

## EDITOR'S NOTE

---

This issue of *Suomen Antropologi* is themed loosely around phenomena connected with tensions between local and global in the twenty-first century. The first contribution, by Irja Seurujärvi-Kari (University of Helsinki), is titled, 'We are no longer prepared to be silent': The making of Sámi indigenous identity in an international context'. In this article, the author, herself a Sámi, reviews the events and initiatives of recent decades which have contributed to the formulation of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, finally adopted in 2007. Drawing on her own long involvement with international indigenous rights and interviews with key indigenous players in the movement, Seurujärvi-Kari also explores the emergence of indigenous identity as 'a valued status with material and spiritual significance'.

From indigenes on an international stage to the migration of peoples from birthplace to new homelands—both examples of the extension of human movement and social activity across geo-political boundaries currently referred to as transnationalism. Two research reports set the stage for our 'Extended Forum' on issues connected with transnational kinship which follows them. The first, by Carlo Cubero (University of Tallinn), titled 'Picturing Transnationalism: Towards a cinematic logic of transnationalism', addresses an issue long faced by all anthropologists engaged in ethnographic fieldwork, that of how to explore concepts that is social scientific rather than local in origin. This problem is greatly compounded, as Cubero describes, by his choice of film as the medium of engagement with the audio-visual dimensions of transnationalism. This thoughtfully reflexive paper is followed by a brief essay by Mara Mabilia (University of Padua)—'Contrasting Tanzanian and Italian Perspectives on Motherhood and Mothering'—in which she reminds readers of variations in approach to a central concept in any kinship system, that of maternity. In drawing comparisons between her fieldwork among the Magogo and her own Italian society, Mabilia notes the fundamental disparity in almost every aspect of maternity, from the social preparation of young girls for future motherhood to child-care arrangements.

Mabilia's paper raises just one example of a multiplicity of divergences in understandings that dog the efforts of 'host' nations and incoming 'other' nationals to reach agreement on transnational connections that fall under the rubric of kinship. The Extended Forum—'Transnational Connections and the Idiom of Kinship'—explores a range of issues emerging from different ways bureaucracies and immigrants understand who is and who is not a family member. The Forum begins with a paper by Petri Hautaniemi (University of Helsinki) which compares the relatively uniform Finnish kinship trope of 'household' with much broader and more fluid understandings of kin-relatedness among Somali immigrants. He notes that the increasing use of biotechnology in the form of DNA testing has not served to clarify family relations for purposes of reunification—and nor has it helped reduce the bureaucratic backlog. Claudia Fonseca and Denise Jardim (Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul) expand upon and generalize the Finland-specific issues raised by Hautaniemi, paying particular attention to the way

#### EDITOR'S NOTE

that rigid state definitions of family may divert family reunification from its original humanitarian intentions, producing a form of symbolic violence that separates rather than unites kin. Esben Leifsen (Norwegian University of Life Sciences) and Alexander Tymczuk (University of Oslo) continue the discussion by suggesting that a solution to what seems an intractable problem might be found if the connection between kinship and localization were reconsidered; kinship should be reconceptualized in terms of process, with priority given to the ways care constitutes relatedness and connectivity structures care. Anna-Maria Tapaninen (University of Helsinki) likewise notes the underlying dissonance in conceptions of family which are not appropriately addressed by prioritizing the biological over the social with DNA testing and adds her view that anthropologists, who might be expected to greatly contribute towards solving these dilemmas, do not help the situation by their frequent 'refusal to engage with what they see as reductive views of social relations that are claimed to be universal-cum-natural'. Finally, Barbara Yngvesson (Hampshire College) ties the various perspectives together with her analysis of transnational adoption over recent decades in which she focuses on both the practices of adopting nations/families and also on the selective 'production of adoptability' in nations which have traditionally been 'senders' of adoptees. Echoing the concerns of other Forum contributors with the bureaucratic inflexibility of notions of 'family', Yngvesson records—in what may be an optimistic note for the future—an increasing grass-roots tendency among adopting families in the transnational process to insist on more open approaches to the adopted child's 'past', thereby forging links with its pre-adoptive kin, flexibly defined, and concurrently extending bounded Western notions of 'true' family.

I would like to conclude by mentioning that *Suomen Antropologi: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society* is currently looking for two sub-editors to assist in generating material, arranging for its review, assisting and liaising with writers, language editing and so on. This does not have to be a Helsinki-based position; if you are interested, please contact the editor-in-chief.

MARIE-LOUISE KARTTUNEN  
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF  
marie-louise.karttunen@helsinki.fi