

# What I talk about when I talk about Lofoten

Heritage Discourse in a Competitive Environment

The Case of a Possible UNESCO World Heritage Listing of Lofoten Archipelago and  
the Hegemonic Heritage Discourse of Economic Rationalisation that Surrounds it

*Master Thesis 2018*

*Master Arts, Culture and Society  
Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication  
Erasmus University Rotterdam*

Student: Anja Helen Olsson Kjærnli

Student number: 478485

Supervisor: Emiel Martens

Course: CC4050 – Master Thesis

Program: Master Arts, Culture and Society

Date of submission: 12.10.18

*If the cod should fail us  
What would we have  
What would we bring to  
Bergen from here?  
No, the fish in the sea  
Is our daily bread,  
And if we lose it,  
Then we are destitute*

Petter Dass “Nordlands Trumpet”<sup>1</sup>,  
translated by Eric Dregni (2011)

---

Title inspired by Haruki Murakami’s novel entitled *What I talk about when I talk about running*

<sup>1</sup> Petter Dass is a Norwegian poet who wrote *Nordlands Trumpet* (trans: *Nordlands Trompet*) in 1739 (Store Norske Leksikon, 2013)

## ABSTRACT

*Lofoten archipelago, located in the northern part of Norway, has been on UNESCO's Tentative List for a possible nomination on the World Heritage List since 2002. The site is believed to fulfil several criteria of Outstanding Universal Value due to its longstanding fishing culture and unique nature, landscape and biodiversity. However, due to the possibility of offshore petroleum resources, with an estimated value of approximately 105 billion NOK (ap. € 11 billion) (Blanchard et al., 2014), a decision to pursue the nomination is yet to be reached.*

*Using a repertoire analysis of news articles on Lofoten's future published between 2002-2018, this thesis examines in what terms the dominant stakeholders in the debate rationalise their position concerning the value of the site in a highly competitive environment. It is demonstrated that, since the oil industry has a firm grip on the national economy and a range of positive economic ripple effects to show to, heritage is forced to compete on these same terms. Thus, the economic value of having a World Heritage status is constantly being highlighted as the main motivational factor to go forth with a nomination. While governmental bodies largely dominate the heritage discourse in Lofoten, all identified stakeholders followed a hegemonic discourse of economic rationalism when accounting for their stance. To justify their stance in the debate, all stakeholders invariably applied economically driven repertoires to explain the benefits of following either plan. This was done by those in favour of offshore petroleum development, those who wanted to safeguard against such activity and those who wanted to pursue a World Heritage status. The result is an economically driven valuation that undermines UNESCO's visions on sites of Outstanding Universal Value. In the public heritage discourse, Lofoten as a World Heritage site is not talked about in terms of uniqueness or importance for humankind, but rather visualised as an alternative and strong source of income, growth and industry security. Only one marginalised group of stakeholders attempted to emphasise that certain values cannot be measured in economics by creating an anti-economic discourse of site valuation. However, it was revealed that they had to respond to the economically driven focus of the debate and thus enter the hegemonic discourse of economic rationalism. Consequently, economics has hijacked the heritage discourse in Lofoten.*

**KEYWORDS:** *World Heritage, UNESCO, Lofoten, Economic rationalism, Value*

## Table of Content

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| ABSTRACT .....  | I   |
| PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....  | III |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....   | IV  |
| 1. INTRODUCTION .....   | 1   |
| 1.1 SETTING THE SCENE .....   | 1   |
| 1.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODS.....   | 4   |
| 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....   | 7   |
| 2.1 EARLY HERITAGE RESEARCH AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITICAL HERITAGE STUDIES:<br>HERITAGE AND CONTEXT ..... | 7   |
| 2.2 VALUING (WORLD) HERITAGE.....   | 11  |
| 2.3 ECONOMIC MOTIVATIONS FOR NOMINATION .....   | 14  |
| 2.4 WORLD HERITAGE AND RESOURCE RECOVERY .....  | 18  |
| 3. RESEARCH METHOD .....  | 22  |
| 3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN: CASE STUDY .....   | 22  |
| 3.2 DATA COLLECTION .....   | 23  |
| 3.3 METHODS OF ANALYSIS .....   | 26  |
| 3.4 LIMITATIONS, CHALLENGES AND METHODOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS .....  | 33  |
| 4. FINDINGS .....   | 36  |
| 4.1 INCOMPATIBILITY .....   | 37  |
| 4.2 THE HEGEMONIC DISCOURSE OF ECONOMIC RATIONALISM .....   | 45  |
| 4.3 THE ANTI-ECONOMIC DISCOURSE OF SITE VALUATION .....   | 57  |
| 5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION .....  | 62  |
| REFERENCES .....  | 68  |
| APPENDICES .....  | 83  |
| APPENDIX A – DIVISION OF MAIN TOPICS IN DIFFERENT ARTICLES.....   | 83  |
| APPENDIX B – CODEBOOK .....   | 88  |
| APPENDIX C - CATEGORIZATION OF STAKEHOLDERS.....  | 84  |
| TRANSLATED STATEMENTS/QUOTES .....  | 90  |

## Preface and Acknowledgements

During the master's program of Arts, Culture and Society at Erasmus University Rotterdam, I took the course of Critical Heritage Studies. The subject intrigued me and made me see Norwegian heritage, UNESCO and myself as a tourist from a new perspective. Before I knew it, for (almost) every article I read for the course, I could relate it to the situation in Lofoten.

I was hungry for new insights and perspectives. This made the reading and critical thinking interesting and fun. However, working towards a master thesis also resulted in frustrations and hesitations when attacking the exceptional amounts of data on a complex topic. This often enough left me with a feeling of being overwhelmed, resulting in a wish to throw my laptop into the wall and scream. Many people helped me save my laptop and supported me through these times, and I am extremely grateful.

I would like to start by thanking my supervisor Emiel Martens for his quick responses, flexibility, outstanding patience and genuine attempts at comforting words, especially in times of desperation. The long diary resembling reflections and frustrations in my e-mails was probably not what he signed up for, but the collaboration and his supervising have been highly appreciated from my side.

Thanks to my mom who have picked up my calls time and time again to comfort and support, but most importantly, to listen. I am still not sure you have completely captured the topic of my thesis, but I cannot really blame you as it might have been lost in all my rambles.

I would also like to thank my friends and boyfriend who cheered me on in this long, loooong process. You made me remember that the lonely library life is not all I am, and I cannot wait to get back to all of you! Also, a special thanks to my former supervisor on my bachelor thesis, Anders Rykkja, who encouraged me to pursue a master's degree. You have been of great inspiration and support.

## List of Abbreviations

|        |   |
|--------|---|
| CDA    | Critical Discourse Analysis   |
| CHS    | Critical Heritage Studies   |
| FT     | Financial Times   |
| LoVeSe | Lofoten, Vesterålen and Senja   |
| NRK    | Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation  |
| OUV    | Outstanding Universal Value   |
| THS    | Traditional Heritage Studies  |
| TransN | Translated from the original quote/statement in Norwegian. This abbreviation is found as endnotes followed by the original Norwegian quote/statement. |
| UNESCO | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation  |
| WWF    | World Wildlife Foundation   |

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Setting the Scene

*“World Heritage is safeguarding. It will hinder growth development. You are freezing Lofoten out of industry development”<sup>i</sup> (Local politician in Johansen, 2014a: para 3)*

*“I still see great opportunities for tourism and coastal fishing with a World Heritage status. Lofoten can end up on an exclusive list together with the pyramids in Egypt, the Chinese wall and other famous places. That is something we can positively take advantage of considering tourism and marketing of fish”<sup>ii</sup> (Local politician in Johansen, 2014b: para 10)*

Lofoten archipelago, located in the northern part of Norway, has been on UNESCO’s Tentative List of sites which the country could nominate to the World Heritage List from 2002. Since then, sixteen years have passed, and no official decision on whether to go forth with a nomination is made. The potential World Heritage status as a mixed heritage site is based on early settlements in the area, fishing traditions and export dating back 200 years, in addition to “outstanding natural beauty of universal value” with an alpine maritime landscape, like the bird cliffs and the Lofoten wall, and Arctic marine biodiversity (Sande, 2011: 260, 2015). This is believed to fulfil UNESCO’s criteria on Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) related to both cultural criteria iii (“testimony to a cultural tradition or to civilization”) and natural criteria viii, ix and x (“representing major stages of earth’s history (...) representing significant on-going ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, freshwater, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals (...) most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity”) (UNESCO, ca. 2018a)<sup>2</sup>. However, Lofoten also holds petroleum resources with an estimated worth of 105 billion NOK (ap. € 11 billion)<sup>3</sup> (Blanchard et al., 2014). Oil and gas have fuelled the Norwegian economy since the 1970s, providing security for the population by funding the country’s welfare system, considered to be “the world’s largest sovereign wealth fund” (Milne, 2017: para. 9; Norsk Petroleum, 2018). With this combination of cultural and natural heritage and profitable petroleum resources, Lofoten has become the centre of a long-lasting national debate. The opening quotes show oppositional opinions from

---

<sup>2</sup> Another inquiry on the nomination state that the area also fulfils cultural criteria v (representation of traditional settlement, land-use and sea-use with example of interaction between human and nature) (Isdal, 2011: slide 12).

<sup>3</sup> Calculation made through The Norwegian Banks website on the 12. June 2018

local politicians on what way to go forth for the region, and the country at large, in the debate which can best be summed up in the following question: World Heritage or petroleum activities?

Lofoten has been of economic importance to Norway for centuries because of its marine life (Bakos, 2009; Misund & Olsen, 2013). The first people settled about 6000 years ago, and fishing has been a major activity for the last 1000 years (Bakos, 2009; Misund & Olsen, 2013: 724; Sande, 2011: 260). Lofoten is the main spawning ground for the Northeast Arctic (NEA) cod, haddock, Norwegian spring-spawning herring and NEA saithe (Misund & Olsen, 2013). These species are of historical importance, as the possibilities for winter fishery was a reason for early settlements in the area (Misund & Olsen, 2013: 724). In addition, Lofoten “is the first place in the world to be known for commercial fishery of pelagic cod and export of stockfish<sup>4</sup> to Europe” (Sande, 2011: 260). Commercial fishing and trade of cod can be traced back centuries, and fish export is still a part of the country’s economy, contributing to almost 7% of the country’s exported products (Misund & Olsen, 2016: 724; SSB, 2018).

Alongside fishing, tourism is now one of the primary industries in the region (Isdal, 2011: slide 2). The actual numbers of visiting tourists are difficult to estimate, and no exact figures have been found. Nevertheless, Sande (2011) have suggested about 500.000 international tourists for the region.<sup>5</sup> Most of these visit Lofoten because of its nature, and the scenery is thus crucial for their interest in the area. A tourism survey conducted by Innovation Norway showed that 80% of foreign tourists wanted to experience nature, particularly fjords and mountains, when visiting Norway (Innovasjon Norge, 2016). The survey also showed that experiencing nature was among the top ten activities seen as important deciding factors for Norwegian holidaymakers in domestic destination choices. Lofoten has a lush nature with fjords and mountains, and tourists find experiencing nature of importance and an influential factor for decisions to visit this area in particular (Madsen, Vinogradov & Velvin, 2015: 30). However, oil spills from possible future oil activities in the extended area of Lofoten, Vesterålen and Senja (LoVeSe)<sup>6</sup> are believed to jeopardise the natural scenery the tourist industry relies on and harm the marine life crucial for traditional fishing (Blanchard et al.,

---

<sup>4</sup> Unsalted and unprocessed cod fish dried outside in cold air (Tørrfisk fra Lofoten, ca. 2018).

<sup>5</sup> This number does not include domestic tourists. Additionally, the last couple of years newspapers have reported there to be one million tourists in Lofoten each year (see Lysvold, 2017). However, an organisation for fact-checking in the public debate and news in Norway has stated that this number is overrated (faktisk.no, 2017). The number they came up with was close to that of Sande (2011), but they stressed the difficulty of providing a definite number on visitors for the region due to issues with unrecorded visitations such as one day visitors, Airbnb and certain unregistered camping spots (faktisk.no, 2017).

<sup>6</sup> The LoVeSe management plan covers both the Barents Sea and Lofoten, Vesterålen and Senja (Faglig forum for norske havområder, 2018), as the two are ecologically connected (Sande, 2011: 262). While acknowledging that decisions about petroleum activities in The Barents Sea are connected to the marine life in Lofoten, and thus the culture, this thesis only focuses on Lofoten, as this is the site of a possible heritage nomination.



2014; Misund & Olsen, 2013: 724). As such, oil drilling also potentially damages what makes up the possible assessment of cultural and natural heritage of OUV. Nevertheless, petroleum activities come with great economic benefits<sup>7</sup> and the possibility for extraction has caused severe halt in the process towards the realisation of a World Heritage nomination.

The Norwegian Ministry of Environment placed Lofoten on UNESCO's Tentative List in 2002.<sup>8</sup> The national process of creating a nomination started in 2005 when an elected board was formed to gather scientific and local knowledge, create a management plan and lead the process towards a nomination application (Direktoratet for Naturforvaltning, 2006; Sande, 2015: 797; UNESCO, n/a). The dossier was aimed at being submitted in early 2010. The elected board consisted of representatives from directorates of nature, culture and fisheries, in addition to "the [area's six] municipalities, the county governor of Nordland, (...) tourist organisations, public museums, the Fishermen's Union and the Farmer's Union" (Sande, 2015: 797). In 2009, a draft nomination dossier in Norwegian was ready and the proposed area for designation consisted of "six municipalities with 24,000 inhabitants, commercial cod fishery, the system of co-management of cod fishery, stockfish export, fishery communities, 3000 km<sup>2</sup> of land and islands and 7000km<sup>2</sup> of sea areas inside and outside Lofoten Islands" (Sande, 2015: 797). However, this proposed area included territories with promising amounts of petroleum resources which could generate an income in the billions and up to 2000 new jobs locally (Blanchard et al., 2014; Sande, 2011: 261). While a concern for the marine eco-system had previously caused the area to be closed for offshore petroleum activities, the Norwegian government started to discuss the possibility of opening up the area as part of "revis[ing] the 'whole of the management plan for Barents Sea'" in 2006 (Sande, 2011, 2015: 798). Based on the lack of decision on this matter, and the fear of a listing hindering profitable extractive activities, the municipalities did not consent to further pursuit a World Heritage nomination in 2009 (Sande, 2015: 798). The Ministry of Climate and Environment tried to restart the process in 2010, but conflicts between political parties and ministries, caused the process to once again stop in 2011 (Sande, 2015: 798).

From the above, it has become clear that the possible World Heritage site of Lofoten exists within a competitive environment. The chain of events makes it plausible to conclude that a nomination will not go forth until a management plan for the Lofoten-Barents Sea is agreed upon, despite the possible fulfilment of UNESCO's criteria of OUV. A decision on

---

<sup>7</sup> The export of oil and gas amounts to almost 50% of the total exported products in the country (SSB, 2018).

<sup>8</sup> Originally the Nordic Council of Ministries had already proposed to nominate the site in 1996 (Direktoratet for Naturforvaltning, 2006; Sande, 2011).

such a plan is known to have been postponed at least four times, the last time as recent as in 2018 with postponement until 2021 (Lorentsen & Sørgård, 2013: para. 14; Milne, 2018).

## 1.2 Research Questions and Methods

The case stands as an example of how the existence of heritage is intertwined with its contemporary environment and context – and how heritage has to compete with economic forces. Or as one local politician put it, “the debate about a World Heritage status has turned into an oil debate”<sup>iii</sup> (Ønsker vi masseturisme i Lofoten, 2012: para. 6). In other words, it is no longer possible to talk about the site’s possible OUV without also talking about the possible offshore petroleum activities. The context of a competitive environment has not only influenced the process of a nomination, as shown above, but also shaped how Lofoten as a potential World Heritage site is addressed and valued.

This thesis will investigate how the possibility of resource recovery in Lofoten has influenced the way a World Heritage nomination and status is discussed. Following Critical Heritage Studies’ contextual approach to heritage and drawing on theories of economic rationalism for nomination, this study will examine in what terms Lofoten is valued (as a possible World Heritage site) in a highly competitive environment. To examine this, the thesis will focus on the following research question: *In what terms do the dominant stakeholders in the debate about the potential nomination of Lofoten archipelago to UNESCO’s World Heritage List rationalise their position concerning the value of the site in a highly competitive environment?*

In critically analysing heritage value shaped within a context of petroleum activities, this thesis is positioned within the field of Critical Heritage Studies (CHS). CHS considers heritage to exist in a context of contemporary factors that influences its valuation and meaning (Harvey, 2001). In this field, it is argued that in contemporary society, heritage is chosen according to current needs (Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge, 2000: 2; Harvey, 2001). Thus, heritage value is not one static thing, but something that is constructed and considered meaningful and important according to a range of factors in society. While UNESCO is considered to favour intrinsic values of heritage, characterised by an importance to all of mankind, i.e. sites that throughout time and place are considered exceptional and unique (Labadi, 2013: 12), contextual factors cause heritage to be addressed and valued in terms far beyond intrinsic values.

Research within CHS has found a current tendency of nominations to the World Heritage List to be economic and politically reasoned, rather than rooted in UNESCO’s

criteria of OUV (Fyall & Rakic, 2006: 161). It is argued that a designation will be economically beneficial by increased visitation on such sites and that this motivates state parties to pursue a nomination (Leask, 2006: 13; Van der Aa, 2005). Similarly, economic benefits of culture, arts and heritage are found to be a dominant topic in the heritage discourse of cultural heritage policies (Klamer, Mignosa & Petrova, 2013; Watson & González-Rodríguez, 2015). Thus, previous research has found an increased focus from state parties and other authorities behind policies on the economic benefits and value of heritage and culture.

This study uses and expands on theories on economic rationalism of nominations by looking at which terms various stakeholders in the Lofoten debate argue the site's value. This is done by analysing the heritage discourse as it emerges in the public debate. More specifically, the research uses repertoire analysis, a form of critical discourse analysis (CDA), and studies 55 news articles on the debate that have been published between 2002-2018 to answer the research question. Previous heritage research using discourse analysis has tended to focus on heritage discourse in academia (see Smith, 2006) or policies and tourism promotions (Wu & Hou, 2015: 46, see Klamer, Mignosa & Petrova, 2013; Waterson & González-Rodríguez, 2015). Instead, this thesis focuses on discourse in the public debate with a multitude of (possible) affected parties. Consequently, this study is scientifically relevant as it addresses perspectives on values from a varied group of stakeholders. It draws on research on how state parties favour economic gain above OUV in the value-making of heritage sites and add to theory by looking further into rationalisation of value among a larger group of involved parties and with the contextual situation of competing future plans.

Additionally, the study will address how heritage “has a stake in” larger issues than its own entity (Winter, 2013: 533), by highlighting how heritage is discussed as a competitor to environmental threatening extractive activities. In this, the research attempts to answer parts of Winter's call (2013) on more research on heritage's relation to contemporary challenges. He argues that CHS should aim at acquiring deeper knowledge of how heritage is connected to “critical issues” and provide a “better understanding [of] the various ways in which heritage now has a stake in, and act as a positive enabler for, the complex, multi-vector challenges that face us today” (Winter, 2013: 533), such as resource recovery and activities that cause climate changes. In its attempt to answer this call, this study contributes to a field that is underexamined, as previous research on the relationship between heritage and (petroleum) extractive activities was found to be scarce. Notable exceptions include Van der Aa (2005) and Turner (2012: 6) who argue that extractive activities and a World Heritage status has difficulties co-existing, causing a “tension between the need to protect the special

qualities of world heritage sites and the broader need to build the local and national economy”. However, while Turner (2012) dedicates his study to the topic, Van der Aa (2005) merely mentions resource recovery in a paragraph on possible influential factors to why state parties might choose not to nominate certain sites. Additionally, during the literature search, the majority of research which was found on heritage’s connection with resource recovery, tended to focus on extractive activities on (or near) sites that had already been designated a World Heritage status (see Benham, 2017; Davis & Weiler, 1992; Osti, Coad, Fisher, Bomhard & Hutton, 2011; Turner, 2012). Therefore, this study tries to fill at least some of the gap of how possible (petroleum) extractive activities can influence heritage discourse and value on a site that is considered for nomination.

In short, by drawing on theories of economic motivation for nomination and research on resource recovery’s tension with World Heritage sites, this thesis aims to explore how heritage valuation is influenced by a contextual competitive environment in the heritage discourse in Lofoten and how this shape the terms in which heritage is valued. It expands on theories of economic motivation for heritage nomination by addressing the topic outside academia and policies and contribute to new knowledge on the relationship between resource recovery and World Heritage site, a lesser researched field.

The thesis is structured into four chapters. The first chapter provides an overview of previous research done in the field of CHS. It focuses on the key theories that have been defining the field. Special attention is given to ideas of heritage in context, power and authority in heritage discourse and the field’s critique of UNESCO’s framework of value, before narrowing down to theories of economic motivations for nominations to the World Heritage List and the relationship between resource recovery and World Heritage. Chapter 3 explains how the research has been conducted, including a detailed accounting for the gathering of data and how this was analysed through repertoire analysis. This is followed by the findings chapter which presents the findings and identified rationale that shapes heritage valuation and the repertoires used to support this rationale. It will be shown that due to a belief of incompatibility between oil activities and a World Heritage status, the stakeholders in the public heritage discourse in Lofoten are forced to rationalise the site’s value in economic terms, causing an economic rationalism of values to overshadow the site’s possible OUV. The concluding chapter reflects on these findings and how they answer the research question. In addition, limitations and suggestions for future research are addressed here as well.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

This chapter will elucidate the main theories, perspectives and approaches within the field of Critical Heritage Studies (CHS), the field in which I position my research. The chapter is divided into four sub-chapters. The first sub-chapter deals with how this field grew out of, and critiqued, what I would like to call Traditional Heritage Studies (THS). The sub-chapter concentrates on the field of CHS' attention to contextual factors and power dynamics which shapes heritage discourse. Additionally, it addresses calls by scholars on where the field should go in the future. This is necessary to understand through which lens I read my data and make sense of heritage discourse. The following sub-chapters will address CHS in relation to United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), and more specifically, World Heritage, as a nomination to their World Heritage List is the main component in this research. Section 2.2 will elucidate how CHS has critiqued the organisation's core values of Outstanding Universal Value of heritage sites and how the field has argued that heritage valuation occurs in different terms than those set up by UNESCO. Section 2.3 deals with research on economic motivations for nominations of sites and the final section addresses research on the relationship between World Heritage and resource recovery.

### 2.1 Early Heritage Research and the Development of Critical Heritage Studies: Heritage and Context

By examining the decision on whether to nominate Lofoten to the World Heritage List, this study explores the complex context of current issues that influence how heritage is discussed, valued and treated. In so doing, it is in line with the focus of the field of CHS, and particularly its attention to the social, political, environmental and economic context that heritage exists within (Harvey, 2001). This research thus separates itself from, or at least exist on the side of, Traditional Heritage Studies (THS), which has mainly focused on management of visitation to heritage sites, often in relation to tourism and the maximization of economic gain or “profit margins” (Waterton & Watson, 2013: 548).

The growing interest for heritage in nineteenth century Europe chiefly consisted of conserving material objects that were considered of value for their beauty and history which spoke to the countries' past (Sørensen & Carman, 2009: 14). Therefore, ‘aesthetics’ and ‘national past’ (or even ‘nation building’ and ‘nationalism’) were key terms related to heritage, largely manifested in tangible, material heritage. What was selected as heritage was controlled by those with expert knowledge of the field, such as historians, archaeologists and

architects (Smith, 2006: 19; Sørensen & Carman, 2009: 16; Waterton & Watson, 2013: 548). Essentially, heritage was a specialised professional field, in which the public consumed and learned valuation of aesthetic and countries' history through material objects, selected and presented by experts<sup>9</sup>. Early years of THS then mainly concentrated research on increased and improved engagement between the consumer and the heritage objects, defined by professionals and presented for educational and profit-seeking activities.

Such research is still present in the field of THS and relevant for tourism development to facilitate heritage for visitors, as heritage tourism is a significant “economic activity” for many countries today (Light, 2015: 144). However, from the 1980s it was felt that heritage should be researched in a larger frame as contextual factors influence selection, definition, engagement, meaning, valuation, and essentially, heritage existence. This approach was the beginning of CHS and emerged from a rise of critique against THS and former heritage practices (Waterton & Watson, 2013, 2015). It was claimed that THS neglected to show concern for how heritage is a problematic term shaped by and reflecting contextual factors like economics and political power dynamics (Harvey, 2001). Scholars within the field of CHS began to argue that heritage is a construct, as the current context and needs of contemporary society shape what is considered as heritage<sup>10</sup>. As stated by Harvey (2001: 320) “heritage has always been with us and has always been produced by people according to their contemporary concerns and experiences”. Similarly, Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge (2000) demonstrate that heritage is defined by the meaning it produces and reproduces, formed by the current needs of an individual or a society. In other words, if the contemporary society does not see places, buildings, landscapes, objects and/or traditions of the past as important, or valuable, for the present, it simply is not acknowledged as heritage. It was argued that the consumption, framing and worshipping of the past, the selection of heritage, including the amount, and how it was presented had a commercial ambition<sup>11</sup> and functioned to support power relations (Graham et al., 2000: 22; Moddy, 2015: 118, Smith, 2006). Hence, heritage was shaped to fit a purpose. Thus, which parts of the past are heritage and which parts are not are a process of “active choice” (Blake, 2000: 68). According to Harvey (2001:

---

<sup>9</sup> THS' approach to heritage was influenced by “museum studies, archaeology and tourism[’s]” (Waterton & Watson, 2015: 4, brackets added). Museum studies focused the attention on material heritage which was displayed in such institutions for visitors, while archaeology (and similar professions within history and architecture) applied its “professional expertise over material culture” and the past (Smith, 2006: 19). Tourism studies, finally, directed its attention to heritage since these institutions were increasingly facilitated for visitors of heritage attractions (Waterton & Watson, 2015: 4).

<sup>10</sup> Within this approach, heritage is not an entity in itself, but a cultural process that exists within a larger context of varied factors (Harvey, 2001). The goal of this approach (nor this thesis) is not to find out what heritage is and what it is not, but rather which factors influence a decision to term something as heritage (of value).

<sup>11</sup> Especially central for this critique were UK scholars, with Hewison and Wright in the centre (Moddy, 2015: 118; Smith, 2006).

13), these choices of what is (valuable) heritage is used in a political context; therefore, heritage must be considered in a larger socio-political environment.

Within this framework of heritage as a political construct, CHS questions who has the authority or power to give meaning/value, and thus also term something as heritage. Harrison (2012: 9) terms this “the discursive turn” in heritage studies, where the element of power dynamics is a central point of research. According to Smith (2006), the professionalisation of heritage central to THS has resulted in what she terms the authorized heritage discourse. She argues that as heritage is selected and assigned meaning and value by experts with knowledge of aesthetics and national ‘past’, they are made the authorities of heritage (Smith, 2006: 29). This professionalisation of heritage results in continued attention to “aesthetically pleasing material objects, sites, places and/or landscapes (...) they may be passed to nebulous future generations for their ‘education’ and to forge a sense of common identity based on the past” (Smith, 2006: 29). However, in her arguing of the authorized heritage discourse, Smith presents a somewhat narrowmindedness to the topic. Through her focus on the power of expert’s valuation and meaning-making, the question of whether the professionalised approach to heritage is accepted and applied in a larger milieu than that of academia is forgotten. As critiqued by Klerk (2017: 5) “Smith focusses merely on the role of the ‘experts’ in the field of heritage (academia, archaeologists), and puts little emphasis on this process of meaning making from the involved parties”.<sup>12</sup> This also points to a gap in research presented in the introduction where Wu and Hou (2015: 46) see a tendency of heritage research focusing on discourse(s) within academia. For this reason, while drawing on Smith’s (2006) theory of the authorized heritage discourse and its power relations and favoured valued of aesthetics and history, this thesis looks into the public debate about Lofoten to uncover such tendencies among a broader set of involved parties. In this, the thesis expands on theories of what the discursive focus is outside academia.

Nevertheless, Smith’s (2006) critique of the authorized heritage discourse captures the discursive turn, the neglect of other alternative discursive approaches to heritage and the creation of an uneven balance of both who has the authority to address heritage and what is selected (Smith, 2006: 35). It seems that following the contextual perspective heritage exist within, some have the power to define heritage and others do not. Such critique of the power relations in heritage issues, can be traced back to the 1980s and the beginning of CHS, as it was influenced and motivated by Indigenous people worldwide who started to claim back

---

<sup>12</sup> Additionally, Smith herself can be considered an ‘expert’ due to her PhD in heritage studies (Sørensen & Carman, 2009: 20), thus maintaining a scholarly dominance in the heritage discourse.

their heritage from museums in the wake of decolonisation and a growing concern for human rights (Logan, 2012; Waterton & Watson, 2015: 5). Within CHS it is argued that due to the previous ‘owners’ of heritage discourses and practices being colonial and imperialist countries, their favouring of material objects of aesthetic and historical value shows a European/Western perspective on heritage (Labadi, 2013), which results in the exclusion of societies where natural and intangible heritage are considered more central than tangible and cultural heritage (Pocock, 1997). As stated by Silverman and Ruggles (2007: 3) “(...) [heritage] can also be a tool for oppression”. This is related to exclusion of natural and intangible heritage, cases of lack of recognition (and nomination) for the heritage of minority groups and Indigenous people and the destruction of heritage to eliminate identity markers in wartime (see Blake, 2000; Logan, 2012; Hodder, 2010). Such cases have resulted in claims of violation of human rights, as access to cultural life is a universal human right according to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and heritage can be considered a part of cultural life (Silverman & Ruggles, 2007: 3 Hodder, 2010: 877). The element of human rights and heritage addresses the socio-political context and power relations that influence whether heritage is allowed to exist in a larger society, and who makes this decision.

Within CHS scholars call for more attention to how heritage is related to, influences and is influenced by current global issues. As stated in the introduction, Winter (2013: 533) argues that the field must aim to understand “the various ways in which heritage now has a stake in, and can act as a positive enabler for, the complex, multi-vector challenges that face us today”. He thus calls for acquiring a deeper understanding of the contemporary global situations we are facing and how this relates to heritage practices. In other words, how heritage ‘has a stake in’ larger issues than that of heritage itself. Particularly, he refers to “poverty reduction, climate change, sustainability, human rights, democracy, the future of the state and of course the protection and preservation of cultural heritage itself” (Winter, 2013: 542). My study should be seen as an attempt to answer at least parts of this call. This thesis will contribute to such research by looking into how the possible heritage site of Lofoten ‘has a stake in’ such issues, specifically focusing on resource recovery. It will investigate how possible (climate threatening) extractive activities influence the way heritage is talked about and valued in the public debate and how this context enables a competitive environment where heritage is considered an alternative source of income. By examining how involved parties rationalise their position concerning value of Lofoten as a potential UNESCO World Heritage site in a highly competitive environment the thesis deepens knowledge of how heritage influence and is influenced by current day challenges. To answer this call and this



thesis' research question, the study will make use of theories on economic motivation for World Heritage nominations and draw from previous research on the relationship between resource recovery and World Heritage sites. For this reason, the remainder of this theoretical framework will be dedicated to CHS research on, and critique of, UNESCO and their World Heritage List. Special attention is given to research on the values and motivations that are considered to drive state parties in their decisions towards nomination of sites and what is previously found on the relationship between World Heritage and resource recovery.

## 2.2 Valuing (World) Heritage

Throughout the years, UNESCO has had to stand up against a wide range of criticism. The critique on bias towards European/Western cultural and tangible heritage above natural and intangible heritage (especially of Indigenous and non-Western heritage) caused UNESCO to broaden the notion of heritage in their conventions (Bouchenaki, 2003)<sup>13</sup>. Nevertheless, within CHS scholars have critiqued UNESCO's idea of a World Heritage with universal value, and the way this heritage is valued and selected by state parties who make up the organisation's Committee and nominates sites (see Bertacchini, Liuzza, Meskell & Saccone, 2006; Labadi, 2013; Meskell, 2013).

With rescue operations and programs, the international adaptation of several policies and conventions regarding protection of both natural and cultural heritage and a shift towards "global ownership of heritage", UNESCO is now the world leader of heritage organisations (Gfeller & Eisenberg, 2016: 286). UNESCO's *1972 Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*'s (hereby referred to as the *Convention*) ambition is "to preserve the most important heritage sites around the globe for all humanity" (Van der Aa, 2005: 1). The World Heritage List is the backbone of the *Convention* and holds cultural, natural and mixed heritage sites measured and included according to the fulfilment of criteria on Outstanding Universal Value<sup>14</sup> (OUV). The idea that there exists a *world* heritage of outstanding *universal* value (OUV) is the foundation of the *Convention* and the World Heritage List. In the most recent *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* this value has been defined as follows: "Outstanding Universal Value means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national

---

<sup>13</sup> This can be seen in the development from the *1964 Venice Charter* which only addressed monuments and sites, to the *1972 UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage* and, lastly, the *Convention for the safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* established in 2003 (Bouchenaki, 2003).

<sup>14</sup> A complete list of criteria for OUV can be found on <https://whc.unesco.org/en/criteria/>. Criteria relevant to the site of Lofoten is mentioned on the first page of the introduction.

boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity” (World Heritage Centre, 2017: 19). Accordingly, some heritage is considered to be so unique that it becomes important for all of humankind, across borders and throughout time.

However, within CHS, the concept of universal value has been questioned. Labadi (2013: 11-12) claims that as the heritage on the World Heritage List is said to be valued by all, it takes for granted that valuation is objective and speaks to all as intrinsic. Opposing this, she demonstrates that heritage value is part of individuals or communities separate and unique contexts and processes, thus relating her argument to the central strain of thought in CHS. By referring to Bourdieu’s famous theories on aesthetic appreciations being based on cultivation, not an innate ability, she argues that the notion of value has turned from something intrinsic to something extrinsic as they are influenced by a variety of variables and external factors (Labadi, 2013). According to Labadi (2013), as heritage value is dependent on contextual factors in the present, they are neither static, universal or intrinsic. Rather, values can be seen “in reference to the qualities and characteristics seen in things, in particular positive characteristics (actual or potential)” related to what is considered important to an individual or a society (Mason, 2002: 7; de la Torre & Mason, 2002: 4; Bouchnaki, 2003: III; Klamer, 2016). Thus, values, seen as positive qualities, can change in different societies and to different people. The idea is supported by Marmion, Calver and Wilkens (2010) who found differences in value-making of heritage in their focus group study: “While for some, heritage seemed to be an entirely personal idea, for others it evoked ideas of a nation and its history” (section 3.2 para 8). Hence, valuing heritage can refer to a range of meanings depending on who is asked. This is of importance for this research as it demonstrates that if the notion of universal value is difficult to accept or might not even exist, it opens up for the idea that World Heritage sites are valued in different terms than those set up by UNESCO.

In CHS literature, it is considered that heritage value is not only subjective, as argued above, but also highly dependent on national ideas and goals. As stated in section 2.1, heritage valuation is historically connected in ideas of a nation’s past (Harrison, 2012; Smith, 2006). This thus addresses the concept of cultural nationalism, in which the perceived communal past that heritage represent has been a highly valuable asset for the creation of nations, national identity, social cohesion and a sense of belonging (Smith, 2006). According to Smith (2006), this search for a collective identity fuelled an interest in heritage in the nineteenth century. During the colonial period, concepts of race and “ethnic and cultural identity” emerged, followed by nationalism, to establish social cohesion and unity during the industrial revolution and the French revolution (Smith, 2006: 17-18). This period valued

monuments and material heritage as tangible proofs of (different) European identity in contrast to other countries and to define what constitutes the nation and its common past. This valuation of heritage as establishing and reflecting nation's history is also echoed in the above quote from Marimon's et al. (2010) study.

In the context of UNESCO, research has found cultural nationalism to be a motivational factor for state parties to nominate heritage sites to the World Heritage List (Van der Aa, 2005). In his dissertation, Van der Aa (2005) argue that state parties use the List to reinforce their national identity and present it to the world. In this, state parties can construct which national identity they want to present when they decide on which sites to nominate. Similarly, Labadi (2013: 63) found that the majority of nomination dossier often contained reasoning of the site's value by showing to "the traditions continuously upheld there over centuries". This, she argues, projects an idea of the nation's identity and its stability (Labadi, 2013: 63). According to her, "heritage has been used in nomination dossiers to construct collective national identity" (Labadi, 2013: 68). Thus, it is argued that cultural nationalism is a central concept of heritage value in the process towards World Heritage nominations. Essentially, (world) heritage value is in this rooted in its positive qualities to establish a sense of the nation and demonstrate this nationally and internationally.

However, it has now been identified by scholars within CHS, that cultural nationalism is replaced by economic rationalism as main heritage value in cultural (heritage) policies (Klamer, Mignosa & Petrova, 2013; Watson & González-Rodríguez, 2015). With economic rationalism the value of heritage and culture is reasoned in economic terms, focusing on the regenerating effects it has on the national economy (Watson & González-Rodríguez, 2015). This is found to be a shift not just concerning heritage, but in culture at large. Throsby (2010: 61) state that cultural policies are increasingly focused on a "broader agenda", with the opportunities for culture and arts to contribute to the national economy. Similarly, Klamer, Mignosa and Petrova (2013: 37) claim that "it is possible to talk about a type of rhetoric where culture and the arts have become a means towards economic and social ends". They argue that, due to the financial crisis in 2008, there is less money to art and culture, which forces the cultural sector to rationalise their national contribution in easily measurable ways. Thus, "cultural significance alone is not an argument for governmental intervention" (Klamer, Mignosa & Petrova, 2013: 37). According to Snowball (2011:172), such measuring of

instrumental value<sup>15</sup>, like income or job creation, is useful in situations where one has to argue why the government should support the arts and culture, rather than other sectors. In essence, this addresses how culture exist in a competitive environment in the way that it is fighting for existence against other sectors, industries or activities. While the creation of national identity markers is historically a way of valuing heritage, the value of national and cultural identity is difficult to measure, compared to job creation and money flow (Blomkamp, 2012: 639; Bowits & Ibenholt, 2009: 4). Instead, culture, and heritage, is increasingly seen having to economically rationalise its value (Snowball, 2011).

This tendency of moving from cultural nationalism to economic rationalism could indicate that in an environment which increasingly favour measurable positive economic effects, the former value of aesthetics, uniqueness and national identity is lost to that of national profit. While it is then possible to observe a tension between cultural nationalism and economic rationalism as their foundation for culture and heritage value differs, the universal value of heritage important for all of mankind is in essence overshadowed by national interests in both approaches. As the economic rationalism starts to show a greater presence in cultural (heritage) policies (Klamer, Mignosa & Petrova, 2013; Thorsby, 2010), the following section will further elucidate on theories of economic rationalism in the context of the World Heritage List and state parties' motivations for nomination.

### 2.3 Economic Motivations for Nomination

Like valuation of heritage, the UNESCO process at large, and the listing process in particular, are found to be highly influenced by state parties' national contextual factors. Scholars claim that UNESCO is politically influenced by the state parties in the decision-making of inscription on the List. Logan (2012: 237) stresses that as the state parties have the power to nominate sites on the World Heritage List, and make up the Committee that governs both the List and the *Convention*, they initially have the power to decide what is heritage worthy of inscription. Essentially, it gives state parties the opportunity to be driven by national interest for nomination and thus "act against the universalist principles underlying UNESCO's mission and the World Heritage system" (Logan, 2012: 237). Similarly, Bertacchini, Liuzza, Meskell and Saccone (2016) and Meskell (2013: 486) argue for a "drift toward a more

---

<sup>15</sup> Snowball (2011: 172) defines instrumental value as "those things that arise as side effects of the arts". This can for instance include job creation and income: "visitors coming to the region and spending on things like accommodation and food, job creation for providers of such services, spending to improve infrastructure and so on" (Snowball, 2011: 172).

‘political’ rather than ‘heritage’ approach” to the *Convention* because advisory recommendations of sites are found to be secondary to state parties’ national interests<sup>16</sup>. In their analysis of decision-making processes at Committee sessions from 2003-2012, Bertacchini et al. (2016) found that when advisory bodies recommended the Committee not to inscribe a site or wanted additional information, sites were still often pushed towards inscription due to economic and political interests.<sup>17</sup> This is supported by Fyall and Rakic (2006) who argue that due to the economic benefits in increased tourism on World Heritage sites, state parties tend to seemingly lobby towards an inscription. Thus, the World Heritage List seems to end up being a tool for realising national plans for economic development.

According to Frey and Steiner (2011) the possibility of positive national effects from an inscription cause state parties to pursue nominations. In their argument, they point to former Director of the World Heritage Centre, Francesco Bandari, who is quoted saying: “Inscription has become a political issue. It is about prestige, publicity, and economic development” (Frey & Steiner, 2011: 560). According to Leask (2006), World Heritage nominations might be motivated by promises of financial support through the UNESCO system or increased tourism (Leask, 2006: 12). In previous research, the effects an inscription has on tourism and visitation is especially attended to as a motivational factor for nomination (see Frey & Steiner, 2011; Leask, 2006; Van der Aa, 2005).

Van der Aa (2005: 107) argue that with a World Heritage status, the tourist industry, and the management of the site will be able to use the uniqueness and the quality associated with this prestigious listing in their marketing strategy to attract more visitors. Furthermore, according to Sande (2011: 260), UNESCO claims that World Heritage listed sites might contribute to a 40-60% increase in visitation. These visitors can provide a considerable amount of income and job creation, and the economic benefits of attracting such numbers of visitors are itself a motivational factor for nomination (Frey & Steiner, 2011: 558; Fyall & Rakic, 2006; Van der Aa, 2005). However, heritage tourism may be a double-edged sword. The massive number of visitors are seen as one of the biggest threats to listed heritage sites (Davis & Weiler, 1992: 320; Van der Aa, 2005: 108). Damage to the physical environment and heritage experience are found to be possible negative effects (Davis & Weiler, 1992; Labadi, 2013; Van der Aa, 2005). However, Labadi (2013: 104) found that the possible

---

<sup>16</sup> The Committee has three advisory bodies in the nomination process, ICOMOS, ICUN and ICCROM, which gives recommendations on which sites to include on the List (UNESCO, ca. 2018b)

<sup>17</sup> This stands partly in contrast to Van der Aa (2005: 19) statement that “the decisions of the World Heritage Committee have hardly ever differed from IUCN’s or ICOMOS’ recommendations”. This difference could be explained by the more than ten years that separate the two findings, suggesting that it could be a rather recent trend where advisory recommendations are less recognised.

destruction on sites as a result of increased tourism activity rarely is mentioned in nomination dossiers. This makes it plausible to conclude that the potential positive effects of increased tourism, outweigh the negative ones in the eyes of the state parties. Thus, increase in tourism after being granted a spot on the World Heritage List is solely considered as a source of economic growth that motivates state parties to nominate sites (Leask, 2006: 13; Van der Aa, 2005).

According to aforementioned literature, World Heritage is then apparently being understood and valued according to other terms than those assigned by UNESCO. The possibility of national gain is found to be a driving force of value and motivation for nomination, as supposed to OUV (Bertacchini et al., 2016; Van der Aa, 2005). In other words, economic rationalisation for nomination dominates over concern and attention for unique heritage that is important outside state borders. This tendency would mean that it is no longer a reason for a state party to nominate a site simply based on OUV. Rather, it needs to come with additional, measurable economic benefits as “state parties want to see clear benefits in exchange for the expense of mounting a nomination bid” (Leask, 2006: 12). According to Waterson and González-Rodríguez (2015), this focus of how heritage can be used for possible national profit is shaping the current heritage discourse present in policies. They term this presence of economic rationalism in heritage usage and discourse “the heritage economy” (Waterson & González-Rodríguez, 2015: 458). While acknowledging that heritage can still have intrinsic value, Waterson and González-Rodríguez (2015: 458-459) argue that it is now often used to assess local and national economic challenges and benefits at a local or national level. The result is a rhetoric, present in cultural (heritage) policies, that focuses on tourism and job creation through heritage sites (Klamer, Mignosa & Petrova, 2013: 37; Waterson & González-Rodríguez, 2015). Hence, heritage sites become “assets”, which might have some intrinsic value, but their ‘real’ value is instrumental and is realised through economic development activities (Waterson & González-Rodríguez, 2015: 463).

Waterson and González-Rodríguez (2015: 473) state that it can be difficult to critique the heritage economy, as it has many advantages. For the developing countries, it includes revenues from tourism and community development, while for the developed world the focus is on regeneration (Waterson & González-Rodríguez, 2015). However, the authors do mention that there is a risk of the tendency of economic rhetoric in policies. As heritage is considered less in ‘expert terms’ and more in the context of national economic and political interests, such interest can cause heritage sites to be transformed to fit into its economic purpose (Waterson & González-Rodríguez, 2015: 473). Additionally, Bowits and Ibenholt

(2009) claim that the economic benefits of gaining a World Heritage status are highly exaggerated. They argue that previous research has not sufficiently considered the negative effects of heritage designation, such as costs of financing and maintaining heritage sites with costs for infrastructure. Nevertheless, they agree to find a trend in policy-making where investments are based on measurable proof of benefits, so that culture can work as a “substitute for more traditional projects” (Bowits & Ibenholt, 2009: 2).

That said, previous research highly focusses on the heritage economy discourse being present in cultural policies. As previously stated, this is in line with what has been identified as the main material used for discourse analysis in heritage research (Wu & Hou, 2015: 46). This thesis will use theories on economic motivational factor and an increased need for measurable effects of culture and expand on them by investigating the presence of these elements in the public heritage discourse in news articles with a variety of involved parties. By researching this in the case of Lofoten with the context of possible petroleum activities, this thesis will provide a deeper understanding of the values of World Heritage among a large group of stakeholders, and more important, how they function in a competitive environment.

State parties believe they have a lot to gain from nominating sites to the World Heritage List, as shown above. Rather than decisions for nominations being derived from a wish to protect sites of OUV, they have been found to be based on economic motivations as World Heritage hold promises of economic development, mainly through increased tourism (Gfeller & Eisenberg, 2016; Leask, 2006: 12-13; Van der Aa, 2005). However, do they have more to gain from World Heritage than other projects? Following Bowits and Ibenholt (2009), comparing heritage to other economic development projects could cause (World) Heritage to not be acknowledged and listed at all if they are found to be less economically beneficial to other projects. This capture the competitive environment where heritage and culture have to justify their existence and value in competition with other projects as addressed by Snowball (2011). Essentially, state parties might choose not to nominate sites that can gain a higher economic profit by pursuing other activities. Hence, there are economic reasons for a state party to nominate a site, there are also economic reasons for why they choose not to. As argued by Van der Aa (2005: 24) a country must be willing to nominate a site to the List. Often this willingness has been linked to a state party’s deliberate (or not deliberate) wish to exclude the heritage of minorities or indigenous groups, as previously discussed or wish for economic profit from tourism. However, willingness to nominate can also be related to the possibility of resource recovery in the future (Van der Aa, 2005: 24).

## 2.4 World Heritage and Resource Recovery

While tourist development and identity marking, both in terms of inclusion and exclusion in relation to human rights and minority groups, are well-covered areas of research within CHS and UNESCO (see Hodder, 2010; Logan, 2012; Silverman & Ruggles, 2007), less literature is found on World Heritage's relationship with resource recovery. Notable exceptions of research on this topic are predominately from the field of Environmental Studies (Benham, 2017; Osti et al., 2011; Turner, 2012). These studies focus on the tension and concerns that arise when extractive resource recovery occurs on already inscribed sites. The following section will be dedicated to outlining what is known about the relationship between World Heritage and resource recovery from these studies and finish by addressing the angles that still need further attention.

World Heritage and resource recovery are found to have difficulty co-existing (Turner, 2012; Van der Aa, 2005: 24). The Arabian Oryx Sanctuary in Oman was delisted from the World Heritage List in 2007 after the state party's wish to limit the protected area to go forth with extractive industries (Osti et al., 2011: 1864; UNESCO, 2018c). This was the first time a site was delisted, and the extraction of hydrocarbon was considered as "contributing to loss of Outstanding Universal Value" (Osti et al., 2011; World Heritage Committee, 2007: 51). Thus, it is plausible to assume that the connection between World Heritage and resource recovery can cause debate, as one might influence the existence of the other.

The relationship between extractive industries and World Heritage sites is addressed in Turner's (2012) study, which was initiated by IUCN in conversation with the World Heritage Centre. Extractive industries are here defined as industries that operate with "exploitation for and extraction of minerals, oil and gas, as well as associated infrastructure" (Turner, 2012: 1). Mining is to a large degree in focus, but I believe that this study can also be applied to offshore industries due to similarities in economic benefits, need for construction for extraction, and possible destruction of both scenery and ecosystems and animal life (Misund & Olsen, 2013). Turner (2012: 6) state that there is "often a tension between the need to protect the special qualities of world heritage sites and the broader need to build the local and national economy". According to him, as extractive activities are economically beneficial activities, state parties might choose to look away from their obligations to protect inscribed World Heritage sites, and rather reap the advantages from mining, oil and gas exploration which benefit the national economy. However, he further argues that there now is a growing



concern for the effects extractive activities have on natural World Heritage. Negative effects can include “damage to biodiversity”, “disruption to ecosystem processes” and “impairment of aesthetic properties that may have contributed to the original assessment of OUV” (Turner, 2012: 5). It is believed that all these negative effects, could apply for Lofoten, as Misund and Olsen (2013: 724) state that leakage from petroleum extractive constructions might lead to the destruction or disruption of biodiversity and the ecosystem and even cause damage to the landscape and initial reasons for both settlement and tourist visitation, not to mention the site’s possible OUV.

The growing concern for negative effects on World Heritage sites from such activities is echoed in Benham’s (2017) study on local communities’ attitudes on industrial development in the Great Barrier Reef region World Heritage Area<sup>18</sup>. Long-term residents of the area did not find the benefits of industrial development to be considerable, despite struggling with depopulation. Additionally, place attachment was a key factor, where there was a reason to suggest that there would be local opposition if the development “is not seen as consistent with the character of a place, or when it disrupts local identities and attachments to that place” (Benham, 2017: 51). However, most important for the local communities’ attitudes on industrial development, was the perceived impacts and risks to the marine environment (Benham, 2017: 48). This is in line with research by Larson, Stoeckl, Farr and Esparon (2015). Both studies found that the concern for putting the biodiversity at danger outweighed the possible economic benefits of industrial development, such as job creation and regional income.

However, not all studies agree to find that concerns for harm on World Heritage sites outweigh the positive effects of extractive resources. At least not in the eyes of governments/state parties. In their book on National Parks, Eagles and McCool (2002: 306) comment that as the living standards rise globally, there will continue to be an increasing demand for extractive resources. The authors believe this will result in governments increasingly make use of protected areas for extraction where it is possible. Similarly, Van der Aa (2005: 24) mentions that the possibility of extractive resources could cause state parties not to nominate sites on the World Heritage List, as such activities might be considered more economically beneficial than heritage protection and preservation and “exploitation might be hindered after worldwide recognition” (Van der Aa, 2005: 24). Thus, state parties might consider the positive economic effects of extraction to exceed the possible negative and damaging consequences (Eagles & McCool, 2002;

---

<sup>18</sup> Specifically liquefied natural gas (LNG) development (Benham, 2017).

Van der Aa, 2005). However, it should be mentioned that both studies only address the issue in a small paragraph.

Nevertheless, considering the increasing focus on economic benefits of heritage in policies, World Heritage might compete with activities for resource recovery. Eagles and McCool (2002: 306) comment that it might be attempted to argue for other “alternatives [for development] than extraction”. They mention that tourism could become an alternative, at least at an argumentative level, to extractive resources in National Parks in the future. Similarly, Turner (2012) argues that governments should pay increased attention to the economic benefits of natural capital and ecosystems. He recommends state parties to look for environmentally sustainable economic opportunities on World Heritage sites (Turner, 2012: 44). He suggests use of renewable resources, like fish, or the tourist industry by marketing natural beauty or uniqueness, through a World Heritage status. However, he does acknowledge that this does not amount in the same incomes as revenues from extractive industries (Turner, 2012: 33). Nevertheless, both authors end this with a kind of speculation or suggestion for the future. Little is known of the increased focus on economic benefits of heritage affects how heritage is addressed as an alternative of competitive force to the extraction of resources on protected areas.

What we can draw from this is that where resource recovery is possible in protected areas, like World Heritage sites, tension arise. It seems difficult for state parties to prioritise OUV over the estimated economic benefits generated by extractive industries, such as job creation and income. This is exemplified in the case of the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary. As a result, state parties might choose not to nominate sites to the World Heritage List. Additionally, local attitudes are negative to the effects industrial development have on already listed sites, and there are some (though small) speculations in the economic benefits of heritage abilities to compete against extractive industries in the future.

However, the majority of these studies address already listed sites, and the effects resource recovery have/could have (see Benham 2017; Larson, Stoeckl, Farr & Esparon, 2015; Osti et al., 2011; Turner, 2012). Thus, little is known about how the relationship between World Heritage and resource recovery relates to sites that are not yet nominated. More importantly, the previous research does not address how the economic benefits of both heritage and resource recovery influence and shape heritage discourse when tension arise. Considering the contextual approach to heritage, it is reasonable to expect that such activities have an impact on how the value, meaning and identification of sites are addressed. This must also be seen in relation to the increasing focus on the economics of heritage (and culture at large) as addressed by Waterson and González-Rodríguez (2015), Throsby (2010) and

Klamer, Mignosa and Petrova, (2013). Furthermore, decisions in cases of tension affect a large pool of stakeholders, ranging from the oil industry, to state parties to local inhabitants, to name a few. This gives reason to assume that the heritage discourse is shaped by a large group of potentially affected people who aim to get their interests realised. In conclusion, little is known about how extractive activities shape heritage discourse, with a diverse group of involved parties, concerning sites that are not inscribed yet. This research will look into this topic. By drawing on the theories and ideas addressed in this chapter, I will investigate the heritage discourse, where multiple parties are involved, that takes place in Lofoten in the context of possible resource recovery.

### 3. Research Method

This research takes a qualitative approach by use of repertoire analysis, a form of critical discourse analysis (CDA), of stakeholder statements presented in 55 news articles published by three different news sources between 2002-2018. Qualitative approaches are common for case studies like this one and provide extensive insight into “the context in which people’s behaviour takes place” (Bryman, 2012: 68, 401). My case study looks at how repertoires build up and support rationalisation of values in a heritage discourse and how they are used to argue the stakeholder’s sides of the public debate in a competitive environment. In this, the research looks at contextual factors and power dynamics as the stakeholders have to negotiate their rationalisation in an environment where plans for a World Heritage nomination and oil compete for future presence in Lofoten. For this reason, the qualitative method of repertoire analysis was considered a suitable way to approach the data.

This chapter starts with a presentation of the chosen research design, before moving over to methods of data collection and the units of analysis. Next, the methods of analysis are addressed. First, I will explain the type of analysis chosen for this research, i.e. repertoire analysis, and its relation to Foucault’s notion of discourse and CDA. Second, I will give account for the coding and analysis in this research. The chapter closes with reflections on limitations, challenges and some thoughts on analysing media texts.

#### 3.1 Research Design: Case Study

Case studies are common practice in heritage research and provide the possibility to look at a particular situation/site in a broad context (Yin, 1994). Such contextual approaches to heritage issues are a central strain of practice in CHS and specifically relevant for this thesis due to the contextual competitive environment that influences the case of Lofoten.

The case of Lofoten serves as both “an exemplifying case” and a “critical case” (Bryman, 2012: 70). First, Lofoten is an exemplifying case as it stands as a representative of heritage sites where national interests influence decisions and discourse. It is specifically selected because the plans for the petroleum development and World Heritage nomination are parallel, intertwined debates that illustrate national interests and power dynamics that play in on heritage issues. It thus exists within “a broader category” of sites (Bryman, 2012: 70) where there is a tension between a variety of interests and heritage existence and where economics become an influential factor in heritage meaning, value, discourse and, finally, decisions on nominations, as discussed in the theoretical framework. Second, Lofoten stands a

critical case with its unique national contextual factors, such as national economy, local community and the specific stakeholders included in the discussion. These elements are different in other cases, times, countries and contextual situations, but critical cases are mainly selected to provide “better understating of the circumstances in which the hypothesis will and will not hold” (Bryman, 2012: 70). Thus, the site is selected because of its contextual factors which can help expand on, and provide deeper insight in, how theories of heritage economic discourse and the relationship between World Heritage and resource recovery work in a specific setting.

### 3.2 Data Collection

In choosing to gather data through newspapers to capture the public debate on Lofoten, I have followed Habermas’ (1964) ideas of the public sphere. According to him, the public sphere is “a realm of our social life in which something approaching public opinion can be formed” (Habermas, 1964: 49). In this, he sees the public sphere as the circulation of communication among people that shape and organise public opinion. He argues that in a democratic society, all citizens have access to the public sphere in which such flow of information and expressions take place (Habermas, 1964: 49). Furthermore, he states that newspapers are among the “media of the public sphere” in current day society as it holds a responsibility to provide information and circulate public discussions, thus providing a platform, in addition to influence as a negotiator between public and government (Habermas, 1964: 49-50). Thus, public opinion and public debate are mediated through the media. Following this, the term ‘public debate’ is here used to refer to the discussion and opinions expressed in news articles. It is considered public through the accessibility of knowledge and expressed opinions, through media and by the fact that public opinion circulates in the debate. With this terminology and notion of circulation of communication in the public sphere, data collection through news articles were deemed suitable to capture the public debate on Lofoten, and thus answer the research question. This allowed for both identification of the dominant stakeholders in the debate by seeing who is included in articles and which language choices the different stakeholders use to justify their argument. It thus provided information on the patterns of dominance, rationalisation and values in the debate.

News articles were collected between April 25<sup>th</sup> and May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2018. An overview of the articles, with translated titles where necessary, can be found in the reference list.

### 3.2.1 Units of Analysis

The selected sample contained 55 written news articles drawn from a search of approximately 14.000 articles from three different news sources. The articles were sampled from one local/regional, one national and one international news source. As the local community is highly affected by decisions for their region, while the decision ultimately lies at a national level, it was deemed necessary to include both a local and national news sources.

Furthermore, following up on Winter (2013) with his addressment of World Heritage and global issues, and the fact that the plans for oil development have gained international attention, an international newspaper was also included.

The three news sources are *Lofotposten* (trans: *The Lofoten Post*), Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation (NRK) and *Financial Times* (FT). *Lofotposten* is the local newspaper for the area. NRK is the biggest Norwegian media outlet in the country (Communication Department, 2017). It is politically independent, state-owned<sup>19</sup>, financed through licencing and located with departments throughout the country (Communication Department, 2017). In an international context, NRK can be compared to BBC and broadcasts and publishes a varied content on TV and radio, in addition to written articles on their online website. As this research looks at heritage discourse in written news articles, a sample was drawn from their online website with written news articles from the years in question. *FT* was selected as it followed the case with several in-depth, feature articles on oil development in Lofoten in relation to environment, cultural and national identity and traditions. It thus separated itself from other international newspaper as it addressed the case in a relevant view connected to the heritage focus of the research.

The article sampling took a purposive approach in that I sampled according to criteria (Bryman, 2012: 418). The articles had to have Lofoten as a main topic and range within a set amount of years to be able to both limit the research to the time in which the nomination of Lofoten had been discussed and to see tendencies that period of time. The articles also had to vary in content (i.e. address the World Heritage nomination in addition to oil development plans and situation of marine life and tourism) to be able to capture contextual factors that could influence the debate.

The sampling was conducted in three steps. In the first step, searches were done in the databases of the selected sources<sup>20</sup>. On NRK's and *FT*'s online archives, 'Lofoten' was used

---

<sup>19</sup> The broadcaster states on its website that despite being state-owned, it "has been given special mandate to be a non-commercial, politically independent public broadcaster" (Communication Department, 2017).

<sup>20</sup> LexisNexis was not a known tool for the student at the time.

as a search word, as this would cover all articles on the area. For *FT* this amounted in 51 hits. NRK did not state a specific number of hits, but based on counting of tabs, the first search amounted in approximately 9.500 articles. Due to the paper's name and location, the following search words were used on *Lofotposten*'s website: 'UNESCO', and the Norwegian words for 'tourism', 'world heritage', 'cultural heritage', 'natural heritage', 'oil' and 'fish/fishing'. This resulted in 4.528 hits. Together, the first search amounted to approximately 14.000 articles. This first step of sampling thus identified a broad spectre of possibly relevant articles addressing Lofoten. For further reduction articles behind pay blocks, dead links, daily briefings, editor notes, readers notes, chronicles, travel articles, survey reporting, articles where Lofoten was only mentioned as a side note/reference point, everyday events and timelines<sup>21</sup> were excluded. This reduced the number to approximately 850 articles.

In the second step, all 850 articles were read and a selection was made based on the context in which Lofoten was mentioned. Articles that explicitly addressed the World Heritage nomination was marked and saved. Additionally, looking for contextual factors of influence, it was necessary to include a representative selection of articles on contextual topics, such as oil plans, tourism and marine life/sea areas. The criteria used to determine relevance was the element of value, considered as "qualities and characteristics seen in things" (Mason, 2002: 7, see chapter 2), in this case, qualities/characteristics of importance in Lofoten or to go forth with either plan. Articles that addressed this in relation to oil, tourism and marine life was grouped together with articles about the possible nomination. Additionally, some articles published by NRK were shown twice, as they had been published in different district offices. When this was realised, a selection was made according to publication date, length and ingress. The total reduction in step two amounted to 155 articles.

The third step consisted of re-reading the 155 articles and making a representative selection. The criteria for selection at this point were articles length/richness of content, continuous focus on values with a special connection to the possible future of Lofoten, and an aim to have an equal sample of articles from local and national perspective<sup>22</sup> and a historical perspective. To provide a historical perspective, at least one article from every year between 2002-2018 was selected, except for 2011<sup>23</sup>. The final sample consisted of 55 articles focusing on topics of World Heritage nomination, tourism development, oil extraction and marine ecology. See Appendix A for the distribution of the article's main topics. The sample ensured

---

<sup>21</sup> For example "Found stranded whale on Lofoten" and <https://www.nrk.no/nyheter/olje-i-lofoten-1.10899468>

<sup>22</sup> The *FT* could not compete with the number of relevant articles published in *Lofotposten* and NRK and an equal amount of articles from this news source could therefore not be acquired.

<sup>23</sup> No articles on Lofoten were found for 2011. The reason is possibly the terrorist attack in Oslo and at Utøya.

bringing about the complexity of the debate, where political/economic interests are discussed together with heritage. All articles were sorted according to date of publication. One additional search was made May 18<sup>th</sup> to ensure updated information. No new articles were found.

### 3.3 Methods of Analysis

The newspaper articles used in this research are mainly written in Norwegian. The coding was done in English and I translated sections used in the thesis for transparency. Before explaining how I coded and analysed the data in this research, it is necessary to explain repertoire analysis, a form of CDA, that provides the framework of my coding and analysis.

#### *3.3.1 Critical Discourse Analysis and Repertoire Analysis*

Acknowledging that ‘discourse’ is a difficult term used in many different ways and disciplines, Foucault’s notion on discourse is especially relevant for this study as it captures elements of power dynamics in language use. Foucault identifies discourse as “practices that systematically form the object of which they speak” (Foucault, 1972:49, cited in Mills, 2004:15). In this, statements, and individuals’ choices for addressment, shape the topic/object that is talked about. Concerning heritage, Wu and Hou (2015: 39) argue that “heritage discourse ‘shapes’ the way heritage is constructed, identified, interpreted, valued, consumed, managed and used”. Thus, how we address a topic influences what we understand as the truth about this topic (Johannessen et al., 2009: 190; Mills, 2004).

Foucault sees discourse as a reflection on power relations in society in that “[power] produces possible forms of behaviour as well as restricting behaviour” (Mills, 2004: 17). How a topic/object is addressed is affected by whose voices are heard (Mills, 2004: 19). In this, our understanding of a topic is “the result or the effect of power struggles” (Mills, 2004: 19). These power struggles consist of a constant negotiation of meanings and understandings, not to say justifications of utterances (Bryman, 2012). Thus, discourses are essentially language, written, spoken, thought or gestured, that is embedded within a larger social context and power dynamic. This idea of power dynamics in discursive formation is a relevant understanding to this thesis as it aims to uncover justifications of positions and which versions of heritage value in Lofoten is made dominant through this rationalisation.

Out of Foucault’s notion on discourse grew CDA, an analytical approach in which discourses are researched in relation to contextual factors and power dynamics (Bryman, 2012: 536, 540; Johannessen et al., 2009:192). In CDA the researcher is attentive to the



notion of intertextuality, which concerns the context the discourse exists within, including other relevant discourses that might cause influence (Bryman, 2012: 538; Johannessen et al., 2009: 192). Discourses are thus believed to “draw on and influence other discourses” (Bryman, 2012: 537). Additionally, CDA examines how actors justify and rationalise opinions and is concerned about finding the function of language: “functions are the findings rather than the raw data” (Bryman, 2012: 537; Wetherell & Potter, 1988: 170). In other words, the purpose of language choices is in focus, as it “constructs and maintains” discourses and thus societies understanding of specific topics or phenomena (Bryman, 2012: 537). Therefore, discourses are considered to be both shaped by society and shape society through power structures and adaptation of a range of different discourses for legitimisation of action (Bryman, 2012: 537; Johannessen et al., 2009:192).

Repertoire analysis is a form of CDA and the chosen tool to approach data in this research. The term was coined by Joke Hermes but influenced by Potter and Wetherell’s interpretive repertoires (Grey, 2011: 165). The attention is not with the “specifics of language” (understood as for instance style and grammar). Rather, as it is shaped by CDA, contextual elements and power dynamics are important when looking at what influences the language choices made by different actors (Grey, 2011: 23). In repertoire analysis, one seeks to find “similarities between verbal accounts” across actors (Allington, 2015: 21) to uncover how accounts are used in different settings for meaning-making and understanding of the world (Grey, 2011: 22-23).

The repertoires can be seen as small, micro-discourses in a larger system of discourse (Wetherell & Potter, 1988: 172). Wetherell and Potter (1988: 172) explain repertoires as “the building blocks speakers use for constructing versions of actions, cognitive processes and other phenomena”. In this, repertoires can be seen as “resources” of vocabularies, terms and statements actors use to support, justify and make sense of actions and opinions (Grey, 2011: 22; Johannessen et al., 2009: 192; Wetherell & Potter, 1988:172). Essentially, repertoire analysis examines how actors use language to negotiate and legitimise their position in a wide contextual frame (Grey, 2011). This is highly relevant for this study both as contextual elements influences and causes a halt in the World Heritage nomination process in Lofoten, and as the aim of the research is to uncover how stakeholders shape, support, justify and negotiate their position concerning value in the debate in question. Or, put differently, which repertoires are used to support certain rationalisations. For this reason, repertoire analysis is considered a suitable analytical approach.

### *3.3.2 Coding and Analysis*

Coding is a common start for qualitative methods of analysis (Bryman, 2012). However, some have argued a difficulty with coding in discourse analysis, as codes break down the text, rather than consider its “complete entity” (Brennan, 2013: 194; Bryman, 2012). Rather, they considered the process to be of “analytical mentality” as only the entirety of the text can reveal the “hidden meanings” and functions language is used for (Bryman, 2012: 530; Matthews & Ross, 2010: 393; Wetherell & Potter, 1988). Nevertheless, coding was considered useful to organise and provide an overview of the large amount of data in this study (Furusetth & Everett, 2013). Through this, it was easier to group similar statements and see repertoires emerge from the data, across stakeholder groups. Therefore, the process of coding started after the data collection ended, as suggested by Bryman (2012: 576). First, the articles were carefully read. At the second read through notes, thoughts and small summaries were written down. Then, the coding started with first categorising the different stakeholders in the debate, followed by coding of statements/passages.

#### *Categorisation of Stakeholders*

The stakeholders were grouped according to the industry, body and/or sector they represented. This categorisation resulted in eight stakeholder groups and five sub-stakeholder groups which are presented in table 3.1. Appendix B also presents a list of the stakeholder groups.

Table 3.1 – Categorization of Stakeholders

| STAKEHOLDER GROUP  |   | ORGANISATIONS/BODIES/REPRESENTATIVES INCLUDED  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Environmental organisations</b>                                       |   | Nature and Youth: Young Friends of the Earth Norway — Friends of the Earth Norway — The people’s force Oil-free Lofoten, Vesterålen and Senja <sup>24</sup> — Bellona — World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Norway — Future in our hands — Greenpeace  |
| <b>Researchers within fields of climate, environment and marine life</b> |   | Ocean Research Institute — Study from University College London on oil and gas extractions effects on global warming— General reference to “climate researchers” (Milne, 2017: para. 11) — Salt  |
| <b>The oil industry</b>  |   | General reference to oil companies/”the oil industry” (Milne, 2017) — Norwegian Petroleum Directorate — LoVe Petro — Petro Arctic — The Norwegian Oil and Gas Association <sup>25</sup> — Statoil  |
| <b>The tourist industry</b>  |   | Destination Lofoten — Lofoten Tourist Enterprises <sup>26</sup> — Lofoten Tourist Centre — XXLofoten — Reine Adventure — Unstad Arctic Surf — Local entrepreneur within the tourist industry (Steen)— Owner of a local rorbu <sup>27</sup> (Skjeseth) — Lofoten Recreation/Outdoor council <sup>28</sup> — The Norwegian Hospitality Association — Director of sustainable tourism in Innovation Norway (Pettersen) —Professor at University College of Bodø (Eide) — Adventure Travel Trade Association |
| <b>The fishing industry</b>  |   | Local fishermen — The Directorate for Fisheries — The Norwegian Fishermen’s Association — The Norwegian Association for Coastal Fisheries <sup>29</sup> —The Norwegian Fishing Vessel Owners Association   |
| <b>Local inhabitants</b>   |   | References to/Surveys on the local inhabitant’s opinions — Interviews with local population  |
| <b>Governmental bodies</b>   | <i>Local and regional politicians</i>             | Mayors of all the six municipalities in Lofoten — Municipality politicians — Municipality boards/councils — Local politicians of national parties — Nordland County Council — County representatives of Nordland — The Lofoten Council <sup>30</sup>   |
|  | <i>National governmental bodies</i>               | The Norwegian government — Political parties — Parliament representatives — Party candidates for parliament seats — The Parliaments Committee for Energy and Environment <sup>31</sup> — Four ministries and their ministers throughout the years; Ministry of Climate and Environment (Formerly Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Environment and Development) — Ministry of Petroleum and Energy — Ministry of Trade and Industry — Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs                    |
| <b>Heritage professionals</b>  | <i>Governmental bodies of the heritage sector</i> | Norwegian Environment Agency— Directorate of Cultural Heritage — Norwegian Cultural Heritage Fund  |
|  | <i>Non-governmental heritage bodies</i>           | UNESCO (incl. advisors and Norwegian members of the Committee) — Lofoten Municipality’s Project Coordinator in the application process (Isdal) —“International experts on cultural and natural heritage protection” <sup>iv</sup> (Helland & Bulai, 2007:para.2)   |
|  | <i>Heritage researchers</i>                       | Professor of fishing history (Christensen) — Professor in social research/heritage (Sande)— Report on value creation around cultural heritage written by Nordland Research Institute, Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research and a professor at University of Tromsø (Bertelsen).  |

<sup>24</sup> Original: Folkeaksjonen Oljefritt Lofoten, Vesterålen og Senja

<sup>25</sup> Original: Norsk Olje og Gass – tidligere Oljeindustriens Landsforening

<sup>26</sup> No longer in operation

<sup>27</sup> A Rorbu is a fisherman’s cabin which traditionally fishermen lived in, but are now often rented out to visitors or tourists (Visit Norway, ca. 2018)

<sup>28</sup> Original: Lofoten Friluftsråd

<sup>29</sup> Original: Norges Kystfiskarlag

<sup>30</sup> Original: Lofotrådet

<sup>31</sup> Original: Stortingets Energi- og Miljøkomité

Two stakeholder groups were categorised according to their addressment of environmental perspectives in the debate. The first group, environmental organisations, consist of spokespeople of both national and international organisations who work on environmental issues<sup>32</sup>. The second group, researchers within fields of climate, environment and marine life, include reports/studies or interviews with researchers on effects of oil activities on marine life/environment. Often these researchers were found to be referred to under the unspecified term “climate scientists” or “climate researchers”<sup>33</sup> (Milne, 2016b: para. 9; 2017: para. 11). Additionally, statements by Salt, “a Lofoten-based consultancy specialising in coastal matters” (Milne, 2017: para. 40) were grouped in this category due to their field of experience and their statements on oil activities threat to marine life in the area.

Three stakeholder groups are sorted according to the industries they represented, namely the oil industry, the tourist industry and the fishing industry. The oil industry consists of three interest organisations for the oil sector<sup>34</sup>, unspecified groups termed “the oil industry” (Milne, 2017), the state-owned energy company and biggest pro-opening company, Statoil<sup>35</sup> (Milne, 2017: para. 35; Statoil, 2018) and the Norwegian Petroleum Directorate. Directorates where grouped into the sector they are related to as they have “authority for action, while still being advisory organs for ministries. The directorates are politically governed, but they are not political. They should primarily take professional considerations in the task execution, but they must have a political understanding”<sup>36</sup> (NOU, 2006 in Direktoratet for Forvaltning og IKT, 2013:15). The tourist industry mainly includes locally based travel companies, councils and entrepreneurs who market Lofoten as a travel destination, provide tourist information and arrange activities and accommodation for visitors. Additionally, The Norwegian Hospitality Association, an employer and trade organisation promoting “the interest of Norwegian tourism and hospitality” (The Norwegian Hospitality Association, n/a), the Director of Sustainable Tourism in Innovation Norway<sup>36 37</sup> and a representative from an international

---

<sup>32</sup> Environmental organisations:: The people’s force Oil-free LoVeSe works specifically against opening up the region for oil activities (Folkeaksjonen Oljefritt, 2015). Nature and Youth is the largest environmental organisation for young people in Norway (Natur og Ungdom, n/a). Their mother-organisation, Friends of the Earth Norway, are the oldest environmental organisation in Norway (Naturvernforbundet, n/a), while Future in Our Hands is the biggest in the country (Fremtiden i våre hender, n/a). Norwegian founded Bellona works both nationally and internationally to combat climate changes (Bellona, n/a) and Greenpeace, works for a “greener” and peaceful earth (Greenpeace, n/a). Both are here represented by their national departments. Additionally, the group includes the Norwegian department of World Wildlife Foundation (WWF), one of the world’s largest environmental organisations (WWF Verdens Naturfond, n/a).

<sup>33</sup> Only one was mentioned by name – Hansen (Milne, 2016b: para: 9)

<sup>34</sup> Interest organisations: LoVe Petro aims to inform the region about the petroleum industry (LoVe Petro, ca. 2009). Petro Arctic provides a network for businesses within the petroleum industry in the northern parts of the country (Petro Arctic, n/a), and The Norwegian Oil and Gas Association is for employers in the petroleum industries (Norsk Olje og Gass, n/a).

<sup>35</sup> Statoil has recently changed its name to Equinor (Equinor, 2018)

<sup>36</sup> Original: Direktør for bærekraftig reiseliv i Innovasjon Norge

<sup>37</sup> Innovation Norway is also responsible for the official online travel guide to Norway, visitnorway.no (Visit Norway, n/a)

organisation for the travel industry named Adventure Travel Trade Association (Adventure Travel Trade Association, n/a) where grouped in this category. Furthermore, a professor at the University College of Bodø was included here as a search on the university's website made it clear that she is a professor of tourism studies (Nord Universitet, ca. 2018). Finally, the stakeholder group of the fishing industry consist of local fishermen, three associations for this industry<sup>38</sup> and The Directorate for Fisheries. It is worth noting that The Norwegian Fishermen's Association participated in the elected board that led the World Heritage nomination process of Lofoten in 2002 (Sande, 2015: 797).

Residents in Lofoten and one survey conducted by Nordland Research Institute on locals' opinions on oil development in the region were categorised as local inhabitants.

The stakeholder group of governmental bodies consist of the sub-stakeholders local and regional politicians and national governmental bodies. Local and regional politicians include mayors of the six municipalities of Lofoten, municipality politicians, local and regional councils and local politicians of national parties. The municipalities and the county governor of Nordland participated in the elected board that led the nomination process in 2002 (Sande, 2015: 797). The second sub-stakeholder group, national governmental bodies consist of the Norwegian government, political parties, national politicians, parliament members and four ministries with their ministers in the years between 2002-2018<sup>39</sup>. The Ministry of Climate and Environment is, with its department of Cultural Heritage Management, responsible for the coordination of UNESCO-cases, including nominations of Norwegian heritage sites to the World Heritage List (The Ministry of Climate and Environment, ca. 2018).

Lastly, following Smith (2006), this study operates with the term heritage professionals for the categorisation of stakeholders connected to the heritage sector and professionalised heritage expertise. Smith (2006) argue that heritage professionals are people with knowledge of the past, aesthetics and heritage conservation and management (see chapter 2). These experts can be considered as people within academia, such as historians and archaeologists, or spokespeople who have "institutionalised in state cultural agencies and amenity societies" (Smith, 2006: 11). In this study, the heritage professionals where divided

---

<sup>38</sup> Fishermen Associations: The Norwegian Fishermen's Association is a union for Norwegian fishermen (Norges Fiskarlag, 2018). The Norwegian Association for Coastal Fisheries is for fishermen in the coastal regions (Norges Kystfiskarlag, n/a). The Norwegian Fishing Vessel Owners Association is interpreted, based on the name, as a union for owners of fishing vessels of a certain set size, but no updated website for the association was found.

<sup>39</sup> The Ministries include: The Ministry of Climate and Environment (Formerly: Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Environment and Development), The Ministry of Petroleum and Energy, The Ministry of Trade and Industry and The Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs.

into three sub-stakeholders. First, governmental bodies of the heritage sector include the Norwegian Environment Agency and Directorate of Cultural Heritage<sup>40</sup> who were handed the responsibilities of the nomination by The Ministry of Environment in 2002 (Verdensarv i Nordland, 2002), in addition to Norwegian Cultural Heritage Fund<sup>41</sup>. Second, non-governmental heritage bodies consist of UNESCO, including advisors and Norway as member of the World Heritage Committee<sup>42</sup>, Lofoten Municipalities Project Coordinator in the application process and what is referred to as “international experts on cultural and natural heritage protection”<sup>vi</sup> (Helland & Bulai, 2007: para. 2). Third, a professor of fishing history and a professor of heritage/social science and a report by, among others, the Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research<sup>43</sup> were categorised as heritage researchers. This categorisation of the stakeholder group heritage professionals is considered to be in line with Smith’s (2006) terminology.

### *Coding and Analysis of Statements/Passages*

After having read through the articles, made notes and categorised the stakeholders, I manually highlighted and colour-coded relevant passages and quotes in the sample. References of value of either the site itself or the plan to go forth with a nomination or oil development were considered of high relevance. As previously stated, and appropriate to the contextual approach to heritage issues, values are regarded as important positive qualities/characteristics (see chapter 2) – thus, textual segments that included qualities considered as important concerning the site and a status (or oil activities) was considered a sign of valuation. Essentially, values could range from the uniqueness of the fishing culture to increased tourism due to listing or more jobs through oil activities. Next, these highlighted passages were sorted into an Excel sheet. Columns showed which stakeholder group who came with an utterance or where referred to, while similar statements were thematically sorted together in a row and given an initial category. To be able to return to the raw data, each statement/passage was given an identifier based on the article they were taken from.

The next step focused on sorting of the data, so all similar statements were further grouped. This provided the possibility to see patterns in statements, which were then given codes. According to Wetherell and Potter (1988: 177) and Hermes (in Allington, 2015: 21),

---

<sup>40</sup> The Directorate of Cultural Heritage is responsible for the national implementation of the *Convention* (Riksantikvaren, ca. 2017).

<sup>41</sup> Original: Norsk kulturminnefond

<sup>42</sup> Norway has been a member of the Committee during the period 2003 – 2007, and 2017-2021 (The Ministry of Climate and Environment, 2017:12; Klima og miljødepartementet, 2017).

<sup>43</sup> Original: Norsk institutt for kulturminneforskning

understanding repertoires is done through close reading of the text, which consists of returning to the raw data and organising the different statements in patterns over and over. The statements were organised, and different codes and structures were tried out, according to possible connections in argumentation. Eventually, this resulted in six categories, fourteen sub-categories and a total of 40 codes. Appendix C shows the codebook in its entirety.

To get an overview of whether certain stakeholders, and thus their arguments and positions, were more or less represented than others in the debate I conducted a small-scale quantitative counting of the stakeholders present in the news articles. Through this, it was possible to determine who is considered to hold the quantitatively dominant voice, in the debate. I did not count the number of times each stakeholder occurred in each article. Rather, I focused on whether they were represented at all to get an impression of who is even considered as stakeholders, and how dominant they are in the debate.

I then returned to the statements. For each statement I asked myself questions of either what was valued in the statement, hence, considered of importance, either for qualities or for realising and rationalising goals and how the statement illustrated influence by contextual factors. When I found an answer, I always returned to the raw data to make sure no context was lost in my interpretation. This allowed me to uncover how stakeholders made sense of the contextual elements of the debate and used this to form repertoires to argue their stand. Furthermore, through the use of these methods, I looked for the functions of the repertoires and how they serve purpose in the competing environment they exist in. This approach was highly useful for this study due to the complexity of the topic. As the debate of whether to nominate Lofoten to the UNESCO World Heritage List consists as part of a parallel debate about oil drilling, it was considered likely that the debates would draw on each other and shape each other for legitimization of future decisions and actions, as tension can arise when such activities come up against each other (Turner, 2012). Through attention to context, repetition and consistency of similar statements, it was then possible to conclude on patterns in discourse, negotiation of opinions and the connection to competing activities.

### 3.4 Limitations, Challenges and Methodological Reflections

There are several limitations and challenges connected to CDA, or more specifically repertoire analysis, of news articles. First, there are considerable difficulties around limiting data and selecting units of analysis because it can create a false reality by (non-)intentionally excluding other discourses that influence the object of analysis (Johannessen et al., 2009: 193). This has been attempted solved through the inclusion of a variety of article topics. Due

to the assumption that oil development would influence the possibilities for a World Heritage designation, as presented in the introduction and the theoretical framework, the sample included articles specifically addressing nomination plans and articles specifically on oil development. In addition, as tourism was considered to be a motivational factor for nominations, articles on the tourist situation were also included. Furthermore, since the sea area is a concern for the opposition of oil development and as its biodiversity, marine life and cultural traditions connected to the sea are part of the qualification for nomination, two articles on this topic was also added to the sample. This inclusion of various articles is considered to be in line with the element of intertextuality highlighted in CDA. Second, the problems with limitations make discourse analysis a time-consuming effort. A public debate, covered in media, provide a massive amount of data. As it is important with a purposive selection of articles based on contextual, possibly influential factors, all articles related to the case in question have to be read through to decide their relevance. Additionally, when a selection is made, this type of analysis requires close reading and several readthroughs to be sure to capture possible influential elements of reasoning. As stated above, despite being time-consuming, this has been attempted solved through always return to and consult the raw data throughout the process of coding and analysis.

### *3.4.1 Reflections on the Journalistic Bias*

The benefit of analysing media texts is that it gives room for analysis across discourses as the researcher can see similar repertoires emerge in news articles on assumed different topics and from a wide range of stakeholders. However, the element of analysing the already interpreted text causes need of reflection as statements and stakeholders included in this thesis have been selected by a journalistic third party. On the one hand, this causes a limitation as Matthews and Ross (2010: 142) state that “qualitative data is typically gathered (...) when the data collected is the words or expressions of the research participants themselves”. In analysing news articles, participants and their words have already been through a filter, in terms of the journalistic selection and interpretation. That said, the vast majority of included text in this research are quotes from stakeholders. This is considered to make up for some of the journalistic bias as the selected Norwegian sources support the ‘Code of Ethics of the Norwegian Press’. Point 3.7 of these ethical considerations state: “it is the duty of the press to report the intended meaning in quotes from an interview. Direct quotes must be accurate” (Pressens Faglige Utvalg, 2015). A similar statement was found in the *FT* Editorial Code (*Financial Times*, 2018). Assuming then that the statements are reported accurately, they have



been handled as original statements. Despite this, it is acknowledged that the setting of the interview/reporting might influence statements, without the possibility for the researcher to gain knowledge of this fact.

On the other hand, the journalistic selection can be a productive and beneficial tool for analysis. This research adopts the journalistic interpretation of the situation as such a tool that reflects on the power dynamics in the debate. As a mediator of the public sphere, the media reflects and circulates opinions in the public debate (Habermas, 1964). Hall (1973: 35) elucidate on this stating that the media “connect’ the centres of power with the dispersed public: they mediate the public discourse between elites and governed”. This highlights the relationship between those who hold power and the general public, who does not. While this relationship is explained by the democratisation process, giving “legitimacy” to an elite few to act and speak for the general public, the media also uphold a power structure in the society by focusing attention to the people who hold power (Hall, 1973: 35-36). Often, this results in a high representation of authorities in the public debate, but more importantly, it reflects those that are considered to be dominant voices and reflect the public opinion (Habermas, 1964; Hall, 1973). This study adopts the journalistic choices of who are considered to be stakeholders which, by following Habermas (1964) and Hall (1973) is believed to represent the dominant voices (and opinions) in the debate. In that way, the journalistic choices itself reflect the power dynamics in the public debate and can thus be considered a useful tool to identify dominant stakeholders and to include stakeholders that would be excluded with use of other methods<sup>44</sup>.

---

<sup>44</sup> As an example of this, it can be noted that this study initially aimed at conducting interviews, in which the environmental organisations and researchers would not be a part of the sample. However, through the news articles, it was discovered that they, in fact, were a stakeholder with an important voice in the debate, both because of the central discussion of climate threatening activity of petroleum recovery and the site’s important and vulnerable ecosystem.

## 4. Findings

In this chapter, I present the findings of my critical analysis of 55 news articles concerning the debate of Lofoten's future and possible nomination to UNESCO's World Heritage List. This study is concerned with how various stakeholders rationalise the value of Lofoten. For this reason, I have examined the different repertoires stakeholders use to justify their stance and values in the debate.

An economic rationale for site valuation was found to shape almost all the repertoires in the debate, resulting in a hegemonic discourse of economic rationalism. While nearly all stakeholders adopt the discourse of economic rationalism, approaching, evaluating and valuing Lofoten in economic terms, they use different repertoires to explain why their side is economically favourable for the nation. Within the Lofoten debate, only one, marginalised group addresses the issue at stake in anti-economic terms, approaching the debate from an alternative discourse. The repertoires in the dominant discourse of economic rationalism consist of a measurable economic variable of value, while the marginalised group uses repertoires that relate to UNESCO's vision of OUV of World Heritage sites.

The first sub-chapter serves as a point of departure for the research. The sub-chapter will establish how incompatibility functions as the backdrop of the debate which results in multiple stakeholders having to negotiate their positions in a competitive environment. Additionally, a brief presentation of the stakeholder's stances and who is quantitatively dominant is included here. Thus, the first part of this chapter addresses the overall picture of the debate. Then, section 4.2 presents the qualitative findings of the repertoire analysis. It will be argued that as a result of the incompatibility, the debate is guided by economic rationalism due to a need for (measurable) legitimisation of action in a competitive environment. This is evident in the repertoires used by the stakeholders. First, the repertoires of the group in favour of oil activity are presented, followed by the repertoires of those who want to safeguard the area against oil development, before looking at the repertoires of those who want to go forth with a World Heritage nomination. This section will finish with a discussion on how this causes heritage to be understood as means towards an (economic) end (Klamer, Mignosa & Petrova, 2013: 37). Finally, the repertoires of the marginalised group participating in the anti-economic discourse are presented with an examination of how they must relate to the hegemonic discourse of economic rationalism.

## 4.1 Incompatibility

It has become impossible to talk about Lofoten's future without talking about oil. The incompatibility of the two future and competing plans, that being oil or World Heritage, is a reoccurring concern for the stakeholders. Statements concerning incompatibility have been found in one article or more every year from 2002-2014, with the last article on the World Heritage nomination in the sample published in 2015. This shows how the element of incompatibility has followed the debate throughout the years, making it an influential factor in shaping the stakeholder's rationales and terms in which value is assigned.

Even though one heritage researcher, Sande, has claimed that oil and World Heritage might be able to live side by side (Krogtoft & Andersen, 2010: para. 10), the majority of stakeholders believe they are facing an either-or situation:

“We think that petroleum development is absolutely not harmonious with a World Heritage status”<sup>vii</sup> (Bellona in Krogtoft & Andersen, 2010: para. 8).

“[Former Minister of Environment] consider[s] oil development/business near the coast of Lofoten as impossible if the area is listed on the World Heritage List”<sup>viii</sup> (NTB, 2008: para. 4, brackets added)

“All experience indicates that this is incompatible”<sup>ix</sup> (Former local mayor in Gerhardsen, 2004: para. 7).

“Oil installations in Lofoten will not be compatible with a status as a ‘World Heritage Site’”<sup>x</sup> (Norwegian Environmental Agency in Johansen, 2004a: para. 1).

Through wording like ‘not harmonious’, ‘impossible’, ‘incompatible’ and ‘not compatible’ stakeholders highlight how the two future plans are not believed to be able to co-exist. This aligns with Van der Aa (2005: 24) and Turner (2012), who claim that extractive activity and World Heritage might be processes that have a difficulty coincide. This causes the alleged need for a choice, which is affecting (and delaying) the decision of whether to nominate the site. As addressed in the introduction, and found in the articles, it has been expressed by different levels of governmental bodies that a nomination dossier will not reach the World Heritage Committee before a final decision on resource recovery is made. In 2009 it was also decided by the then Minister of Environment that the nomination plans would have a complete stop until a final decision for oil development was reached (Lysvold, 2009: para. 1). Thus, the fear of excluding possible extractive activities results in a lack of nomination,

further supporting Van der Aa (2005: 24) claim that state parties might choose not to nominate sites due to a possible hindrance of resource recovery.

As the country is up against an either-or situation, many wishes to have a say in the decision and influence the debate in their direction. The stakeholders are divided in their stances, and as both outcomes have a wide range of affected parties, stakeholders have to negotiate their position in a competitive environment to be heard. The following section will briefly address the different stakeholders' stances before section 4.1.2 addresses their quantitative dominance in the debate.

#### *4.1.1 Stance*

As mentioned in the method chapter, eight stakeholder groups have been identified in the public debate as played out in the press:

- (1) environmental organisations
- (2) researchers within fields of climate, environment and marine life
- (3) the oil industry
- (4) the tourist industry
- (5) the fishing industry
- (6) local inhabitants
- (7) governmental bodies consisting of the sub-stakeholders local and regional politicians and national governmental bodies
- (8) heritage professionals consisting of governmental bodies within the heritage sector, non-governmental bodies within the heritage sector and heritage researchers

While the last stakeholder group on this list, the heritage professionals, are consistently in favour of nominating Lofoten to the World Heritage List, it is clear that there are divided opinions among the other stakeholders. Some are in favour of World Heritage and others are in favour of oil development. Others again are found to be against oil, but not vocal of the nomination.

As expected, environmental organisations and researchers within climate, environment and marine life were found to be collectively against oil activities. Instead, they want and recommend safeguarding the area by prohibiting oil activities for the future. However, even though a World Heritage status is considered to come with the safeguarding<sup>45</sup> these

---

<sup>45</sup> As addressed in chapter 2, according to Van der Aa (2005: 24): "exploration might be hindered after worldwide recognition" that comes with a status.

stakeholders call for, they rarely express their stand towards advocating a nomination of Lofoten. Environmental organisations are only found twice in the sample to advocate going forth with a nomination (Krogtoft & Andersen, 2010; Lysvold, 2014), while researchers within climate, environment and marine life are not found to address this in any of the articles.

As environmental organisations and researchers within climate, environment and marine life want to stop oil plans in Lofoten, their main contrasting stakeholder (and competitor) is the oil industry. This stakeholder group are in favour of oil development and oppose a nomination to the World Heritage List. Despite not being included in articles specifically addressing the nomination, they have come out against this in articles on oil recovery (ANB, 2009).

The tourist industry is against oil development in Lofoten, but, like the environmental organisations, rarely address a possible nomination. However, one article refers to a survey which found that this stakeholder group are in favour (Olsen, 2013). Additionally, a representative for an environmental organisation state “[The tourist industry] rather want a World Heritage Status” in an argument against oil development (Steffensen, 2009: para. 11). As the tourist industry has not been found to address this in own words, it is difficult to make a strong conclusion on their stance. Nevertheless, the survey and the statement by the environmental organisation suggest that the group wants to go forth with a nomination.

Due to their dependency on the marine life, the fishing industry is found to be against oil activities. However, concerning the possible nomination, the group’s opinions are divided and rarely expressed. In the one article where the stakeholder’s opinion is represented, The Norwegian Association for Coastal Fisheries, is in favour of a nomination, while a local fisherman is against (Ønsker vi masseturisme i Lofoten, 2012).

As stated in the method chapter, local inhabitants include residents in the area and a survey by Nordland Research Institute. The survey expresses the group’s attitudes pointing to the group opposing oil extraction (Skeptisk til oljeleting, 2002). Another article quotes a local who is positive towards a nomination (Ønsker vi masseturisme i Lofoten, 2012). However, local inhabitants are only represented in four articles in the entire sample, and only one that specifically addresses the nomination. This is too few to firmly conclude on a consensus. To some extent are the local inhabitants represented through the local politicians as it is assumed that the local politicians are inhabitants and representatives of Lofoten, selected by the majority of the local population. In some cases, local politicians also refer to a ‘we’ interpreted as ‘we the community of Lofoten’, implicitly applying their position to speak on

behalf of the local inhabitants as one united group with shared opinions (Johansen, 2004a: para. 10). Despite referring to the will of the inhabitants, the number of non-political locals who have, with their own voice and words, taken part in the discussion is strikingly low. This results in a lack of knowledge of what the average inhabitant thinks. However, local and national politicians and heritage professionals have called for more local voices in this public debate (Johansen, 2006a; Sjørgård, 2013).

The stakeholder group of governmental bodies is divided in their opinions, as some are in favour of opening the area for oil and others want a spot on the World Heritage List<sup>46</sup>. This applies for both the sub-stakeholder group of local and regional politicians and the national governmental bodies. One article state that “most politicians and councils in Lofoten itself have come out against oil” (Milne, 2017: para. 34) and another state that the municipalities agreed on going forth with a nomination in 2007 (Helland & Bulai, 2007). This gives the impression that local and regional politicians to a large degree are against oil activities and for a World Heritage nomination. However, based on statements found in the news articles, and the fact that Lofoten Council declared a halt in the nomination process in 2009 due to the possibility of petroleum activities (ANB-NTB, 2010a, Sande, 2015: 798), it is clear that the group is rather divided in its opinions. The same applies to the national governmental bodies. As stated in the introduction, Sande (2015: 798) suggest that the lack of consensus is due to conflicts among both ministries and political parties.

#### *4.1.2 The Loudest Voice*

It is plausible to conclude that with such a varied stakeholder environment, the heritage discourse is shaped by diverse parties with contrasting opinions as these stakeholders continuously have to argue against each other to position their interests and stand. However, some stakeholders and thus also their opinions, are more frequently represented in the articles than other. This is expected as Hall (1973) argue that media often focus their attention on the people with authority to make decisions for the larger population (see chapter 3). Nevertheless, it does result in an uneven balance in whose opinions are visible in the debate.

The frequency of stakeholder representation in the sample is shown in table 4.1. The table shows the above-mentioned stakeholder’s quantitative dominance in the public debate. Whether they are mainly for or against oil and World Heritage is also included in the table for

---

<sup>46</sup> No clear characteristic that guides their position has been found in this study. It should be mentioned that this could be explained with a lacking reference in the news articles to local politician’s political party. It is believed that if this had been a part of the sample, the opinions would align with the different national parties’ manifestos.

clarification. As addressed above, in some cases, such as with the tourist industry, the environmental organisations and the local inhabitants, there have been found some statements that suggest that the stakeholders support a nomination, but their opinions on this matter are still rarely included. This makes it difficult to firmly conclude on a consensus but could suggest a slight favouring of nominating Lofoten to the World Heritage List. These cases are marked with a parenthesis. The table is hierarchically ordered according to quantitative representation in the entire sample of 55 news articles, ranging from the stakeholder group with the highest representation at the top to those with the lowest representation on the bottom. In addition, the stakeholder groups representation in the 30 articles that specifically address the World Heritage nomination has been added to the table to reveal possible changes in stakeholder representation according to topic of articles.

Table 4.1 – Frequency of stakeholder representation in the 55 analysed news articles on Lofoten’s future, published between 2002-2018.

| STAKEHOLDERS   | STAND                      |                   | REPRESENTATION                  |        |                              |        |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------|------------------------------|--------|
|  | World Heritage             | Oil               | REPRESENTATION IN ENTIRE SAMPLE |        | IN SAMPLE ON W.H. NOMINATION |        |
| <b>Government representatives</b>  | -                          | -                 | -                               | -      | -                            | -      |
| - <b>National governmental bodies</b>                                    | Divided                    | Divided           | 30                              | 54.55% | 14                           | 46.67% |
| - <b>Local and regional politicians</b>                                  | Divided                    | Divided           | 26                              | 47.27% | 21                           | 70%    |
| <b>Tourist industry</b>  | Yes (few articles)         | No                | 11                              | 20%    | 1                            | 3.33%  |
| <b>Oil industry</b>  | No                         | Yes               | 11                              | 20%    | 0                            | 0%     |
| <b>Environmental organisations</b>                                       | Yes (few articles)         | No                | 10                              | 18.18% | 2                            | 6.66%  |
| <b>Researchers within fields of climate, environment and marine life</b> | Lack of position expressed | No                | 7                               | 12.73% | 0                            | 0%     |
| <b>Heritage sector/organisations</b>                                     | -                          | -                 | -                               | -      | -                            | -      |
| - <b>Governmental bodies of the heritage sector</b>                      | Yes                        | No                | 7                               | 12.73% | 7                            | 23.33% |
| - <b>Heritage researchers</b>  | Yes                        | No                | 6                               | 10.9%  | 6                            | 20%    |
| - <b>Non-governmental bodies of the heritage sector</b>                  | Yes                        | No                | 4                               | 7.27%  | 4                            | 13.33% |
| <b>Fishing industry</b>  | Divided (few articles)     | No                | 6                               | 10.9%  | 1                            | 3.33%  |
| <b>Local inhabitants</b>   | Yes (few articles)         | No (few articles) | 4                               | 7.27%  | 1                            | 3.33%  |



The figures validate that governmental bodies, both at local, regional and national level, are the stakeholders with “the loudest voice” in the public debate, to borrow from Harrison (2005: 7). These stakeholders are dominant in the sense that they get interviewed or referred to in the highest amount of articles. The national governmental bodies alone are represented in 54.54% of the articles, while the representation from the heritage professionals is 12.72%, 10.9% and 7.27%. These numbers are below the majority of other stakeholders.

The finding of the low representation of heritage professionals stands in sharp contrast to Smith (2006) who claims that the power in the heritage discourse is often held by this group (see chapter 2). Based on this it was assumed that the heritage professionals would represent a highly present stakeholder group in the public debate to spread knowledge on why Lofoten is considered unique and need to be preserved and protected through a spot on the World Heritage List. In other words, inform of the sites (outstanding universal) value. However, in this specific heritage debate, they are found to be quantitatively inferior to the governmental bodies. Even though the heritage professionals are, percentage-wise, more frequently present in articles on the nomination than the sample at large, the local and regional politicians are still represented in almost double the number of articles. Furthermore, only once are the heritage professionals represented without presence of either local and regional politicians or national governmental bodies, while these governmental bodies are included in 17 articles where the heritage professionals are completely absent. This shows that governmental bodies are unquestionably the most dominant stakeholder group in the debate.

As the governmental bodies have the authority to make decisions on behalf of the public, their high representation was expected, as mainstream news media typically focus on power centres (see chapter 3; Hall, 1973). Thus, the dominance of government voices is visible both in its presences in these articles, as shown above, and through the fact that they have been selected for interviews and statements by the media in several occasions, thus supporting the dominance. However, it should be noted, that the dominant representation of governmental bodies’ gives this stakeholder an upper hand in which opinions of the debate circulate. Following Foucault, who argue that the voices heard shape the understanding of a topic/object (Mills, 2004: 19; see chapter 3), this could indicate that the governmental bodies have the power of shaping the understanding of the debate and how Lofoten is discussed and valued.

As (heritage) discourse reflects power struggles and negotiations of meaning in society (Mills, 2004: 19; see chapter 3), it is not only interesting who gets space, but also who is completely, or almost completely, deprived of space in the debate. A lack of representation in

articles could indicate which voices lose in the power struggle to negotiate the terms in which the Lofoten is valued. At the very least it indicates whose opinions are being marginalised. Within the overall sample researchers from the fields of climate, environment and marine life, heritage professionals, the fishing industry and local inhabitants are shown to be the least represented stakeholders. As discussed above, the representation of the local inhabitants is to some extent made up for in the high representation of governmental bodies, due to the democratic system. However, the fact that the heritage professionals have a low representation rate in the sample could suggest that the heritage perspective on what to do with Lofoten is deemed less important than other industries points of view. That said, heritage professionals get more space in the articles concerning the nomination. While governmental bodies are still dominant, heritage professionals are here within the higher levels of representation. At the same time, local inhabitants, the oil industry and the tourism industry, which all will be affected by a possible listing are to a large degree excluded in articles on the nomination. The same can be said about the fishing industry and the environmental organisations, which could be considered representatives or guardians for the criteria's that are deemed worthy of inscription on the World Heritage List; fishing traditions, beauty of nature and biodiversity.

These findings align with the idea that expert opinion is becoming less central and that political presence is largely taking over in consideration of possible World Heritage sites, as argued by Fyall and Rakic (2006), Bertacchini et al. (2016) and Meskell (2013). The findings suggest that such a political presence is not solely evident in the nomination and listing processes in the UNESCO system, as suggested by Bertacchini et al. (2016) and Meskell (2013), but in the heritage discourse at large, as shown in the public debate through media coverage. As presented above, expertise viewpoints from heritage professionals, are indeed given less space than political governmental bodies', in the public debate about whether to nominate Lofoten to UNESCO's World Heritage List. However, the identification of stakeholders in this section also shows that there is a considerably larger number of involved parties in a heritage debate, and thus influencing heritage discourse, than Smith (2006) seem to suggest. This gives further indication that there indeed is a need to see how heritage discourse is constructed outside politics and academia. As the aim is to understand what rationalisation of values dominates this heritage discourse, the content of these stakeholders' statements must be further examined through qualitative methods. What dominates these stakeholder's rationale for a World Heritage status?

## 4.2 The Hegemonic Discourse of Economic Rationalism

Incompatibility has caused a World Heritage status to be valued in economic terms. The belief that it is one or the other results in a competitive environment where stakeholders turn to measurable economic effects for legitimisation of action. Heritage is forced to compete in the same terms as the oil industry as the resource is usually providing great economic benefits for a country with oil reserves.

In Norway, heritage is thus fighting against the country's "most important [industry] both in terms of revenues for the State Treasury, investments and share of total value-creation"<sup>xi</sup> (The Ministry of Petroleum and Energy, 2013, brackets added). Oil has (literary) fuelled the Norwegian economy since the 1970s (Norsk Petroleum, 2017), providing security for the population through for the countries welfare system and job creation and "several local communities benefit from the ripple effects the oil industry has provided"<sup>xii</sup> (Mehren & Haraldsen, 2007: para. 11). That is to say, the stakeholders in favour of a nomination are coming up against a strong competitor with a solid track record of measurable positive effects for the national economy. They are therefore forced to compete on the same terms and show how a World Heritage status can provide similar national economic benefits as oil activity. The value of the site is thus not considered in terms of OUV, but what it can bring to the region or the country at large. This is especially evident when local and regional politicians are demanding impact studies on the possible status' effects on "possible limitations in industry development (...) [and] regional development and value creation"<sup>xiii</sup> (Johansen, 2013a: para 5) and "to find out what they gain/profit/win from/on a World Heritage Status"<sup>xiv</sup> (Krogtoft & Andersen, 2010: para 15). It is likely that measurable economic values, such as 'profit', uncovered through an impact study can be used to advocate nomination, as such values are 'easy' tools to weigh one outcome against another in a decision-making process (Snowball, 2011: 172).

Therefore, the debate is not simply about whether a listing is economically beneficial for the nation, through for instance increased tourism activities, as suggested in previous literature. Rather, it is about whether the listing is *more or less* economically beneficial than oil development. National economic and political agendas are in the high seat for motivation for nominations to the World Heritage List as addressed in the theoretical framework. However, in the case of Lofoten, the site's possibility of realising such national interests through a spot on the World Heritage List are measured up to another major industry. In this competitive environment, stakeholders position themselves in economic terms to be able to

stay in the ‘race’. As a consequence, both the stakeholders in favour of a nomination and those in favour of oil development adopt economic rationales for their stance. This creates a hegemonic discourse of economic rationalism.

The economic rationalism is entering the debate in Lofoten to such a degree that ‘universal’ values of UNESCO are almost completely forgotten. As stated in the theoretical framework, UNESCO highlights non-measurable values in the World Heritage Convention with the World Heritage List and its sites of OUV. The *Operational Guidelines for the Convention* state that some heritage is so special that it “transcends national boundaries” and becomes important for all of humankind, across borders and throughout time (World Heritage Centre, 2017: 19). As mentioned, Labadi (2013: 11-12) further explains that this creates a platform for assumed objective and intrinsic values. Essentially, the repertoire of the *Convention* is a non-economic one, where heritage is valued in and for itself, intrinsically, and not as a means towards an economic end. However, as presented above, the incompatibility in the case of Lofoten causes a discourse of economic rationalism when discussing the possible World Heritage site’s future. Representatives within all eight stakeholder groups have been found to participate in the discourse of economic rationale at one point or another. The different stakeholders are found to form repertoires that function as foundations for their argument and to support value of the site in economic terms. These repertoires change according to stance in the debate. The dominant repertoire identified among those who favour going forth with oil development is that of ‘local economic activity’. Those who argue against oil but are less verbal on nomination are found to use ‘favourable economic activities’ to address the challenges oil development can have on other industries in the region. For those who advocate a World Heritage nomination the repertoires of ‘local development through tourism’, ‘policy change’, and ‘government support’ are frequently applied.

#### *4.2.1 The Economic Rationale of Oil Development*

As mentioned in section 4.1.1 and presented in table 4.1, the people in favour of pursuing oil development plans in Lofoten are the oil industry and parts of the governmental bodies, both local and regional politicians and national governmental bodies. They support oil development in the region based on the great economic benefits this resource has had on local and national economy throughout the years. One article illustrates the power of oil on the Norwegian economy as follows:

“For decades, the nation’s economy and jobs market have been boosted by oil and gas. It has used the revenues from petroleum to create the world’s largest sovereign wealth fund, which owns on average 1.3 per cent of every single listed company on earth.” (Milne, 2017: para. 9)

After Norway started to drill for oil in 1966, the country’s economy has relied on the resource (Norsk Petroleum, 2017). In 2011, 25% of the country’s GNP was “based on offshore exploitation of petroleum resources on the continental shelf” (Sande, 2011: 253) and, as the quote above suggests, the income is a large part of the foundation for the Norwegian welfare system (Norsk Petroleum, 2017). While the income from the petroleum sector has dropped as a result of changes in oil and gas prices, the export still amounts to almost 50% of the total exported products in the country (Norsk Petroleum, 2017; SSB, 2018). As stated in the introduction, the petroleum resources in Lofoten alone have an estimated value of 105 billion NOK (ap. € 11 billion) (Blanchard et al., 2014: 314). However, parts of the oil industry have claimed that the number can be closer to between 300-600 billion NOK (Urdahl & Andersen, 2004: para. 2). While one governmental official addresses the oil’s effect on the national economy by highlighting “income for the state” and that the country has “better welfare than we could ever have imagined before” (Milne, 2017), the dominant repertoire is not ‘national economy’ as the Norwegian oil history would indicate. Rather, the dominant repertoire for those who want to pursue oil development and argues against a World Heritage nomination is that of ‘local economic activity’:

“When we talk about such great values in oil and gas, it is not just about income and profit for the welfare system and state budget. We are talking about local activity, jobs and ripple effects of great impact for the local and regional society”<sup>xv</sup> (The Norwegian Oil and Gas Association in NTB, 2010: para. 3)

The repertoire of ‘local economic activity’ presents arguments focusing on the creation of jobs, growth and a range of unspecified positive economic ripple effects in the area. This can be seen in relation to the local and regional politicians concern for the younger population moving out of the region (Urdahl & Andersen, 2004). The repertoire thus appears as solution oriented by addressing the problem of depopulation with the clear answer being oil:

“Adm. Dir. in LoVe Petro put great emphasis on the depopulation and the possibility for new jobs and growth in his opening statement under today’s public meeting on oil and gas in Lofoten and Vesterålen. (...). Our greatest challenge is that the younger population moves out of the area. It is not just a challenge, but our responsibility. We have to offer jobs that are challenging and

interesting for the young after they finish their education, said Robertsen”<sup>xvi</sup> (LoVe Petro in Steffensen, 2009: para. 1-3)

Similar statements, concerning job creation and depopulation, has also been found among governmental bodies. Hence, oil development is not only about money for the nation, but a range of positive economic ripple effects which can provide a solution for regional problems. While the local activities are focused on, possibly to allure the local community, it must be acknowledged that the positive economic ripple effects will play in on both national and local economy in terms of employment rates, production of exported goods, and thus also (global) trade and both local and national income, to name a few variables. By referring to the favourable economic ripple effects for the local community and a solution to regional problems, the repertoire creates the foundation of belief that a decision should be based on economically justifiable values.

In addition, the repertoire is used to contrast the possible limiting consequences a World Heritage status is believed to have on local activities and sovereignty. While the oil development fosters local activity, stakeholders, particularly within local and regional politicians, consider a World Heritage status to do the opposite due to restrictions. Local and regional politicians against a nomination are afraid that the status will limit the possibilities of what is referred to as ‘business activities’, as a local mayor is for example quoted saying:

“Here we are concerned about being our own lord, and we are afraid we will lose sovereignty over our own future. Bjørnstad is especially concerned about the safeguarding perspective and is afraid it will have a too great impact on business activities. The mayor of Vågan specifically mentions the plans on oil and gas development outside Lofoten, but also the business of fisheries”<sup>xvii</sup> (Local politician in Gerhardsen, 2004: para. 5-6).

It is expressed concern about the hindering effects World Heritage has, both regarding ‘other’ activities and concerning sovereignty. Different versions of this statement are repeated by local and regional politicians and give reason to conclude that this is a major concern for the group. It seems that the stakeholders interpret a World Heritage status as a governing force which will cause more problems for the economic (oil) opportunities for the region. The belief of hindrance is also supported by the oil industry which argues that a World Heritage status will block for “many types of business activities”<sup>xviii</sup> (ANB, 2009: para. 2), further pushing economic terminology, with ‘business activities’, into a heritage debate. It is thus evident that the economic advantages of oil development are highlighted, parallel to the hindering effects of a status, among the people in favour of petroleum activities. As a result,

the repertoire of ‘local economic activity’ ends up giving the impression that it will be economically beneficial while a World Heritage status will not, as it causes restrictions in development and sovereignty. This repertoire thus challenges the values of a World Heritage status to be measured in economics and lays a foundation for competition. However, the repertoire is challenged by both those who argue for safeguarding the area against oil development and those who purpose a nomination. The first group of oppositions challenge what constitutes ‘business activity’ by illustrating the economic importance of other industries, mainly the fishing and tourism industries.

#### *4.2.2 The Economic Rationale Against Oil*

The main oppositional parties to oil development, who has not activity come out in favour of the nomination, are those from environmental organisations, researchers within fields of climate, environment and marine life and the tourist industry. Additionally, this stance has been found to be supported by the fishing industry and local inhabitants. In some cases, these stakeholders relate their argument towards a World Heritage nomination, but mostly they stick to advocating against opening the area for petroleum activities separately. However, they participate in shaping the discourse of economic rationalism in the debate. They do so by applying the repertoire of alternative ‘favourable economic activities’:

“We conclude that a petroleum-free Lofoten and Vesterålen gives the best foundation for continuous growth and settlement in the region”<sup>xix</sup> (The people’s force Oil-free LoVeSe in Steffensen, 2009: para. 15)

“People in Lofoten are still sceptical of oil searches in the region – mainly because of the fisheries and tourist industry.”<sup>xx</sup> (Skeptisk til oljeleting, 2002: para. 1)

In these two examples, it is a foundational belief that oil activities will cause damage to other economically favourable activities in the region. More importantly, cause damage to the two primary industries; tourism and fisheries (Isdal, 2011: slide 2, see introduction). Here, the stakeholders try to outperform the economic values of oil activities by arguing that essentially oil will jeopardise other sources of income due to contamination of marine life and scenery.

While this repertoire mainly is used to state that oil will cause harm to industries Lofoten relies on, the argument is occasionally addressed in explicit relation to sustainability and long-term perspectives for local income. The tourist industry is not found to be discussed in this way, however, it is argued that the fishing industry is a more sustainable activity than oil development:

“Here it lies considerable natural resources, one of the world’s most unique natural areas, large fishing and spawning grounds, a great potential for sustainable development/renewable value creation and jobs.”<sup>xxi</sup>(WWF in Oseid & Solvang, 2014: para. 5)

“The oil would last just a few years — it’s a drop in the ocean. But fishing has been going on here for thousands of years.” (Fisherman in Milne, 2017: para. 49)

In the first of these quotes, it is explicitly stated that fishing is an activity with great potential for local sustainable development. In the second, the fisherman illustrates sustainability by referring to the “thousands of years” fishing has been around, contrasting it to oil which the area will eventually run out of (Milne, 2017: para. 49). In both, the fishing industry is essentially seen as an industry with a long-term perspective for economic activity in the region.

The underlying function of this repertoire is to address that by going forth with oil, one will not only lose the income the tourist and fishing industries amount for by damage to marine life and natural scenery, which the industries rely on (see introduction), but the area will eventually be left with no source of income as the oil well will reach a point of exhaustion. In this, especially the fishing industry is thus eventually economically favourable precisely through its sustainable features. Thus, the stakeholders who apply this repertoire not only state what is lost by pursuing oil plans, but rather hint at what is gained of economic possibilities through a long-term perspective on the activities in the region.

While the argumentation on focusing on the advantages of other industries is used to oppose petroleum activities, it has a lot in common with the repertoires used to rationalise a nomination. While the repertoire of those who oppose oil address what industries might be lost due to petroleum activities and that fishing in the region is a sustainable activity, the repertoires of those in favour of a nomination highlight how tourism and fisheries can benefit from a World Heritage status.

#### *4.2.3 The Economic Rationale of a World Heritage Nomination*

A spot on the World Heritage List is valued in economic terms, rather than OUV as wished by UNESCO. While UNESCO might hold a non-economic repertoire by focusing on values that transcend borders, time and contextual factors, this repertoire is rarely shared among stakeholders who favour nomination in the debate about Lofoten. It is not even dominant among the heritage professionals as was expected based on Smith (2006). Rather, positive economic ripple effects of Lofoten becoming part of the List is mentioned in 80% of the 30 articles on the nomination, making it a highly dominant topic in the heritage debate. The



stakeholders who favour a nomination rationalise their view in accordance with three main repertoires; ‘local development through tourism’, ‘policy change’, and ‘governmental support’. These repertoires are especially evident among heritage professionals, governmental bodies at both local/regional and national level and parts of the fishing industry. However, although the tourist industry is not very vocal about a nomination, these repertoires draw on the economic possibilities for the industry that come with a status.

### *Local Development Through Tourism*

The most used repertoire is that of ‘local development through tourism’ and applies the three elements of ‘job creation and income for the region’, ‘sustainability’ and ‘diversification of economy’. Together they serve as explanations as to why local development through tourism is an economically favourable outcome of a World Heritage designation and rationalise why a nomination should be pursued.

As previously mentioned, tourism is one of the primary industries in the region (Isdahl, 2011: slide 2) and is highly dependent on the natural scenery to attract visitors to the region. This dependency is often used to argue against oil development as shown above, but is also echoed in the argumentation for World Heritage:

“The survey also shows that the [tourist] industry wants a World Heritage status for Lofoten. They want to show off the region as pure and authentic. It is the essence of what tourists want when they travel to Lofoten, according to associate professor Dorthe Eide at University College of Bodø<sup>xxxii</sup> (Olsen, 2010: para. 3, brackets added).

“Kjersti Isdal [Lofotens project coordinator in the nomination process] thinks that tourism and coastal fisheries can gain advantages with a World Heritage Status. Tourism because the status can result in more people visiting Lofoten, and give the region an extra stamp of quality<sup>xxxiii</sup> (Johansen, 2008: para. 9, brackets added)

The World Heritage status is interpreted as to be a security for the industry to present the ideal scenery to visitors, hence also relating the granting of a status to an important economic activity. It is argued that the status will provide a “quality stamp<sup>xxxiv</sup> (Helland & Bulai, 2007: para. 3) which will result in more visitors to the region. This is believed to create more jobs and income as exemplified in the following quote by heritage researcher, Sande:

“If Lofoten is granted a World Heritage Status, it will result in 250.000 more tourists a year and create 500 new jobs in Loften and Vesterålen<sup>xxxv</sup> (Heritage professional in Johansen & Olsen, 2010: para. 2)

Additionally, in one article the former Minister of Environment also characterises such heritage tourists as “wealthy and environmentally oriented people from all over the world (...). These are people who leave a lot of money”<sup>xxvi</sup> (Johansen, 2007: para. 7). Hence, the increased visitation is interpreted as to be both economically beneficial through income and jobs, in addition to being considered a sustainable approach to the future due to (apparently) ‘environmentally oriented’ visitors. The environmental organisation, Nature and Youth, support this perception of heritage tourism as a sustainable and environmentally friendly activity:

“World Heritage makes a focus on more environmentally friendly and greener development in the region possible. It will contribute to show Lofoten as a travel destination with rich nature and culture and can strengthen industries and businesses who use the nature in a sustainable and environmentally friendly way”<sup>xxvii</sup> (Nature and Youth in Lysvold, 2014: para. 5)

Looking to literature in the field of CHS, such perceptions of heritage tourism as sustainable for the region can be highly questioned. Tourism has been found to be a destructive force on local communities and heritage sites (Davis & Weiler, 1992; Labadi, 2013; Van der Aa, 2005). Locally, recent years news articles have also shown that tourism itself is a threat to the nature (Johansen, Ødegård & Sørgård, 2016). Despite this, while a concern for the destruction on Lofoten caused by tourists in the region is present in the sample at large, it rarely overlaps with articles on the nomination. In the 30 articles on the nomination, negative effects of increased tourism as a result of a status is only found in 23% of the articles, while a positive view on such an increase is found in 70% of these articles.

Additionally, when the repertoire of ‘local development through tourism’ is applied to rationalise a nomination, it is not addressed how the area will tackle the increased amount of tourists. While the area already experiences damage as a result of tourism (Johansen et al., 2016), and some local politicians show concern for the increase a status will result in, none of the stakeholders has been found to come with statements addressing or referring to management plans for the possible designation. This could indicate the absence of a sustainable plan for tourism development, or at the very least show that such plans are excluded from the public heritage discourse.

Although 23% of the articles on a nomination captures stakeholders who see the increase of visitors as a challenge and no reference to how to tackle increased masses in the case of a designation has been found, tourism is celebrated as a positive effect of a status. So,

while a small group address the possible negative effects, most support the argumentation of tourism as a positive force and support a nomination based on this view towards the industry:

“The status can boost the tourist industry through heightened interest in Lofoten”<sup>xxviii</sup> (Local politician in Rørstad & Sørård, 2014: para. 22)

“[The status] can give the region more tourist who will stay longer, just the kind of tourists we are looking for”<sup>xxix</sup> (Local politician in Johansen, 2014a: para. 5, brackets added).

This illustrates that in the economic context the negative effects are chosen not to be in the centre, thus becoming inferior to the possible positive outcomes. World Heritage is seen as a door opener, rather than a hindrance, despite regional problems with tourists, lack of circulation of a management plans in the public debate or other addressment of how to tackle increased visitations.

Additionally, it is believed that the industry development that comes with a status will have a healthy influence on the economy through industry diversification:

“World heritage can create new jobs and not make us dependent on oil to move on”<sup>xxx</sup> (Local politician in Johansen, 2006b: para. 4).

This is the only quote of its kind but illustrate that some do not necessarily see oil as a part of the Norwegian future, possibly indicating that the country will have to look for other resources to rely on. Thus, it is believed that a nomination can result in reduction of national dependency on one industry through diversification as a result of stimulating the tourist sector. The former Minister of Environment also stated that the possible loss of tourists due to oil installations are among the reasons for why the country should not go forth with plans for extraction of oil in the area (Johansen, 2010: para. 6). It is then plausible to conclude that the repertoire articulates the tourist industry’s economic potential through ideas of increased visitation causing profit/income and job creation as a result of a designation of a World Heritage status, in addition to being a (believed) sustainable activity and secure diversification in the economy. This results in tourism being dominantly seen as a positive economic, competitive force against oil development among various stakeholders and an economically rationalised motivational factor for a World Heritage nomination.

### *Policy Change*

The second repertoire used by those in favour of a nomination is that of ‘policy change’ and is identified to be mainly used among parts of the fishing industry, local and regional politicians

and Lofoten municipalities project coordinator in the nomination process. The fishing industry is currently experiencing challenges as quotas are acquired by large fishing companies and hence “squeezing out small fishermen” (Milne, 2017: para 5). More importantly, the industry is also facing increased competition over sea areas from “the petroleum industry, development of ocean wind turbine at sea, in addition to fish farming”<sup>xxxix</sup> (ANB-NTB, 2010b: para. 3). In this current situation, risks are often proposed by The Norwegian Fishermen’s Association and local fishermen arguing that that oil development could jeopardise the fishermen’s livelihood:

“It will take decades before we know the long-term consequences [of oil development]. What should we live off of if oil damages the future of fisheries? Then we have destroyed our own culture”<sup>xxxix</sup> (Fisherman in Eriksen, 2008: para 10, brackets added).

The quote highlights an environment where local income is at stake. This relates to the repertoire used by those against oil activities, as the fishing industry is considered favoured as economic activity above oil. For some, a World Heritage status is deemed a possible solution to save the industry and hence also the local livelihood.

The Norwegian Association for Coastal Fisheries<sup>47</sup> believes that the status will provide better policies for management of fisheries. Thus, like the repertoire of ‘local economic activity’ used by those in favour of oil development, the repertoire of ‘policy change’ is interpreted as solution oriented. It provides an answer to regional issues. However, it is not addressed what these policies or commitments entail. It is believed that a status will result in obligations for the Government to secure the industry and thus the livelihood of approximately 850 locals (Fiskeridirektoratet, 2018):

“Since we are nominated because of the unique coastal fishing traditions and stockfish production, it has to entail commitments from the government to preserve and protect the industry”<sup>xxxix</sup> (The Norwegian Association for Coastal Fisheries in Ønsker vi masseturisme i Lofoten, 2012: para. 9).

While this could indicate a wish to safeguard the ‘unique’ cultural tradition, it is mainly supporting and relating to economic rationalism for two reasons. First, the protection of this industry is economically beneficial. As the tourist industry, the fishing industry is a primary industry of the region (Isdal, 2011: slide 2; see introduction) and a livelihood for many locals, as shown above. Second, marketing fishing culture as unique through a World Heritage status is an economic advantage for the region:

---

<sup>47</sup> Original: Norges Kystfiskerlag

“[Stockfish] is already world known, associated with stockfish trade in south Europe. Many Italians, Portuguese and Spaniards already know the area and it will be even more attractive to visit the region when it has become World Heritage, says associated professor Allan Sande at University College in Bodø<sup>xxxxiv</sup> (Heritage professional in Johansen & Olsen, 2010: para. 6, brackets added).

“I still see great opportunities for tourism and coastal fishing with a World Heritage Status. Lofoten can end up on an exclusive list together with the pyramids in Egypt, the Chinese wall and other famous places. That is something we can positively take advantage of considering tourism and marketing of fish<sup>xxxxv</sup> (Local politician in Johansen, 2014b para. 12)

The traditional fishing culture and processing of fish are seen in connection with increased visitation which is considered profitable. Therefore, it is reason to believe that policies that would protect the tradition through a status will be economically beneficial as it would provide security for livelihood, safeguard an economically important industry for the region and contribute to more visitors and promote marketing of traditional and uniquely produced fish from the region. In short, while policy changes will safeguard cultural tradition, it is used by these stakeholders as a highly economically driven rationale for a nomination.

### *Governmental Support*

The third repertoire used by those in favour of a nomination is that of ‘governmental support’. This repertoire is only used in four articles in the sample, and only by governmental bodies and two heritage professionals. Those who use this repertoire relates to economic rationalism by positioning the status as something that will grant the region resources and money. While this group say that a listing will provide governmental support and funding that can help take care of the cultural and natural heritage, again indicating a wish to preserve heritage, ‘governmental support’ is mainly seen as positively influencing safeguarding of the area so that it will remain interesting for tourists and hence create jobs and local activity. Governmental funding and tourism are mentioned in the same breath as economically motivational factors for nomination by a national politician from an opposition party:

“It will release resources and grants for preservation if you get Lofotodden national park<sup>48</sup> and World Heritage, in addition to more tourists. If I were from Lofoten, I would have used great resources to get a World Heritage Status<sup>xxxxvi</sup>. (National politician in Fagerbakk, 2015: para. 5).

---

<sup>48</sup> The debate about making parts of Lofoten a national park has been a separate issue the last couple of years.

Additionally, a representative from the non-governmental heritage sector, namely the project coordinator, almost allure with promises of money by comparing the possible listing with other World Heritage sites in Norway:

“Both Vega and West-Norwegian fjords get extra money from the Directorate of Cultural Heritage and the Norwegian Environmental Agency to take care of natural and cultural heritage. They also have better/easier access to SMIL-funds and money from the Norwegian Cultural Heritage Fund.”<sup>xxxvii</sup> (Lofoten municipalities project coordinator in Johansen, 2008: para. 14)

In these quotes, the main idea seems to be that a World Heritage status will mainly release money for the region, rather than the site being important in itself. This can be seen in relation to recent reporting on local mayors calling out for tourist taxes as they are forced to move “(...) money from schools and elderly care to build toilets for tourists”<sup>xxxviii</sup> (Lysvold, 2017: para. 1)<sup>49</sup>, and, more importantly, destruction of land and nature, crucial for the tourist industry (Johansen et al., 2016). Hence, money is needed for the preservation and protection of Lofoten to maintain, or even boost, the income that the tourist industry today provides. Thus, again, the value of Lofoten as a World Heritage site is addressed in economic terms and this economic rationale justify the motivation for nomination.

The incompatibility of the two plans causes the site’s value to be reduced to economically measurable variables. In relation to previous literature, culture, arts and heritage increasingly needs to legitimise their value and existence in economic terms (Klamer, Mignosa & Petrova, 2013: 37; Throsby, 2010: 61). These repertoires presented above validate that in a competitive environment, heritage is essentially forced to show its value in such terminology. Oil has a grip around Norway’s economy and has a consistent economically driven repertoire based on its positive effects on local activities. Thus, all other stances are forced to adapt to these terms to be able to stay in the competition of what way to go forthwith. Traditional heritage values, such as cultural nationalism and identity, and aesthetic and historic value (Smith 2006; Sørensen & Carman, 2009: 14), are hidden in the debate in favour of jobs, income and growth. As are the values of uniqueness and universal importance, proposed by UNESCO.

Thus, while World Heritage might be aimed to be valued for universally unique, intrinsic qualities, this valuation is not embraced by the stakeholders in a public heritage discourse in Lofoten. The above sections have shown that all eight stakeholder groups have adopted the hegemonic discourse of economic rationalism through economically driven

---

<sup>49</sup> The government rejected the motion for tourist taxes. (Lysvold, 2017)

repertoires and Lofoten's potential is valued in economic terms. This makes it evident that the rationalisation based on economic values has spread through all stakeholders and sides as a result of the power dynamics in the debate. As a nomination is coming up against an activity that has formed the foundation of the national economy, the stakeholders need to negotiate their positions in measurable economic terms to compete. The power struggle and negotiation to shape the discourse has resulted in a complete lack of attention for Lofoten's value as a World Heritage site with unique characteristics of universal importance. In addition, it has neglected possible negative effects of a designation. The economic rationalisation of site valuation makes it clear that the value of the site is very much within the national boundaries. The value of Lofoten as a heritage site is measured according to whether a listing will create positive ripple effects such as jobs, activity and income for the region, and thus also for the nation. This focus on national economic value stands in contrast to UNESCO's wish that sites on their list represent a value that transcends national boundaries, is important to all of mankind and thus worthy of safeguarding. The heritage discourse draws on the oil debate by applying repertoires that compete with the economic benefits of petroleum activity and strengthen the industries that the opposition fears is threatened by the oil industry. In doing so, a World Heritage status is being economically valued. In the process, the discourse loses attention to all other possible values.

### 4.3 The Anti-Economic Discourse of Site Valuation

While all stakeholder groups have been found to rationalise their stance in economic terms at one point or another, in some cases, there are evident attempts not to be dictated by economics. Some stakeholders are seemingly trying not to be affected by the hegemonic discourse of economic rationalism and present an alternative by advocating safeguarding and/or listing with use of UNESCO resembling values of the site. Their discourse is here termed the anti-economic discourse of site valuation. Rather than aiming to reach their goal through economic benefits of safeguarding, they focus their arguments around the two repertoires of 'environmental concerns/responsibility' and 'un-measurable value'.

The anti-economic discourse of site valuation has two angles. First, there are those who participate in the discourse to safeguard the area against oil development. Second, there are those who participate to highlight heritage values of the site and turn the discourse in UNESCO terms. The first group position their argument by highlighting concern for "what is happening in the world" (Norwegian Fishing Vessels Association in Milne, 2016a: para. 5),

interpreted as to mean global environmental challenges and climate changes. However, both groups align in an idea that certain values cannot be measured.

According to both environmentalist organisations and climate researchers in the articles, the petroleum resources in Lofoten need to be left untouched to limit the rise of the global temperature (Milne, 2017: para 11). Due to this, the repertoire of ‘environmental concern/responsibility’ is applied by parts of the environmental organisations and climate researchers but has also been supported by sections of the fishing industry, to safeguard the area against oil development. When using the repertoire, the stakeholders call for the Norwegian government to look ahead, adapt and take the current day international environmental concerns into account when making decisions:

“Of course, it’s an act of war. It’s a stupid act. This kind of politics belongs to 20 years ago. They are missing what is happening in the world” (Norwegian Fishing Vessels Association in Milne, 2016a: para 5).

“It is these kinds of calls that make you think: why the hell are we doing this? [Opening up Lofoten] would be very short-term thinking trumping long-term thinking,” (WWF in Milne, 2016b: para. 21)

Extractive activities are considered backwards, something that belongs to the past and simply stated, no longer a sustainable approach of international politics. In contrast to the hegemonic discourse which highlights national economic interests, the stakeholders in the anti-economic discourse thus bring in why the protection for this area is of global concern.

That said, the repertoire of ‘environmental concern/responsibility’ can be related to economic rationalisation of what to do with Lofoten. It resembles the economic rationale against oil development by highlighting the element of sustainability. The reference to “long-term thinking” by WWF in Milne (2017) above could indicate environmental awareness as a sustainable economic route in concern for damaging and exhausting the areas renewable resources, like fish. ‘Environmental concern/responsibility’ is often related to a concern for the marine life in Lofoten, a renewable resource which is found to be both a source of local and national<sup>50</sup> income and considered as a more (economic) sustainable activity than oil. As shown above, a concern for the marine life qualities as revenue generating and sustainable is used in the hegemonic discourse to rationalise stances in economic terms. However, when the repertoire of ‘environmental concern/responsibility’ is applied it is not found to include

---

<sup>50</sup> As stated in the introduction, fishing amounts to approximately 7% of Norway’s exported products (SSB, 2018)



economic terminology by pointing to economic activities (and effects) from the natural renewable resources. Additionally, it does not address sustainability in a narrow sense, only taking a local perspective by referring to economic activities for the region. Instead, it addresses a global concern for environmental challenges worldwide. The repertoire thus separates itself from the hegemonic discourse of economic rationale by not discussing environmental responsibility in economic terms and by bringing the issue of environmental awareness across borders.

By arguing that the area has several globally unique, natural qualities which need special care, these stakeholders highlight the international perspective and strengthen their argument on safeguarding. Often superlatives are used to strengthen the argument:

“(…) one of the *world’s most* rich and productive sea areas (…). We have *the last* large cod stock in the world, Skreien”<sup>xxxix</sup> (The people’s force Oil-free LoVeSe in Steffensen, 2009: para. 8-9, emphasis added).

“It is *the most* unique area. If you can’t leave oil and gas resources in an area like that, then nothing is sacred. That is why this battle is so important.” (WWF in Milne, 2017: para. 12, emphasis added)

The superlatives separate this place from other, argumentatively ‘less special’ sites, making it the most important place on earth. While these stakeholders do not use this to advocate a nomination, this is a common strategy in dossiers to the World Heritage List (Labadi, 2013: 71; Van der Aa, 2005: 7). The anti-economic discourse aims at distinguishing the area as unique and critiquing the possible opening as being old-fashioned politics. This function to evoke feelings on environmental responsibility on account of contemporary global challenges.

Additionally, the anti-economic discourse presents the repertoire of ‘un-measurable value’. This repertoire is mainly used by a small group of representatives from environmental organisations, national governmental bodies and governmental, and non-governmental bodies of the heritage sector. However, all of these stakeholders are also found to participate in the economic discourse through use of economic repertoires. It is thus possible to assume that stakeholders try out different argumentative strategies to get their voice out. Moreover, governmental bodies of the heritage sector are mainly included in articles published between 2002-2007, with a full stop in 2010. From this point on they are more or less replaced by heritage researchers who, in contrast, are not present in articles prior to 2010 and has a contrasting repertoire which centres around positive economic effects a status would provide. This indicates a shift towards economic reasoning and confirms the increasing dominance of

the economic rationale in heritage and culture issues as presented by Waterson and González-Rodríguez (2015) and Klamer, Mignosa and Petrova (2013).

When the repertoire of ‘un-measurable value’ is found it highlights elements of intrinsic values that cannot be measured in economic gain:

“[Lofoten] is the place for our national identity. It’s the core of our fishing, coastal, mountain identity. So it’s a fight we can’t afford to lose.” (Greenpeace in Milne, 2017: para 46)

“The culture and nature in Lofoten are unique. By gaining a World Heritage Status we show how much we appreciate this and wish to take care of it. This is an area that is important both for us who live here now, but also for future generations all over the world”<sup>xli</sup> (Nature and Youth in Lysvold, 2014: para. 3)

“The fishing and natural heritage are factors that need to be highlighted [in an application]. The coastal culture in Lofoten is outstanding.”<sup>xlii</sup> (Heritage professional in Nikolaisen, 2007: para. 4)

These statements address qualities and values which cannot be measured such as identity and importance of unique/outstanding qualities. In the first of these statements, Greenpeace addresses the national identity rooted in the area as an argument against oil activity. While not using national identity to advocate a nomination, the statement still brings in the concept of cultural nationalism which has historically been a central element for heritage valuation (see chapter 2). It highlights the cultural value of the area by addressing the country’s relationship with nature as shaping national identity. While this statement does address the value of the area from a national standpoint, focusing on why the area is sacred for the Norwegian identity, it relates to the other statements through its attention to un-measurable cultural and natural values embedded in the site.

The repertoire of ‘un-measurable values’ relates to UNESCO’s vision by valuing heritage in intrinsic, non-economic terms. Heritage is then valued for an importance that cannot be measured in money, jobs, business activities and development. The repertoire rather addresses the unique qualities of the region, which are seen as important both for a current community, and future generations, nationally and globally. This is considered to be in line with UNESCO’s vision of OUV. These values are seen as a reason to safeguard in and for itself, despite a lack of economic benefits/effects.

The anti-economic discourse of site valuation highlights UNESCO’s fundamental belief that some sites should be protected and preserved for its universal importance. The repertoires in this discourse address a concern for global challenges and how this site must be safeguarded not just for the benefit of the region, but as an act to show attention to current day

environment. In addition, a vulnerable and unique marine life, cultural and natural heritage is valued. Even though not all stakeholder who participates in this discourse do so to advocate a nomination, the values they address are those of OUV due to the site's uniqueness and global importance for safeguarding for future generations.

Nevertheless, the anti-economic discourse is forced to respond to the hegemonic economic discourse, despite not using economic benefits to support their own stance. It is acknowledged that the economic rationale has taken control, but the group still attempts to stress that some values cannot be measured in economic terms:

“My religion is first and foremost nature (...) When I hear about oil exploration, it's just money, money, money and we never seem to have enough. We always go for more money, and we never get close to real values.” (Local inhabitant in Milne, 2017: para. 24)

“We are frustrated most of the time because jobs go before the environment.” (Future in our hands in Milne, 2016b: para. 6)

These stakeholders suggest that other values, such as environment and nature are more important than measurable economic effects like jobs or ‘money, money, money’. Here the economic gains of achieving a World Heritage status or go forth with oil is not as important as ‘real values’, interpret as meaning identity and outstanding nature which have created a unique coastal culture. Instead of arguing in economically beneficial terms, they rather appeal to a sense of what is intrinsically important to the population. However, in some cases, arguments might start as driven by un-measurable values, but switch during the interview/article, possibly to gain more competitive force. The above quote by Nature and Youth was followed by a clear economic rationalisation:

“By applying for a World Heritage Status, one chooses a path that can secure increased focus on environmental friendly business and sustainable use of resources”<sup>xlii</sup> (Nature and Youth in Lysvold, 2014: para. 10)

Thus, the repertoire tries to distinguish itself from that of the economic discourse while still needing to respond, and therefore also participate in, or rather, against, the hegemonic discourse on economic rationalism. Consequentially, economics has highjacked the debate in Lofoten.

## 5. Conclusion and Discussion

The question about Lofoten's future has been part of the public debate in Norway for nearly two decades. Because of the assumed incompatibility, there exists an either/or situation where the government of Norway has to choose between extractive industries and a World Heritage status. The case of Lofoten thus exemplifies that contextual factors and power dynamics influence heritage existence, discourse and value.

This study set out to examine how stakeholders in the debate about Lofoten's future rationalises the site's value within a highly competitive environment. In order to examine this, the research was conducted through repertoire analysis of 55 news articles published between 2002 and 2018. This gave the opportunity to answer the research question, which reads: *In what terms do the dominant stakeholders in the debate about the potential nomination of Lofoten archipelago to UNESCO's World Heritage List rationalise their position concerning the value of the site in a highly competitive environment?*

By looking at news articles, this research has investigated valuation by a variety of involved parties in the shaping of heritage discourse in Lofoten. Former heritage research using discourse analysis has largely centred on academia, tourism texts and policies (Wu & Hou, 2015: 46). This gives the impression that heritage discourse is mainly shaped by the agencies of such texts. However, with use of repertoire analysis of news articles, it was possible to look at statements made by a variety of parties throughout the years of the debate. Thus, this method and sample provided the opportunity to present findings on a broader perspective on which terms Lofoten and its possible World Heritage status is valued and how this function in the public heritage discourse.

As the competing debates on oil and World Heritage draw on each other many parties have a stake in what is said about Lofoten, and thus shape the heritage discourse without necessary explicitly referring to the possible nomination plans. They are all still positioning their argument in a competitive environment where their justification for action has to hold up against other competing interests. While the heritage discourse in Lofoten includes eight stakeholder groups, this study found some to be more dominant in the debate than others. The stakeholders within governmental bodies, including local and regional politicians and national governmental bodies, are represented in considerably more articles than any other stakeholder. They are therefore considered the (quantitatively) dominant stakeholder. This stands in contrast to Smith (2006) who argues that heritage discourse is controlled and shaped

by heritage professionals<sup>51</sup>. Rather, the quantitative findings in this research suggest that, in Lofoten, the heritage discourse is dominated by governmental bodies' opinions and understandings of the topic in question.

An economic rationale for site value was found to have taken control of the debate in Lofoten. Due to the incompatibility of oil and a World Heritage status, stakeholders argue and legitimises their position in measurable economic terms. All stakeholders addressed value in economic terms at one point or another, resulting in a hegemonic discourse of economic rationalism. This finding can be seen in relation to Snowball (2011: 172), who states that measurable values are often considered useful when arts and culture have to compete for funding. As a World Heritage status is advocated in economic terms, the findings in this study suggest measurable economic values are not only used to compete for funding, but to legitimising value of heritage over extractive industries, and thus justify heritage existence.

This research found that stakeholders apply economic repertoires to rationalise their position concerning the site's value. The economic benefits of pursuing oil activities in the region were argued by use of the repertoire 'local economic activity'. It stressed regional problems such as depopulation and provided a solution through the positive ripple effects oil activity would have. Those who oppose oil development in the region, but are not vocal about a nomination, challenge the repertoire of 'local economic activity'. They do this by pointing to the industries that potentially will be harmed by oil activities. Thus, they argue that tourism and fishing are 'favourable economic activities'. By those who advocate going forth with a nomination of Lofoten to the World Heritage List, it is argued that the status will result in economic benefits for the region which can compete with the benefits of oil activity. Essentially, they rationalise going forth with a nomination in economic terms using the repertoires of 'local development through tourism', 'policy change' and 'governmental support'. By applying these repertoires, these stakeholders highlight a World Heritage status as an economic beneficial future for Lofoten.

A small group was found to attempt steering the discourse away from the economic rationale. Due to a concern for the environmental responsibility, resulting from a need to reinforce policies adapted to climate changes, this marginalised group attempted to highlight the unmeasurable values of the site. This is done by addressing the uniqueness of culture and nature, and specifically the marine life and the nations "fishing, coastal, mountain identity"

---

<sup>51</sup> However, it should be mentioned that Smith (2006: 42) does state that the control of the heritage discourse might change in time and context. Therefore, following Hall (1973), the presence of the governmental bodies was somewhat expected due to their decisive role, not just in the case of a World Heritage nomination, but also regarding opening the area for petroleum activities, making them a natural dominant part of the public debate in media texts.

(Greenpeace in Milne, 2017: para 46) embedded in the area. However, they are forced to respond to the economic rationale due to its dominance. Furthermore, and more importantly, no stakeholder group was in this study found to stick to this anti-economic discourse consistently. At one point or another, every stakeholder group used economics as a rationale for either opening the area to oil activity, safeguarding from it or push towards a nomination.

The findings in this research suggest that with an economic rationale of a nomination, World Heritage can (argumentatively) compete as a positive force against climate threatening activities such as oil. In the case of Lofoten, the economic repertoires for a nomination function as a counter solution to petroleum activities, a highly climate threatening activity. It does so by focusing on the economic benefits of a World Heritage status and makes this an alternative source of national income. Winter (2013) called for further research on how heritage can be a positive force against issues of our time. By focusing on the economic benefits of a World Heritage designation, a status can (argumentatively) be used as an alternative source of national income, and capable of competing against climate threatening activities. That said, no decision is yet to be made in Lofoten, so the question remains of whether the economic rationale is enough to decide on a nomination within a competing context. Therefore, it would be interesting for further research to investigate the effects of the economic rationalism of heritage valuation. Here it is suggested to conduct a comparative longitudinal study which looks at the highlighted values in public debate on several possible heritage sites which hold extractive resources and see whether economically driven repertoires have an impact on final decisions for nomination in competitive settings.

To conclude, the dominant stakeholders in the debate about Lofoten's future rationalise their position concerning the value of the site in economic terms. The economic valuation of a World Heritage status is used to rationalise stakeholders' stand, the site's value and essentially drives the heritage discourse in Lofoten. Through the economically driven repertoires, World Heritage is capable of competing with the oil industry, which already has a track record of reinforcing the national economy. Thus, national economic gain is what determines if a site is worthy of a nomination and hence eventually a spot on the World Heritage List, or if it should be opened for oil. This stands in contrast to UNESCO which applies a non-economic repertoire through OUV. Hence, heritage that is universally important and unique. Based on the focus of national profit in the economically rationalised repertoires found in this research, the site's possible universal importance and uniqueness is lost and buried. Instead, World Heritage is valued according to what it can provide of measurable economic benefits. The situation in Lofoten thus fits into a larger tendency where heritage is

valued for its economic potential as argued by previous research (see Klamer, Mignosa & Petrova, 2013; Thorsby, 2010; Watson & González-Rodríguez, 2015). Essentially, economic gains of a nomination have taken control over valuation and alternative discourses and OUV are ignored.

The conclusion shed light on two strain of theories within CHS. First of all, the study expands on Fyall and Rakic (2006), Bertacchini et al. (2016) and Meskell (2013) findings on political and economic agendas becoming more central than expert opinions and heritage concerns in nomination and listing processes within UNESCO. This study has shown that this is not just the case within UNESCO, but the heritage discourse as a whole. Two main findings in this study support this. First, the governmental bodies are more quantitatively dominant in the debate and present in almost double the number of articles compared to heritage professionals. Second, economic agendas are the dominantly discussed motivational factor in regards to a nomination. This brings me to the second strain of theories this study contributes to; theories on economic rhetoric in heritage discourse and theories of economic motivations for nomination. Watson and González-Rodríguez (2015) and Klamer, Mignosa and Petrova (2013) argued that economics have entered heritage policies, making heritage a means towards an end (Klamer, Mignosa & Petrova, 2013: 37). This research shows how the economic rhetoric is not just present in policies, but also in the public heritage discourse. The findings also challenge Smith's (2006) claim that heritage discourse is controlled by heritage professionals who favour aesthetics and historic value of heritage sites. Rather, through the public debate expressed in the sample of news articles, economics are found to be the central value for heritage based on a variety of stakeholder's repertoires on heritage value.

However, on a finishing note, it cannot go unaddressed that the economic rationale has implications. As UNESCO's goals with the World Heritage List is to preserve and protect heritage sites of OUV (Van der Aa, 2005: 1), it is essential that sustainable protection and use of heritage sites are a part of every nomination. Nevertheless, while articles and stakeholders in this study expressed the experience of negative effects of tourism in Lofoten and local and regional politicians have called out for tourism taxes, these issues were not found to influence the economic benefits of increased visitation as a solid reason to go forth with a nomination. In fact, this study found the negative effects of (increased) tourism to rarely be mentioned in the articles on a nomination. This supports Labadi's (2013: 104) finding that state parties rarely address the negative effects of increased tourism activities on heritage sites in nomination dossiers. Additionally, this study did not find references to a sustainable plan on how to tackle the increase in visitation after a possible designation in the debate. These

findings imply that the economic rationale for nomination overshadows the potential negative effects of a status. As World Heritage is considered as a means to an economic end, attention to how to act on economic potential in a long-term sustainable perspective is seemingly shoved under the carpet. Thus, the consequence of economic rationalism of site valuation is not only that UNESCO's OUV is being marginalised in the discourse, but that the focus on showing economic potential in a competitive environment possibly overshadows a sustainable rationale for nomination and the future of the area.

Considering previous research stating that heritage tourism is a significant threat to World Heritage sites (Davis & Weiler, 1992: 320; Van der Aa, 2005: 180) and the neglect of negative effects of tourism and lack of addressing plans to tackle increased visitation in the Lofoten debate, it is reason to question whether we have reached a point where heritage actually can be used as positive, sustainable source of income, despite being presented by the stakeholders as an economic alternative to climate threatening activities like oil extraction. For this reason, future research is advised to investigate how heritage can be used as an alternative source of income while being cautious of ethical and sustainable approaches to heritage tourism. This thesis can thus be considered as exploratory where stakeholders rationalisation of heritage value is attended to and how heritage is argued as a positive force against income from petroleum activities, while also looking into Winter's (2013) call on how heritage has a stake in issues of our time. The next step of research is suggested to examine how stakeholders' economic perceptions of heritage can be realised in an eco-friendly way. A great starting point for such research is to strengthen a collaboration between CHS and Environmental Studies<sup>52</sup>, where the majority of research on World Heritage's relationship with resource recovery are currently derived from (see Benham, 2017; Osti et al., 2011; Turner, 2012). These two fields need closer dialogue on how heritage can actually function as a positive, sustainable, alternative of national income and thus help bring stakeholders belief and rhetoric of World Heritage as economic and environmentally sustainable, into action. In this way, a World Heritage status can, to borrow from a local politician, "be an amazing opportunity"<sup>xliii</sup> (Johansen, 2014a: para. 8).

As stated introductory, a nomination is likely not to come before a decision is made on the management plan of the Lofoten-Barents Sea. In early 2018 it was made clear that a decision on these plans were postponed yet again (Milne, 2018). This time until 2021. In addition, it

---

<sup>52</sup> More specifically suggested is the field of ecological economics.



is recently decided that Norway will not nominate new sites to the World Heritage List during the time they serve as a member country of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee between 2017-2021 (Klima- og Miljødepartementet, 2017). This makes 2021 an interesting year where the debate possibly will rise again. Perhaps even the deciding year in the debate. But that thought has probably been circulating every year since the very beginning in 2002.

## References

### *Primary sources*

- ANB. (2009, December 12). Frykter verdensarvstatus [World Heritage Status causes worry]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/frykter-verdensarvstatus/s/1-71-4757015>
- ANB-NTB. (2010a, January 18). Ett skritt nærmere verdensarv [One step closer to World Heritage Status]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/ett-skritt-narmere-verdensarvstatus/s/1-71-4811355>
- ANB-NTB. (2010b, June 6). Venter spisset kamp om havområdene [Expecting fight over ocean]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/venter-spisset-kamp-om-havomradene/s/1-71-5147401>
- Andersen, B. (2013, March 19). Ny rapport: -Lofoten og Vesterålen er et helt unikt havområde [New study: - Lofoten and Vesterålen are unique oceans]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/enestaende-omrade-for-fisken-1.10955640>
- Eriksen, M. (2008, September 13). Halvparten er imot oljeleting [Fifty percent against oil search]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/nordlendingene-sier-nei-til-olje-1.6218321>
- Fagerbakk, L. (2015, September 2). Solhjell tar verdensarv-saken til Stortinget [Solhjell takes the World Heritage case to the Parliament]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/nasjonalpark/lofoten/fritid/solhjell-tar-verdensarv-saken-til-stortinget/s/5-29-122875>
- Fredriksen, B. (2017, August 12). Vil ha prøvekommune for turistskatt i Lofoten [Want a trial run for tourist taxes in Lofoten]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/vil-ha-provekommune-for-turistkatt-i-lofoten-1.13639393>
- Gerhardsen, A. (2004, June 23). Nei til «Lofoten naturpark» [No to "Lofoten nature park"]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/nei-til-lofoten-naturpark/s/1-71-1160921>
- Helland, M. and Bulai, E. M. (2007, March 16). Hele Lofoten vil bli verdensarv [All of Lofoten wants to be World Heritage]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/hele-lofoten-vil-bli-verdensarv-1.2058300>

- Holand, A. M. and Haraldsen, O. R. (2007, August 7). Vågan kan spolere verdensarvstatus [Vågan could spoil World Heritage Status]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/vagan-kan-spolere-verdensarvstatus-1.3131059>
- Johansen, A. D. (2010, September 28). Må velge mellom olje og verdensarv [Has to choose between oil and World Heritage]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/olje-eller-verdensarv-1.7313091>
- Johansen, B. H. and Olsen, K. E. (2010, June 1). Kan få 250 000 flere turister [Could gain 250 000 more tourists]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/kan-fa-250-000-flere-turister-1.7148989>
- Johansen, J. I., Forland, G. and Yildiz, M. (2015, October 29). Amerikansk turistguru: Turismen i Lofoten bør kvotereguleres [American tourist guru: The tourism in Lofoten should be regulated by quota]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: [https://www.nrk.no/nordland/amerikansk-turistguru\\_-turismen-i-lofoten-bor-kvotereguleres-1.12628573](https://www.nrk.no/nordland/amerikansk-turistguru_-turismen-i-lofoten-bor-kvotereguleres-1.12628573)
- Johansen, J. I., Ødegård, J. and Sørgård, K. O. (2016, September 27). Slår alarm om Lofoten: - Det haster å innføre turistskatt [Give warning: - To establish tourist taxes is urgent]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: [https://www.nrk.no/nordland/slar-alarm-om-lofoten\\_-\\_det-haster-a-innfore-turistkatt-1.13151254](https://www.nrk.no/nordland/slar-alarm-om-lofoten_-_det-haster-a-innfore-turistkatt-1.13151254)
- Johansen, J. I. and Kristoffersen, K. J. (2018, January 16). Debatt: - Er turisme en velsignelse eller forbannelse for Lofoten? [Debate: - Is tourism a blessing or curse for Lofoten?]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: [https://www.nrk.no/nordland/debatt\\_-\\_er-turisme-en-velsignelse-eller-forbannelse-for-lofoten\\_-1.13868941](https://www.nrk.no/nordland/debatt_-_er-turisme-en-velsignelse-eller-forbannelse-for-lofoten_-1.13868941)
- Johansen, M. (2004a, April 22). Lofoten som arvegods [Lofoten as hairloom]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/lofoten-som-arvegods/s/1-71-1091504>
- Johansen, M. (2004b, April 15). Ærefull listeplassering [Honourable listing]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/arefull-listeplassering/s/1-71-1082753>
- Johansen, M. (2005, August 23). Ordfører-skepsis til olje og turiststrøm [Sceptism amongst mayor on oil and tourism].. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/ordorer-skepsis-til-olje-og-turiststrom/s/1-71-1707493>

- Johansen, M. (2006a, March 22). Nå må Lofoten diskutere arven [Now Lofoten has to discuss World Heritage]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/na-ma-lofoten-diskutere-arven/s/1-71-2011389>
- Johansen, M. (2006b, December 14). Kun Lofoten kan bli verdensarv [Only Lofoten can become World Heritage]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/kun-lofoten-kan-br-bli-verdensarv/s/1-71-2469866>
- Johansen, M. (2007, September 3). Oljeutfordringer for verdensarv [Oil challenge for World Heritage]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/oljeutfordring-for-verdensarv/s/1-71-2968360>
- Johansen, M. (2008, July 16). Vil ha debatt om verdensarv [Want a debate on World Heritage]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/vil-ha-debatt-om-verdensarv/s/1-71-3669978>
- Johansen, M. (2013a, October 6). Olje ut, verdensarv inn? [Oil out, World Heritage in?]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/olje-ut-verdensarv-inn/s/1-71-6902106>
- Johansen, M. (2013b, October 12). Frykter Lofoten vil bli «fjernstyrt» av verdensarvstatus [Worry that Lofoten will be controlled by World Heritage Status]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/frykter-lofoten-vil-bli-fjernstyrt-av-verdensarvstatus/s/1-71-6912498>
- Johansen, M. (2013c, October 28). Heller verdensarv enn nasjonalpark [Rather World Heritage than National park]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/heller-verdensarv-enn-nasjonalpark/s/1-71-6945867>
- Johansen, M. (2014a, June 19). - Verdensarv er vern. Det vil hemme næringsutvikling. Dere fryser ut Lofoten fra industriutvikling [World Heritage is safeguarding. It will constrain local development. You are freezing the area out of industrial development]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/verdensarv-er-vern-det-vil-hemme-naringsutvikling-dere-fryser-ut-lofoten-fra-industriutvikling/s/1-71-7427973>
- Johansen, M. (2014b, May 3). - Lofoten bør ha kontroll over egen fremtid og muligheter [Lofoten should have control over own future and opportunities]. *Lofotposten*.

- Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/lofoten-bor-ha-kontroll-med-egen-framtid-og-muligheter/s/1-71-7331000>
- Johansen, M. (2014c, July 7). Vil redusere verdensarven [ Want to reduce the World Heritage]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/vil-reducere-verdensarven/s/1-71-7462745>
- Johansen, M. (2017, July 19). Frykter at bildet av Lofoten som oversfylt av turister og skitt og søppel skal feste seg [Worry that the picture of Lofoten as flooded with tourists, dirt and garbage will stick]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/moskenes/vagan/reiseliv/frykter-at-bildet-av-lofoten-som-overfylt-av-turister-og-skitt-og-soppel-skal-feste-seg/s/5-29-301967>
- Krogtoft, H. and Andersen, B. (2010, June 2). Ordfører: Lofoten må velge [Mayor: Lofoten has to choose]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: [https://www.nrk.no/nordland/ordforer\\_-lofoten-ma-velge-1.7150733](https://www.nrk.no/nordland/ordforer_-lofoten-ma-velge-1.7150733)
- Lorentsen, H. M. and Sørgård, K. O. (2013, October 17). Professor ser mørkt på Lofoten og verdensarv [Lofoten as World Heritage looks dark says professor]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/verdensarv-mulig-tapt-sak-1.11303653>
- Lysvold, S. (2009, August 24). Utsetter Lofoten-fredning [Postpones protection of Lofoten]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/utsetter-lofoten-fredning-1.6743633>
- Lysvold, S. (2014, June 10). Arrangerer folkemøte for verdensarv i Lofoten [Arranges public meeting for World Heritage in Lofoten]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/folkemote-for-verdensarv-i-lofoten-1.11769071>
- Lysvold, S. (2017, March 22). - Må ta penger fra skole og eldre for å bygge toaletter til turistene [Has to take money from schools and elderly to built tourist toilets]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: [https://www.nrk.no/nordland/\\_-ma-ta-penger-fra-skole-og-eldre-for-a-bygge-toaletter-til-turistene-1.13439475](https://www.nrk.no/nordland/_-ma-ta-penger-fra-skole-og-eldre-for-a-bygge-toaletter-til-turistene-1.13439475)
- Mehren, N. and Haraldsen, O. R. (2007, September, 1). Vil åpne oljekranene [Want to open the oil faucet]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/vil-apne-oljekranene-1.3351335>
- Mere penger til verdensarv [More money for oil exploration]. (2003, May 15). *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/finnmark/mere-penger-til-oljeutredning-1.108409>

- Milne, R. (2016a, September 8). Norway halts controversial Arctic oil plans. *Financial Times*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ft.com/content/9212b7ba-75bd-11e6-bf48-b372cdb1043a> NB! Subscription or log on via eur.
- Milne, R. (2016b, May 5). Norway: Environmental hero or hypocrite?. *Financial Times*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ft.com/content/6c984298-12bc-11e6-bb40-c30e3bfcf63b> NB! Subscription or log on via eur.
- Milne, R. (2017, July 27). Oil and the battle for Norway's Soul. *Financial Times*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ft.com/content/c2dad93c-7192-11e7-aca6-c6bd07df1a3c> NB! Subscription or log on via eur.
- Milne, R. (2018, January 15). Norway coalition deal dashes oil exploration hopes. *Financial Times*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ft.com/content/027cb250-f9d2-11e7-9b32-d7d59aace167> NB! Subscription or log on via eur.
- Nikolaisen, K. (2007, February 28). Ja til verdensarv [Yes to World Heritage]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/ja-til-verdensarv/s/1-71-2614722>
- NTB. (2008, July 9). FN kan stoppe oljevirkosomhet [UN could stop oil business]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/fn-kan-stoppe-oljevirkosomhet-1.6131923>
- NTB. (2010, April 15). - Verdiene avgjør ikke boring i Nord [Profit does not decide drilling in the North]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/verdiene-avgjør-ikke-boring-i-nord/s/1-71-5071367>
- Olsen, K. E. (2010, September 12). Reiselivsbedrifter mot olje-og gass [Tourism businesses against oil- and gas]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/reiselivsbedrifter-mot-olje-og-gass-1.7289623>
- Oseid, K. A. and Solvang, F. (2014, December 21). Vil at Erna skal ta en Obama [Want Erna to do a Obama]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/norge/vil-at-erna-skal-ta-en-obama-1.12114424>
- Pedersen, G. M. (2006, August 20). Reiselivet snart viktigste næring [Tourism soon most important industry]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/aktuelt/reiselivet-snar-viktigste-naring/s/1-71-2247193>
- Rørstad, O. M. and Sørgård, K. O. (2014, May 2). Vil ikke ha verdensarvstatus: - Lofoten er attraktiv nok [Do not want World Heritage Status: - Lofoten is attractive enough].

- NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/vil-ikke-soke-om-verdensarvstatus-1.11695464>
- Røiseland, S. F. (2018, April 15). - Det er helt klart enklere å selge et produkt folk vet hvordan ser ut [It is easier to sell a product people know what looks like]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: [https://www.nrk.no/nordland/\\_-det-er-helt-klart-enklere-a-selge-et-produkt-folk-vet-hvordan-ser-ut-1.14005259](https://www.nrk.no/nordland/_-det-er-helt-klart-enklere-a-selge-et-produkt-folk-vet-hvordan-ser-ut-1.14005259)
- Skeptisk til oljeleting [Sceptical of oil search]. (2002, August 20). *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/skeptisk-til-oljeleting-1.88360>
- Steffensen, M. (2009, June 11). Olje vil gi vekst og arbeidsplasser [Oil will provide growth and work]. *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/olje-vil-gi-vekst-og-arbeidsplasser/s/1-71-4392754>
- Sørgård, K. O. (2013, October 13). Onsdag må de avgjøre Lofotens fremtid [Wednesday they have to decide the future of Lofoten]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/uenighet-om-lofoten-og-verdensarv-1.11294801>
- Thonhaugen, M. and Skeie, K. (2017, January 10 – updated 2017, April 3). - Skjer det et uhell her, vil utslippene drive rett inn i de mest problematiske områdene [If a accident happens here, the oil spills will drift right into the most problematic areas]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: [https://www.nrk.no/nordland/\\_-skjer-det-et-uhell-her\\_-vil-utslippene-drive-rett-inn-i-de-mest-problematiske-omradene-1.13314876](https://www.nrk.no/nordland/_-skjer-det-et-uhell-her_-vil-utslippene-drive-rett-inn-i-de-mest-problematiske-omradene-1.13314876)
- Urdahl, R. and Andersen, B. (2004, October 22). Vil ha oljeleting nå [Want oil search now]. *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/--vil-ha-oljeleting-na-1.95317>
- Verdensarv i Nordland [World Heritage in Nordland]. (2002, October 25 – updated 2002, October 28). *NRK*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/nordland/verdensarv-i-nordland-1.88976>
- Ønsker vi masseturisme i Lofoten [Do we want mass tourism in Lofoten?]. (2012, September 26). *Lofotposten*. Retrieved from: <https://www.lofotposten.no/lokale-nyheter/onsker-vi-masseturisme-i-lofoten/s/1-71-6256037>

### *Secondary sources*

- Adventure Travel Trade Association. (n/a). Overview. [Web page]. Retrieved from: <https://www.adventuretravel.biz/about/>

- Allington, D. (2015). On the use of Anecdotal Evidence in Reception Study and the History of Reading. In Gunzenhauser, B. (Eds.), *Reading in History: New methodologies from the Anglo-American Tradition* (pp. 11-28). London and New York: Routledge
- Bakos, F. (2009). *Oil Development in Lofoten: A Case Study of Tourism and the Possible Effects from an Oil/Gas Development in Lofoten* (Master Thesis, Nord University). Retrieved from: <https://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/handle/11250/140905>
- Bellona. (n/a). About Bellona. [Web page]. Retrieved from: <http://bellona.org/about-bellona>
- Benham, C. F. (2017). Understanding Local Community Attitudes Toward Industrial Development in the Great Barrier Reef Region World Heritage Area: Are Environmental Impacts Perceived to Overshadow Economic Benefits? *Natural Resources Forum*, 41, 42–54. DOI: 10.1111/1477-8947.12112
- Bertacchini, E., Liuzza, C., Meskell, L., and Saccone, D. (2016). The Politicization of UNESCO World Heritage Decision Making. *Public Choice*, 167(1-2), 95-129. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11127-016-0332-9>
- Blake, J. (2000). On Defining the Cultural Heritage. *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 49(1), 61-85. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/761578>
- Blanchard, A., Hague, K. H., Andersen, G., Fosså, J. H., Grøsvik, B. E., Handegard, N. O., ..., Vikebø, F. (2014). Harmful Routines? Uncertainty in Science and Conflicting Views on Routine Petroleum Operations in Norway. *Marine Policy*, 43, 313-320, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2013.07.001>
- Blomkamp, E. (2012). Discourses of Legitimation in New Zealand's Film Policy. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 15(6), 629-644. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367877912451687>
- Bouchnaki, M. (2003, October). The Interdependency of the Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage. In: 14th ICOMOS General Assembly and International Symposium: *Place, Memory, Meaning: Preserving Intangible Values in Monuments and Sites*. 27 – 31 October 2003, Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe. [Conference or Workshop Item]. Retrieved from: <http://openarchive.icomos.org/468/>
- Bowits, E. and Ibenholt, K. (2009). Economic Impacts of Cultural Heritage - Research and Perspectives. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 10(1), 1-8. doi:10.1016/j.culher.2008.09.002
- Brennen, B. (2013). *Qualitative Research Methods for Media Studies*. New York and London: Routledge.



- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods* (Fourth ed.). Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press
- Communication Department. (2017). A Gigantic Small Broadcaster. [Web page]. Retrieved from: <https://www.nrk.no/about/a-gigantic-small-broadcaster-1.3698462>
- Davis, D and Weiler, B. (1992) Case Study – Kakadu National Park: Conflicts in a World Heritage Area. *Tourism management*, 13(3), 313-320.
- De la Torre, M. and Mason, R. (2002). Introduction. In M. de la Torre. (Eds.), *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage. Research Report* (pp. 3-4). Los Angeles, CA: The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Direktoratet for Forvaltning og IKT. (2013). *Merverdi eller unødvendig omvei? Om direktoratenes rolle i gjennomføringen av nasjonal politikk* [Report 2013:11]. Retrieved from: [https://www.difi.no/sites/difino/files/merverdi\\_eller\\_unodig\\_omvei\\_1.pdf](https://www.difi.no/sites/difino/files/merverdi_eller_unodig_omvei_1.pdf)
- Direktoratet for Naturforvaltning. (2006). *Vurdering av Lofoten som fremtidig Verdenarvområde* [Evaluation document], Retrieved from: [ballstad.origo.no/-/document/show/139\\_sluttdokument-fase-1-verdensarv](http://ballstad.origo.no/-/document/show/139_sluttdokument-fase-1-verdensarv)
- Eagles, P. F. J. and McCool S. F. (2002). *Tourism and National Parks and Protected Areas: Planning and Management*. Wallingford: CAB International
- Equinor. (2018). Statoil skifter navn til Equinor. [Web site]. Retrieved from: <https://www.equinor.com/no/news/15mar2018-statoil.html>
- Faglig Forum for Norske Havområder. (2018). Forvaltning av Barentshavet og Lofoten [Web page]. Retrieved from: <http://www.miljostatus.no/tema/hav-og-kyst/barentshavet/forvaltning-av-barentshavet-og-lofoten/>
- Faktisk.no. (2017) Nei, det kommer ikke én million turister til Lofoten hvert år. [No, there are not one million tourist yearly in Lofoten]. [Fact-checking website]. Retrieved from: <https://www.faktisk.no/faktasjekker/eeP/en-million-turister-sliter-pa-lofoten>
- Financial Times. (2018). FT Editorial Code [Web page]. Retrieved from: <https://aboutus.ft.com/en-gb/ft-editorial-code/>
- Fiskeridirektoratet. (2018). Fiskere fra fiskermanntallet. Fiskere, antall på kommunenivå 1983-2017: Hovedyrke, antall, kommunenivå. [Data set]. Retrieved from: <https://www.fiskeridir.no/Yrkesfiske/Statistikk-yrkesfiske/Fiskere-fartoy-og-tillatelse/Fiskere-fra-fiskermanntallet>

- Folkeaksjonen Oljefritt Lofoten, Vesterålen og Senja. (2015). Om Folkeaksjonen. [Web page]. Retrieved from: <http://folkeaksjonen.no/content/om-folkeaksjonen>
- Fremtiden i våre hender. (n/a). Om oss. [Web page]. Retrieved from: <https://www.framtiden.no/om-oss.html>
- Frey, B. and Steiner, L. (2011) Word Heritage List: Does it Make Sense? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 17(5), 555-573.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2010.541906>
- Furuseth, I. and Everett, E. L. (2013). *Doing Your Master's Dissertation: From Start to Finish*. London: Sage Publications
- Fyall, A. and Rakic, T. (2006). The Future Market for World Heritage Sites. In A. Leask and A. Fyall (Eds.), *Managing World Heritage Sites* (pp. 159-177). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann. Retrieved from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/book/9780750665469>
- Gfeller, A. É., & Eisenberg, J. (2016). UNESCO and the Shaping of Global Heritage. In P. Duedahl (Eds.), *A History of UNESCO: Global Actions and Impacts* (pp. 279-293). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-58120-4>
- Graham, B., Ashworth, G. J., Tunbridge, J. E (2000). *A Geography of Heritage*. London: Arnold
- Greenpeace. (n/a). About us. [Web page]. Retrieved from: <https://www.greenpeace.org/international/about/>
- Grey, A. (2003). *Research Practice for Cultural Studies*. Retrieved from: <http://methods.sagepub.com.eur.idm.oclc.org/book/research-practice-for-cultural-studies/d12.xml>
- Habermas, J. (1964). The Public Sphere: An Encyclopaedia Article. *New German Critique*, 3, 49-55. DOI: 10.2307/487737
- Hall, S. (1973) The "Structured Communication" of Events. Paper for *Obstacles to Communication Symposium*. UNESCO: Division of Philosophy. Retrieved from: [http://epapers.bham.ac.uk/2960/1/Hall\\_SOP05\\_1973.pdf](http://epapers.bham.ac.uk/2960/1/Hall_SOP05_1973.pdf)
- Harrison, D. (2005). Introduction: Contested Narratives in the Domain of World Heritage. In D. Harrison & M. Hitchcock (Eds.), *The Politics of World Heritage: Negotiation Tourism and Conservation* (pp. 1-10). Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Channel View Publications.
- Harrison, R. (2012). *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. New York and London: Routledge

- Harvey, D. (2001). Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents: Temporality, Meaning and the Scope of Heritage Studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 7(4), 319–338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13581650120105534>
- Hodder, I. (2010). Cultural Heritage Rights: From Ownership and Descent to Justice and Wellbeing. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 83(4), 861-882. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40890842>
- Innovasjon Norge. (2016). *Key Figures for Norwegian Travel and Tourism* [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from: <http://www.innovasjon norge.no/contentassets/0d32e3231c0a4367a96838ee3bb5b294/key-figrues-2016.pdf>
- Isdal, K. (2011). *Verdensarvutredning i Lofoten*. [Presentation]. Retrieved from: <http://www.icomos.no/cms/icontent/filer/Lofoten%20tentativ%20liste%20030311%20Kjersti%20Isdahl.pdf>
- Johannessen, A., Tufte, P. A. and Kristoffersen, L. (2009). *Introduksjon til Samfunnsvitenskapelig Metode*. Oslo: Abstrakt Forlag.
- Klamer, A. (2016). *Doing the Right Thing*. <https://doi.org/10.5334/bbb>
- Klamer, A., Mignosa, A. and Petrova, L. (2013). Cultural Heritage policies: A Comparative Perspective. In I. Rizzo and A. Mignosa (Eds.), *Handbook on the Economics of Cultural Heritage* (pp. 37-53). Cheltenham: Edward Edgar Publishing Limited
- Klerk, D. (2017). *The meaning of Heritage*. (Master Thesis, Erasmus University Rotterdam). Retrieved from: <https://thesis.eur.nl/pub/39262>
- Klima- og Miljødepartementet. (2017, November 14). *Norge Nytt Medlem av UNESCO's Verdensarvkomité* [Press release]. Retrieved from: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/aktuelt/norge-nytt-medlem-av-unescos-verdensarvkomite/id2578891/>
- Labadi, S. (2013). UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value: Value-based Analysis of the World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage Conventions. Plymouth UK: Rowman & Littlefield
- Larson, S., Stoeckl, N., Farr, M. and Esparon, M. (2015). The Role the Great Barrier Reef Plays in Resident Wellbeing and Implications for its Management. *AMBIO* 44(3), 166-177. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-014-0554-3>
- Leask, A. (2006). World Heritage Site Designation. In A. Leask and A. Fyall (Eds.), *Managing World Heritage Sites* (pp. 5-19). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann

- Light, D. (2015). Heritage and Tourism. In E. Waterton and S. Watson (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research* (pp. 144-158). Houndmills, Basingstoke and Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan
- Logan, W. (2012). Cultural Diversity, Cultural Heritage and Human Rights: Towards Heritage Management as Human Rights-based Cultural Practice. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18(3), 231-244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2011.637573>
- LoVe Petro. (ca. 2009). Om oss 2. [Web page]. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.lovepetro.no/index.php/om-love-petro>
- Madsen, E. L., Vinogradov, E. and Velvin, J. (2015). *Gjesteundersøkelse i Lofoten*. [Survey]. Retrieved from: [http://www.nordlandsforskning.no/getfile.php/136972-1434636424/Dokumenter/Rapporter/2015/Med%20forside3\\_15.pdf](http://www.nordlandsforskning.no/getfile.php/136972-1434636424/Dokumenter/Rapporter/2015/Med%20forside3_15.pdf)
- Marmion, M., Calver, S. and Wilkes, K. (2010). Heritage? What do you mean by Heritage. In S. Lira and R. Amoêda (Eds.), *Constructing Intangible Heritage*. The Green Lines Institute for Sustainable Development, Barcelos, Portugal. Retrieved from:  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272474922\\_Heritage\\_What\\_do\\_you\\_mean\\_by\\_heritage](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272474922_Heritage_What_do_you_mean_by_heritage)
- Mason, R. (2002). Assessing Values in Conservation Planning: Methodological Issues and Choices. In M. de la Torre (Eds.), *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage. Research Report* (pp. 5–30). Los Angeles, CA: The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Matthews, B. and Ross, L. (2010). *Research Methods: A Practical Guide for the Social Sciences*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Meskeel, L. (2013). UNESCO's World Heritage Convention at 40: Challenges in the Economic and Political Order of International Heritage Convention. *Current Anthropology*, 54(4), 483-494. <https://doi.org/10.1086/671136>
- Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse* (Second ed.). London: Routledge
- The Ministry of Petroleum and Energy (2013). Norsk Oljehistorie på 5 minutter. [Web page]. <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/tema/energi/olje-og-gass/norsk-oljehistorie-pa-5-minutter/id440538/>
- The Ministry of Climate and Environment (2017) Norway – Candidate to The World Heritage Committee 2017.[Presentation]. Retrieved from:  
<https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/feec48a5ec5a43b591e44bb0b47fd008/t-1558e.pdf>

- The Ministry of Climate and Environment. (ca. 2018). Department of Cultural Heritage Management. [Web page]. Retrieved from:  
<https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/kld/organisation/departments/department-cultural-heritage-management/id1207/>
- Misund, O. A., and Olsen, E. (2013). Food for thought: Lofoten-Vesterålen: for cod and cod fisheries, but not for oil? *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 70(4), 722-725.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fst086>
- Moody, J. (2015). Heritage and History. In E. Waterton and S. Watson (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research* (pp. 113-129). Houndmills, Basingstoke and Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan
- Natur og Ungdom. (n/a). Nature and Youth – Young Friends of the Earth Norway. [Web page]. Retrieved from: <https://nu.no/english/>
- Naturvernforbundet. (n/a). About Norges Naturvernforbund. [Web page]. Retrieved from: [https://naturvernforbundet.no/?lang=en\\_GB](https://naturvernforbundet.no/?lang=en_GB)
- Nord Universitet. (ca. 2018). Dorthe Helen Næss Eide. [Web page]. Retrieved from: [https://www.nord.no/no/\\_layouts/15/uin.internet/userprofilepage.aspx?pid=nord%5C03200087#&acd=h-uprr&rrpi=1](https://www.nord.no/no/_layouts/15/uin.internet/userprofilepage.aspx?pid=nord%5C03200087#&acd=h-uprr&rrpi=1)
- Norges Fiskarlag. (2018). Welcome to Norges Fiskarlag [Web page]. Retrieved from: <https://www.fiskarlaget.no/index.php/english>
- Norges Kystfiskarlag. (n/a). Om Oss. [Web page]. Retrieved from: <http://www.norgeskystfiskarlag.no/index.php/om-oss>
- Norsk Olje og Gass. (n/a). About Us. [Web page]. Retrieved from: <https://www.norskoljeoggass.no/en/about-us/>
- Norsk Petroleum. (2017). Norway's Petroleum History. [Web page]. Retrieved from: <http://www.norskpetroleum.no/en/framework/norways-petroleum-history/>
- Norsk Petroleum. (2018). The Government Revenues. [Web page]. Retrieved from: <https://www.norskpetroleum.no/en/economy/governments-revenues/>
- The Norwegian Hospitality Association. (n/a). This is the Norwegian Hospitality Association. [Web page]. Retrieved from: <https://www.nhoreiseliv.no/om-oss/in-english/>
- Osti, M., Coad, L., Fisher, J. B., Bomhard, B. and Hutton, J. M. (2011). Oil and Gas Development in the World Heritage and Wider Protected Area Network in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 20, 1863–1877. DOI 10.1007/s10531-011-0056-6

- Petro Arctic. (n/a). Om Petro Arctic. [Web Page]. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.petroarctic.no/petro-arctic/om-petro-arctic/>
- Pocock, D. (1997). Reflections on World Heritage. *Area*, 29(3), 260-268. Retrieved from  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/20003806>
- Pressens Faglige Utvalg. (2015). Code of Ethics of the Norwegian Press. [Web page].  
 Retrieved from: <http://presse.no/pfu/etiske-regler/vaer-varsom-plakaten/vvpl-engelsk/>
- Riksantikvaren. (ca. 2017) Verdensarv. [Web page]. Retrieved from:  
<https://www.riksantikvaren.no/Tema/Verdensarv>
- Sande, A. (2011 December). World Heritage in The Lofoten Islands and The Barents Sea. Paper presented at *The Future of the World Heritage Convention in a Nordic Perspective. Vasa, Finland*. Retrieved from: <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A623256&dsid=-3579>
- Sande, A. (2015). Mixed World Heritage in Scandinavian Countries. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 21(8), 791-804. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2015.1023332>
- Silverman, H., and Ruggles, D. F. (2007). Cultural Heritage and Human Rights. In H. Silverman and D. F. Ruggles (Eds.), *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights* (pp. 3-22). New York: Springer-Verlag
- Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of Heritage*. New York and London: Routledge
- Snowball, J. D. (2011). Cultural value. In R. Towse (Eds.), *A Handbook of Cultural Economics* (pp. 172-175). Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar.
- SSB. (2018). *Utenrikshandel med Varer. Tabell 2: Import og Eksport av Varer, Etter Produktgruppe (CPA)* [Data set]. Retrieved from:  
<https://www.ssb.no/utenriksokonomi/statistikker/muh/aar>
- Statoil. (2018). About us [Web page]. Retrieved from: <https://www.statoil.com/en/about-us.html#get-to-know-us>
- Sørensen, M. L. S., & Carman, J. (2009). Heritage Studies: An Outline. In M. L. S. Sørensen & J. Carman (Eds.), *Heritage Studies: Methods and Approaches*. (pp. 11-29). London and New York: Routledge.
- Throsby, D. (2010). *The Economics of Cultural Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Turner, S. D. (2012). *World Heritage Sites and the Extractive Industries*. Independent study commissioned by IUCN in conjunction with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, ICMM and Shell. Retrieved from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/extractive-industries/>

- Tørrfisk fra Lofoten. (ca. 2018). Tørrfisk fra Lofoten. [Web page]. Retrieved from:  
<https://www.torrfiskfralofoten.no>
- UNESCO. (n/a). The Lofoten Islands. [Web page]. Retrieved from:  
<https://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/1751/>
- UNESCO. (2018a). The Criteria for Selection. [Web page]. Retrieved from:  
<https://whc.unesco.org/en/criteria/>
- UNESCO. (2018b). Advisory Bodies. [Web page]. Retrieved from:  
<https://whc.unesco.org/en/advisorybodies/>
- UNESCO. (2018c). Arabian Oryx Sanctuary. [Web page]. Retrieved from:  
<https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/654>
- Van der Aa, B. (2005). *Preserving the Heritage of Humanity? Obtaining World Heritage Status and the Impacts of Listing*. (Dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen)  
 Retrieved from: [https://www.waddenacademie.nl/fileadmin/inhoud/pdf/06-wadweten/Proefschriften/thesisBart\\_van\\_der\\_Aa\\_verkl.pdf](https://www.waddenacademie.nl/fileadmin/inhoud/pdf/06-wadweten/Proefschriften/thesisBart_van_der_Aa_verkl.pdf)
- Visit Norway. (n/a). Om visitnorway.no. [Web page]. Retrieved from:  
<https://www.visitnorway.no/info/om-visitnorway/>
- Visit Norway. (ca. 2018). Fishermen's cabins [Web page]. Retrieved from:  
<https://www.visitnorway.com/places-to-go/fjord-norway/northwest/accommodation/fishermens-cabins/?lang=uk>
- Waterton, E., and Watson, S. (2013). Framing Theory: Towards a Critical Imagination in Heritage Studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 19(6), 546-561.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2013.779295>
- Waterton, E. and Watson, S. (2015) Heritage as a Focus of Research: Past, Present and New Directions. In E. Waterton and S. Watson (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research* (pp. 1-17). Houndmills, Basingstoke and Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan
- Watson, S. and González-Rodríguez, M. R. (2015). Heritage Economies: The Past Meets the Future in the Mall. In E. Waterton and S. Watson (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research* (pp. 458-477). Houndmills, Basingstoke and Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan
- Wetherell, M. and Potter, J. (1988). Discourse Analysis and the Identification of Interpretative Repertoires. In C. Antaki (Eds.), *Analysing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods* (pp. 168-184). London, New Dehli, California: Sage Publications Ltd.

- Winter, T. (2013). Clarifying the Critical in Critical Heritage Studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 19(6), 532-545. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2012.720997>
- World Heritage Centre. (2017). *Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.
- World Heritage Committee. (2007) Decisions adopted by the Thirty-First Session of the World Heritage Committee, WHC-07/31.COM/24. Paris:United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Wu, Z. and Hou, S. (2015). Heritage and Discourse. In E. Waterton and S. Watson (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research* (pp. 37-51). Houndmills, Basingstoke and Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan
- WWF Verdens Naturfond. (n/a). Hvem er vi? [Web page]. Retrieved from:  
[https://www.wwf.no/om\\_wwf/hvem\\_er\\_vi/](https://www.wwf.no/om_wwf/hvem_er_vi/)
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case Study Research. Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

### *Opening quote*

- Dregni, E. (2011). *Vikings in the Attic: In Search of Nordic America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Store Norske Leksikon. (2013) Nordlands Trompet [Online dictionary]. Retrieved from:  
[https://snl.no/Nordlands\\_Trompet](https://snl.no/Nordlands_Trompet)



## Appendices

### Appendix A – Division of main topics in different articles

| TOPIC                  | NUMBER OF ARTICLES IN SAMPLE |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>World heritage</b>  | 30                           |
| <b>Oil exploration</b> | 15                           |
| <b>Tourism</b>         | 8                            |
| <b>Other</b>           | 2                            |
| <b>TOTAL</b>           | <b>55</b>                    |

## Appendix B - Categorization of stakeholders

### ENVIRONMENTAL

- The category of environmental organisations includes the following:
  - Nature and Youth – Young Friends of the Earth Norway
  - Friends of the Earth Norway
  - The people’s force Oil-free Lofoten, Vesterålen and Senja<sup>53</sup>
  - Bellona
  - World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Norway
  - Future in our hands
  - Greenpeace
- The category of researchers within fields of climate, environment and marine life includes the following:
  - Ocean Research Institute (Separate report and Sundby as researcher for the institute)
  - Study from University College London
  - General reference to climate researchers. Only one mentioned by name.
  - Salt (“a Lofoten-based consultancy specialising in coastal matters” Milne, 2017: para. 40)

### INDUSTRIES

- The category of the oil industry includes the following:
  - General reference to oil companies
  - Norwegian Petroleum Directorate
  - LoVe Petro
  - Petro Arctic
  - The Norwegian Oil and Gas Association<sup>54</sup>
  - Statoil
- The category of the tourist industry includes the following:
  - Destination Lofoten
  - Lofoten Tourist Enterprises
  - Lofoten Tourist Centre
  - XXLofoten

---

<sup>53</sup> Original: Folkeaksjonen Oljefritt Lofoten, Vesterålen og Senja

<sup>54</sup> Original: Norsk Olje og Gass – tidligere oljeindustriens landsforening

- Reine Adventure
- Unstad Arctic Surf
- Local entrepreneur within the tourist industry (also referred to through Arctic Competence<sup>55</sup>)
- Owner of a local rorbu<sup>56</sup> (Skjeseth)
- Lofoten Recreation/Outdoor council<sup>57</sup>
- The Norwegian Hospitality Association
- Director of sustainable tourism in Innovation Norway<sup>58</sup>
- Professor of Tourism Studies at University College of Bodø (Eide)
- Adventure Travel Trade Association
- The category of the fishing industry includes the following:
  - Local fishermen
  - The Directorate for Fisheries
  - The Norwegian Fishermen's Association
  - Norwegian Association for Coastal Fisheries<sup>59</sup>
  - The Norwegian Fishing Vessel Owners Association

## **LOCAL INHABITANTS**

- The category of local inhabitants includes the following:
  - References to the local inhabitant's opinions made by the journalist or surveys
  - Interviews with local population

## **GOVERNMENTAL BODIES**

- The category of local and regional politicians includes the following:
  - Mayors of all the six municipalities in Lofoten
  - Municipality politicians
  - Municipality boards/councils
  - Local politicians connected to national parties (non-translatable)
  - Nordland County Council
  - County representatives of Nordland
  - The Lofoten Council<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Original: Arktisk Kompetanse

<sup>56</sup> A Rorbu is a fisherman's cabin which traditionally fishermen lived in, but are now often rented out to visitors or tourists (Visit Norway, ca. 2018)

<sup>57</sup> Original: Lofoten Friluftsråd

<sup>58</sup> Original: Direktør for bærekraftig reiseliv i Innovasjon Norge

<sup>59</sup> Original: Norges Kystfiskarlag

<sup>60</sup> Original: Lofotrådet

- The category of national governmental bodies includes the following:
  - The Norwegian government
  - Political parties
  - Parliament representatives
  - Party candidates for parliament seats
  - Ministry of Environment (later Ministry of Environment and Development, then Ministry of Climate and Environment) including its Ministers
  - Ministers of Petroleum and Energy
  - Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs
  - Ministries of Trade and Industry including its Minister
  - The Parliaments Committee for Energy and Environment<sup>61</sup>

## HERITAGE PROFESSIONALS

- The category of heritage sector (governmental) includes the following stakeholders:
  - Norwegian Environment Agency/Directorate for Management of Nature
  - Directorate of Cultural Heritage
  - Norwegian Cultural Heritage Fund<sup>62</sup>
- The category of heritage sector (non- governmental) includes:
  - UNESCO (incl. advisors and Norwegian members of the World Heritage Committee)
  - Lofoten Municipalities Project Coordinator in the application process
  - International experts on cultural and natural heritage protection
- The category of heritage researchers includes the following stakeholders:
  - Professor fishing history (Christensen)
  - Professor in social research (Sande)
  - Report written on value creation around cultural heritage written by Nordland Research Institute, Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research<sup>63</sup> and a professor at University of Tromsø (Bertelsen)

## OTHERS

- The category of others<sup>64</sup> includes the following stakeholders:

---

<sup>61</sup> Original: Stortingets Energi- og Miljøkomité

<sup>62</sup> Original: Norsk kulturminnefond

<sup>63</sup> Original: Norsk institutt for kulturminneforskning

<sup>64</sup> In the majority of cases, people are categorised as “others” when people or actions of people are used as a comparison in an article. Examples include former US president Obama safeguarding Bristol Bay in Alaska, mayors of Vega in Norway coming to Lofoten to tell about their experiences of being a UNESCO World Heritage Site and inhabitants of Førde interviewed in an article which included several resource recovery projects in Norway. Additionally, people and representatives from industries that did not reoccur in the debate such as a journalist, Vågan Chamber of Commerce (trans:

- Former US President Obama
- Local inhabitants in Førde
- Mayors of Vega
- Project Coordinator of unknown project
- Nordic Mining
- Swedish Industry Firm
- Oil Analyst at The Nordic Bank
- Norwegian Shipowners Association
- Vågan Chamber of Commerce<sup>65</sup>
- Journalist

---

Vågan Næringsforening), Norwegian Shipowners Association, an oil analyst for the Nordic Bank, Nordic Mining and a Swedish industrial company. One local was also filled in this category as he was referred to as a “project coordinator” but it was unclear whether he was a project coordinator for petroleum activity or the possible World Heritage application. A search through local papers and LinkedIn did not provide further clarification.

<sup>65</sup> Original: Vågan Næringsforening

## Appendix C – Codebook

| CATEGORY/DISCOURSE                              | REPERTOIRE/SUB-CATEGORY (IF APPLICABLE) | CODE(S)   |
|---|---|---|
| Context   | Progress of nomination                  | X   |
|   | State of tourism                        | Issues  |
|   |   | Measures for sustainable tourism                    |
|   |   | Positive impact                                     |
|   | State of Norwegian politics on climate  | Climate concern in government                       |
| Hierocracy                                      |   |   |
|   | State of national opinions              | Opinions  |
| Incompatibility                                 | X                                       | Either/or   |
|   |   | Delaying decision                                   |
|   |   | Existential dilemma                                 |
|   |   | Need for local consensus                            |
| Economic rationale of oil development           | Local economic activity                 | Jobs  |
|   |   | Population/depopulation                             |
|   |   | General ripple effects                              |
|   |   | Contrasting limitation in activities due to listing |
|   |   | Sovereignty   |
|   |   | Co-existing with other industries                   |
|   | National economy                        | Income  |
|   |   | Welfare   |
| Economic rationale of World Heritage nomination | Local development                       | Opportunity   |
|   |   | Tourism   |
|   |   | Jobs  |
|   |   | Diversification of economy/industry                 |
|   |   | Sustainability                                      |
|   | Policy change                           | Challenges  |
|   |   | Nomination as solution                              |
|   | Governmental support                    | X   |
| Economic rationale against oil development      | Favourable economic activities          | Natural resources for fisheries                     |
|   |   | Tourist branding                                    |
|   |   | Co-dependency (tourism/fisheries)                   |

|                                  |                                       |   |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
|                                  |                                       | Job creation                              |
| Anti-economic discourse of value | Environmental concerns/responsibility | Calling for adapting                      |
|                                  |                                       | Unique, vulnerable natural qualities      |
|                                  | Un-measurable values                  | Past and future generations               |
|                                  |                                       | Special                                   |
|                                  |                                       | Identity                                  |
|                                  |                                       | Emotional effect                          |
|                                  |                                       | Show appreciation                         |
|                                  | Responding to economic rationale      | Prioritization of jobs                    |
|                                  |                                       | Hindering business development and growth |

## Translated Statements/Quotes

---

- <sup>i</sup> Translation from Norwegian (herby referred to as TransN): “Verdensarv er vern. Det vil hemme næringsutvikling. Dere fryser ut Lofoten fra industriutvikling” (Johansen, 2014a: para 3)
- <sup>ii</sup> TransN: “Jeg ser fortsatt store muligheter for reiselivet og kystfisket med verdensarvstatus. Lofoten kan komme på eksklusiv liste sammen med pyramidene i Egypt, den kinesiske mur og andre berømte områder. Det kan vi utnytte positivt, blant annet i forhold til reiselivet og i markedsføringen av fisk” (Johansen, 2014b, para 10)
- <sup>iii</sup> TransN: “Debatten om verdensarvstatus er blitt en oljedebatt” (Ønsker vi masseturisme i Lofoten, 2012: para 6).
- <sup>iv</sup> TransN: “Internationale eksperter innen kultur- og naturminnevern” (Helland & Bulai, 2008: para. 2)
- <sup>v</sup> TransN: “De utøver myndighet, samtidig som de er rådgivende overfor departementet. Direktoratene er politisk styrt, men de er ikke politiske. De skal primært ivareta faglige hensyn i oppgaveutførelsen, men de må ha en politisk forståelse” (NOU, 2006 in Direktoratet for Forvaltning og IKT, 2013:15)
- <sup>vi</sup> TransN: “Internationale eksperter innen kultur- og naturminnevern” (Helland & Bulai, 2008: para. 2)
- <sup>vii</sup> TransN: “Vi mener at olje- og gassvirksomhet overhodet ikke er forenelig med verdensarvstatus” (Krogtoft & Andersen, 2010: para. 8)
- <sup>viii</sup> TransN: “Han mener oljevirkosomhet nær kysten i Lofoten vil bli umulig dersom området havner på verdensarvlisten.” (NTB, 2008: para. 4)
- <sup>ix</sup> TransN: “All erfaring tilsier at her er det uforenlige hensyn, sier Bjørnstad.” (Gerhardsen, 2004: para. 7)
- <sup>x</sup> TransN: “Oljeinstallasjoner i Lofoten vil være uforenelig med status som ‘verdensarvområde’” (Johansen, 2004a: para. 1)
- <sup>xi</sup> TransN: “Norges viktigste [industri] både når det gjelder inntekter til statskassen, investeringer og andel av total verdiskaping” (Ministry of Petroleum and Energy, 2013, brackets added).
- <sup>xii</sup> TransN: “Flere lokalsamfunn nyter godt av ringvirkningen fra olje industrien.” (Mehren & Haraldsen, 2007: para. 11)
- <sup>xiii</sup> TransN: “mulige begrensninger i næringsutvikling (...) regional utvikling og verdiskaping” (Johansen, 2013a: para 5)
- <sup>xiv</sup> TransN: “Nå krever ordførerne i Lofoten ei utredning for å finne ut av hva de får igjen for en verdensarvstatus” (Krogtoft & Andresen, 2010: para. 15)
- <sup>xv</sup> TransN: “Når vi snakker om så store verdier i olje og gass, snakker vi ikke bare om rene penger i pensjonsfondet eller i statsbudsjettet. Da snakker vi om lokal aktivitet, arbeidsplasser og ringvirkninger for lokal- og regionsamfunn som vil være av svært stor betydning” (NTB, 2010: para. 3)
- <sup>xvi</sup> TransN: “Adm. dir Ørjan Robertsen i LoVe Petro la stor vekt på fraflytningen, samt mulighetene for nye arbeidsplasser og vekst i sitt innledningsforedrag under dagens folkemøte om olje og gass i Lofoten og Vestrålen. (...) Vår største utfordring er at ungdommen flytter ut.



---

Dette er ikke bare en utforing, men vårt ansvar. Vi må tilby arbeidsplasser som er utfordrende og interessante for ungdommene etter endt utdanning, sa Robertsen” (Steffensen, 2009: para. 1-3)

<sup>xvii</sup> TransN: “Her er vi opptatt av å være herre i eget hus, og vi er redde for å miste råderetten over egen framtid. Bjørnstad tenker spesielt på verneperspektivet, og er redd det vil få for stor innflytelse i forhold til næringslivets aktiviteter. Ordføreren i Vågan nevner planene om olje- og gassvirksomhet utenfor Lofoten spesielt, men også fiskerirelatert virksomhet” (Gerhardsen, 2004: para 5-6).

<sup>xviii</sup> TransN: “umuliggjøre mange typer næringsvirksomhet” (ANB, 2009: para. 2)

<sup>xix</sup> TransN: “Konklusjonen vår er at et petroleumsfritt Lofoten og Vesterålen vil gi det beste grunnlaget for fortsatt vekst og bosetning i regionen, avsluttet Wahl.” (Steffensen, 2009: para. 15)

<sup>xx</sup> TransN: “Folk i Lofoten er fortsatt svært skeptiske til oljeleting i regionen - først og fremst av hensyn til fiskeriene og turistnæringa” (Skeptisk til oljeleting, 2002: para. 1)

<sup>xxi</sup> TransN: “Også her ligger det betydelige naturressurser, et av verdens mest unike naturområder, store fiske- og gyteplasser, et stort potensiale for fornybar verdiskapning og nye arbeidsplasser” (Oseid & Solvang, 2014: para. 5)

<sup>xxii</sup> TransN: “Undersøkelsen viser også at næringen ønsker verdensarv for Lofoten. De ønsker å vise frem regionen som ren og autentisk. I følge førsteamanuensis Dorthe Eide ved Handelshøgskolen i Bodø, er dette selve essensen i det turistene søker når de reiser til Lofoten. “ (Olsen, 2010: para. 3)

<sup>xxiii</sup> TransN: “Kjersti Isdal mener reiselivet og kystfisket får fordeler med en verdensarvstatus. Reiselivet fordi statusen kan trekke flere folk til Lofoten, og gi regionen et ekstra kvalitetsstempel.” (Johansen, 2008: para. 9)

<sup>xxiv</sup> TransN: “kvalitetsstempel” (Helland & Bulai, 2007: para. 3)

<sup>xxv</sup> TransN: “Dersom Lofoten får verdensarvstatus, vil Lofoten og Vesterålen få 250.000 flere turister i året, og skape 500 nye arbeidsplasser” (Johansen & Olsen, 2010: para. 2)

<sup>xxvi</sup> TransN: “velstående og miljøbevisste folk verden over, har som mål å besøke verdensarvsteder. Dette er folk som legger igjen mye penger” (Johansen, 2007: para 7)

<sup>xxvii</sup> TransN: “Verdensarv muliggjør en satsing på en mer miljøvennlig og grønnere utvikling i regionen. Det vil bidra til å vise fram Lofoten som et natur- og kulturrikt reisemål, og kan styrke næringer og bedrifter som bruker naturen på en bærekraftige og miljøvennlige måte, sier Austgulen.” (Lysvold, 2014: para. 5)

<sup>xxviii</sup> TransS: “statusen kan gi et løft for reiselivet i form av økt interesse for Lofoten” (Rørstad & Sørgård, 2014: para. 22)

<sup>xxix</sup> TransN: “kan gi regionen flere turister som vil oppholde seg her lenger, nettopp den typen turister vi er ute etter” (Johansen, 2014a: para. 5)

<sup>xxx</sup> TransN: “Verdensarv kan skape nye arbeidsplasser, og ikke gjøre oss avhengige av olje for å komme videre” (Johansen, 2006b: para. 4)

<sup>xxxi</sup> TransN: “(...) olje- og gassindustrien, utbygging av havvindmøller og også fiskeoppdrett (...)” (ANB-NTB, 2010b: para. 3)

<sup>xxxii</sup> TransN: “Det vil ta tiår før vi vet konsekvensene på lang sikt. Hva skal vi leve av dersom oljeutvinningen ødelegger for fisket? Da har vi ødelagt vår egen kultur” (Eriksen, 2008: para. 10)

---

<sup>xxxiii</sup> TransN: “Når vi nomineres på grunn av det unike kystfisket og tørrfiskproduksjonen, må det innebære forpliktelser for myndighetene til å ta vare på næringen.” (Ønsker vi massetursime i Loften, 2012: para. 9)

<sup>xxxiv</sup> TransN: “Det er allerede verdenskjent i forbindelse med tørrfiskhandel til sør-Europa. Mange italienere, portugisere og spanjoler kjenner jo allerede området og det vil bli enda mer attraktivt å besøke området når det er blitt verdensarv, sier førsteamanuensis Allan Sande ved Høgskolen i Bodø.” (Johansen & Olsen, 2010: para 6)

<sup>xxxv</sup> TransN: “Jeg ser fortsatt store muligheter for reiselivet og kystfisket med verdensarvstatus. Lofoten kan komme på eksklusiv liste sammen med pyramidene i Egypt, den kinesiske mur og andre berømte områder. Det kan vi utnytte positivt, blant annet i forhold til reiselivet og i markedsføringen av fisk” (Johansen, 2014b: para. 12)

<sup>xxxvi</sup> TransN: “Hvis dere får en Lofotodden nasjonalpark og verdensarv, vil det utløse ressurser og tilskudd til forvaltning – og flere turister. Hvis jeg var fra Lofoten ville jeg ha brukt store ressurser på å få verdensarv” (Fagerbakk, 2015: para. 5)

<sup>xxxvii</sup> TransN: “Både Vega og vestnorske fjorder får ekstra penger fra Riksantikvaren og Direktoratet for Naturforvaltning for å ta vare på kultur- og naturarv. De får også lettere adgang til SMIL-midler og penger fra Kulturminnefondet”. (Johansen, 2008: para. 14)

<sup>xxxviii</sup> TransN: “penger fra skole og eldreomsorg for å bygge turistdoer” (Lysvold, 2017: para 1).

<sup>xxxix</sup> TransN: “er et av verdens mest fruktbare og produktive havområder (...). Vi har verdens siste store torskebestand, som er skreien.” (Steffensen, 2009: para. 8-9)

<sup>xl</sup> TransN: “Kulturen og naturen i Lofoten er helt unik. Ved å få verdensarvstatus viser vi hvor mye vi setter pris på dette og ønsker å ta vare på det. Dette er områder som er viktige både for oss som bor her nå, men også for de kommende generasjoner over hele verden” (Lysvold, 2014: para. 3)

<sup>xli</sup> TransN: “Fiske og naturarven er områder som må fram. Kystkulturen i Lofoten er enestående” (Nikolaisen, 2007: para. 4)

<sup>xlii</sup> TransN: “Ved å søke om verdensarvstatus, velger man også å gå en vei som kan sikre økt fokus på miljøvennlig næring og bærekraftig utnytting av ressurser” (Lysvold, 2014: para. 10)

<sup>xliii</sup> TransN: “Dette kan bli en fantastisk mulighet” (Johansen, 2014a: para. 8)