiske miljøet, håndfaste og originale vitnesbyrd om menneskenes liv og virke i tidligere tider. At fortidens generasjoner på en måte er til stede i omgivelsene og landskapet man selv ferdes i, kan gi en opplevelse av at historien angår en selv, av at man inngår i en større sammenheng. Disse samme landskapene som deles med tidligere generasjoner, skal jo også deles med dem som kommer etter oss. Kulturminner og kulturmiljøer kan derfor gi perspektiv både bakover og framover i tiden" (KU 2000:21).

"Hvilke verdier som betyr noe for enkeltmennesker og grupper avhenger av mange faktorer, som bakgrunn, interesser, kunnskap og erfaringer. Hva man oppfatter som kulturminner og hvilke verdier man legger i dem, varierer både over tid og etter geografiske, kulturelle og ervervsmessige forhold" (KU 2000:23).

"Kulturminner og kulturmiljøer gir opplevelser og kunnskap, de er viktige for vår forståelse av oss selv og andre, og for forståelsen av andre tider" (KU 2000:26).

"Å forvalte kulturarven handler om å forvalte et bredt spekter av verdier som ikke alltid er sammenfallende og som også kan stå i motsetning til andre verdier" (KU 2000:27).

"Kulturminner og kulturmiljøer viser et historisk, kulturelt og materielt mangfold" (KU 2000:30).

"For å gi ulike grupper av befolkningen mulighet for opplevelse av tilhørighet og kulturell identitet, er det viktig at kulturminnebestanden avspeiler et mest mulig helhetlig bilde av historien. For å nå dette målet for kulturminnepolitikken må det – legges vekt på kulturell variasjon og mangfold, – gis muligheter for et differensiert vern og for regionale variasjoner – gis rom for åpne og fleksible verdivurderinger som tar hensyn til historiske, sosiale og kulturelle sammenhenger" (KU 2000:31).

"For at folk skal ha glede av og engasjere seg i kulturminner, må de oppleve at kulturminnene har betydning for dem eller at de gir tilhørighet og identitet. Historien må fortelles og forstås. Gjennom å gi kommunene større innflytelse over egne kulturminner og større ansvar for lokale tiltak, kan kulturminnepolitikken lettere forankres lokalt" (KU 2000:32).

"Realverdien av kulturminnene er en betydelig del av nasjonalformuen. Det er en viktig del av kulturminnepolitikken å forvalte denne formuen, og sørge for at verdiene ikke forringes" (KU 2000:36).

"Økt kommunikasjon og flytting over landegrensene gir nye impulser og øker det kulturelle mangfoldet, men kan også føre til at den stedlige egenarten gradvis blir utvisket. Utfordringene ligger i å styrke bevisstheten om kulturminnenes verdi for livskvalitet og trivsel" (KU 2000:38).

"Situasjonen for de nasjonale minoritetene er høyst ulik. I St.meld. nr. 15 (2000–2001) Nasjonale minoritetar i Noreg – Om statleg politikk overfor jødar, kvener, rom, romanifolket og skogfinnar omtales minoritetenes rettigheter i forhold til kulturarven: «Kulturarven til dei nasjonale minoritetane er ein del av kulturarven i Noreg. Norske styresmakter har såleis eit særskilt ansvar for å ta vare på kulturarven og dei kulturelle tradisjonane til minoritetane. Ved å ratifisere Ramme-konvensjonen om vern av nasjonale minoritetar og Den europeiske pakta om regions- og minoritetsspråk, har staten teke på seg eit spesielt ansvar for å støtte tiltak med sikte på å ta vare på, styrkje og vidareutvikle kulturen til dei nasjonale minoritetane og minoritetsspråka kvensk/finsk, romanes og romani.» Felles for alle disse gruppene er at storsamfunnet har gjort svært lite for å sikre deres kulturarv. Det samme er tilfellet når det gjelder å ta vare på kulturminner skapt av grupper med innvandrerbakgrunn i løpet av de siste 30 årene. Det må utformes nasjonale mål og retningslinjer for i første omgang å vurdere å verne et minimumsantall objekter. Det er viktig at de nasjonale minoritetene selv får være med og avgjøre hvilke tiltak som skal prioriteres, og hvordan de skal utformes. De nasjonale minoritetenes organisasjoner spiller en viktig rolle i dette arbeidet, og må settes i stand til å fylle sin rolle. Dette kulturelle mangfoldet må i sterkere grad integreres i kulturminnearbeidet, og må blant annet komme til uttrykk i arbeidet med tematiske, sektorvise og geografiske verneplaner, og arealplaner etter plan- og bygningsloven" (KU 2000:46).

"Mange lokalsamfunn har et bevisst forhold til sin kulturhistorie. Den brukes målrettet og med stolthet i ulike sammenhenger, blant annet i forbindelse med innspill til ulike arealplanprosesser. Å vise til at kommunen har en bevisst politikk på dette området, vil ofte være et konkurransefortrinn ved næringsetablering eller tilflytting" (KU 2000:52).

"Det er akseptert at kulturminnene har en verdi. I flere undersøkelser de siste årene sier et stort flertall av de spurte at kulturminnene har stor verdi og at det er viktig å ta vare på dem. Det er imidlertid vanskelig å kvantifisere verdien. En mulig tilnærming er å tenke seg at verdifulle kulturminner forsvinner. Hvilke konsekvenser ville det hatt dersom alle gravhauger og helleristninger forsvant? Kan vi tenke oss Norge uten viktige nasjonale symboler som det kongelige slott, Eidsvollsbygningen eller Stiklestad? I Bergen var det på 1950- tallet demonstrasjoner for å få revet Bryggen. Hvilke konsekvenser ville det hatt for dagens turisttilstrømming eller for markedsføringen av Bergen om Bryggen var blitt revet? Å tenke seg en slik situasjon er viktig for å fastslå verdien av kulturminnet. Det mest dramatiske tapet av verdifulle kulturminner de siste årene, er kirkebrannene på 1990-tallet. Ikke overraskende førte tapet av en kirke til sterke reaksjoner i lokalsamfunnet, også fra dem som ikke brukte kirken som kirke. For de fleste var dette et opplagt tap, også langt ut over kirkens økonomiske verdi" (KU 2000:133).

"I en verden der globaliseringen stadig griper om seg, er det viktig at mangfoldet av kulturminner og kulturmiljøer blir tatt i bruk på en bevisst og konstruktiv måte, som brobygger mellom grupper, land og regioner" (KU 2000:205).

The Cultural Heritage Management Office of Oslo (2003) - *Bystyremelding 4/2003 – Kulturminnevern i Oslo*:

"Byantikvaren ønsker med denne utgivelsen av Bystyremelding 4/2003, Kulturminnevern i Oslo å gjøre den overordnede strategien for kulturminnevernet i Oslo kjent og tilgjengelig for beslutningstakere, planleggere, tiltakshavere og andre interesserte og dermed bidra til at Oslo utvikles med bevaring og opplevelse av byens historie som en sentral premiss" (BAO 2003:3).

"Byrådet ønsker med denne bystyremelding å gi en samlet, overordnet strategi for bedre å ivareta kulturminnevernet i Oslo. Meldingen fastsetter en politisk og faglig plattform for kulturminnearbeidet i kommunen. Det er første gang en slik melding fremmes i Oslo. … Byrådet vil formulere hovedmålet for kulturminnevernet slik: De overordnete prioriteringene for kulturminnevern skal knyttes til viktige historiske deler av det fysiske miljøet, slik at Oslo oppleves med en tidsdybde – et historisk uttrykk – som er den 1000 år gamle byen og dens forhistorie verdig" (BAO 2003:7).

"Byens identitet er sterkt knyttet til kulturminnene, og vår historie og kunnskap om fortiden gir et solid grunnlag for videre utvikling. Byrådet vil ivareta dette til beste for individet og fellesskapet" (BAO 2003:7).

" Hovedstaden Oslo står klart fram som den mest mangfoldige byen i Norge. Det gjelder så vel befolkning og offentlig administrasjon som nærings- og kulturliv. Også det fysiske kulturmiljøet og historien den representerer er av de mest mangfoldige i norske byer Samtidig har Oslo som hovedstad viktige særtrekk sammenlignet med mange av de øvrige hovedsteder i Europa. Det er kulturminnevernets oppgave å bidra til at disse verdiene videreføres til berikelse for byens identitet, landet og vår samlede historie" (BAO 2003:9).

"Å ta vare på våre kulturminner er blitt stadig viktigere de siste tiårene. Byens historie dokumenteres i stor grad av kulturminnene. De bidrar til å gi den identitet, og gir rammer og er inspirasjon for videre utvikling. Vi trenger en historisk forankring og kulturminnene rundt i byen er daglige henvisninger til vår fortid. Dette gir oss trygghet og opplevelser – en øket livskvalitet. Kulturminnenes betydning som identitetsskaper og miljøfaktor vil sannsynligvis øke de kommende årene" (BAO 2003:9).

"I denne meldingen er det vern av faste kulturminner og kulturmiljøer – sporene i landskapet – som er emnet. Byen som helhet er pr. definisjon det store sporet i Oslolandskapet. Vern av løse gjenstander og immaterielle kulturminner er først og fremst en oppgave for museene og knyttet til kultursektoren, mens vern av faste kulturminner er meget sterkt knyttet til miljøforvaltningen" (BAO 2003:11).

"Det overordnete målet for miljøvern er å sikre levende organismer overlevings- og utviklingsmuligheter. Brudd og endringer i livsvilkårene er ofte årsak til store skader. Følgende spørsmål er derfor sentralt også for kulturminnevernet: - hvor og når oppstår de utålelige, fremmedgjørende brudd på sammenhenger som påfører

oss skade som enkeltindivider og samfunn? Dette er spørsmål om så vel fysiske og biologiske vilkår som sosiale og kulturelle vilkår. - hvilke livshorisonter skal være til stede som muligheter i byen? Dette er et spørsmål om mangfold i motsetning til ensidighet og monotoni" (BAO 2003:13).

"Moderne kulturminnevern er "for alle" – alles historie er viktig. Kulturarven er et felles ansvar og anliggende, og godene som forbindes med kulturminnene er ikke forbeholdt noen eksklusiv gruppe. Ikke minst er dette viktig i det flerkulturelle perspektivet som blir stadig tydeligere i samfunnet vårt. Det perspektivet medfører også at innvandrernes kulturminner etter hvert blir et viktig tema. Problemstillingene som knytter seg til dette er nær beslektet med kulturminnene som knytter seg til de nasjonale minoritetene" (BAO 2003:13).

"Kulturminnevern skal vise alles historie; og kulturminner skal så langt det er mulig, uten å påføre objektet vesentlig skade, gjøres tilgjengelig for alle, også for orienterings- og bevegelseshemmede" (BAO 2003:14).

"Demokratiet er på sin side en forutsetning for det sosiale og kulturelle mangfoldet som kjennetegner den europeiske kultursfæren og det mangfold av impulser som byene representerer" (BAO 2003:16).

"Byer kan også forstås som resultater av felles innsatser og/eller innordning av mer individuelle innsatser i kollektive strukturer. Den velfungerende byen må derfor også til enhver tid trekke grenser mellom stimulerende mangfold og unødig variasjon, mellom destruktivt kaos og nødvendig orden. Byborgeren må kunne orientere seg i det sosiale, kulturelle og fysiske bylandskapet for å fungere. Og orienteringen er avhengig av varige kjenne og landemerker som gjenkjennes av generasjon etter generasjon, med grunnlag i det kollektive minnet. Så vel fysisk form som symbolsk innhold har betydning for dét minnet" (BAO 2003:16-17).

"Både Stockholm og København har et dynamisk kulturminnevern som viktig premiss i sine overordnede planer. EU's felles planperspektiv, European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) har en sterk fokusering på bevaring av byers kulturhistoriske og arkitektoniske særpreg, nettopp for å styrke og utvikle en regional identitet. Flere av de europeiske byene som for tiden opplever størst økonomisk suksess, er også på topp i forhold til kulturminnevern, estetikk og bymiljø! Ikke sjelden skjer dette gjennom høy kvalitet i det nye som synliggjør det moderne samtidig som viktige eldre miljøer vernes. På samme måte kan Oslo utnytte og løfte fram sin identitet ved sterkere profilering av det særpreget som allerede ligger i kulturminner og kulturmiljø" (BAO 2003:36-37).

"Et vesentlig trekk ved forvaltning av kulturminner er at mye av grunnlaget er basert på faglig skjønn. Dette skjønnet endres også over tid i takt med de allmenne samfunnsmessige og historiske endringene" (BAO 2003:42).

"Kjærlighet til og stolthet over byen er kanskje det viktigste fundament for å drive kulturminnevern. Samtidig er kulturminnene et av de aller beste utgangspunkt for å utvikle nettopp slik kjærlighet og stolthet. Men kulturminnevern må utvikles med grunnlag i kunnskapsbaserte verdivurderinger. Det ligger derfor store forpliktelser på kulturminneforvaltningen i å formidle kunnskaper og vurderinger til alle byens borgere; og særlig overfor nye innbyggere som ikke har tatt del i generasjoners overføringer av historiske linjer og sammenhenger" (BAO 2003:48).

Miljøverndepartementet (2005) - *St. meld. nr. 16 (2004–2005) Leve med kulturminner*:

"Kulturarven forteller om utviklingen i samfunnet fram til i dag, og den er med på å prege beslutninger for framtiden. Både historiske bygninger, bymiljøer, arkeologiske spor og landskap er kulturminner. Alle kulturminner og kulturmiljøer inngår som elementer i samfunnets kollektive hukommelse. Kulturarven kan bidra med kunnskap, fortellinger og opplevelser som kan ha betydning for gruppers og det enkelte menneskets tilhørighet, selvforståelse, selvutvikling og trivsel" (MD 2005:5).

"I 2001 fremmet Unesco en universell deklarasjon om kulturelt mangfold der det blant annet heter at «kulturelt mangfold er like nødvendig for menneskeheten som biologisk mangfold er for naturen. I et slikt perspektiv er det kulturelle mangfoldet menneskehetens felles arv og må erkjennes og sikres til beste for dagens og morgendagens generasjoner»"(MD 2005:5).

"Begrepet kulturarv favner et bredt spekter av materiell og immateriell arv fra tidligere tider. Med immateriell kulturarv menes for eksempel muntlige tradisjoner og uttrykk, inkludert språk, utøvende kunst, sosiale skikker, ritualer og festiviteter, kunnskap og ferdigheter knyttet til naturen og tradisjonelle håndverksferdigheter. Der

annet ikke er presisert, blir begrepet kulturarv i denne meldingen begrenset til å omfatte faste kulturminner i det fysiske miljøet. Det omfatter også steder det knytter seg hendelser, tro og tradisjon til" (MD 2005:5-6).

"Kulturminner er uerstattelige kilder til kunnskap og opplevelse. De gir muligheten til å forstå at mennesket inngår i en større sammenheng. Denne tilhørigheten og tryggheten i egen kultur er viktig også for å kunne møte andres kultur med respekt. Norge har alltid fått betydelige kulturelle impulser utenfra. I møte med fremmede kulturuttrykk har folk til alle tider latt seg inspirere av dem og gitt dem en lokal fortolkning. Mange av landets kulturminner er resultat av en utveksling av kunnskap og tradisjoner med mennesker fra andre kulturer og nasjoner. I en verden der ulike land og kulturer er brakt tettere sammen, blir kulturarven enda viktigere for kulturell selvforståelse og utveksling" (MD 2005:5).

"Det er gått 18 år siden den forrige stortings meldingen om kulturminnepolitikken ble lagt fram. St.meld. nr. 39 (1986–87) Bygnings- og fornminnevernet la grunnlaget for den desentraliserte kulturminneforvaltningen på regionalt nivå i fylkeskommunen. I 1994 ble det etablert en egen samisk kulturminneforvaltning" (MD 2005:9).

"I St.meld. nr. 58 (1996–97) Miljøvernpolitikk for en bærekraftig utvikling – Dugnad for framtida ble kulturminne feltet utførlig presentert som ledd i en samlet miljøpolitikk" (MD 2005:9).

"Regjeringen Bondevik I nedsatte i 1999 et bredt sammensatt utvalg med 17 medlemmer for å utrede mål, strategier og virkemidler i kulturminne politikken. Kulturminneutvalget leverte sin utredning, NOU 2002: 1 Fortid former framtid – Utfordringer i en ny kulturminnepolitikk, 21. desember 2001. Utredningen inneholder vurderinger og formuleringer av verdigrunnlag, mål og strategier for en fornyet kulturminnepolitikk" (MD 2005:9).

"Arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer som det knytter seg hendelser, tro og tradisjon til, har ofte stor verdi knyttet til opplevelse av tilhørighet og identitet" (MD 2005:26).

"Kulturminner og kulturmiljøer representerer ressurser som kan ha stor betydning for å utvikle levende lokalsamfunn og ny næringsvirksomhet. Både nasjonalt og internasjonalt blir stadig større oppmerksomhet rettet mot hvordan kulturminner og kulturmiljøer kan bidra til sosial, kulturell og økonomisk utvikling. Kulturminnene og naturen representerer et stort potensial for fortsatt sysselsetting og bosetting i mange bygder, både langs kysten og i innlandet over hele landet. En forutsetning for verdiskaping og næringsutvikling basert på kultur- og naturarven er at aktiviteten ikke må komme i konflikt med verdiene som ligger i denne arven, jf. St.prp. nr. 65 (2002–2003) Tilleggsbevilgninger og omprioriteringer i statsbudsjettet medregnet folketrygden 2003" (MD 2005:45).

"I motsetning til hva som skjer andre steder, har industrien i Moss økt omsetningen. Dette har Møllebyen bidratt til. Møllebyen og dens aktiviteter blir aktivt brukt i markedsføringen og eksponeringen av mange bedrifter. I en undersøkelse Econ utførte i 2003, peker representanter for beboerne i nærområdet på at Møllebyen er en viktig trivselsfaktor. Undersøkelsen viser videre at rehabiliteringen av Møllebyen har bidratt til å gi mossingene en ny identitet. «Mosselukta» er byttet ut med «Møllebyen» (MD 2005:47).

"Til alle tider har folk flyttet inn og ut av området som i dag utgjør staten Norge. Dette gjenspeiler seg også i landets kulturarv. De siste 35 årene har imidlertid innvandringen hatt et større omfang og en annen sammensetning enn tidligere. Norge er blitt et samfunn med større kulturelt, religiøst og verdimessig mangfold, bestående av mennesker med ulike opprinnelser, språk, tradisjoner og skikker. Særlig innvandringen av mennesker fra ikke-vestlige land stiller samfunnet overfor nye muligheter og utfordringer. I tillegg til å ta vare på norsk kulturarv handler kulturminneforvaltning i det flerkulturelle Norge om å dokumentere, formidle og ta vare på kulturarv med tilknytning til: – samene som urfolk – de fem nasjonale minoritetene – jødene, kvenene, rom, romanifolket og skogfinnene – de nyere minoritetsgruppene – de siste 35 årenes innvandrere" (MD 2005:63).

"Norge har ratifisert Europarådets rammekonvensjon for beskyttelse av nasjonale minoriteter. De nasjonale minoritetene i Norge er jødene, kvenene, rom (sigøynerne), romani (taterne) og skogfinnene. Norge er forpliktet til å legge til rette for at disse gruppenes kulturarv blir bevart og utviklet, jf. konvensjonens artikkel 5. Dette arbeidet er i en startfase" (MD 2005:63).

"Hittil har lite vært gjort for å sikre de nasjonale minoritetenes og de nyere minoritetsgruppenes kulturarv. I den offentlige forvaltningens arbeid med å sikre de ulike minoritetenes kulturarv er det en utfordring å håndtere kulturelle uttrykk man selv er relativt lite kjent og fortrolig med. Det kan være både fellestrekk og forskjeller i

arbeidet med de minoritetsgruppene som har bodd i Norge i flere hundre år og de som har oppholdt seg her en relativt kort periode. Dette innebærer blant annet at det stilles store krav til dialogen med og medvirkningen fra de ulike gruppene og generasjonene blant minoritetene" (MD 2005:64).

"Kulturarven blir stadig viktigere for hvordan menneskene oppfatter seg selv og sitt eget ståsted i en verden der ulike land og kulturer er brakt tettere sammen. Samtidig fører internasjonaliseringen til at det enkelte lands kulturarv også blir sett på som et globalt anliggende. For å kunne samarbeide internasjonalt om å forvalte kulturarven er det nødvendig å respektere både egen og andres kultur og å være bevisst hvor viktig det kulturelle mangfoldet er" (MD 2005:87).

Riksantikvaren (2006) - *Rapport fra Riksantikvarens arbeid med minoritetenes kulturminner 2003-2006:*

"Rapporten fremhever behovet for å styrke vern av minoritetenes kulturminner, og at dette arbeidet bør inngå som en naturlig del av kulturminneforvaltningens øvrige arbeid. En slik alminneliggjøring av dette arbeidet vil imidlertid ikke skje av seg selv over natten. Den vil først skje etter en mer utdypet og mer omfattende gjensidig innsikt og forståelse mellom storsamfunnet og minoritetene i tiden fremover. Det er nødvendig med en ekstra innsats de nærmeste årene, slik at fortidens forsømmelser i å ta vare på de nasjonale minoritetenes kulturminner kan rettes opp" (RA 2006:3).

"Hovedmålet har vært å kartlegge behovet for identifikasjon og vern av kulturminner knyttet til nasjonale minoriteter og andre minoriteter. I tillegg har følgende delmål vært en del av arbeidet: • å sikre varig vern av faste kulturminner gjennom et tett samarbeid med minoritetene • å øke bevisstheten og kompetansen i kulturminneforvaltningen om nasjonale minoriteters og andre minoriteters kulturminner • å øke bevisstheten hos de nasjonale minoritetene og andre minoriteter om faste kulturminner som gir informasjon om deres historie i Norge i samarbeid med minoritetene" (RA 2006:4).

"Til alle tider har mennesker vært på vandring. Krig, fattigdom og forfølgelse har vært viktige årsaker til at mennesker har brutt opp. Drømmen om en bedre fremtid for seg og sine har vært en viktig motivasjon for mange. I eldre tid var det ingen nasjonale grenser som satte formelle hindringer for en slik vandring. Begreper som inn- og utvandring, samt mobilitet fikk større betydning i vår del av verden etter dannelsen av nasjonalstatene. Norge har i lang tid hatt et innslag av ulike folkegrupper. Gjennom mange generasjoner har vi hatt innvandring fra andre land i Norden og fra resten av Europa. De siste 20 – 30 årene har vi også fått en økende innvandring fra land utenfor vår egen verdensdel – enten de er kommet som arbeidsinnvandrere, flyktninger og asylsøkere eller gjennom ekteskap og familiegjenforening. Denne nye innvandringen har bidratt til å øke det flerkulturelle innslaget i Norge, og den vil i stigende grad bidra til å prege det norske samfunnet i årene fremover" (RA 2006:4).

"-Alle har rett til sin historie og kulturarv -. Dette utsagnet griper inn i sentrale spørsmål knyttet til minoritetenes historie. De ulike minoritetsmiljøene har hatt høyst ulike erfaringer med storsamfunnets håndtering av deres interesser og situasjon opp gjennom historien; fra brutal undertrykkelse og forfølgelse, til usynliggjøring og forsømmelse" (RA 2006:5).

"Da Riksantikvarens arbeidsgruppe startet sitt arbeid, hadde vi liten eller ingen kunnskap om de ulike minoritetsgruppene og deres kulturarv. Arbeidsgruppen var derfor tidlig bevisst at den ville bruke god tid overfor minoritetene, slik at vi kom i en god dialog med de ulike grupperingene. Som representant for en statlig instans var vi videre innforstått med at vi i mange av miljøene lett kunne fremstå som representant for storsamfunnet med alle de negative assosiasjoner som dette kunne frembringe. En tillitskapende tilnærming – gjennom dialog og utveksling av kunnskaper - var derfor en avgjørende forutsetning for at dette arbeidet skulle lykkes. En slik kunnskaps - og erfaringsutveksling var dessuten helt nødvendig for å styrke arbeidsgruppens kompetanse og innsikt, både når det gjelder de ulike miljøene generelt og deres kulturminner spesielt" (RA 2006:5).

"En god dialog forutsetter også en utveksling og brytning av holdninger og oppfatninger, der storsamfunnets og de ulike minoritetenes forståelse og definisjon av kulturminner og kulturarv kan divergere. Riksantikvarens arbeidsgruppe har i stor utstrekning valgt å legge vekt på synspunktene fra minoritetene" (RA 2006:5).

"Da arbeidsgruppen startet opp, ble arbeidet med de nasjonale minoritetene prioritert. Disse gruppenes formelle status gjorde at det var naturlig å begynne der" (RA 2006:5).

"Kontaktmøtene har også satt i gang prosesser innad i de ulike miljøene, noe som i seg selv vil kunne få betydning på lengre sikt med større bevissthet og oppmerksomhet om egen kulturarv" (RA 2006:6).

"Arbeidsgruppen var bevisst at den som representant for storsamfunnet måtte gå frem med varsomhet og ydmykhet. Samtidig skulle samfunnsoppdraget med å løfte frem minoritetenes kulturarv, ivaretas" (RA 2006:7).

"Arbeidsgruppen har erfart at det er relativt liten oppmerksomhet knyttet til minoriteters kulturarv i regional kulturminneforvaltning. Riksantikvarens arbeid med feltet har i en del tilfeller virket som katalysator for å få startet en tankeprosess. Regional- og lokalforvaltningen etterspør kompetanseheving på feltet. Dette er et område Riksantikvaren vil følge opp i tiden som kommer" (RA 2006:7).

"Romani/taterne har forholdsvis få faste kulturminner. Det er ikke bygningstyper eller andre anlegg som er spesielt for romani/taternes kultur. De var - og er delvis ennå, et fritt reisende folk som ikke har lagt stor vekt på egen byggeskikk" (RA 2006:8).

"Siden det dreier seg om få bygninger eller fartøyer, har vi lagt vekt på at også romani/taternes ulike møteplasser for handelsvirksomhet, sosialt samvær og overnatting, er viktige kulturminner" (RA 2006:9).

"Synagogene i Norge – både nåværende og restene av tidligere – er den jødiske minoritetens kanskje viktigste kulturminner, selv om også andre bygninger rundt om i landet vitner om jødisk arbeid og virksomhet" (RA 2006:11).

"Nyere innvandrere fra ikke-vestlige land har de siste tiårene satt preg på bybildet i de fleste større byer i Norge. Det kanskje mest typiske er de såkalte innvandrerbutikkene som finnes både i deler av byene der mange innvandrere bor, samt i andre strøk. Et annet typisk innslag er khebab-sjappene. … Religiøse institusjoner og bygninger er et annet synlig kjennetegn, men fortsatt i hovedsak konsentrert til Oslo-området. Møtelokaler, forsamlingslokaler og diverse kafeer har de fleste minoriteter av en viss størrelse tatt i bruk.… De såkalte etniske restaurantene finner en over hele landet. De er langt på vei et uttrykk for at det norske samfunnet har fått et mangfoldig flerkulturelt innslag, men de er kanskje like mye et uttrykk for en generell globalisering … Hovedtyngden av innvandringen til Norge de siste 20 årene har vært asylsøkere og flyktninger fra ulike kanter av verden. Deres første møte med Norge har vært asylmottak. Over hele landet har disse mottakene satt sitt preg på lokalsamfunn" (RA 2006:18-19).

"Riksantikvaren har forståelse for at det i mange innvandrermiljøer vil være andre temaer som står høyere på prioriteringslista enn kulturminner. Særlig gjelder det miljøer som har kort fartstid i landet og mange krevende utfordringer i omgivelser som er nye og ukjente. Det er derfor viktig at dette arbeidet gis tid (RA 2006:19). Arbeidsgruppen har innenfor mandatets tidsramme funnet det vanskelig å gå bredt ut i forhold til andre minoriteter. Dette skyldes både gruppenes størrelse og mangfold" (RA 2006:19).

"Ser vi litt frem i tid, er det forutsatt at minoriteters kulturminner vil være en integrert del av den ordinære kulturminneforvaltningen" (RA 2006:21).

Akershus fylkeskommune (2007) - *Spor for framtiden – Fylkesdelplan for kulturminner og kulturmiljøer i Akershus 2007-2018:*

"Vi håper planen blir et godt utgangspunkt for å legge ansvaret på riktig nivå, og et redskap for bedre samhandling mellom fylkeskommune, kommune og det frivillige kulturminnevernet" (AFK 2007:1).

"Et annet viktig mål for vårt arbeid har vært å få fram kulturminnenes verdi. Først og fremst er de viktige fordi de gir oss mulighet for gode opplevelser, fordi de forteller historie, og fordi de gir tilhørighet og stolthet. Men kulturminnene kan også være viktige i miljø- og ressurssammenheng og for verdiskapingen. Ekte opplevelser har fått økonomisk verdi. Vi håper denne planen kan bidra til at riktig bevaring og forvaltning av kulturminner kan skape økonomisk merverdi. Det er likevel viktig at kulturminnene skal brukes, ikke forbrukes" (AFK 2007:1).

"Gjennom fylkesdelplanen for kulturminner og kultur miljøer vil vi vise mangfoldet og særpreget ved kulturarven i Akershus, og ikke minst hva kommunene og fylket kan være stolte av!" (AFK 2007:5).

"Kulturminner kan styrke særpreg og kvaliteter i lokalsamfunn, og de kan være med å bygge opp følelsen av tilhørighet for både gamle og nye innbyggere" (AFK 2007:5).

"Hva er kulturminner, kulturmiljøer, kulturlandskap, kulturarv og kulturminnevern? Kulturminner er alle spor etter menneskelig virksomhet i vårt fysiske miljø. Kulturmiljøer er områder hvor kulturminner inngår som del av en større helhet eller sammenheng. Kulturlandskap er kulturpåvirket landskap, og begrepet blir oftest brukt i tilknytning til landbruk. Kulturarv er en fellesbetegnelse på kulturminner, kulturmiljøer og kulturlandskap. Kulturminnevern er vern av faste kulturminner og kulturmiljøer" (AFK 2007:6).

"Ta vare på og bruke kulturminner og kulturmiljøer som en positiv ressurs i Akershus, og derigjennom bidra til økt kulturforståelse, identitet og tilhørighet, trivsel og verdiskaping" (AFK 2007:7).

"I et fylke med stor vekst og stadig nye innbyggere kan kulturarven bidra til tilhørighet, og den kan gi lokalsamfunn en tydeligere stedsidentitet. Kulturminner kan også være byggesteiner for framtidig verdiskaping og utvikling. Med verdiskaping menes i denne sammenhengen et bredt spekter av positive effekter som kulturarven gir for den kulturelle, sosiale, økonomiske og miljømessige utviklingen" (AFK 2007:13).

Planens faglige avgrensing følger av den regionale kulturminneforvaltningens ansvar og oppgaver innenfor kulturminnevern, som omfatter vern og forvaltning av faste kulturminner. Kulturminnevernet har siden 1973 vært en del av det overgripende miljøvernet. Dette omhandles nærmere i kapittel 9.Planen omhandler således ikke vern og forvaltning av løse kulturminner som f.eks. båter og redskaper, eller immateriell kulturarv som f.eks. musikk, fortellinger og stedsnavn. De løse kulturminnene blir tatt hånd om av museene. Når det gjelder immateriell kulturarv, kan det nevnes at musikk bl.a. blir ivaretatt av Dokumentasjonssenteret for musikk i Akershus, som er et samarbeidsprosjekt mellom Fylkesbiblioteket i Akershus og Akershus musikkråd" (AFK 2007:13-14).

"I arbeidet med folkehelse rettes oppmerksomheten bl.a. mot tiltak som bedrer stedstilhørighet. Identitet, tilhørighet og trivsel handler om at mennesker er del av et fellesskap, og i denne sammenhengen dreier det seg om fellesskapet der de bor, på hjemstedet" (AFK 2007:23).

"Mange innbyggere tilhører familier som har bodd i fylket i generasjoner. For dem er det ikke uproblematisk at nærområdene utbygges og at det stadig bosetter seg nye mennesker i nærmiljøet. For innflyttere kan kunnskap om stedets historie gjøre at de vil bedre kunne forstå sitt nye bosted og menneskene der. Kunnskap om stedets historie og bevaring av kulturminner kan styrke tilhørigheten til lokalsamfunnet og fellesskapet mellom menneskene. Historiene som fortelles om kulturminnene på stedet blir historiske minner som deles av det lokale fellesskapet" (AFK 2007:23-24).

"Landskapet omkring oss har stor betydning for hvordan vi har det, og er en viktig del av vår felles identitet" (AFK 2007:24).

"Ved å bygge på stedenes kulturhistoriske identitet kan de utvikle seg som særpregete, spennende og individuelle steder. Dette vil inspirere næringsliv og utbyggere, innbyggere og brukere" (AFK 2007:25).

"Kulturminner som er nærmere vår tid forteller om et samfunn som mange har minner om, og som mange kan kjenne seg igjen i. For den oppvoksende slekt og alle innflytterne til Akershus med ulik kulturell bakgrunn er kulturminner fra det siste århundret en del av deres egen historie og tilhørighet til et sted. Også for kommende generasjoner er det viktig at denne kulturarven blir tatt vare på" (AFK 2007:36).

"For at nye innbyggere raskere skal finne seg til rette, er det også viktig at innflytterne som bærere av sine egne historier, får mulighet til å fortelle hvem de er og hvor de kommer fra. Fra det øyeblikket innflytterne er på plass, er de blitt en del av stedet. Da vil alle som bor der være med å skape historien. Dette omfatter også den oppvoksende generasjon, som det er viktig å inkludere og ivareta i formidlingsarbeidet" (AFK 2007:39).

"Med stor lokal kunnskap, entusiasme og patriotisme, har man et godt utgangspunkt for formidling" (AFK 2007:39).

"Arbeide for å fremme gode relasjoner, toleranse og samhandling mellom mennesker med ulik kulturell bakgrunn. – Arrangere møter, temakvelder, foredrag, åpne dager m.m. i et kulturminne/- miljø. Målgruppe: Allmennheten. Ansvarlig: Historielag, museer Samarbeidspartnere AFK(k.a), komm, skoler, innflyttere" (AFK 2007:55).

"Det flerkulturelle Akershus – Den flerkulturelle kulturarven i Akershus, innvandringshistorie før og nå. – Utveksling av kulturuttrykk, og hvordan det har påvirket samfunnet og bruken av fellesområder og det offentlige rom (f.eks. restauranter, nærbutikker tatt over av innvandrere, hus for utøvelse av religion) – Møtesteder i flerkulturelle miljøer – Fem nasjonale minoriteter i Norge – jøder, kvener, rom (sigøynere), romani (tatere), skogfinner – 200 andre minoriteter i Norge – rommer alt fra innvandrere fra våre naboland til innvandrere fra såkalte ikke-vestlige land" (AFK 2007:86).

Riksantikvaren (2011) - *Strategisk plan for forvaltning av arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer 2011-2020:*

"Riksantikvarens strategiske plan for forvaltning av arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer er utarbeidet på oppdrag fra Miljøverndepartementet, som en oppfølging av prioriterte tiltak omtalt i bl.a. NOU 2002:1 Fortid former framtid, St.meld. nr.16 (2004-2005) Leve med kulturminner og St.prp. nr.1 (2007-2008) og de siste årenes tildelingsbrev for Riksantikvaren. I den forbindelse har Riksantikvaren utformet et strategisk dokument om måloppnåelse fram mot år 2020, med en planlagt revisjon i 2015. Den strategiske planen har som langsiktige strategisk mål at arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer forvaltes og formidles som unike kilder til kunnskap om fortidens samfunn, og som grunnlag for ny innsikt, opplevelse og bruk. I planen er det skilt ut tre delmål, og under hvert av disse delmålene er det igjen definert tre sentrale satsingsområder. Delmålene og satsingsområdene er: Delmål 1: Sikring av arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer baseres på et godt datagrunnlag, enhetlige kriterier og forsvarlige metoder. Satsingsområder under delmål 1: - Datagrunnlag - Kriterieutvikling og prioritering - Metodeutvikling. Delmål 2: Forvaltningen av arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer er tydelig og preges av god dialog og ressursbruk. Satsingsområder under delmål 2: - Forvaltningsstruktur og forvaltningsrutiner - Virkemidler - Kunnskap og kompetanse. Delmål 3: Allmennhetens interesse og ansvarsfølelse for arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer er styrket. Satsingsområder under delmål 2: - Formidling - Tilgjengelighet og bruk - Samarbeid" (RA 2011:3).

"Kulturminnelovens definisjon av begrepene kulturminner og kulturmiljøer ligger til grunn for den strategiske planen. Det samme gjør kulturminnelovens opplisting av hva som er automatisk fredete kulturminner, jf. kml § 4. I den strategiske planen er det gjennomgående brukt betegnelsen "arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer". Kulturminneloven gir imidlertid ingen definisjon av hva som skal forstås som arkeologiske kulturminner. I det følgende er derfor Vallettakonvensjonens definisjon av arkeologiske kulturminner lagt til grunn.

'To this end shall be considered to be elements of the archaeological heritage all remains and objects and any other traces of mankind from past epochs

i. the preservation and study of which help to retrace the history of mankind and its relation with the natural environment
ii. for which excavations or discoveries and other methods of research into mankind and the related environment are the main sources of information; and
iii. which are located in any area within the jurisdiction of the Parties

The archaeological heritage shall include structures, constructions, groups of buildings, developed sites, moveable objects, monuments of other kinds as well as their context, whether situated on land or under water.'" (RA 2011:4).

"I ca. 12000 år har det levd mennesker i Norge som har etterlatt seg fysiske spor. Disse konkrete sporene og sammenhengen mellom dem, samt steder det knytter seg tro og tradisjon til, representerer uerstattelige kilder til kunnskap om tidligere generasjoners liv og virke. For det meste av vår historie har vi ikke noe annet kildemateriale som kan gi oss slik innsikt" (RA 2011:5).

"Arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer, representerer uerstattelige kilder til kunnskap og opplevelse, og utgjør en viktig erfarings- og kunnskapsbank for nålevende og fremtidige generasjoner. I tillegg til å representere uerstattelige kilder til kunnskap om forhistorien, er arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer også en viktig ressurs for samfunnet. De bidrar positivt i utviklingen av levende lokalsamfunn, gir steder særpreg og egenart, grunnlag for opplevelser og fungerer som ressurs for verdiskaping. En åpen og aktiv kommunikasjon mellom forvaltningen og samfunnet for øvrig bidrar til å styrke bevisstheten om kulturminnenes betydning for livskvalitet og trivsel, både i lokalt og globalt perspektiv" (RA 2011:5).

"Internasjonale konvensjoner forplikter også Norge til å forvalte vår fysiske kulturarv på en forsvarlig måte. I 1995 ratifiserte Norge Vallettakonvensjonen – Europarådets konvensjon om vern av den arkeologiske kulturarv. Formålet med konvensjonen er å verne om arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer som en kilde til felles europeisk historie og identitet, og som redskap for vitenskapelige og historiske undersøkelser. To andre konvensjoner som også er særlig viktige for forvaltningen av arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer er Firenzekonvensjonen – Europarådets landskapskonvensjon (ratifisert av Norge i 2001) og Farokonvensjonen – Europarådets rammekonvensjon om kulturarvens verdi for samfunnet (ratifisert av Norge i 2008). Viktige elementer i Faro-konvensjonen er bl.a. alle kulturelle gruppers rett til at deres kulturarv bevares, bærekraftig utnyttelse av kulturminnene i samfunnsutviklingen, folks tilgang til kulturminnene, samt den demokratiske forvaltning av dem. Lokal forankring og medvirkning er også et viktig mål i landskapskonvensjonen der det legges vekt på å styrke enkeltmenneskets og lokalsamfunnets medvirkning i arbeidet med vern, forvaltning og planlegging av landskap" (RA 2011:6).

"Økt grad av forutsigbarhet i forvaltningen stiller krav til mest mulig enhetlige verdivurderinger, og behov for et felles nasjonalt kriteriesett for vurdering av arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer. For å kunne sikre lokale særtrekk og regionale forskjeller må et slikt kriteriesett være både romslig og dynamisk. Dette må også ses i sammenheng med vurderinger av hva som er nasjonale interesser, og hvordan man skal sikre et representativt utvalg av arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer" (RA 2011:10).

"Det er også et uttrykt mål at mangfoldet av kulturminner i dagens flerkulturelle samfunn skal sikres. Dette krever en økt bevissthet om og større vektlegging av nasjonale minoriteters kulturminner" (RA 2011:10).

"En tydelig forvaltning og fornuftig ressursbruk må baseres på kunnskap om arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer, kjennskap til hvordan forvaltningen foregår i dag, og om hvordan ressursene brukes. Oppdatert kunnskap er helt nødvendig for en konstruktiv dialog internt i forvaltningen, og mellom forvaltning, fagmiljø, andre sektorer og allmennheten. Kulturhistorisk kunnskap og kunnskap om arkeologiske kulturminner og kulturmiljøer utvikles kontinuerlig i forvaltningen og i forskningsmiljøene. Ny kunnskap innhentes i form av resultater fra forvaltningsundersøkelser, forskning og utvikling og utredninger. Utvikling av ny kunnskap er nødvendig for å holde en profesjonell forvaltning faglig oppdatert til en hver tid, og for å utøve faglig skjønn i bl.a. saksbehandlingen" (RA 2011:16).

Miljøverndepartementet (2013) - *Meld. St. 35 (2012-2013) Framtid med forfeste –*
Kulturminnepolitikken:

"Kulturminnene og kulturmiljøene gir menneskene forankring i tilværelsen. De er en felles kunnskaps- og erfaringsbank, og de er møteplasser mellom fortiden, nåtiden og framtiden. Kulturminner og kulturmiljøer representerer både miljømessige, kulturelle, sosiale og økonomiske verdier. De har betydning for enkeltmenneskenes identitet, trivsel og selvforståelse. De gir steder særpreg og egenart. De kan også være en ressurs for en god lokalsamfunns- og næringsutvikling" (RA 2013:5).

"Det er viktig å sikre at de beste representantene for ulike stilarter, ulik arkitektur, ulike næringer og sosiale lag og ulike etniske grupper blir tatt vare på" (RA 20113:7).

"Begrepet kulturarv brukes ofte for å beskrive både den materielle og den immaterielle kulturarven fra tidligere tider og omfatter i tillegg til faste kulturminner i det fysiske miljøet, også muntlige tradisjoner, skikker, ritualer og ferdigheter knyttet til tradisjonelle håndverk. Der ikke annet er presisert, blir begrepet kulturarv i denne meldingen begrenset til å omfatte kulturminner i det fysiske miljøet, inkludert steder det knytter seg hendelser, tro og tradisjon til" (MD 2013:7).

"De første innvandrerne er navnløse og ikke like berømte som Dronning Ragnhild, Tordenskjold, Christian Magnus Falsen eller Sigrid Undset, men alle har satt fysiske spor etter seg i landskap, bygd og by eller gitt opphav til steder det knytter seg sagn eller tradisjoner til. Deres spor er kilder til vår historie. Denne historien har materialisert seg i alt fra boplasser, kullmiler, historiske steder, fangstgroper, kulturlandskap, hellige fjell, bygninger, veier, fotefar, skipsvrak og gravsteder for å nevne noen. Til forskjell fra Svartedauden er mange av de utfordringene som nå kommer varslet. Vi vet at det kommer en betydelig innvandring som vil medføre befolkningsvekst og endret bosetningsmønster. Dette vil legge et stort press på arealer og infrastruktur rundt de største byene" (MD 2013:7).

"I løpet av de siste 40 årene har den norske befolkningen økt raskere enn innenlands fødselstall. Folkevandringer er ikke noe nytt i verden eller for Norge, men akkurat nå har Norge en betydelig befolkningsvekst som følge av arbeidsinnvandring. Det har vært og er behov for arbeidskraft i alt fra lavtlønnsyrker til spesialister i oljeindustrien. Arbeidsinnvandrere, flyktninger og asylsøkere setter i ulik grad sitt preg på Norge, men har så langt satt få spor etter seg i det bygde miljøet. Det har sammenheng med at de i stor grad har flyttet inn i allerede eksisterende strukturer i byer. Deres kultur kommer i større grad til utrykk gjennom levende kultur som mat, klesdrakt og musikk. De 500 000 nye innbyggerne som er forventet innflyttet til østlandsområdet, vil ikke bare komme fra Sogn eller Nordland, men like gjerne fra Mombay og Tallin. Det blir derfor viktig å bidra til å skape tilhørighet, forståelse og innsikt i det norske samfunnet. Helleristningene, stavkirkene, Eidsvoll, husmannsplasser og Rjukan forteller om et samfunn i stadig endring. Det er viktig at alle inkluderes i fortellingen. Slik kan kulturminner og kunnskap om fortiden bidra til forståelse, identitet og stabilitet i et samfunn i endring" (MD 2013:10).

"I St.meld. nr. 26 (2006 – 2007) Regjeringens miljøpolitikk og rikets miljøtilstand inngår kulturminnepolitikken som én del av en samlet framstilling av miljøpolitikken. Ambisjonene i St.meld. nr. 16 (2004 – 2005) Leve med kulturminner ble opprettholdt og videreført, og regjeringen varslet at den ville videreutvikle kulturminnepolitikken. Riksrevisjonen gjennomførte i 2008 – 2009 en forvaltningsrevisjon av Miljøverndepartementets oppfølging av St.meld. nr. 16 (2004 – 2005) Leve med kulturminner: Dok 3:9 (2008 – 2009) Riksrevisjonens undersøking av korleis Miljøverndepartementet varetek det nasjonale ansvaret sitt for freda og verneverdige bygningar. Riksrevisjonen konkluderte med at sentrale forutsetninger for at forvaltningen skal kunne nå målene, ikke er på plass og at dette innebærer en vesentlig risiko for at målene ikke blir nådd innen fristen i 2020. I regjeringsplattformen/Soria Moria II sier Regjeringen at den vil «forbedre kulturminneforvaltningen i tråd med Riksrevisjonens forvaltningsrevisjon». Med utviklingen i de åtte årene som er gått siden Stortinget behandlet kulturminnemeldingen som bakgrunn, legger regjeringen nå fram en ny stortingsmelding om kulturminnepolitikken. Meldingen inneholder en statusoppdatering per januar 2013 og tydeliggjør hvilke utfordringer som gjenstår for at man innen 2020 skal nå målene som ble vedtatt gjennom behandlingen av St.meld. nr. 16 (2004 – 2005) Leve med kulturminner" (MD 2013:11).

"I fredninger som er gjennomført, er det i stor grad kunsthistoriske og arkitektoniske kriterier som har ligget til grunn for vurderinger av om bygningen eller anlegget har nasjonal verdi. Bygninger, anlegg og områder som ikke har slike kvaliteter, men som er viktige for å kunne fortelle historien vår, er i mindre grad fredet. Det er derfor behov for å vurdere objekter i denne kategorien. Det kan for eksempel dreie seg om etterreformatoriske tingsteder, militære slagsteder, bygninger og anlegg knyttet til historisk viktige personer og begivenheter eller utviklingen av demokratiet" (MD 2013:37).

"Kulturminner og kulturmiljøer er viktige miljøressurser. De har betydning for folks identitet og trivsel. De gir steder særpreg og egenart og de er grunnlag for lokalsamfunnsutvikling og for andre former for verdiskaping" (MD 2013:41).

"Kulturell verdiskaping innebærer økt kunnskap og bevissthet om lokal kultur- og naturarv, særpreg, tradisjoner, historiefortelling og symboler som gir grunnlag for formidling og utvikling av en stedlig identitet og stolthet" (MD 2013:42).

"Innvandringen til Norge de siste drøyt 40 årene har vært langt større og hatt en annen sammensetning enn tidligere. Dette har satt og setter sitt preg på samfunnet, både når det gjelder språk, tradisjoner og skikker, men også i form av fysiske spor i landskapet. Norge er i dag et samfunn med 54 Meld. St. 35 2012–2013 Framtid med fotfeste større mangfold, både kulturelt, religiøst og verdimessig. Å forvalte kulturminnene i det flerkulturelle Norge handler derfor også om å dokumentere, formidle og ta vare på kulturarv med tilknytning til: – samene som urfolk – de fem nasjonale minoritetene – jødene, kvenene, rom, romani og skogfinnene – innvandrere som har kommet de siste 40 årene" (MD 2012:53-54).

"Norge ratifiserte i 1999 Europarådets rammekonvensjon om beskyttelse av de nasjonale minoritetene. I 2008 ratifiserte Norge også Europarådets rammekonvensjon om kulturarvens verdi for samfunnet, Farokonvensjonen. Denne konvensjonen sier blant annet at enhver har ansvar for å respektere andres kulturarv i samme grad som sin egen, og som følge av dette respektere hele Europas kulturarv" (MD 2013:54).

"I 2003 startet Riksantikvaren arbeidet med en systematisk gjennomgang av de nasjonale minoritetenes kulturminner, der målet var å få oversikt over og ta vare på et representativt utvalg kulturminner. Prosjektet ble avsluttet i 2006, og rapporten fra prosjektet er tilgjengelig på Riksantikvarens nettsider. Siden slutten av 1990-årene har museene i stadig større grad rettet søkelyset mot arbeidet med å dokumentere og sikre minoritetenes

kulturarv. Det er etablert et eget nettverk, mangfoldsnettverket, som skal styrke arbeidet med minoriteter og kulturelt mangfold i det norske museumslandskapet, gjennom å skape møteplasser, utveksle erfaringer og gjennomføre prosjekter" (MD 2013:54).

"De ulike minoritetsgruppenes kulturminner representerer en stor spennvidde. For mange av minoritetsgruppene, og da særlig de nyere innvandrergruppene, kommer kulturarven først og fremst til uttrykk gjennom levende kultur som mat, klesdrakt og musikk. Det er viktig å sikre at den fysiske og den immaterielle kulturarven ses i sammenheng. Her er samarbeidet med museumssektoren viktig. Minoritetsgruppene er forskjellige og har ulike behov og ønsker knyttet til bevaring av egen kulturarv. Dette skaper en del utfordringer for kulturminneforvaltningen i arbeidet med å sikre en god representativitet. Det er viktig å få til et godt samarbeid med de enkelte gruppene, jf. kapittel 4.1.2." (MD 2013:54).