EDITORS’ NOTE

In normal circumstances, we would be delighted to introduce the new issue of *Suomen antropologi*, which is also the first issue we have published as the editors-in-chief of the journal. However, our enthusiasm is considerably tempered by Putin’s shocking and appalling attack on Ukraine, which, as we write this, has continued for over a month and which has included brutal and deadly attacks on Ukrainian civilians.

While our gut reaction as anthropologists would be to start seeking a novel or sharp analytical angle for unpacking the war in Ukraine, for now, it is better to set analysis aside and, following the Ukrainian anthropologist Volodymyr Artiukh (2022), focus on the concrete ways we can act in solidarity with Ukrainians. Similarly, we need to think about how we can support our Russian and Belarusian colleagues in speaking out and mobilizing against the war, whether in Russia, Finland (see Joint Letter Against the War in Ukraine 2022) or elsewhere.

As a scholarly journal, we will think about how to best support our Ukrainian colleagues, whose work and lives have been disrupted by the war. To protest the criminal attack on Ukraine by the Russian Federation, we follow the measures taken by other scholarly organizations in Finland (see for example University of Helsinki 2022). In our case, this means that for the time being, we will not consider manuscripts from scholars affiliated with Russian or Belarusian state universities. We want to emphasize that this measure is not directed against Russian or Belarusian scholars, but applies to scholars affiliated with those institutions regardless of their citizenship and that conversely, we will consider submissions from Russian and Belarusian scholars working at other institutions or as independent scholars. We will publish those articles that have been accepted for publication before the Russian invasion of Ukraine.

We also recognize that such sanctions are problematic and that some of our Russian and Belarusian colleagues (Arzyutov 2022) have—at great risk to their personal safety—courageously spoken up by circulating a petition condemning Russia’s invasion of Ukraine (Petition to President V. V. Putin 2022). We want to support them and other dissident voices in the Russian Federation and Belarus, and we will continue to accept publications from them. Furthermore, we are appalled by the response of the Association of Anthropologists and Ethnologists of Russia, whose leadership (Tishkov, Funk, Golovnev, Kradin and Bazarov 2022) parrots Putin’s propaganda about the invasion and abandons our colleagues, who stood up against Putin’s war on Ukraine.

Having said that, banal as it may seem, we need also to keep on doing what we do, namely, publishing a scientific journal. Thus, we want to take this opportunity to briefly discuss the beginning of our term and the
journal’s new editorial board, after which we will introduce the contents of this issue.

But first, we want to thank our predecessor Matti Eräsaari (University of Helsinki), who has tirelessly worked as the editor-in-chief of the journal for the last four years and overseen the publication of 16 issues. Especially during the first part of his term, Matti had to shoulder much of the editorial work by himself, much like his predecessor Timo Kallinen. Gradually, Matti managed to recruit new editors and now the editorial team is larger than ever—something for which we are very grateful. We are also happy to announce that Matti will, for the time being, continue as an editor of the journal, watching over the transition, until he feels like it’s time to get some well-deserved rest from editing the journal. Our warmest thanks!

OUR VISION

So, what are our plans for the next two years as editors-in-chief? Mainly, we’re envisioning our role as that of a caretaker. In an era that overemphasizes ‘innovation’, ‘grand visions’, and change for its own sake, we want to maintain and take care. Recent work in the study of infrastructures has focused on the importance of care and maintenance. Steve Jackson (2014: 222) notes that repair and maintenance are ‘subtle acts of care by which order and meaning in complex sociotechnical systems are maintained and transformed, human value is preserved and extended, and the complicated work of fitting to the varied circumstances of organizations, systems, and lives is accomplished’. This will be our guiding principle.

Furthermore, writing about maintenance, Jessica Barnes (2017: 146) emphasizes that it is crucial to ask what, exactly, is being maintained? We want to maintain, care for, and develop the independent open access publishing model initiated by our predecessor Timo Kallinen and developed further by Matti Eräsaari. We subscribe to the open access mission of Suomen antropologi (see Graan et al. 2018) committed to diversity, transparency, genuine open access with no article-processing-fees or embargoes, and peer-reviewed research. Suomen antropologi is a general anthropology journal that publishes texts in anthropology and related disciplines. We particularly encourage the use of Suomen antropologi as a publishing venue for material by scholars working outside the academic mainstream—whether from other ‘small countries’ like Finland or non-English speaking countries, or those working in new or under-represented research areas. As an ‘indie journal’ we are also interested in publishing experimental work, such as collaborations between researches and artists.
Suomen antropologi is funded by membership payments of the Finnish Anthropological Society and a small public grant paid by the Finnish Federation of Learned Societies (TSV), which also provides the open source publication platform. All members of the editorial team have equal access to the platform, which is jointly controlled by TSV and the society’s board—thus ensuring that no member of the team can exclude the others. The editors of the journal work on a voluntary basis, while the editor-in-chief can be paid an honorarium, providing there is money left by the end of the year, which has usually not been the case. The technical staff, namely the editorial secretaries, language editor, and type setter are paid for their work.

This is the spirit we want to maintain, and we look forward to work with the editorial team composed of editors Matti Eräsaari, Laura Huttunen (Tampere University), Anna-Riikka Kauppinen (Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies), and Patricia Scalco (University of Helsinki), editorial secretaries Ville Laakkonen (Tampere University) and Saara Toukolehto (University of Groningen), book review editor Pekka Tuominen (University of Helsinki), language editor Marianna Keisalo (University of Helsinki), and typesetter Maija Räisänen.

In addition to keep on doing what the previous editors-in-chiefs and editorial teams have done, we aim to develop the editorial processes of the journal so that new people can join the editorial team as smoothly as possible. In practice, this means writing instructions, documenting workflows, and codifying various aspects of the day-to-day running of the journal. These instructions and documents are stored on a shared digital workplace (a wiki space) used by the editorial team. In other words, we aim to make ourselves as easy to replace as possible. Related to this, and in cooperation with the editorial team, we are writing new instructions for our peer-reviewers, whose volunteer work makes scientific publication possible in the first place.

We are also interested in experimenting with and developing peer-review and the genres of academic publications. We will return to these themes in later issues.

THE NEW EDITORIAL BOARD

Together with Matti Eräsaari and the rest of the editorial team, we decided to expand the editorial board of our journal. The editorial board is a consultative body consisting of researchers who endorse the journal and its mission, and whom the editorial team can ask for help, for example, in finding suitable reviewers or solving ethical dilemmas. Members of the
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The previous editorial board consisted of Melissa Demian (University of St Andrews), Karen Fog Olwig (University of Copenhagen), Alberto Gomes (La Trobe University), Sarah Green (University of Helsinki), Chris Gregory (Australian National University), Martin Holbraad (University College London), Donna P. Hope (The University of the West Indies), Yasmine Musharbash (The Australian National University), Joel Robbins (University of Cambridge), Minna Ruckenstein (University of Helsinki), Donatella Schmidt (University of Padova), and Borut Telban (Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts). All of them agreed to keep on working with us and stay on the board.

We decided to expand the board in order to broaden the thematic, theoretical, and regional expertise of its members. Additionally, we wanted to include board members from all Finnish universities where anthropology is taught, as well as include more early career scholars. We are happy to announce the new board members, who are:

Wale Adebanwi (University of Pennsylvania), Henni Alava (Tampere University), Indira Arumugam (National University of Singapore), Kirsten Bell (University of Roehampton), Hande Birkalan-Gedik (Frankfurt University), Čarna Brković (University of Göttingen), Sophie Chao (University of Sidney), Kimberly Chong (LSE), Carlo Cubero (Tallinn University), Antonia Gama (independent scholar), Ilana Gershon (Indiana University Bloomington), Andy Graan (University of Helsinki), Fiona Hukula (Pacific Islands Forum), Welyne Jeffrey Jehom (University of Malaya), Timo Kallinen (University of Eastern Finland), Eeva Keskiäla (Tallinn University), Mari Korpela (Tampere University), Mwenda Ntarangwi (Calvin College), Minna Opas (University of Turku), Katja Pettinen (Mount Royal University), Malgorzata Rajtar (Polish Academy), Dayabati Roy (University of Helsinki), Irja Seurujärvi-Kari (Dutkansearvi & University of Helsinki), Marissa Smith (De Anza College), Rachel Spronk (University of Amsterdam), Alice Stefanelli (Durham University), Sirpa Tenhunen (University of Jyväskylä), Olga Ulturgasheva (University of Manchester), Paige West (Columbia University), Pirjo Kristiina Virtanen (University of Helsinki), and Johanna Ylipulli (Aalto University).
THE NEW ISSUE

This issue consists of two research articles, ‘Anti-sedentarism and the anthropology of forced migration’ by Nicholas Parent (McGill University) and ‘Emotional tapestry of Arctic cities: Emotions of senior citizens at the Swedish-Finnish border’ by Tatiana Zhigaltsova (Northern (Arctic) Federal University), a book forum marking the re-publication of *Culture and History in the Pacific* (ed. Jukka Siikala 2021 [1990]), a research report, namely the *lectio precursoria* by Jaanika Kingumets (Tampere University), and book reviews by Eeva Berglund, Agnese Bankovska and Nora Repo-Saeed (Independent scholar).

In his review article ‘Anti-sedentarism and the anthropology of forced migration’, Nicholas Parent makes a theoretical contribution to the anthropology of migration and movement. Drawing on existing work, Parent presents a genealogy of ‘anti-sedentarism’, namely a critique of the more or less implicit ‘sedentarist bias’ in anthropology and social sciences. This sedentarist bias, in his reading, over-emphasizes and unduly naturalizes conceptions of rootedness, boundedness, and territoriality. In his article, Parent shows how the ‘cultural turn’, critiques of notions of the ‘field’, and 1990s anthropology of space and place laid the groundwork for the theoretical insights in studies of forced migration and displacement, which in different ways critiqued sedentarism as a human baseline and essentializing conceptions of place-based identities. Through a detailed reading of selected ethnographies of forced migration as well as their critiques, Parent goes on to develop the concept of ‘anti-sedentarism’. Parent argues that insights drawn both from critiques of essentialized rootedness and their counter-critiques allow for more nuanced perspectives into forced migration and displacement, for example, by showing how displaced people continue to hold strong ties to former places while fashioning their identities based on present conditions and actively creating relations to the new places they inhabit.

Our second research article also focuses on questions of place, belonging, boundaries, and movement. While Parent develops these themes in a review article, Tatiana Zhigaltsova’s article ‘Emotional tapestry of Arctic cities’ is based on her qualitative and quantitative research among senior citizens in the neighboring, or ‘twin’, cities of Haparanda (Sweden) and Tornio (Finland). Zhigaltsova situates her research within emotional geography and the study of people’s emotional relations to past and present places. Through research conducted in both cities, as well as her previous research on urban belonging, Zhigaltsova creates emotional maps, or ‘tapestries’, of the cities as experienced by senior citizens. Related
to Parent’s discussion, Zhigastlova shows that people’s relations with the city are based on attachments to particular places, sorrow over lost or degraded ones, and, crucially, on movement between the places. Indeed, for senior citizens of both cities, the attachment to the city is based on activity, emotional relations to places beyond the city, and moving between the urban and surrounding rural environment. Accordingly, Zhigastlova’s interlocutors from both cities relate also to the border between the cities and their movement across it.

Both Parent and Zhigaltsova, whether drawing theoretical insights from a large body of literature or through detailed research on a particular case, stress the importance of recognizing the nuanced relations people have with past and present places, of movement, and the multiple evaluations and emotions created by places, placedness, displacement, and migration.

We also feature a book forum marking the open access republication of *Culture and History in the Pacific* (ed. Jukka Siikala, 2021 [1990]). The volume was originally published by the Finnish Anthropological Society based on a symposium held in Helsinki in 1987. Well-known anthropologists of Oceania, such as Aletta Biersack, Roger Keesing, Marilyn Strathern, and Valerio Valeri contributed to the volume, which, however, remained hard to get hold of outside Finland. In collaboration with the Helsinki University Press, we worked to re-publish the volume in digital open access and as a print-on-demand book.

Is there, however, a ‘best before’ date to anthropological knowledge and what are the merits of republication? In the book forum Martha Kaplan (Vassar College), Alex Golub (University of Hawai‘i), and Nayahamui Michelle Rooney (Australian National University) delve into these questions. Martha Kaplan, who reviewed the original publication (see Kaplan 1992), assesses the republication and her original review. Kaplan notes that the themes she identified, namely a ‘structure and history approach’, a Marxist-inspired analysis of systems and hegemony, and the theme of representation remain as important as ever. In 1992 Kaplan had hoped for more engagement with colonialism and Christianity, themes that anthropologists from and working in Oceania have since picked up. Now, 30 years down the line, Kaplan reminds us that the perilous, and history-making, environmental problems cannot be ignored. As Oceanic scholars have noted, inhabitants of Oceania are among the first to experience the existential questions posed by climate change (Teaiwa 2018).

Both Alex Golub and Nayahamui Rooney relate the volume to persons that have borne a special significance to the history and anthropology of Oceania and to the writers themselves. Alex Golub examines the ‘culture and history’ turn in the anthropology of Oceania through his mentor,
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Marshall Sahlins (1930–2021), who passed away shortly before this volume was republished. Sahlins was a major scholar in establishing the direction of historical anthropology, in which the original volume was situated. In his essay, Golub presents a (sub)disciplinary history of the rise, peak, and cresting of the scholarly wave of historical anthropology advanced by Sahlins and the authors of the volume. As a student of Sahlins and a professor at the University of Hawai‘i in Mānoa, Golub reflects also on the absence of indigenous Oceanic voices in *Culture and History in the Pacific* and what might be the value of Chicago and Helsinki to anthropologists from Oceania.

In her essay, Nayahamui Rooney first discusses the limits and merits of *Culture and History in the Pacific*. She then focuses on Marilyn Strathern’s contribution to the volume on ‘artefacts of history’. Rooney’s use of Strathern’s text is two-fold: first, she discusses, on a more general level, questions of hegemony, gender, and whose perspective counts in the anthropology of Oceania—which has long been dominated by outsider accounts, but where indigenous voices keep growing stronger. Secondly, she examines these questions in practice on an intimate level by discussing the life, and death, of her mother Nahau Kambuou Rooney (1945–2020). Nahau Rooney, born on Manus Island, was a woman of renown, a local leader, and an MP in Papua New Guinea’s parliament. In fact, she was one of the three first women to be elected into the parliament in the first post-independence elections of 1977. Nahau Rooney was also an indigenous critic of Margaret Mead, who had conducted research on Manus, and of anthropology in general. Nayahamui Rooney examines her mother’s life, and funeral, as ‘artefacts of history’ in a Strathernian sense and weaves together an analysis of women’s role as leaders on Manus, on anthropological knowledge production, and on the possibilities afforded by the republication of *Culture and History in the Pacific*.

Our issue includes also a research report, or a *lectio precursoria*, namely the lecture given by a doctoral candidate at their public defense. In her lectio, Jaana Kingumets (Tampere University) presents her doctoral dissertation, which examines how Soviet-era speakers of Russian establish relations to, and their home in, the Estonian city of Narva, where the majority of inhabitants are Russian speakers. Kingumets examined ‘home-making’ among Narvans, who had been born elsewhere—of Russian, Ukraininan, Belorussian and Kazakh origin among others—but did not consider themselves migrants. Amid significant changes from the Soviet-era to Estonia’s current position as an EU member, Russian speakers have made Narva their home through various dwelling practices, such as berry-picking and building *dachas*. Kingumets also discusses the difficult position
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of many Narvans in independent Estonia, whose citizenship they may lack, but who, partly thanks to international attention, the Estonian state and civil society have come closer to regard Russian speakers as equal to the Estonian population. Kingumets’ timely and important research discusses many of the same questions as the research articles and the forum, thus drawing our issue together into a well-rounded entity.


TUOMAS TAMMISTO AND HEIKKI WILENIUS,
Editors-in-Chief
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