

Changing demographics and cultural heritage in Northern Europe: transforming narratives and identifying obstacles. A case study from Oslo, Norway

Christopher Prescott, Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History, University of Oslo

Archaeology and cultural heritage has had minor impact on immigrant communities in Norway. Immigrant communities have up to the present had minor impact on archaeology and heritage narratives. In practical terms, students and professionals are largely recruited among Northern Europeans. However, “immigrant communities” are not homogeneous, and practices and attitudes vary between the different communities, in part depending on where they originated. It is not readily clear why immigrants are not more strongly involved in archaeology and cultural heritage, but a historiographical survey of archaeology and some recent studies concerning attitudes to museums and educational choices in Oslo allow us to generate hypotheses. These revolve around the exploration of two assertions: Traditional national narratives are out of step with contemporary society, and there are socio-cultural institutions in important immigrant communities that discourage participation in the cultural heritage sector.

In November 2012 the Norwegian directorate for Cultural Heritage, *Riksantikvaren*, celebrated its 100 anniversary. I participated on a panel assigned with the task of sharing thoughts about the future. Sitting on a raised stage and looking out over the audience of several hundred people, it struck me that one would be hard put to find a more ethnically and socially homogeneous audience in contemporary Oslo. This observation fed into previous concerns (Prescott 2013a) that after 40 years of large-scale migration to Norway, recruitment to archaeology and the heritage sector - university programs and jobs – poorly reflects the country’s contemporary population. Recent surveys seem to suggest that important diaspora communities do not use and are not particularly interested in museums, Norwegian heritage or non-ethnic specific culture events.

Does this have something to do with the stories archaeology tells? Norwegian and Scandinavian archaeology was originally an integral part of the national projects. In modern and contemporary times overt nationalism has been critiqued, mainly within the disciplinary discourse. However, the national agenda has largely been replaced by an identity-paradigm based on perceptions of continuous links between ancient inhabitants and contemporary Scandinavian populations. The appeal to identity contains some of the same fundamental ideas that were inherent to other national projects. And indeed, the appeal to identity has been part of the reasons for archaeology’s and historical heritage’s success in securing recognition, legislation and funding.

However, global migration is conceivably undermining the feasibility of the traditional ethnic identity strategy. Alison Wylie (2003:16) contended that “*moral or ethical issues arise when taken-for-granted conventions of practice are disrupted, ... a rupture occurs, as sociologists sometimes describe it, that makes it impossible to go on as you’ve been*

used to doing, or when you confront a situation where it just is not clear what you should do". It is reasonable to ask whether globalization, and resulting global migration, has resulted in just this sort of "rupture". It seems politically, ethically and pragmatically untenable to ignore a substantial part of the population, and to maintain identity narratives that are not only inaccurate, but also a priori exclude a substantial part of the population. In line with Wylie's more general observation, it is not immediately clear what strategy should be pursued in the future. Although narratives and their underlying ideological premises need to be reformulated, drawing on previous experiences of incorporating marginalized groups might not offer an appropriate recipe.

However, narratives are probably only part of the problem. If the goal is to include and engage the whole population in heritage issues and archaeology, obstacles are probably not only located in the practices and discourses of cultural heritage institutions and archaeology. There are probably significant structures within various immigrant communities that generate variable practices rooted in socio-cultural structures. In other words, the observed patterns are also a result of structure and practice in the diaspora communities.

Using material from Norway, the present article first outlines a history of archaeological heritage discourse. The article then examines three studies of immigrant attitudes towards heritage, museums and education. Although not an exhaustive analysis, combining main stream society's narratives with studies of immigrant group's values and practices, theoretically recognizes that "[t]he constitution of agents and structures are not two independently given sets of phenomena, a dualism, but represent a duality." (Giddens 1984, 25). Though recognizing all parties as knowledgeable actors, with resources and power – a capability to reach outcomes - I hopefully avoid the "derogation of the lay actor" (Giddens 1982, 37f) – a fallacy that in my opinion is inherent to much argument concerning minorities' and institutions of main stream society.

Understanding the situation and defining policies are inhibited by limitations in the quality and validity of data concerning immigrant attitudes and practices to material heritage, as the studies below makes apparent. There are, as the reference to Wylie indicates, no clear cut routes of policy and action by which to proceed. Still, the article hopefully illuminates both the need for research and some initial steps be taken to understand and meet contemporary and future challenges.

Archaeology in the public domain: an ethnic discipline?

Popular perceptions of the value of material heritage and archaeology are largely related to the narratives attached to the material remains – not the material itself. Which

narratives that are found to be important by whom are contextually conditioned. For the researcher an obscure object can be immensely important for developing an interpretation. Selling archaeology and cultural heritage to the public or policymakers is often dependent on a readily grasped narrative declaiming relevance for contemporary society (like developing tourist attractions, educational facilities or creating socio-political cohesion) or sub-groups (e.g. identity claims). Archaeology in Scandinavia is a case in point.

Scandinavian archaeology is among the prominent international schools within archaeology (Trigger 1989, 73). Given the peripheral position and small size of the Nordic nations, it is rather surprising that they should assume such a prominent position in the history of archaeology. Part of this success can be attributed to generous financial support engendered by comprehensive heritage legislation and that archaeology has enjoyed a high level of prestige since the 1800's (Trigger 1989, 84f). Archaeology contributed to the consolidation of nation states, and these Nordic states' need to create national narratives both authentic and mythical (Baudou 2004:112ff, Klindt-Jensen 1975, Prescott 2013b, more generally Díaz-Andreu 2001). As these states lacked substantial written sources for heroic deep-history on which to base national narratives, they turned to archaeology and disciplines like comparative linguistics and ethnology. The national ideals were bound up to a conceptualization of the populations as homogeneous in terms of genesis, language, culture and ideology.

A decimated Norway entered into a union with Denmark in 1380, and sovereignty was transferred to Copenhagen in 1536. With Denmark's defeat in the Napoleonic wars in 1814, Norway was awarded Sweden. This latter union was dissolved in 1905. In the quest for building a national identity in support of Norwegian autonomy, the historical disciplines had their task cut out:

Historians everywhere seek to emphasize what can serve to glorify their own nation. For centuries the political situation in Norway has been cause, to a greater extent than for most nations, to see her nationality forgotten, and that the part of [Norway's] history that was part of world events was either ignored or portrayed in an inaccurate light." "...and the works witness my continuous toil, to the best of my capabilities, for the nation's honour and interests." (P.A. Munch 1852: v-xiii, transl. by author).

The tales of government and individuals were not central to this history, as P.A. Munch¹ made clear when he argued that history is about the core of the nation, i.e. the people. The people transcend episodes and ephemeral politics. To this end folklore and comparative linguistics (and much speculation) were prominent sources, but in time

¹ P.A.Munch (1810-1863) is probably the most prominent member of the generation that created a modern discipline of Norwegian history.

archaeology became important, rocketing into centre stage with the Viking Ship finds (1870's to 1903) and the growing appreciation of the Medieval stave churches. At the heart of the ensuing narratives is the idea that culture, people and the land uniquely co-evolved.

The relationship between building national identity, heritage preservation and archaeology has been profitable for all parties. Archaeology has enjoyed political patronage, public interest and an enviable, legislation-generated resource flow. Given the relative homogeneous nature of a country in a struggle to reconstitute its autonomy, the scientific transgressions were perhaps innocuous. Indigenous minorities like the Sami and Kven (peasants of Finnish descent) could have posed a challenge to the national identity narrative. However, these minority groups were initially ignored, assimilated or relegated to insignificance. Later, in the post-colonial atmosphere of the 1970's and on, the Saami struggle for recognition (stoked by the threat of hydro-electric developments) led to an explicit ethnically oriented Saami-archaeology. In many ways the indigenous minorities adopted the familiar strategy of generating ethnic identity narratives as part of a successful national campaign.

Thus, in addition to the goal of generating knowledge about the past, archaeology in Norway (like most countries) also has an ethnic origin. Archaeology resonates with broader political trends in that there are two competing national meta-narratives. First, Norway conceived as *part of Europe* (Shetelig 1925), often propagated by those who identified with the political establishment and cultural elite. In the second narrative Norway conceived as the *other* (conceptually in reference to Baumann 1991), an opposite to *normal* Europe in a dichotomous construction of the continent, Norway being formed by unique environmental and cultural conditions (Brøgger 1925). This latter view has echoed through modern and contemporary national rhetoric of the political right to the political left.

In processual and post-modern Norwegian archaeology, ethnicity and nationalism were criticised and ostensibly abandoned. Still, archaeology had and has a complicated relationship to nationalism. Norway has held two referendums (1972 and 1994) rejecting EU-membership (most intensely opposed by opposite ends of the political scale, the far right and the centre-left). The underlying arguments held a strongly national note. The concurrent political nationalism is found in archaeology's embrace of the cultural exceptionality paradigm, rejection of migration, emphasis on local development and an environmental approach emphasising the connection between natural conditions (perceived as exceptional), culture, society and economy. The ensuing histories are local or regional, avoiding large scale history, and resonating with Baumann's *other* and *norm* (i.e., Norwegian versus European) in the construction of identity.

In appealing to the public, identity narratives that claim a co-evolution of the landscape, the people inhabiting the landscape and the culture used to adapt to the landscape, have continued to be used. The ensuing histories are often small-scale, discussing regions or national environments (coast, inland valley and the semi-Arctic to Arctic). Archaeology has at times entered contemporary political discourse to prove historical continuity and provide symbols and analogies. Often appealing to the regional, national or ethnically specific, and framed as inclusive localism and environmentalism in opposition to alienating globalism and greed, such campaigns have employed a superficial appreciation of the symbols they lift from prehistory. A case in point is the 1994 campaigns in advance of the second EU-referendum. Opponents used a Bronze Age rock carving motive of a boat. Ironically, these renditions of boats are best perceived as a symbol of European interaction, networks and the power aspirations of the elites.

Identity as a justification for cultural heritage management also saturates the Norwegian 1970/2000 heritage legislation that is still in force:

§1 Cultural monuments and their environments... must be protected, both as part of our cultural heritage and identity....

It is a national responsibility to manage these resources ... as a source for contemporary and future generations' experience, self-understanding, well-being and activity. (in Holme 2005, 24, transl. by author)

The explication of the legislation not only emphasizes scientific material and sources of experience, but that heritage is a “source of values to generate identity and a sense of security”, that it is local and “Norway’s contribution to world heritage” (Holme 2005, 25-27).

Most archaeologists probably feel uneasy with the identity premise, but as the goals are perceived as benevolent, they have tended to look through their fingers with the scientific shortcomings – in ethical terms a consequentialist approach (Wylie 2003,7). However, identity and attendant concepts of the co-evolution of people, culture and country are also used for ends the archaeological community is less sympathetic to. In the court case against Anders Behring Breivik (the perpetrator of the July 22nd 2011 massacres) he and his supporters referred to Norwegians as an indigenous population that migrated into the country after deglaciation, maintaining that he was defending this indigenous population in the face of colonization. The historiographical basis for this assertion was laid with the national agenda of mid-1800’ history (that aimed to differentiate Norwegians from other Northern Germanic groups), as well as more recent popular rhetoric about the “first Norwegians”. A critique of Breivik’s assertion is based on the observation that in genetic terms the contemporary population is a result of continuous mobility and migration (though disputed in archaeology). In cultural terms today’s population is the outcome of

dynamic processes on scales that don't match national borders. In short, there are not strong connections between contemporary populations and the early post-glacial immigrants. Ironically, this critique is equally relevant to a number of more "progressive" uses of the identity paradigm.

When confronted with a need to incorporate new groups into narratives of archaeology, the traditional approach has not been to genuinely question the fundamental ethnic content of the narratives, but to add the identity narratives of new groups - Saami, women, children, elderly and, recently, immigrant groups - to the repertoire of histories, or integrate groups into existing narratives (Högberg 2013,155ff; 2015,50). But is generating new ethnos-narratives a credible or productive strategy today? Or, does globalizing compel us to construct narratives (probably scientifically more honest) that are experienced as relevant and challenging across ethnic lines (Holtorf 2009)?

Demography and agendas

The identity premises can be challenged on empirical and theoretical grounds, and they are ethically dubious. There are also weighty sociological arguments for retiring ethnic identity programmes in their modernist and post-modernist forms. In the course of the last two decades, the population of Norway can no longer be perceived as homogeneously comprised of two ethnic categories with deep histories in the region. According to *Statistics Norway*, in 2013 non-Norwegian immigration was down 14 % from the year before, but it was still nearly 67000 (i.e. equating the size of the Saami-population in Norway).

Oslo is one of the fastest growing cities in Europe, a growth fuelled by immigration. In 2014, according to Oslo City's statistics agency, 197612 of 640000 inhabitants had an immigrant background. This is nearly 31% and up from 22% in 2004. 41% of the immigrant population has an Asian origin, while 17% is of African descent, while Europeans constitute 37%. A quarter of those registered as immigrants are born in Norway to two immigrant parents, whilst the rest are immigrants themselves. Major source nations are Pakistan (22 585), Poland (14 765), Sweden (13 858) and Somalia (13 424), Eritrea, Turkey, The Philippines, Iraq and Vietnam. In 2015, though not processed statistically, Iraqis became a significant group of immigrants. *Statistics Norway*, usually conservative in its estimates, predicts that in 2040 24% of the country's and 40-56% of Oslo's population will be comprised of immigrants. According to an article from 2011 in the major newspaper *Aftenposten* (Slettholm 2011) the proportion of immigrant pupils in Oslo's schools has increased from 29% in 1999 to 40% in 2011. 58 of 139 primary schools had a majority of pupils registered as "non-Norwegian speakers" in 2011, 7% of the schools had more than 90% non-Norwegian speakers

Statistics of ethnic demography are notoriously difficult to generate, already categories and criteria are subject to heated debates. However, for all their flaws, the statistics demonstrate that the populations of Norway and Oslo are increasingly heterogeneous. Immigration and cultural tensions are contested subjects in Europe, Scandinavia and Norway, but no matter what position one holds on the politics of immigration, the make-up of the population is a fact. Furthermore, with an increase in immigrant pupils in the schools of one percentage point a year, the immigrant population is young and will increasingly contribute to the shaping of society in the future. Obviously, archaeology and the broader heritage sector have an obligation to strive to be relevant to and involve all major population groups. Such endeavours are also in the discipline's own interest

Cultural heritage and archaeology, ethnic professions?

The Norwegian Heritage Directorate's (*Riksantikvaren*) 100th anniversary that I mentioned initially, though extreme, is not completely without parallels. The university programs in archaeology (and the humanities in general) do not reflect the ethnic constitution of the population, nor does academic employment in the CRM- and heritage sector. The extreme skewing renders statistics superfluous.

There are ethical, pragmatic and political problems with this situation. The immigrant communities are a substantial part of the population, cultural heritage is also managed on behalf of these groups, and cultural heritage narratives should target these groups. It is therefore reasonable to expect a social constitution of the practitioners within archaeology that to some degree reflects the broader population. It is also in the pragmatic interest of archaeology and the heritage sector itself, as not drawing on the talent and labour from a substantial part of the population limits the intellectual and experiential pool in archaeology. As archaeology's success is historically linked to broad political and popular recognition, involving a growing minority to ensure robust legislation is certainly important. Not doing so could readily translate into a reduced resource flow to heritage management, research and training, i.e. jobs.

Though the importance of archaeology in contemporary society tends to be exaggerated by archaeologists, archaeological knowledge can be useful, and archaeology can also make a small contribution to contemporary society in dismantling ethnic barriers by providing long-term perspectives. Archaeology and other heritage disciplines have an obligation to participate in contemporary discourse with insights into the dynamics of migration, culture meetings, and transformations – even if it is naïve to expect these narratives not to contain elements of strife, uncertainty and loss, as well as growth, development and prosperity. The lessons from study of the past are not the cotton candy stories about how everyone got along before some arbitrarily chosen institution arose, but

they do not provide understanding concerning cultural, ethnic and social encounters and transformations.

From producer agendas to user perspectives – two recent museum studies

What should be done (or what is effective) to more strongly involve various immigrant groups in archaeology and the heritage sector is not immediately clear. A starting point is surveying the present situation and identifying analytic strategies. A traditional shortcoming is that approaches have been based on what the sector wants to convey, and its perception of accommodating “them”, i.e. immigrant groups (Gran and Vaagen 2010:7). Is it therefore relevant to initially investigate how archaeology and cultural heritage are experienced by immigrant groups? Methodologically, an ideal starting point would be a three-pronged data-set: quantitative data (e.g. concerning museum visits, impact factors, attitudes among non-users), qualitative data (interviews with various user groups, museum employees, educators, public that is not reached by dissemination etc.) and finally observational data of how people actually respond and act. These data don't exist. However, there are surveys concerning immigrants and museums in Oslo and there are studies of educational choices that open the field to initial scrutiny. These are the basis for the following discussion.

Initially, the museum surveys referred to below are used to explore public experiences and expectations. This is followed by a tentative discussion of institutions and structures in immigrant communities that condition actions and priorities. Traditionally there has been a one-way focus on power relations (oppressive majority structures versus minority actors) and categorical dualism where minority-majority populations are concerned. However, all actors draw on resources from institutions and structures that are constraining and enabling, all groups chose actions (though despite intentions, consequences are unpredictable), i.e. a “dialectic of control” (Giddens 1982, 36ff; 1984, 14ff). The practical implication of this sociological position is that it is not sufficient to analyse narratives, public policy or majority behaviour. To pose informed questions one must also draw on the choices generated by resources and constraints located in institutions and structures within immigrant societies. To further complicate things, immigrant societies do not represent a homogeneous entity – there are significant differences in the habitus of urbane Poles compared to people with a background in rural Punjab. The present discussion draws on a study of educational choices in West Asian caste groups. The aim is not to supply definitive answers, but create a platform to define relevant research questions and strategies, not the least in an attempt at replacing dichotomist “dualism” with a dialectic “duality” in the approach to action, structure and institution (Giddens 1982, 36ff).

Two surveys have been conducted in Oslo to explore practices and attitudes in “diverse” museum audiences, *Knowledge about – participation by – public outreach to diverse museumgoers* (Gran & Vaagen 2010) and *Immigrants’ use of museums - a survey*² (Norsk Folkemuseum/ Oslo Museum 2011). Both surveys have a quantitative section based on questionnaires and a qualitative section with interviews of individuals in focus groups. There are significant methodological problems in the data the studies present, and neither study has observational data. However, they are noteworthy for their emphasis on the “reception side”, and their attempts at breaking up the heterogeneous “immigrants” category. They tentatively signal a redirection of focus and understanding, as explicitly expressed in the 2010 survey:

Norwegian cultural policy up to the present has focused on the production side of things when it comes to diversity: it has been about programming (relevant content for “them”), recruiting from minorities (enhancing visibility of diversity) and establishing arenas of dialogue and cooperation with minorities. Politically this has been a question of representation and integration; minority artists and their aesthetics/culture must be represented in Norwegian cultural institutions. The reception side of things, the audience or culture consumer, has not been absent from the rhetoric of diversity, but in practice has been subordinate to the production side: If one programs relevantly for “them” and/or recruit “their own”, the minority audience will turn out. Our data does not support this assumption.” (Gran and Vaagen 2010,7, transl. by author).

Knowledge about – participation by – public outreach to diverse museumgoers was commissioned by the University of Oslo’s *Museum of Cultural History*. The study targeted immigrant minorities at three college institutions in Oslo. In a wider perspective this group is interesting for several reasons: students are a key target group for cultural institutions. Immigrant students are important as they are well-educated, have a high level of participation in contemporary society, are urbane and balance between modern Norway and their parent’s socio-cultural background.

Before shortly presenting and discussing the results, it should be pointed out that there are issues concerning how representative a face-value reading of the quantitative data is. In short, it conceivably generates a picture that is biased in favour of the museums. The initial survey questionnaires were distributed through 21 societies for minority students at the three colleges, representing 5,130 non-western students. With a response rate of 2.7% and heavily skewed towards a single student society, the results were deemed invalid. A second campaign used minority interviewers and incentives to attract responses. Out of 1001 students (15.8% of the non-western minorities), 32% responded after two reminders. Though response rates were low, and despite a number of skewing factors that

² *Kunnskap om – medvirkning av – formidling for mangfoldige museumsbrukere and Innvandreres bruk av museer – En undersøkelse.*

potentially inflate positive responses, the response rate was deemed adequate. The majority of the respondents were from Africa (23.3%) and Asia (65.9%). The quantitative survey was followed up by interviews of eight teachers (seven Norwegian and one Romanian, from elementary schools to university summer schools) and six students (from Morocco, Somalia, Pakistan, Vietnam and Iraq). The survey's quantitative data mainly demonstrates that interest in museums is very low. The interviews in the focus groups offer other insights, though representability is not assessable. The interviewed (European) teachers emphasized that exhibitions should reflect cultural heterogeneity, whilst the (African and Asian) students were more critical to an inclusion practice based on a mechanical extension of the range of ethnic narratives. The students did not call for productions of their "own" culture. Indeed, some respondents were concerned about political agendas at the heart of "ethnic" and "immigrant" productions, and questioned the accuracy of previous exhibitions. Expressing a position outside of the dichotomy "Norwegian – immigrant", they encouraged exhibition productions relevant to their experiences, contextualized as part of Norwegian history or in histories of hybridization. These responses perhaps reflect not so much ethnic or immigrant background, but the experiences of growing up in contemporary Oslo. One might ask if young ethnic Norwegians were part of the same survey, would they have responded along similar lines? In other words, instead of an essentialist ethnicity context, many young people in Oslo experience a dynamic and globalized society as their context and reference (no matter where their parents came from)– and explorations of this context's history and content might conceivably engender stronger involvement.

The other survey, *Immigrants' use of museums - a survey*, was commissioned by the *Norwegian Folk museum* and *Oslo Museum*. It was based on 411 respondents from four immigrant groups: Poles, Pakistanis, Vietnamese and Somalis. The respondent group encompassed broader age demographics than the University of Oslo's survey, but though it included age groups "31-45" and "older than 46", it was skewed towards the 15-30 year age group. There is also a skewing towards people with higher education. As the 15-30 age group has probably visited museums as part of mandatory school trips, and educated people are more inclined to be positive to museums and respond to a survey, the respondent group is conceivably skewed toward people with a positive attitude to museums compared to the immigrant population as a whole. The quantitative data are supplemented by nine interviews.

An interesting feature of this survey is that it encompasses a northern European group, immigrant Poles. Labour immigration from Poland is among the later waves into Norway, and the number of Polish children that have attended and completed school in Norway is probably low. Museum visits in this group are therefore not primarily the result of school excursions. It is noteworthy that nearly 70% had visited a museum/cultural event in the course of the last year. A majority of respondents (55-60%)

from the other groups, mostly with a multi-generational history in Norway, had *not* visited museums at all. As a large segment of the African and Asian population has attended schools in Norway (with the obligatory excursions to museums) this figure is equally remarkable.

The lack of interest in museums among non-European immigrant groups is corroborated by interviews in a focus group. These indicate that work, homework, Quran studies and relaxing with the family are priorities. Some respondents remark that as children they were not encouraged by their parents to visit museums or partake in cultural activities that were not related to their own ethnicity. Though several interviews indicate that the interviewed persons were primarily interested in their “own culture”, several younger respondents were concerned about the political agendas of exhibitions, frustrated with being pigeon-holed into socio-ethnic stereotypes and critical to their elders’ lack of involvement.

Again, the above surveys have limited quantitative representativeness and suffer methodological shortcomings, and it is difficult to draw detailed conclusions. There are, however, grounds to formulate hypotheses that could guide future research:

- Interest in the museums and cultural heritage is determined by region of origin, and there are substantial differences between immigrant groups. This mirrors patterns observed in educational choices, where variations between immigrant groups is greater than between minority and majority populations (Fekjær 2006, 86f).
- The relevance of the critique of the national and ethnic identity narratives in the first part of this article is supported by some of the observations. The ethnic perspective, whether traditional-national, indigenous or immigrant, is not an adequate base for generating broad interest or perceptions of relevance among youth growing up in Oslo (Prescott 2013a, see Holtorf 2009 for similar argument).
- Productions targeting the experience of globalized genesis in a local place might be experienced as relevant.

Understanding how various social and cultural groups perceive and respond to heritage productions, is not simply a question of supply, narrative and recruitment. The various immigrant communities make active choices based on their broader social context in Norwegian society, but also based on the socio-cultural values and priorities in diaspora communities and their networks that extend to the region of origin. By necessity this impacts success rates for inclusion strategies, and emphasizes the need for knowledge of the habitus-specific contexts of the various groups. This is tentatively explored below through a study of educational choices in immigrant societies with roots in caste societies originating in Punjab.

Caste and choice

The above observations suggest that national narratives are but part of the explanation for low immigrant minority involvement in museums and other heritage venues. Values and practices within immigrant communities structure use of museums. However, it would not be accurate to reduce choices in contemporary Norway to solely reflect ethno-cultural values. Choices result from social and economic goals pursued by actors in relation to structural parameters, whether “imported”, “indigenous” and or generated along the dynamic interface of the two. In-depth studies and qualified interpretative discussions of choices concerning heritage in diaspora communities are limited in Norway, and to my knowledge, otherwise in Scandinavia. However, there are studies of choices within education (e.g. Fekjær 2006, 2007; Moldenhawer 2005), and they can indirectly help understand choices and practices in relation to cultural heritage and archaeology. An underlying premise is that choices concerning cultural heritage are steered by some of the same structural and institutional mechanisms that affect education choices. To generate hypotheses here, I used a 2011 study by Mariann Leirvik entitled “*To Study Art History or Political Science is a luxury not everyone can afford*”. *Do different forms of capital in ethnic communities explain educational outcomes?*³ This study is based on in-depth interviews of informants from diaspora communities originating from caste societies in Pakistan and India: 23 interviews conducted 2006-07 of young women (11) and men (12) from 17 to 29 years of age. They’ve all grown up in Oslo, half are from India (eight Sikhs, three Hindus) and half are Pakistani (Muslim). The informants were asked about the families’ ethnic networks, principles of inequality and how these latter factors influenced their choices of education. In the analysis, Leirvik interprets this data set with reference to Bourdieu’s sociology: the forms of capital (Bourdieu 1986) that actors may draw on and the habitus within which they act (1990).

An important theoretical premise (from Bourdieu) is that society is a multidimensional hierarchy, and that various groups draw on variable forms of capital. Members of the ethnic networks studied in Norway share forms of practice, which can be termed sub-cultures. In Leirvik’s study, class is not as important as caste. Though younger cohorts, i.e. second and third generations, are “probably less pre-occupied with these codes [of cultural inequality], they must relate to them” (Leirvik 2012, 197) – and reproduce the sub-cultural habitus. The important reference for the minority networks is not majority society, but values and practices within the sub-cultural networks extending back to the region of origin. Old capital structures are reproduced from the caste-based source countries, but capital may also be converted into new standards of practice and value, especially when interpreted with what Bourdieu termed the “Don Quixote” effect: “*In conjunction with migration one readily experiences that “old” principles of domination lose their meanings when encountering new forms of hierarchization. ... though the old*

³ “Å ta kunsthistorie eller statsvitenskap er en luksus ikke alle kan unne seg.” *Kan utdanningsatferd forstås ut frå ulike kapitalformer i etniske nettverk?*

principles of dominance do not achieve recognition in the country of reception, they can continue to be of ... importance in the ethnic network. ... If the forms of capital in the country of reception ... gain importance in the family's ethnic network, it will be important to convert old forms of capital." (Leirvik 2011, 197, transl. by CP). Capital conversions are necessary and draw on resources found in Norway, but have values and goals in reference to the socio-ethnic subculture. As practices are internalized in the ethnic subculture through upbringing, they are reproduced.

Caste is thus "transported and transformed", and remains decisive in choices and strategies. According to Leirvik's argument, based on data from her informants, high castes seek to reproduce the hierarchical structures and practices from the caste society of origin. This affects gender practices, reproducing a patriarchal structure, where women are expected to behave and are treated in a traditional fashion, and men gain status through overt displays of power and wealth. From the majority society's perspective, this has a detrimental effect on academic choices – and allows us to generate grounded hypotheses about why certain immigrant groups do not pursue education, or why young men from certain groups are statistically unsuccessful in education (ref. Fekjær 2006) – or why some groups pursue education (and use museums?) more actively than members of the majority society.

Moving to a country with other dominant structural conditions allows new options of choice. Some parents recognize that a conversion of capital to the new context entails changed practices. Despite their high caste background, some parents for example encourage their daughters to pursue education, but primarily within fields that can compete for prestige in the ethnic networks. As society is multi-level, strategies also differ with families' position in the caste system. Lower castes experience problems and discrimination in Norway, but compared to the region of origin this is experienced as a mild problem. Instead, they view the resources, institutions and structures found in Norway as a vehicle for escaping the caste structures to improve their economic and social position. As opposed to trends in the higher castes, this group actively embraces education and a number of the values expounded in the Norwegian part of society⁴. One of Leirvik's high caste female informants ("Ambreen") formulates it like this: *"There are two kinds of Pakistani boys, those who... are often lower class, take advanced education and are well integrated in Norwegian society and are preoccupied with equal rights. And then you have the Gujar and Jat caste.... , I'd say the majority of those in the A- and B-gangs⁵ They're preoccupied withtraditional values, segregation of men and women like one finds in the countryside, that they want to show off as chiefs. ... They*

⁴ All education –from elementary school to PhD-level studies – is tuition-free in Norway. All students qualify for stipends and advantageous government loans to cover living expenses. Tuition for studies abroad is also sponsored by the government.

⁵ Criminal gangs in Oslo, predominantly Pakistani.

brag all the time in Oslo: “In Pakistan our house is so big, we own so much land, and my wife is going to stay home and make children”. There is a big difference between... [these categories of boys]” (Leirvik 2011, 203f, transl. by author).

It is also important that members of mainstream majority society do not have the competence to understand and identify differences in caste systems, treating everyone alike. The lack of relevant competence arguably creates an inefficient platform for policymaking and defining educational (or heritage) involvement strategies.

Good news or bad?

From the above we can surmise that parts of the upper castes that wish to convert out of the traditional capital of the caste system and lower caste groups pursue academic education. For upper caste groups this may represent an attempt to uphold traditional practices and strategies – maintain power and a prestigious position - through capital conversion. Lower castes see the structures of majority Norwegian society as a way of escaping constraints of caste institutions that originate in their home countries.

For those interested in involving immigrant minorities in cultural heritage this could be perceived as good news; at first glance there are substantial groups that could potentially study, work and engage in cultural heritage and archaeology as part of social strategies. However, this hasn't been the case, and again it is probably wise to also look for causes within the community originating from caste societies. The differences between Polish and Asian/African groups identified in the museum studies above, indicates as much.

First of all, there is the common immigrant goal that the next generation should have a better life than the preceding: *“Most of our parents ..., were insecure, they had no job, strictly speaking no future, and they didn't want that for their children ... its best to bet on professions that give both status and income, going about studying political science, history and art and stuff like that is a luxury that is not for everyone.”* (“Khalid” in Leirvik 2011, 207, transl. by author).

Moving beyond this virtually universal trait, educational choices are partially determined by the immigrant sub-cultures. Though some of the above groups pursue strategies – education – more in line with mainstream values in Norwegian society, this can be seen as a conversion from traditional caste society values and practices (e.g., overt displays of wealth and power) to more actively drawing on resources in the Norwegian context. However, strong competition in the ethnic sub-group, sending wealth back to the family in India/Pakistan and securing prestigious symbols of success are still active factors. The ethnic sub-culture conditions high academic achievers, but constricts choices to fields that are secure, provide prestige and generate high incomes. The result is what in Norway

is called the ALI⁶-syndrome: immigrants apply to studies that generate capital in the ethnic-networks and lead to well-paid and prestigious professions – i.e. not the humanities. So, based on Leirvik's studies in disciplines like archaeology and cultural heritage, and jobs within the humanities, museums and CRM are not within the culturally conditioned priorities of the Indian/Pakistani caste communities.

An ethical rupture; connecting the dots

As immigrant communities have grown and matured, they have gained economic and social clout. For example: Nearly 30% of the permanent seats on the Oslo City Council are held by people with a non-western background. If large sections of the population are indifferent to cultural heritage, or even regard it as a nuisance or waste, the sector risks increased political resistance, weak legislation and cuts in funding. Part of the issues dealt with in this article can be seen from a pragmatic vantage: what serves archaeology best in the competition for minds, recognition and resources?

However, most of the points dealt with have important ethical implications, as well. Ethics are arguments about what we should do. The ethical issues discussed in this article deal with or impact archaeological ontology (particularly Nordic archaeology's stance in relation to migration and concept of cultural evolution), the inaccurate identity narratives that have been reproduced in the public sphere, the obligation for all disciplines to attract the best minds and most diverse perspectives possible and a commitment all disciplines in the humanities should share not to serve narrow instrumentalist purposes, but to generate and disseminate knowledge. For archaeology knowledge is a primary end in itself, and we should further the production of that knowledge. However, there is a social obligation for publically financed disciplines to facilitate the experience of archaeology and cultural heritage for as diverse social groups as possible. A secondary aim, admittedly more based in political philosophy than empirical study, is that critical knowledge helps contemporary citizens better understand their society. From a socio-political angle we also have an obligation to free archaeology from the not completely undeserved perception of it as the luxury pastime of the western middle class.

Returning to Wylie's (2003, 6) claim that ethical issues arise when taken-for-granted conventions of practice are disrupted, it would seem that old practices are not adequate in a world characterized by global migration, and only time will tell where the rupture will lead us. Contemporary globalization with conflicts that impact the entire globe, instantaneous communication, global labour markets, global migration and the ensuing cultural and social tensions have ruptured the ethical complacency of post-war archaeology and heritage disciplines that evolved in the nation states of Northern Europe. I would contend that no other force will more strongly challenge established practices in

⁶ ALI, «advokat, lege, ingeniør» = «lawyer, doctor, engineer»

the heritage sector, archaeological ontology and heritage narratives than mass migration. In line with Wylie's argument, it seems that the globalized and dynamic constitution of citizenry in Norway and other nation states of Northern Europe generates the need for new interpretative approaches and narratives, and academic and heritage institutions are embedded in new practices – but just what these will be is not yet clear.

This article started by outlining the national and ethnic agendas that evolved and served archaeology, cultural heritage and society so well for 150 years, irrespective of their scientific accuracy. It then pointed out that the dominant narratives and practices are increasingly out of step with local societies increasingly impacted by globalizing forces, especially migration. The traditional strategies of incorporating new stakeholders into the heritage sector by generating new group-specific narratives has also been attempted in the case of immigrant groups, but with little success (Gran and Vaagen 2010,7).

The two museum surveys referred to in this article suffer from substantial methodological shortcomings in terms of respondent recruitment, respondent frequencies, quantitative significance and lack of observational data of actual behaviour. There is also a lack of repetitive studies that test the validity of the results. However, they suggest not only that the old national or ethnic identity narratives are experienced as irrelevant, but that pigeon-holing a new generation growing up in Norway into immigrant or ethnic stereotypes is unfortunate. Archaeology should be well equipped in the narrative department, because it has always worked with change, culture, innovation, adaptation, materiality and (despite theoretical and political restrictions in its ontology) immigration, information transfers and meetings. In a historical perspective, these narratives should strive not only to be more relevant in contemporary society, but to be more accurate than stories of arbitrary groups within state boundaries.

There have been attempts to critique the national and ethnic narratives, but these have mainly been from the producer side, often based on predicated on perspectives of minority exclusion and mainstream dominance. A tentative dialectic appreciation of the audience side of the equation is acutely necessary – as the museum surveys referred to in this article demonstrate. Theoretically this is in accordance with Giddens' "dialectic of power", i.e. not solely incorporating a concept of majority and structural dominance, but also informed choices made by actors leading to unintended consequences, into our analytical strategies.

The surveys and arguments presented in this article do not provide conclusive evidence, but help generate reasonable hypotheses concerning the basis for future strategies of expanding participation in archaeology and cultural heritage. These may be summed up in five points that build on each other. First, the traditional identity narratives are inaccurate and have become unproductive. Second, the dichotomies of "majority/Norwegian: minority/immigrant" are inaccurate. Third, it cannot be taken for

granted that all immigrant sub-cultures share the same goals and values. Fourth, the lack of involvement outside of traditional, ethnic-specific cultural arenas is a choice generated within the habitus of some diaspora communities and sub-cultures, and reflects priorities in these communities. Fifth, with immigration the habitus of ethnic Norwegians is also transforming. In an increasingly globalized and urban society, youth of Norwegian descent probably do not think in a dichotomy of Norwegian and immigrant. Just like some of the immigrant informants in the museum surveys referred to in this article, they should probably not be pigeonholed into a traditional stereotype.

Changing contemporary patterns is thus not solely a question of top-down politics of accommodation and accessibility. It is also the politics of choice in the diaspora communities themselves. This is probably far more difficult to impact than narratives and politics of access. The tentative observations and arguments in this article primarily serve to generate hypotheses, and are certainly inaccurate in terms of groups and individuals. To better understand what is happening, and to define strategies to expand the demography of future stakeholders in cultural heritage, a body of robust quantitative and qualitative studies is necessary that can throw light on the choices actors are making that impact attitudes to cultural heritage - the constraints and resources they respond to in various subcultures in contemporary society.

References

- Baumann, Z. 1991. *Modernity and Ambivalence*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
- Bourdieu, P. 1986. The forms of capital. In Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, 241-58. Greenwood, New York.
- Bourdieu, P. 1990. *The logic of practice*. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Brøgger, A. W. 1925: *Det norske folk i oldtiden*. Aschehoug, Oslo.
- Giddens, A. 1982. *Profiles and critiques in social theory*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Giddens, A. 1984. *The Constitution of society. Outline of a theory of structuration*. Polity Press, Oxford.
- Fekjær, S.N. 2006. Utdanning hos annengenerasjon etniske minoriteter i Norge, *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning* 47(1), 57-93.
- Fekjær, S.N. 2007. New differences, old explanations: can educational differences between ethnic groups in Norway be explained by social background? *Ethnicities* 7(3), 367-89.

Gran, A.-B. & Vaagen, H. 2010. *Kunnskap om – medvirkning av – formidling for mangfoldige museumsbrukere*. Perduco Kultur/Kulturhistorisk museum, Universitetet i Oslo/ Norges Museumforbund.

<http://www.museumsforbundet.no/pdf/brukerundersokelse10.pdf>

Högberg, A. 2013. *Mångfaldsfrågar i kulturmiljövården. Tankar, kunskaper och processer 2002-2012*. Nordic Academic Press, Lund.

Högberg, A. 2015. The heritage sector in a multicultural society: A discussion from a Swedish perspective. In Biehl, Comer, Prescott & Soderland (eds.), *Identity and heritage. Contemporary challenges in a globalized world*, 47-54. Springer, Cham.

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

Leirvik, M.S. 2011. “Å ta kunsthistorie eller statsvitenskap er en luksus ikke alle kan unne seg”. Kan utdanningsatferd forstås ut frå ulike kapitalformer i etniske nettverk? *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning* 53(2), 189-216.

Moldenhawer, B. 2005. Transnational migrant communities and education strategies among Pakistani youngsters in Denmark. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies* 31(1), 51-78.

Munch, P.A. 1852. *Det norske Folks Historie*. Chr. Tønsbergs forlag, Christiania.

Norsk Folkemuseum/Oslo Museum/Synovate 2011. *Innvandrerens bruk av museer – En undersøkelse*. <http://www.oslomuseum.no/om-oslo-museum/prosjekter/innvanderens-bruk-av-museer>

Prescott, C. 2013a. Heritage and the New Immigrant Minorities: A Catalyst of Relevance for Contemporary Archaeology? In Biehl & Prescott (eds.), *Heritage in the context of globalization. Europe and the Americas*. Springer, Cham.

Prescott, C. 2013b. *Recurrent themes: Indo-Europeans in Norwegian archaeology*. In Begerbrant & Sabatini (eds.), *Counterpoint: Essays in archaeology and heritage studies in honour of Professor Kristian Kristansen*. BAR int’nl series 2508, 607-12. Hadrian Books, Oxford.

Shetelig, H. 1925. *Norges forhistorie. Problemer og resultater i norsk arkæologi*. Aschehoug, Oslo.

Slettholm, A. 2011. Varsellampene blinker. *Aftenposten* April 19, 2011, 19-22.

Trigger, B 1989. *A history of archaeological thought*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Wylie, A. 2003. On Ethics, in L.J. Zimmerman, K.D. Vitelli and J. Hollewell-Zimmer (eds), *Ethical Issues in Archaeology*, 3-16. Altamira Press, Walnut Creek.

Internet sites accessed March 2015:

Oslo City Statistics: <https://www.oslo.kommune.no/politikk-og-administrasjon/statistikk/befolkning/landbakgrunn/>

Sapmi, Allt om Sveriges ursprungsfolk samerna och deras land Sápmi:
<http://www.samer.se/1536>

Statistics Norway: <http://www.ssb.no/en/befolkning/statistikker/flytting/aar/2014-04-28?fane=tabell&sort=nummer&tabell=174053>