

What Alters When the Traditional Sámi Costume Travels?

A Study of Affective Investments in the Sápmi

Britt Kramvig & Anne Britt Flemmen

The wearing of a traditional Sámi costume (*gákti*) that was light green in colour and produced in China at an internal event staged by the employees of the Norwegian grocery retail chain KIWI¹ resulted in an emotional public debate in Sápmi/Norway.² Some saw the use of the traditional Sámi costume as disrespectful, while others saw it as harmless fun. People reacted in different ways: some were disgusted, some were frustrated and angry and some were amused and intrigued. We were faced with a situation in which the majority population was seen to tread on the (already sore) toes of the indigenous Sámi people. In the debate that followed multiple positions were performed – and within the Sámi community too. This was one of these rare occasions when the respectful use of indigenous Sámi objects was publicly debated and differences in opinion within the Sámi community became publicly visible. Disagreement and discontent within the Sámi community is not often verbally expressed in Norwegian public arenas. It is rather communicated in other, subtler ways.

Our task in this essay is to track what it is that alters when matter, terms, and aims travel from one place to another. We will argue that the costumes need to be considered as more than iconically charged objects. Objects such as the *gákti* enact connections to a specific heritage that is celebrated, as well as to memories and a sense of nostalgia and loss. The *gákti* is part of some highly affective practices for a group of people exposed to centuries of persecution and marginalization. We also sug-

gest how affect aroused by the presence of objects can be articulated. We take inspiration from Navaro-Yashin's claim (2012: 203) that affect is contained and emitted through the solidity, presence, visibility, and tangibility of objects. In line with Frykman and Povrzanović Frykman (Chapter 1) we attempt to approach objects as materiality that become sensitised through use, but also serve as containers of affects.

We use the ethnographic story of the KIWI jacket debate to argue that we need to view affect through the qualities, textures and potentialities of the objects themselves. The affect that is transmitted by objects can be explored through the disconcertment and tension present in the debate. With this story we want to explore what happened when the traditional Sámi costume (*gákti*) travelled into the internal building of collective identity amongst the employees of the grocery retail chain KIWI, and how this can be understood. The emotions and heated debate that followed testified to the challenges of recognising and establishing respect for difference in a postcolonial era.

The KIWI jacket

In autumn 2010 there was a Norwegian media storm when 630 KIWI employees wore a specially made 'KIWI green', Guovdageaidnu/



Figure 8.1. The KIWI jacket. Photo with permission, ryan.txanson@gmail.com



Figure 8.2. The Guovdageaidnu/Kautokeino *gákti*. Photo: Valerie Stalder. With permission, Tromsø Museum – Universitetsmuseet.

Kautokeino-inspired traditional costume made in China. The group of employees took to the streets of the city of Tromsø on their way to an event created by ‘Better and Better’, a company based in southern Norway. This company had been commissioned to gather KIWI employees from the entire country to celebrate the philosophy and strengthen the identity of the KIWI group using untraditional means. On meeting members of the group in their green copies of the Kautokeino-inspired *gákti*, the artist Sara Marielle Gaup,³ from the Sámi band Adjagas, said on NRK Sámi Radio that she was in total shock: ‘This is an insult to us [Adjagas] personally, but also an insult to the Sámi people.’⁴ Adjagas had been booked to play later that evening, but decided to withdraw from the

KIWI event with immediate effect. The Sámi lawyer Ande Somby said in the local newspaper *Nordlys* that ‘this was like pissing on a Sámi symbol’.⁵

Hans Kristian Amundsen, the editor of *Nordlys* newspaper, wrote an editorial entitled ‘Relax’:⁶

I think that Sámi lawyers should take it easy. Their fierce condemnation is more harmful to the Sámi reputation than the green jackets from China. The image of the Sámi as sensitive and lacking in self-irony is unfortunately confirmed by the verdict of the morality police. We suggest relaxing. It is not harmful to any part of the Sámi community when people dress up in green jackets.

I hope that Sámi lawyers will learn from this incident. In 2010 the Sámi have to tolerate tasteless elements without interpreting them as oppressive. The Sámi culture is strong enough to withstand the ridicule and teasing. Moreover, it was nice that 650 KIWI employees came to the High North and learned about Sámi culture.⁷

The event sparked a lively open debate about the extent to which the Sámi community should be expected to accept and tolerate the (mis)use of Sámi national symbols.

The Sámi designer Anne Berit Anti regarded KIWI’s use of the colourful Kautokeino costume as positive:⁸ ‘They may simply have wanted to build bridges.’ When interviewed by the Sámi newspaper *Sagat*, she suggested: ‘Why not take advantage of this media frenzy and get KIWI to run a big campaign on reindeer meat?’ She believed that this would be a fruitful cooperation, especially at a time when reindeer meat was in abundance. This could be done ‘quickly, safely and cheaply’ she chuckled, referring to KIWI’s slogan. She also added that she could understand the Sámi’s reactions, especially in the light of the Finnish tourist industry’s extensive (mis)use of Sámi culture, and in particular the *gákti*.

Another contribution to the debate expressed a somewhat different point of view:

We have inherited these somewhat painful things from Norwegian Sámi interactions, and the KIWI jacket with its colourful splendour reflects these stories. I believe we will be able to progress further if we deal with this more honestly, rather than just

being politely self-ironic, to secure that the recognition of the Sámi will not be damaged.⁹

KIWI's CEO used the media to apologise for hurting people's feelings and explained that they had collaborated with the Sámi people via a local Sámi company prior to the event and that no objections to their plans had been raised. The event company explained that: 'We simply wanted to be part of the culture, with lavvu, reindeer, a fireplace and the whole package. We had set up camp at Breivikeidet (outside Tromsø). Jeans and suits do not fit into such a camp.'¹⁰ The story was published in the southern regional newspaper *Drammens tidende* under the headline 'KIWI in Sámi trouble'. Prior to the production of the KIWI jacket the company had also checked the legal aspects of the matter and found no concerns. A very heated debate followed in *Nordlys*, on the website iTromsø and in the social media. This debate ranged from supportive and humorous contributions to scorn and anger.

This is a very interesting case because it contains all the necessary and fundamental prerequisites for indigenous people's cultural expressions to travel from one place (the Sámi community) to another (an internal company event). One of the more interesting aspects of the debate, in addition to its intensity, is that it did not simply take place within the Sámi community. On the contrary, many new and unexpected constellations and statements and inter- and intra-ethnic alliances were formed and clearly articulated. The object multiplies in such a process and gives us the chance to explore and rearticulate the similarities and differences of this specific event.

Positions in the debate

Three major positions were at play in this debate. We refer to these as the cultural flexibility argument, the rights argument and the equality argument. In different ways, all these arguments address the issue of how to bring the past into the present. The tensions arising from this debate can appear as postcolonial moments, a concept introduced by Verran (2002), where differences and similarities are seen as possibilities.

The cultural flexibility argument resonates with the overarching values that guide everyday Sámi practices (Kramvig 2005). The flexibility argument, launched by for example Anne Berit Anti, claims

that the KIWI jacket could be laughed at and seen as a way of building bridges. She also points to the commercial potential of KIWI copying Sámi items. At the same time she understands that someone might experience this as a violation of Sámi culture. In the everyday life of ethnically mixed communities, which most Sápmi communities are, the concept of Sáminess is dynamic, flexible and situated. Social practices that sustain ambiguous identity categories are present. After a century of institutionalised assimilation, some people still insist on ambiguity as a way of resisting Norwegian society and the logic of nationalism. In the practice of everyday life, objects are materials that are employed in the creation of a local, collective self-perception that transcends ethnic boundaries. In the flexibility argument, memories and experiences of different pasts are recognised as being present and in need of articulation. The complexity of memory and affects performed in emotionally conflicting situations is also recognised.

The rights argument refers to the work done to ensure indigenous people's rights to their own cultural expressions, self-determination and land. In Norway, this work has meant a balancing act between the transnational channel of NGOs and institutionalised ways of conducting politics. Bargaining for their rights as indigenous people within the state system, or 'bounded entities', the Sámi rights movement has been able to bring about institutional changes in Norway (Minde 2008). After colonisation, in both politics and everyday life indigenous people have lived the complex relationship between citizenship claims and participation in transnational social movements. Indigenous people strive towards visibility and acceptance. Since the 1960s many liberal nation-states have made space for their 'rights movements' and other forms of 'identity politics'. Nevertheless, according to Brown (1993: 398) these claims have become a 'vehicle of subordination through individualisation, normalisation and regulation'.

In our case, we consider the rights argument to have been put by, for example, Sara Marielle Gaup (Adjagas) and the lawyer Ánde Somby. They viewed the KIWI jacket as a violation of Sámi tradition and identity and as a disrespectful mockery of the political work done to recognise Sámi autonomy.

In his PhD thesis, Mattias Åhren explores who has ownership of the traditional Sámi costume and beauty pageants. Through his work, the rights positions are now in the process of being stabilised in legal

terminology (Åhren 2010). These questions have not been considered as pressing in Norway in the same way as they have for example in Finland (Junka-Aikio 2014). The Norwegian Sámi Parliament has not (yet) adopted Åhren's suggestions and taken up the global indigenous rights arguments in these cases. This hesitance can be viewed as a way of maintaining the flexibility and not being forced to fix Sámi cultural objects legally in terms of rights. It can also be viewed as a way of sustaining a local perspective and not simply adopting a global indigenous rights argument. It could be argued that in each specific case it is the local community's right to judge how matter or objects can travel. The argument about local communities' rights to decide on these issues is also launched by Åhren (2010). The Sámi *gákti* are different and the patterns reflect and are 'owned' by specific communities or by the local *siida* or families using the specific patterns.¹¹

The equality argument has an immediate and particular force in any debate, because it appeals to an (implicit) understanding that the same rules apply for everyone. Here, the questions asked seem to be why or how are you (people) different and why should you be treated differently? Marianne Gullestad (2002) argues that Norwegian discourses are performed through a specific combination of a bureaucratic welfare state and an open globalised capitalist economy, with a particular relationship between egalitarianism, nationalism and racism. Gullestad (2001) further argues that equality conceived as sameness ('imagined sameness') underpins the equality discourse in Norway. This makes statements of equality and difference challenging for the Sámi, as well as for other minorities. The imagined sameness becomes a prerequisite for equality.

When Amundsen stated that Sámi culture is strong enough to withstand ridicule and teasing, we read this as an equality argument. His appeal is for the Sámi to tolerate 'tasteless elements', to 'not be so sensitive' and to 'have more self-irony'. It is an appeal to allow the (colonial) past to remain in the past without bringing it into the present, the here and now. In the debate, the space for laughter was very limited, and with the exception of the Sámi designer Anne Berit Anti, very little laughter was heard.

How can we analyse these tensions and controversies regarding the respectful use of and ownership of the Sámi *gákti* in particular, of indigenous (symbolic) objects in general, and their naming and use? These objects come with different stories. What kinds of stories are told in moments of tension and conflict about the use of traditional Sámi

objects? Our reflections on these questions are inspired by Verran's own questions (2013), which are both ontological and political: How can we be respectful of difference, but not intimidated by it, in practical engagements between practitioners of disparate knowledge traditions? How can we imagine struggles of doing difference together in the here and now (Verran 2013: 141)?

Doing pasts differently

Like other indigenous people, the Sámi have often been described as wild, unruly and uncivilised, and their religious beliefs seen as an expression of a barbarism that has to be overcome (Kramvig and Flemmen 2010). The first expressions of 'civilization' in Sápmi often came with the introduction of churches, followed by the establishment of trading posts. This was followed by military fortifications, educational institutions, trade routes etc. The fascination with indigenous people – like the noble savage – has been described as deeply rooted in the Western modernity project (Said 1984; Hastrup 2007). The authentic 'we', which we in the West lost access to as a result of modernity's disintegrating effects, could be recovered as a nostalgic vision into the past that was derived from their contact with others.

The othering of the Sámi people can be regarded as a prerequisite for colonial projects to discipline the Sámi in terms of law, religion, education and language. This disciplining was part of an aspiration to 'help less fortunate others'. Sámi society has changed radically over the past 30 years, with new images emerging of Sáminess and the Sámi as one people (Stordahl 1994). The process of ethnic incorporation and the establishment of a Sámi political movement required images and symbols that worked both internally within the Sámi population and externally vis-à-vis the Norwegian government and public. These images were based on language and other cultural features, such as Sámi costumes, music, handicrafts and ecological sensibility, which articulated something different than the symbols of Norwegian culture (Schanche 1993). As reindeer herding was a very specific Sámi occupation, it lent itself to being used in the creation of a Sámi culture and history.

Schanche (1993) focuses on the paradoxes of this creation of an official Sámi past. The emphasis on the different Sámi values and symbols means that, at least to a certain extent, the Norwegian majority indirectly (by

negation) defines these values and symbols. Earlier research on Sámi issues focused on the process of ethnic revitalisation that began after a hunger strike outside the Norwegian Parliament in 1979 and the protests against the development of the Alta–Kautokeino river basin for hydro-electric power and the subsequent flooding of important Sámi pastures in 1980–81. Inspired by Fredrik Barth's study (1969) of ethnic groups and boundaries, the social construction of ethnicity and the establishment of boundaries between the Norwegian and the Sámi are seen by Thuen (1995) as important processes in the production of the Sámi nation.

The terms colonisation and decolonisation have only recently entered the public debate in Norway. The movement for Sámi rights was not really on the international agenda until the hunger strike outside the Norwegian Parliament and the civil disobedience at Stilla (the protests against the damming of the River Alta–Kautokeino). These events made the Norwegian state's treatment of the Sámi nationally and internationally visible. The government's assimilation policies gave way to increased Sámi consciousness, a gradual recognition of Sámi rights and support for the development of Sámi institutions, such as the Sámi Parliament (opened in 1989). In the 1980s and 1990s, the consequences of the colonial processes were brought to light, and the young people who had become more aware of a suppressed history claimed Sámi ethnicity to be increasingly relevant. Nevertheless, the social and political hierarchies and epistemic regimes that regulate the relationship between indigenous and dominant societies are hard and slow to undo (Kuokkanen 2010). Moreover, as Fanon (1963) argues, the undoing of colonial relations risks provoking conflict. In the contemporary process of decolonisation, our particular interest is how pasts are constructed differently and how objects come with different affects and pasts.

When we refer to the Sámi people we need to remember that we are actually talking about differences. Both the Sámi and Norwegians have lived in the same or neighbouring communities in which intermarriage and different kinds of bridging practices have been relatively common. The Sámi communities do not only differ when it comes to language (there are nine different Sámi dialects), but also in terms of artistic expressions and knowledge traditions. The traditional chanting (*joik*) differs from one community to the next; likewise traditional costume (*gákti*), Sámi practices and stories. In addition, it is important to remember that these practices have been multiplied by the processes of colonialism and

decolonialism. It is important to many that differences are respected and not erased in the eagerness to establish the category of the Sámi as a particular subject or citizens with specific rights. It is emphasised that people as well as communities should be able to ‘speak for themselves’ and not be reduced to one category with one voice and one past.

Some communities never gave in to the government’s assimilation policy. Others lost track of their Sámi past and are now trying to revitalise it. All these practices, and the different affects related to them, add to the complexity in Sápmi, where different indigenous communities and generations bring the past into the present in different ways. The sense of pain, shame, and guilt are more vivid for the older generations than the younger (Stordahl 1994). For some, memories are extremely intense, while for others they can be just a vague ‘something’ (see Chapter 1 in this volume). Younger Sámi organisations taking part in these debates often express respect for Sámi ownership, heritage and ways of life.

Questions about how to bring the past into the present are painful for many people. At times they have led to conflicts about how to connect the past, places and indigeneity. Families and places are reinterpreted, while ‘forgotten’ Sámi pasts are retrieved and often the subject of turbulent debate. This makes Sámi cultural expressions fragile, because they contain highly contested, valuable, repressed and often painful experiences and stories. The challenge in today’s Sápmi is mainly related to the effort to reclaim and revitalise the traditional Sámi culture and knowledge. These efforts are undertaken at the highest political levels, for example through the construction of institutions and the development of autonomous administrative units, such as environmental and resource management, culture, education and health. In addition, the same efforts are made in people’s everyday lives, in the challenge of recapturing the Sámi traditional knowledge, and the challenges related to self-articulation in a turbulent and complex landscape (Kramvig and Flemmen 2010).

The KIWI jacket as boundary object

An object is something people act towards and with (Star 2010: 603). Its materiality derives from action, not from prefabricated stuff or ‘thingness’.¹² These actions are manifold, which means that (some) Sámi objects have multiple and conflicting stories to tell. Further, these objects differ in the sense that they do not travel easily from one place to another. For

example, the *gákti* belongs to a very specific place, a specific community of *siidas* and to the people inhabiting these specific areas. The traditional costume thus enacts a given area and is connected to given place. Patterns, ribbons, belts and silver accessories also point to specific places. Social positions, such as married–unmarried, woman–man and differences in economic resources, also become visible. But the *gákti* has some flexibility. In areas that have recently reclaimed their Sámi heritage, such as Stjernøya (a Coastal Sámi area in Finnmark), reconstructions of the *gákti* have been made using old pictures, old fabrics and the stories told in the different communities. Furthermore, young people often make their own fashion statements by adding to, combining or introducing new objects to the *gákti*. All this is done with a sensibility of the tradition.

Given this flexibility, what went wrong in the case of the KIWI jacket? How should we understand the anger, frustration and conflicts that were provoked on this specific occasion? We argue that the emotions, or rather the affects of this object, need to be understood in relation to the object's ability to travel from one place to another. On this occasion movement provoked alterity. It is important to understand what alters when objects, here represented by the *gákti*, travel in this way. We follow Navaro-Yashin's argument (2012) that the transmission of affect between object and subject that produces disharmony, tension or uneasiness needs to be considered. This, she claims, is a specific quality of affect and follows it up by asking where this qualification comes from. The multiple qualities of the objects and the different stories they embody in relation to the viewer's knowledge of their context evoke anger and tension among those who come into contact with them. 'Objects and a material environment can generate affect, then, but only as they get entangled in forms of human mediation' (ibid. 214).

Science and technology studies (STS) are helpful in an analysis of this topic in that they suggest that objects are effects of stable arrays or networks of relations (Law 2002: 91). Law (2002) argues that objects hold together as long as the relations hold together and do not change shape. Our argument is that in the case of the KIWI jacket the relations changed and the object was instead connected to networks that were not regarded as responsible and trustworthy for sustaining the shape of the *gákti*. The traditional Sámi costume was thus not flexible enough to withstand this new enactment, at least not for some. The way the object, in this case the KIWI jacket, was held together or stabilised was challenged.

Some objects are referred to as boundary objects (Star and Griesemer 1989). These objects are of particular interest to us because they enable different views and practices to coexist without consensus and enact interpretive flexibility. According to Star (2010), they mean a shared space, where the sense of here and there are confounded (*ibid.* 602–603). Star argues that the distribution of standards is at the core of many social justice issues concerning standardisation. We need to study the standardisation and both the ill-structured and well-structured aspects of a particular boundary object (*ibid.* 613–614).

The KIWI jacket holds on to the differences between an ill-structured object and a locally tailored one. As we see it, standardisation is what is at stake in the present public debate. With regard to international law, Åhrén (2010) addresses the appropriation of ‘non-members’ and the use of parts of indigenous people’s culture. As previously indicated, Åhrén aims to establish the extent to which international law gives indigenous people the right to own and/or determine their distinct collective creativity and does this by analysing human rights law (in particular the right to self-determination) and property rights. Åhrén concludes that indigenous people are the beneficiaries of ‘collective rights proper’, including the right to self-determination. This means the right to continuously pursue their cultural practices and to maintain and develop their distinct cultural identity (*ibid.* 215). It also means not making use of indigenous people’s cultural elements in ways that seriously harm their collective cultural identity.

Standardisation is a clearing of the field and the elimination of contradictions. All standardised systems throw off or generate residual categories, i.e. the ‘not categorised elsewhere’. These categories then form new boundary objects and a cycle is born (Star 2010: 614). Ongoing unsolved standardisation issues balance the need for flexibility and the need for order and stability (which are necessary in order to define rights): ‘the battles and dramas between the formal and informal, the ill-structured and the well-structured, the standardized and the wild, are being continuously fought’ (*ibid.*).

Even though standardisation produces new boundary objects and does not offer a final solution, a certain degree of standardisation is needed in order to protect people from the experience of violation and harm to cultural identities and property rights. Åhrén (2010) argues along these lines when he discusses that not all non-members’ uses of

indigenous people's dress should be regarded as 'prohibited'. In order to be considered damaging, the use must be seriously culturally offensive or risk integrating members of the indigenous people into the majority population. According to international law, a respectful use of objects that acknowledges the Sámi as a distinct people is allowed (ibid. 278).

A heated debate can be productive for recognising affects and for raising awareness of difference and awareness of an object with all its ambiguity and contingency. One of the actors expressed this turbulence in the following story:

If you wear a *gákti* outside the core Sámi area people throw the *Ánti-joik* at you.¹³ I do not know how many times this has happened. But then I also think it is not done in bad faith, for nowadays the non-Sámi also talk about the Sámi in a positive way. But even though people mean no harm with jokes and imitate the Sámi joik, it has become easier for non-Sámi to denigrate the Sámi. Thinking and saying things like 'they are only colourful clowns that speak in a funny way' are now standard.¹⁴

There is a wide array of unspoken affective attitudes at the basis of discriminatory names (see Chapter 1 in this volume). These affective attitudes are not easily changed but – as argued by Sarah Ahmed (2004) – naming emotions can involve different orientation towards the objects they construct. Discriminatory naming practices can be done in good faith, as indicated in the quote above, or in bad faith. We therefore need to focus our attention on the ever shifting but temporarily stabilized entanglements of place, embodied practices and discursive constructions (Di Masso and Dixon 2015).

Objects of affect

Navaro-Yashin (2012: 203) challenges the way affect generally has been theorised through metaphors that invoke abstraction, imaginaries of immateriality and conceptualisations of invisibility – in both the psychoanalytic and the sociological traditions. She claims that affect is both contained and emitted through the solidity, presence, visibility and tangibility of objects. Inspired by her position, we have viewed affect through the qualities, texture and potentialities of the object itself. In this

essay, we have illustrated how the affect for a specific object, the KIWI jacket, only becomes felt and known to us as human beings when we engage with it via mediation and qualification. We have illustrated how affect is in this case qualified, and how affects emitted by materialities can mean anything in a specific context.

We have analysed the KIWI jacket as both an unconventional classification practice and as a boundary object. What is the significance of the KIWI jacket? In this specific situation, what affects does the object transmit? We argue that the remnants and residues that link it to the Kautokeino *gákti* also have tangible affects. More specifically, it is the sense or knowledge of the context in which such objects are normally used that mediates the affects that people experience, qualifies the transmission of affect, puts it into words and meaning. For people who are distanced from the colonial history of the Sámi people, the tangibility of the KIWI jacket may not produce the same affective tension. Together with Navaro-Yashin, we would thus argue that tangibility transmits affect, but that these affects are mediated and qualified by the knowledge that people have about the object's context. Affect is tangible (and not just immaterial), but it is also mediated and qualified by the specific people who experience it.

The story of the KIWI jacket represents an affective transmission between objects and human subjects that produces laughter, uneasiness, tension and anger. In order to decide where this qualification comes from, we need to look at the KIWI jacket and its qualities: the green colour, the pattern, the ribbons, the Chinese producer etc. It is these qualities of the object, in relation to the observer's knowledge about its context, that evoke the laughter, the unease, the tension and the anger. Objects and the material environment can generate affect, but only when they become entangled in forms of human mediation (Navaro-Yashin 2012: 214). This affect may cause disharmony and disturbance.

Closing remarks

The KIWI jacket highlights the differences *within* the Sámi communities in the Norwegian (but still mostly regional) public debate. Different standpoints have been taken on how the multiple (colonial) past should be articulated, how Sámi objects move and what alters when they do. We have argued that in order to understand the affects, the tensions in

the debate, the KIWI jacket should be considered a boundary object. In line with Wetherell (2015: 86) we consider that ‘body/brain landscapes, meaning making, feeling, communication, and social action entangle and become figured together in emotion episodes. The affective and the discursive intertwine’. We have furthermore argued that three major positions have been at play in this debate: cultural flexibility, rights and equality. In their different ways these three arguments address the issue of how to bring the past into the present. The tensions arising from this debate can appear as postcolonial moments, where differences and similarities are present as possibilities (Verran 2002). What is for some an eager promise becomes for others a situation without hope. This also signals the different positions that (indigenous) people can take, and their possibilities for articulation. As DeMasso et al. (2015: 87) argue, there are ‘some huge advantages, however, to not attempting to disentangle just the affect in the moment, and advantages, too, to ranging more widely in our analyses beyond participants’ orientations and accounts to reflect on the histories of affective discursive meaning making and their biographical and ideological place and force.’

The question here is how to bring the past into the present. People live in different affective and narrative communities, where some see the past while others see the present, and where some see a post-colonial situation while others see a colonial one. The conflicts that take place concerning the standardisation of Sámi objects such as the *gákti* can be harmful, tiring and humiliating, however, the creation of a public space for discussing how complex cultural objects can be respectfully dealt with would be helpful.

The affects of the KIWI jacket show that not everyone attaches themselves to the objects in the same way and for the same reasons. The affective community involves positive, hopeful attachments for some and alienating and unequally shared burdens for others. These affective states show that the histories of race and racism cannot be wished away by commonly asserted attachments to abstract ideals of shared belonging (Ahmed 2010). These affective states demonstrate that differences are not eliminated by abstract ideas of shared belonging and the contemporary dream of unconditional movements in time and space. At the same time, examining these affective states provides a greater understanding of how unequal attachments move people towards action in relation to racism and discrimination.

Notes

- 1 KIWI is one of Norway's largest grocery retail chains, with around 600 stores nationwide.
- 2 There are different Sámi dialects and spellings, and we have followed the advice of the Swedish Riksantikvarieämbetet, as this is a Swedish-based publication, even though we consider Norwegian material.
- 3 Gaup lives in the Sámi municipality of Guovdageaidnu/Kautokeino and is also a *duodji* (Sámi handicraft) student at the Sámi University College in Guovdageaidnu/Kautokeino.
- 4 'KIWI i sametrobbel', *Drammens tidende* 12 Sept. 2010. Available from: <http://www.dt.no/nyheter/KIWI-i-same-trobbel-1.5621079> [accessed 8 Aug. 2014].
- 5 'Raser mot KIWI's kofstunt', *Nordlys* 11 Sept. 2010. Available from: <http://www.nordlys.no/nyheter/articles5306233.ece> [accessed 12 Sept. 2012].
- 6 The authors have translated this and other contributions to the debate into English.
- 7 'Slapp av' comment by the editor in *Nordlys* first published 14 Sept. 2010 www.sett-fra-nord.origo.no 14 Sept. 2010 Available from: http://www.sett-fra-nord.origo.no/-/bulletin/show/595154_slapp-av?ref=checkpoint [accessed 15 Feb. 2015].
- 8 'KIWI kofte gir reinkjøtt muligheter' The newspaper *Sagat* 15 Sept. 2010 Available from: <http://www.sagat.no/hovednyheter/2010/09/15/28034/> [accessed 4 Nov. 2014].
- 9 Ludvig R. Comments www.sett-fra-nord.origo.no published 13 Sept. 2010. Available from: http://www.sett-fra-nord.origo.no/-/bulletin/show/595154_slapp-av?ref=checkpoint [accessed 4 Oct. 2014].
- 10 'Raseri mot KIWIs tulle-koft', the newspaper *VG*, 13 Sept. 2010, p. 8.
- 11 The northern Sámi expression *siida* has multiple meanings, including community and home. *Siida* is a particular and flexible form of organisation for reindeer herders and has a central place in today's husbandry legislation. The Reindeer Act uses the term *siida* when referring to a group of herders who jointly practise reindeer herding in specific areas.
- 12 As Frykman and Povrzanović Frykman remind us (Chapter 1 in this volume), objects do not have an independent affective charge. We are concerned with the practices of people using objects.
- 13 *Ánti and the Ánti-joik* (or Sámi song) was first seen on Norwegian TV in 1975. The series focused on a boy called Ánti and the difficulties he had fitting into the Norwegian school in Kautokeino. The series was a major success, was sold to 26 different countries and is part of the Norwegian collective memory.
- 14 From a radio documentary made by NRK, available from: <http://p3.no/dokumentar/sapmifil/> [accessed 12 May 2016]. Translation from Norwegian by the authors.

References

- Ahmed, Sara. 2010. Feminism and the history of happiness. *Signs* 35(3): 571–594.
- Åhrén, Mattias. 2010. *The Saami Traditional Dress & Beauty Pageants: Indigenous Peoples' Rights of Ownership and Selfdetermination over Their Cultures*; PhD thesis. Tromsø: University of Tromsø.
- Barth, Fredrik. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget Notam.
- Brown, Wendy. 1993. Wounded attachments. *Political Theory* 21(3): 390–410.

- Di Masso, Andrés and John Dixon. 2015. More than words: Place, discourse and the struggle over public space in Barcelona. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12(1): 45–60.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Gullestad, Marianne. 2001. Imagined sameness: Shifting notions of ‘us’ and ‘them’ in Norway. In Line Alice Ytrehus (ed.), *Forestillinger om ‘den andre’ / Images of Otherness*, 32–53. Kristiansand: Norwegian Academic Press.
- Gullestad, Marianne. 2002. Invisible fences: Egalitarianism, nationalism and racism. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 8(1): 45–63.
- Hardt, Michael. 2007. Foreword: What affects are good for. In Patricia Ticineto Clough and Jean Halley, *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social*, ix–viii. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hastrup, Kirsten. 2007. Ultima Thule: Anthropology and the call of the unknown. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 13(4): 789–804.
- Junka-Aikio, Laura. 2014. Can the Sámi speak now? Deconstructive research ethos and the debate on who is a Sámi in Finland. *Cultural Studies*, published online 24 Nov. DOI: 10.1080/09502386.2014.978803
- Kuokkanen, Rauna. 2007. The responsibility of the academy: A call for doing homework. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 26(3): 61–74. Available from: <http://journal.jctonline.org/index.php/jct/article/view/262/92> [Permalink].
- Kramvig, Britt. 2005. The silent language of ethnicity. *European Journal for Cultural Studies* 8(1): 45–64.
- Kramvig, Britt and Anne Britt Flemmen. 2010. Mangfold, likhet og likestilling i Sápmi [Multiplicity, similarity and equality in Sápmi]. In Anne Jorunn Berg, Anne Britt Flemmen and Berit Gullikstad (eds.), *Likestilte norskheter: Om kjønn og etnisitet* [Equal Norwegiannesses: On gender and ethnicity], 167–195. Trondheim: Tapir.
- Law, John. 2002. Objects and spaces. *Theory, Culture & Society* 19(5–6): 91–105.
- Minde, Henry ed. 2008. *Indigenous Peoples: Self-determination, Knowledge, Indigeneity*. Delft: Eburon.
- Navaro-Yashin, Yael. 2012. *The Make-Believe Space: Affective Geography in a Postwar Polity*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Said, Edward. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Schanche, Audhild. 1993. Kulturminner, identitet og etnisitet [Cultural memories, identity and ethnicity]. *Dugnad* 19(4): 55–64.
- Star, Susan Leigh. 2007. Power, technology and the phenomenology of conventions on being allergic to onions. In Asdal, Kristin, Berit Brenna and Ingunn Moser (eds.), *Technoscience: The Politics of Interventions*, 79–109. Oslo: Unipub.
- Star, Susan Leight. 2010. This is not a boundary object: Reflections on the origin of a concept. *Science, Technology & Human Values* 35(5): 601–617.
- Star, Susan Leigh and James Griesemer. 1989. Institutional ecology, ‘translations’ and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley’s Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907–39. *Social Studies of Science* 19: 387–420.
- Stordahl, Vigdis. 1994. *Same i den moderne verden: Endring og kontinuitet i et Samisk lokalsamfunn* [Sámi in the modern world: Change and coontinuity in a Sámi community]; PhD thesis. Tromsø: University of Tromsø.
- Thuen, Trond. 1995. *Quest for Equity: Norway and Saami Challenge*. St. John’s, Nfld: ISER Books.
- Verran, Helen. 2002. A postcolonial moment in science studies: Alternative firing regimes of environmental sciences and Aboriginal landowners. *Social Studies of Science* 32(5–6): 729–762.

SENSITIVE OBJECTS

- Verran, Helen. 2013. Engagements between disparate knowledge traditions: toward doing difference generatively and in good faith. In Lesley Green (ed.), *Contested Ecologies*, 141–162. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Wetherell, Margaret. 2015. Tears, bubbles and disappointment – new approaches for the analysis of affective-discursive practices: A commentary on ‘Researching the Psychosocial’. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 12(1): 83–90.