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This article approaches Indigenous concerns with World Heritage through the use of three Norwegian Sámi sites. The article argues the importance of approaching World Heritage as a process. A process, in this context, is a multi-sited, multi-dimensional coming into being. Exploring the ways in which World Heritage sites are brought into existence provides the opportunity for a closer view of exactly how Indigenous rights are relevant. The three Norwegian Sámi cases examined confirm the need to maintain two perspectives of the use of Indigenous rights. Firstly, Indigenous rights are useful as a post-colonial trope, making visible the cultural gaze of World Heritage institutions and processes. Secondly, heritage protection processes have a concrete impact upon the lives of a people. Significant themes in the course of such processes are opportunities of co-management; the continuation of cultural practices and opportunities for economic development. While Norway, internationally speaking, is recognised for its Indigenous rights initiatives, cases of heritage protection have indicated the existence of several severe blind spots in the Sámi rights implementation.
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Introduction
The UNESCO World Heritage List aspires to protect the world’s most outstanding monuments, natures and cultures for future generations of mankind. Since its establishment in 1977, the list has become enormously popular. Logan (2012) refers to it as the ‘magic list’, expressing the status and expectation of benefits that come with it. To have one’s culture acknowledged as outstanding is obviously prestigious. However, despite its enormous popularity, the List has had some negative impacts. In this article, I explore Norwegian-Sámi experiences with World Heritage through three examples: Tysfjord-Hellemo, Roros and the Circumference and Ceávcca-géadgi. Following these three examples, I ask: Can Indigenous or Sámi rights instruments benefit Norwegian Sámi groups in the course of heritage protection processes? A view of World Heritage inscription as a process is essential in order to grasp the complexities of this seemingly simple question. In the following pages, I will include details of how Norwegian Sámi sites are suggested, nominated and inscribed, as well as the consequences of these actions for the Sámi involved. Other
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Indigenous and minority experiences are included throughout, for comparative purposes.

Collecting for the future of humanity

As the authorised heritage discourse (Smith 2006), World Heritage is framed in a similar trope as a number of other UN global environmental discourses. From a panoptical view, one imagines that it is possible to salvage and register orders, and count every kind. Since 1972, a steady stream of new sites have been suggested, thoroughly evaluated, and a few have actually been approved. This process can be perceived as an ongoing mapping exercise. Each country that has signed the World Heritage Convention (1972) contributes to the ‘identification, nomination, protection, conservation, presentation, and transmission to future generations of sites found on their territory’ (Operational Guidelines point 15a). Sites are forwarded to the Commission as standardised documents, describing their ‘Outstanding Universal Value’ (OUV). OUVs are assembled in precise processes by state institutions, in accordance with existing bureaucratic and academic research practices.

Bringing a site into existence as a potential World Heritage item takes considerable time and involves hard work from a number of actors. At each session of the World Heritage Commission, all state parties may submit up to two complete nominations, provided that at least one of them is a natural property (Labadi 2005). Inscription on the List marks the end of a process that, in Norway, starts with initiatives from local stakeholders, municipal politicians and regional authorities being presented for assessment to the Directorate of Cultural Heritage. Should a site survive this evaluation process, it will be gradually transformed from a local to a national site, inscribed on the Norwegian tentative list.

Jokilehto (2011), who himself is a member of the World Heritage Committee, notes that in the beginning of the Committee’s existence, the outstanding value of a site was largely self-evident. For example, sites suggested included the Great Wall of China and the Galápagos Islands. Since then, the List has grown to host 911 sites (Logan 2012). With this dramatic expansion of the number of sites, the size of the nomination dossiers has grown accordingly. Jokilehto (2011) argues that, in recent times, it is the narrative and the site justification that determines its outstanding value, rather than the site itself. These narratives may change in the course of the site evaluation process. Jokilehto exemplifies using the city of Assisi, Italy. Assisi was first proposed for nomination simply as a medieval town. However, medieval towns are not outstanding. Eventually, after evaluations, negotiations and rewrites, Assisi was inscribed on the World Heritage List as ‘central to the birth and expansion of the Franciscan movement, as well as the philosophy of St. Francis and his relationship with nature’ (Jokilehto 2011, p. 68).

This example clearly speaks against the cartographic trope of the authorised World Heritage discourse. Sites are not out there, waiting to be discovered. The impression of an intrinsically objective OUV presented to the world at large is, as a number of academics have pointed out, obviously a matter of perspective (Østigård 2001, Smith 2006, Labadi 2007, Grahn 2011). The World Heritage Committee is also well aware of this. What is defined as outstanding is continuously debated. For example, following the August 2010 session, the Committee observed that there were 704 cultural, but only 180 natural and as little as 27 mixed sites on the List (Logan 2012a). On these grounds, the Committee decided to invite more applicants.
from cultural sites outside of Europe, more sites that exemplify recent history, and more natural or mixed sites (Labadi 2007).

**Indigenous rights issues in World Heritage processes**

In the context of World Heritage processes, Indigenous rights are relevant as an alternative trope (Hayden 2007) that raises awareness of other measures of outstandingness, but also as concrete legal objections to particular points in World Heritage processes. As a trope, Indigenous rights forwards new issues of representation. As with any other kind of United Nations-authored list, the World Heritage List is a status competition (Riles 2000). Having sites on the UNESCO lists testifies to a nation’s cultural or natural beauty (Connerton 1986, Logan 2012a). Sites also authorise particular narratives of the past, at the exclusion of other landscapes and time-places, and therefore embody a potential to shape the future (Ashworth and Larkham 1994, Tunbridge 1994, Labadi 2007).

However, the costs of becoming a World Heritage site involve more than a symbolic transference of ownership. According to the UNESCO Operational Guidelines that underlines the opportunities for sustainable use of sites, protection is a win-win situation. Site protection represents new employment opportunities, both in the course of restoration and as part of heritage tourism. On the downside, people themselves may become an attraction. Protection often involves surrendering control; loss of self-determination and restrictions on existing lifestyles. Indigenous experiences describe how local groups may become unwanted and how local uses may become redefined as illegitimate (Jacoby 2001, Nustad 2011). In such cases, the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, or the International Labour Organisation Convention (ILO) 169 Indigenous and Tribal Peoples’ Convention, may hypothetically offer protection. However, as the Norwegian processes will illuminate, it is not always clear and how Indigenous rights instruments are useful.

In the following section, I will illustrate why it is that Sámi or Indigenous rights protocols have not been terribly successful in aiding Sámi interests in Norwegian World Heritage cases. In these cases, Indigenous rights are relevant as a trope, and for expressing a need for post-colonial redefinitions of existing narratives and categories of aesthetics. At the same time, existing narratives of protection also have concrete consequences. These are exasperated by existing blind spots in the Norwegian implementation of existing Indigenous and Sámi rights obligations. Before I describe the Norwegian Sámi experiences of World Heritage, I must provide the reader with an understanding of the Norwegian Sámi rights situation.

**Norwegian Sámi and their rights**

The Sámi live in Norway, Sweden, Finland and Russia. Sámi subsistence practices include combinations of reindeer herding, farming, fishing, hunting and gathering (NOU 1984:4, Sillanpää 2002, Thuen 2002, Minde 2005, Ravna 2006, Ween 2010). There are more Sámi in Norway than in the other countries, and Sámi rights are also more developed within a Norwegian national state than in the other countries with a Sámi presence. For the purposes of this article, the first relevant inclusion of Sámi rights into Norwegian law in contemporary times came in 1978, when Sámi cultural heritage received particular mention in the Cultural Heritage
Act (Kulturminneloven). The new Cultural Heritage Act provided new recognition of the existence of a Sámi history. It also acknowledged the particular nature of Sámi cultural heritage: Made primarily from organic, perishable materials, Sámi cultural heritage deteriorated faster and had to be protected at an earlier point (Fjellheim 1999, Ween 2008) (see Figure 1).

At this point, Sámi politicians realised that in the absence of land rights, the Cultural Heritage Act could be used to protect Sámi areas from development. The Act could also be employed to establish new forms of Sámi self-determination as Sámi administration of heritage (Fjellheim 1999, Ween 2006). The Cultural Heritage Act was also introduced in the beginning of Sámi land rights history. In 1979, the State decided to build a hydro-electric power plant in Sámi core areas by damming the Alta-Kautokeino River. Sámi attempted to use the new Cultural Heritage Act to have the construction stopped (Paine 1982, Thuen 2002, Minde 2005). However in 1982, the Supreme Court decided in favour of the Government (Berg 2004). Between 1979 and 1982, there were also large-scale demonstrations at the construction site in Finnmark and hunger strikes outside the Norwegian parliament in Oslo, (Minde 2005). Although the Alta-Kautokeino River eventually was dammed, these events dramatically changed the view of non-Sámi Norwegian’s towards the Sámi within a national imagery. These events then led to the establishment of the Sámi Rights Commission (Minde 2005, Ween 2008). In time, its recommendations led to the amendments of the Norwegian Constitution to include the Section 110a, popularly called the Sámi Act (Sameloven) (1988). This Act states that it is ‘the responsibility of the State to enable the Sámi to preserve and develop their language, their

Figure 1. Map of Sápmi.
culture and their way of life’ (translated in Sillanpää 2002, Minde 2005). Land and resources was considered a prerequisite to the maintenance and continuation of culture (NOU 1984:18, Gintal 2010).

The Alta-Kautokeino conflict also empowered a Sámi civil society and contributed to identifying the Sámi as an Indigenous people. In 1990, Norway became the first nation to sign the ILO Convention No. 169, on the Rights of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples (Minde 2005). A few years after, in 1993, the Sámi Rights Commission published its propositions on the rights to land and resources in Finnmark (NOU 1993:34). In 2003, the Finnmark Act, in acknowledgement of the Norwegian state’s colonisation and unlawful acquisition of the county of Finnmark, returned the land to its original owners, the inhabitants of the county (NOU 1997:4, Ravna 2006).

Despite all that has been accomplished, there are still a number of issues that have not been dealt with. These are also highly relevant to World Heritage issues: The special mention of Sámi culture in the Cultural Heritage Act was not extended to the Sámi cultural landscape, or to what non-Sámi Norwegians perceive as nature, or even wilderness. There is Sámi reindeer herding in two-thirds of Norwegian national parks (Einarsbøl 2005). However, up until recently, environmental protection legislation did not accommodate the concerns of Sámi reindeer herders (Riseth 2007, Riseth and Holte 2008, Ween 2009). Nature protection was prioritised in front of the survival of the industry. Little was done to secure reindeer herders’ fair representation in local national park management structures. With this connection, the resource geographer Riseth has pointed to that this could be improved by including the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Protected Area Category VI ‘Protected Area with sustainable use of natural resources’ into Norwegian environmental protection. This category would serve to recognise not only the Sámi presence, but to acknowledge the sustainability of Sámi uses of the lands, allowing the co-presence of protection with ongoing sustainable use, as well as new institutionalisation of Sámi rights concerns within nature protection processes and co-management (Riseth 2009, IUCN Guidelines).

Sámi experiences of World Heritage

The three Norwegian heritage protection experiences involving the Sámi display some of the Indigenous dilemmas associated with World Heritage sites. In the first case, UNESCO and IUCN saw the Sámi cultural landscape as worthy of protection. However, as the mixed site category does not exist within Norwegian natural resource management, this had no consequence for the people involved. In the second case, it was another landscape that was considered worthy of protection, rather than the Sámi. The deletion of reindeer herding from the landscape narrative put local Sámi in an awkward negotiating position. In the final case, the value of protecting a Sámi landscape is pitched against other sites worthy of protection within a larger heritage economy. As significant for this case is an ongoing archaeological debate over what a Sámi landscape is. This debate has consequences for the representation of Sámi on the Norwegian Heritage List, effectively eradicating an official Sámi prehistory.

Tysfjord-Hellemo National Park – the Norwegian Laponia?

What was to become the Tysfjord-Hellemo National Park is situated in Nordland, surrounding the deep green waters of Tysfjord, above the Arctic Circle in the Lule
Sámi areas. Tysfjord is the Lule Sámi centre. Nielsen describes the area as being predominantly Sámi up until the sixteenth century (Nilsen 1990). Today, Tysfjord is still a vital Lule Sámi cultural area and the home of several prominent Sámi politicians and cultural actors (Myrvoll 2010). The Tysfjord-Hellemo National Park was first suggested in the New National Park Plan in 1992 (Ween 2009). At about the same time, on the other side of the Swedish-Norwegian border, the Laponia area was in the process of being inscribed on the World Heritage List. Eyeing the opportunity for a transnational Sámi site (a type of site the World Heritage Committee had expressed an interest in), Tysfjord-Hellemo was soon proposed as an extension. As was the case with Laponia, Tysfjord-Hellemo was suggested for the Norwegian tentative list as an UNESCO mixed site, acknowledging both its unique nature and Sámi culture, as human–nature interaction (see Figures 2 and 3).

The Tysfjord-Hellemo National Park first had to become a reality. From the start, local Lule Sámi leaders were remarkably efficient in resisting both the establishment of the national park and the World Heritage nomination. Protesting Lule Sámi leaders were aware of the growing troubles of Sámi reindeer owners in the Swedish Laponia. In Laponia, the two protection purposes (nature and culture) soon came into conflict. Swedish environmental authorities complained about the damage caused by motorised vehicles. Swedish Sámi reindeer herders protested that reindeer herding was forced into a position where they were present for tourism purposes, rather than as a contemporary, viable economic practice (Dahlström 2003, Green 2009). Information of these troubles reached the Sámi on the Norwegian side. In connection with the proposed Norwegian extension, a local Lule Sámi leader, Anders Urheim, commented: ‘The Government parties want us to represent ourselves as a museum people for the UN and a spectacle for the world of tourists. We are about to become protected to death’ (Sagat 2003).

Figure 2. Map of Swedish Laponia and closeness to Norwegian border.
The acknowledgement of Sámi presence implied in the inscription of Laponia as a mixed site was also not mirrored in the suggested park management structure. Only after years of negotiation, as late as 2010, did the Swedish Sámi secure a majority of representatives on the management committee (Green 2009). Similarly, in the case of Tysfjord-Hellemo, Norwegian Nature Protection did not offer special mention of Sámi rights. Lule Sámi leaders therefore made it clear that all national park establishments should be postponed until the Sámi Rights Commission had finished its inquiries into the rights in the areas south of Finnmark (NOU 2007:13).

Unparalleled in the Norwegian history of environmental protection, the Ministry of Environment agreed that the Tysfjord-Hellemo had a special position (Parliamentary prp. No. 33, (2001–2002)). Towards the end of 2011, Tysfjord-Hellemo, the last of the parks named in the New National Park Plan of 1992, has still not become reality. As local acceptance and participation is a prerogative for World Heritage establishment, the site in turn failed to qualify for further World Heritage development.

What happens to Sámi interest if the landscape deemed worthy of protection is not their landscape?

**Roros and the Circumference**

To non-Sámi Norwegians, Røros is a picturesque sixteenth-century mining town in the north of Østerdalen. However, Røros is also a central part of the southern Sámi area, an area with long-standing reindeer herding traditions. The Sámi population in Røros has inhabited the area since time immemorial (Fjellheim 1999, NOU 2007:13, Bergstøl 2008). Since the sixteenth century, conflicts with a growing non-Sámi population have been ever present (Fjellheim 1999, Ween 2006) (see Figure 4).

Røros was first admitted by World Heritage as an outstanding example of an early industrial mining site (Gjaestrum 1999). In 2009, the Directorate of Cultural
Heritage suggested an extension of the Røros site, called the ‘Circumference’. The Circumference was originally brought into being by the King Christian IV as a circle drawn around the Røros mining site when the copper mine was established. By drawing this circle, the King obligated the farming population inside to deliver wood to the mine. The site is considered an early industrial–rural cultural landscape by the Cultural Heritage Directorate. In the World Heritage dossier, there are descriptions of transport routes, the historical water supplies and the absence of trees. With the exception of some historical photos, the dossier does not mention that the area also is the winter grazing land for several Sámi reindeer herding groups (Riksantikvaren 2009).

For many local Sámi, the establishment of the Røros Circumference was unsettling. They argued that Røros was a reindeer herding area long before the copper mines were established. In their eyes, the mining in its time had served to banish the Sámi from what had been their areas. The historical revision involved in making the Circumference an exclusive mining landscape was also painful because the Sámi in this area already have suffered the loss of land in previous historical revisions (Fjellheim 1999, Ween 2006).

Such classifications are known to have practical consequences. The anthropologist Nustad describes how site classification also has practical consequences for the populations involved. When iSimangaliso Wetland Park became a natural site it, in his opinion, legitimised the deportation of local Indigenous people (Nustad 2011). The overall World Heritage, ambition of new economic activity also provides hindrances to ongoing subsistence activities (Jacoby 2001, Maikhuri et al. 2001, Palmer 2004). The reindeer owners in Røros feared that the reindeer would be disturbed by tourists and that the local Sámi would suffer loss of access to grazing.
land. The Sámi were worried that they would be included in the local management of the Circumference when they were not part of the rationale of the protection purpose. Many were also concerned that the Sámi cultural heritage sites within the Circumference would not be protected from the expected tourism developments. To protect their animals, the reindeer owners asked that new planning routines be developed, to aid the co-existence of reindeer and tourists. However, these negotiations are still not over.

Ceávcçageádge

Ceávcçageádge is the Sámi name of a spiritual landscape that from a distance appears as a mosaic of greens and grey stretching into the waters of Varangerfjord in Finnmark. Unjárga, (Nesseby) has always been considered a Sámi village, although the population today is more mixed. According to archaeologists, Ceávcçageádge has been a settlement for 10,000 years; there has been a continuous human presence from the Neolithic era onwards. At this site, there is evidence of hunting and fishing, as well as traces of religious activities. There are graves and sacrificial stones, as well as a labyrinth. The cultural heritage site is named after such a sacrificial stone, the Ceávcçageádge (or cod-liver stone). The Sámediggi (Sámi Parliament) has argued that Ceávcçageádge is unique, both in the density of existing cultural heritage in the area, the time perspective manifested at the site, as well as the multitude of different sites present. They also stress that Ceávcçageádge is a testament to living culture, as many Sámi still grow up with the same stories and practices embedded within this landscape (Sametinget 2008) (see Figure 5).

Ceávcçageádge was mentioned as a possible candidate to the Norwegian tentative list in 2006. In contrast to Tysfjord-Hellemo and Røros, Ceávcçageádge is a site that Sámi actively work towards having placed on the Norwegian tentative list. The Directorate of Cultural Heritage has not nominated the site, but keeps encour-

Figure 5. Ceávcçageádge, the Rock.
aging local stakeholders and Sámi institutions, explaining that the building of a dossier takes time.

With a nation state such as Norway, built upon the land of two peoples (the Sámi and the Norwegian), it was felt that it should have a Sámi site on the list of its World Heritage. To the Directorate of Cultural Heritage however, Sámi representativity is only one of many concerns to be juggled. Looking at the existing Norwegian List of inscribed properties, there is no doubt that the Directorate of Cultural Heritage has made sure to include a range of different kinds of significant points in Norwegian history, as well as a range of geographical sites presumed to represent the entire nation: Rock Art of Alta, Bryggen in Bergen, Norwegian Points on the Struve Geodetic Arch, Røros Mining Town, Urnes stave church, Vega Archipelago and West-Norwegian Fjords (Riksantikvaren 2007).

In line with the aforementioned World Heritage Commission’s expressed interest in nature sites, most sites on the Norwegian tentative list today are described as such; examples being Lofoten and the Spitsbergen archipelago. Also, in line with the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee, the Norwegian tentative list hosts examples of modern industrial sites, as with the towns of Rjukan and Odda. With similar recommendations in mind, the Directorate of Cultural Heritage has suggested that Ceávccegeádge would stand a better chance if it became a transnational site (as was the intention with Laponia). In its communication with the Ministry of Environment, the Directorate of Cultural Heritage questions whether, given the existence of Laponia, there is a need for more Sámi sites. The Directorate also expresses doubts about how Ceávccegeádge would compare to other possible sites within the larger transnational Sápmi (Riksantikvaren 2007).

However, from a Sámi perspective, one could argue that the nomination of Ceávccegeádge on the Norwegian tentative list would represent a national post-colonial embrace. The post-colonial in this context refers to the inscription of the Sámi in national histories, but also to making explicit the politics of academic site production. As mentioned above, the Alta rock carvings could have been described as Sámi heritage, but they are largely not. This is because Norwegian archaeologists argue that Sámi ethnicity only became a significant identity marker 2000 years ago. Although those who created the Alta rock carvings were the forefathers of the Sámi, it is argued that they did not at the time consider themselves as such (Olsen 1986, Hesjedal 2001, Grahn 2011). This archaeological position, however, serves to render a Sámi prehistory impossible (Hesjedal 2001). Ceávccegeádge then could become the first explicitly Sámi Norwegian World Heritage site. In insisting that Ceávccegeádge has been a Sámi site for 10,000 years, the Sámegi implicitly asks for a reevaluation of existing archaeological truths, with consequences for the inscription of the Sámi in official Norwegian history.

Conclusion: World Heritage and Indigenous issues.

How then, do these three cases contribute to a discussion of Indigenous rights issues in World Heritage protection processes?

I started this article by underlining the necessity of regarding World Heritage sites as a process, as co-produced by a number of contributing factors. As described, World Heritage management struggle with issues of balance and representativity at all levels. The World Heritage Committee is aware of this and has strategies in place to decolonise its gaze, inviting the nomination of natural
sites, industrial sites, transnational sites and cultural sites outside of Europe. Still, summing up the three Norwegian cases this article has provided, there is a visible lack of understanding of Sámi issues. I argue that the way this balance is tipping is not accidental. As Smith states, cultural heritage management cannot be figured apart from a nation’s ongoing negotiations over history and identity (Smith 1994). In the Norwegian Sámi cases, non-Sámi perceptions of landscape and history persist, to the detriment of Sámi interests.

With the World Heritage Committee’s efforts to include other sites, and as illustrated by the classification of Laponia as a mixed site, it is evident that Indigenous rights can contribute to making other kinds of outstandingness visible. However, the World Heritage Committee’s efforts to achieve this have little impact if new categories and amended guidelines are not also implemented in the protection work of individual nation states.

All three cases underline the significance of the classificatory aspects of site-making. In both Røros and the Circumference, the Sámi felt excluded and left out of the protection purpose. In Tysfjord-Hellemo, Sámi were suggested to be included in the World Heritage process, but similar recognition was not offered within Norwegian environmental management regimes. Ceávccageádge illustrated another classificatory difficulty, where the consequences of naming particular time-places extended into the past as well as into the future.

The three examples of Sámi heritage processes make it evident that the categories employed and the histories evoked in particular time-places have real-life, practical consequences for local Indigenous people. In this respect, World Heritage processes do invite concrete legal objections to particular issues. However, the question is, when, in the course of a World Heritage process concrete legal objections should be made. The cases discussed here, have raised a number of examples: in the case of Laponia and Røros, reindeer owners must share land with new nature tourist initiatives. The World Heritage establishment hence brings a significant loss of useable land, as well as restricted access to existing resources (Dahlström 2003, Ween 2009, Nustad 2011). World Heritage establishment also leads to increased development: areas must be made accessible; hence more roads. The buffer zone surrounding the actual protected site creates room for tourists; it is made with consideration for accommodation, food venues, souvenir shops, parking lots and recreational areas. As illustrated by Sámi demands in Røros and in Laponia, local Indigenous groups are rarely given control of what it is that should be developed (Jacoby 2001, Maikhuri et al. 2001). Norwegian Sámi experiences with nature protection and national park development are that interventions are difficult to negotiate because there is little long-term planning. Instead, interventions are piecemeal and involve different stakeholders. Under such circumstances, individual cases never really become significant enough to be argued as Indigenous rights cases (Ween 2009).

Sámi rights issues cannot, in other words, be solved piecemeal, as concrete ailments in the course of particular protection processes. Instead, Indigenous rights instruments must be employed with a view of protection processes as an entirety. Indigenous rights must be included from the start, in a way that reconstitutes the relations between the parties involved. This is illustrated by the opportunities emerging with the new Nature Diversity Act (2009), which explicitly calls for the inclusion of local knowledge and Sámi knowledge into nature protection processes. As this Act is currently interpreted by the Ministry of Environment and the Direc-
torate of Nature Management, it has brought moves to establish proper Sámi representation nature protection cases (Sametinget SAK 132/10). Although it is early days, the existing Ministry of Environment implementation of this Act signals awareness that Indigenous or Sámi rights cannot be added as an afterthought to an already established or concluded heritage process.
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Notes
3. According to galdu.org: 40,000 in Norway, 20,000 in Sweden, 7500 in Finland and 2000 in Russia.
4. As I will return to, this was changed with the introduction of the new Biodiversity Act in 2009, which states that although nature protection shall be science based, science must be complemented by local knowledge and particularly Sámi knowledge. This appears to have caused considerable changes in the Directorate of Nature Management approaches to local Sámi interests, however, the consequences of this law is just beginning to show.
5. The site was listed in 1996.
6. As expressed by Norwegian High Court Judge, Carsten Smith, the leader of several Sámi Rights Commission inquiries.
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