

12 World heritage and cultural sustainability

The farmers and fishermen of Vega, northern Norway

Karoline Daugstad and Knut Fageraas

Introduction

There are a number of perspectives on how to conceptualise cultural sustainability within the theoretical framework of sustainable development, ranging from a general statement about the way it builds a bridge with other dimensions of sustainability – its social, economic and environmental aspects – to more specific definitions of cultural vitality and viability (see Birkeland, 2008; Soini and Birkeland, 2014). It is not about a fixed state of affairs, although it is said to imply some sort of authenticity, but a continuing process of change towards positive development (cf. Stefanovic, 2000). For this chapter, an understanding of John Hawkes' (2001) conception of cultural sustainability is applicable; in short, it is about a society's ability to cope with the challenges and possibilities in a way that reflects the values and aspirations of its citizens. Hence, in our usage it points towards desired changes that are not in conflict with the cultural values that people attach to a place, their sense of traditions and heritage. The concept of tradition we use more or less in the same way as people we have interviewed, referring to cultural habits with long continuity. Heritage, not so often used by the interviewees, is defined, as it will appear in the following, in line with leading theories in the field of cultural heritage studies.

Auclair and Fairclough (2015: p. 1) put cultural heritage at the core of the sustainability discourse and practices. They demonstrate that 'the cultural values that people attach to a place are enmeshed with issues of memory, identity and aspirations', which they see both as central for people's wellbeing and as important elements in enhancing sustainable development (ibid.). Heritage is defined by heritage theorists as acts of remembering that work to create ways to understand and engage with the present (e.g. Smith, 2006: p. 2). Laurajane Smith emphasises that heritage is ultimately a cultural practice, performed through and affecting social relations – with real consequences for people and surroundings (ibid.: pp. 3–15). In the framework of cultural sustainability, and in accordance with Auclair and Fairclough, we see heritage as a productive cultural practice in line with citizens' identity-based values, memories and aspirations.

Such aspirations can be manifold. People relate differently to a particular place or a local community and do not necessarily share the same values, views

and priorities regarding cultural heritage. Hence, people will impact on, contribute to and make use of the cultural heritage attached to a place in different ways. As Smith (2006: p. 13) outlines in her book *Uses of Heritage*, there are a great variety of uses of heritage, ranging from political usage to how it is understood and experienced in people's everyday life. In this study, based on the World Heritage site of The Vega Archipelago in northern Norway as a case study, uses of heritage are primarily analysed in the different ways representatives from the two main industrial sectors, farmers and fishermen, are getting involved with and engaged by World Heritage values. It includes ways of making economic profit, contribution to landscape management and voluntarily work organised by the special interest organisations for the preservation of the eiderdown tradition. Exploring how people working in the different sectors relate to cultural heritage is important in order to understand cultural sustainability at community level, and, on the more applied side, to generate useful knowledge for both policy-makers and those implementing public policies.

Vega was classified in the World Heritage List in 2004 as a 'cultural landscape' as it reflects the ways in which generations of fishermen/farmers over the past 1500 years have maintained a sustainable living in an inhospitable seascape near the Arctic Circle (UNESCO, 2004). The cultural practice of eiderdown production, crucial to people's subsistence in the past and still performed on a small-scale, was a key argument for Vega's World Heritage status. Eiderdown production was seen as representing a symbiotic relationship between culture and nature: people built small shelters for the eiders and protected the birds during breeding and in return they obtained, processed and sold the soft and highly cherished down.

In this chapter, our attention is directed towards how the recent United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) status and its promoted values are utilised, understood and appreciated locally by farmers and fishermen. Our approach was chosen on the basis of prior knowledge about the differences in social, economic and not least the environmental conditions for farming and fisheries at Vega and involves four research questions:

- How do the community's farmers and fishermen relate to Vega as a World Heritage site?
- Do they actively engage with the World Heritage, and if they do, in what ways?
- How can these relations or engagements be understood in the context of cultural sustainability?
- What role does the sector's different natural resource-basis and environmental conditions play?

In order to answer these research questions, we build on 18 semi-structured interviews recorded at Vega in spring and autumn 2009 as part of the research project 'Cultural Heritage as an asset for economic added value, selection

1 processes from a coast-inland perspective' (see Daugstad, 2012; Fageraas, 2013;
2 Flø, 2013; Krøgli *et al.*, 2013). The main aim of the project was to investigate
3 how heritage was seen or used as an asset for economic development, i.e. how it
4 was contributing to the 'heritagisation process' (cf. Harvey, 2001; Daugstad and
5 Kirchengast, 2013). People employed in a range of key professions in the com-
6 munity (farmers, fishermen, tourist operators, politicians, bureaucrats and man-
7 agers) were interviewed along with people who participated in legitimising,
8 mobilising and utilising heritage. Some of the interviewees, amongst them
9 farmers and fishermen, were employed in more than one of these professions
10 and were politically active as well as being members of the interest organisations
11 for preserving the World Heritage values. We draw on all of our interview
12 material in this chapter, although predominantly the interviews with farmers and
13 fishermen.
14

15 **Background**

16 Vega has a population of 1250 people inhabiting a few of the many islands in a
17 vast archipelago that reaches far off shore to the continental shelf in the North
18 Sea. Most of the archipelago was included in the World Heritage Area, except
19 the two main inhabited islands that were given status as a buffer zone. Eider-
20 down production is presently practised only on a few of the small outermost
21 islands, but was customary on most islands in the archipelago in the past as it
22 comprised a substantial part of people's income. 'Fisher-farmers' (smallholders
23 making a living from a combination of fishing, small-scale farming and subsidi-
24 ary economic activities) dominated the economic activity on Vega until the
25 1970s (Floa, 1999: p. 31). However, Vega transformed during the twentieth
26 century due to structural changes in the primary industries into a two-tier society
27 of full-time farmers and fishermen. The permanent settlements that existed on
28 the outer islands were abandoned as many residents moved to the main island or
29 to the mainland in search of better living and employment conditions. On the
30 main island of Vega, the settlement pattern consists of fishing villages in the
31 north and farming in the south. However, while the southern areas became
32 the social, economic and political stronghold of the community, the north, where
33 most of the former fisher-farmers from the outer islands settled, became socially,
34 politically and economically marginalised (Fageraas, 2013).
35

36 In general, the Vega community experienced negative developments in the
37 post-war era, caused by centralisation, population decline and environmental
38 degradation. Fish stocks collapsed due to over-fishing and over-grazing of the
39 kelp beds by sea urchins, while the eider population fell steadily to a tenth of its
40 previous size. Furthermore, overgrowth caused by less livestock grazing threat-
41 ened the open cultural landscape. Despite concerns that UNESCO status would
42 demand the development of conservation plans with restrictions on marine as
43 well as on-shore resource use, locals hoped that the UNESCO status would work
44 as a catalyst for economic development, counteract population decline and –
45 important to its local enthusiasts – help preserve the remains of the cultural

practice of eiderdown production. Some also expected the designation to contribute to the primary industries by enhancing the marketing status of conventional economic activity within both farming and fishing. The interviews suggest that the UNESCO-listing has indeed revitalised the local community and strengthened its viability. However, the effects on farming and the fisheries have been highly divergent.

During the process of evaluating Vega prior to its nomination for World Heritage status the advisory expert from UNESCO concluded that the scope of the site had to be narrowed. One of the conclusions was that the ‘fishing practices are largely historic and the traditions based on memories’ (Ogden, 2002: p. 13). The practice of producing eiderdown, in contrast, was seen as a unique and rare example of a sustainable relationship between people and wildlife (ibid.: p. 6). The priority given to this rare land-based practice at the expense of practices related to the marine sphere has, since the nomination in 2003 and the entry on the World Heritage List in 2004, been accentuated by heritage experts, local enthusiasts and tourism operators. In the heritage discourse the outer islands became invariably termed ‘down sites’, no matter how much the settlements previously relied on fishing. Nevertheless, the physical remnants of the fishing villages in the archipelago with quays, warehouses and navigation buildings were classified as World Heritage, and the site is presented by UNESCO as a seascape, emphasising people’s historic dependency on marine resources (UNESCO, 2014). However, not all land-based practices were given priority. World Heritage values do not include modern farming and consequently the productive agricultural areas of Vega were excluded from the World Heritage Area (Ogden, 2002: p. 12; Fageraas, 2013; Fageraas, 2016; pp. 94–95). Despite this, our results suggest that those related to this excluded form of economic activity may have benefited more from World Heritage status than most others – particularly fishermen.

Farming on Vega is almost exclusively based on grass-fed livestock production. Structural change and a shift from extensive to intensive practices during the last half of the twentieth century led to both an increase in productivity and landscape change (Floa, 1999). This is most evident in the southern areas of the main island where fields were merged into larger units and parts of previously outlying land (heaths and moors) brought into cultivation. In the northern areas where fisher-farmers survived the longest, there was little change in farmland structure and only a small increase in the extent of agricultural land (Krøgli *et al.*, 2013). Most of the outlying land/outfield areas on Vega are subject to overgrowth, due to less free-range livestock farming and a dramatic drop in fodder collection in the outfields (ibid.). However, the UNESCO-listing placed the development of a management plan for landscape maintenance and restoration of the World Heritage cultural landscape high on the agenda. The funding of the specific measures needed to implement the management plan came from state authorities via the local World Heritage Foundation and national agri-environmental schemes administered by the municipality. These provided farmers the opportunity to contribute to the upholding of World Heritage values

1 related to cultural landscapes through schemes supporting grazing, mowing,
2 restoration of fences and paths, etc. However, some of them also showed an
3 interest in preserving the built cultural heritage and old cultural practices as well
4 as in participating in the tourism business.
5

6 **A progressive agricultural sector**

7
8 The farming industry on Vega is widely perceived to be intensive, modern and
9 progressive – a perspective that was emphasised by politicians, representatives
10 from the fishing and farming sectors and others commenting on the conditions in
11 the primary industries. Statistics support this perception as they show that Vega
12 is one of the most prominent municipalities for pork and dairy farming (Vega
13 Municipality, 2014). There are also a number of co-operatives of two to four
14 farmers involved in joint investments in large, high-tech robotic cow systems.
15 Even if the structural changes have radically reduced the number of farmers,
16 agriculture is still the dominant employer, with 22 per cent of the population
17 involved in farming (ibid.). In addition to favourable conditions for farming
18 (productive farmland, agro-economic structure and technological developments)
19 the active social environment among the farmers seems to have contributed
20 significantly to creating a strong agricultural sector. The interviewees, local
21 historical accounts, newspaper articles and information about the organisational
22 life at Vega provide insight into the active social environment that farmers enjoy.
23 Moreover, a relatively large recruitment to local, regional and national politics
24 and management from the farming sector has probably contributed to its devel-
25 opment in a progressive way, and at the same time reflects the sector's domi-
26 nance in social, economic, environmental as well as cultural terms.

27 When asked what major changes the Vega community has experienced in the
28 last 50 years, all farmers emphasised landscape change. The open grazed land-
29 scape of Vega of the past was seen as aesthetically pleasing, while the more
30 closed landscape of today was referred to in negative terms. The spread of Sitka
31 spruce, an alien species introduced in the 1950s and 1960s, was mentioned as
32 particularly unwanted. The disappearance of plant and bird species due to the
33 replacement of traditional agrarian practices by modern intensive farming
34 methods was mentioned as having had a severe impact on the landscape. As a
35 counter-measure, agri-environmental schemes in the wake of the UNESCO
36 status, have been directed to the farmers involved in grazing the cultural land-
37 scape in the World Heritage Area. This was seen as an important means of
38 slowing down the overgrowth.

39 Not all of the farmers were involved in grazing the World Heritage cultural
40 landscape. One interviewee was concerned about creating an 'A' and 'B' team
41 in farming as a result of the agri-environmental payments. The A-team in this
42 context were farmers who were paid to let their animals graze in the World Heri-
43 tage Area while the B-team were those who were not and thus missed out on the
44 economic benefits as well as the positive status (for maintaining open landscape)
45 such measures implied. This division of A and B was arbitrary as eligibility for

participation in the World Heritage management was dependent on having some of the limited suitable grazing land, not on a desire to participate in agri-environmental provision.

Interviewed farmers mentioned the positive effects the UNESCO status had on Vega's reputation. A number of potential benefits were suggested, such as making Vega a more popular place to live, slowing down the population decline and increasing tourism potential. Prior to World Heritage status a few farmers were already renting out simple accommodation for visitors. Now, more farmers are engaged in such services, first and foremost by rebuilding their old sea-warehouses. After the award of the UNESCO status several other kinds of tourist ventures were started. One couple, from one of the larger farms on the northern part of the main island, bought a small island property in the World Heritage Area, and renovated and rebuilt the houses to reconstruct a former fisher-farmer holding (complete with grazing) as a tourist initiative. They saw their initiative as part of the World Heritage effect on the community and emphasised that they would not have started grazing in the World Heritage Area or established the tourist initiative without economic support. The couple are one of the clearest examples of how farmers have become engaged in the World Heritage and participation in landscape maintenance schemes.

A depressed fishing industry

Compared with the agricultural sector, the fishing industry at Vega is depressed and in decline. The number of fishermen is much lower than in the past and hardly any of them are fishing their traditional areas on the Helgeland coast. Local fishermen were given a lower priority by the government who favoured deep sea fishing vessels. 'We are a dying breed', one of the interviewed fishermen noted, adding: 'there is no recruitment to the fisheries'. According to him the quotas set for the Helgeland region fisheries are too small to be shared, so to have someone with you on the boat is not economically viable. He saw a one-man fishing operation as being lonely, and, with just one crew-member on board, rather unsafe. This worked against recruitment in the sector. In 2009, when our interviews were conducted, the last of the many fish landing sites at Vega was closed. It was, however, reopened later the same year through a joint effort by the municipal council and the local professional fishermen's union and business organisation (Vega Fiskarlag). Despite this, the fishing industry appeared incapable of making any noteworthy progress according to the interviewed fishermen.

The fishermen we spoke to saw their industry neither as modern or traditional. They had not invested in large fishing vessels and did not see themselves representing a fishing tradition. They could have been typical representatives of the coastal fisheries in Norway as it has been practised during the twentieth century, with their fleet of 'Sjarks' – the characteristic small one-man fishing boats. Fishermen also showed little interest in the sector's old practices and traditions mentioned in the UNESCO documents. One of the interviewees said:

1 'The fisheries have not been valued highly (...) the status of the profession has
2 been low' while another (a descendent of a fishing family but not a fisher)
3 expressed concern that the industry had already been lost and would soon dis-
4 appear. Many of the interviewees were critical of the way the down tradition had
5 been given higher status in the World Heritage site than fishing and the marine
6 sphere. They argued for greater emphasis on the fishing practices and traditions,
7 referring to the nomination text and UNESCO documents.

8 The active fishermen interviewed did not express any particular interest in the
9 UNESCO status. One fisherman, although appreciating the economic benefits,
10 claimed that it was just 'old rubbish' that was preserved in the name of World
11 Heritage, and that strict restrictions prevented people building what they really
12 needed. Neither did this interviewee feel included in the World Heritage values.
13 He emphasised it was the archipelago and the fisher-farmer that actually had
14 significance as World Heritage but associated the fisher-farmer mostly with
15 farming and the subsidiary activity of down production. Another fisherman, a
16 pensioner, also held rather negative views of UNESCO status because it placed
17 too many restrictions on private property. None of these fishermen were directly
18 involved in the work to support traditional activities or the securing of the cul-
19 tural landscape. However, one had later become a member of the special interest
20 organisation supporting the down producers. At the time of the interview this
21 interviewee was running a tourist enterprise, taking tourists in the archipelago to
22 visit the World Heritage Area by sea. Several other fishermen and boat-owners
23 were also involved in transporting tourists in the archipelago. Nonetheless, the
24 interviewed fishermen thought that despite the obvious economic benefits, Vega
25 would have been just as well off without UNESCO status. Even the fisherman
26 who ran the rather professional tourist enterprise was not at all positive about
27 World Heritage status and claimed that it had no direct effect on his business.

28 Discussion

29 The interviews revealed a significant difference between the farmers' and fisher-
30 men's views of the impacts of the World Heritage status, how they became
31 engaged in World Heritage and what potentially positive effects they saw for
32 themselves. While the fishermen perceived the status to be of little positive value
33 both to their sector and to the community, many farmers saw possibilities for
34 new income and also benefits for the whole community by slowing down popu-
35 lation decline, increasing the attractiveness of the place and offering new
36 employment opportunities. This complemented the farmers' aspirations to find
37 additional income opportunities as well as interesting recreational activities. The
38 fishermen's attitude towards the UNESCO status, on the other hand, mirrored
39 the negative development and challenging future for coastal fisheries, related to
40 disadvantageous policies, their social and cultural status, as well as the environ-
41 mental degradation of the marine ecosystem and over-exploitation of fish stocks.

42 There is a general perception, forwarded by national authorities as well as
43 UNESCO, that World Heritage is synonymous with economic added value
44
45

(e.g. Miljøverndepartementet, 2012: p. 38; UNESCO, 2015). According to UNESCO, World Heritage is of crucial importance to society through its great potential to achieve social, economic and environmental goals (UNESCO, 2015). The nomination text for the inscription of The Vega Archipelago on the World Heritage List from 2004 also raised these expectations (Miljøverndepartementet, 2003: p. 52). Recent research has, however, concluded that this is not necessarily the case. The cultural historian Herdis Hølleland, referring to several research projects and consultancy reports, explains that a narrative has developed of heritage's regenerative possibilities which can lead to a sense of disappointment when the expectations do not materialise (2013: p. 230). To benefit from such status relevant actors need to be motivated beforehand and an outline of development possibilities needs to be clearly drawn (*ibid.*: p. 231). This may partly explain why, compared with the fishermen, farmers were more actively engaged by the World Heritage cultural values and made use of the UNESCO status for economic gain. At the heart of such motivation is a progressive perspective on their own industry.

However, the farmers' positive attitude and their engagement with the World Heritage status was also due to the way they benefited from and actively partook in landscape maintenance. Cultivation of arable land and livestock grazing in outfield areas gave the farmers an opportunity that was not an option for the fishermen. The farmers could contribute to cultural landscape management by having their livestock brought to the outer islands, and quite a few farmers have done exactly that. At present 700 sheep and cows are grazing the World Heritage cultural landscape (Vega Municipality, 2016). Such measures for landscape management are not at all new to farmers as agricultural policy from the 1970s onwards has increasingly focused on the multifunctional role of farming and the agrarian cultural landscape as heritage, economically supported by national agri-environmental schemes (Jones and Daugstad, 1997; Rønningen, 1999; Daugstad *et al.*, 2006). The existing system of agri-environmental schemes in Vega have after the UNESCO status been targeted towards managing and restoring the cultural landscape of the island realm, and thus function as an incentive for farmers' engagement with the World Heritage.

One particularly interesting difference between the farmers and the fishermen is in the way they related to the World Heritage values. The archipelago in all stages of the site's preparation, nomination and designation as World Heritage was described as a seascape with a rich fishing history. Whereas the fishermen failed to identify with World Heritage many farmers did, despite the fact that the agricultural sector's intensive operations were said to be inconsistent with the UNESCO status. Paradoxically, the occupants of farming smallholds in this region were historically so dependent on fishing that the men in most households could be termed full-time fishermen (Slettedal, 2009: p. 28). This was acknowledged in the local heritage discourse to such a degree that the World Heritage Area prior to the UNESCO listing had largely been associated with the fishing industry. It was (and still is) a gendered landscape – a male domain. However, this was now changed. As men historically spent most of the year

1 fishing, land-based resource activities such as eiderdown production were left to
2 women (cf. Elstad, 2004). This women's domain became the core value of
3 Vega's World Heritage, celebrating as the UNESCO status was meant to do, the
4 cultural *landscape* of the island realm and of women's contribution to down pro-
5 duction (UNESCO, 2004). Hence, in the context of the World Heritage status,
6 the site was no longer the seascape that fishermen could identify with. Not sur-
7 prisingly, it is mostly women who are occupied in the heritage-based revival of
8 former down sites and tourist initiatives based on the World Heritage (Sundli,
9 2011; Fageraas, 2013).

10 The difference in attitudes to heritage between fishermen and farmers at Vega
11 must also be understood in a national context. Despite the omnipresent fishing
12 activity with its immense significance for all human settlements along the Nor-
13 wegian coast, and with great economic importance to state finances through cen-
14 turies, it has not been valued as national heritage in the way farming has (cf.
15 Daugstad, 2000; Jones, 2008: p. 283). Through the national Romantic period of
16 the nineteenth century, the Norwegian farmer and the cultural landscapes of the
17 inland valleys and mountain areas became iconic symbols of Norwegian iden-
18 tity. This seems to have impacted on conceptions of what constitutes valuable
19 cultural expressions and landscapes to date, although coastal culture and its dis-
20 tinctive landscapes have been increasingly recognised as important heritage in
21 recent decades. It is most likely that this bias has affected the conception of what
22 is valuable at Vega, and, subsequently, how farmers and fishermen view the
23 UNESCO status. The local historical accounts clearly show this bias towards
24 emphasising the history of farming at the expense of the fisheries (Fageraas and
25 Skar, 2013). Generally, heritagisation seems to be a positive process at Vega. It
26 becomes, however, a particularly productive force when merged with the already
27 progressive agricultural sector stimulated by a solid social, cultural, economic
28 and environmental basis.

29 Given the depressed situation in the fisheries sector it is somewhat surprising
30 that the fishermen did not seek to use the opportunities that World Heritage
31 status can provide. The fishermen could (and there are good examples of this),
32 participate in the tourism industry or establish their own tourism initiatives. Even
33 if the farmers, like many others, were sceptical early on about being part of a
34 World Heritage site, those we interviewed showed greater interest towards
35 engaging with the UNESCO status. This may be connected to the way that
36 World Heritage status corresponded with the farmer's values and identity, rooted
37 as it is on land-based resource-use and animal keeping. However, the positive
38 attitude towards World Heritage among the farmers was not confined to those in
39 the 'A-team' who had access to subsidies through the uptake of agri-
40 environmental schemes. Generally, the farmers seemed better prepared for parti-
41 cipation in the heritagisation process, the work on landscape maintenance as well
42 as participation in the tourism business. Without their progressive thinking and
43 appreciation of World Heritage it seems unlikely that the cultural landscape of
44 this vast island pastoral realm could be maintained.
45

Conclusions

Overall, the UNESCO status has been a positive development for Vega, bringing new possibilities to the local communities. To benefit from such status, however, it seems necessary that it is in line with peoples' cultural values and aspirations, i.e. it must be culturally sustainable. However, as evident in the case of Vega the cultural sustainability must not be seen in isolation to the social, economic and environmental basis of peoples' livelihoods. On Vega, it was the farmers who saw the potential of UNESCO status. The fishermen, in contrast, have experienced economic depression along with environmental problems, a resource crisis and social degradation resulting in a negative discourse in the sector about its conditions and future scenarios. Furthermore, the difference between the two sectors' appreciation of their heritage as well as the World Heritage status seems to have been influenced by a national heritage ideal. Heritage production in Norway has for nearly 200 years favoured heritage related to farming as representing the authentic national history and iconic landscape features. Vega's twofold character of farming in the southern areas and fishing villages in the northern parts is a microcosm of the conflict between land-based versus marine cultural values across the country. In addition, the farmers had the advantage of an agricultural policy that supported involvement in the maintenance of the cultural landscape through agri-environmental schemes. The fishermen's lack of engagement with the World Heritage reveals that UNESCO status does not always have positive effects for a local community and all its industries. The UNESCO-listing of Vega reinforced the existing division between the agricultural and fishing sectors in the community by strengthening the former, while the latter were still associated with social, economic and environmental decline.

There are two key findings from this analysis with implications for cultural sustainability. First: World Heritage status affected the farming and fishing industries differently as a result of differences in the two sectors' vitality and viability. Second: differences in the farmers' and fishermen's heritage engagement is connected to the prevailing policies in the sectors and their social, economic and environmental bases – which have had divergent impacts on the community's cultural sustainability. World Heritage as a land-based cultural practice celebrated for its sustainable interplay between nature and culture was something that farmers could identify with, but fishermen could not. The farmers had the advantage, through their conventional economic activity, of possessing a way to engage with nature that corresponded more with the World Heritage concept at Vega. Furthermore, through their engagement the farmers were able to optimise some of their aspirations towards new income possibilities and recreational activities. The World Heritage was also seen by farmers, like many others in the community, as a potential means of securing the viability of the local community as a whole, while the fishermen tended to see it as a threat.

The different outcomes for the fishing and farming sectors on Vega illustrate that the heritagisation processes do not necessarily have positive

1 effects on local industries and, therefore, on the cultural sustainability of a
 2 society. While the status generally enhanced the cultural status of the farming
 3 sector, in the fishing sector there were only a few enthusiasts in the local com-
 4 munity who worked to highlight the fishing practices and traditions so that
 5 they could be more appreciated as part of the site's World Heritage status.
 6 This could contribute to strengthening the cultural basis for the sector, which
 7 could have a significant impact on the social, economic, and eventually, the
 8 environmental basis of the industry. At present, there are positive tendencies
 9 in the fisheries sector related to the rebuilding of fish stocks and re-vegetation
 10 of the marine ecosystem of the archipelago. Moreover, there is an evolving
 11 public movement in the north of Norway in favour of the coastal fisheries
 12 and in support of the local fishing communities along the North Atlantic coast.
 13 This implies that government policies concerning logistics and quota
 14 systems have to be revised accordingly. If this leads to an improvement in
 15 the natural and economic basis of the sector, it would also strengthen its cul-
 16 tural and social sustainability, thus, potentially contributing to sustainable
 17 development.

Acknowledgements

21 This project was funded by the Norwegian Research Council's 'Environ-
 22 ment2015' programme.

References

- 24 Auclair, E. and Fairclough, G. (2015) *Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustain-*
 25 *ability: Between Past and Future*. Routledge, London.
- 26 Birkeland, I. (2008) Cultural sustainability: industrialism, placelessness and the re-
 27 animation of place. *Ethics, Place and Environment* 11(3):285–299.
- 28 Daugstad, K. (2000) Mellom romantikk og realisme: om seterlandskapet som ideal og
 29 realitet. Doctoral thesis. Department of Geography, Norwegian university of science
 30 and technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway.
- 31 Daugstad, K. (2012) Verdiskaping og kulturarv. *Kulturarven* June:44–47.
- 32 Daugstad, K. and Kirchengast, C. (2013) Authenticity and the pseudo-backstage of agri-
 33 tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 43:170–191.
- 34 Daugstad, K., Rønningen, K. and Skar, B. (2006) Agriculture as an upholder of cultural
 35 heritage? Conceptualizations and value judgements – a Norwegian perspective in inter-
 36 national context. *Journal of Rural Studies* 22:67–81.
- 37 Elstad, Å. (2004) *Kystkvinner i Norge*. Kom forlag, Kristiansund, Norway.
- 38 Fageraas, K. (2013) Verdensarvens forandringer på Vega: kulturell verdsetting langs nye
 39 og gamle skillelinjer. In: G. Swensen and T. S. Guttormsen (eds) *Å lage kulturminner –*
 40 *hvordan kulturarv forstås, formes og forvaltes*. Novus, Oslo: 287–335.
- 41 Fageraas, K. (2016) Housing Eiders – Making Heritage. The Changing Context of the
 42 Human-Eider Relationship in the Vega Archipelago, Norway. In: K. Bjørkdahl and T.
 43 Druglitrø (eds) *Animal Housing and Human-Animal Relations. Politics, Practices and*
 44 *Infrastructures*. Routledge, London and New York: 82–99.

- Fageraas, K. and Skar, B. (2013) Frambringelser av dun- og stølstradisjoner – Vega og Valdres i lokalhistorisk litteratur. in B. E. Flø (ed.) *Kulturarv og verdiskaping i eit kyst-innlandsperspektiv*. Norsk senter for bygdeforskning, Trondheim, Norway: 17–37. 1
- Floa, O. (1999) Vega – Landbruksøya. In: I. E. Næss (eds) *Vega gjennom 10 000 år*. Vega kommune, Vega, Norway: 27–32. 2
- Flø, B. E. (ed.) (2013) *Kulturarv og verdiskaping i eit kyst-innlandsperspektiv. Report 2/2013*. Norsk senter for bygdeforskning, Trondheim, Norway. 3
- Harvey, D. C. (2001) Heritage pasts and heritage presents: temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 7(4):319–338. 4
- Hawkes, J. (2001) *The Fourth Pillar of Sustainability: Culture's Essential Role in Public Planning*. Common Ground Publishing, Melbourne, Australia. 5
- Hølleland, H. (2013) *Practicing World Heritage: Approaching the Changing Faces of the World Heritage Convention*. PhD thesis. Institutt for kulturstudier og orientalske språk, University of Oslo, Oslo. 6
- Jones, M. (2008) The 'Two Landscapes' of the North Norway and the 'Cultural Landscape' of the South. In: M. Jones and K. F. Olwig (eds) *Nordic Landscapes, Region and Belonging on the Northern Edge of Europe*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, United States and London. 7
- Jones, M. and Daugstad, K. (1997) Usages of the 'cultural landscape' concept in Norwegian and Nordic landscape administration. *Landscape Research* 22(3): 267–281. 8
- Krogli, S. O., Dramstad, W. and Skar, B. (2013) World heritage and landscape change – heritage buildings and their changed visibility in the coastal landscape of Vega, Norway. *Norsk geografisk tidsskrift*, 69(3):121–134. 9
- Miljøverndepartementet. (2003) *Vegaøyane – The Vega Archipelago. Norwegian Nomination 2003 – UNESCO World Heritage List*. Norwegian Ministry of Environment, Oslo. 10
- Miljøverndepartementet. (2012) *Ny, helhetlig verdensarvpolitikk*. Norwegian Ministry of Environment, Oslo. 11
- Ogden, P. (2002) *World Heritage Site Nomination. The Vega Archipelago, Helgeland, Norway. Report of Advisory visit: Peter Ogden (IUCN)*. June 2002. Unpublished. 12
- Rønningen, K. (1999) Agricultural policies and countryside management. A comparative European study. Doctoral thesis. Department of Geography, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway. 13
- Slettedal, S. (2009) *Steinalderøya i endring: en historisk studie av Vegaøyenes utvikling etter 1950*. Master's thesis in history. Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway. 14
- Smith, L. (2006) *Uses of Heritage*. Routledge, London. 15
- Soini, K. and Birkeland, I. (2014) Exploring the scientific discourse on cultural sustainability. *Geoforum* 51:213–223. 16
- Stefanovic, I. L. (2000) *Safeguarding Our Common Future: Rethinking Sustainable Development*. New York State University of New York Press, New York. 17
- Sundli, K. (2011) *Omsorg eller kvinnoavasjon?: mulig sysselsetting for kvinner på Vega i dag*. Master's thesis. Institutt for sosiologi og samfunnsgeografi, Universitetet i Oslo, Oslo. www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/15401/Sundli.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y (Accessed 13 December 2017). 18
- UNESCO. (2004) *Decision adopted at the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee (Suzhou, 2004)*. World Heritage Centre, UNESCO, Paris. 19
- UNESCO. (2014) *Vegaøyane – The Vega Archipelago*. World Heritage Centre, UNESCO. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1143> (Accessed 4 November 2012). 20

- 1 UNESCO. (2015) *World Heritage and Sustainable Development, World Heritage*
2 *Centre, UNESCO*. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sustainabledevelopment/> (Accessed 19
3 November 2015).
4 Vega Municipality. (2014) *Jordbrukstjenesten*. www.vega.kommune.no/jordbruk (Accessed
5 7 January 2016).
6 Vega Municipality. (2016) *Skjøtsel i verdensarv*. www.vega.kommune.no/skoetsel (Accessed
7 23 August 2016).
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution

Proof

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

Proof