

Contested Indigenous Sámi Rights and Public Dispute –

How the ILO Convention No. 169 became rejected in Finland

Veli-Pekka Lehtola

Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
Legislation created a new group of “Lapps” – “Knowledge” of Sámi? – Background: Sámi – minority and indigenous people	
SÁMI RIGHTS – DICTATORIAL POWER?	19
Oppressive legislation? – Rival histories – Freezing ratification – Menacing atmosphere – Proposal at last	
WHO IS SÁMI?	39
Identities in the archives – Minority oppresses minority? – “Why are you setting boundaries?” – Wanna be a Sámi? Just do it! – Case 1: “Why water down the difference between them?”	
CONTESTED HISTORIES OF LAPLAND	61
Forgotten population group? – Case 2: How to conquest Sámi history Sámi lineage in borderlands – Borderlands identity – Case 3: Cultural heritage of Kemi Lapland?	
“ADAM AND EVE WERE INDIGENOUS”	81
Them – illegal immigrants – Us – the most original indigenous people – Inari Sámi – an ally and a disguise ... – In the name of peace and optimism... – Case 4: Racism, Lehtola and police	
THE VOICE OF A MOSQUITO DOES NOT CARRY UP TO HEAVEN?	109
“National solution of Finland” – “The proceedings are really not democratic” – “This must not be approved in this chamber” – Expertise from Lapland – Case 5: Good minority – troublesome indigenous people	
SILENCE – A HUMBLE MODE OF RESISTANCE	138
“For my part, everybody can be...” – Sámi rights? Local interests!	
CONCLUSION	154
Own courses of action?	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	167

Introduction

Finland's Parliament House in Helsinki, March 2015. The *Čahppes ráidu* (Black string of people¹) protest procession arranged by Sámi youth arrives at the Parliament House from the Senate Square. Some of the young people are clad in black waste bags and their faces are painted with white and eyes with black paint. They are leading people in Sámi costumes tied in rope collars. Some of the young people have their Sámi costumes inside out, which has traditionally signified a silent demonstration.

“The goal is to raise the issue of what will become of the Sámi if legal matters aren't progressing. We [Sámi] will disappear from here”, explains Anne-Maria Magga, chairperson of the Sámi youth of Finland association. The young people have come to Helsinki to demonstrate their support for two Sámi-related laws. The demonstrators want to point out that the views of the Sámi themselves are not respected in the drafting and passing of laws.²

One of the laws is the convention concerning indigenous and tribal peoples, or ILO convention no. 169, in independent countries of the International Labour Organisation. This international convention requires that also the Finnish government launches special actions to protect the culture, language as well as the social and economic status of Sámi people. The Sámi rights to the land and waters of their own home area are the controversial question.

The other legislative proposal concerns the Sámi definition, which has been disputed since the Sámi Parliament was founded (1995). According to the proposal by Finnish government and Sámi Parliament, Sámi themselves are capable of determining who is Sámi and who is not. The legislative

proposal wants to change a paragraph of the 1995 law, which grants Sámi identity also to those inhabitants of Lapland who have not considered to be Sámi this far.

In autumn 2014, Alexander Stubb's cabinet has included both issues in the list of projects to be enforced before new general election. During the last weeks of the parliament session, however, both proposals supported by Sámi are killed. The extended Sámi definition remains in force in the parliamentary reading by a vote of 162 to 28. The ILO convention isn't debated or ratified.

The Finnish Parliament is in chaos in March 2015 anyway. Government parties are turning against even their own proposals and legislative reforms remain unenforced in large part. With laws concerning the Sámi, however, it's only a matter of a logical continuum. They've been chewed over in various parliaments and cabinets already for 25 years. It has become clear during this time that even though the Sámi were granted cultural autonomy in the 1990s, they have no voice whatsoever in Sámi-related issues.

No wonder that minister of justice Anna-Maja Henriksson expresses her deep disappointment at the situation. "I haven't seen a circus such as this one in all these eight years", the minister of justice frets, and she isn't merely referring to the farce during the last weeks of the parliament session. In her opinion, even the big parties shouldn't be allowed to change their mind arbitrarily. "This is contrary to all rules of the game. If we weren't so close to the election, this would signify a cabinet crisis. That is how serious this matter is."³

President of Sámi Parliament, Klemetti Näkkäläjärvi, makes an even more drastic move. The chairman of the government-appointed Sámi parliamentary body announces his resignation in protest against the actions of the Finnish government in the Sámi definition issue. "Human rights took a great stride backwards in Finland", he says. "The parliament didn't have the courage to make a positive and responsible decision for basic and human rights."⁴

For a long time, Finland has been praising its progressive minority policy and, from 1995, also its indigenous people policy to the world. Now both are getting clearly stained. The Sámi emphasise that by dismissing Sámi proposals, Finland is failing to fulfil its international commitments. A week later in Finland's Arctic Strategy conference, foreign minister Erkki Tuomioja has to reassure that the ILO convention hasn't been abandoned; the process has only been delayed.

"I consider this regrettable and detrimental and I would have hoped that it could have been ratified right away", states Tuomioja. He emphasises, however, that because the international labour organisation ILO indigenous peoples convention is an international convention, the process doesn't stop at the general election. The new parliament and cabinet have to take up the ratification of the convention again. "The convention is now on the table and it has to be addressed."⁵

The new cabinet, led by the Centre Party and starting its work in early summer 2015, isn't including the ratification of the ILO convention in its governmental program, however. It hasn't courage to have another try with the issue that proved to be that controversy and confusing. Were the Sámi right after all in thinking that it was abandoned after being discussed for over 25 years?

Legislation created a new group of "Lapps"

Sámi are the indigenous people of Finland with their own democratically elected representative body, Sámi Parliament. It has been in operation already from 1973 and in cooperation with the Finnish government it has achieved significant reforms especially with Sámi languages and administration. The precursor of Sámi Parliament, Sámi Delegation, had little power in the 1970s and 1980s, therefore it could work in relatively peaceful conditions.

Changes in Finnish legislation at the turn of the 1990s strengthened the judicial status of the Sámi. They also created a dispute which has been apparent locally and to some extent nationally. Sámi rights to cultural autonomy started to materialise in the 1990s, but an especially important pursuit to

strengthen them was the discussion of ratifying the international ILO 169 indigenous peoples convention.

Now Sámi ethnicity started to interest locals even wider. People, who had earlier been considered as local Finns (“lantalainen” in Finnish, *láddeláš* in Sámi, i.e. Finnish inhabitants of Lapland), started to question the exclusive rights of Sámi to potential future benefits. The convention was ratified already in 1990 in Norway, where it was expected to increase the democratic participation and influence of locals – both Sámi and Norwegian. Instead, in Finland the ILO convention has aroused fears in local Finns that their own advantages could decrease. They’ve opposed the new Sámi rights and the Sámi Parliament, but have nevertheless tried to get into the electoral register of the parliament to receive potential benefits.⁶

They have invoked their remote Sámi roots in a manner that has acquired even mystical properties. In 2013, Aslak A. Pieski, a Sámi from Utsjoki, wondered at the situation where people “have suddenly remembered hearing from their grandmother that she had seen a strange Lapp coat when she was a child. In adult age, she had heard that it may have been great-grandmother’s paternal father’s forefather’s Lapp coat. Another boasts that one of his 256 ancestors was listed as a fisherman Lapp in the tax roll. Now there is strong evidence of Sámi identity to open the way to the Sámi Parliament electoral register.”

Often the same people, who are searching for their roots in this way, don’t accept the ILO convention. Pieski comments: “So they wear two hats: oppose the ILO convention, but enter an application to the parliament electoral register just in case. When a crow flies, it remains a crow, but it seems that a Finn can change into a Sámi during a lifetime.”⁷

Sámi have been an officially esteemed and accepted minority in Finland especially since the 1980s, and also an indigenous people since 1995 in line with international recommendations. The recent two decades have shown, however, that when there have been plans to grant more significant rights to the

Sámi, the attitude is no longer unambiguously positive. In 2015 Mikkel Näkkäljärvi, Sámi youth delegate to the United Nations, criticised the reasons for dismissing the ILO convention:

All along there have been the most fantastic reasons expressed for why the ratification of the convention shouldn't be done. There have been demands for more clarification and circumstance analysis, it has been argued that the convention is unsuited to Finland's conditions. It has been said that it will take away people's privately owned land, hinder or even stop economic growth and development in employment rate. Fears have been stirred up that it will bring a state of war in Lapland. Spreading this uncertainty has been successful: many people really don't seem to know any longer what would follow from enforcing the convention.

In reality, the convention is about protecting Sámi culture, languages, livelihoods and identity. It would also be a sign to the world that Finland is interested in how our indigenous people are doing. It would strengthen Finland's reputation as an egalitarian and fair country.⁸

In 2011 Klemetti Näkkäljärvi, chairman of Sámi Parliament, wondered in his blog at the constantly repeating claims that seem ridiculous from the Sámi point of view. They state that the modern Sámi people consist only of "reindeer Sámi who migrated from Norway to Finland", and that ratifying the ILO 169 convention would impoverish the livelihood rights of local Finns, so that they would have to ask permission from the Sámi to move freely in their home area.

These claims live in the Internet and newspaper opinion columns as well as in the activities of "Lapp culture and tradition associations", and no policies or research results from the Sámi Parliament can budge this lot.⁹

I had personally observed that the hyperspace is populated by many other beliefs and a dense collection of various interpretations of Lapland's history. I followed them half-heartedly for a long time, mainly perhaps with amusement or slight irritation. In spring 2015, I awoke to realise that when issues vital to the future of Sámi were discussed in Finland's Parliament, unfavourable decisions were justified with exactly the same reasons that I had been sneering at.

The ILO convention and Sámi definition seemed to be fairly clear issues to me and I was puzzled how the parliament or the highest decision-making body in Finland had arrived at such decisions. I was awakened by a discussion with a South-Finnish cultural researcher I had come to know as a

progressive and inquisitive person. When I expressed my wonder at the situation, he said: “That case is really quite confusing.” This view surprised me, but I knew that if it was confusing to him, it had to be confusing. I also got the same impression when discussing with Sámi acquaintances in Nordic countries, as well: they didn’t know what to think about what was happening in Finland.

In my book, I try to map 25 years of development, and how a seemingly clear issue became so confusing. What is the Sámi debate all about? One important thing is to clarify why even the Finnish parliament, despite the sanctimonious talk, has continuously ended up refusing the Sámi right to decide about their own affairs. It’s also a matter of an international convention, and by not ratifying it, Finland has received increasing numbers of complaints in the international community. Why have several Finnish cabinets and most recently the parliament in March 2015 postponed the ratification time after time? What are the perspectives that erode Finland’s international reputation as developer of legislation concerning indigenous peoples?

I’m even more interested in the modes of speech that have been used during the debate. Opponents of Sámi rights have successfully promoted the view that the Sámi Parliament is controlled by “a very small circle” of “Sámi who have migrated from Norway”, who engage in “nepotistic” policies by accepting “only their own folk” as Sámi and by restricting “the democratic opportunities” of genuine Forest Sámi to be involved in decision-making. This view has penetrated Finnish media as well as decision-makers surprisingly well. Where has this mode of speech come from and what kind of reality is it building up?

Several scientific articles have been made on this subject, even doctoral theses, but mostly in Finnish. Seija Tuulentie’s *Meidän vähemmistöimme* [Our Minority] (2001) and Erkki Pääkkönen’s *Saamelainen etnisyys ja pohjoinen paikallisuus* [Sámi Ethnicity and Northern Locality] (2008) are excellent journeys into the Sámi struggle, as well as Sanna Valkonen’s *Poliittinen saamelaisuus* [Political Sáminess] (2009). My own description here is a more popular and timely follow-up to them and, at the same time, it’s a summary of a 25 years long struggle.¹⁰

The only English monograph on the issue is *The ILO Convention No. 169 in a Nordic Context with Comparative Analysis: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, the dissertation of Tanja Joona in the University of Lapland in 2012. It is mostly limited to juridical analysis, while the treatment of social and especially contextual issues remains quite superficial.¹¹ It also represents the view that has been opposed by e.g. Sámi scholars Antti Aikio and Mathias Åhren in their article which deals comprehensively with the issue of the Sámi definition in Finland.¹² Laura Junka-Aikio has deepened this analysis as a social scientist.¹³

The publications describe how continually repeated adverse modes of speech, which do not follow the rules of normal scientific debate, may shake a national state's self-evident conceptions, such as international human rights or an indigenous people's autonomy. They also reflect the attitudes of politicians and decision-makers, where seemingly positive starting points "to protect minority cultures" can lead to most negative results for the legislative initiatives.

"Knowledge" of Sámi?

In my book, I would rather ask what knowledge and expertise the contemporary discussion and modes of speech are based on. Before the culmination of the debate, I had just published a large history volume, *Saamelaiset suomalaiset – kohtaamisia* [Sámi Finns - Encounters] 1896-1953 (SKS 2012), where I also contemplated the expertise that Finns applied in managing Sámi affairs in the first part of the previous century.

I concluded that the "knowledge of Sámi" the decision-makers and civil servants used was a mixed bag of various influences. Often it wasn't based on science, but it was influenced by old Sámi-related images, ideas of Finns as the vanguard of civilisation in the north and public pseudo-information, which was fostered by abundant popular media. A great deal of ordinary Finns – even of civil servants

on their way to Lapland – adopted their views from a very diverse field of communication, from newspapers to travel guides and text books to fiction.¹⁴

When I was writing the study, I still thought that luckily the “information” of Sámi is generated differently nowadays. Then I realised that it was still happening at the same manner. Still at the end of the 1990s, many Sámi believed that decisions important also to the Sámi, as well as the Sámi image in media, were based on “facts” and solid expertise, deliberated documents and researched information. One may ask if this confidence was caused by a strong judicial emphasis in Sámi policies or by a positive development of Sámi society till the 1990s.

Perhaps this confidence makes you wonder at the debate going on in letters to the editor and social media about ratifying the ILO convention and the Sámi definition; every inhabitant of the north, even a national beauty contestant, becomes an expert on the ILO convention. In reality, the claims that are very popular in publicity despite their dubious nature seem to have had a quite strong influence both in Finnish media and the views of decision-makers. These networks are a very essential part in the current Sámi debate on local and international arenas.

In recent years, the concept of “knowledge” has been problematized when the popular ways of argumentation and the “post-truth” discourses in internet forums, for instance, have become more visible and influential. Arthur Schopenhauer ironically named this kind of rhetoric “the art of being right”, when studying the tricks, dodges, and chicanery that people are using in order to be right in the end. According to Schopenhauer, you can generalize and exaggerate the opponent’s specific statements in order to revoke or ridicule them, to choose both facts and metaphors favourable to your own propositions, to appeal to authorities that support your claims, or to construct falsely the opponent’s conception of the matter and argue against that. Schopenhauer also reminds about becoming personal or insulting as a popular means to be right.¹⁵

To study these manoeuvres in contemporary Sámi discussion, I wanted to extend my research material to especially review local communication in the Sámi territory, such as the Sámi speaking *YleSápmi* channel on Finnish national radio and especially the local Finnish *Inarilainen* newspaper and its letters to the editor, as well as Internet sources from newspapers to opinion columns. I'll also present personal examples, because I've been involved in the affairs a few times, promoting Sámi opinions in public and signing appeals for the ILO convention.¹⁶

Due to my complicity, I thought I should declare myself partial right off the bat – I'm Sámi after all, and traditionally, in the eyes of Finns at least, a Sámi cannot be impartial in matters related to Sámi, while they can claim themselves to be impartial when investigating the Finnish-Sámi relations from their own point of view. In recent years, however, it has been emphasized that even openly political perspectives can increase the objectivity of knowledge if they succeed to reveal some biases or blind angles that have been remained invisible or unrecognized. Thus, impartiality and objectivity are not parallel concepts, but there are diverse possibilities for objectivity, as long as the evidence will not be replaced by values or ideologies.¹⁷

In order to decrease my subjectivity and to avoid starting to use tricks and dodges myself, I have tried to depict and analyse events and argumentations as transparently as possible so that the reader can follow my reasoning and assess its reliability him/herself. This has been my effort to produce justifiable and reliable knowledge about the controversies on Sámi issues that I think are in danger to remain invisible, not only in the Finnish society, but also in Nordic discussion on indigenous rights of the Sámi.

Background:

Sámi – minority and indigenous people

The Sámi are a people with a uniform origin and their own languages and culture. They live in an extensive, thousands of kilometres long zone, which extends from southern Scandinavia to the tip of the Kola peninsula in northern Russia. It's called Sámiland (Sápmi in North Sámi). The Sámi are a minority in the territories on four countries: Finland, Norway, Sweden and Russia. They are the only population recognised as an indigenous people in the European Union. According to international law, a population group is considered an indigenous people when their ancestors inhabited their territory during the time it was occupied or subsequently colonised or before the current national frontiers were born.¹⁸

After the territories were occupied and colonised, the Sámi have preserved their traditional way of life as well as their social, economic, cultural and political institutions. Special Sámi characteristics also include nine existing Sámi languages with histories dating back two or three millennia. Sámi and Finnish have developed from the same parent language, which separated in the course of changing livelihoods and lifestyles. The inhabitants of southwestern Finland or later Finns received strong Germanic influences in agriculture, for example, while the inhabitants of midlands mostly continued in hunting livelihoods. Sámi language professor Pekka Sammallahti has wittily stated that Finns are Sámi who have become Indo-European.¹⁹

Depending on the calculation method, the number of Sámi is estimated between 60,000 and 100,000 people. The best Sámi statistics have been compiled in Finland, where there are currently about 10,000 Sámi. Most of them live in Norway, where the estimate varies between 30,000 and 60,000 people. Only part of the Sámi belong in the Sámi Parliament electoral register in Norway. There are 20,000 - 30,000 Sámi in Sweden and a couple thousand in Russia.

Sámi territory in Finland consists of Enontekiö, Inari and Utsjoki municipalities and the area of Lapland's reindeer-grazing association in the Vuotso region in the Sodankylä municipality. Sámi have been the majority only in Utsjoki. North Sámi (also called Mountain Sámi) has the strongest position among Sámi languages in Nordic countries today. It's spoken in a wide region in Finland, Sweden and Norway. Also two smaller Sámi languages are spoken in Finland, Inari and Skolt Sámi. Only a couple hundred people speak these languages.

So Finnish Sámi are divided into three groups on a linguistic basis: North, Inari and Skolt Sámi. North Sámi are traditionally divided into two dialect groups, which also reflect a difference in livelihoods: speakers of the eastern dialect have been river Sámi from Utsjoki, while speakers of the western dialect have been reindeer Sámi from Enontekiö, Sompio and West Inari. Sámi languages were granted official status in 1992 in Finland, when the Sámi language act was decreed. It was renewed in 2004. The act granted Sámi people the right to receive government services in Sámi languages. The right is rarely fulfilled, however, because many civil servants don't know the Sámi languages. The law does not oblige them; it only recommends that they know the language.²⁰

Children and young people in the Finnish Sámi territory have the right to receive basic education in Sámi languages. It has also been enabled in secondary level schools as well as on the university level in the Giellagas institute in the University of Oulu. Smaller Sámi languages have been especially revitalized with language nests, and Inari Sámi have been particularly active there. A language nest is a child care method similar to a kindergarten, where small children are taught an endangered language and culture with language immersion. Language nest operation supports the transfer of language from generation to another.²¹

Sámi identity has traditionally been associated with reindeer husbandry, language and traditional way of life in the Sámi territory. They constitute the cultural background which the identity of a modern Sámi is based on. It acquires new forms, however, as the Sámi youth of Finland association describes:

Although lean-tos, huts and other traditional things belonging to Sámi culture are still part of the Sámi year-round life, we Sámi youth also have modern dwellings, porcelain toilet seats, top-class information technology gadgets, such as mobile phones and computers - - as well as modern cars, motor sledges and ATVs. Today more than half of the Sámi live outside the Sámi territory, many of them in the city areas — in principle, Helsinki is the biggest Sámi village in Finland.²²

This change is one factor in the Sámi debate when outsiders have wondered what ethnicity is all about. Today a person listed in the Sámi Parliament electoral register doesn't necessarily live in

Sámi land. A person doesn't need to know the Sámi language to be Sámi. Although a person is a reindeer herder in Finland, he or she isn't Sámi, unless the other Sámi characteristics are present.

Sámi identity cannot therefore be solely reduced to a certain characteristic, as outsiders often seem to expect. Klemetti Näkkäljärvi, chairman of Sámi Parliament, stated in 2012: "Sámi culture isn't merely good or non-existent language skills. Culture cannot be pruned into superficial attributes or concepts based on tax lists or language certificates. - - Sámi culture is a way of life, and in addition to Sámi language, it includes traditional livelihoods, knowledge of tradition, epic tradition, yoik, community history, values, customs and social system."²³

Defining Sámi identity is based on *objective* characteristics, such as language or kinship. *Subjective* characteristics are equally important in ethnic Sámi identity. Individual self-identification or a person's own identification with a group is an essential condition of belonging to an ethnic group, but so is group identification. The community itself must have the right to define who belong to it. This creates the feeling of "us", the idea of a shared group that makes the members of a certain group aware of their *shared dissimilarity*. They feel they share the same culture and same identity, which is different from other groups.

They have a consciousness of a common heritage with their *own people* and a language that strengthens both community with "us" and difference from "them". The essential thing today is, however, the affinity of the ethnic group, which is also central to the definition of an indigenous people. With ethnic groups, we speak of relationships between living persons, where kinship and common cultural heritage are in a vital role.²⁴

Siida or Lapp village system is considered the basic historical form of Sámi society. The network of villages still covered the whole Sámi territory in early 18th century. The term Lapp village referred to a certain area inhabited by Sámi, which was bordered from other Lapp villages with strict agreements. Lapp villages also constituted the administrative system in northern Sweden at that time. Later the Kemi Lapland siida was located in Finnish territory, and it covered approximately the

current Lapland province, excluding Utsjoki and Käsivarsi (northwest Lapland), which belonged to Tornio Lapland.

The lands and waters of Lapp villages were used by clans or families, which lived scattered on their Lapp taxation lands for most part of the year, but gathered to the common winter village for midwinter. All common social activities of the community were conducted there. The operation of Lapp villages has been reconstructed later in studies, and there's no reliable knowledge of whether all Sámi had winter villages, for example.

The Lapp village system has been considered a form of Sámi self-government, even autonomic government. It crumbled gradually from the end of the 17th century, when Nordic societies took the territories over. Old Lapp village usufructs were often changed into private new farm properties. The Sámi debate has been accompanied by a disagreement whether the Lapp villages owned the lands and waters, i.e. do Sámi have rights from time immemorial to their historical territories. Sámi Parliament has emphasised that the burden of proof lies with the government, which has not been able to prove its own right of ownership.²⁵

When Sámi have laid claims to the land use of the Sámi territory, they have also proposed an administrative return to the Lapp village system (see chapter 1). On the other hand, the counter-movement to Sámi, so-called neo-Lapps, started to establish "Lapp village associations" in the 1990s and implied that they were continuation to the Lapp village heritage.

The current Sámi government is based on a different model, which took shape on the basis of the Finnish government in the 1970s. The highest political body of the Sámi is their parliament *Sámediggi* or Sámi Parliament. In Finland, it was founded already in 1973 under the name Sámi Delegation, which changed into Sámi Parliament after the Nordic example in 1995. 21 members and four deputies are elected from among the Sámi in elections organised every four years. The most important organs in the Parliament are the Plenum, executive Board and full-time chair. Additionally, the Parliament appoints numerous expert committees for different sectors.²⁶

Founding the Sámi Parliament in 1995 was related to a wider cultural autonomy that the Finnish government granted to Sámi. This gives Sámi Parliament authority to decide such things as directing funds to teaching material production, social services in the Sámi language and supporting culture. According to the Sámi Parliament law, civil servants should hear the parliament more extensively in matters that concern the Sámi “in a far-reaching and significant way”. Many think, however, that this hearing doesn’t work out very well compared to Norway, for example, where civil servants are obliged to consider the Sámi parliament. Finnish Sámi Parliament does not have actual jurisdiction over the land use of traditional Sámi territories, for example.

Modern Sámi identity is no longer committed to traditional livelihoods or way of life as strongly as before. The traditional Sámi livelihoods have been reindeer husbandry, fishing and hunting, but most Sámi acquire their income outside the traditional livelihoods. Land use in the Sámi territory is nevertheless an important factor as a foundation of the whole Sámi culture. According to the ILO convention, for example, the unique culture, identity and way of life of indigenous peoples are “shaped by their traditional territories and natural resources and closely connected to them.” Therefore, rights to the land use and environment are important to indigenous peoples. The Sámi youth of Finland association has stated:

In the current system, Sámi affairs, such as fishing rights, issues related to reindeer husbandry and education, are decided by others than Sámi themselves. Sámi self-determination is rather artificial and doesn’t provide any real possibility to decide about their own affairs. One of the greatest challenges today is to achieve true self-government in affairs that justifiably cannot be decided by anyone else but the Sámi themselves.²⁷

According to the youth, the self-government granted to the Sámi in Finland in 1995 extends in practice as far as consensus with different authorities. It’s threatened by competing ways of land use from tourism to mining, and ultimately the government has free rein in these respects. For the Sámi, control over land use is a question of the foundation of the whole cultural environment, which is equally important as Sámi languages and the rest of the cultural heritage.

Questions related to land use and Sámi self-determination are precisely the hot potato that crystallises the debates on defining Sámi identity and the ILO convention.

There have been attempts to develop Sámi self-government in all Nordic countries from the 1980s. They have their own administrative institutions, specifically Sámi Parliament, which was founded in Norway and Sweden at the turn of the 1990s. Favourable development was based on active Sámi-related legislation, which has resulted in fruitful development on local and regional levels. Enforcing legally stipulated Sámi policy decisions predominantly on municipal and provincial levels has led to the emergence of new local and regional institutions.²⁸

Sámi parliaments are among the most important influences in the public sector of their home area, but the official service apparatus cannot serve special groups sufficiently. Therefore, civic activity organised in associations is lively also in the Sámi society. Associations often belong to national or Nordic umbrella organisations. Saami Council (Sámiráđđi) functions as the international cooperation body of Sámi communities involved in civic activities.

Saami Council is a cooperation body of Norwegian, Swedish, Finnish and Russian Sámi, which distributes and administers cultural subsidies to organisations and promotes visions of cultural policy. Saami Council has also striven to foster the competence and community activities of Russian indigenous peoples. The success of Sámi has traditionally been based on wider connections, which have extended to national and international levels, from the Nordic Sámi community to cooperation to with indigenous peoples.²⁹

Sámi have been active in the cooperation between indigenous peoples, which has developed into a global network since the 1970s. Saami Council especially has taken a strong role in the UN indigenous peoples work, for example in the Permanent Forum of Indigenous Issues. Indigenous people status can influence national legislation through international law. Saami Council's special priority is international influence through the UN to national levels. It has occasionally even come into conflict with the Sámi Parliaments, whose official cooperation in the Nordic countries mainly takes place in joint forums of parliament presidents.³⁰

Sámi culture is a matter of pride for many people, because different forms of Sámi art, for example, are well-known even internationally. In the field of culture, signs of becoming established include regular festivals and events, which are venues for varied encounters.

The development of Sámi government and culture has made Sámi identity a positive or even emulated thing. The current strong position of the Sámi is reflected in the way new kinds of struggles are fought over their (real or imagined) rights. The heritage of the Sámi movement has become challenged in many ways especially in the 2000s.

Chapter 1

Sámi rights – dictatorial power?

Finland was a pioneer in the 1970s when it founded a dedicated Sámi parliament or *Sámi delegation* (Saamelaisvaltuuskunta) already in 1973, as the first Nordic country.³¹ In Norway, for example, the old tradition of assimilation policy or Norwegianisation was still strongly felt, although young Sámi had begun to move against it. The Sámi policy of the Norwegian government didn't change until the struggle over the Alta-Kautokeino waterway dam at the turn of the 1980s. The Alta Conflict was one of the most remarkable societal controversies in Nordic countries which has been studied a lot.³²

In Finland, awareness of Sámi rights especially at the turn of the 1970s resulted in the emergence of committees and proposals discussing the status of the Sámi language. The radical movement of Sámi youth wanted to bring up also social issues, such as land and water rights. They had plans for a national Sámi organisation to support their claims, as the Sámi in Norway and Sweden already had. The political pressure could be a reason for Finland's cabinet, led by the Centre Party in 1971, to found a state committee to discuss a rational way to deal with Sámi issues.

Committees had convened before, but reports had not yielded perceptible results. Work in the Sámi committee did, however, result in the birth of a democratically elected representational body, Sámi Delegation. A test election was organised already in autumn 1972, before the committee work ended. The committee report, which was published in 1973, was a comprehensive document and a certain kind of programme for the new Parliament.

The report specified that the most important goals of Sámi policy were to protect Sámi rights to their livelihoods, to achieve official status for the Sámi language in Finland and to secure the status of the

Sámi in Finnish legislation and administrative system. In a wider perspective, the goal was a Sámi Act which would enable extensive Sámi government in the Sámi territory, including land and water rights.³³

The starting points were difficult: the Delegation had been assigned the task to oversee Sámi rights, but it wasn't provided with authority or sufficient resources for this task. Authorities weren't obligated to listen to Sámi opinions. The operation of the Sámi Delegation was largely reactive in the 1970s and 1980s: usually it presented statements on projects that were already in preparation. Significant results were achieved mainly in language and school politics. A Sámi school affairs planner was appointed in Lapland's State Provincial Office. The status of the Sámi language was considerably strengthened in primary and upper secondary school legislation.

Among the most successful undertakings of the Sámi Delegation was the proposal of the Sámi language act, which came into power in 1992 in Sámi territory municipalities. Compared to the similar act in Norway, however, it was a compromise in many respects: Sámi language skills were not required of civil servants, it was only a recommendation. The enforcement of the act especially in local level was to cause problems especially because of the attitudes of civil servants. Anyhow, the act did raise the status of the Sámi language among outsiders as well as Sámi.³⁴

At the same time, the Sámi Act or the question of governing the lands and waters in the Sámi territory was carefully considered in many committees all through the 1970s and 1980s. The Advisory Board of Sámi Affairs, fronted by provincial governor Asko Oinas, prepared a proposal for a Sámi Act and submitted it to minister of employment Matti Puhakka before midsummer 1990. The starting point was that the so-called state lands in Sámi territories not included in the farm system would constitute Sámi common land, an undivided land and water territory, which would be managed by a Sámi governing body consisting of Lapp villages. Lapp village referred to the basic unit of the ancient Sámi society, which paid joint Lapland tax.

According to the Sámi Act, private rights, such as the fishing rights of farms and rights belonging to reindeer, natural livelihood and Skolt farms, would remain as they were. Governor Oinas explained the nature of the proposal:

“These arrangements wouldn’t detract from any private person’s property or established right concerning a livelihood. All other legal land usage, fishing and movement of the local population would also remain unchanged. Municipalities would also retain authority in town planning and construction matters.”³⁵

Despite reassurances, the published draft law aroused “astonishment” and “irritation” especially among those who used nature and resources in the Sámi territory. Newspaper headlines reported the reactions: “Sámi Act would decrease hunting possibilities of inhabitants”, “Sámi Act proposal astonishes hunters and fishermen in Inari”. In local newspapers, Sámi claims were compared to the apartheid politics of South-Africa and there were fears that the situation could become similar to Northern Ireland. Letters to the editor snapped: “Sámi Act is a new oppression law”.³⁶

Opponents considered that the act would create inequality among local population groups. Local nature users were worried about their fishing and hunting rights. Change from the Finnish National Board of Forestry role to Sámi government preoccupied many people. There were fears that the Sámi territory would change into a “reservation” if it was handed over to the Sámi. An old fear spread on the local level that the Finns in the region would be exiled from their land and hunting rights.

Matti Morottaja, former chair of the Sámi Delegation, regarded the fuss as a sign that the importance of Sámi government had increased. Back in the 1970s, the Sámi Act didn’t rouse great emotion and passion: “The idea was perhaps considered so utopian that the local majority population, for example, didn’t take it quite seriously.” Now the Sámi Delegation had become a power factor. It was seen as a threat that would change circumstances both in land ownership and reindeer husbandry. On the other hand, Finns already believed in its possibilities to bring benefits and so they wanted to secure also their own benefits.³⁷

Commotion against the Sámi Act and the contradictory statements had the effect that the ministry of the interior was ready to freeze the draft law. Minister of justice, Hannele Pokka, also thought that it would cause more problems than it would solve. However, Pokka wanted to develop certain proposals of the draft law separately, such as transforming the decree-based Sámi Delegation into a statutory Sámi Parliament.³⁸

On this basis, Sámi Delegation proposed two committees. Sámi Delegation itself would clarify land ownership issues and problems related to the ratification of the ILO convention on indigenous peoples. The ministry of justice appointed its own committee to discuss Sámi-related administration and constitutional status. The committee view was that the equal treatment of Sámi as an indigenous people would become implemented when they were constitutionally decreed their own ethnic cultural autonomy or cultural self-government. The resources of the Sámi representational body had to be increased and it had to be granted more authority to decide about their own affairs. Also, it had to have a direct right of initiative in Finnish parliament in issues concerning the Sámi.³⁹

The model now was Norway, where Sámi parliament had started in 1989 and had turned out to be a strong local and national influence. The Norwegian government granted it significant rights and it sought to build cooperation with local Norwegians. Norwegian Sámi policy had made a complete about-turn in the 1980s. The Alta conflict had smeared Norway's reputation internationally, and it started to investigate Sámi rights to remedy the situation. The result was the Sámi language act and the founding of the Sámi parliament at the end of the 1980s. Norway also ratified the ILO convention among the first countries in 1990 and recognised the Sámi as an indigenous people. The best-known consequence of the ILO convention in Norway was the Finnmark Act (2004), which gave the former state-owned lands in the region to the possession of the local Sámi and Norwegians.⁴⁰

Finland also had plans to implement new legislation to ensure better possibilities for the Sámi to be involved in the preparation of affairs concerning them. In spring 1995, the cabinet completed

proposals for cultural autonomy laws. The status of the Sámi as an *indigenous people* in Finnish legislation was ratified in them for the first time.

The cultural autonomy of the Sámi ended up consisting of three separate laws in 1995. The law about changing Finland's constitution granted the Sámi as an indigenous people the right to autonomy over their own language and culture in their home area. At the same time, Finnish parliament passed laws on the Sámi parliament and the use of the Sámi language with authorities.⁴¹

Oppressive legislation?

Finland's Parliament House in February 1995: A citizen's delegation has arrived from Enontekiö to demonstrate against the Sámi rights that are being discussed in parliament. The aim is to enact the legislation for establishing the Sámi cultural autonomy. The members of the delegation call themselves "Lapps" and some of them are dressed in pseudo-Sámi costumes. This event means a beginning for a long process of appropriation of the concept "Lapp" to a local group which has been usually considered to be Finnish.

The demonstrators gathered on the parliament house steps carrying posters: "Is the parliament blessing a civil war starting in Lapland?", "Adam and Eve were indigenous, and "Why an oppressive law only to the North?". There have been acrimonious writings in newspapers, where the Sámi parliament act has been considered "a racial discrimination and inferior population deportation law of Northern Lapland's reservation". Northern Lapland has been compared to South Africa and Nazi Germany. The draft law is regarded as a conspiracy and "a Trojan horse" which is used for covertly enforcing the old Sámi Act and for letting the Sámi to establish a dictatorship in Lapland.⁴²

Despite the demonstrations, the Finnish parliament ratifies the act, but it's postponed after the elections. In June 1995, both Sámi representatives and opponents of the act gather at Finland's Parliament House to wait for the parliament decision. The culture and self-government package is

ratified by a vote of 159 to 20. Five of the members of Finnish parliament from Lapland oppose the act, three are in favour. Chairman of Sámi Parliament, Pekka Aikio, is pleased to say that the Sámi have “good reason to be proud of Finland as a leading country in the commonly narrow path of implementing human rights.”⁴³

The *Sámediggi* or Sámi Parliament, starting in 1996, continues the work of the former Sámi delegation with slightly better resources. It gets a full-time chairman or president. The parliament itself can also distribute the funds to support Sámi culture; previously the Finnish ministry of education decided on these funds. That’s about all the power the new legislation has to offer for the Sámi. Authorities still don’t have to consult Sámi Parliament in affairs concerning the Sámi territory.

44

Similarly, the proposed direct right of initiative to the Finnish parliament has been dropped off the bill. The Sámi Parliament still isn’t granted more political power; it remains an advisory body. The new president of the Sámi Parliament, Pekka Aikio, assumes that minister of justice Jyri Häkämies watered down the reform, because he didn’t want the Sámi to have a right of initiative that would overtake the cabinet.⁴⁵

Many Sámi suspect that “the mention of Sámi cultural autonomy that will possibly be entered in Finland’s constitution will remain just a declaration”.⁴⁶ Opponents of the draft law state, however, that they will continue the fight to repeal the law. They found a new organisation, “A Lappish Culture and Tradition Association”, in Enontekiö with the purpose to “foster and protect Lappish culture”. It’s categorically opposed to Sámi Parliament. Journalist Jaakko Tahkolahti from the Helsingin Sanomat newspaper characterises it:

People who had before sharply criticised the operation of Sámi Delegation, the predecessor of Sámi Parliament, and had demonstratively dissociated themselves from it, gravitated to the association. In their opinion, Sámi Parliament had been a leftist political group. - - Now they said they were afraid the new laws would result in Sámi dictation policy in northern Lapland and demand that they must also be accepted as Sámi based on their family roots and the new law.⁴⁷

Chairman of the association, Jouni Eira, states that he will appeal against the ratification of the law in the European Court of Human Rights and the United Nations. That never happens. Instead, the association starts a campaign against Sámi Parliament and Sámi rights that has continued to this day. The counter-movement adopts the name Lapps to describe their identity. This faction has subsequently been called “neo-Lapps” in Sámi research.

Rival histories

Sámi were acknowledged as an indigenous people for the first time in Finnish legislation in the 1995 Sámi Parliament act and the concurrent civil rights reform. Ratifying the associated ILO convention required settling the legal status of the Sámi in a way satisfactory to the Sámi. The pain spot was land rights, which the Sámi Parliament regarded as an essential condition to the activities of traditional land use and further to all culture.

The Sámi Parliament had promised to make a land right report under Kaisa Korpijaakko’s direction and funded by the ministry of the interior. No financial support came, however. This happened although the Finnish parliament, in connection with the Sámi Parliament act, had required a quick report as a basis for ratifying the ILO convention. So the Sámi Parliament worked on the report with its own funds.

Contrary to this, the ministry of the interior started its own investigations. In 1998, it appointed its own investigator, member of the Supreme Administrative Court Pekka Vihervuori, to deliver an opinion on Sámi usufructuary rights on the state-owned land. He proposed founding a new Land Rights Council in connection with the Sámi Parliament. Four of its eight members would be appointed by the Sámi Parliament, the other four would be representatives from the municipalities in the region.

Based on Vihervuori's report, the ministry of the interior appointed a committee under the direction of provincial governor Hannele Pokka. It proposed an advisory board to control the use of state land, consisting of representatives from the government, municipalities and Sámi groups. The last-mentioned would have been a minority in the group, however, and the Sámi Parliament did not approve the proposal.⁴⁸

Since issues related to land ownership were not part of Vihervuori's assignment, only the usage of land, the ministry of justice requested Doctor of Laws Juhani Wirilander to draw a judicial assessment of land ownership conditions in the Sámi territory based on reports made so far. According to Wirilander, there was no undisputed evidence that Lapp villages owned their lands.⁴⁹

The Sámi Parliament did not approve the reports of the ministry of justice, because they had been made without hearing the views of the Sámi. The Sámi were involved neither in framing the questions for the reports, nor as any other kind of experts. According the Sámi Parliament, the problematization of the mentioned assignments was incorrect since the real question should be, if the state has undisputed evidence to be the owner of Sámi lands. Korpijaakko, for instance, stated that the annexation of Sámi lands by the states in 17th and 18th centuries had not based on legislation but decrees which the officials and civil servants started to follow.

In 2000, the ministry of justice ceased appointing requested experts to the work group supervising Sámi Parliament's own land rights investigation. Instead, it founded its own committee to prepare proposals that would clear the way for ratifying the ILO convention. It did not include experts nominated by the Sámi Parliament because it considered the Sámi to be partial when clarifying the land ownership in northern Finland.⁵⁰

The Sámi Parliament published the report of its own work group, to the effect that the lands in the Sámi territory "had been transferred from their earlier owners to the formal ownership of the state without expressed justification and without constitutional contribution". According to the report

later research information has been able to convincingly vindicate the traditional property rights of the Sámi to the lands and waters of the northern territory. Arguments presented by the government for the rights of the state are feeble and superficial compared to preceding ones, and insufficient to prove the ownership of the state from a historical viewpoint or to substantiate its legally acceptable transfer to the ownership of the state based on newer land legislation.⁵¹

In 2002, the ministry of justice started to fund a new commissioned study. A group of history and law researchers from the universities of Lapland and Oulu, led by professor Jouko Vahtola, was assigned to clarify “the settlement and demographic history, land use and land ownership conditions in former Kemi and Tornio Laplands”.

Again, the Sámi Parliament did not approve the premises of the new research. It specifically criticised the way the viewpoint of the indigenous people had been completely ignored already in the definition and tendering of the research, which was carried out without consulting the Sámi Parliament. The research frame did not even mention that the state would have to prove its ownership “on Sámi lands”, not the Sámi.⁵²

Erkki Pääkkönen has drawn attention to the peculiar premises in the ministry research project. The researchers were given a precondition that they shouldn't have “any connections to interest groups determined by the research subject”. Thus, the Sámi were consequently defined legally incompetent in their own affairs in a dispute between the Sámi and Finns. Pääkkönen states: “However, questions of legal incompetence weren't problematised in any way in the case of the researchers, who were North-Finnish and represented the majority population.” Three of them had appeared as experts when neo-Lapps petitioned for a wider Sámi definition, for example. Instead, not one Sámi or Sámi representative researcher was included.⁵³

The history work group of the ministry of justice published its report in 2006. It didn't think it had found support in its research to a view that the Sámi had owned their land. “It cannot be proved that Lapp villages had collective right to the lands of the village in Kemi and Tornio Laplands”, it stated.

“The Lapland tax of Mountain, Fisherman and Forest Lapps entered in the land register in the 19th century wasn’t - - in any part based on and proof of land and land ownership, as has been claimed.”

54

Mauno Hiltunen, a researcher in the project, later said that results from the investigation were keenly waited for, like decisions from the highest court in complicated cases. In his view, historical research “cannot however function as a court of law or truth commission, because historical knowledge cannot be used either for the present or against it”.⁵⁵ In a land law seminar arranged by the Sámi Parliament in Inari in 2008, administrative director Olli Muttilainen from the ministry of justice said that he had heard expressions of disappointment in public about the fact that the research did not solve the land ownership issue. “The assignment wasn’t based on that assumption anyway.”

Muttilainen admitted that there was some foundation in the criticism that the negotiations towards the Sámi Parliament could have been conducted better. He argued, though, that the state wasn’t officially obliged to negotiate, but such an essential project shouldn’t be started without negotiating with the Sámi. The same applied to other projects that significantly influenced the status of the Sámi.⁵⁶

It seemed, however, that there were two rivalling histories about the historical ownership of Sámi territories. The results from both of them didn’t change the general notion of the life or cultural history of Lapp villages as such, but they had a strong impact on the current Sámi debate. The Sámi Parliament stated that the rights of the Lapp villages had not been revoked by legislation, but merely in the course of a gradually evolved practice. The opinion of the ministry was that state ownership was undisputed: Lapp villages had had usufructuary rights to their lands, not property rights.

Neither party accepted each other’s interpretations but stuck firmly to their own standpoints. Ending up with two rivalling histories seemed to signify a deadlock in land rights investigations. The ownership issue of the historical Sámi territory drifted into a stalemate. The new chairman of the Sámi Parliament in 2008, Klemetti Näkkäljärvi, stated that the issue couldn’t be solved with new

investigations or models. His notion was that “we no longer need investigations, we need political will”.⁵⁷

Freezing ratification

At the same time, discussions on ratifying the ILO convention continued in public as well as in different cabinets. Its purpose was to protect the rights of the indigenous people to its language and culture in a way acceptable to the indigenous people. Control over Sámi territories was in an important role also here, although the Sámi Parliament was prepared to compromise over it in the final stages. Among the local population, however, the ILO convention was considered almost an equivalent to the Sámi Act. Therefore, it was emphatically rejected.

ILO 169 is an extensive convention involving many sectors. The judicial experts said to be noteworthy that Finland had already fulfilled the ratification requirements of the convention in many respects. Especially land law and natural resource issues were still unsolved however. In public discussion, they stood out as almost the only things that were associated with the ILO convention, as did the question who the convention applies to. The public discussion completely ignored the sections of convention, aiming to use special means to support Sámi cultural traditions, such as the customs and traditional customary law of indigenous peoples, i.e. Sámi ways of understanding their own cultural environment and the related land use, for example.⁵⁸

Another issue missing in public discussion was the essential goal in the ILO convention to create practices and structures that would help the Sámi make themselves heard. The convention would give the Sámi a better right to participate and a genuine possibility to get a strong role in decision-making in issues that influence the Sámi. The convention requires systematic, not merely sporadic negotiations with the Sámi. The parties in the negotiations are the government and the representative bodies of the indigenous peoples — in the case of Finland, Sámi Parliament and Skolt village meeting

in matters concerning the Skolt Sámi. The goal is to achieve consensus or approval to proposed actions.⁵⁹

Also practices for audition already had a point of comparison in Norway, which had ratified the convention. The Norwegian government must consult the Sámi parliament regularly in issues that influence the Sámi. This isn't a mere formality; the goal is consensus on legislation or other actions concerning or influencing the Sámi. The Norwegian government also has a separate minister and state secretary in charge of Sámi affairs.

A remarkable example of the results from the ILO convention in Norway is the Finnmark Act, which was fully enforced in 2007. Large areas of land, 90 percent of northern Norway, were consequently transferred to the care of a new administrative body (*Finnmarkeiendom*). The Finnmark Act is based on regional administration without any ethnic group in dominant position. The Sámi do have an important role in the administration, because three out of the six members of the new administrative body are appointed by the Sámi parliament, the other three by the Finnmark County Municipality. So, the Sámi haven't been granted exclusive rights in legislation over other groups.⁶⁰

In Finland, 90 percent of the land in Sámi home territory is owned by the state and the rest 10 percent is privately owned. The state-owned land is administered and cared for by the National Board of Forestry (*Metsähallitus*). ILO 169 convention supporters in Finland emphasised that the Sámi wouldn't become new owners of the land, because formal ownership isn't necessary according to the proposal to fulfil the ILO convention requirements. Ratifying the convention would not interfere with private land property, either.

According the Sámi Parliament, the convention cannot be implemented by removing rights, which are based on long-term usufruct, from other groups or individuals living in the area. The implementation of the convention would not mean creating new "land rights", but acknowledging

that the Sámi have rights to these territories through traditional land use, ownership and control. These rights exist regardless of whether the state has recognised them.⁶¹

These reassurances were not, however, believed among opponents of the Sámi Parliament. The convention was considered an attempt to get more extensive land rights or even exclusive rights over state lands to the Sámi, as was the case with the Sámi Act. The question of private property was also blurred so that the most drastic threat scenario predicted “deportation from the country” to non-Sámi inhabitants.⁶²

Ratifying the ILO convention was included in the program of many ministries and cabinets in Finnish parliament as a more or less formal item during the 2000s. For the international reputation of Finland it was an important issue, since the status of the Sámi as an indigenous people was entered in the year 2000 constitution. Finland was also involved in formulating the UN declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples and ratified it in 2007. The government committed itself through its statements to actively supervise and implement the enforcing of Sámi rights in legislation, administrative decisions and also in practice.⁶³

When President Tarja Halonen opened the quadrennial period of the Sámi Parliament in April 2008, she reminded that the cabinet of prime minister Matti Vanhanen had the objective to solve the land rights dispute during its term. Minister of justice in Vanhanen’s cabinet, Tuija Brax, hinted at a favourable attitude to ratifying the ILO convention on several occasions. On her trip to Lapland, she was also startled by the fierce opposition against the convention on the local level. She concluded that the situation was so confusing that the only possibility was to have an independent court of justice solve the dispute. Among the Sámi, this was thought to only result in a vicious circle of litigation.⁶⁴

An interesting interpretation about the necessity of ILO convention in Finland was heard from the President of the Republic, Sauli Niinistö when he visited Inari before Christmas 2011. He said: “The ILO convention has been drawn up for those countries where injustices inflicted by colonial powers

on indigenous peoples have been rectified. Finland has not been under colonial power and the ILO convention does not apply to us as such.”⁶⁵

A few weeks later he stated to Helsingin Sanomat newspaper that his opinion on the ratification is open. When opening the new Sámi Parliament term in March 2012, the president only spoke generally about the significance of the Sámi language and culture. He passed the ILO convention over quite quickly by saying: “Ratification requires, however, that national solutions can be found to issues that have proved difficult and diversified. - - In the course of years, the goal has been to find a balanced solution acceptable to all parties.”

The president seemed to emphasise the Nordic Sámi convention, the official negotiations of which had just started. Niinistö wished that the preparations of both conventions could proceed in a reconciliatory manner. The general message was that Finland should consider its international commitments in indigenous people issues only after a national and local agreement has been achieved.

66

Professor emeritus of jurisdiction, former secretary of the Supreme Court, Jyrki Virolainen, wondered at Niinistö’s views. His opinion was that the ILO convention was one of the most important international conventions concerning Finland. “If we were to follow Niinistö’s example and remained waiting for an absolute consensus about who belongs to the indigenous people and who not, it would probably be impossible to ever ratify the convention.”⁶⁷

Another question was whether important national or international conventions have been made in perfect agreement, as Niinistö seemed to expect. The president also denied the colonial history of Finland. This has been a popular argument in Finland in 2000s, which has been used to minimize the need for Sámi special rights. It’s true that there are special features in the history of Finnish Lapland that seem to support this claim, but in detailed studies, the obvious colonial structures of the Sámi policies by the Finnish state have been well argued. ⁶⁸

Menacing atmosphere

The chairman of the Sámi Parliament, Klemetti Näkkäljärvi, disagreed with Niinistö. He pointed out how the atmosphere in Finland had been growing harder towards minorities as well as immigrants. The Sámi have also had their share of discrimination and even threats. Efforts to improve the status of the Sámi have also raised wishes in the rest of the population to be recognised as Sámi based on their political views, experiences, dwelling place or ancient forefathers”, said Näkkäljärvi and continued:

Sámi culture isn't a state of mind nor does culture move or survive in genes, tax certificates or opinions. Sáminess is a connection to one's own ancestors and grandparents, reindeer pastures, fishing waters or hunting grounds, richness of language, traditional knowledge, set of values and community system. - - In Sámi culture, you grow into the knowledge, skills and experience conveyed by previous generations with guidance and example from the whole clan.⁶⁹

With a hard atmosphere, Näkkäljärvi referred to the public discussion about Sámi rights that had been going on throughout the 2000s in the press, Internet as well as everyday life. In the comment threads in media and in other Internet discussions, for example, appropriate views were often drowned in a torrent of prejudiced beliefs, which started to amplify itself as it recurred. (See chapter “Adam and Eve were indigenous”.)

Discussion about the ILO convention was characterised by duality. Plenty of expert seminars were arranged with lawyers, researchers and representatives of cabinets and Sámi organisations. There was no easy-to-follow information available about the convention, however, and this paved the way for the so-called popular logic that is characteristic to Internet discussions. Perhaps it was just this duality that created the notion of a “master's” or “elite's” project on one hand, and created a foundation for the most outlandish notions of the ILO convention on the other.

It was peculiar that when the time came to make decisions, these popular interpretations from the local and regional levels stood out and even became decisive. Antagonisms usually became sharper always when there was a turn in the convention process or when decision-makers visited Lapland. In April 2013, the parliamentary committee for constitutional law travelled to the Sámi territory to hear what the Sámi and municipalities in the Sámi territory thought about the ILO convention. Southern masters got an earful about how Lapland's affairs should and shouldn't be understood.

The tenseness of the atmosphere was reflected in a simultaneous television broadcast on current issues. Chairwoman of Enontekiö municipal board, Sari Keskitalo, was stern in the live broadcast: "It would be a state of war, if the ILO convention gets approved! - - It cannot be so that other Sámi groups can determine who can get about and use the lands." She stated:

The Sámi Parliament wants the state to give the lands back to them. Here in Enontekiö, for example, this would mean that 90 percent of the lands would change to the ownership of a small group. There would be no more reindeer herding for the descendants of local Lapps.

Another participant, chairman of the Global Indigenous Youth Caucus Tuomas Aslak Juuso, answered reassuringly: "This is clearly a misunderstanding of the ILO convention. The question is about bringing Sámi rights to the same level with others." In his opinion, the Sámi parliament didn't want to endanger anybody's existing rights.⁷⁰

Juuso referred to Norway where the convention has been ratified. "Local municipalities, provinces and the Sámi parliament have equal administration on lands in the Finnmark region in Norway. One solution could be to raise Sámi decision-making to an equal position in Lapland." He continued: "According to the UN indigenous peoples declaration, indigenous peoples have a legal right to define themselves, who belongs to them. Personally, I favour language and culture as criteria."

According to Finnish national radio, the presiding officers of the Sámi Parliament had decided not to participate the discussion on the ILO convention with representatives of the Enontekiö municipality.

In their view, the ratification concerned the Finnish government and the Sámi Parliament only. The Sámi Parliament was willing to discuss the issue in the future also in public with representatives of the Finnish government.

Chairman of the Sámi Parliament, Klemetti Näkkäljärvi, had followed the program, however, and intervened in Keskitalo's statements. "I think it's a very serious matter that the chairwoman of the Enontekiö municipal board threatens with war, if the ILO 169 convention is ratified. This isn't acceptable conduct from a municipal official and verges on incitement against an ethnic group, which is criminalised under criminal law."

In Sámi radio, even a Finnish state prosecutor was asked to comment the issue. He said: "Quite extensively interpreted, the comments are perhaps along that line, but not however - - unlawful threat in the sense of the criminal law." Instead, his view was that the comments were a sign that people were in bad terms with each other. Chairman of the constitutional law committee, Johannes Koskinen (social democrat), also thought that both sides were exacerbating the effects of the ILO convention. "Perhaps the Sámi Parliament sees that it would mean greater changes in legislation than is necessary. Lapp village representatives, on the other hand, exaggerate that it would bring some dramatic changes."⁷¹

In May, the Sámi Youth of Finland (Suoma Sámi Nuorat) association criticised the "obvious attacks against the Sámi" published in the Internet and elsewhere. They considered the impact on Sámi youth and children especially outside the Sámi territory, where they didn't have the support of the Sámi community. "I think their purpose is to create a menacing atmosphere and blur the facts, and this way prevent the ratification of the ILO convention in Finland. We cannot tolerate any kind of ethnic harassment towards the Sámi in our society", the youth appealed. The association was active also by correcting false claims and misunderstandings in the Sámi debate.⁷²

The Equality First project of the ministry of the interior arranged a conference in Inari called *Boahhtevuohta* (Future) in August 2013. The goal was to discuss the ILO convention on a practical level and consider the role of media in taming or increasing hate speech. Ombudsman for Minorities Eva Biaudet noted that a new aggressive spoken culture had emerged in Finland and discussion about it was avoided. According to her, hard criticism or somebody's hurt feelings should not be considered as hate speech, but a provoking behaviour and speech stemming from fear of diversity, frustration, rage and safety needs could overstep the boundaries defined in law.⁷³

One of the keynoters, former ILO specialist Lee Swepston, emphasised that talk about human rights and stopping discrimination eventually mean little, if they aren't actively implemented in the whole society. In the case of the ILO convention, he specifically emphasised the importance of negotiation and involvement in relationships between a government and an indigenous people.

Legal scholar Mathias Åhren from the University of Tromsø had the opinion that the difference between the Sámi and the majority population is seen more clearly in Norway than in Finland, where it would be important to educate administrators to see ethnic differences better – especially that the Sámi are a separate people of their own. Based on Norwegian ILO experiences, he emphasised that the ratification shouldn't be regarded as an especially dramatic change in rights.⁷⁴

The panel discussion brought out the view that media gives little space to different minorities. Also, media often tries to look for problems rather than answers. Journalism is often given the mission to tell about things, not to campaign for any cause. The views of minorities are easily drowned in the media of the majority, however. In 2012, Finnish UN Association published the UN declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples and the ILO general convention no. 169 as a booklet. The ministry of justice appointed a special official in charge of Sámi affairs, and legislative Counsellor Camilla Busck-Nielsen was selected to the post.⁷⁵

Also the Ombudsman for Minorities (later Non-Discrimination Ombudsman) Biaudet stated that there was uncertainty among politicians, administrators as well as private persons about the convention and its purpose. Her office compiled a popular guide *99 questions and answers about the ILO 169 convention* in 2014.⁷⁶

Proposal at last

The ILO convention had been on the table almost a quarter of a century, but it wasn't until June 2014 that a cabinet proposal was accomplished. Alexander Stubb's cabinet announced they would bring it to parliamentary proceedings during the autumn, "if the cabinet reaches agreement about the Sámi definition".⁷⁷ The cabinet emphasised that several international human rights organisations had reminded Finland of how necessary the ratification was. According to the cabinet, the proposal wasn't aimed at creating special land rights to the Sámi, but settled for the decrees allowed by the current slightly privileged position.

In October, minister of justice Anna-Maja Henriksson who had been active with the convention travelled to Lapland to explain the effects of the ratification. Her message was that it wouldn't bring any special rights to the Sámi or anybody else, i.e. there was no intention to weaken anybody's rights. Opponents of the convention were actively on the move and loudly questioned the special rights given to the Sámi as well as the Sámi definition.

Especially the group acceptance part of the Sámi definition – i.e. the demand of Sámi Parliament that the Sámi themselves should have the right to define who are Sámi – was believed to lead to arbitrary actions. Henriksson stated that it wouldn't be possible to make such an accurate definition that everybody would be satisfied, but therefore the decision could be appealed from.⁷⁸ Lapland regional radio journalist described the atmosphere in the event:

“Group acceptance is all wrong. I should be allowed to accept other Inari Lapps, my own people. People who have immigrated from Norway partly illegally are now deciding about Sámi identity”, said Risto Seppänen, who introduced himself as an Inari Lapp, and received applause from the audience.

“Group acceptance is a quite clear issue, as the minister said. The scientific world talks about identity negotiations or, in other words, each person has the right to demand access to a certain group, but every group has also a similar right to investigate if the applicant fulfils the requirements of their culture. Manninen [another participant] was quite right in saying that group acceptance derives from international law and there’s no need to apologise for it. I just wonder about this talk that goes on year after year”, Pekka Aikio said, and received applause from the audience.⁷⁹

In early October 2014, the Sámi Parliament session decided to support the ratification of the ILO 169 convention by a vote of 14 to 4.⁸⁰ However, the cabinet proposal was caught in a headwind as the autumn progressed. Many members of the Finnish parliament suspected that the ratification could bring long-reaching obligations to Finland in Lapland. Professor emeritus of international law, Lauri Hannikainen, refuted this by saying that many details related to the convention are in order in Finland. “Are the members of the parliament afraid?”⁸¹

In spring 2015, the cabinet proposal of ratifying the ILO convention proceeded to the constitutional law committee, which approved it for sending to the parliament. The issue became more complicated, because the Sámi parliament had bundled the convention with the Sámi definition – thus, approving the Sámi definition in a form supported by the Sámi Parliament was a precondition for approving the ILO convention.

The Sámi definition wasn’t approved, however, according to the cabinet proposal. It was to be expected that the Sámi Parliament wouldn’t support the proposal for the ILO convention. As a demonstration, Näkkäljärvi resigned from the chairman post of the Sámi Parliament. The presiding officers of the parliament turned around and were ready to approve the ratification. Despite of this, minister of justice Henriksson considered that the proposal wouldn’t have the required support in the parliament, so she withdrew the proposal. The proposal for the ratification was tabled for processing by the next cabinet.

Chapter 2

Who is Sámi?

How to define a Sámi has been a continuous subject for debate in Finland in recent decades. In the original Sámi Delegation definition (1973), Sámi referred to persons who had at least one parent or grandparent who had learnt Sámi as their first language, and the descendants of that individual. The persons themselves had to identify themselves as Sámi, of course, because nobody can be considered Sámi against their own will.⁸² The definition emphasised that the persons should have a connection to the Sámi language community over three generations. So the persons did not have to know the Sámi language themselves, because many people had become estranged from the Sámi language after WWII, due to the school system, for example.

In the 1995 cultural autonomy act, an amendment was made to the effect that also “descendants of a fishing, hunting or mountain Lapp who has paid Lapland tax according to land and population registers” are considered Sámi. The Sámi Parliament itself has not approved this amendment; it has the principle, based on the international right of self-determination, that the Sámi themselves must have the right to determine who “we” are.⁸³

One of the most popular claims in discussions during recent decades has been that the definition preferred by the Sámi had emerged accidentally, as the result of one interview survey in summer 1962. Swedish and Norwegian Sámi definitions, where the criteria have been interpreted “very liberally”, have been brought up as points of comparison.⁸⁴ The fact is, however, that Finland is a pioneer of the Sámi definition and Sámi-related demographics.

The Society for the Promotion of Sámi Culture, an association focused on managing Sámi affairs, started an extensive family history study of Finnish Sámi families in 1945. The work was directed by the keeper of the Oulu provincial archives, Aslak Outakoski, whose so-called family register files date back to the beginning of the 18th century. Apart from Sámi families, also population information from the whole Sámi territory was collected to the files at first.⁸⁵

The state-appointed Sámi Affairs Committee, which delivered its report in 1952, collected detailed information from parishes and defined the statistics further. On the local level, people had good or even accurate knowledge of who were Lapps or Sámi and who were not. The committee defined the Sámi territory and drew a list of the people who were considered Sámi. The information was checked by experts of different disciplines. The map created as an appendix of the report presented these Sámi people in their own Sámi groups either as reindeer or mountain Sámi, Inari and Tana fishing Sámi, or Skolt Sámi.⁸⁶

The committee secretary, magister Karl Nickul, had a notion already then that it would be possible to establish a democratically elected representative body based on the detailed Sámi statistics. The joint Nordic Sámi council raised the compiling of consistent statistics as an important theme in the 1959 Sámi conference in Inari. Nickul, who had become general secretary of the Sámi Council, directed the clarification work in the municipalities of the Finnish Sámi territory.

The field work done by young Sámi people was aimed at verifying earlier statistics, which were checked also by vicars of the Sámi territory. The central question in the interviews was if people considered themselves Sámi and part of a population group. In Nickul's view, people could not belong to the Sámi register without their own consent. Subsequently there was an effort to complement the statistics with all Sámi who had moved out of the Sámi territory and their descendants.⁸⁷

Nickul's son Erkki made a separate statistical dissertation from the material in the university of Helsinki.⁸⁸ It was a pro gradu thesis on the population, not a "Sámi register", as was claimed later.

Finnish legislation does not allow the publication of person registers involving ethnic information. The use of Sámi Parliament's registers is therefore quite restricted, which has given rise to suspicions of conspiracy and "small circle intrigue" in recent decades.⁸⁹

Contrary to Finland, the clarification work could not be started in Sweden and Norway. Due to the comprehensive Sámi register, it was only possible in Finland to start a Sámi representational body at all. In Sweden and Norway, it was not even discussed too seriously at that time; Sámi activity was focused on establishing strong civic organisations.

In Finland, the Sámi Parliament has had a dedicated election committee, managing the election activities and Sámi register. It also makes decisions of accepting new members. The electoral register has been continuously supplemented in later years. A rejected applicant has had the right to appeal to the Sámi Parliament and Supreme Administrative Court. Due to the whole extensive clarification work, the Sámi Delegation and later the Sámi Parliament have been considered a judicial representative of all Sámi.⁹⁰

The Sámi definition was not much debated before the 1990s and the ILO convention. There was some discussion about whether the definition excluded some descendants of Inari Sámi, for example, from the electorate. They were considered distinctly Sámi, but did not belong to the group based on language criteria. This group did not seem to be large, however.

Expanding the Sámi definition came up during the Sámi act preparation. According to Asko Oinas, head of the Advisory Board of Sámi Affairs, this was considered necessary, because "the land and water rights of Lapps/Sámi were primarily based on land and tax documents".⁹¹ In the 1990 Sámi act draft, Sámi identity consequently applied to "a descendant of a fishing, hunting or mountain Lapp, who has paid Lapland tax according to land and population registers". These Lapps were to be registered on the basis of land and tax registers from 1875 as well as subsequent land and population registers.⁹²

When the Sámi cultural autonomy act was in preparation, this extension of the definition was included. However, the Sámi definition changed drastically in the act implemented in 1995. Year 1875 was still included in the cabinet law proposal, but the constitutional law committee dropped the limiting year, because that would have required a decree. The Sámi Parliament was not consulted about the change. Therefore, the time definition concerning ownership in a Lapp village became unlimited.⁹³

The act thus had a disparity, because the main criterion (language) covered only three generations, but the subsidiary criterion went centuries back. Now anybody who could find one ancestor who was co-owner in a Lapp village hundreds of years ago could claim “Sámi status” and the right to vote in the Sámi Parliament elections. The extension was not merely temporal, but also territorial: descendants of co-owners in all Lapp villages, even outside the Sámi territory, had to be accepted as Sámi.

The Sámi Parliament has opposed the current Sámi definition from the start, because a large proportion of the descendants of Lapp village co-owners in Southern Lapland in the 17th and 18th centuries are fully Finnish-speaking. They have not had any connection with living Sámi heritage for several generations, if ever. The new definition expanded the boundaries of Sámi identity also quantitatively. The Sámi Parliament deemed already in 1997 that every second Lapland inhabitant, about 100,000 people, had more or less Sámi lineage and were therefore eligible for Sámi status if they wanted.⁹⁴

Instead, the supporters of the Sámi definition extension estimated that the number would be in thousands at the most. The Sámi Parliament’s view was that even a thousand “non-Sámi members” would frustrate the original purpose of the Sámi definition: to protect the rights of the current Sámi-speaking population to their own language and unique cultural heritage. A tenfold increase in the population through the inclusion of people who spoke Finnish and had become Finnish would mean that the Sámi language and Sámi culture drown in the majority culture.⁹⁵

Identities in the archives

The extension of the Sámi definition in 1995 caused a huge commotion. Supporters of the so-called Lapp movement started to prepare for the 1999 Sámi Parliament elections, where the new Sámi definition would be implemented for the first time. Oulu province archives were flooded with people and hundreds of requests for clarification if it would be possible to find Lapp village co-owners from the applicant's ancestors from the 17th century onwards. The archives had to hire extra staff, and the ministry of justice granted a 10,000 FIM allowance for the purpose.

In 1999, a total of 1,128 people applied to the Sámi Parliament register with such documents. The Sámi Parliament rejected a large proportion of the applications, because the electoral committee did not regard the applicants as Sámi. The applicants made appeals to the Supreme Administrative Court, which accepted the Sámi Parliament's argument that a people should have the right to define its members. It rejected a large part of the appeals.

Niilo Tervo delivered 605 appeals of the cases, and only seven of them were accepted on the second round. Some people thought that the Sámi Parliament and the Supreme Administrative Court had acted contrary to existing law. Docent of international law, Lauri Hannikainen, appraised however that the SAC interpreted the 1995 Sámi Parliament act "on evidently solid grounds". Almost all applicants invoked an ancestor who had been registered as a Lapp in the land register most recently during the period from 1739 to 1825. Only 50 applicants based their case on land registers from 1826-1857, and nobody invoked statistics from 1858-1950.

The Sámi Parliament accounted for the rejections with the fact that the applicants had not had a society-approved connection to Lapps for the last 140-300 years. "They belong to the linguistic Finnish-speaking community and culture based on its farm system." Instead, ancestors of current language-based Sámi had been entered both in the 1739 land register and in the 1875 or later registers:

“the existing group of Sámi with their language, culture, identity and traditional livelihoods represent a continuous tradition from their Lapp ancestors to the present day.”⁹⁶

The number of incomers would have meant a complete upheaval in the composition of the Sámi Parliament. According to the 1999 statistics, the Sámi electorate numbered 5,121 people. If a thousand applicants were accepted to the Sámi Parliament, they would have constituted about 20 percent of all voters. The turnout in the election was 57.5 percent. New voters would certainly have been active, so their turnout would have been close to a hundred percent. In effect, the incomers would have taken the Sámi Parliament over. Opening the definition would also have opened the door to new demands for voting right.

Complainants based their case on a strict interpretation of the law in claiming that it would be sufficient for registering as Sámi to be able to prove even one ancestor in some old Lapp register. Instead, the Supreme Administrative Court, as well as the Sámi Parliament, adhered to a more comprehensive interpretation of the law, which follows the purpose of the law and does not stick to the wording of a single rule in the law.

The Supreme Administrative Court emphasized the purpose of law instead of singular rules. It stated that when the language criterion of the Sámi definition allows the applicant to invoke ancestors three generations back, it would be wrong to allow the application of the land tax criterion further back in history. It specified the boundary at year 1870. The SAC pointed out that protecting the cultural autonomy of the indigenous people, i.e. the Sámi, was the ultimate purpose of the law. It also referred to the basic rights in the constitution. It preferred the indigenous people’s own view of who belong to the indigenous people. If this was not the case, you could suspect a tendency to assimilate the indigenous people to the majority population.⁹⁷

Chairman of Lapp Association, Jouni Eira, made an unusual interpretation of the decision. His view was that Lapps were “too indigenous for an indigenous people”, because they had Lapp ancestors too

far back in the history in the opinion of the Supreme Administrative Court. Although they were indigenous population (which was obvious to Eira), they were not Sámi or indigenous people.⁹⁸

In 1999-2011, there was in a way “balance of terror” around the Sámi definition. The Sámi parliament and the Supreme Administrative Court consistently applied the law according the policy they had chosen. There was, however, continuous pressure to change the Sámi definition. In the 1990s, the ministry of justice had decided to wait for experiences from the 1999 elections, where the new definition was implemented for the first time, but nothing happened after the elections.

In connection with the 2011 elections, the Supreme Administrative Court unexpectedly accepted four persons as Sámi merely on the basis of their own notification and a Lapp ancestor entered in the land register in 1825. A distance of 186 years to an ancestor was enough now. One of the applicants asserted his own Sámi identity by relating his skills in reindeer handling and woodsmanship. The case involved only a few people, but it was feared to be a sign of policy change in the Supreme Administrative Court.

The former legal secretary of the Sámi Parliament, Heikki J. Hyvärinen estimated that if all people entered as Lapps in the 1825 land register were accepted as ancestors of existing Sámi, it was numerically possible to “have 30,000 new Finnish-speaking and agrarian ‘document Sámi’”.⁹⁹ Sámi circles considered that one reason for the change in the Supreme Administrative Court policy was that the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination had previously interpreted the Finnish Sámi definition as too narrow, which had startled the Supreme Administrative Court.

The policy change stemmed equally from the Sámi Parliament, however. Earlier, the rejected applications had been thoroughly explained, but now the report to the Supreme Administrative Court had been defective. It did not refute the false claims of applicants, but relied on the continuity of the earlier policy without any need for special statements. Besides, the Sámi Parliament board was itself

inconsistent in accepting people as Sámi on the basis of an ancestor who had been entered as Sámi in the 1739 land register, and this decision came to the Supreme Administrative Court's knowledge.¹⁰⁰

These reasons were the background to the fact that the decisions of the Supreme Administrative Court created new pressure to change the Sámi definition. However, in future, the SAC regularized its changed policy. In 2015, it decided to pass the assessments of the Sámi Parliament by and to estimate the appeals itself. About two hundred complaints that were made against the Sámi Parliament, the SAC approved nearly a hundred. For many Sámi this was a shock – according to them, they had lost the last signs of their self-government. Now they were the Finns in Helsinki deciding who would be a Sámi and who would not be.¹⁰¹

Minority oppresses minority?

In 2012, the Sámi debate in Finland was enlivened by Erika Sarivaara's doctoral thesis about the identities of persons who "descend from a Lapp family and have learned the Sámi language, but do not belong to the electoral register of the Sámi Parliament". She brought up a new concept, "Sámi without status", based on the model of the North American Indian debate.¹⁰² Seldom has an academic dissertation raised such fuss as Sarivaara's thesis.

The author had interviewed ten persons, some of whom would want official Sámi status. Others, on the other hand, felt it important to be part of the Sámi community through language, without claims to be recognised as Sámi. Sarivaara demanded that the Sámi definition should be extended further in Finland to accommodate those without status. If a person belongs to an old Lapp family and has learned the Sámi language, the author thinks he or she should meet the criteria of Sámi identity.¹⁰³

Sarivaara made more far-reaching conclusions in public than in her thesis. During the Salla festival in 2012, she announced she had demonstrated that "Forest Sámi have not disappeared or become Finnish; Forest Sámi is a living culture."¹⁰⁴ This led her to found an association to foster the *Forest*

Sámi cause and also to start discussion about whether the whole region of the former Kemi Lapland should be included in the ILO convention. (See next chapter.)

She also appraised that she had proved in her thesis that “the Sámi without status are conveyors of language”. In many of her statements, she connected this to the Forest Sámi, who were now language speakers and tradition conveyors important to the Sámi community. According to Sarivaara, some of the interviewees felt that being excluded from the electoral register was “an open wound”, which undermined their identity and right to their own history. “When their Sámi identity is not accepted, it wounds their identity. They have to defend themselves and justify their Sámi identity.”¹⁰⁵

Sarivaara’s notion was that the Sámi had consequently become intolerant oppressors. The regional Lapin Kansa newspaper wrote sympathetically: “Being dismissed is a hard experience. Exclusion from the definition brings suffering, pain and a feeling of worthlessness.”¹⁰⁶ So, by wanting to define themselves, the Sámi pressed down the ones excluded by the definition and inflicted incurable wounds on those without status. This image was effective on many outsiders: a minority was oppressing its own minority.

Sarivaara opposed the election committee of the Sámi Parliament, which she thought was actually discriminating against the Sámi without status. She considered the Sámi definition and its interpretation outdated, because it was based on “judicially and sociologically outdated information”.¹⁰⁷ However, she did not explain how. Sarivaara also started to emphasise that the Sámi language was only such part of the Sámi identity that could be learned. “I emphasise that the Sámi language is a person’s native language, although it has been lost. A language can always be revitalized.”¹⁰⁸

Chairman of the Sámi Parliament, Klemetti Näkkäljärvi, had a negative attitude to Sarivaara’s suggestions. He stated that if all descendants of the former Kemi Lapland inhabitants were included, the Sámi Parliament would become a sort of Regional Council of Lapland, where the voice of the Sámi would not be heard. “Sámi culture and Sámi languages disappear, if anybody who is willing

can be Sámi. Then Finland would also be in violation of international human rights agreements and these actions would result in assimilation of the Sámi by force.”¹⁰⁹

Sámi Parliament member Pirita Näkkäläjärvi stated that “this group has largely no (and at best have not had for a century) connection to living Sámi culture; they represent the majority population – should they still be allowed to be deciding about the future of Sámi culture?” She suspected that the group had no genuine interest in the Sámi language and cultural heritage, but this was all about the benefits brought by the ILO convention. She repeated the calculation that 100,000 Finns could come to the electoral register: “This would be a new, ingenious way to assimilate Finland’s 10,000 Sámi to the majority population!”¹¹⁰

Sarivaara’s research had an inherent contradiction. It indicates that many interviewees did not regard lineage or descent as very important to themselves or as a primary criterion of Sámi identity; their connection to Sámi identity develops through language. In the title of the book, however, Sarivaara gives the name “Sámi” also to people who do not feel or do not want to be called Sámi. It was a problem even in the sense of research ethics. It was exactly these kinds of cases that the definition was developed for in its time – Sámi have to feel they are Sámi, because they cannot be called Sámi against their will.¹¹¹

Sarivaara’s research brought a new trend alongside the folksy, masculine and genealogy-oriented neo-Lappish conception; it derived from a single academic (female) researcher’s construction, i.e. the concept of a Sámi without status. Contrary to neo-Lapps, it started to talk about personal language studies as linguistic revitalisation, which juxtaposed the (already dead) Kemi Sámi with strengthening living Sámi languages. It was therefore more about personal self-identification than revitalising the language of the Sámi community. Similarly, the question in the ILO convention about “recognising” a person as Sámi was transferred to the individual level, which seems to have been easier for Finns to identify to than recognition on the community level.¹¹²

Many neo-Lapps have appealed to the looser Sámi definition in Norway. Some Lapp movement members, such as Sarivaara, have applied to the Sámi parliament in Norway only to demonstrate the slant in Finland's Sámi definition. "I am good enough for the Norwegian Sámi parliament, but not for the Finnish", said Arto Enojärvi in 2013.¹¹³ In reality, Norway had almost the same definition as Finland had originally. The difference was that it goes back one generation further, to the fourth generation. In Norway, the Sámi parliament also has final authority in accepting members. Contrary to Finland, there is no right of appeal to the Supreme Administrative Court (Høyesterett) in Norway. In the laws concerning the Sámi parliament in both Norway and Sweden, Sámi refers to persons who regard themselves as Sámi, providing that they have spoken Sámi at home or either of their parents or grandparents have spoken Sámi at home, or that they have a parent who is or has been listed in the Sámi parliament electoral register. Unlike the definition, Norway's practices are different from Finland's. Despite the wish of the Sámi Council in the 1960s, registering Sámi population did not get under way in Norway and Sweden, as it did in Finland. The reason may have been the larger Sámi populations in these countries, but another reason could be that the difference between the Sámi and Norwegians has been historically more pronounced than in Finland. For example, reindeer husbandry is an exclusive Sámi right in Norway and Sweden.

Compiling Sámi parliament voters started from scratch in Norway in the 1980s, and it has not progressed very rapidly. Still in the 2010s, the electoral register of the parliament had about 14,000 names, while the number of Sámi is estimated at 30,000- 60,000. They are figuring out ways to have more members in Norway. Anyone can get to the parliament today, because – unlike in Finland – there is no control whatsoever on who is admitted. There have even been small scandals in Norway, when some non-Sámi public figures have been admitted in the parliament just to demonstrate they can do it, the way Enojärvi did.¹¹⁴

This has had some effect in Norway's Sámi parliament, because some ex-members of the parliament have regretted the way the Sámi language has faded in parliamentary activities. On the other hand,

there has traditionally been such a strong notion in Norway of the difference between the Sámi and Norwegians that there have never been similar problems of exploiting Sámi identity in tourism, for example, as there have been in Finland. This is why Norwegian non-Sámi do not “dare” to apply to the Sámi parliament, even if they would be admitted, because they would be laughed at even among their own people.

Näkkäljärvi was so interested in the Norwegian way to trace Sámi lineage to the fourth generation and the number of the descendants of the Kemi Lapland inhabitants that he had mathematician Tapani Matala-aho make a calculation of them in 2013. Sarivaara had estimated that the number of the “new Sámi” would not be great, “only” about 1,000-1,500 incomers. She admitted that there were about 100,000 such Sámi without status, but “most them would not apply for Sámi status”.¹¹⁵

Based on the Norwegian model, Matala-aho calculated the descendants of those Sámi who had become Finnish and who were listed in the 1880 tax registers. Even a conservative estimate added up to 14,525-24,633 “new Sámi”. When the time boundary was moved further back, Matala-aho calculated that each Lapland tax payer in the 1750s now has about 1024 descendants. For example, if there had been 500 persons subject to Lapland tax, the number of their descendants could be as much as 512,000, i.e. half a million.

Matala-aho commented that “a large part of Lapland’s current inhabitants have an ancestor who lived in the 18th century and paid Lapland tax. The population of the Lapland province at the end of 2012 was 182,844 according to official Finnish statistics. Descendants of Lapland tax payers would constitute 9.4 percent of Finland’s population at the end of 2012.”¹¹⁶ The figure Matala-aho arrived at is huge, but it is a calculative estimate, of course. Anyhow, even if the actual estimate was one fifth smaller, for example, the figure would still be tenfold the number of Sámi in all of Finland.

In 2013, professor Pekka Sammallahti wrote a memorandum about the Sámi definition to the ministry of justice. In his opinion, invoking historical ancestors was not a valid criterion in defining Sámi

identity, if the person lacked subjective connection to the Sámi language and Sámi culture. He commented that “the ILO 169 convention is not retroactive and consequently does not apply to population groups and their rights in circumstances before the ratification of the convention”.

In Sammallahti’s view, if people use their ancestors as justification for belonging to some ethnic group, they are not members of a living ethnic group. “The ethnic group is history, not the present day for them, and nobody can be a member of a bygone group.” The professor thought there were clear reasons why the Sámi definition could not be based solely on lineage, language or culture without a communal angle. The same applied to the definition based solely on the individual’s self-identification.

The only remaining possibility was therefore “group identification, where individuals identify to their ethnic community on one hand, and the ethnic community identifies the individuals as members based on the characteristics of the ethnic community on the other”. According to Sammallahti, group identification is based on linguistic, cultural and communal characteristics inherited from the community. This is emphasised in UN documents as a criterion controlling the identification of an individual.

Therefore, Sammallahti concluded, persons cannot become members of an indigenous people by their own decision. He stated that applying the Sámi definition added to the law in 1995 against the will of the Sámi, as expressed by the Sámi Parliament, had enabled people other than ethnic Sámi to enter the electoral register. This threatened the legitimacy of the Sámi Parliament, and he had a strong view on that issue:

If cultural autonomy gradually transfers to other groups than ethnic Sámi, it [Sámi Parliament] loses its legitimacy as an institution sustaining and developing the language and culture of the Sámi. An institution that has lost its legitimacy must also be discontinued.¹¹⁷

“Why are you setting boundaries?”

During the Lapp debate, virtues emphasised by the Sámi, such as cross-border activities, multiculturalism and their own representational body, Sámi Parliament, were used against them. In the discussion about the Sámi definition, the Sámi were suddenly intolerant nationalists, who emphasised racial purity and built narrow boundaries in a freedom-loving world. The Internet discussion related to the Finnish Parliament House demonstration in 2015 revealed the opposing views clearly. An opponent of the Sámi Parliament wondered:

Some “race-aware” Sámi would have liked to tighten the Sámi definition, so that those who feel they are Sámi and those who have Sámi lineage but fall short of some vague cultural criteria can be smoked out of their own ethnic identity. - -

It is rather strange that we would support these kinds of tighter ethnic definitions when, at the same time, we have the view that you have the right to choose your sex / sexlessness and there is no right to discriminate against anyone based on ethnic origin. In Norway, for example, Sámi identity is just a matter of notification, just like Finnish Swede identity is in Finland; when you feel you are Sámi / Finnish Swede / Finn and you also know the language, why should you not be one also in the Sámi Parliament?

A young Sámi answered this:

There are so few Sámi in Finland that if you can become Sámi merely with a notification, Finns could destroy Sámi self-government and culture in a minute out of pure mischief. Undoubtedly many Finns in Lapland would not mind that at all.

Changing one’s official native language to Sámi is probably just a matter of notification, like changing it to Swedish. It is clear, however, that this should not get you to the Sámi Parliament to decide on matters.

The essential thing here is the freedom Sámi self-definition. In other words, they themselves – whatever the definition – define on the basis of their own culture and customs who are Sámi and who are not. No southern technocrat should have any say in the matter.¹¹⁸

Disapproving the Sámi definition involves a fair share of moralising by the Finns. When we talk about international legislation or special rights for protecting the existing language and cultural heritage of a certain group, it is vitally important to define this group and who belong to it. Definitions belong to

legislation. If outsiders of the group change the criteria and say that “in fact we are also Sámi”, the question is how much should the criteria be expanded eventually.

It is like people wanting unemployment benefit despite not being unemployed. They could appeal to the fact that they have been unemployed before, or that it is not reasonable to restrict unemployment benefit only to the unemployed, because many working people are more or less unemployed after working hours. On the same grounds, you could demand that children’s rights should be extended also to adults, because adults have also been children once. Anybody can see how absurd these claims are, because they void the meaning of definitions.

Instead, when the opponents of the Sámi definition assert that “I am Sámi although actually I am not”, or “I am a member of an indigenous people, although I belong to the majority population, why am I discriminated against”, they are taken at face value. The same applies to the concept indigenous people, which is defined on the basis of protecting the rights of today’s indigenous peoples. Applicants want to be part of the system because they have had the same ancestors as the Sámi two hundred years ago. “And although we were not an indigenous people, we are at least an indigenous population”, they may say.

The Sámi definition supported by the Sámi Parliament has been considered tight partly because the Sámi themselves decide who are Sámi. This has always been hard for Finns to accept, as Sámi-Finnish histories of the 20th century indicate: the Sámi have not been trusted to decide on their affairs without protection from Finns.

Critics often have no point of comparison to relate the Sámi definition to. Journalist Oula Antti Labba has pointed out how strict requirements there are for becoming a Finn. In an unofficial context, for example Rozhta Kenttälä, living in Cyprus, did not qualify for the Miss Finland contest in spring 2014 despite her Finnish passport, because her language skills were rated inadequate. Officially, applying for and receiving Finnish citizenship requires that the person must live in Finland for several

years, pass the language and culture test, and the criminal record must be clean. Also, returning migrants must know the Finnish language in everyday dealings. A separate language test measures speech and text comprehension and writing.¹¹⁹

In the 1990s, Finland started to take in Ingrian-Finnish returning migrants on terms that were tighter than the Sámi definition: the Ingrian-Finns were required to have knowledge of the Finnish language and at least two Finnish grandparents. One grandparent with Sámi language skills is sufficient for becoming Sámi. At first, only one grandparent was sufficient to ensure the remigration of an Ingrian, but the conditions were tightened by the initiative of the minister of the interior, Kari Håkämies, to make the connection to Finnish culture stronger and to assimilate the migrant to the Finnish society. The remigration of Ingrians was discontinued definitively by a parliament decree in summer 2011.

According to Labba, Finnish politicians are quite worried about the demands of the Sámi Parliament, although it defines Sámi identity more widely than Finns define Finnish citizenship.¹²⁰ Sámi Internet columnist *Árvaleaddji* (Thinker) has similarly made fun of Finns by switching the point of view. In his Internet causerie “Dispute in Finland: Who can be a Finn?”, the Russians Vasili Smirnov and Sergei Ivanov file their visa applications in the Finnish Consulate General in St. Petersburg to get Finnish citizenship. They want to have the right to vote in Finnish elections and get their share of Finnish social benefits.

The applicants emphasize their bloodline connecting to ancient Ingrians: “My great-great-grandmother was a genuine Finn, and I cannot even visit Finland without a visa”, they grumble. According to them, Finland controls its eastern border tightly, although there is a few millions of people beyond the border with Finnish lineage, but without official Finnish status. Would not it be democratic in the global world to let them also decide on the affairs of Finns?

In *Árvaleaddji*’s causerie, the peace-loving indigenous people of Finland, the Sámi, feel sad to watch the wildly milling hate speech against people who try to come to Finland. “It is hard to understand

that the Finnish people cannot live in peace and harmony with each other. And there goes our Sámi tax money to pay for trivial quarrelling and political horse trading”, they wonder. The Sámi would gladly accept all who want to be Finn or feel they are Finn: “After all, this is a human rights issue: is it right that Finland’s parliament can pass laws defining who are Finns and can vote?” The causerie ends up to demand an external, objective assessment of the inflamed situation, which should be done by an impartial body, such as the Norwegian Sámi parliament.¹²¹

Wanna be a Sámi? Just do it!

In 2012, the ministry of justice appointed a work group to clarify the law on the Sámi Parliament and propose changes to it. The work group, which also assessed the amendment needs to the Sámi definition, delivered its report to the minister of justice in October 2013.¹²² The work group proposed unanimously that the definition should be changed. According to the work group, the criterion about the entry in land, tax or population register should be removed. Instead, there was a proposal that Sámi should refer to persons who have adopted Sámi culture in their family community and maintained a connection to it.

On this basis, minister of justice Anna-Maja Henriksson started to draw the proposal of Stubb’s cabinet for changing the Sámi definition. However, opponents were able to effectively publicise their own message that the situation was so confusing and unfair that the process should be discontinued. In March 2015, the parliament rejected the cabinet proposal on changing the definition in the Sámi Parliament act. Chapter 5 clarifies what factors produced this result. In any case, the disputed Sámi definition remained in effect.

When the Sámi definition did not change in parliament in spring 2015 as the Sámi Parliament wished, applications to become Sámi continued. Before the Sámi Parliament elections in autumn, there was even a temporary neo-Lapp office in Ivalo to instruct people how to apply for Sámi status. The recipe

was simple: march to the Oulu provincial archives, where you can search by yourself (if you can read old handwriting) or let a clerk investigate if any of your ancestors was a member of a Lapp village in the last 400 years.

If such an ancestor is found, request a certificate of the fact and apply for Sámi Parliament membership. It is possible, however, that if you have no living connection to the Sámi community for the last hundred years, the Sámi Parliament electoral committee will reject your application to become Sámi. Paragraph 6 in the constitution states, however, that citizens are equal before the law, in other words, you can make an appeal to the Sámi Parliament or Supreme Administrative Court. Usually they have nevertheless rejected applications based solely on ancient historical documents.

In any case, the applicant may be in for a futile round. Not to worry. The Lapp village office consoles the applicant by saying that in such an important matter you should not be afraid of costs. “If there are costs, experience tells they are quite reasonable.”¹²³

Case 1:

“Why water down the difference between them?”

There has been discussion on the definition of Sáminess on various discussion forums. In 2014-2015, for example, municipal manager of Enontekiö, Mikko Kärnä, defended the rights of the Forest Sámi or Sámi without status on his own Internet pages and regretted the boundaries drawn by the Sámi. Linguist Jaakko Häkkinen was his most industrious interlocutor and emphasised that, in the case of indigenous peoples’ rights, definitions cannot be vague or so wide that they have no meaning. He defended the original definition of the Sámi Parliament. A selection of statements from Kärnä’s Internet pages, especially from the discussion with linguist Jaakko Häkkinen, reveal many arguments of both parties that were used also in other forums¹²⁴:

Mikko Kärnä:

I have never understood why people should be separated into different groups and create conflicts when things get on better in harmony. - - I think we should see to it that as many people as possible would continue a disappearing tradition and not exclude anyone unnecessarily.

Jaakko Häkkinen:

The language criterion is the only sensible criterion because, based on genetic criteria, all people in the northern half of Finland would be Sámi, and a good part on the southern side. An ethnic Finn cannot be an ethnic Sámi, of course, so the Sámi who have become Finnish generations ago are Finnish descendants of Sámi, but not Sámi.

Timo Harju:

Should this be interpreted so that when Sámi lose their native language as a result of Fennicisation, they stop being Sámi?

Häkkinen:

Surely not right away, that is why a grandparent's Sámi language is enough in the Sámi criterion.

Anonymous:

Finns are also an indigenous people.

Häkkinen:

Finns have their own state, so Finns cannot be called an indigenous people according to international law.

Kärnä:

Language is only one factor here among others. I agree with Jaakko on the issue that the judicial descent criterion alone does not work. But when the descent criterion is combined with a way of life criterion, for example, it becomes quite workable in my opinion.

Häkkinen:

Think about descent from this angle: the number of ancestors each of us has doubles every generation we go back. It would be absurd to have the right to the ethnicity of all our biological ancestors: We could be Finns, Sámi, Swedes, Russians, Estonians, Germans... That would not make any sense.

The significant distance in time must be limited, and grandparent level is a very sensible limit. Also because there is no significant difference in the living styles of different ethnicities on a collective level in Lapland (there are exceptional individuals, of course), the language criterion is the only sensible one.

This is why the language of a grandparent is an important criterion for Sámi identity. Abandoning this criterion would result in a situation where a Sámi could not be reliably distinguished from a Lapp.

Kärnä:

A purely language-based criterion is discriminating and racist in my opinion. If it is going to be continued, the judicial position of the Forest Sámi and other Sámi without status as an indigenous people should be recognised with separate legislation, and they should be given their own cultural autonomy body.

Häkkinen:

There are no Forest Sámi today, there are only descendants of Forest Sámi, who have been speaking Finnish for generations. On what grounds should these Finns have the right to be Sámi?

As far as Sámi without status refers to those who would meet the Sámi Parliament criteria, but who are nevertheless not accepted, the arbitrary actions of the Sámi Parliament must be intervened by sanctions. If it refers to descendants of Sámi who have become Finnish long time ago, they really are ethnically Finnish, and they no longer have any right to Sámi identity.

Petri Kivikangas:

That definition clearly has a political motive to divide populations into “indigenous” and incomers. Let’s rather talk about historical peoples, for example. It is impossible to prove which people is “indigenous” in a certain area, but it is possible to investigate how long histories these peoples have approximately had in a certain area.

Häkkinen:

The issue is that the indigenous people status has been established to protect the rights of those population groups that have become a minority in their own dwelling area. The majority ethnic group of a state does not need such protection, because it has the decision-making power and it can even repress the minorities. The status of an indigenous people is consequently weaker than the status of the majority ethnic group.

Ethnic Finnish identity on the southeast coast has an equally long history as the Sámi have in Finland, so in that respect also western Finns are an indigenous people. This is undeniable, but they have no right to the indigenous people status due to their majority status.

Kärnä:

When processing complaints about the electoral register, for example, the board of the Sámi Parliament has ended up voting if an applicant to the register is Sámi or not. In my opinion, this alone proves that something is wrong. The group acceptance model, where five North Sámi decide on the group acceptance, cannot be workable.

Häkkinen:

This is a sign of arbitrary actions by the Sámi Parliament, not of any fault in the criteria themselves. Of course, the criteria must be applied fairly and equally to everyone – anything else is arbitrariness. It is completely incomprehensible if one person in a family is accepted and another is excluded. - - Who watches the Sámi Parliament? The preliminary ruling of the Supreme Administrative Court is at least a good indication that arbitrariness is not tolerated.

Kärnä:

As to the Forest Sámi, there really are people who identify themselves as Forest Sámi. They descend from Sámi families and live in their traditional territories and pursue traditional livelihoods. These people can be found in Enontekiö especially in the old Peltojärvi Lapp village area in Peltovuoma and Vuontisjärvi. In my opinion, they have every right to their own identity and protection of their traditional livelihoods and way of life. People outside the language criterion are now being made “strangers in their own land”, and this cannot be right on any account.

Häkkinen:

Sarivaara also identifies herself as Forest Sámi, although she mentions that the language had changed generations ago. The criteria of Sámi identity cannot be safely extended four generations back, for example (“as long as one of the great-great-grandparents spoke Sámi), because then the inhabitants of the whole northern Finland would suddenly be Sámi. Even I would be Sámi by that criterion!

The criterion cannot be loosened to stop these kind of absurdities, and then the so-called “Forest Sámi” are marginalised. The likes of Sarivaara constitute a problem: why on earth do they feel they are Sámi? What is it in their traditions that differs from the traditions of Lapland’s Finns?

Kärnä:

One possibility to solve the issue is to have separate legislation to recognise the judicial status of the Forest Sámi and other Sámi without status, who are not sufficiently pure linguistically and culturally to satisfy the leadership of the Sámi Parliament. There are examples: <http://fi.wikipedia.org/wiki/Métisit>".

Häkkinen:

I support protecting the rights of indigenous persons, even if they are not admitted in an indigenous people.

Kärnä:

The language-based Sámi definition, which the current leaders of the Sámi Parliament promote, is not workable.

Häkkinen:

From the Sámi point of view, it is workable and safe because it stops the invasion of Finns into Sámi identity. As I have argued, if the generation limit of the language criterion is loosened, the door opens to a large group of Finns, who would be thrilled to find their new identity in hope of special rights. The criterion must be tight to prevent this scenario: the majority of the Sámi is protected, but the price is the exclusion of a small minority. This is, however, the lesser evil from the Sámi point of view.

Kärnä:

Norway does not have these problems and no "invasion of Norwegians into Sámi identity" has happened there, although the criteria are not based on language. The Sámi Parliament is currently promoting a model where the only Sámi would be those who have learned Sámi as their native language. In Sarivaara's case, I have understood that two generations did not speak Sámi as their native language, and now Sarivaara has revived the language. Why in the world would not she have the right to Sámi identity?

Häkkinen:

Why in the world would I and hundreds of thousands other Finns not have the right to Sámi identity? You must understand that it would not be sensible nor desirable from the Sámi point of view. Finns do represent a different ethnicity from the Sámi. Why water down the difference between them?

Why in the world would western Finns not have the right to Swedish or Estonian identity, although there were both ethnicities in their ancestors? Because 1) a person grows into one ethnic identity, not many, 2) and the ethnicity of ancestors has no effect on this – only the recent generations count.

Kari Virtanen:

If the difference, or the issue is only the native language, why then do not Swedes or Russians have their own parliament in Finland working for their autonomy, although there are much more speakers than there are Sámi?

Häkkinen:

Exactly because there are so much more of them. Finnish Swedes have even their own party and they are an influential factor in Finnish politics, when the party automatically sits in every cabinet. The Sámi cannot get leverage in Finland's parliament due to their small numbers, so they have their own system.

Kärnä:

Language alone does not define ethnicity.

Häkkinen:

Not alone, of course. But as I have argued, it is not possible to draw a line between Sámi and non-Sámi without language, because peoples who live near each other for long have their ancestral roots intertwined. Without language, Sámi identity disappears and blurs to nothingness.

Therefore, the language criterion cannot be abandoned, and will never be abandoned. It would lead to an unendurable situation where the inhabitants of the northern half of Finland and Scandinavia would suddenly have the right to Sámi identity. It would be an utterly unendurable and absurd situation from the Sámi point of view – the same situation if all Russians were now given the right to Finnish identity and they would redefine Finnish identity based on their majority status! Surely you would not want that to happen?

Chapter 3

Contested histories of Lapland

In 1995, the municipality of Inari started to fund the writing of an extensive general history of Inari region. The kick-off seminar took place in the municipal council hall, where over 200 listeners squeezed in. The unusual size of the crowd for a history seminar reflected the interest that local inhabitants had in their own past. It's not only the Sámi who have the urge to perceive their own identity also through history. There has been Finnish-speaking population living in Lapland for centuries and their paths cross with the Sámi in many places. They may have blood ties with the Sámi, and Sámi families may have become completely Finnish likewise.¹²⁵

Similar throngs have been seen also in other history events in Lapland. The interest of the local people for their past was a welcome phenomenon, which has produced a great number of publications on local and regional history of the Northern Finland in the course of decades. They have largely had a balanced approach on the Sámi issue.¹²⁶ The situation has, however, also resulted in problematic tendencies, when a passionate desire to establish own histories has merged with the current dispute of Sámi identity. Histories always come with a lot of emotions, since the heritage of ancestors is concerned. When history is viewed from today's political basis, interpretations often become tendentious. The result was a competitive situation when the history became a subject of dispute.

For the local people, which earlier was not considered to be Sámi, the possibility for ratifying the ILO convention raised pressures to demonstrate their own specificity also through history. Because the history of the Sámi seemed as passing for "proof" of old land and water rights, it became a subject of

struggle. The exclusive right of the Sámi to their past was questioned, and the contested interpretations of local histories were constructed into a parallel or even surrogate of the Sámi historiography.

Fear of the Sámi act and ILO convention started to produce new historical interpretations, where the local population of Lapland rewrote the “true history” of Lapland. In its core were the Lapps of the historical sources, not as ancestors of the modern Sámi but as ancestors of “us”, the cultivators of their “true heritage” – those who *the elite Sámi* did not accept as members of the Sámi Parliament. Interpretations of history were then linked with the central political goal of the neo-Lapps, contesting the current Sámi representational body, the Sámi Parliament.

With clever and constantly repeated turns of phrase, Reindeer Sámi, who had settled to the current Finnish territory after 1852, were labelled the sole representatives of the Sámi Parliament. Branding them “immigrants” or late incomers has been an essential part of the opposition to the Sámi Parliament. (See next chapter.) Also new and even fictitious interpretations of history were often directed against the Sámi specificity. Modern Sámi were not the true heirs of Lapp culture – “we are”.

This was already evident when neo-Lapps adopted the name Lapp, which specifically referred to the new *us* group in contrast to the Sámi. They regarded the *Sámi* word as a newly invented term, which referred to a political group. Researcher Maritta Stoor, coming from western Lapland herself, has used the term *concept takeover* in describing the way the opposition has taken possession of the word “Lapp” and denied the Sámi right to it. In this process, the scope of an established concept is first blurred and then filled with new semantic content.¹²⁷

Previously the words Lapp and Sámi had the same meaning: *Lapp* was an eksonym, a name given by outsiders, while *Sámi* was an ethnonym, the name used by the group itself. The Sámi felt that the Lapp word contained too many negative connotations, while the word Sámi from the Sámi language was quite suitable to the Finnish language, too.¹²⁸ When the Sámi rejected the Lapp word, other locals

took it over to describe their own view of who were “genuine” and “original” in the region. Soon the term *indigenous people* was also given a new content, which did not exist in legislation. Now it referred to the clan or family that had been the first to settle to a place, and it had nothing to do with the rights of modern Sámi.

Blurring the concepts was an attempt to put across the idea that there had always been two groups in Lapland, Lapps and Sámi, and Lapps were the older community – as the claim of the newness of the Sámi concept indicates. So they thought they matched the indigenous people concept better than the “late-born” Sámi. This identity change took place gradually during the 1990s. Erkki Pääkkönen notes that in the beginning, the groups opposing Sámi rights presented themselves as “lantalainen” (a local concept of Finnish inhabitants in Lapland) in a report jointly created by the governing bodies of Enontekiö’s landowners’ association and common forest, for example.

After the uncertain initial phase, however, they realised that they should start to emphasise the continuity of the lost Forest Sámi culture, where they represented the “true Lapp families”. The Sámi living in the forest zone had been called Forest Lapps earlier. The same way, neo-Lapps took over the former societal model of the Sámi, Lapp village system, by starting to found political associations with the names of “Lapp villages”, as if they were historical successors of 17th and 18th century Lapp villages or *siidas*.¹²⁹

The names of Ivalojoiki, Kyrö, Peltojärvi and Suonttavaara Lapp village associations were partly based on fictitious Lapp villages, which had never existed. Their Lapp village term competed with the efforts of the Sámi Parliament to create new Sámi administration with the Lapp village principle. Erkki Pääkkönen’s view is that neo-Lapps started to seek for society’s acceptance by founding associations and presenting themselves as “revitalised Lapp villages”. At the same time, they started to emphasise their significance as the voice of the local population towards the government, with the expressed goal to replace the existing Sámi government.¹³⁰

Later in the 2000s, a new turn took place when the opposition started to call themselves *Forest Sámi*. Thus, they also overtook the concept Sámi. The term Forest Sámi as such has a true historical nature, thus it is a general concept developed in old ethnological research, which has referred to all Sámi groups living in the forest region. They also included the Inari Sámi and Skolt Sámi. In the current political context, however, it became a fictitious or invented concept with the purpose to give an impression of the “real” Sámi roots of current people.

This context also enabled the takeover of Sámi historiography, where Forest Sámi were considered predecessors of the modern Sámi. When the Forest Sámi talked about their own history with the concepts and descriptions of Sámi research, an outsider had difficulty in understanding why “the Sámi” were opposing to the “Forest Sámi”, as well as “Lapps”. The Sámi dispute started to become very confusing in the eyes of outsiders; Lapps objected to the views of the Sámi and the Sámi did not approve of the Forest Sámi.

Even old Sámi people, who were accustomed to use the old Lapp term in Finnish about themselves, became confused. In the middle of the 1990s when feelings ran high, Reindeer Sámi Jouni Piera Jomppanen from West Inari hurried to Teuvo Lehtola and cried out in agony: “Now those Sámi are planning to kill us Lapps!”¹³¹

The opposing movement to the Sámi was itself divided into *Lapps* and *Forest Sámi*, and those were further challenged by a new term *Sámi without status*. Occasionally the opponents of the Sámi Parliament themselves have been about to get confused over their own concepts. For example, a Forest Sámi seminar took place in Inari in December 2012 and most of the speakers objected to the dominance, if not even a dictatorship of the Sámi Parliament.

Hilkka Joki from Enontekiö wondered how “us Lapps” were forgotten, when the chairman only spoke about “Forest Sámi”. The leader of the Forest Sámi, Erika Sarivaara, who had also launched the term “Sámi without status”, explained that the usage of the term seemed to be a matter of generation:

people from the 1990s were evidently more Lapps, and those from the 2000s were Forest Sámi or Sámi without status.¹³² An outsider could easily sigh that those Sámi are always fighting each other.

Compared to Sámi without status, who emphasized the skills of Sámi language as the main manifestation of their Sáminess, neo-Lapps were mostly interested in the past, which they considered the key to their own special rights. The past was pursued especially with the means of genealogy, which was used for validating the old rights of individual families. Genealogy as such was a serious research method. Interpretations made on its basis could, however, lead to wild speculations.

Forgotten population group?

According to historian Mauno Hiltunen, the root searching of neo-Lapps resulted in “a historico-politically oriented, downright mythological” interpretation of history, the results of which he calls *northern neo-myths*. According to Hiltunen, identifying themselves as a group of their own, Lapps required their own history, a cultural narrative made up of genealogy studies, very extensive source material collected among the movement and “selective use of existing research”. To the opposing movement, history became

“a sort of a court of law where the articles related to the interpretation of the ILO convention must be applied as if they were a binding law for interpretations of the past. It has led to falsifications of history and to myths, because proving that the Sámi are incomers and characterising your own ancestors an indigenous people have become the burden of proof.”¹³³

The conscious construction of neo-Lapp history started already in the 1990s. The Lapp village associations published a handout *Information for Sámi debate*¹³⁴, which was the manifesto of the movement in a sense. It was a historical review compiled by amateur historian Niilo Tervo and largely based on genealogical studies. The review presented “research results to decision-makers collected by the descendants of Lapland’s verifiable original Lapps”.

The associations opposed the view of Finnish minister of justice Kari Håkämies that the Sámi definition should be reverted to the language-based form, as had been suggested. The associations pointed out that both the minister and the expert of his, the president of the Court of Appeals, in their lack of knowledge had gone wrong when emphasizing the viewpoint of Reindeer or Mountain Sámi. In other words, the Finnish gentlemen from south could not understand the real situation in the north. In their clarification, the Lapp village associations objected to Sámi identity “as a political movement”, which had emerged in the 1960s “due to a few young activists, and they were mainly well-educated descendants of nomadic reindeer herders, who were guided and encouraged by a few southern scientists”. According to the associations, the whole Sámi debate reflected the poor self-esteem of extremist Sámi groups, which was propped up by language when the right kind of lineage and documents could not be found. The associations wanted to bring up information concealed by the Sámi:

There’s one verifiable cultural group, however, which nobody seems to know anything about, the Forest Sámi, that elusive and humble population group, which has lived in primitive wilderness economy since the stone ages; hunting, fishing, gathering, small-scale cattle husbandry and small-scale and medium inland reindeer husbandry. **Will they be completely forgotten?** (Bold and underlined type by the authors.)¹³⁵

The associations claimed that Mountain or Reindeer Lapps were originally Finnish (*birkarl*) people who had immigrated from Sweden and started a nomadic way of life. In addition to Fishing Lapps near Lake Inari and by the Tana river, there was reputedly “an untold group of Forest Sámi” who had led a quite isolated life before and married only inside their own cultural circle. This group of Lapps had been “pressed” by colonialism to establish new farms, which didn’t hinder their traditional way of life, however.

In this interpretation, the Forest Sámi were considered to be separate from Finnish-born settlers, who constituted a tight group of their own. They were Finns, while Lapps were persons who descended from earlier tax-paying Lapps of Lapp villages. So, according to the associations, the three groups in

Enontekiö, for example, were “Finnish-born settlers, acknowledged Sámi and descendants of the true indigenous Lapps of the region”.¹³⁶

The prevalent knowledge on Lapland’s history indicates these interpretations to be pure fantasy. The history of the Forest Sámi has been studied substantially and they have not been forgotten or ignored, as it was claimed. Part of them assimilated and became Finnish, another part remained ethnically Sámi and their history evolves to the current Sámi groups. No mysterious, forgotten population groups can be found there – tax authorities already took care of that centuries ago.

Researchers have used different classifications with Sámi groups, and apart from linguistic and occupational characteristics, researchers have divided the Sámi into Mountain and Forest Sámi based on their environment. These concepts don’t refer, for example, to linguistic Sámi groups, which were the basis for the classification with Inari Sámi or Skolt Sámi. Forest Sámi refers generally to the Sámi in the coniferous forest regions from Sweden up to Russian Lapland.

The Forest Sámi is, however, a concept developed by researchers. None of the ancient Sámi groups called themselves “Forest Sámi”. There are no grounds for constructing Lapland’s history on the contrast between the imaginary Forest Sámi and Reindeer Sámi, as the Lapp village associations have done in their use of history to support current politics.

In the neo-Lapp interpretation of history, Hiltunen sees an aspiration to scientific like argumentation, which they use for building a “continuity hypothesis” to support their current claims. There are genealogical studies in the background for validating the Forest Sámi roots of the neo-Lapps. Hiltunen points out, however, that the neo-Lapps don’t speak specifically of the old Lapp village system, which was a central part of the Forest Sámi culture. Instead, they maintain that they have preserved a connection to their old (private) tax lands through the fact that they were converted into a peasant land property system in the 18th century tax collections. The ILO convention, however, doesn’t talk about private lands or persons but peoples.¹³⁷

Another central goal in the neo-Lapp interpretation of history is to deny the specificity of the Sámi. It focuses especially on questioning the position of the Reindeer Sámi. To them, the only Sámi are Reindeer Sámi, who have no right to the indigenous people status due to their “late immigration”. Neo-Lapps utilise modes of speech from the Sámi ethno-political movement. These include the victim myth or talk about a silenced and forgotten population group. In the background, they see colonialism, which the establishment has used to deprive the Lapps of their original rights.¹³⁸

The colonialist framework also explains why neo-Lapps no longer speak Sámi, only Finnish. It has been taken away from them, and by externalising them from their group, the modern Sámi try to double the damage. In other words, the modern Sámi continue this policy of forgetting. Neo-Lapps have suggested that today only language separates the inhabitants of Savukoski and Kuttura villages.

¹³⁹ The claim is quite bold and also peculiar, because the “Kuttura people” from Guhttor village represent precisely that Reindeer Sámi identity so abhorrent to the Lapps.

Hiltunen reflects the central role of genealogical studies in neo-Lapp historiography. He thinks it has been excessively emphasised, without considering cultural change factors that shape ethnic groups. In their thoughts, genealogy then replaces the ethnicity-linked historical continuum, which is a continuous and mutable process. Hiltunen states:

The counter-movement (of “Lapps”) sees that the historical connection to land and its resources is the most important criterion of the indigenous status, irrespective of the changes in the ethnicity of the groups it represents. However, it’s possible to verify empirically that neo-Lapps have lost their original culture and become part of the northern peasant culture. Through the ILO convention, connection to land has become a symbol of the lost indigenous past to the counter-movement. They use it in trying to attain the active role that has been regarded solely as Sámi property.¹⁴⁰

In their search for their own identity, neo-Lapps have elevated history interpretations almost above everything else. They have been linked to support today’s political struggle, but history can only help understand past events, not give answers to the present day. When the rivalling academic studies on the historical land ownership in Sámi area had drifted into a stalemate (as described earlier), also the

Finnish authorities started to retreat. It was stated by the ministry of justice in 2008, that the ILO decision cannot be based solely on historical information about the development of land ownership and land use. Their view was that also the contemporary situation should be examined, including the current status of the Sámi and the use of natural resources in the Sámi territory.¹⁴¹

Similarly, Sámi sources have emphasised similarly that the question of ethnic Sámi identity as well as the indigenous people definition pertains specifically to the current situation. In fact, there was a clear shift of Sámi politics, which still in 1990s relied strongly on historical research, but which especially after the stalemate practically abandoned the value of historical information and started to emphasize the current belonging. Thus the view of the Sámi Parliament is that descent or genetic relationship alone isn't sufficient basis for Sámi identity. Persons and their families should have a living connection to the Sámi community.

According to the Sámi related opinions, restricting to the genealogical continuity would lead to absurdity. Professor Pekka Sammallahti says that the whole Finland's rural population has plenty of Sámi ancestors, from more ancient times in the south than in the north. In his opinion, this illustrates how descent cannot be a very important factor in defining the Sámi. Sámi identity isn't merely descent; it consists of belonging to a certain language, culture and community in a certain time. Although the remembrance and heritage of ancestors are important in Sámi identity, it takes shape among people living in the present age.¹⁴²

Case 2:

How to conquest Sámi history

In his blog¹⁴³, pseudonym *Hirvasrumpu* has written about the Lapland past in a way that it could be considered to be a proposal for neo-Lapp history. For a history scholar, it's a complex fabrication and its convoluted train of thought can be hard to follow, because it's fully based on existing Sámi

historiography, but the interpretation is completely arbitrary. It works through Lapp villages, Lapland territories, settlements and the relationship to the Finnish government, which are all elements of Sámi history writing.

In the beginning of his story “Lapps and Sámi”, Hirvasrumpu suggests that the Lapps and the Sámi are the one and same indigenous people of Finnish Lapland. The writing ends up, however, demonstrating that Lapps are in fact more indigenous, while the Sámi don't fulfil the characteristics of the ILO convention. In between, the blogger tells there is a “minority of an indigenous people” or Lapps, whose right to their own identity has been denied by the Sámi Parliament.

The account diverges from the Sámi historiography when Hirvasrumpu states that the “common people” has divided into two, Forest Sámi and Reindeer Sámi cultures. According to him, Reindeer Sámi are emigrants from Norway, foreigners who have moved in the end of 19th century to Finland. The lineage starting from the Reindeer Sámi leads to the modern Sámi and the dictatorship of the Sámi Parliament, reigned by the Reindeer Sámi. Forest Sámi, on the other hand, remain “forgotten” and suffer internal ethnic oppression from the indigenous population. Circumstances force the Forest Sámi to gradually abandon the Lapp language and they are outcasted from the “Sámi family”.

After reducing the situation to an antagonism between Reindeer Sámi and Forest Sámi, Hirvasrumpu also conquers the 19th and 20th century events of Sámi historiography. Now the so-called ethno-political movement turns out to be “Blut und Boden” kind of ethno-nationalism by the Reindeer Sámi, incited by international trends. The attitude of the Reindeer Sámi gives the word “Lapp” a derogatory slant and the “real Lapps” have to hide their Lapp identity.

According to this history, it wasn't until the conspiracy between the Sámi Parliament and the Swedish People's Party of Finland in 2000s, concerning the ILO convention, that “we” have finally awoken to claim our rights. The ILO convention would benefit “a few clans”, which conceal that their reindeer husbandry has become modern and which also hide their true origin as Norwegians. “In the case of deprived rights, the Sámi activists from Norway don't explain either what has been taken from them

(in history). They still seem to have their language and culture. If they have been deprived of their land, that land is in Norway.”

Hirvasrumpu winds up condemning the Sámi term: “The proper and entirely politically correct name for the indigenous population of Lapland is ‘Lapp’, while ‘Sámi’ is an ideologically slanted designation, which the supporters of the internal ethno-nationalistic faction of Lapps invariably use of themselves.” He laments: “The situation with the terms is undeniably causing confusion.” For him, Sáminess doesn’t represent the “unbroken tradition or even tradition required by the ILO convention; it’s a late-born product of the present day”.

After denying the right of the Sámi to special rights, Hirvasrumpu adopts a more conciliatory attitude. In his view, the government is to blame for the contradictions, because keeping the indigenous people divided is compatible with the interests of the majority population and state land ownership. As a sign of reconciliation, he proposes the Sámi Parliament to be repealed and replaced with a new administrative model, Lapland’s parliament, where Lapps would have sufficient representation. Instead of the Sámi, power should be distributed also to other groups to ensure local and regional democracy. “The Sámi Parliament has used up its credibility credit. It’s time for its current leadership to step down from its power and, at the most, continue managing routine matters as a “caretaker government”.¹⁴⁴

The final suggestion of Hirvasrumpu reflects the eventual aim of Lapps: to finish the parliamentary work of the Sámi. The writing also verifies Mauno Hiltunen’s suspicion that in a political framework neo-Lapps could be considered a populist movement with certain reservations. Against better judgement, Hirvasrumpu creates black-and-white contradictions and produces “arbitrary historical argumentation”. It takes documents out of their context and uses them as indisputable evidence of their own cause.¹⁴⁵

Another intimation of populism is the way the writing completely dismisses a more constructive source-critical approach and debate. Neo-Lapp historiography has been characterised by a recurrent

claim that several professional historians have misrepresented the past, mostly to participate in the protection of the “illegal” indigenous people status of the Sámi.

Sámi lineage in borderlands

Hirvasrumpu’s writing strikes many Sámi people as parodic at first, until it’s understood as a seriously written variation of the above-mentioned northern neo-myths. As Hiltunen has noted, however, it’s good to bear in mind that interpreting the neo-Lapp historiography merely as a political project “does not do justice to the historical experiences of the people who live in cultural borderlands and represent the so-called Finnish-Sámi hybrid”. In the case of Hirvasrumpu, these experiences have been filtered by a former officer in Finnish border guard.¹⁴⁶

With hybrid, Hiltunen refers to the notion of borderlands identity, which takes shape in the encounter and interaction of two or more cultures. Studies have talked about hybrid cultures or creolisation – intermingling of groups and peoples – as a global and generally historical phenomenon, which has been a highly significant occurrence in world history, as well as indigenous peoples. The hybrid nature of the borderlands must not be understood as a kind of “mixed culture”, let alone crossbreed. When two cultures encounter and hybridise for a long time, the result can no longer be restored to these two origins; the result is something new – “a third front”, where a new cultural form and history begins to develop.¹⁴⁷

If we forget mystifications about a forgotten and unknown Lapp tribe in the obscurity of history, the question is what kind of demarcations and encounters took place between the Sámi and Finns during centuries, and what kind of “borderlands culture” they may have engendered. In my doctoral thesis (1997), I have called the characteristic of this population *borderlands identity*. Representatives of many old families in Lapland feel they aren’t completely Finnish, and not Sámi either.¹⁴⁸ This has

created a strong feeling of a distinctive “own history”. Unlike the history of the Sámi, the development of the self-conception and culture of this borderlands has not been studied much.

Historical Lapps in documents were predominantly practitioners of Lapp livelihoods: hunting, fishing and reindeer husbandry. Finnish settlement on Lapp village lands was impossible until the end of the 17th century. The lands were owned by the shareholders of the Lapp villages according to Swedish legislation. The settlement bills in 1673 and 1695 enabled settlement also on Lapp village lands. In the Kemi Lapland, the settlement rush was directed across the Lapland border to the Kuusamo-Kitkajärvi region, and the agricultural society based on burn-beat cultivation made the old Sámi settlement Finnish. Further in the north, settlers still needed permission from the Lapp village to enter the region. Another way was to marry a Sámi, or to buy or lease land. ¹⁴⁹

Previously, it was thought that Lapps were chased to the north before the continually invading Finnish settlers. In the light of recent studies, however, this wasn't the case; the “disappearance” of Sámi from documents was largely a result of the Sámi becoming Finnish. It was also characteristic that the Sámi themselves became settlers. This happened because the rights of the Lapp villages were no longer appreciated, and the old border between Lapland and South was forgotten on the quiet.

Sámi settlement changed into Finnish only in documents at first, due to the change in livelihood. A new farm established by a Sámi was usually entered in the new farm register with a Finnish name, which became the surname of the settler or his descendants. The former practitioner of natural livelihoods was counted among settlers based on the new occupation. A change of culture was often involved in the event. When changing into settlers and joining the Finnish village system, Sámi often became Finnish in their way of life as well as language, even in their personal names. Sámi identity even began to be a shame. Former Sámi started to speak Finnish to their children to help them succeed in the new environment. ¹⁵⁰

Many Inari Sámi families, for example, retained their Sámi characteristics despite becoming settlers. These characteristics included speaking Sámi, using the Lapp costume (although variably) and certain special uses of nature, from knowledge of Sámi place names to traditional common law, where traces of the old Lapp village were evident. Many 19th century sources make it clear that locals had distinct knowledge of who were Sámi or Lapps, and who were local Finns (“lantalainen”).

In the sources of 19th century, for instance, local civil servants could give detailed information of who were fishing or Reindeer Sámi and who were Finns. This knowledge has obviously based on the divisions of local inhabitants themselves. The accuracy of this identification was reflected in the notions about “borderline cases”, who were shifting either way. For example, a Sámi woman had married to the Finnish village of Kyrö, which had a strong Fennicising influence. Others then wanted to follow if her descendants became Sámi-speaking or if they became completely Finnish.¹⁵¹

This is an important thing about Sámiification and Fennicisation. It has often been claimed in the Sámi debate that like certain Finnish family branches, such as Holmberg, Helander and Torikka, have become Sámi in Utsjoki, nowadays Finns should similarly be accepted as Sámi, if they learn the Sámi language, for example. This isn't enough, however. Traditional Sámiification involved that although a person married a Sámi, only the descendants could be considered Sámi. Ethnicity became established in the second or third generation at the latest. This also made it possible that some branches of certain families became Sámi, although others remained Finnish. This happened in the Kangasniemi, Veskonniemi and Seurujärvi families, for example.¹⁵²

Ethnic development may seem confusing to an outsider, but the Sámi had distinct knowledge about it. Internal observation was the basis for the identification practice of the “us” group, demarcation between “us” and “others”, which is a basic human feature. It did not signify hostility or conscious discrimination, but awareness of differences. The statistical outlining of the Sámi population also started from this kind of internal knowledge after World War II. The goal was specifically to protect

the language and culture of those Sámi people who had retained their Sámi kinship to some extent.

153

As we saw earlier, the new “Lapp histories” have aimed at blurring the difference between the local Finns (“lantalainen”) and Lapps. Some academic researchers have also claimed that earlier all “Lapland dwellers” were one and the same people, which was divided into two groups mainly by the arbitrary measures of administrators. For example, Maria Lähteenmäki, a historian from Lapland, has claimed that others than the Reindeer Sámi were not considered an ethnic group of their own earlier; the categorisation concerned only livelihoods. She cites the fact that because ethnicity is a new concept, ethnic groups couldn’t have existed earlier, there were only different livelihoods.¹⁵⁴

Lähteenmäki’s idea of ethnicity is confusing. She doesn’t consider that livelihoods and the way of life are part of ethnicity, inasmuch as language and family history. The feeling of ethnicity or the idea of “us” was quite strong among the Sámi in the 19th century. In Finnish sources, there are many accounts about the expressions of “Lapp nationality” which meant a conscious ethnic identification. One of the rare Sámi writers in Finnish newspapers used the Finnish term “Lapp kin” (Sámi kinship) to describe the common feeling between separate Sámi groups.

The Sámi called Finns by the name *láddelás* or *láttán* (‘lantalainen’ in Finnish) or women by *ládde-rivgu* or *rivgu* (southern woman). Finns, on the other hand, knew the Sámi by the name Lapps. The use of these names clearly reflected ethnic differences. Lähteenmäki admits that reindeer nomads were still different from Finns, but she thought that other Sámi in Inari, for example, didn’t differ from local Finns. In reality, Inari Sámi were clearly different from Inari Finns: they called themselves *sämmiláš*, wore the Sámi costume and spoke Sámi, although they knew also Finnish well. They were largely settlers, but fishing was still the main livelihood, and their way of life still followed the traditional yearly migration pattern to some extent.

The existence of these boundaries didn't mean that the Sámi and Finns were against each other all the time. In Inari, for example, their relations were mostly good, and there was no need to emphasise the differences. They existed, however, and became apparent especially in disputes and conflict situations. Boundaries could be tested also in everyday encounters, for example when a Sámi became daughter-in-law in an entirely Finnish village environment on the outskirts of the Sámi territory. She could be reminded of her Lapp identity so much that she soon wanted to forget her own roots.

The goal of the neo-Lapp interpretation of history, however, has been to blur this ethnic difference. Heli Saarinen, a scholar for eastern Lapland, has only referred to an "image boundary" between Sámi and Finns. According to her, the dividing categories were created by external administrators, resulting "the segregation required by taxation", and therefore the authorities harshly divided the common folk into two groups: peasants and Lapland tax payers. They've been separated from each other by force, without hearing the wishes of the locals.

Saarinen implies that there's no other background to the whole distinction of the Sámi and other local groups than administration. This way, two groups were born: "Lapland dwellers" and reindeer nomads, who have retained "their independent culture". The former group lost their Sámi language due to the unjust actions of administrators. Consequently, only the Sámi-speaking Reindeer Sámi "remained to represent the Sámi". Saarinen states: "In the multinational and multilingual Lapland, also language became a means of cultural segregation besides nomadism."¹⁵⁵

In reality, Reindeer Sámi by no means represented the only Sámi group with their own language and cultural heritage. In Finland's area alone, there were Tana Sámi, Inari Sámi as well as Skolt Sámi, a true spectrum of Sáminess and Sámi languages. Saarinen gives an impression that the past ethnic identification in Lapland was somehow indefinite, topsy-turvy. As mentioned earlier, the ethnic boundary between the Sámi and Finns was quite well known on the local level, although it may have seemed foggier from afar. Administrators, such as county constables and vicars, usually learned from the locals who was Sámi and who was a local Finn, if it was not obvious from external essence.

The notion that the differences between the Sámi and local settlers had become blurred is largely based on the situation in southern Lapland, where both Lähteenmäki and Saarinen originally come from. There these differences no longer existed even in the 19th century, because the Sámi had already assimilated into the majority population. However, this situation didn't apply further in the north, the subsequent Sámi territory, where the Sámi – also others than Reindeer Sámi – were a group quite distinct from Finns.

Borderlands identity

The Sámi-Finn borderlands had developed during centuries in different regions where the Sámi identity had gradually disappeared to make way for settlement. Influences intersected. The Sámi adopted characteristics of settlement, such as log houses, animal husbandry, language and, finally under pressure, often the whole settler culture. Finns adopted or retained elements of the Sámi way of life and know-how to help them adjust to new conditions. The borderline identity is reflected in reindeer husbandry with its Sámi-originated terminology in Finnish language, as well as clothing and Sámi-originated place names which are traces of the historical encounter.

The cultural connection is especially apparent in the old Finnish language of Lapland, which developed in its own direction in the north. Grammatically it followed the development of western Finnish dialects. On the other hand, the vocabulary manifests strong influences from the multilingual background of northern Fennoscandia, such as Scandinavian languages and even Russian, but especially from the Sámi language. The numerous loan words from the Sámi language are mostly related to the natural environment, rich reindeer terminology as well as place names. Loan words could make Finnish dialects in Lapland so strange-sounding that later they may have been considered some “strange language”.¹⁵⁶

The Finnish dialect in Lapland is a good example of the subsurface effects of the borderlands, which began to transform the settler culture of Lapland into a different form than in the more southern “heartlands”. The fact is, however, that the borderlands culture in the 19th century, for example, was fundamentally Finnish-speaking and based on the values of the Finnish society. The way of living in southern Lapland and Finnish villages, such as Kyrö or subsequent Ivalo in Sámi area, was closer to the cultural forms of other remote districts in Finland than the Sámi way of life.

These two separate histories of both Sámi and local Finns have intercepted each other a lot, but in the “Lapp discourse” of 2000s it has been wittingly confused with each other. Searching for one’s identity has taken a wrong turn in Lapland, to a contest with the Sámi over “the right to Lapland’s history” – as if there was only room for one history. Actually, Lapland has a very multi-voiced history with enough material for a dedicated identity without pinning it to the history of the Sámi.

Case 3:

Cultural heritage of Kemi Lapland?

“An indigenous people is an indigenous people in the region where their specific culture emerged, developed and prevailed”, is the basis of the ILO convention. The stipulations concerning Sámi rights have been limited to “the geographic area that the Sámi have traditionally inhabited and used”. The Sámi representatives have understood this to concern the modern Sámi territory. The opponents of Sámi parliament, however, have brought up a wish to extend the ILO convention to the whole area of the former Lapland. Thus, the ILO convention should apply to all old families in Lapland.¹⁵⁷

In 2012, the *Vuovde-, guolásteaddji- ja duottarsámit* (Forest, fisherman and mountain Sámi, written in Northern Sámi language) association was founded in Inari for raising “Forest Sámi” culture in the Salla and Savukoski region, for example. The founder of the association, Erika Sarivaara, has criticised that limiting the convention to the Sámi territory “excludes a large part of traditional Sámi

regions and therefore naturally also of Sámi families”. According to the association, the ILO convention and Sámi definition should apply to the whole historical Lapland. ¹⁵⁸

In spring 2015, a member of Finnish parliament from Lapland, Eeva-Maria Maijala, who had unsuccessfully applied for Sámi Parliament membership, spoke in Finnish parliament about the culture of Salla and Savukoski Forest Sámi as still an existing cultural form. She strongly opposed the exclusion of Kemi Lapland from the ILO convention: “This is a cultural murder”, she exclaimed to the press. ¹⁵⁹ Heikki J. Hyvärinen, a former lawyer of Sámi parliament, has stated that to be an indigenous people, a group must have retained all or some of its social, economic, cultural and political institutions. “It’s not known which of these institutions the persons, who are erroneously called Lapps, have retained”, Hyvärinen wondered. ¹⁶⁰

Practical examples of specific Sámi characteristics in the Forest Sámi cultural heritage have remained sparse. The Forest Sámi association has planned to revive the Kemi Sámi language, for example, spoken earlier in the Salla and Savukoski regions. They were belonging to historical Kemi *lappmark* where the Sámi language disappeared already 150-200 years ago. The association suggested that the dead Sodankylä Sámi language could be reconstructed.

According to the association, there existed a few hundred word vocabulary as well as yoiks and prayers. Moreover, the language “still lives in place names, reindeer husbandry terms, dialect words and the consciousness”, the association stated. ¹⁶¹ The association used the term “language revival”, which means increasing the number of people speaking a marginally spoken but living language. The situation was compared to that of Umeå Sámi and Piteå Sámi, where language revival had produced positive experiences. They are still living languages, too.

The Sámi were not enthusiastic about constructing the Kemi Sámi language. They fretted that funding was hard to get even for living languages. There’s need for Inari and Skolt Sámi language nests and adult education and hopefully the society will grant more funds for them. According to professor Pekka Sammallahti, there aren’t enough preserved words for reviving the language, “and nobody knows how Sodankylä Sámi was pronounced”. Based on his own studies on the same

region, Sammallahti refuted the rumour about the Kemi Sámi language spoken in the 20th century or even as late as the 1960s. The Kemi Sámi language had disappeared from the region in the first half of the 19th century at the latest.¹⁶²

Not everybody in the neighbourhood was interested in the venture either. Doctor Katja Hirvasaho from Savukoski commented in a newspaper interview that if Kemi Sámi was to be reconstructed with a computer, the result would be an artificial language that nobody has ever spoken. “Only the words that are already known would be genuine Forest Sámi. Moreover, this kind of language doesn’t carry any cultural traditions.”

She was also sceptical on the continuity of other “(Forest) Sámi” traditions in the region. Only some traces of the Forest Sámi culture have been preserved, apart from archaeological relics. The historical information has largely been interpreted by Finns, including the linguistic data. She emphasises that a vanished culture cannot be revived by studying the existing Sámi language or dabbling in traditional handicrafts and reindeer herding.

Hirvasaho pointed out that it’s misleading to link reindeer economy solely to Forest Sámi, because reindeer were owned by Finnish settlers alike already in the 18th century. The development of animal husbandry and agriculture expanded Finnish villages, which decreased contacts to nature and, as the population grew, resulted in excessive exploitation of nature, for example deer stock. Also Hirvasaho referred to her former studies in the region, when she had interviewed older people in Kuolajärvi and Salla regions. “The villagers identified themselves solely as Finns”, she stated.¹⁶³

Adam and Eve were indigenous

The neo-Lapp movement is quite contemporary with the recent right-wing conservative trends, which had their opportunity for five decades to get organised publicly in the 1990s in Finland. Before that, the socialdemocratic welfare state ideology, with a sensitive attitude towards minorities, kept public discussions in certain frames. Adverse thoughts against just about anything could only be expressed by grumbling at the kitchen table, in bars and in hunting parties. Now many groups, previously overlooked in social debate and decision-making, could make their voices heard. Another change came in the middle of the 2000s, when the world of Internet started to demonstrate its true potential. Research has established that populist movements and right-wing conservatives were quite efficient in making use of it.¹⁶⁴

Taking over net trolling is one basis of modern populism. Net forums help in finding like-minded people and formulating argumentations. When colourful ideas and figures of speech are continuously repeated also in other channels, the significance of the issue seems to become so emphasised that also media must take it into account. Eventually these bloggers begin to be regarded as experts. This seems to have happened also in the Sámi dispute, where populism has proliferated regardless of party boundaries. Every piece of news concerning the Sámi in a provincial newspaper or a trivial blog entry arouses an automatically activated mode of speech, which shifts the discussion to a desired track and repeats previously expressed even imaginary notions as established truths.

The role of the Sámi also in this communication is the minority role in a majority democracy: for each debater, there are a hundred others. The voice of the Sámi is easily drowned.

This is not, however, solely a development of the recent decades. The black-and-white, all-antagonistic speech is part of a global and human phenomenon – adverseness, which is characterised, in Arthur Schopenhauer’s words, by “the unimportance of truth and the obstinate defence of one’s own view”. Aspiration to the ability to be and remain right easily oversteps the boundaries of logic and changes to obstinacy, which makes the trickster fight with “cunning moves”, not for truth but for his or her own claim. The frenzy of argumentation overtakes prudence.¹⁶⁵

The opinions of the debaters – or in Tommi Uschanov’s words, “the confusing and partly contradictory package of opinions” – operate more with their own rules than through scientific argumentation. Uschanov states that especially in the domain of politics, people are emboldened to make interpretations, which all would recognise as childish in their areas of true competence, but which seem quite rational and credible in the arena of politics. In the net, you can start groups where many kinds of beliefs grow and prosper. Through continuous repetition, unsubstantiated claims become established as some sort of facts in discussions. They can contain factual errors and absurdities, which continue their lives even if they are rectified. “The same claims that have been rectified for dozens of times keep rising from their graves like some zombies”, Uschanov comments.¹⁶⁶

Concerning the Sámi debate, one recurring and peculiar notion is connected to the word *Sámi*. Already in 1992, Vuontis-Kalle from Hetta claimed that “as far as I know, the name Sámi refers to the so-called Helsinki Lapps. They have come here mostly after WW II, some of them employed by the society.”¹⁶⁷ The claim was perhaps ridiculous also to the person who said it, but the main thing was to prove that the Sámi had *come here from somewhere*.

A more general notion in Finland has been that *Sámi* was a political term, engendered in the 1960s, which the “new party” had used for justifying its seizure of power from the *original Lapps*. Professor Pekka Sammallahti, for example, refuted these kinds of claims as unhistorical and outright lies¹⁶⁸, but they crop up at regular intervals. The claim was seemingly supported by the fact that the *Lapp* concept

had been almost exclusive in Finnish-speaking publicity till the 1950s and 1960s, until it had quite rapidly and “mysteriously” been replaced with the *Sámi* term by the 1980s.

Adopting the *Sámi* name did not signify the birth of a new group, however, but simply marked a change in the public emphasis when the Sámi started to use the name from their own language in majority languages. It was an ancient Sámi language term that has a counterpart in all subsequent Sámi languages, such as *saemie* in South Sámi, *sää'm* in Skolt Sámi and *sábmelatj* in Luleå Sámi. The Sámi word itself was known in Finland already in the 19th century, but it was officially adopted along with the Sámi movement to describe “us” – the Sámi wanted to bring in a term from their own language to replace the Lapp name, which was given by outsiders. Similarly, eskimos wanted to call themselves inuits or Samoyeds preferred the concept Nenets people. ¹⁶⁹

So, neo-Lapps used diversionary tactics or cunning moves in Schopenhauer’s words: some fact (Sámi replaced the Lapp word in publicity) is used as proof of another fact (Sáminess is an invented thing). In Tommi Uschanov’s words, such a claim is not in itself fabricated or spurious – it is rather a half-truth or quarter-truth than untrue. It is based on a real phenomenon that has just been removed from its context and completely misinterpreted. ¹⁷⁰

It has been characteristic of the takeover or blurring tactics to bring the concepts describing “us” as close to the established Sámi mode of speech as possible. As noted earlier, neo-Lapps have aimed at adopting the Sámi set of concepts, such as terms *Lapp*, *Forest Sámi* or *indigenous people*. In a sense, they have acquired a complete manner of speaking that has plausibility in the ears of outsiders. Also the concept *Sámi without status* creates an image of an already existing group beside the Sámi who have a status. This way, we forget that the concept is one researcher’s creation, which has been argued for with statements from ten interviewees, some of whom were even opposed to the concept.

When emphasising that they are “Kemi Lapland Sámi population, descended from Lapps and excluded from the Sámi Parliament”, neo-Lapps have repeated the description “of indigenous

inhabitants of Lapland, who have become assimilated in the Finnish language due to the language politics of the church and government”.¹⁷¹ According to the neo-Lapp narrative, these indigenous inhabitants of Lapland have been exposed to *the oppression of latecoming conquerors* or *the small circle* of the Sámi Parliament, who have not wanted to include “us”. The expression of *persons who are already in* the Sámi Parliament refers to a corrupted and self-interested small circle, while *those excluded from the electoral register* represent the displaced in the narrative, the ones “rightfully entitled” to the Sámi Parliament.

The expressions insinuate that the democratically elected Sámi representative body had unjustly rejected a great number of applications, and the Finnish government or the people of Finland should intervene in the matter. The tactics of the neo-Lapps has been to publicise populist and emotional views to build community spirit among “Lapps”, as well as to question the special status of the Sámi. This questioning has changed into downright defamation of the Sámi in many cases.

Research indicates that the populist mode of speaking is characteristically directed against the *elite*. Lapland has a long tradition of hatred against masters, as well as loathing of faceless politics (which is countered with politicking). Sámi “privileges” have been criticised in the Sámi territory since the 1970s, when various commissions and committees started to consider improving the status of the minority. Improving the status of the Sámi Delegation or later the Sámi Parliament has aroused talk about a Sámi elite or a privileged group.

The Sámi Parliament has actually less power than the Finnish municipal administration, which attracts nowhere near as much aggressive criticism of “undemocratic oppression” or “inbreeding” as the Sámi Parliament does. Uschanov comments that even slightly more abstract issues, detached from everyday life, arouse hatred against masters. These include international conventions, which are suspected to influence people’s lives. They must be immediately reverted to everyday logic, by ridiculing them with comparisons to everyday life, for example, or by invoking the inexperience of southern or foreign masters.¹⁷²

Together these factors – notions of Sámi special status, suspicion about the administration of the Sámi and “imported” international conventions – arouse strong enemy images and even conspiracy theories. Already in the 1990s, neo-Lapps hinted or spoke openly about a conspiracy of scientific, administrative and political elites. There was a famous “circuit diagram” seen by a journalist from the national *Ilta-Sanomat* evening paper in 1996. It consisted of Sámi supporters from the local county constable to President Martti Ahtisaari. During a restaurant evening, it even changed into a “hit list”.¹⁷³

More moderate versions of these connections have been made later, but still the group of ignorant masters and lackeys of the Sámi has included such persons as county governor Hannele Pokka and President Tarja Halonen, not to mention numbskull lawyers and university professors. As Uschanov points out, an approach that extends beyond the everyday perspective is analogous with the arrogance and presumptuousness of the opponent in populist discourse.¹⁷⁴

Conspiracy theories strongly reflect the basic structure of the narrative created by the neo-Lapps: the pampered Sámi group that has escaped from the control of the people or “us” has been granted a special status that it is going to use for displacing other local groups. The antagonistic neo-Lapps have created a strong enemy image that has also many distasteful features.

Them – illegal immigrants

In 1852, the Wasa Court of Appeal gave a circular letter, which effectively closed the border between Norway and autonomous Finland. Next year, the emperor of Russia gave more detailed orders that reindeer herders from Norwegian soil were forbidden to enter Finland. The closing of the border in 1852 was then based on a unilateral order by Russia-Finland, and Norwegian civil servants could only declare it as a notification. Norway ratified it in 1854. In 1889, the border between Sweden and autonomous Finland was also closed.

Reindeer Sámi had previously used extensive fjell and forest areas as their pastures throughout the northern Fennoscandia. The countries had divided these areas between themselves already in 1751. The Sámi were not asked, but they were still allowed to cross borders freely. Closed borders in the late 19th century caused an upheaval in the Reindeer Sámi society, however, because they were forced to choose the citizenship of one of the countries.

The situation became very confusing and even catastrophic because the closed border prevented the Reindeer Sámi from entering their old winter territories. The pressure was directed to the winter pastures in Norwegian fjell regions, which already had plenty of reindeer. The situation resulted in mass migrations of Reindeer Sámi to different parts of northern Finland, Sweden and Norway in the next decades. Many of them settled in their earlier pasture areas, in the fjell and forest regions of Enontekiö or western Inari, for example. Others headed for new areas, such as the forest regions of northern Sodankylä or even central Scandinavia.¹⁷⁵

Martti Linkola has stated that by closing the borders the authorities committed a harmful and even cruel action towards the traditional reindeer nomadism of the Sámi. This has evidently ended the centuries-long extensive reindeer nomadism, which was based on long migrations between inland forest areas and the coast of the Arctic Sea.¹⁷⁶

More than 160 years after the closed borders, neo-Lapp supporter Jouni Kitti claimed that the Reindeer Sámi had entered Finland as a result of illegal immigration: “If the issues were not handled in compliance with an official agreement, this was an illegal trespassing to the territory of a foreign country.”¹⁷⁷ Kitti was a former member of the Sámi Parliament who had changed sides to oppose Sámi special rights.

Kitti’s claim is severely distorted and quite cynical because the Reindeer Sámi migrations were consequences of the colonialist or even imperialist policies of countries. The countries caused a livelihood catastrophe to the Reindeer Sámi and forced them to choose the citizenship of a country.

The countries subsequently left the Reindeer Sámi to cope on their own, and there was nobody to draw them “an official agreement” on the migration. The Sámi were not negotiated about anything at any point.

Kitti’s statement is, however, only one of the countless malevolent opinions that have labelled Reindeer Sámi immigrants and conquerors. This view has penetrated Finnish media and politics surprisingly well. Hilka Joki, municipal politician from Enontekiö, has criticised on several occasions that in Enontekiö “immigrant Sámi have walked all over the rights of the original population and in a sense stolen their history”.¹⁷⁸

On the other hand, the leading figure of the neo-Lapp movement in the 1990s, Jouni Eira, stated that associating large-scale reindeer husbandry “as the most essential characteristic of Lapp identity is not historically founded, because large-scale reindeer husbandry together with private ownership is specifically a Finnish livelihood originally brought to Finnish Lapland by immigrants”.¹⁷⁹ The reference to the Finnish livelihood is based on the peculiar neo-Lapp interpretation of history that large-scale reindeer husbandry was originally developed by Finnish-born *birkarls* or tax collectors! In other words, Reindeer Sámi were not “indigenous” even in their livelihood, but had in a sense robbed it from Finns as immigrants to take over areas belonging to Finns (and indigenous Lapps).

In neo-Lapp interpretations, Reindeer Sámi immigrants corrupted the relations between different population groups. Niilo Tervo’s view is that all were happy Forest Sámi for a long time, but “the idyll was broken - - once: the arrival of Reindeer Lapps started fierce conflicts over reindeer pastures and many Inari people fell into poverty”.¹⁸⁰ Kari Akujärvi comments: “Before the Sámi Parliament controlled by Reindeer Sámi, we could live without quarrels and self-interest.”¹⁸¹

In 2013, the Sámi Youth of Finland association refuted the conception of Reindeer Sámi as immigrants, because Finland did not become independent until 1917. There was no state called Finland before that:

The Sámi groups living in the area of the present-day Finland lived demonstrably in their current dwelling areas at that time. Therefore, the Sámi could not have come to Finland from another state. Speaking of immigrants is consciously fabricated untruthful propaganda aimed at denying the immemorial rights of the Sámi to their current territories. The idea of “the Sámi coming from somewhere” is based on Finnish historiography, which does not consider the Sámi history and nomadic way of life.¹⁸²

The latter part of the Sámi youth statement referred to the part of the ILO convention that specifically emphasises the historical heritage of an indigenous *people* in an area – regardless of what discrete Sámi group that is.

When Kari Kyrö repeated the idea of Reindeer Sámi as immigrants from somewhere else, Inari Sámi Hannu Kangasniemi replied: “He forgets, however, how young the Finnish state is. It is quite usual that a nation, such as the Kurds, lives in the territories of several countries. They are nevertheless a united people – and Inari Sámi or Skolt Sámi (or North Sámi) cannot be separated from this people.”

¹⁸³ Historian Tarja Nahkiaisojä has also commented that the number of Reindeer Sámi migrating to Finland was after all quite small compared to the migration of Finns to the Sámi territory especially in the late 19th century. Inari met with a real invasion of Finns starting from the 1890s.¹⁸⁴

Historical accuracy or diversity was not the purpose of the neo-Lapps in the Reindeer Sámi debate, however. It was all about conscious political tactics, and the right-wing populist concept of *immigrant* was a cunning invention for that purpose. It contained negative anti-immigration associations elsewhere in Finnish discussion and justified the rights of *original inhabitants* or “us”.

A neo-Lapp master-stroke was to draw a parallel between the whole Sáminess and the Reindeer Sámi or these Norwegians who had taken over “the lands of the indigenous Lapps”. In effect, they implied that the Reindeer Sámi had also unlawfully taken over the Sámi Parliament.

In reality, there are Utsjoki Sámi, Inari Sámi as well as Skolt Sámi working in the Sámi Parliament, apart from Reindeer Sámi. The Sámi Parliament therefore represents all known Sámi groups in Finland from different parts of the Sámi territory. The representatives are elected in democratic

elections, and these representatives form a cabinet in mutual negotiations and decide on common issues in plenary sessions.

Based on their interpretation of history, however, the neo-Lapps dispute the legality of the Sámi Parliament by stating that it does not represent true Sáminess. They are not particularly concerned with the accuracy of counterarguments. One writer implies that the descendants of the immigrants “got organised and founded the Sámi Delegation in the 1950s”¹⁸⁵, but the delegation was actually founded by the government in the 1970s as a joint representative body of all Sámi. The claim of another commentator that the Sámi have not been active until “year 1974”¹⁸⁶ as a sort of political party probably refers to the fact that the Sámi Delegation started in 1973 – there was no special change in Sámi politics in 1974.

A report made in 1962 is continuously mentioned in connection with the Sámi definition. It is called “graduate summer job” or “survey of one graduate group”. “Does the indigenous people or the Sámi rest on the personal opinion of graduates without historical basis?”¹⁸⁷ As stated earlier, the 1962 report complemented the population survey that had been ongoing already from 1945. Statistics have been checked continuously. Everyone has the right to apply to become voter in the Sámi Parliament and appeal the decision all the way to the Supreme Administrative Court.

At worst, the accounts of the neo-Lapps stumble from one error to another regardless of publicly presented accurate information about the issues. For example, Pekka Pekkala states that there is an attempt in Sámi politics to seize Lapp rights and history to clans that came from Norway in 1847.¹⁸⁸ The year is entirely invented, and so is the whole claim. According to the same writer, the state and the reindeer farm act gave farms also to those who have “fled from the taxman with their reindeer to Finland and conquered the home district of the North Lapland and Inari Sámi, driving Fisherman, Reindeer and Forest Lapps into a predicament”.¹⁸⁹ Now the Reindeer Sámi were also tax exiles and violent conquerors.

The intentional and continuous defamation of the Reindeer Sámi is regrettable in the sense that they have traditionally been the strongest carriers and transmitters of the Sámi cultural heritage. The incessant harping about the inferiority of the Reindeer Sámi on Internet columns can even be considered harassment where the objects no longer seem to be regarded as people with feelings, but as targets to the frustrations and stereotypes of the oppressors.

Earlier chairmen of the Sámi Parliament, Pekka Aikio and Klemetti Näkkäljärvi, were themselves Reindeer Sámi and had to personally endure smear campaigns for that. In spring 2015, Skolt Sámi Tiina Sanila-Aikio became chairperson, but the modes of speech remained harsh. This proved that the opposition was ultimately directed at the Sámi Parliament or the foundation of Sámi cultural autonomy.

Us – the most original indigenous people

The desire of the neo-Lapps to refute “the claims of the Reindeer Sámi who are now posing as majority Sámi” also led to their denial of the Sámi as an indigenous people. They invoked common sense and threat scenarios – as well as expert knowledge, as long as it was the right kind:

Can the rest of the population be collectively wrong and only the Sámi Parliament with their claims right? - - The ministry of justice should wake up to hear new study results, for hindering clear distortions of history to be manifested right by laws. If we do not now listen to reason and start researching in cooperation, there is a great danger that people, harassed “against the wall”, direct their anxiety to wrong channels.¹⁹⁰ (Underlining by Lapp village associations.)

Already in 1997, neo-Lapps refuted the importance of the Sámi language as an essential basis of the indigenous people status, because international laws and statutes reportedly do not require language as a characteristic of an indigenous people; it is only a part of the culture. “Language is important in culture, but anyone can learn a language”, they disparaged.¹⁹¹ If someone had stated this about the relation of Finnishness and the Finnish language, it would certainly have created a sensation.

When the Sámi Parliament and the Supreme Administrative Court rejected over a thousand applications to be recognised as Sámi in 1999, Lapp village associations interpreted the court statement strangely. Their view was that they represented “the indigenous people whose linguistic minority the Sámi are”. Law expert Lauri Hannikainen could not find this interpretation from the decree.¹⁹² Neo-Lapps have questioned the indigenous people concept defined in international conventions also by reducing it to a question of who were first in each region in Lapland. Here they have relied on documents drawn by the majority population, which pertain especially to settlement, while societies based on Sámi oral tradition were not considered “permanent settlement”.

Lapp village associations invoke the ILO convention definition of an indigenous people, which 1) has an idiosyncratic culture, which 2) descends from a population that already lived in the area when the current majority population started to conquer and settle the area and which 3) regardless of its judicial status has completely or partly retained its culture. As noted earlier, neo-Lapps have not much tried to demonstrate “their idiosyncratic culture”; they have rather emphasised the significance of genealogy. Their view is that direct lineage is sufficient to prove a person’s Sáminess.

Lapp village associations even suggested using medical methods to determine whose veins really carry the blood of the indigenous people. Law experts state that races and tribes have mixed to such an extent that this sort of investigation does not solve anything. “Sáminess, for example, is not based on the composition of the blood; it is based on the person’s living connection to the Sámi language and culture”, commented Hannikainen.¹⁹³

One populist practice has been to extend the concept of indigenous people historically and geographically to blur its meaning almost completely. Professor Eljas Pohtila, who has lineage to Lapland and is the former chief director of the Finnish Forest Research Institute, has commented on several occasions that all Finns belong to “an endangered tribe” as justifiably as the Sámi.¹⁹⁴ The indigenous people status of Finns has been an especially popular argument in Internet discussion forums.

A still more extensive conception is equally popular; it was presented on the placards of neo-Lapp demonstrators at the Finnish Parliament House already in 1995: “Adam and Eve were indigenous”. Again, you can point out along the lines of Uschanov that the claims are not untrue in themselves. It is quite true that all people in the world are indigenous one way or another. The purpose of the claims is not to prove the self-evidence, however, but to make the indigenous people concept ridiculous or at least meaningless.

In this respect, the populist mode of speech differs essentially from appropriate argumentation, which has its own set of rules: claims must be justified with verifiable information. It is a language founded on agreement, and all participants in a discussion are expected to use and understand it. Instead, the elusive populist mode of speech starts to speak another language with other rules. It wants to see Monday as Wednesday, and the moon as blue cheese. As Uschanov says, facts are the first to fly to the scrap heap in this language, or in Homer Simpson’s words: “You can use facts to prove anything that is even remotely true.”¹⁹⁵

It is easy to be lured into populist reasoning, because it is based on clear black-and-white dichotomies. A listener might react guardedly if the speaker states that minority legislation is unnecessary because we all belong to minorities in some way, or that the state of Finland does not exist because it was not founded unanimously by all countries. But these are matters of common knowledge. Sámi issues, on the other hand, are a subject where absurd arguments are not a vice but a refreshing point of view.

You may ask, however, what sense is there in the indigenous people concept that strives to international justice, if it includes all Finns or all inhabitants of the world. *Indigenous people* is a present-day concept developed by means of a common agreement between countries to protect the current situation of peoples that have been designated as indigenous peoples. As Pekka Sammallahti reminded, the ILO convention is not retroactive or merely pertaining to history. Researcher Sanna Valkonen specifies:

So, it is easy to forget that the indigenous people concept primarily refers to the present time of these peoples: the Sámi are a culturally and ethnically special group inside a different and governing system. The social conventions and knowledge systems of the indigenous people, such as the ethnic recognition based on lineages that the Sámi use, have enabled the survival of this cultural specificity and community. ¹⁹⁶

Inari Sámi – an ally and a disguise

The attack on the Reindeer Sámi reflects one of the neo-Lapp blurring tactics. They have visibly taken the side of Inari Sámi against *majority Sámi*, who consist of Reindeer Sámi only. Instead, Inari Sámi are mentioned as if all of them were excluded from the Sámi Parliament. In reality, North Sámi people also include other groups than Reindeer Sámi: Utsjoki Sámi and Tana Sámi. Similarly, the electoral register of the Sámi Parliament includes the majority of Inari Sámi and Skolt Sámi.

The desire of the neo-Lapps to identify with Inari Sámi reflects their attempt to take advantage of the disagreements between Sámi groups that have become apparent as the modern Sámi society has become established. In the 1970s and 1980s when the Sámi movement demanded its rights from the government, it was building an image of united Sáminess and tried to fade differences and raise a community spirit. North Sámi from Utsjoki, Inari and Enontekiö fronted the movement, which also included Inari Sámi and Skolt Sámi in Finland.

The ways of the Sámi movement to speak about Sáminess were quite widely accepted among the Sámi as a defensive strategy at that time, when they were used for arguing for their own claims to majority populations. The situation changed when the Sámi administration stabilised with the Sámi language act and the establishing of the Sámi Parliament, for example. Small Sámi groups – Sea Sámi in Norway, South Sámi in Sweden and Norway, Inari Sámi and Skolts in Finland – did not necessarily recognise themselves in the Sámi image that was largely based on the North Sámi cultural tradition.

Strengthening small languages or so-called revitalisation means “an independence struggle” for small Sámi groups also in relation to the heritage of the Sámi movement. It does not apply only to language,

but relates broadly to a re-evaluation and appreciation of one's own cultural heritage. It can be even intense when the special nature of one's own language and cultural heritage is emphasised by contrasting it to others, especially to North Sámi culture.¹⁹⁷

So, there are tensions also among the Sámi, arousing discussion about how Sáminess should be talked about. These tensions have been apparent in the Sámi dispute especially in discussions about Inari Sáminess – even among the Inari Sámi themselves. Especially Inari Sámi Anu Avaskari (from the Aikio clan) has become prominent in the Sámi Parliament by emphasising the role of the Inari Sámi in decision-making. She has founded the Anarâšah (Inari Sámi) association, which has regarded the language criterion of the Sámi definition as a problem. The association has supported a wider Sámi definition, and consequently it has become an important ally to the neo-Lapps. According to the association, the indigenous people definition is unclear in the case of the Inari Sámi, and it has called for a similar special law for the Inari Sámi as the Skolt Sámi have.¹⁹⁸

Inari Sámi Matti Morottaja, former chairman of the Sámi Parliament, has considered a dedicated Inari Sámi law a good idea in principle. However, it involves similar problems with defining the Inari Sámi as in general Sámi legislation. Morottaja's view is that not all members of the Anarâšah organisation are Sámi according to the Sámi Parliament definition. Some families may also have Utsjoki and Skolt Sámi roots, and so Morottaja asks if these people have the same rights as other Inari Sámi. In some districts, the Inari Sámi home area also overlaps the Skolt Sámi home area.¹⁹⁹

Inari Sámi Jouni "Haikonen" Aikio, on the other hand, collected an appeal of private Inari Sámi people about the Sámi definition as a countermove to Avaskari's politics in autumn 2014. The list had the names of 80 Inari Sámi people. "I became alert when such things as the North Sámi discriminating against the Inari Sámi started to pop up in publicity. I thought this was not right and decided to collect a list to support the Sámi Parliament law", commented Aikio. The appeal stated that the Sámi definition proposal of the Sámi Parliament working group was sufficiently broad, while the existing "Lapp paragraph" or Sáminess proved with documents was contrary to the means of the

Inari Sámi to recognise their community members. “It would also endanger the future of the whole Sámi community.”²⁰⁰

Another Inari Sámi association, Anarâškielâ servi, which focuses on developing the Sámi language especially by means of language nests and seldom comments political issues, expressed its support to the ratification of the ILO convention in spring.²⁰¹ Ilmari Mattus, long-time Inari Sámi opinion leader, even mentioned identity theft (*identiteetsuáladem*) in connection with the Anarâšah association, because he could not recognise many association members as Inari Sámi:

If some group starts to use the name of a people, and part of the people do not accept the use of their name, that is an identity theft, or at least kidnap. Although the group uses the people’s name, its true owners cannot influence how this group behaves, who belong to the group and what kind of statements the group makes.²⁰²

Because of its counterposition towards the Northern Sámi, Inari Sáminess has provided the neo-Lapps an object to identify with. It has seemed to be in a similar “discriminated position in relation to the majority Sámi” as the neo-Lapps themselves. This has been apparent also in writings by outsiders, where Inari Sámi have been used as weapons against *the Sámi in power*.²⁰³ Contrary to Reindeer Sámi, Tana Sámi or Skolts, the Inari Sámi have been in contact with Finns for a long time, and there have been mixed marriages already since the 18th century. Consequently, the Fennicisation of Inari Sámi families has been taking place for a longer time and continued through the 19th century, unlike in more southern parts of Lapland, for example.

When neo-Lapps or Forest Sámi present Inari Sámi as their “allies”, they like to list all Inari Sámi families from Valle to Sarre as circuitous evidence²⁰⁴, as if it would prove the Sáminess of the Lapps. Most of the Valle or Sarre families are actually members of the Sámi Parliament, while neo-Lapps are not. The attitude towards Sámi roots has changed in a few decades in Inari. Still in the first part of the 1990s, a speaker in a summer party of an Inari family commented how fortunate it was for the family that “Lapp blood has not tainted our veins”. It was known already at that time from Anja

Akujärvi's *Morottajien sukukirja* (Morottaja Genealogy), for example, that there was a lot of Inari Sámi blood running in Finnish families in Ivalo.²⁰⁵

When discussion about the ILO convention became heated, many people quickly found Sámi roots in their families. Their earlier deprecation of Sáminess changed into emphasising instead that they were victims of history (and “the Reindeer Sámi parliament”), when they had been forced to deny their own Sáminess. Some have appealed to the fact that the boundaries of Inari Sámi identity have always been more flexible or indeterminate than with the North Sámi, because they have always lived on the borderlines of different cultures. The lifestyle of Inari Sámi in western Inari, for example, has crossbred with Reindeer and Tana Sámi, while in main villages it could have resembled the Finnish freeholder lifestyle. In eastern Inari, coexistence with Skolt Sámi has given its own nuance to both cultures.

The discussion in the former Kemi Lapland area about the Sámi roots of Lapland's inhabitants manifested itself in miniature size in Inari. These roots are closer to the present day in Inari than elsewhere in Lapland, however. The Akujärvi, Huhtamella, Manermaa and Kiviniemi families, for example, are partly kin to the Inari Sámi Morottaja family, but they were already mostly categorised as Finns in the 1880s. One Akujärvi was said to have lived “like a Lapp” still in the 1890s, while others were found to be Finns in their way of life and language.²⁰⁶

Awakening to Sáminess has happened even in the Kyrö or Ivalo village, which had traditionally been a strongly Fennicising centre in the municipality. Vicar Jakob Fellman commented already in the 1820s that the Kyrö villagers were “Finns all the way to their clothing”. The Sámi language was not used as the community language, and the villagers identified themselves as ethnic Finns in distinction from the surrounding Sámi.²⁰⁷ While Sáminess was preserved along with settlement also in the life of freeholders in northern Inari, for example, it became assimilated with the Finnish language and culture in Kyrö. This development continued strongly also after WWII when Sámi spouses came to visit, for example.

In a family reunion in Kyrö in 2008, however, questions were asked if the Kyrö villagers were Finns, Lapps or perhaps Forest Sámi. Local historian from Ivalo, Usko Luostarinen, tended to the opinion that they were Finns.²⁰⁸ Amateur historian Erkki Lilja's series of articles, published in the local Inarilainen newspaper, shared this sentiment.²⁰⁹ Former director of the provincial archives, Samuli Onnela, joked that the blood picture of the Kyrö villagers was more similar to Tavastians than "damn Savonians" – also he said nothing about the Sámi. There was also a play in the family reunion which colourfully enacted the arrival of the Finnish family ancestor to the Inari Sámi Morottaja family lands and the later turns in the lives of his peasant descendants.²¹⁰

Hely Johanna Kyrö, on the other hand, thought that these opinions were unfounded, and the play was "a fabrication of outsider imagination and a fake Kyrö village history infiltrated through a family reunion". She also discarded the Inari parish history (1952) by Tuomo Itkonen as fancifully untrue.

Kyrö invoked factual knowledge in an emotional manner:

Fabricating history is a shameful crime. As a child, I sat by my grandfather and heard him say that he used to sit by his own grandfather and talk about these things. I absorbed all knowledge he told me in the Henterk chamber. His own grandfather had lived in the cabin of the first Henterk, and the knowledge was authentic and by no means "hearsay", outsiders can say what they will. The Kyrö village had and has no universities and researchers to record scientific documents, but knowledge is knowledge. - - It is clear that part of the Kyrö villagers have become Finns, but it is equally clear that quite many have their old identity, and history is and remains.²¹¹

Kyrö's statement is a good example of circuitous argumentation where you say one thing and believe you are proving another. When the writer started from the crime of fabrication, you would expect the reasoning to proceed to evidence. However, she only told about sitting in the Henterk chamber and listening him giving "information" about something that is not told. Kyrö repeated in her writing the Fennicisation history of the Sámi as part of the Kyrö villagers' history also after WW II: "It is sad but understandable that post-war generations tended to be raised as Finns, because Lapps were not appreciated in Ivalo, which was populated by Finns working on the power plant sites across the

eastern border. It was not particularly pleasant for people who had been in evacuation to hear ‘the the truth about inferior people’”.²¹²

So Kyrö’s view is that the racial scientific studies were now focused on the Kyrö villagers, when the earlier notion was that they only involved the Sámi population. Other similar statements have sentimentally invoked the Inari Sámi ancestors resting on the Inari cemetery island and how their resting places “cry for justice”.²¹³ Invoking ancestors on a cemetery island refers to the exhumations of Sámi skeletons in anthropological studies from the end of the 19th century to the 1930s. Furthermore, they support the neo-Lapp claim that because the cemetery island has only “our” ancestors, not ancestors of the latecomer Reindeer Sámi, “we are indigenous”.

Kari Kyrö, for example, used the metaphor of ancestors resting peacefully on the cemetery island as an antithesis of the Sámi Parliament representatives, who were quarrelsome and aggressive in their opinions. Kyrö was one of those who had found his Sáminess in his later years. He could not fully identify with the existing Sámi, not even Inari Sámi, but declared himself “an Inariland Lapp” in some newspaper writings. He also used the paraphrase “Sámi of Inari”, thus he did not refer to the language or the Inari Sámi group, but Sámi in the Inari area generally. Associating with the Inari Sámi, however, gave him opportunity to identify himself specifically with their history and draw examples from there.

He began one of his writings with a cunning move by connecting a thousand Sámi Parliament applicants to the Inari area, although the applicants were actually from different parts of Lapland. He also connected the Inari Sámi language nests to himself: “Fortunately, language revival is now in progress. Children of parents who have lost their language can learn the language of their ancestors in language nests and grown-ups can learn it in schools.” This way, the strong language revitalization started and maintained by the Sámi became part of “our” struggle.

Through the Inari Sámi, Kyrö suggested that “we” are the only group that has lived through known history in the area of one parish in the territory of the present-day Finland. In his reference to the ancient origin of the group, he nevertheless had to use a sentence from author Johan Turi, a Reindeer Sámi (!) from the far west: “It has not been said that we had come here from anywhere” – and even that in the inaccurate sloganised form.²¹⁴ Kyrö could now invoke also other characteristics of Inari Sáminess, such as docility and peacefulness. He used these terms to taunt the Sámi Parliament working in Sajos, which was a crooked troublemaker in his opinion:

[The Sámi Cultural Centre in Inari] Sajos is located on the ancient lands of the Inari Sámi, who are peace-loving and tolerant people and who have extended group acceptance to incomers. - - The graves of their ancestors are on the cemetery islands in Lake Inari. It is not appropriate to come to Sajos with intrigue in mind. Such that is aimed at denying blood brothers, disowning their identity and displacing them from their land. They who still some time ago used the Inari Sámi language at home, but who were once forced to forsake it by the actions of administrators and the church.²¹⁵

Kyrö used cunning moves to draw attention away from the fact that he should also have proved his basic claim: that quarrelsome Reindeer Sámi really had taken over the Sámi Parliament, and that there were no other North Sámi or Inari Sámi or Skolts in the Parliament, and that someday in Inari there had actually been a group, to which he so emphatically belongs.

In Kyrö’s views, searching for distant Sámi roots turned into criticism of the prevalent Sámi administration, and at the same time descendants of local families start to emphasise that they are “more indigenous” than “contemporary” Sámi, who had mostly immigrated from the territories of Norway and Sweden. Inari Sámi Hannu Kangasniemi objected to the image painted by Kyrö that there were three kinds of people living in the Inari area: Sámi, Finns and Lapps. Lapp stood for Sámi, however, because the former term had been replaced with the Sámi word due to its negative tone. Kangasniemi criticised the “Lapp” concept used by Kyrö as a new invention:

So there have been no other peoples living here apart from the Sámi (=Lapps). Kyrö and the heritage association have thus created a new people, which was apparently born 20 years ago, when some people started to appeal for land rights based on various registers.

But surely registers cannot create a new people. It is just a means of registering people in the state of Sweden at that time.²¹⁶

According to Kangasniemi, Sáminess is not only lineage. He wondered why local Finns have to try to create themselves a new identity “as a Lapp” – their own cultural heritage should suffice. A writer in the letters to the editor in the *Inarilainen* newspaper accompanied him: “The Sámi Parliament is for the Sámi. A lot of people live in Inari with quite long-time roots in Inari, but that does not make them Sámi. - - They can be Inari people, for instance, and proud of that.”²¹⁷

... In the name of peace and optimism...

Neo-Lapps have often complained that the Sámi hush them up to death, or that their cause is neither heard nor considered, which reflects the arrogance of *the majority Sámi*. On the other hand, when the chairmen of the Sámi Parliament, members and external researchers, for example, have commented neo-Lapp statements, they have been branded quarrelsome, uncooperative and self-interested. Neo-Lapp statements are often harsh and occasionally even denigrating, but generally they conclude with an assurance of the writer’s own peacefulness.

Kyrö, for example, begins one of his letters to the editor by stating that although he is a peace-loving person, he has now been forced to interfere in the discussion, because issues “are obviously being confused on purpose”. After attacking *the Sámi Parliament, its defenders, outsiders* and “*the selection collegium*” of the election committee, he starts to look for the culprit:

Outlines of land rights are marketed by obscure administration in the leash of the Sámi Parliament. - - It startles even an unsuspecting and thoroughly peace-loving person. Have all forces now been unleashed in this completely useless warmongering? Has the outsider militia also been recruited to this mercenary army provoking false notions? Have these already well-known ‘warriors’ and pompous wordsmiths been appointed as inspiring demagogues? If this is so, it begs the question: where do these assignments come from? Do they perhaps come from organs funded by the society or from people hired for official jobs?²¹⁸

After using increasingly hard expressions about the worthlessness of the Sámi Parliament, Kyrö wants the Sámi to be more constructive and peaceful: “Our ancestors have lived here in harmony. Is it not the time now to sit down at several negotiation tables?” As a peaceful man, he appeals to conciliatory actions and encourages cooperation: “If some have succeeded to cunningly trick some current state decision-makers momentarily to their side, is it wise to rely on its favour and permanence?” Then he smashes *registered Sámi*, who are supported by *politicians hunting for brownie points* and whose *arbitrary machinations are ousting* the true Lapps. To break this autocracy, there is reportedly “irrefutable research data on many issues concerning us that has been shrouded in mystery before”.²¹⁹

Neo-Lapp discussions repeat the phrase “Lapps, Sámi and Finns have lived as equals for a long time”. It contains two meanings: Lapps are separate from the Sámi, and equality has disappeared on the local level because of the Sámi Parliament: “Before the 1960s and 1970s, all were Lapps without problems with each other.”²²⁰ When Pekka Sammallahti has interfered with the factual errors of neo-Lapps, he has been reproached: “Like other southerners, also Pekka Sammallahti tries to create artificial conflicts between practitioners of different livelihoods and disrupt families, villages and other communities, so that they would not be able to cooperate to defend their rights, but would lose their rights because of various state property transactions and laws.”²²¹

Thus Sammallahti is also a *southerner* and therefore disqualified to discuss matters. An essential concept in the hatred against masters in Lapland has always been the south. The sentence implies that before artificial boundaries, different families and villages in Lapland have not quarrelled, but lived in harmony. Take it with a pinch of salt.

The intolerance of the Sámi is emphasised in many writings. Maria Lähteenmäki, a historian from Lapland, has crystallised her opinion: the extreme sides of the current identity struggle are “multicultural open Lapland against ethnically closed Sámland”. She names a representative of her former extreme, geographer Pentti Viitala, who in 1987 stated that the Sámi are riding on the imago of “an oppressed people” and that “the sound of the yoik carries far now” – this is then a

multiculturally open statement. Instead, Maria Lähteenmäki wonders at a map she saw in the Sámi museum Siida; the Sámi territory drawn in it signifies a bitter demarcation in the identity of Central Lapland's inhabitants. In the writer's view, it seems that Finland's decision-makers have indeed committed treason:

Today the southern border of Lapland (=Sámi territory) passes across the country on the latitude of Vuotso or 130 kilometres more to the north than before. Not one shot has been fired nor a proper speech given about this huge cession of territory to the white lords of Finland. The primeval forests, powerful rapids and other natural resources of central Lapland have been turned over to forest capitalists. High and mighty Sámi researchers and civil servants evade the issue carefully. The chairman of the Sámi Parliament, who is also from central Lapland, will not or is not allowed to admit that Lapland is a wider entity.

Lähteenmäki admits that, contrary to the inhabitants of Central Lapland, the Sámi have founded their identity on ethnicity, common history and the Sámi language, and they have found a reference group in the international indigenous people's forum. "Because ethnicity and a reference group are so clearly justifiable for the Sámi, they have also succeeded in proposing a culturally autonomous region in the northern polar cap."

Instead, "the Lapps and Finns who are considered less pure racially" feel that the Sámi have abandoned them and do not want to acknowledge and support the inhabitants of Central Lapland. In Lähteenmäki's opinion, this means that the Sámi promote closed borders in the multicultural northern territory, while the inhabitants of Central Lapland would be supporters of "open borders".²²² So Lähteenmäki thinks that the Sámi territory, which was founded for protecting Sámi rights, is an unfair and exclusive demarcation brought about by political and economic reasons. The Sámi people, which has generally been considered multilingual and multicultural, has become a closely guarded community that wants to keep others strictly on the outside.

Case 4:

Racism, Lehtola and police

In May 2011, I was on a holiday trip “somewhere in the Pyrenees”. I also stopped off in France in the town of Lourdes, where I joined pilgrims from various parts of the world to wonder at the holy cave of Lourdes. I did not experience a miracle cure, but continued my journey to the northern coast of Spain. I received a phone call in Bilbao. I answered it to inform the caller that the call would cost a lot to both of us and could we talk later. “This is the police department of Oulu, good day. I am calling about the police investigation request that has been made of you. Could you come to an interrogation soon?”

I already knew about the matter beforehand. In last autumn, I had given an interview to Sámi radio, where I had compared the ongoing Sámi discussion to the racist statements of the 1920s and 1930s. I had studied the atmosphere of the newly independent Finland and its conceptions of the Sámi. Racial studies had of course faded since then, but similar attitudes and positions had returned. Sámi radio had made a bulletin of my interview in Finnish on the national radio website. The headline was “Racist movements are becoming more common in Finland.”

The bulletin stated: “The Sámi believed generally in the 1980s and 1990s that racism had already disappeared from Finland. Lehtola himself thought this had already happened, but the reality was different. Movements with critical views on immigration have grown stronger and forces with a unilingual agenda have increased also in old parties. The Sámi territory also has a racism-oriented ‘Lapp’ movement.” The editorial staff had appended the bulletin with: “Local so-called Lapp village associations supported by some journalists refuse to accept the Sámi as an indigenous people and claim that status to themselves.”²²³

Soon after the bulletin was published, Veikko Väänänen, journalist from the Lapin Kansa newspaper, wrote to me in slight agitation: “Can you elaborate your statement on Sámi radio ‘in writing’? What exactly is racism in the activity of the Lapp movement? Which journalists are supporting that racism? This racism talk has caught my interest when such serious accusations are shot quite lightly in the

dark. I have sometimes wondered – for I have also had my share of that – when some ‘racist’-branded person makes an investigation request of him/herself to the police and a reciprocal request to investigate an unfounded claim or denunciation at the same time.”

Väänänen referred to his own reputation as a reporter, whom the Sámi had long criticized about anti-Sámi journalism. Even researchers had pointed out to his attitudes as injurious for the Sámi. In order to make mutual understanding, I promised him to make a correction to the radio by explaining that Lapp village associations specifically were not racist in my opinion, but that there were racist characteristics in the Internet discussion on the Sámi issue. The Sámi radio did correct the matter, but the Sámi language TV news broadcast, *Ođđasat*, cited the bulletin again that evening.²²⁴

The next day, chairman of the Inariland Lapp village association, Yrjö Mattila, made a police investigation request of me. The day after that, the Lapin Kansa newspaper ran a piece of news written by journalist Väänänen, where Mattila said he was “upset” by Lehtola’s statements. The news article cited my correspondence with Väänänen.²²⁵ The reasons for the police investigation request were agitation “against an ethnic group” and libel/gross libel. It was related to my accusation that Lapp associations were racist.

I agreed with the police constable that I would come to the interrogation after my return to Finland. I promised to send my preliminary answer soon, although he did not require that. My holiday in Bilbao took an unexpected turn. When I thought back what kind of language had been used against the Sámi in papers and the Internet, it seemed absurd that it is a Sámi who gets sued for libel and agitation against “an ethnic group”. I also thought it was typical aggressive tactics of them, trying to staunch discussions.

In my statement, I refuted the notion that “Lapps” are an ethnic group like the Sámi are. I explained that with the opinions of “Lapps”, I had referred to the extensive discussion that had taken place in media, letters to the editor as well as in the Internet. I commented: “I have considered the two last-mentioned channels especially good forums for anti-Sámi writings, which have ranged in their tone from prolonged disparagement and defamation to chauvinistic and “racism-oriented” writing. There

are plenty of examples already from the Kiisa newspaper, published by “the Lapps” in the 1990s, to current letters to the editor and Internet writings.”

To be on the safe side, I decided to search the Internet for examples of what kind of racist writings I was referring to. It took five minutes in my Bilbao lodgings to collect several pages of evidence material. I pulled it from two randomly read Internet discussions from 2011. I copied the example material with typos and all and added my own interpretations to the statements.

Attachment:

Randomly picked opinions from the Internet related to the anti-Sámi “Lapp” discussion. V.-P. Lehtola’s comments included:

Source: <http://keskustelu.suomi24.fi/node/9610951>

BRUUNOEMELI

21.1.2011 13:41

To the ignorant

Speaking of the indigenous people of Lapland, I can tell the ignorant that before the Sámi came to Finnish Lapland from Norway with their great -mostly stolen- reindeer herds, this area had already been inhabited for centuries before that. So much for the indigenous people.

Comment: So the writer thinks the Sámi are basically reindeer thieves and not the indigenous people they have untruthfully impersonated in connection with the UN since 1973. Disclaiming and adopting the indigenous people status is characteristic to “Lapp” modes of speech, but apparently indignation is also vented through slander and distortion.

MANQUU

22.1.2011 19:50

the sámi

could be called hillbillies

Comment: derogatory comment

NUOIT

22.1.2011 16:22

The Sámi started to conquer Lapland at the same time as Finns conquered Southern Finland. The Sámi destroyed the language and culture of Lapland’s indigenous people. And are now Lapland’s indigenous people. The most indigenous group in Finnish Lapland are Inari people, others have

either changed their language or come from elsewhere. That is the dispute. Dammit, nowadays you can get land and lots of money with the indigenous people status.

Comment: The Sámi are aggressive conquerors who have committed fraud against the state to acquire land property and economic prosperity?

TÖLLÖTTELEMÄÄN

21.1.2011 13:02

Sámi to a reservation and tourists to stare at them.

Immigrants could sell tickets, that takes care of them, too.

Comment: Derogatory comment, which is probably meant as a joke, agitates against an ethnic group, i.e. encourages to imprisonment and humiliation. Comparison with (idle in many writings) immigrants resembles "Lapp" notions of the Sámi as "immigrants".

ALKUPERÄISKANSALAINE

21.1.2011 15:54

Finnish Sámi are demanding unreasonable privileges for themselves e.g. in land ownership which other Finns don't have. Impartiality and social justice are needed also in this issue. The Sámi mustn't be granted rights which other Finns don't have. A small Sámi minority is now trying to displace the Finnish majority.

Comment: The notion that the Sámi are discriminating against the majority with "unreasonable privileges" has been a continuous "Lapp" argument.

----R----

21.1.2011 17:07

Damn Sámi!

Feeding the Sámi costs a lot to Finnish taxpayers. Even berry pickers have to be flown to Lapland from the other side of the globe because the Sámi cannot be bothered to work, they just fool around with booze. Goddam ingrates just complain!!!

Comment: Purely racist assertion of the Sámi as slackers and drunkards who are sustained by "us" (the state).

22.1.2011 12:08

Work-shy and binge drinking Sámi don't bring tourists to Lapland!

Comment: See above.

FINLAND TO FINNS

22.1.2011 14:44

whaaat

What the...!! are the Sámi an indigenous people in Finland now? WTF!!! Haven't they come from elsewhere like us other Finns. None of us can be called an indigenous people. And is it right that some culture, which is sustained artificially with various legislative means, gets special treatment.

Comment: Includes a popular Lapp notion of (Reindeer) Sámi as immigrants who are not entitled to benefits. The idea of an artificial culture is a so-called essentialistic generalisation, where "primitiveness" or non-modernity are considered the basic nature of the Sámi, in the vein of old race theoretical thinking.

In my statement to the police I pointed out: “Even such a small sample reflects diversely the opinion climate I referred to in my interview. Part of these writings are distinctly ‘racism-oriented’ – especially when the definition of racism is understood more intricately than merely as visible ‘racial discrimination’. Racism-orientation can manifest itself as prolonged belittling and defamation of the Sámi, questioning their identity on more sophisticated grounds than racism, or consciously refusing them the rights that enable them to foster their own language and culture.” I specifically referred to Vesa Puuronen’s book *Suomalainen rasismi* (Finnish Racism).

“You may ask how harmful to the developing identity of the maturing Sámi youth, for example, is the constant blaring in the letters to the editor that you are not true descendants of Lapps (you have an invented history), that you are not genuine citizens of Finland but immigrants, who are discussed in a negative tone in Finland, or that you are not an indigenous people, although your untruthful representatives claim that? The repetition and continuation of such speech during 20 years compelled me to talk about ‘a racism-oriented’ mode of speech.”

I continued: “Especially Reindeer Sámi have suffered downright harassment, because “Lapps” argue that they have deprived (both other Sámi and Finns) of their lands as well as the right to represent the Sámi. The claim about Reindeer Sámi dominance does not hold true, because the Sámi Parliament, for example, has representatives from Utsjoki Sámi as well as Inari and Skolt Sámi. The purpose of the defamatory rhetoric against the Sámi is to arouse conflicts among the Sámi – or group punishment in the Sámi community.

I also added that the publicity of the Inariland Lapp village association has been managed strictly according to paragraphs of law and even with “admirable journalistic competence”. The phenomenon was wider than the Inariland Lapp village association, however, and therefore the association could not declare itself representative of all “Lapps” in publicity policies or opinions, for example, when the most gruesome stories of the Sámi were distributed in the letters to the editor and the Internet in the name of the so-called Lapp movement.

After returning to Oulu, I marched to the police station, where a police constable drew up an examination record. “Lehtola has told in the preliminary investigation that he has not offended any

private person's honour, nor has he mentioned any person by name in his interview, but has talked about the matter on a general level. Lehtola has not mentioned any association by name, nor has he talked about the Finnish population of Lapland, but he has talked about the Lapp movement as a group with a certain political attitude, albeit an unorganised group and a larger entity. Lehtola tells he has criticised the Internet discussion concerning the Sámi."

In autumn, an acquitting statement came from the state prosecutor: "Lehtola's purpose has been to protect the rights and culture of the Sámi. Based on the material available to me, Lehtola cannot be considered to denigrate or insult any ethnic group at least consciously."²²⁶

Chapter 5

The voice of a mosquito does not carry up to heaven?

Finnish Parliament House in December 2014. A MP from Lapland, Eeva-Maria Maijala, discusses Sámi affairs in an emotional speech, where she defends her rights to Sámi status. She has just applied for Sámi status from the Sámi Parliament but has not been accepted. She criticises the cabinet proposal of ILO Convention to “limit Sáminess in Finland into three groups: Inari, Skolt and North Sámi. The Sámi of Kemi Lapland have been forgotten.”

Maijala states: “Is it compliant with human rights that people counted among Forest Sámi are not officially acknowledged as Sámi based on their genetic inheritance as well as livelihoods and culture.” She brings the issue to the level of personal emotions: “I’m culturally active and I’m genetically Sámi, but that’s not enough.” She thinks the current proposal is “a cultural murder”. The MP trusts the parliamentary committee work, however: “Everyone who has heard experts in committees thinks the proposal is all wrong.”²²⁷

Maijala’s speech was connected to the plenary session of the parliament where Alexander Stubb’s cabinet presented two Sámi-related legislative proposals during autumn 2014. Maijala’s statement reflected the general tone of the discussions. The ones mostly speaking in the almost empty chamber were MPs from Lapland – like Maijala, they all criticised the legislative proposals sharply. Parliamentary committees and the plenary session represent the pinnacle of Finnish decision-making, and therefore the *expertise* emphasised by Maijala is strongly present in them.

Processing Sámi-related legislative proposals in the parliament in 2014-2015 provides a good perspective to whose information and what kinds of opinions the decisions important to the Sámi

were based on. Recent discussion has drawn attention to the fact that expertise is undergoing a radical change, when all information in publicity is becoming equal, be it scientific results or expertise based on public pseudo-information. This also influences decision-making.²²⁸

In fact, this “radical change” in expertise has existed in Sámi affairs for a long time. In my historical study *Saamelaiset suomalaiset. Kohtaamisia 1896-1953* (Sámi Finns. Encounters 1896-1953) from 2012, I observed the foundations of Sámi-related decision-making both locally and nationally in Sámi politics in the first part of the 20th century. I noted that the legislation and official decisions should not be regarded merely as impartial actions by faceless committees and administrators. Experts also have their backgrounds and conceptions, which influence their actions as attitudes or external pressures and expectations, for example.²²⁹

When you examine the relation of Finnish administration with the Sámi, it is essential to recognise people in key positions whose views and roles can have a significant impact on adopted emphases and resolutions passed. They are always taking part in some discussion, where they have their own roles or agenda. As noted earlier, even the experts’ conception on the Sámi was not necessarily built on a scientifically cool and researched foundation, but there could be (positive or negative) stereotypes and beliefs adopted from literature and media together with information presented by colleagues.

Similarly, in the Sámi dispute in 2000s, the opinions of experts – even the parliamentary ones – are not detached from the public dispute, which can extend its modes of speech quite strongly to the parliament chamber or committees. Information concerning the Sámi can vary greatly depending on the points of departure or the agenda. This is ultimately a matter of whose information is considered relevant and authoritative.

It is often assumed that the further away the decision-makers are, the more injudicious and incompetent decisions they make in Sámi affairs. The concept “masters from Helsinki” appeared

already in century-old sources as a metaphor of an approach unappreciative of northern conditions. Crucial statements and decisions in Sámi affairs, however, have actually been given nearer than the capital. In my book, I had a descriptive example on the proposal for legislation protecting Skolt Sámi culture in the 1930s. During the process, “masters from Helsinki” adopted a positive attitude and certain ministries were preparing for its implementation. Instead, the toughest opponents came from the local level, from the National Board of Forestry and the Pechenga municipality.

The fate of the proposal was eventually decided on the provincial level, when the newly founded Lapland provincial government in Rovaniemi made a negative decision. That effectively terminated the development of the proposal.²³⁰ Thus, provincial and local conflicts of interest seem to have influenced decisions more than distance. The provincial government wanted to focus on a modern development program concerning the future of the whole province, and not spend funds on protecting “a vanishing culture”, which would supposedly treat the rest of Lapland’s inhabitants unequally.

When examining the Sámi dispute of the 2000s, the same characteristics seem to be reoccurring. The distance between the south and the north does not seem to work as one may expect. In Helsinki, you might expect that Lapland’s MPs would support the views of the Sámi Parliament, while the unappreciative would come from southern heartlands where they know next to nothing of the Sámi. That is not how it seems to be, however.

In her doctoral thesis *Meidän vähemmistömmä* (Our Minority) (2001), Seija Tuulentie described discussions on Sámi-related legislation in Finland especially in the 1990s. She demonstrated how the conceptions and threat scenarios of local and regional discussions shifted also to parliamentary speech and the vocabulary of politicians and especially Lapland’s MPs. They were related to fears of diminishing local interests, attempts to question the concepts of *Sámi* and *indigenous people* as well as distrust in the possibility of the Sámi to decide on their own affairs, which manifested itself as suspicion of the actions of the Sámi Parliament.

Tuulentie described the sophisticated rhetoric that could be used for bringing threat scenarios alongside positive visions. All sides in the discussion in the 1990s emphasised sincere aspiration to “preserve Sámi culture”, which was considered a self-evident starting point. This was often preparation for criticism against law proposals, which could refute the initial tolerant notion in practice. According to this view, a minority was always a minority which cannot be granted special rights at the expense of others in a majority democracy.

The basic issue was how to define equality, or what kinds of rights a group can get without threatening the rights of other groups. Consequently, the different sides in the Sámi rights rhetoric were balancing between the equality of citizens and the rights of the minority, as well as between international human rights and “special national conditions”. Tuulentie pointed out that the discussion on Sámi-related law proposals raised many questions also essential to the Finnish national identity. So this not only about the Sámi, but equally about how Finns consider the issues being discussed.²³¹

This gives cause for reminding that the discussion is not only about the Sámi and their rights as such, but also about the debaters’ conceptions of the Sámi and their rights. It would be important for equality and impartiality that the conceptions about the Sámi were not solely based on Finnish angles and presumptions, but also Sámi viewpoints would be appropriately presented. Otherwise the situation shall be the same as in the 1920s, when Inari Sámi Uula Sarre commented the role of the Sámi in Finnish society in the words of a Sámi saying: “The voice of a mosquito does not carry up to heaven”.²³²

“National solution of Finland”

The parliament was processing two Sámi-related law proposals in autumn 2014. Changes to the Sámi Parliament act were brought to the plenary session in November 2014, but they were also referred to in other contexts, such as the law of equality. In December, minister of justice Anna-Maja Henriksson

presented the cabinet proposal of ratifying the ILO convention in the plenary session.²³³ The proposal to amend the Sámi Parliament act, ratified in 1995, aimed at emphasising the position of the Sámi Parliament, through a stronger consultation obligation, for example.

The autonomous status was also going to be improved, by submitting the Sámi Parliament to report directly to the national parliament, for example. The aim to change the Sámi definition to meet the established practice of the Sámi Parliament and the Supreme Administrative Court took a greater role in the discussion, however. In the cabinet proposal, which was jointly drawn by the minister of justice and the leaders of the Sámi Parliament, wanted to remove the paragraph on the historical Lapp villages.

Instead, the proposal emphasised the community-based belonging as the basic element for identification as a Sámi. In her presentation speech, Henriksson underlined the importance of group acceptance which had also been emphasised by the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in 2012. Apart from the fact that the persons themselves feel they are Sámi, it was also essential that the group should determine who belong to it. This would take place the same way as before in the election committee, which the proposal wanted to enlarge. Henriksson pointed out that every rejected applicant had the democratic possibility to appeal all the way to the Supreme Administrative Court.²³⁴

The other law proposal was about ratifying the International Labour Organisation ILO convention for protecting indigenous peoples. Henriksson emphasised that also this was aimed at equality and the right to participate. Administrators were to implement the negotiation obligation so that it would take place starting from the project planning stages together with the Sámi Parliament. The ministry of justice and the Sámi Parliament had negotiated a separate comment section to the ILO convention. The question of land and water rights in the Sámi home region had caused special disputes, where a frequent argument was that many populations had lived side by side in the Sámi area for a long time. Now the ministry of justice and the Sámi Parliament had interpreted “the national solution”

mentioned in the convention in a way that, with the consent of the Sámi Parliament, Finland can make a compromise in land ownership issues. Henriksson stated to the parliament:

Finland's national solution is that the property, usufruct and possession rights of land and water areas in the Sámi home region will not be changed. This applies to private as well as state-owned land and water areas. Consequently, the ratification has no effect on property, usufruct and possession rights. This means that both Sámi and the rest of the population continue to have the right to use state lands for reindeer husbandry, for example, the same way as at present.²³⁵

The law proposals came to the parliament at different times, but they were considered to be interconnected. Any time either of them was discussed, the other law proposal was also discussed. MP Tuija Brax hoped that the laws “should be wisely processed here side by side”. The opponents of the law proposals thought that the Sámi Parliament act should be decided first to clarify also the indigenous people definition. Minister of justice Henriksson's view was that it would be sensible to approve the ILO convention in any case.²³⁶

The ILO convention raised the most comprehensive discussion in the plenary session in December 2014, when a total of 17 MPs took the floor; there were 56 speeches in all. Apart from the minister of justice, the most frequent speakers were Markus Lohi (9 speeches) and Eeva-Maria Maijala (8), both Centre Party MPs from Lapland, and True Finn MP Maria Tolppanen (4) from Vaasa. Lohi represented a pertinent line, which was based on attacking minister of justice Henriksson with questions about the content of the ILO convention. MPs Maijala, tried to influence the emotions of the listeners by constantly returning to her personal background and the historical Kemi Lapland issue. In addition, the most active MP outside of Lapland, True Finn Tolppanen, also opposed the law proposals.²³⁷

Lohi drew special attention to the compromise between the cabinet and the Sámi Parliament, which had come as a sort of a surprise to the opponents of the law proposals. When the biggest problem in the ILO convention had earlier been the transfer of land rights from the state to some other instance,

now the dilemma was that there was no more talk about that. According to Lohi, no reservations or explanations could be attached to the ILO convention afterwards, because they were not judicially valid and binding from the viewpoint of any side. Johanna Ojala-Niemelä (Social Democratic Party) and Heikki Autto (National Coalition Party) emphasised the same thing. They demanded to know what additional value the convention would bring to Sámi affairs, when the most essential part, Sámi land ownership (which the MPs would have opposed), had been removed.

According to Henriksson, the convention was a declaration which experts did not consider exceptional; it could be interpreted as part of the national solution. It was judicially solid, because the indigenous people had approved it in addition to the cabinet. Lohi maintained that the ILO expert committee would interpret the decision after the ratification and probably would not accept separate claims. Autto was also afraid that there would be “demands for land rights” after the ratification.

Ojala-Niemelä stated that

when the 14th article of the convention decrees that the land ownership right of the indigenous people must be recognised, this means property rights, and that cannot be changed with a mention in the cabinet proposal. Thus, the ILO convention should be approved as it is or it should not be approved at all.²³⁸

Criticism was quite in order, as law professor Martin Scheinin commented in an interview on the Sámi radio: “Because this is a reservation which cannot be attached to the ILO convention, the explanation is - - judicially void and does not in any way diminish Finland’s obligations as a party of the ILO convention.”²³⁹ However, Henriksson maintained that the indigenous people’s own opinion was decisive, and the explanation could not be questioned later:

Based on the basic rule of ILO, The Hague Permanent Court of Arbitration is the only officially competent body to bindingly interpret ILO conventions, and the only instance that can sue somebody to The Hague court is another country. We are not granting individual Sámi or the Sámi Parliament opportunity to take the issue to The Hague court, but we are still searching for the national, fair solution, which I think the cabinet has also reached in a good manner in mutual understanding with the Sámi Parliament.

Henriksson downplayed the changes caused by the proposed ILO convention, when Lohi snapped that “why should we ratify a convention that changes nothing”. He demanded for “such concrete rights that could not be guaranteed otherwise with a separate law”. So, he objected to the convention by bringing up an idea of a separate law, which was not otherwise talked about by him or anybody else.²⁴⁰

The speeches strongly raised threat scenarios that the approval of the laws would create in Lapland. Both Lohi and Simo Rundgren (Centre Party) appealed to how Lapland had its fears and conflicts as it is, and they should not be increased. In his own convoluted speech, Autto from the National Coalition Party considered the Sámi language and culture the greatest loser when the ratification would weaken the position of the Sámi population and the overall development of Lapland:

The more there is uncertainty of the future in the area, the weaker are the chances to develop the original natural livelihoods connected to the Sámi culture as well as more modern ones, both Sámi-related and ones pertaining to the inhabitants of the region on the whole. And if there are no jobs or prospects for livelihoods, young people will not stay in the region to develop the culture.

Lohi also demanded to know what the geographical area would be where the ILO convention would be applied to. If it would apply to the Sámi home region, the rights would cover 10 percent of Finland’s surface area. Lohi suspected: “What if the area that the indigenous people has used traditionally for their livelihoods turns out to be bigger?” Lohi’s question seemed like a threat scenario, but it was connected to changing the Sámi definition, which became the major target of criticism in the parliamentary discussion. The MPs considered the definition such an unclear issue that it had to be clarified before ratifying the ILO convention. Lohi formulated the problem:

During the existing legislation, there have been cases where a person has not been accepted to the Sámi Parliament electoral register – as Sámi, that is – but the Supreme Administrative Court has overruled the decision. The cabinet proposal would introduce a so-called group acceptance. I myself at least would pose the question: when you cannot decide who is Sámi, how can you decide which is the community that can decide who is Sámi?²⁴¹

“The proceedings are really not democratic”

The Sámi discussion in the parliament in autumn 2014 was generally characterised by similar blurred talk that was also evident both in local publicity and countless Internet discussions²⁴². Statements painted a picture of a conflict situation in Lapland with fateful names, such as “cultural murder” (Maijala) or “final decision” (Rundgren). Simo Rundgren (Centre Party) appealed touchingly to the feelings of listeners:

Lapland has minorities of minorities, which truly feel spurned and indeed are spurned, have been spurned in past decades and will continue to be spurned if this law is passed in parliamentary proceedings in this form. The law as it is now will continue the unjust state of affairs that has prevailed already for decades.

Statements were usually directed against the Sámi Parliament, whose representativeness was questioned in many ways. Nobody pointed out that it was a democratically elected government-appointed representative body for Finnish Sámi. Instead, it appeared to be the ultimate problem in the Sámi issue. Minister of justice Henriksson emphasised on several occasions: “According to our Sámi Parliament act, Sámi in Finland are represented by the Sámi Parliament.” This self-evident truth even caused amusement in the chamber, but Maijala questioned it repeatedly:

Does the Sámi Parliament represent all Sámi in your opinion? - - Is it true that only people from the Sámi Parliament have been heard at this stage? Have you heard, listened in any way to any other folks than Sámi Parliament folks in the preparation of this matter, and is it possible that the Kemi Lapland area and issue could be after all considered in this proposal even somehow? ²⁴³

The expression *Sámi Parliament folks* attempted to present the Sámi representative body in an unfavourable light, as if it was a strangely limited circle. Also Hanna Mäntylä (True Finns) stated as a self-evident fact that “the Sámi Parliament does not represent all Sámi by any means”. Her view was that “also those Sámi who really do not represent this Sámi Parliament here” should be heard in the matter.

Many statements presented the Sámi Parliament as an antithesis of tolerance and democracy. For example, Maijala commented about the Sámi Parliament: “I personally feel that the proceedings in that issue are really not democratic, and we as decision-makers should be able to interfere in it, so that all affairs in Finland would be handled democratically.” Rundgren even thought the Sámi Parliament act was against human rights. He commented that when you talked about the rule of the people or democracy, “it is confusing and surprising in this context that the Sámi Parliament act now being processed in parliament is specifically justified also with notions of human rights”.

As in the discussion surging in Lapland, also Rundgren thought that “people have been added to the current indigenous people group on relatively random grounds”. In the background loomed the conspiracy of the 1960s and 1970s, when Sámi statistics were collected. According to Rundgren, the basic work had been done “very poorly”, “negligently” and in a way that “does not bear critical scrutiny”. Thus the electoral register of the Sámi Parliament was based on the inadequate report from 1962, which did not involve all Sámi. “Many people, many families in Lapland have been - - excluded. Nobody even in the 1970s could understand where things were heading or what kind of concentration of power would emerge around the Sámi Parliament”, Rundgren stated.

Moreover, the national parliament had approved “a worthless law” or the Sámi Parliament act in 1995. Now there was a new law being processed, which in Rundgren’s view “strengthens the prerogatives of the specific group that was originally established on flimsy grounds. - - We are now enacting a new law on top of an old worthless one to confirm, or in a sense bless, existing injustices.”

Rundgren grumbled:

So Lapland has the only categorised indigenous people in the European Union. The MPs from Lapland in the 1970s probably did not realise what the random compiling of the Sámi register would lead to four decades later. What seemed like an exotic Sámi issue at that time has become quite a nightmare for people in the north of Lapland during the ILO process.

Rundgren thought it was very suspicious that the Sámi Parliament decided on its members, because this resulted in a vague “group that wielded power”. He described the electoral register of the Sámi Parliament as a closed, sporadically working community whose insiders had “conclusive power to decide who can vote in the next election, and also who are voting for them”.²⁴⁴ The same characterisation of Finland’s Parliament or Finnish citizenship would have sounded peculiar, to say the least.

In the discussion, the selection procedure related to the Sámi definition was considered almost self-evidently problematic, although it was mostly referred to with allusive expressions and with few actual cases. The only concrete example was a story of two siblings, one of whom was accepted to the electoral register, the other not. This was repeated five times during one plenary session. The example was brought up by Mikko Savola and Johanna Ojala-Niemelä in almost identical words. Then it was used three times by Tolppanen (True Finns), who even altered the persons into speakers of the Sámi language. Tolppanen wondered that if

one of the siblings can get to the electoral register and the other cannot, it follows that one of their children can get to a Sámi-speaking kindergarten and the other cannot, one can go to a Sámi-speaking primary school and the other cousin cannot. There is no way this can promote Sámi culture comprehensively in that area.²⁴⁵

This is not true, because going to a Sámi-speaking kindergarten does not require membership in the electoral register. The purpose of the example was rather to spread suspicion against the Sámi Parliament. The case of two siblings was a certain kind of popular legend, which was impossible to verify because the limited publicity of electoral register of the Sámi Parliament. The Sámi Parliament act decrees that “the electoral register and such documents related to the preparation of the electoral register that contain information about the person’s ethnic background must be kept confidential”. A ten-day period once in an electoral term is an exception when the documents can be seen but not copied.²⁴⁶

Because the persons in the case cannot be identified, the reasons for potential contradiction cannot be analysed either – or, as an example, had one of the siblings applied to the electoral register at all, had he or she perhaps delivered an incomplete application, were they half siblings (different mother or father) or was he or she citizen of another country or lacked a municipality of residence that the Sámi Parliament act required, or was the decision actually unjust. Due to the privacy law, the electoral register of the Sámi Parliament can be accessed only restrictedly. This has kindled a conspiracy theory about “a secret list”, as well as given an opportunity to speculations with various alternatives, and the case of two siblings is one of the most popular.

The thing that most irritated Finnish debaters was that the Sámi themselves would define Sáminess. This was a central item in Sámi Parliament’s amendment proposal and the ILO convention. Legislation concerning indigenous peoples determines that self-determination includes the right to define who belongs to the indigenous people. Rundgren regarded this as revolting and spoke of downright tyranny: “do we give some group the right to decide in such a basic human rights issue, starting from justification of power, for example”.

Why is Finland implementing a convention here that is foreign to the legal concept? One cannot help thinking that this is a question of exercising power, which is unfortunately linked to this serious human rights issue. - - This kind of principle would not be approved in any other community, I’m sure of that.

So in Rundgren’s opinion it was *a convention foreign to the legal concept* when the state appointed an electoral committee in the Sámi Parliament to approve or reject applications to the electoral register. Rundgren emphasised that this provided “a great opportunity to abuse that power”. He reproached: “It includes the right of appeal, but we can see clearly that the electoral committee and Sámi Parliament make the selections, reinforce this group. I think this is a very big constitutional issue and it should be carefully investigated in the committee.”

Rundgren emphasised that belonging to an indigenous people would bring “special opportunities and rights”, but other people living in municipalities in the Sámi territory would not be able to use them according to the proposal. Therefore, the definition as well as the geographical region pertaining to the convention should be expanded. He asked if the indigenous people status required “compulsory membership in the electoral register” or would it be possible to belong to an indigenous people without membership in the electoral register. It remained unclear if Rundgren meant that the indigenous people status would not require any definition; anybody willing could enjoy the ILO convention.²⁴⁷

Also other statements presented acceptance to the electoral register as a big problem which should be “dealt with”. Tolppanen (True Finns), for example, went as far as to propose that the Sámi Parliament should have “independent observers when a person applies to this electoral register”. Her idea was that people’s equal treatment must be ensured “regardless of how closely they are connected to these central decision-makers up there in the Sámi Parliament”.

Sámi Parliament’s right to decide who can belong to them sounded reprehensible to almost all opponents. Tolppanen demanded that the starting points of the ILO convention must be changed in a way that “one conclave, one instance, one institution cannot itself decide who can join them and who cannot”. In effect, Tolppanen thought that the Sámi Parliament should not have anything to do with the ILO convention or the indigenous people definition generally.²⁴⁸

Surprisingly, this seemed to be the prevailing opinion in parliamentary debates. The principle in the international indigenous people convention that the Sámi considered most essential – right of self-determination – needed to be changed in the name of “a national solution”. Discrediting the Sámi Parliament and the electoral register was part of the tactics that included blurring the concept of Sáminess in the parliament. Sámi groups got mixed up in the debate regardless of whether they were real ethnic groups, such as *the Sámi*, or politically created groups, such as *(neo-)Lapps*, *Forest Sámi* and *Sámi without status*.

In parliamentary debates, also political groups appeared as if they were real ethnic groups that had to have the same rights as the Sámi. Blurring the groups could be the result of ignorance, or conscious tactics in the case of some MPs from Lapland. Simo Rundgren, for example, commented Stubb's cabinet program already in summer 2014. His view was that the Sámi definition should be "widened so to speak", so that the electoral register of the Sámi Parliament could accept also those who really wanted to be included through self-identification. "This applies especially to Inari Sámi and Forest Sámi." The Forest Sámi group, which had been created by political activity in associations, was then analogous to the ethnic group of Inari Sámi in his opinion.²⁴⁹

Rundgren grumbled in another occasion: "It is an unbearable situation that there are hundreds of people in Lapland who have been excluded from this membership on untenable grounds: Inari Sámi, Forest, Fisherman and Mountain Sámi, representatives of Inariland Lapp villages and so on."²⁵⁰ Only Inari Sámi were a real Sámi group among these. It could have aroused amazement in the parliament if Rundgren had criticised that "the groups of Baltic-Finns, Chuds and Vepsians as well as Finns without status" were missing from the eligible Finnish citizens on untenable grounds. In the context of the Sámi, the new "population groups" presented by Rundgren seemed almost credible, however.

Maria Tolppanen (True Finns) was active in the discussion, but she confused the Sámi groups probably out of ignorance. She demanded that "everyone, *landless and reindeerless as well as Forest Sámi and Fisherman Sámi*, receive the legitimacy they are entitled to as part of an indigenous people". The sentence confused both linguistic and economic as well as political groups. Tolppanen continued: "Will this be a guarantee that also *Forest Sámi and Mountain and other Sámi* get similar rights as those who have the right to participate in the Sámi Parliament and who receive Sámi status?" Mountain or Reindeer Sámi were precisely the group that Internet discussions claimed to be the small circle of "register Sámi". Tolppanen also commented that the "Sámi without status and other inhabitants of Lapland have been systematically excluded".²⁵¹ Sámi without status were also a politically engendered group.

Tolppanen's idea of the indigenous people concept was fuzzy, when she demanded Henriksson to say what the convention would bring to Finland's Romani population. The minister also got confused answer: "Finnish Romani have not contacted the ministry of justice about wanting to be included in the convention." In fact, Romani are considered an ethnic minority in Finland, not an indigenous people.

Opponents of the law proposals appealed to the threat that the laws would pose especially to other inhabitants of Lapland. According to Markus Mustajärvi, the laws could "even deprive some population groups of their right to practise their traditional livelihoods. The essential question is who will defend the minorities of a minority, how will they be heard." The expression *minorities of a minority* insinuated that the people excluded from the Sámi Parliament actually belonged to the group of Sámi, i.e. they were their minority. The Sámi Parliament opinion was that there were no such minorities, apart from the Inari and Skolt Sámi.

Opponents of Sámi-related laws were repeating in parliamentary discussions the same opinions that the Sámi counter-movement had used throughout the 1990s and 2000s to draw themselves level with the Sámi. They alleged that the Sámi Parliament was an arbitrarily elected and administered institution that did not represent "significant Sámi groups", such as the inhabitants of the historical Kemi Lapland, neo-Lapps and Sámi without status.

Henriksson was almost the only one in the plenary session who stood up for defining Sáminess the way the Sámi representative body, the Sámi Parliament, wanted. "It would be extremely important to also understand that just anybody cannot become Sámi. Therefore, we need conventions to protect minorities and, in this case, an indigenous people." Although MPs Haavisto, Brax, Koskinen and Wallin congratulated Henriksson during the parliamentary discussions in autumn for achieving an important proposal, voices defending the content of the ILO convention were rare.

Only Katja Hänninen from the Left Alliance wondered if the Sámi truly were not allowed to decide on their own affairs: “The issue related to the Sámi definition can be illustrated by asking how Finns would feel if the Russian government, for example, started to grant Finland’s citizenship to Russian citizens or anybody.”²⁵² Here she continued a tradition of the Left Alliance, because MP Heli Astala from the same party had asked already in 1994: “How would we Finns feel if somebody else defined the concept of Finn for us, or somebody else determined the composition of our parliament against our own opinion? Someone probably thinks: impossible example. Quite so, but it is an allegorically possible case, however.”²⁵³

“This must not be approved in this chamber”

Eeva-Maria Maijala (Centre Party) became the most prominent figure in the plenary sessions, although usually to an empty house, because the Sámi issue was quite peripheral for the “southern” MPs. Maijala constantly demanded justice to the descendants of the Sámi of the historical Kemi Lapland. She assured she was descended from the ancient Sámi families and emphasised that her family had practised “always Lapp culture and livelihoods”, thus been reindeer herders, as many Finns in Finland. Maijala told that her father had spoken “partly in the Sámi language” while tending the herd of the Reindeer Sámi of Vuotso as a hired hand.

In Maijala’s view, it was “the first time in any documents that the Sámi of Kemi Lapland or Lapps, or my history, background, are being completely excluded from the Sámi culture and unity. This would be a really harsh message. An essential part of Finnish Sáminess is about to be excluded here.” She spoke of her own cultural heritage as a human rights issue, which the Sámi Parliament did not accept:

We have been speaking about the human rights issues of foreigners, but let’s return to our homeland. Sámi without status, or Sámi who have not been accepted to the electoral register, are a real human rights violation; that is to say, we have a great number of people

who feel they are Sámi, but they are denied their own identity, human right to their own culture, own way of life and own community.

In the autumn plenary session, Maijala made a spectacle of her application process to the Sámi Parliament. She predicted already in advance that the application would end up “in the same waste heap” as the applications of her relatives and several thousands of others. She appealed emotionally: “This being the case, my family, Sámi of Kemi Lapland, Lapps, are clearly being excluded from the group of Sámi for the first time. This is cultural murder. This must not be approved in this chamber on any account.”

In March, just before the decisive votes in parliament, she received a negative decision from the Sámi Parliament. She considered that the reason for the rejection was the incorrect criteria of the Sámi Parliament. On the other hand, she avoided mentioning that there were no Sámi-speaking persons in her family background for the last three generations according to the Sámi Parliament definition. The negative decision must have included this information.

Like the other MPs from Lapland, Maijala criticised the principle of group acceptance, because it was completely untenable if, after the law amendment, “those sitting in the Sámi parliament could - - decide who can vote for them in the next election”. So her opinion was that the international conceptions of the self-determination of indigenous peoples could be scrapped in this case.

In her statements, Maijala established strong antagonism towards “the majority Sámi” or the Sámi Parliament. She sought allies from the Inari Sámi, whom she identified with her own reference group, the descendants of the Sámi of the historical Kemi Lapland, on several occasions. She was very concerned about the survival of the traditional Inari Sámi culture and implied that it was being threatened by the North Sámi:

They have been forced to become Finns, although they are fully Sámi in my eyes, but because there have been a lot of small-scale reindeer herders among them, there have been North Sámi, for example, coming later and they have had larger-scale reindeer herding and have come with the idea that they are the only true Sámi.

In Maijala's story, Inari Sámi and the inhabitants of Kemi Lapland had become victims of (both Finnish and North Sámi) colonialism, and she assumed the responsibility to "us Finns": "quite many in the Inari area had been forced to become Finn and had lost their language. It is the fault of our own Finnish culture, also of the decisions of this house that we have ended up in this situation." Maijala emphasised that language was the only thing that distinguished her cultural heritage from the Sámi. She asserted: "Our language has been forced to become Finnish, but our culture still survives."

In her search for the culprit of the questionable ILO convention, Maijala commented that this was a political game, even a conspiracy between the Sámi Parliament and the Swedish People's Party of Finland, from which party the minister of justice, Henriksson, came. Maijala reduced this cooperation to *core team* machinations of political parties. Maijala wanted to prevent both law amendments pursued by the Sámi Parliament, but emphasised that she was defending Sámi culture: "Let us work for this culture together. Just give us a chance to do this. We will put something into this ILO convention, we will make something about the content, too." Maijala criticised the Sámi for poor preparation of the projects, but declared her willingness to cooperate:

How can we develop Sáminess in Finland? How can we make Inari Sámi, Kemi Lapland language revival, Skolt Sámi, North Sámi and all other things fashionable? We would ponder here among ourselves what funding we could put together. How do we develop culture and all these things? But what kind of impression have we given of ourselves? We have given an impression of a quarrelling group. Everybody has cause for self-reflection, especially the current leadership of the Sámi Parliament has cause for self-reflection in this matter. We must get this thing on track together.

Maijala spoke almost tearfully in the plenary session: "It's up to us. We in this chamber can do it. The ILO 169 convention is quite good now, I mean quite good, when it can be made to apply to the whole Sámi population." To reach a good result, she suggested opening the Sámi definition in a way that "all inhabitants of the Sámi territory who identify themselves as Sámi, who feel they are Sámi, who have a Sámi family, Lapp family background and cultural bond" could be recognised as Sámi.

In addition to emphasizing sincere cooperation (despite the reluctance of the Sámi Parliament), Maijala proposed a revival of the Kemi Lapland language “or the language of my ancestors”. Inari Sámi language could be learned in the Kemi Lapland region, added with known historical words of the Kemi Lapland language. So Maijala’s idea of cooperation with the Sámi meant that resources would be directed at “revitalising” an already disappeared language and culture outside the Sámi territory.²⁵⁴ This proposal was not cheered among the Sámi language workers at a time when living Sámi languages needed all available support.

Expertise from Lapland

It became evident in the parliamentary discussions in autumn 2014 that especially Lapland’s MPs wanted to postpone or completely reject both Sámi-related law proposals. The statements appealed that *new clarifications* should be made or especially the question of the Sámi definition should be *elaborated* – in any case, the *issue should be postponed* to the future. There were seven MPs from Lapland from five parties during the 2011-2015 parliamentary term. They were unanimously opposed to the Sámi-related law proposals. Centre Party did have three MPs, but the other parties were also in consensus.

Lapland’s MPs were easily considered experts of northern issues, especially because they were unanimous. Perhaps this was illustrated by how the MPs from the rest of Finland did not particularly defend Henriksson – although the representatives of the Greens, the Left Alliance and the Swedish People’s Party of Finland expressed their satisfaction with the cabinet proposals. Actually, Lapland’s MPs represented one side in the Sámi dispute in a sense – those who felt that granting the Sámi more rights was a threat and who were referred to as the voice of Lapland’s voting majority.²⁵⁵

Being one side in the dispute was exemplified in the way Lapland’s MPs consistently characterised the Sámi Parliament at least as a suspicious if not completely undemocratic entity. They also had a

clear agenda: the law proposals should not be approved, if a certain part of Lapland's non-Sámi inhabitants would not be allowed to contribute to the specification of the ILO convention. This proved a point that also Erkki Pääkkönen has emphasised; the main resistance in disputes on Sámi rights usually does not come from the government but from other local groups.²⁵⁶

The most radical views against the initiatives of the Sámi Parliament about the Sámi definition and the ILO convention came from, besides the local level, especially from the provincial level. The voice of Lapland's MPs represented the majority of Lapland's inhabitants, which, in a democracy, made their views relevant and justified (also in view of the next elections). The other Finnish MPs seemed to accept their points of view: because the law proposals caused so much controversy in the north, they should not be approved.

The general conception about the Sámi-related law proposals was that consensus should be reached in Lapland before the law proposals could be approved. At the same time, the parliament approved the same-sex marriage law, which had aroused an intense social struggle without consensus²⁵⁷. In that context, there was no expectation about full unanimity when approving the law. Everyone understood that the law was required because there was no unanimity. The ILO convention was an international human rights agreement aimed at protecting the status of an indigenous people also in situations where the conflict with majority interests was perhaps irreconcilable. It emphasised the right of the indigenous people to self-determination.

The general air in the plenary session in parliament was that the Sámi had no right to determine the members of their own people. The majority also decided that there was no need for special Sámi rights regarding negotiation obligation or controlling the natural environment. Former chairman of the Sámi Parliament, Pekka Aikio, has commented: "There is an old saying that the judicial status of a minority cannot be improved with the means of majority democracy."²⁵⁸ Former legal secretary of the Sámi Parliament, Heikki J. Hyvärinen, has referred to the same thing in his comment that

democracy is not always effective in helping minorities: “We have 5,000 votes every four years, but others have a lot more.”²⁵⁹

This became clear also in spring 2015 when the Sámi-related laws were processed: the voice of a mosquito did not carry up to heaven. The cabinet proposal about the Sámi-related legal matters was supposed to be forwarded to the Committee for Constitutional Law. However, an MP from Lapland, Markus Mustajärvi, proposed during the preliminary debate in October 2014 that the proposal for the Sámi Parliament act should be processed in several committees. Maijala supported his proposal.²⁶⁰

Consequently, the cabinet proposal proceeded to the Employment and Equality Committee, which included Maijala herself as well as the True Finns representative Tolppanen, and to the Agriculture and Forestry Committee. A total of 34 entities were heard in three committees, and only the Sámi Parliament and the Skolt village meeting represented the Sámi. A quarter of the written statements came from Sámi organisations, but as a former member of the committees said, they don't have the same influence as the oral hearings.

The frontlines in the Sámi law discussions had divided into two, defenders and opponents of the Sámi Parliament. It is interesting to see from this basis what kind of expertise the committees heard.

In addition to written statements and representatives of the Sámi parliament, the Employment and Equality Committee used five experts, who were heard orally. They were Bachelor of Social Services Anu Avaskari, research fellow Tanja Joona, reindeer herder Tuomas Keskitalo, inspector Jouni Kitti and researcher Ari Laakso. Who or what they represented was not mentioned.²⁶¹ Two of them were members of the Sámi Parliament electoral register, but all were known as sharp critics of the Sámi Parliament.²⁶²

For example, Kitti had waged a fiery war for years against the Sámi Parliament, and now also against Finland's cabinet, on web pages of NRA Finland. Apart from these, Kitti even questioned the UN,

which he criticised for unreality, ideological nature of human rights and disjointedness of available means. In Kitti's view, the UN "is not a real power in the struggle - - for solving conflicts".²⁶³

Ari Laakso comes from Enontekiö and is a researcher in the University of Lapland. He blamed the narrow-mindedness of *the elite Sámi* for not being accepted as Sámi. Laakso recommended that the Sámi Parliament "voting right should be granted to all Sámi with equal conditions, without approval from the rulers for getting the vote". He listed "North, Inari, Skolt or Forest Sámi" and proposed removing group acceptance from the Sámi Parliament act.²⁶⁴

The report of the Employment and Equality Committee did comment on the problems involved in the definition of Sáminess, and warned that group acceptance must not risk people's equal treatment. The report stated that the Sámi definition should have the widest possible acceptance and consensus of the Sámi and the other population. The long report mentioned: "The committee finds it important that the effects of the proposal to the status of people possibly excluded from the electoral register, or the so-called Sámi without status, are considered in this matter."²⁶⁵

Committee member Maijala gave an interview to the Lapin Kansa newspaper based on the report. She stated that the committee demanded that the Sámi without status are included in the scope of the ILO benefits. She emphasised that the report had "a very critical" tone, and that the ILO convention must not weaken the position of the Sámi without status. According to Maijala, the ILO convention did not contain any definition of a person belonging to an indigenous people. In the cabinet proposal, it had been linked to the definition compliant with the Sámi Parliament act. Maijala's view was, however, that this was a national solution, and the committee propounded that another tactic should be found.²⁶⁶

The Agriculture and Forestry Committee heard a total of nine experts in oral hearings, including representatives from the Sámi Parliament and the Skolt village meetings. Five of the experts represented opponents of the Sámi Parliament. Among them, Jouni Kitti represented the Anarâšah

association, Keskitalo represented the Forest Sámi and Tanja Joonas name was followed by the University of Lapland. Additionally, Yrjö Mattila represented the Inari common forests and Kari Kyrö represented the Inariland Lapp villages. Both committees stated that the expert hearings had revealed that joining the electoral register was much easier in Norway. It happened with a notification from the applicant, “and there have never been appeals to decisions to accept a person to the electoral register”.²⁶⁷

The Committee for Constitutional Law held oral hearings for 15 experts. Their distribution was more even. Apart from the Sámi Parliament and the Skolt representative, the more favourable view of the Sámi Parliament was represented at least by Non-Discrimination Ombudsman Eva Biaudet, Master of Law Aimo Guttorm from the Utsjoki municipality and Bachelor of Law Heikki J. Hyvärinen. Apart from Kittilä, Avaskari and Tanja Joonas, critics of the Sámi Parliament and definition included researcher Juha Joonas, chairperson of the Forest Sámi association Erika Sarivaara and Enontekiö municipal manager Mikko Kärnä, who had prominently criticised the legitimacy of the Sámi Parliament.²⁶⁸

Generally speaking, the experts were from Lapland, which demonstrates that the committees tried to acquire regional and local expertise. The proportion of experts with positive or sympathetic attitudes towards the Sámi definition or the ILO convention remained considerably low, however. City Sámi were not heard at all, although several statements had established that a great number of the Sámi lived in cities. This implies that the committees thought they did not need experts to understand what standpoints the Sámi and the Sámi Parliament had. Instead, they wanted to hear the representatives of those inhabitants of Lapland whose voice was allegedly unheard. The result was that the conceptions dominating the parliamentary discussion in the autumn were repeated also in the committee hearings.

At the beginning of March 2015, the Committee for Constitutional Law approved the cabinet proposal for the ILO 169 convention. Markus Lohi, Centre Party MP from Lapland, made an amendment

proposal with Rundgren's support that the proposal should not be approved without extensive clarifications. The cabinet proposal won by a vote of 8 to 6.

The matter did not proceed to parliamentary process, however, because the Sámi Parliament act did not pass in the parliament in the form proposed by the cabinet, and the definition in the former law remained valid. The Sámi Parliament had made it clear that if the amendment to the Sámi Parliament act is not approved in the proposed form, it will not support the ILO convention either. Henriksson thought it best not to take the ILO proposal to the plenary session.

At the end of April in the UN Permanent Forum of Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) in New York, the new chairperson of the Sámi Parliament, Tiina-Sanila Aikio, criticised the Finnish government for giving empty promises. Three years of negotiation and hard work fell through with the decisions of the parliament. Sanila-Aikio pointed out that by rejecting the negotiated new Sámi definition, the Finnish government violated international conventions. She was particularly sorry, because the Sámi were not even granted the right to determine Sáminess in compliance with the decision:

Through its decision, the Finnish government has acted against the UN declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples (UNDRIP) and its article 33, which states that indigenous peoples have the right to decide on their own identity. The Finnish government and the Supreme Administrative Court retained the right to determine who is Sámi. We have been deprived of our right to determine our own identity and the membership of our community.

Sanila-Aikio appealed to various UN bodies as well as to the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, Victoria Tauli-Corpuz. She said she would take this request for help seriously. "We have regarded Finland as a progressive country in fostering and supporting the rights of indigenous peoples."²⁶⁹

Finland's Sámi organisations also requested help from the UN and other indigenous peoples. They were especially astonished that Finland's Sámi cannot themselves determine who belongs to the indigenous people. The organisations wanted to know whether any international human rights

convention supported the right of Finns to decide who belongs to the Sámi people, completely without Sámi consent, which is voluntary and based on foreknowledge.²⁷⁰

Contrary to the wishes of Finnish Sámi representatives, the human rights report of UNPFII settled for giving general recommendations: “The permanent forum is concerned that legal obligations and commitments’ and indigenous peoples’ treaties, agreements and other constructive arrangements with States are routinely denied and violated by States.” The forum calls upon states to “fairly and equitably redress the long-standing unresolved land rights issues through good faith negotiations”.²⁷¹

Case 5:

Good minority – troublesome indigenous people

Support to the cabinet and the Sámi Parliament in both legal issues rested on small parties, such as the Swedish People’s Party of Finland, the Greens and the Left Alliance. This was considered a problem in the Sámi politics. Chief editor Antti Kokkonen from the regional Lapin Kansa newspaper, for example, debated upon the rejection of the Sámi-related law proposals in his column:

Why did this happen? The main reason is that the Sámi Parliament failed to represent its interests. The parliament sought only one partner, the Swedish People’s Party of Finland, which is a small party with support in Southern Finland. Dialogue with Lapland’s inhabitants and Lapland’s MPs was neglected. The parliament was rather in open conflict with the rest of the local community.²⁷²

The cooperation of the Sámi with the Swedish People’s Party of Finland was certainly natural, because they both had similar histories through their language policy and minority status. It is perhaps even surprising that active cooperation has not developed earlier. The cooperation has also included a perspective of power, because the Swedish People’s Party of Finland had been in the cabinet for decades since the 1970s.

The background of the legislation related to the Sámi definition and ILO convention was that Henriksson, the minister of justice in the cabinet of six (in the last stages four) parties, represented

the Swedish People's Party of Finland. She was the one who negotiated with the Sámi Parliament about the lines and details of the law proposals.

Cooperation between the Sámi and the Swedish People's Party of Finland opened an opportunity for public needling, where the elite conception associated with Swedes was conveniently transferred to the Sámi. Also when Klemetti Näkkäljärvi, chairman of the Sámi Parliament, was candidate for the Swedish People's Party of Finland in the national parliament elections in 2011 and the EU parliament elections in 2014, critics saw a chance to insinuate about various "connections". Pertti Virtanen (True Finns) sneered in Finnish parliament that "the Swedish party Ombudsman for Minorities is the main machinator for the Sámi Parliament, and even Näkkäljärvi from the Sámi Parliament converted to the Swedish party faith, which has a quite elitist flavour".²⁷³

Besides small parties, the Sámi have also tried to cooperate with big parties, although with varying results. When the Sámi Delegation was founded in 1973, the Sámi considered that the best solution would be not to operate on a party-political basis. There was an idealistic notion in the background that Sámi affairs were administrator issues, which required support from all parties. Even after this, members of the Sámi Parliament have been elected on personal grounds and they mostly represent their domiciles. Instead, the elected members do not belong to any stakeholder group, whose joint program they could follow. This has been considered a benefit as well as a problem.²⁷⁴

With respect to national politics, the original idea to operate outside party-political interests does not seem to have succeeded. The Sámi question has been a peripheral issue from the viewpoint of big parties. Especially questions about strengthening Sámi government, land rights and improving the indigenous people status have been sensitive issues, which the traditional majority party of Lapland, Centre Party, for example, has been reluctant to address.

The relation of Lapland's MPs to the Sámi issue came up interestingly also in the parliamentary debates in 2014-2015. They were unanimously opposed to amending the Sámi Parliament act and ratifying the ILO convention, but otherwise they emphasised the importance of the Sámi issue. Markus Mustajärvi resented that he had been branded as a Sámi-hater because of his opposition to

the law proposals. He pointed out that he had supported many Sámi projects: constructing the cultural centre Sajos to Inari, improving the preconditions of reindeer husbandry, and similarly “language nest operation has been invested in, although funding has regrettably been short-sighted and fickle”. Mustajärvi reminded that Finns had obligations to the Sámi:

Finns also have their indisputable sins towards minorities, and the atonement of those sins is still ongoing. The time is not far in the past when Sámi children and youth speaking their mother tongue were punished, taught to be ashamed of their own roots, language and culture when, on the contrary, the educational system and government should have encouraged them to be proud of their roots.

Also Johanna Ojala-Niemelä (Social Democratic Party) stressed that she was in favour of developing the Sámi language and culture, but she opposed the ratification of the ILO convention on several grounds. According to her, the convention was defended in Finland by international pressure, “as if Finland would seem better in the eyes of the world if this issue came up for ratification”. She asked the minister of justice, however, what added value the convention would bring to the Sámi or original population “and what concrete things does it bring”.²⁷⁵

Markus Lohi emphasised that in a country, which has the only indigenous people in Europe “our most important cultural deed should be to mind that it is preserved”. He deplored that there had to be a struggle every year about how to get sufficient funds to sustain the language, “the indispensable activity that can keep alive the three languages that we have here”.²⁷⁶ Maria Tolppanen explained: “As such, the ILO convention and its ratification quite globally would be very good and worth supporting, because indigenous peoples truly are such a richness to every culture that they are worth holding on to and cherishing and giving them the legitimacy that they have.”²⁷⁷

In their statements, the MPs then contrasted the protection of the Sámi culture and approving problematic law proposals. “Good” Sáminess for them were activities related to the Sámi language, especially the language nest operation where Sámi children received language immersion. According to Lohi, for example, the ILO convention “ultimately has not much importance to the development of this language”.²⁷⁸ The sentence is interesting, because it proved that the development of the Sámi culture was limited to improving the role of its language in Lohi’s opinion.

Nordic Sámi research has regarded a conscious dichotomy into “desired” and “troublesome” issues as a traditional strategy in Sámi-related politics. In Sweden, for example, administrative authorities restricted the Sámi issue only to reindeer husbandry or livelihood.²⁷⁹ The Swedish Sámi movement was the first to raise the Sámi question also as a cultural and social issue, which required wider social measures. Despite that – and also due to the Sámi policy of the country – reindeer husbandry is still the main criterion in Sweden underlying the politics of the Sámi themselves.

The traditional Finnish way has been to consider the Sámi merely as a linguistic minority, whose essential problems are related to language and education issues. Sáminess was often solely linked with language in Finnish thinking, while livelihoods and land rights, often also culture, were problematic. Erkki Pääkkönen has pointed out that political decision-making in the 1990s prominently adopted the dichotomy between culture and livelihood: language and cultural autonomy needed to be solved separately, while land use caused special problems in legislation.²⁸⁰

This was clearly the case in the discussion in 2014-2015. As in the material of Seija Tuulentie’s research²⁸¹, the other side of Sáminess was neglected – the one that was connected to the Sáminess spanning national frontiers. The Sámi were seen solely as a Finnish minority, not as an indigenous people inhabiting four countries. Norway only came up as a reference of a good electoral register system.

There was a tone in the discussion that concessions granted for developing language rights were enough for the Sámi. The fact that the Sámi Parliament act from 1995 as well as the constitution from 2000 recognised the Sámi as an indigenous people did not appear to influence the discussion, because the Sámi seemed to be regarded in a sense as a linguistically different “tribe” in Finland. To many speakers, the ILO convention seemed to represent an exaggerated endeavour to change the existing conditions in Lapland, especially regarding land rights, where transferring ownership or even control to the Sámi seemed an impossible idea.

MPs had the impression that the Sámi were heard quite sufficiently – to the extent that Rundgren, for example, thought that they had all too much influence in land use and planning matters. The

status of the Sámi as an indigenous people remained empty words in the speech and deeds of the MPs. They were recognised as a minority, and there was a lot of work to be done in keeping their languages alive. Instead, it was not worthwhile to emphasise international conventions or Nordic Sámi unity, because special rights to the Sámi would be a loss to the rest of the local population.

Chapter 6

Silence – a humble mode of resistance

In January 1952, a conference took place in Stockholm, where Nordic experts had gathered to discuss the future outlines of Sámi handicrafts (*duodji*). Finnish Karl Nickul, a friend of the Sámi, pointed out that there was only one Sámi among the dozens of people, Israel Ruong. “It seems to be characteristic of Sámi issues in their current stage that they are discussed by others than the Sámi themselves. This is ridiculous”, Nickul commented.

Together with Ruong and a Norwegian representative, he started to arrange a Nordic Sámi conference, which took place in Jokkmokk in Sweden in 1953. The conference was the stimulus for a completely new Nordic cooperation, but Sámi politics began to change also on national levels. The Sámi themselves could develop their conditions in the modern society. This resulted in cultural strengthening and even legislative breakthroughs in the 1980s and early 1990s.²⁸²

In the 2010s, discussion on the status of the Sámi seemed to have reverted to its old track, however: it was mainly discussed by others than the Sámi themselves. In the Finnish parliament, Sámi issues were solely discussed by Finns. This was obvious in the plenary session of the parliament, because there were no Sámi MPs, but that was the case also in committees. The cabinet did finalise the proposals together with the Sámi Parliament, but as the parliamentary discussions in the autumn illustrated, minister of justice Henriksson was left quite alone to defend Sámi opinions. The parliament chamber was almost empty, to be sure, so there was not even a trace of potential defenders. Discontinuing the Sámi-related law proposals gave the Sámi reason to consider what went wrong. The question was how the message of the neo-Lapps or Forest Sámi or Sámi without status succeeded to break through so well in regional as well as partly in national media. How did they manage to

change the political atmosphere even in the parliament house in a way that their cause was considered more significant and considerable than the view of the Sámi Parliament or international recommendations on human rights?

It has often been considered that the error of the Sámi Parliament was that it did not enter the publicity competition, where the counter-movement succeeded. This was partly because the leadership of the Sámi Parliament regarded the neo-Lapp counter-movement in the 1990s as a transient phenomenon, started by a small but loud group of individuals who were concerned about their own interests. When journalist Helena Sahavirta from the Kaleva newspaper saw similar anti-Sámi activity in Norway as in Finland, chairman of the Sámi Parliament, Pekka Aikio, commented:

This is more a problem of the media than of the Sámi. Trivial issue. Just like in Finland, there are two or three people with loud voices, and the press writes about it at once. Every place has its village idiots. Earlier they were known and they were ignored, now they get to publicity. - - This is not rational activity, it is more of a problem for social psychology and the problem must be studied that way.²⁸³

The estimated transience turned out to be wrong, however, because the loud opposition to the Sámi Parliament remained and even gained strength with the changing social media. The Sámi Parliament discussed in the 1990s whether it should start a consistent communication policy to rectify false information and notions. People with communications skills were certainly available. The leadership of the Sámi Parliament, however, consciously chose the line that there was no need for special information policy.

At least initially, it believed that absurd claims would invalidate themselves and the people would see through them. It thought that responses to the neo-Lapps would only have given them incentive for their aim to remain in publicity. The Sámi Parliament also did not want to make local opponents a *party* in the debate and to have to negotiate about anything with them. Chairmen of the Sámi Parliament constantly emphasised that they would only negotiate with representatives of Finland's government. This attitude could be considered arrogant²⁸⁴.

The choices in information policy as well as the silence in publicity have been criticised afterwards. This gave the counter-movement an opportunity to relatively freely spread notions, which seem to become truths when they are repeated, even if they are false. Many people can be suspicious or uncertain about the truthfulness of the claims, but in the absence of counterarguments or competing information, they may be convinced of their validity.

Many Sámi know that silence is not an especially good strategy, because there is an Inari Sámi saying that *silent ones are not given even water*. Silence is an absolutely pitiful strategy in the Internet publicity. Silence has been part of the Sámi tradition for centuries, however. This involves cautiousness of upsetting the status quo. Nils-Henrik Valkeapää has spoken about “the meek”, who often agree with the more radical ones: “They fear, however, that claiming their rights would displease Finns, especially the masters. Therefore, they are wisely silent.”²⁸⁵

Silence has been wisdom also in a situation where it is known that the sound of a mosquito does not carry up to heaven. Teuvo Lehtola has described an ambivalent old Inari Sámi attitude towards the establishment. Their demands and rules were received with acceptance and nods, but as soon as their eyes were turned, the Sámi did what they wanted, as they had intended. This was a case of peaceful stubbornness, when they did not want to directly challenge the establishment.

According to Magreta Sara, “it is not characteristic of the Sámi to speak in media and push their opinions; the Sámi do not behave like that, and then there are often misunderstandings when people think it is a sign of assent, but that is really not what it is”.²⁸⁶ An old saying tells that the silence of a Sámi is not a sign of assent, on the contrary rather. The greater the insult, the deeper the silence.

For example, when Finnish anthropologists in 1930s exhumed numerous skeletons of Sámi ancestors on a sacred cemetery island in Lake Inari, there were no loud objections from the Sámi. The vicar of Inari, Tuomo Itkonen, only received an anguished Inari Sámi who wanted to confess and receive the Holy Communion. He managed to ask: “Why are the masters digging up those graves – were not they consecrated as final resting places?”²⁸⁷ The bitterness took 60 years to discharge when there were

wishes to return the remains back to the Sámi for reburial. There were strong reactions among the Sámi where the long-time grudge erupted. When the discussion turned to retaining some bone remnants perhaps for studies with better equipment, a member of the Sámi Parliament snapped bluntly: “Bury them all – and all academic studies in the same hole, too!”²⁸⁸

Silence has also been considered the convention of a repressed people when it is clear that words are of no avail. Studies have revealed that the victims of deprecation and racism often become frustrated and withdraw instead of fighting back. Anna Rastas states that racism puts a stamp of inferiority and worthlessness on things that are often the closest and most personal for its targets:

The mere knowledge that others want and can insult some people in this way arouses feelings that make it difficult even to talk about these kinds of insults. Experiences of racism can paralyse even strong persons, especially if they know that others do not care if some people become targets to such insults.²⁸⁹

Continuous deprecation and contempt can lead to unwillingness to appear in public. “If you must constantly respond to unfounded claims or face negative generalisations, taking part in discussions does not necessarily feel sensible.”²⁹⁰ This has been apparent in the unwillingness of the Sámi to be seen and heard on public forums. When the opposing side loudly demands the Sámi to state arguments for their viewpoints on what is *supposedly* wrong in the situation of the Sámi, or how they *supposedly* differ from local Finns, many feel uncomfortable to join the debate.

Furthermore, the Sámi way of speaking has traditionally been multi-layered. Utterances come with double meanings when the same sentences or yoiks or idioms may mean something quite different to the members of the community than to outsiders. Minority status complicates the attempts of the Sámi to influence matters in an adverse atmosphere. This also applies to public discussion. Often it involves the idea expressed in a proverb: *the wicked have their ways*. In the society as a whole, others define the rules for discussion and therefore hold the trump cards. It is no use joining a game where others are better.

It is clear that the publicity of the Sámi Parliament could have worked and could work better. The operational model and legitimacy of the Sámi Parliament electoral committee has been perhaps the

thing most criticised in publicity. A more open publicity policy could elaborate the role of the committee and especially deny accusations of arbitrariness, which came up even in plenary sessions. We must remember, however, that the Sámi Parliament in Finland has meagre resources especially for publicity policy. The electoral committee, for example, has no permanent secretary who could officially take care of publicity. The resources of permanent employees are often spent in everyday activities. In that respect, it is remarkable that, during his two terms, chairman Näkkäljärvi had the stamina to keep updating his blog where he described his work and expressed his views on current issues.

The fact that the Sámi Parliament did not choose a conscious publicity campaign in its time is not rare among administrative agencies. Communications researcher Marja Nousiainen has stated that silence is a common publicity policy in Finnish administration, although the law requires openness. Public discussion may feel annoying and it can be experienced as a hindrance to work, for example by impeding or slowing decision-making. Therefore, public accusations are not responded to, which may even feel like a matter of honour. Incorrect notions can spread this way and take root in peace:

People, ordinary citizens, objects of administrative actions get the impression that the accusations are true, silence is considered a sign of consent. The public often also interprets silence in a way that the citizens are not heard, their opinions are not worth responding to. If the machinery of government keeps silent, the one who shouts the loudest is heard more easily. Regardless of the content.

Nousiainen says that rumours and incorrect information spread quickly because of the Internet, but it also provides a new kind of channel for rectifying incorrect information and for genuine interaction with the citizens. “Not everything in the net is fundamentally irrelevant. Citizens feel that the channel is a functional and useful part of the society”, Nousiainen writes.²⁹¹

The problems of communication strategies have been aptly reflected in the discussion that has been taking place in Finland in 2015 about whether we should respond to the Russian information warfare. In an interview in the Kaleva newspaper, major Tommi Liimatainen, for example, suggested that spreading valid information is the best communication strategy: “We must not leave the information

vacuum to be filled, but neither should we be provoked by anything the opponent says. The discussion must - - always be restored to facts.”

Computing expert Petteri Järvinen, on the other hand, dismissed the idea of shooting down incorrect claims: “The best communication strategy could be perfect silence. False claims die of their own accord, because there will always be new false claims. If you start rectifying them all, it’s an endless effort. Lies just stay alive longer and even become prevailing truths.” – So Järvinen was willing to adopt the same tactic as the Sámi parliament in the neo-Lapp dispute.

Conversely, Director of Government Communications, Markku Mantila, stressed that half-truths, misrepresentation and outright lies leave a digital footprint. They can become the truth for some people later. In Mantila’s view, “errors must be corrected and lies must be rooted out, but all village idiot talk needn’t be dealt with”.²⁹² Mantila’s reference to the talk of village idiots is also valid with the Sámi discussion. Certain neo-Lapp claims are based on peculiar and even absurd notions from the Sámi point of view. It feels strange to respond to them, no matter how favourable it would be to the public media image.

When describing pseudo-scientific claims, researcher Björn Kurtén talked about scientific fools, who present absurd claims that, for example, that there never was an ice-age or man originated from the experiments of outer space visitors. The fools criticise scientists of arrogance, because they do not want to discuss these claims seriously. Kurtén states, however, that if someone comes to the scientific community and claims that the moon is made of blue cheese, “you cannot quite expect the astronomer to climb down from his telescope to argue about it”.²⁹³ The same is true with the neo-mythical interpretations of “Lapp” histories in the shadow of colonialist-Sámi, or the indigenous people status of Adam and Eve. They just have penetrated the Finnish publicity better than the blue cheese composition of the moon.

“For my part, everybody can be...”

Although the Sámi have been mostly absent from publicity, their voices can be heard in occasional writings, interviews and Facebook sites. Chairman of the Sámi Parliament, Klemetti Näkkäljärvi, kept a regular blog where he commented current issues quite sharply at times. Among the members of the Sámi Parliament, Jan Saijets, for example, has sought to moderately rectify publicly presented false notions that keep reappearing:

First of all, the ILO convention does not enable any kind of redistribution of lands. Privatising lands to Sámi ownership is not possible! It is all about land rights, which are aimed at securing the preconditions of pursuing our traditional Sámi livelihoods. International conventions do not allow for anything else. The purpose is to see to it that also the material basis of culture can survive without merging the Sámi to the majority culture.

Secondly, the indigenous people definition in the ILO convention is clear and Finns cannot be interpreted as an indigenous people – as someone suggests here. Finns can be indigenous population, but not indigenous people in the sense of the ILO convention. The clearest condition for that is the so-called non-dominant status with respect to the majority population, and in Europe this condition is only fulfilled in the case of the Sámi.²⁹⁴

There have been heated tones also in Sámi statements from time to time. The creation of the Forest Sámi group has been considered a clear attempt by Lapland's Finns to talk themselves into the Sámi Parliament and an indigenous people specifically in hope of potential land rights. Emotional arguments have been used during the dispute with references to racism and neo-colonialism experienced by the Sámi. When the Sámi debate was discussed in the current affairs program A-Stream on television, Raili Pirinen, a tana Sámi living in Helsinki, spoke about stealing the Sámi identity. She described the development of the Lapp and Forest Sámi movement on the Yle Sápmi channel on Finnish national radio:

The same people who called themselves Lapps and the only true indigenous people in the 1990s are now calling themselves genuine Sámi, because the Lapp identity did not bring the desired result. And call us immigrants.²⁹⁵

In an interview in the same program, Reindeer Sámi Magreta Sara startled the listeners with a reference to the concept of racial purity: "I have heard it said of dogs that the breed becomes pure in four generations. I think the same applies also to people."²⁹⁶ Some people interpreted this statement out of context as a Reindeer Sámi notion of their superiority in comparison to other Sámi as well as

Finns. On a closer look, Sara used a slightly awkward figure of speech to prove that the 3-4 generations in the Sámi definition was a reasonable way to define an ethnic group:

Sáminess is not a thing you just pick up, you must be born and grow into it. Sáminess is not a thing you can buy or learn. And when I say that you are born Sámi, it means that Sáminess must be in the blood – it runs in the blood.

If you have a drop of Sámi blood somewhere 13 generations back, that does not make you Sámi in my opinion. You must have Sámi blood in recent generations. I have heard it said of dogs that the breed becomes pure in four generations. I think the same applies also to people.

And when I say that you grow up into a Sámi, I mean that growing up in a Sámi environment teaches a person the values, ways of life, attitude to kin, livelihood, use of a Lapp coat and even manners.²⁹⁷

Unlike what journalists coming to Lapland, for example, often seem to think, the Sámi do not represent a single way of thinking; there are many opinions, as in other communities, too. Some are stricter in their views, others emphasise their liberalism. Someone would like to teach the Sámi language to anyone willing and says: “Surely you know yourself if you are Sámi.” Interpreting the sentence is left to the listener. It can be seen in a way that the person wants to open Sáminess to outsiders. However, it also contains the notion that a Sámi knows a Sámi, which is precisely a common argument for the internal group identification of the Sámi.²⁹⁸

Inari Sámi Anna Morottaja has wanted to put the dispute of Sámi definition into proportion. She thinks that the Sámi have paid too much attention to “a small group in search of its roots and identity”, while the real threats are the mining projects, disappearing language and problems in Sámi wellbeing. Morottaja has tried to arbitrate heated sentiments in Inari by appealing to the fact that the interfaces of Inari Sáminess should still be understood as flexible. “We must have courage to let those who are insecure in their Sámi identity grow into a richness and strength of our community. We must not scare off the Sámi who are ‘on the borderline’.”

The Finnish ancestors who married into an Inari Sámi family and brought a Finnish surname with them did not Fennicise the family and the whole chain of descendants. The girls, the wives remained Sámi, the neighbourhood and family community remained Sámi, children were born and grew up Sámi and the way of life remained Sámi. The Inari Sámi way of life is, however, different from “the stereotypical Mountain Sámi way of life”, and was already before those Finns married into the family. Because the Inari Sámi representation differs from the Mountain Sámi also today, many Mountain Sámi assume that the differences are caused by Fennicisation.

I know that the Finnish influence has been great after the wars. We are nevertheless still Sámi and our children will grow up Sámi, even today.

However, Morottaja concludes that it is specifically the electoral committee of the Sámi Parliament that ultimately investigates and decides on the Sáminess of the applicants. The right of appeal guarantees proper treatment. Morottaja thinks that group identification is essential to Sáminess, the means to recognise *our own people*: “International conventions state that an indigenous people itself knows who belong to it. Yet I do not know all Sámi or all Inari Sámi or even all members of my own kin. Fortunately, there are people who know better than I, and I can ask them. This is what the idea of group identification is based on.”²⁹⁹

Sámi politics firmly includes group definition and many Sámi see it as a part of the social activity. As individual people, on the other hand, they often say that a person’s own identification is personal and everyone’s own affair, which the Sámi do not want to interfere in as such. A typical comment in the statements of the Sámi is that “for my part, anyone with a drop of blood can feel Sámi, if it is important for peace of mind and mental wellbeing”. It is a different question whether they should be accepted to the Sámi Parliament electoral register.

Pauliina Feodoroff has said: “It does not do me any harm if some people in Kolari or Rovaniemi take back their language, costume and culture even from several generations back. As long as it is true desire to know who you are, and not a protest against some group.”³⁰⁰ It can be tiresome especially for young Sámi when Sáminess is expected to be of a certain kind. Young Sámi Reetta Tornensis explains:

I’m already a bit fed up with thinking what a true Sámi is like, because I know some requirements should be met before I’m a proper Sámi so to speak. I should speak Sámi as fluently as Finnish, I should come from a reindeer herder family, I should have grown up in the Sámi territory, I should be a good artisan. Why do I feel I’m Sámi anyway, although I cannot tick off any of these items?³⁰¹

She tells she has experienced “ethnostress” for being Sámi, because she often has to define her Sáminess. The ethnostress concept presented by Sámi researcher Rauna Kuokkanen³⁰² has been used by many Sámi, such as Pirita Näkkäljärvi, Xia Torikka or Anni-Helena Ruotsala. Ethnostress means

a constant feeling of inadequacy with one's own Sáminess. For example, Näkkäljärvi thinks it “can be related to Sámi language skills or traditional skills, handicrafts in my case. I cannot sew a Lapp coat.”³⁰³ It can also mean pressure to work for the benefit of one's own ethnic group in all matters, which can feel tiresome for a young person. It involves a need to make excuses for new forms of Sáminess, as in the case of Xia Torikka when she uses Tinder and other social media channels as part of Sámi everyday life. Torikka comments:

Young Sámi - - think that they should speak perfect Sámi, make Sámi handicrafts, yoik, keep reindeer or be active in Sámi politics. Keeping up and finding their own identity is difficult especially for young Sámi living in the south.

When Sámi duo Solju appeared in the Finnish Eurovision song contest trials in spring 2015 with their song *Hold Your Colours*, the young singer in the duo, Hilda Länsman, told she had received feedback asking if she was a proper Sámi when she does not sing in Sámi. In the trial previews, “the judges seemed disappointed, because there were not more Sámi elements in the piece. On the other hand, the gang in the Sámiland encourages the Solju duo just the way it is.”³⁰⁴

The division into “right” and less “right” is a basic human quality, because also the Sámi have their own internal categories. The study of Minna Rasmus from 2010 indicates that the Inari Sámi and especially Skolt Sámi told that they had experienced unequal treatment from Finns as well as from North Sámi – or more generally from other Sámi.³⁰⁵ Internal hierarchies are reflected in Sámi speech as “super Sámi”, and others are compared to their characteristics – reindeer herding, yoik and Sámi language skills. Torikka says: “There are people also in the Sámi community who think that Sáminess should be demonstrated all the time in everything you do. And we often cause ethnostress to ourselves by thinking that we are not good enough Sámi, if we want to do something else than Sámi things.”³⁰⁶

The greatest pressures seem to come from outside the Sámi community, however. Ethnostress can also manifest itself so that the Sámi must constantly explain their own identity and tell what Sáminess is. Finns belonging to the majority population need not do that. Anni-Helena Ruotsala says there is often an assumption that all Sámi know the history of their people and the issues of Sámi politics.

She comments: “I don’t want to be a walking Sámi dictionary.”³⁰⁷ The curiosity often involves a certain kind of challenge when, for example, the identity of a young Sámi is tested with attitudes of “genuineness”. This can be interpreted as intrusion, as Reetta Tornensis states:

The people who question me the most are Finns. It’s insulting how those few people feel they have the right to say to me squarely that I’m not a proper Sámi, because I didn’t yet speak Sámi in high school. It’s insulting to the Sámi how the majority population assumes the right to categorise, question and judge people as Sámi or non-Sámi based on what kind of image they themselves have of genuine Sámi.³⁰⁸

The reverse side is that if a young person is not inclined to be a walking dictionary, he or she can be considered impertinent or proud. Ruotsala thinks that the political brand involved in Sáminess makes people regard the Sámi as troublemakers, who loudly demand their rights on all forums. This kind of Sáminess can also feel frightening. The Sámi are often presented with a claim to demonstrate what special there is in their way of life or culture compared to the local Finnish lifestyle.

When the Sámi reply with characteristics related to family-centric life, understanding of Sámi cultural environment or belonging to a group, the answer in Lapland is often that it is the same with us, too. The definition of Sámi specificity is expected to be unambiguous, therefore the inquirer is not satisfied if the Sámi appeal to “diverse notions” and the wish to see “the whole picture”. At the same time, nobody asks how to define “a genuine Finn”.

According to Risto Alapuro, the essence of Finnish identity crumbles when you try to analyse it. He thinks the situation can be solved by stopping the search for “the genuine” specificity and looking at what Finns see as specifically Finnish.³⁰⁹ When outsiders ask about the special characteristics of Sáminess, answers can be quite varied and ambiguous. Journalist Sammeli Heikkinen described his discussion with Anna Morottaja:

The Sámi must also decide what is the essence of Sáminess that remains while the world changes and a Sámi may become an interior designer living in New York.

“It’s easy for me to reply that it’s language. The language contains culture and embraces the Sámi view of life. The syntax is different than in Finnish and it contains vocabulary from old livelihoods”, Anna Morottaja replies.

When Morottaja has asked this question during her cultural courses, the answers have been extensive:

Sáminess has been considered a way of thinking or a mental state. A person's own subjective conception is primary", says Morottaja.³¹⁰

Xia Torikka states: "Anyone can study and adopt the culture and language, but that's not the whole of Sáminess. Sáminess also includes its own philosophy, way of thinking and set of values. That is what we were brought up to." Magreta Sara's view is that the thing overlooked in the Sámi definition debate is how important the community acceptance was:

Sáminess does not work so that you can drop it off or hold on to it. There is no way to shed it off, it is me.

I think the acceptance of the own community has been forgotten in the Sámi definition. Old Sámi grannies, ahkus, and generally all Sámi are in the habit of asking, whose girl or boy you are, who are your parents? When we discover acquaintances, we know we are all the same Sámi.

We Sámi know well who are Sámi and who are not. And a good example of that is when Sámi meet and always talk about who belong to the family or which family everyone belongs to. This is the Sámi way of proving that you belong to the Sámi kin.³¹¹

Sámi rights? Local interests!

In 2013, the local education and culture committee of Inari received an extraordinary initiative from the Centre Party council group. It proposed that the name of the Sámi Library should be changed to a more neutral one, because non-Sámi might shun the name and would not come to borrow books. Librarian Eija Leivo did not see any need for changing the name at this point. Her argument was that it would also bring extra costs to the municipality, when signs would have to be changed.³¹²

Pseudonym "Use your brain" defended the Centre Party line in the Internet:

The Sámi Parliament seems like a racist, autocratic organisation, to which the government has given a say in affairs concerning other population groups for some reason. Other people in Inari cannot understand nor accept this. It's not far-fetched that they wouldn't like the municipal library to be identified with this completely uncooperative and discriminating Sáminess also in namings like this.³¹³

This is a small isolated case, but it illustrates the conflicts in the Sámi territory. They date already from a longer period and are based on the notion that the Sámi have gained special rights and benefits, which the other locals have not received. Some locals have difficulty in understanding why the Sámi

would be “better” than they. These special rights have included the Skolt act, reindeer farm act and linguistic rights, which included special educational arrangements, as well as the development of Sámi administration, giving the Sámi their own administrative bodies and institutions.

Locals may have been irritated by such things as the complex and even costly details in procedures related to services in the Sámi languages, publishing official announcements in all four languages of the municipality of Inari, for example. The power of the Sámi in these special rights is easily considered bigger than it actually is. Sámi institutions, such as the Sámi Parliament, Sámi museum Siida or the Giellagas institute in the university of Oulu, generally have a national responsibility in their areas, but only meagre resources.

While this kind of delusion of grandeur creates threat scenarios of the great power and influence of the “Sámi elite”, it also creates illusions of great benefits or rights they allegedly have. In Norway, researchers comment that the irritation is partly related to the dual nationality (*dobbelborgerskap*) of the Sámi. It means that, in addition to the administration of the majority population, the Sámi can participate in the operation of another democratically elected body, where other locals have no access. If some group seems to get special benefits on ethnic grounds, others may feel it is against the basic principle of democracy. In Norway, there is been talk about “super citizenship”, which the majority finds hard to tolerate. In the case of the Sámi, however, it is based on the generally recognised idea of positive action – persons or groups are supported with special measures if they are in danger of being unequally treated without them.

The starting point of positive action for the Sámi has been the idea also emphasised by Pekka Aikio that it is difficult for a minority to pursue their affairs equally in a majority democracy. Although the Sámi can participate in municipal administration, their interests are easily overtaken by “common interests”. Among the municipalities in the Sámi territory, the possibilities of the Sámi to influence the administration of both municipalities and parishes are quite modest especially in Enontekiö and Sodankylä, but also in Inari.

Then you must create your own channels of influence. The most significant of them in Finland has been the Saami Delegation, current Sámi Parliament, which has been in operation from the 1970s. When some people were once envious of the power of the council, the chairman of that time, Matti Morottaja, replied that they had no other power than to decide when the meetings took place. The Sámi themselves were not even authorised to decide where they convened, because the law stipulated that they had to be in the Sámi territory.³¹⁴

The current Sámi Parliament in Finland is an autonomous body like municipal administration, but with considerably less resources. It has not many statutory tasks, which municipal administration characteristically has, let alone taxing power. The Sámi Parliament can mainly decide on funding in three sectors: arranging cultural services, developing teaching materials and providing social services in the Sámi language. Even in these sectors, the government has ruled out items in advance that cannot get funding.

The ILO convention brought a new direction in the discussion in the 1990s, when it offered the Sámi opportunity to develop their self-government substantially both in the areas of land use and being heard by the government. The notion of potential benefits created a counter-movement, which has continuously appealed to the need to secure equal treatment to the rest of the local population.

The effects of the convention ratified in Norway in early 1990s to the use and control of Finnmark territories were not as drastic as presented in Finnish threat scenarios. For example, the Sámi and other locals administer the issue together. The negotiation obligation of the government benefits also the rest of the region.³¹⁵ This has not hindered any threat scenarios of Sámi autocracy in Finland.

A wisecracker from eastern Lapland commented once that with the ILO convention the Sámi are “like the pauper boy of the stories who was sitting on a motherload”. Neighbours, who had looked down at the boy earlier, are now rushing to get their share and shoving the pauper boy out of the way once again.³¹⁶ The image is somewhat overblown, but it reflects the competitive situation the ILO convention seems to create. It engendered an identity struggle that could not be even imagined in the

1970s and 1980s. This was commented by an anonymous non-Sámi Internet writer who criticised MP Eeva-Maria Maijala's craving to be accepted as Sámi:

All sorts of "current Sami" have soiled the reputation of the true Sámi. The Sámi have been trampled underfoot for centuries, pushed towards the north, deprived of their land and Fennicised by might and main. Now that the Sámi have worked hard to save their languages (North, Inari and Skolt Sámi in Finland), maintained their cultures and livelihoods and drawn a little bit nearer to an equal status with the majority population, others are rushing in to get their "dividend". Making up that also we (and we and we and...) are Sámi.

The case with these "current Sámi" is no other than greed for power and the underlying benefits. These freeriders exist in all workplaces, communities and even families. When others do the work, they come to reap the "fruits". Pretty immoral stuff. I'm from an old southern Lapland family on both my mother's and father's side, and there are certainly Sámi in the lineage, but I don't have the "nerve" to pretend I'm a Sámi. For starters, I would be the laughing stock in my family – stop kidding yourself! ³¹⁷

The writer describes the feelings many Sámi movement activists since the 1970s certainly share about the current situation. Activists have often used their whole free time in civic organisation work with no pay. When the Sámi have worked for decades and gained some rights and their own institutions, others are also willing to chip in. This may seem somewhat unfair to some "veterans". There is an old Sámi saying: *Following the trodden path is the easiest way.*

That is not the key question in the ILO dispute, however. How the Finnish decision makers understand Sámi rights is more important. The parliamentary discussion in winter 2014-2015 made it clear that Lapland's MPs, among others, see the Sámi mainly as a linguistic minority. Instead, the Sámi as an indigenous people are entitled to much more extensive rights, which also apply to land use.

Finland's parliament has recognised the Sámi as an indigenous people both in the 1995 Sámi Parliament act and in the 2000 constitution. Some people think that this happened by accident, when decision-makers did not understand what obligations the indigenous people concept would entail. The indigenous people concept relates to international human rights, which Finland is also otherwise committed to develop. In the discussion on local and regional levels, on the other hand, there has been an increasing attitude which questions even the principle of positive action, not to mention special land rights arrangements, for example.

The discussion about Sáminess has been dominated by “the local interests of others” and the fact that consensus should be reached about the ILO convention in Lapland before decisions can be made about it. So in winter 2014-2015, the Sámi issue and the ILO convention became matters of opinion, instead of a point to decide on positive action or international human rights.

It should have been remembered also in the Sámi dispute that although there were problems with the identity of individual persons, the collective basic rights of the whole ethnic group of the Sámi as an indigenous people were at stake. The Sámi Parliament act and the ratification of the ILO 169 convention are constitutionally defined matters of law drafting, which should not be decisively influenced by individual opinions.

The purpose of both these amendments was to create a legal framework for the operation of the Sámi Parliament and thereby for the activities of the Sámi. This legislative operation is not about opinions, but actions in compliance with the Western judicial principle. Southern decision-makers saw the conflicts in Lapland as somehow different than arguments presented in normal political debate. They were disconcerted to view the so-called Lapp or Forest Sámi associations, for example, as something else than political organisations, which they effectively were and which always have their own agendas.

Many arguments opposing the Sámi Parliament were actually linked to the fact that people had the need and desire to participate in the decision-making of the Sámi Parliament, because they thought that the Parliament decisions have effects involving their interests. This should have been recognised as political agenda of a certain group with their own interests, not as “a cry for help from an existing ethnic group”.

The preparation of the laws was then hindered by the wish of the decision-makers to consider the opinions of this group, not as political claims as they were, but as a surprising appearance of a new ethnic group. The Sámi Parliament act is a means of building a framework, and it should have been distinguished from how the Sámi Parliament subsequently operates within the limits of the law.³¹⁸

Conclusion

Three interviews picked from the publicity reflect the different ways to view the Sámi issue. In an interview in the national Helsingin Sanomat newspaper in 2013, North Sámi lawyer Antti Aikio considered legislation as a main reason for the conflict situation concerning the ILO debate. According to him, people could well be motivated by a desire to recapture their historical Sámi cultural heritage, but because of the legislation, the only option for securing one's rights was "to apply to become Sámi". Aikio stated:

The government should solve these problems and see to it that no-one would need to change into someone else by force or demand extending the Sámi definition counter to the right of self-determination. That would stop the pointless intimidation that strengthening the Sámi rights takes fishing waters and cloudberry marshes from others.³¹⁹

On the other hand, Inari Sámi Petter Morottaja expressed a wish in the local newspaper to develop the Lapland and Sámi issue quite independently of the ILO convention. "When I examined the convention in the Internet, I found many beautiful ideas, which would have helped the Sámi retain their traditional way of life a century ago. The modern Sámi are already adapted to the western society, and the western Lapland to the Sámi."

His opinion was that the earlier communities had disappeared, and so the Sámiland could not be returned to the Sámi just like that, because that would also influence the other inhabitants of the Sámi territory. He criticised the fact that "the basis of the ILO convention seems to be that an indigenous people should be tolerated and protected because they are different". In his view, the Sámi should be part of the rest of the society, despite their own special character.³²⁰

Skolt Sámi activist Pauliina Feodoroff criticised in the Helsingin Sanomat newspaper that the Sámi issue in Finland is often seen as a problem and cause of dispute, not as part of the realisation of social equality.

The EU is not discussed in Finland as a dispute, although Finns are not in agreement about the euro and subsidies. But the discussion on the ILO convention takes place as an outdoor rally, and the ratification of the convention is determined by acclamation.

In Feodoroff's view, the Sámi disputes were about whether a historical injustice would be rectified and whose narrative wins: "Can Finland as a state bear the narrative where it does not have a clear conscience concerning the Sámi?"³²¹

Conflicting opinions indicate that the Sámi do not represent a unanimous voice. Outsiders seem to require, however, that the Sámi should have consensus about the Sámi Parliament policy, for example. As Feodoroff suggests, administrators and decision-makers seem to have arrived at the conclusion that the local and regional levels in Lapland should reach consensus about Sámi issues before they can be decided on. This is a quite strange requirement, because Sámi rights are always a controversial issue, and they usually require special solutions in a majority democracy. The heated discussion has blurred the fact that processing international human rights, for example, is always political activity involving different agendas.

As Feodoroff states, Finns admit that arguing about the EU is business as usual, but it does not undermine the legitimacy of the EU. The legitimacy of the Sámi Parliament, however, has been questioned repeatedly, and the dispute on the laws concerning Sáminess makes Finnish decision-makers appeal that even all opponents should agree with the decision-makers on managing the Sámi issue.

Antti Aikio's view on the responsibility of the government in solving the Sámi issue hits the mark, because the whole Sámi dispute is based on failed legislation. Almost everyone seems to

agree that the Sámi definition included in the 1995 Sámi Parliament acts was a failure. Compared to previous legislation, the definition was appended with a paragraph, which stated that Sáminess could also be determined with historical documents. The decisive mistake according to the Sámi Parliament was that the committee for constitutional law omitted year 1874 from the definition, and that year would have made the definition sensible and complemented the linguistic definition.

With the omission of the year, historical documents became a battlefield of defining modern Sáminess. Anyone who could find even one ancestor from the registers of ancient Lapp villages could claim Sámi status. The Sámi Parliament and the Supreme Administrative Court, however, interpreted the law in a manner that seemed reasonable for preserving Sáminess. The struggle has become especially problematic when the Sámi definition has been linked with the ratification of the ILO convention. It involves real or imaginary benefits and rights, which kindled such a fervent struggle that part of the Sámi, like Petter Morottaja, have been prepared to waive these kinds of special rights to preserve social peace.

This development has been inconvenient to the Sámi, because legislation has created new groups, which have questioned the legitimacy of the Sámi Parliament and the Sámi identity in general. Criticising the indigenous people has involved even drastic rejection of the “true” Sáminess of the Sámi, which has sometimes resembled harassment. The failed legislation has been harmful to the rest of Lapland’s population, because the energy has been spent on wrong issues.

There has been a huge surge of interest among Lapps in their own history, which is a very positive thing in itself. It has been reflected in the popularity of genealogy and in the profusion of local histories. It has led to problematic interpretations when the history of Lapland has been harnessed as a political tool against the Sámi Parliament and Sámi identity. This has engendered

historical mythology with the purpose of denying the “indigenoussness” of the Sámi and even questioning their past.

The basic problem in this mythology is that descent proved by means of genealogy has been considered sufficient to prove a person’s Sáminess. The goal has been to prove that individuals belong to some family that was Sámi in the distant past, and this allegedly establishes also “my rights” to these lands and waters. It has been completely ignored that Sáminess is a predominantly ethnic concept which is related to a living culture and language community.

This is precisely what is emphasised in the traditional linguistic definition, in which connection to the Sámi language should span over three generations – i.e. at least through the native tongue of the parents or grandparents. Sáminess is additionally defined by values, importance of upbringing, communality, centrality of family and multiculturalism. They open a perspective to Sámi cultural heritage, which, in Magreta Sara’s words, one grows into and which cannot be restored only to certain individual characteristics.

Neo-Lapps have claimed, on the other hand, that blood heritage is enough, if there is one drop to be found through historical documents, although they have hardly any connection to the Sámi language and modern Sáminess. Neo-Forest Sámi have appended this with language studies, which especially the descendants of the historical Kemi Lapland inhabitants use as proof of their Sáminess.

The dispute on the ILO convention is based on the genuine concern of the non-Sámi population of Lapland of their own roots, which many people have become conscious of through the discussion on the convention. However, it has been directed against the current Sámi self-government in a problematic way, when it would be preferable to build their own “borderlands identity”. In my opinion, the Sámi-Finnish cultural heritage should be appreciated as such without questioning Sáminess. The situation caused by legislation, however, has resulted in a

contest of “the true” indigenous people identity that entitles to the definition specified by the ILO convention.

As a result, ethnicity has become a subject of a narrow definition in Finland, when only descent and language are seen as its distinctive features in public discussion, as if the Sámi and neo-Lapps had no other differences. The choices of individual people are emphasised over a strong community, and learning the Sámi language would then be the solution to the ethnicity issue. This involves a notion that personal identification is sufficient, or that “everyone who feels Sámi” is Sámi.

This goes against the Sámi idea how to recognise their *own people*. Also anthropologist Thomas Hylland Eriksen has stated that you cannot choose identity and therefore it is not just a matter of descent or choice. People are born into Sámi families and they receive their identity as part of the Sámi family. And one cannot give it up just like that, because that would mean denying one’s kinship.³²²

The family-based recognition of the Sámi has been and still is a strong social institution, which works undetected by outsiders of the culture. Neo-Lapps have not even tried to deny that in public discussion, because they are not aware of its existence. This is indicated by claims of recognising the significance of individual identification, which is completely contrary to the conception of the Sámi.³²³

So it is difficult to define the basic character of Sáminess unambiguously, because only one or even two characteristics cannot determine it. The essence of Finnishness is equally hard to determine, but precise definitions are required especially from the Sámi for some reason. The Sámi Youth of Finland association has gone as far as to claim that no other population group has a corresponding burden of proof³²⁴.

On the other hand, even proof and the notion of the Sámi of their own Sáminess are not enough because, based on the public opinion, the Sámi do not seem to have the right to determine who belong to them. This became crystal clear during the parliamentary discussion in winter 2014-2015. The right of self-determination is the basis of both the indigenous people law and human rights thinking. Thus, it was quite peculiar in the plenary session how “upset” and downright “appalled” particularly MPs from Lapland’s were about the fact that the Sámi Parliament itself could determine who belong to the Sámi.

This reflects the attitude of Finns towards the Sámi. Still in the early 20th century, it was clear that Finnish administrators considered the Sámi incapable of managing their own affairs, and that they needed fatherly guardianship. The vicar of Inari, Tuomo Itkonen, called this attitude “Finnish master thinking”³²⁵. It is surprising that this attitude still characterises Finnish Sámi politics. Also in the Sámi dispute, one side in the conflict, or the representatives of the majority, are considered the party with the essential information. Instead, the other side is not recognised as a source of “correct” information in principle. Therefore, also the capability and understanding of the Sámi to manage their own affairs is not recognised.

I would claim that this attitude also engenders the debaters’ immense suspicion against the Sámi Parliament, or the democratically elected representative body of the Sámi. Other representative bodies, such as the national parliament or municipal administration, are much criticised, to be sure, but the blurring and insinuating malevolence against the Sámi Parliament is in a class of its own. The old Sámi-related stereotypes have become somewhat modernised: instead of primitive foresters, the Sámi are now a cliqued, undemocratic group, which tramples the rights of “their own minorities” and reels in rights that it is not entitled to.

This interpretation implies that the Sámi are using the ILO convention to pursue autocracy, which denies the history of other locals by limiting the (imaginary) rights entailed by the ILO convention only to a small select group. Opponents of the Sámi right of definition have

managed to get their message through in publicity, a message largely based on blurring the issues. It is strange that this message was clearly repeated also in the speeches of Lapland's MPs in parliament in winter 2014-2015, when the Sámi-related laws were discussed and disputed. Lapland's MPs were also the experts whose opinions were instrumental when the amendment of the Sámi Parliament act as well as the ILO convention were dismissed – or in official terms, tabled to wait for the opinion of the next cabinet.

The Sámi themselves, on the other hand – even those who are against the ILO convention – seem to be inclined to recognise the Sámi Parliament as the representative of all Sámi. There are certainly those who have a critical attitude towards “the parliament” of the Sámi and give it nicknames, such as *travelling cocktail party*, but the irony is directed more at the Sámi Parliament's courses of action than its principles.

Even in the critical statements, the electoral committee of the Sámi Parliament seems to have been considered the body that is ultimately responsible for official issues concerning Sáminess. The aim of the counter-movement to question the role and legitimacy of the Sámi Parliament has not been successful in that sense. It has certainly spread bad mood, when chairmen have been constantly mocked, and especially the operation of the electoral committee has been made into an antithesis of equality and democracy.

Own courses of action?

The new Finnish cabinet for 2015-2018 consisted of the Centre Party, True Finns and the National Coalition Party. Sámi affairs were not even mentioned in the 36-page program. Rauna Kuokkanen, a Tana Sámi who works in the university of Toronto, commented:

It should be clear to everyone now that Finland is not going to ratify the ILO convention, contrary to its claims. There have not been any results in 25 years. - -

The Sámi policy of the Finnish government is quite indifferent. Finland lacks a comprehensive, strong Sámi political basis.

Kuokkanen thought that we should not expect much in the Sámi affairs during this electoral term. It would not be worthwhile to even try to reopen the Sámi Parliament act or to ratify the ILO convention. Her view was that we should not waste energy in a pointless struggle. Instead, she recommended that the Sámi should reconsider the political modes of action and goals:

I believe that it would be important to evaluate the big picture. What we have achieved when the Sámi Parliament has been active for almost twenty years. Which issues have progressed and which have not? I believe that now it is more important to promote matters of principle and to build a foundation. On that basis, it is good to build concrete actions, which are included in the wishes the Sámi Parliament has for the cabinet program.³²⁶

Kuokkanen's statement reflected the disappointment caused by the ILO convention struggle, which was also seen as a turning point. Chairman of the Sámi Parliament, Tiina Sanila-Aikio, commented that also the Sámi Parliament should discuss seriously where it should use its energy after three years of futile work. Pirita Näkkäljärvi, chief of the Sámi radio channel, YleSápmi, commented in her own column that the defeat had brought frustration, but it could also be a good opportunity to discuss what direction new Sámi politics should be developed to.

327

Professor Kuokkanen's statement reflected her background in the international indigenous peoples' community, which has demonstrated similar disillusionment at the possibilities of indigenous peoples to influence on the forums of majority populations. A pattern of thought has been gaining ground among the Indians of Canada and the United States, for example, and some Indian groups have withdrawn from national and also international cooperation, because they have seen little results from it. Instead, these tendencies emphasise the need of indigenous peoples to tighten their internal structures and solidarity, when at the same time, they

consciously try to stop seeking for approval and recognition for their own rights from the majority populations.

Indian researcher Glen Sean Coulthard (Yellowknives Dene) has questioned the idea that the relations of indigenous peoples to states could be repaired or reconciled through traditional means, such as judicial struggle or seeking for recognition. Instead of them, indigenous peoples should concentrate on their own cultural customs and how to strengthen them as resistance to the ways majority societies work. Apart from direct action, indigenous peoples should create new political and economic models based on their own traditions.³²⁸

These remarks are also valid for the operation of the Sámi Parliament. It has often been considered more reactive – responding to existing processes – than spontaneous or based on traditional conventions.³²⁹ Therefore, it should examine its own operative strategies critically and create new ones. It is clear, on the other hand, that relations to the majority population and its institutions are essential to the operation of modern Sámi communities. Developing Sámi cultural autonomy largely depends on the relations of the Sámi to the government and international human rights development.

During summer 2015, the minister of labour and justice in Finland's new cabinet, Jari Lindström, said he would bring the ILO convention back into process. Many people were delighted and many were irritated in Lapland. It is clear, however, that new strategies and routes should be found for processing the convention. Several years in limbo with the ILO convention has been a time of ill omen for the Sámi as well as other locals.

This should be finally solved – one way or another. Otherwise the inflamed situation will continue, when the loose ends foster a mode of speech that sustains threat scenarios and conflicts. Furthermore, the Sámi Parliament should be able to concentrate on other issues, because the ILO convention has taxed its energy inordinately. Apart from the ILO convention,

another significant international project is the Nordic Sámi convention, negotiated since 2006, for creating a similar framework of operation for Sámi in different Nordic countries. Although the work has been interrupted at times, it has been considered a promising step towards the internal self-determination of indigenous peoples.³³⁰

It would also be important to develop more agile practical solutions for improving the negotiation relationship between the government and the Sámi. For example, the National Board of Forestry and the Sámi Parliament have together drawn a management and operation plan for the Hammastunturi wilderness region in Inari based on the so-called *Akwé:Kon* procedure. It emphasises the land use conventions of the Sámi and aims at protecting them based on the international biodiversity convention.³³¹

On the whole, a challenge for the Sámi Parliament has always been the pursuit to work in many networks from the local level to the national arena, Nordic connections to international forums, from arctic circles to indigenous peoples' cooperation. With its meagre resources in mind, it should constantly consider which levels require more attention and are some networks getting less attention. The Sámi have been able to operate successfully in the global networks of indigenous peoples, for example, but with the result of the ILO dispute, one could ask why it has not been manifested on the national level and eventually on the local level.

Reetta Karjalainen has stated in her recent doctoral thesis that cultural work in the Sámi language is more equally positioned in the international networks of indigenous peoples than in the national context. It is seen as a valuable asset in global connections, while national and local levels do not regard it as a special characteristic but as a peripheral and stereotypical extension of Finnishness.³³²

The Sámi Parliament is facing great challenges in the negotiation on improving rights. The situation has changed from the 1990s, when the general atmosphere towards the Sámi issue was

quite positive. Sámi-related legislation was proceeding well. The Sámi dispute, however, has opened channels to discussion, which is also characterised by downright anti-Sámi statements. It is always appropriate to examine Sámi politics critically, but the tones in the discussion have become more drastic.

It is alarming that the often populistically oriented discussion is increasingly directed against the basic values that underlie the equal status of the Sámi in Finnish society. As a result, some people consider themselves entitled to disparage the affairs of the Sámi in terms each more outrageous than the last, probably often forgetting that they are talking about real people with feelings or small Sámi groups whose position in the surrounding society is insecure as it is.

The Sámi dispute is especially problematic for the growing youth, because people born in the 1990s, for example, have lived their whole lives in the shadow of these modes of speech. The feelings of shame that older generations have felt of their Sáminess are acquiring quite new forms. Vesa Puuronen comments about the feelings of the Sámi in his work *Suomalainen rasismi* (Finnish Racism):

From the angle of studying emotions, shame has a particularly strong link with the development or breakdown of the self (identity). When a person notices that his or her identity or way of expressing it is not approved, that he or she cannot meet the identity expectations of the surrounding community or that expressing identity is penalised, he or she feels one of the three basic emotions: hate, fear or guilt. - - The Finnish majority community has communicated to the Sámi for decades that their identity or means of expression are not approved.³³³

One way of questioning the identity of the Sámi is to blur ethnic boundaries, which is often expressed in public discussion by challenging the way the Sámi differ from other locals. This resembles the idea of sociologists that the principal form of repression against a minority is denial of their specificity.³³⁴ It is gratifying in this sense how active the Sámi youth is. The operation of both the Sámi youth association, *Suoma Sámi nuorat*, and artists such as

Suohpanterror demonstrate the significance of searching for the essence and roots, which is originally contained in the word *radical*.

Promoting Sámi rights in the future may involve more work than before, because linking the question of the Sámi definition to any issue has become an established mode of speech. Sámi blogger Neeta Jääskö has anticipated the effects of this mode of speech ironically:

“Must get funding for language nests.” – “Well, but what about this Sámi definition?” – “Could we stop this forced assimilation?” – “SÁMI DEFINITION!” – “At least services for seniors in their own language” – “but the Sámi definition”.

335

Language-related legislation has developed well in Finland, although the situation on the day-to-day level is often contradictory. Language rights involve a lot of work, because the Sámi Parliament has limited resources, and funding for many different activities must be negotiated separately from the state budget. Instead, developing more extensive autonomy could be more problematic after the experiences from spring 2015. Judging by the parliamentary discussion, Finns see the Sámi merely as a linguistic minority, not as an indigenous people. The indigenous people identity has been defined in two texts of law in Finland, but it seems that there has been a tendency to blur and fade its meaning.

According to the Sámi Parliament, the reference to an indigenous people should lead to actions that protect the linguistic and cultural rights of the modern Sámi. They are ultimately based on control over the resources in their own territory one way or the other. The ILO convention has been an attempt to solve this issue. The constitution is the cornerstone of all Finnish judicial thinking, and only carefully deliberated proposals are usually accepted into it. There is also an aspiration to implement it in a way that the issues involved in it would not become empty words.

The greatest emphasis in Finland, however, has been placed on threat scenarios, which indicate that ratifying the ILO convention would mean a division between the Sámi and the rest of the local population. In the opposing views, the ILO convention would dramatically decrease the

rights of the other local population in land use, for example. Norway's example shows that this need not be the case at all. Untold numbers of clarifications and reports have been prepared during the dispute, and new investigations and situation analyses have been demanded on top of them. Many people think, however, that it is ultimately a political decision that should solve the 25 years old conflict – one way or the other.

This would reveal if Finland is developing the rights of the indigenous people as they are defined in international conventions and its own constitution. Measures entailed by international human rights would require political decisions rising above individual opinions and contradictions. Finland was a forerunner in the development of Sámi administration, as well as in defining Sáminess and in demographic research of the Sámi in the Nordic countries in the 20th century. Finland has also prided itself on its achievements in developing human rights for a long time.

Legislation concerning the indigenous people rights of the Sámi has been stalled in Finland, however. The parliamentary decisions made on the Sámi Parliament act and the ILO convention in winter 2014-2015 mean that Finland's government is neither implementing its constitution nor fulfilling its international commitments towards its indigenous people.

Bibliography

- Achenbach, Joel 2015: Epäuskon aikakausi. *National Geographic* 3, 44–61.
- Aikio, Antti – Åhren, Mathias 2014: A reply to calls for an extension of the definition of Sámi in Finland. *Arctic Review on Law and Politics* vol. 5, 1.
- Aikio, Pekka 2013: Reunahuomautuksia 2000-luvun saamelaisuuteen. *Agon* 37–38, 43–44.
- Alapuro, Risto 1993: Suomalaisuuden erikoislaadusta. In *Suomesta Euro-Suomeen. Keitä me olemme ja mihin matkalla*. Eds. Pertti Joenniemi, Risto Alapuro and Kyösti Pekonen. Tampere: Tapri.
- Anaya, S. James 2011: The situation of the Sami people in the Sápmi region of Norway, Sweden and Finland. A report of the Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. UN Human Rights Council, New York 2011, also jamesanaya.org/country-reports/the-situation-of-the-sami-people-in-the-sapmi-region-of-norway-sweden-and-finland-2011
- Broderstad, Else Grete 2014: Implementing Indigenous Self-Determination. The Case of the Sámi in Norway. Edited Collection – Restoring Indigenous Self Determination. *E-International Relations*, May 3, see <http://www.e-ir.info/2014/05/30/implementing-indigenous-self-determination-the-case-of-the-sami-in-norway/>.
- Burke, Liz 2004: Adam Elliot on Carbog, Clay and Harvie Krumpet. *Metro* 139, 134–139.
- Coulthard, Glen Sean 2014: *Red Skins, White Masks. Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis – London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Eidheim, Harald 1997: Ethno-political Development among the Sami after World War II: The Invention of Selfhood. In Gaski, *Sami Culture in a New Era*, Davvi Girji OS.
- Enbuske, Matti 2008: Vanhan Lapin valtamailla. Asutus ja maankäyttö Kemin Lapin ja Enontekiön alueella 1500-luvulta 1900-luvun alkuun. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Frankfurt, Harry G. 2006: *Paskapuheesta*. Helsinki: Johnny Kniga.
- Heikkinen, Vesa – Hurme, Tuure 2008: *Hölynpölyimuri*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Heinämäki, Leena 2013: Saamelaisten itsemääräämisoikeus: konkretiaa vai sananhelinää? *Agon* 37–38, 22–25.
- Hiltunen, Mauno 2012: Alkuperäiskansasta uuslappalaisiin ja kveeneihin – kamppailu Lapin historian tulkinnoista. *Faravid* 36. Oulu: Pohjois-Suomen historiallisen yhdistyksen vuosikirja, 279–296.
- Joona, Tanja 2012: *The ILO Convention No. 169 in a Nordic Context with Comparative Analysis: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Rovaniemi: Lapin yliopisto.
- Joona, Tanja 2013: Ihmisoikeusnäkökulma ILO-sopimukseen No. 169. *Agon* 37–38, 6–12.

- Junka-Aikio, Laura 2014: Can the Sámi speak now? Deconstructive research ethos and the debate on who is a Sámi in Finland. *Cultural Studies* 2014, 2–28. Published online in 24 November 2014. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09502386.2014.978803>.
- Karjalainen, Reetta 2015: Saamen kielet pääomana monikielisellä Skábmagovat-elokuvafestivaalilla. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Keskinen, Suvi – Rastas, Anna – Tuori, Salla 2009: Johdanto: Suomalainen maahanmuuttokeskustelu tienhaarassa. In *En ole rasisti, mutta... Maahanmuutosta, monikulttuurisuudesta ja kritiikistä*. Eds. Suvi Keskinen, Anna Rastas and Salla Tuori. Tampere: Vastapaino & Nuorisotutkimusverkosto.
- Koivulaakso, Dan – Brunila, Mikael – Andersson, Li 2013: Äärioikeisto Suomessa. Helsinki: Into.
- Koskinen, Inkeri 2015: Researchers Building Nations: Under what conditions can overtly political research be objective? *Recent Developments in the Philosophy of Science: EPSA13*. Eds. Uskali Mäki, Ioannis Votsis, Stéphanie Rupy, and Gerhard Schurz. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 129-140.
- Kuokkanen, Rauna 1999: Etnostressistä sillanrakennukseen. Saamelaisen nykykirjallisuuden minäkuvat. Teoksessa *Pohjoiset identiteetit ja mentaliteetit I: Outamaalta tunturiin*. Inari – Rovaniemi: Kustannus-Puntsi – Lapin yliopisto, 95–112.
- Kuokkanen, Rauna 2009: Achievements of Indigenous Self-Determination. The Case of the Sami Parliaments in Finland and Norway. In: *Indigenous Diplomacies*. Ed. J. Marshall Beier. New York: Palgrave, 97–114.
- Kurtén, Björn 1982: *Kuinka mammutti pakastetaan*. Helsinki: Tammi.
- Lehtola, Veli-Pekka 2004: *Sámi people – Tradition in Transition*. Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press, 86-87.
- Lehtola, Veli-Pekka 2005: *Nickul. Rauhan mies, rauhan kansa*. Inari: Kustannus-Puntsi.
- Lehtola, Veli-Pekka 2005: *Saamelaisten parlamentti. Suomen saamelaisvaltuuskunta 1973–1995 ja Saamelaiskäräjät 1996–2003*. Inari: Saamelaiskäräjät.
- Lehtola, Veli-Pekka 2009: Saame-sanan juuria suomalaisessa julkisuudessa. In *Ei kiveäkään kääntämättä. Pentti Koivusen juhla-kirja 2009*. Eds. Janne Ikäheimo – Sanna Lipponen. Oulu: Oulun yliopiston arkeologian laitos.
- Lehtola, Veli-Pekka 2010: *Porojen kansalaisuus? Suomen ja Norjan kiista rajaseudun poronhoidosta 1852–1936*. *Faravid* 34. Oulu: Oulun historiallisen yhdistyksen vuosikirja.
- Lehtola, Veli-Pekka 2012: *Saamelaiset suomalaiset. Kohtaamisia 1896–1953*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Lehtola, Veli-Pekka – Länsman, Anni-Siiri 2012: Saamelaisliikkeen perintö ja institutionalisoitunut saamelaisuus. In *Saamenmaa. Kulttuuritieteellisiä näkökulmia*. Eds. Veli-Pekka Lehtola, Ulla Piela and Hanna Snellman. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 13–35.
- Lehtola, Veli-Pekka – Korhonen, Kuisma – Alenius, Kari – Mantila, Harri 2015: *Approaches to transcultural encounters*. In *Transcultural encounters*. Eds. Kari Alenius and Veli-Pekka Lehtola. Oulu: Pohjois-Suomen historiallinen yhdistys, 5–13.

- Lähteenmäki, Maria 2001: Kotini on vanha siida. In Suomalaisen ja saamelaisen Lapin rajankäyntiä keskiajalta nykypäivään. Suvaitsevaisuus. Ed. Mikko Lahtinen. Helsinki: Tanner-akatemia, Väinö Tannerin säätiö 2001.
- Lähteenmäki, Maria 2004: Kalotin kansaa. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Magga, Päivi 2007: Rakennuksia, kotasijoja, muistoja – saamelaista kulttuuriympäristöä inventoimassa. In Eletty, koettu maisema. Näkökulmia saamelaiseen kulttuurimaisemaan. Eds. Tiina Elo and Päivi Magga. Rovaniemi: Lapin ympäristökeskus.
- Magga, Päivi 2014: Mikä tekee kulttuuriympäristöstä saamelaisen? In Ealli biras – Elämä ympäristö. Saamelainen kulttuuriympäristöohjelma. Inari: Sámi museum – Saamelaismuseosäätiö.
- Martti Linkola 1985: Saamelaisten paimentolaisporonhoidon vaiheet. In Lappi 4: Saamelaisten ja suomalaisten maa. Ed. Martti Linkola. Hämeenlinna Karisto, 177–186.
- Nahkiaisoja, Tarja 2006: Asutus ja maankäyttö Inarissa ja Utsjoella 1700-luvun puolivälistä vuoteen 1925. Helsinki: Oikeusministeriö.
- Nickul, Erkki 1968: Suomen saamelaiset vuonna 1962. Selostus Pohjoismaiden saamelaisneuvoston suorittamasta väestötutkimuksesta. Pro gradu thesis in statistics. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto.
- Niemelä, Teuvo 2003: Saatteeksi. In Inari – Aanaar. Inarin historia jääkaudesta nykypäivään. Ed. Veli-Pekka Lehtola. Inari: Inarin kunta.
- Nieminen, Petteri 2015: A unified theory of creationism – Argumentation, experiential thinking and emerging doctrine. Joensuu: Itä-Suomen yliopisto.
- Nikula, Kaisu 2003: Muistelevat inarinsaamelaiset. Empiirisen etnisyyden ja identiteettien kirjon tarkastelua elämänkerron kautta. Pro gradu thesis in folklore studies. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto. (Unpublished thesis.)
- Nyyssönen, Jukka 2007: ”Everybody recognized that we were not white.” Sami Identity Politics in Finland, 1945–1990. Tromsø: University of Tromsø.
- Olthuis, Marja-Liisa – Kivelä, Suvi – Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove 2013: Revitalising Indigenous Languages. How to Recreate a Lost Generation. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Outakoski, Aslak 1957: Katsaus saamelaisväestöä koskevaan tutkimukseen Suomessa. In Sámiid dilid. Föredrag vid Den nordiska samekonferensen i Jokkmokk, 1953; svensk, norsk och finsk utgåva. Red. Kalle Nickul, Asbjörn Nesheim och Israel Ruong. Oslo: Nordisk råd.
- Pietikäinen, Sari – Leppänen, Sirpa 2007: Saamelaiset toisin sanoin. In Kolonialismin jäljet. Keskustat, periferiat ja Suomi. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 175–189.
- Pääkkönen, Erkki 2008: Saamelainen etnisyys ja pohjoinen paikallisyhteisö – Saamelaisten etninen mobilisaatio ja paikallisperustainen vastaliike. Rovaniemi: Lapin yliopisto.
- Rasmus, Minna 2008: Bágggu vuolgit, bágggu birget. Oulu: Giellagas-instituutti
- Rasmus, Minna 2010: Saamen kielten ja saamelaisen kulttuurin koulutustarpeet Suomessa. Oulu: Giellagas-instituutti.

- Rastas, Anna 2009: Rasismien kiistäminen suomalaisessa maahanmuuttokeskustelussa. In *En ole rasisti, mutta... Maahanmuutosta, monikulttuurisuudesta ja kritiikistä*. Eds. Suvi Keskinen, Anna Rastas and Salla Tuori. Tampere: Vastapaino & Nuorisotutkimusverkosto.
- Ravna, Øyvind 2015: Sami Rights to Natural Resources and Lands in Norway. *Polar Law and Resources*. Ed. by Natalia Loukacheva. Copenhagen: Norden, 63 – 77.
- Saarinen, Heli 2011: Valkoisen peuran myyttinen Lappi. Rovaniemi: Lapin yliopisto.
- Sammallahti, Pekka 1996: Saamelaiset julkisuusmyllytyksessä. *Kanava 7*: 401–404.
- Sammallahti, Pekka 2013a: Saamelaismääritelmästä. *Agon 37–38*, 26–39.
- Sammallahti, Pekka 2013b: Saamen maa ja saamen kieli. In *Ealli biras – Elävä ympäristö. Saamelainen kulttuuriympäristöohjelma*. Eds. Päivi Magga and Eija Ojanlatva. Inari: Sámi museum – Saamelaismuseosäätiö.
- Sarivaara, Erika 2012: Statuksettomat saamelaiset. Paikantumisia saamelaisuuden rajoilla. *Diedut 2/2012*. Sámi allaskuvla: Guovdageaidnu (Koutokeino) 2012.
- Scheinin, Martin 2006: Ihmisen ja kansan oikeudet – kohti pohjoismaista saamelaissovimusta. *Lakimies 1*, 27–41.
- Schopenhauer, Arthur 2005: Taito olla ja pysyä oikeassa. *Eristinen dialektiikka*. Helsinki: Eurooppalaisen filosofian seura.
- Selle, P. – Semb, A. J. – Strømsnes, K. 2013: Citizenship Identity among Norwegian Sami in Core Sámi Areas. In: *Citizenship Studies Vol. 17, No. 6–7*, 712–727.
- Seurujärvi-Kari, Irja 2012: Ale jaskkot eatnigiella. Alkuperäiskansaliikkeen ja saamen kielen merkitys saamelaisten identiteetille. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto.
- Stokke, Hugo 2012: Rethinking social citizenship: the case of the Finnmark Act. In: *Judification and Social Citizenship in the Welfare State*. Ed. by H. S. Aasen, S. Gloppen, A.-M. Magnussen and E. Nilssen. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 241–260.
- Tervaniemi, Saara 2013: Symbolista sodankäyntiä saamelaisuudesta. *Agon 37–38*, 14–18.
- Tuominen, Marja 2010: Pohjoisen kulttuurihistorian paikat ja haasteet. In *Kulttuurihistoriallinen katse*. Eds. Heli Rantala and Sakari Ollitervo. Turku: Turun yliopisto, 309–337.
- Tuulentie, Seija 2001: Meidän vähemmistömmme. Valtaväestön retoriikat saamelaisten oikeuksista käydyssä keskustelussa. Helsinki: SKS.
- Uschanov, Tommi 2010: Suuri kaalihuijaus. Kirjoituksia yhteiskunnallisesta tietämättömyydestä. Helsinki: Teos.
- Vahtola, Jouko – Enbuske, Matti – Hiltunen, Mauno – Nahkiaisola, Tarja – Joonas, Juha 2006: Yhteenvedot ja tiivistelmät Lapinmaan maa- ja metsäoikeudet -tutkimuksesta. Helsinki: Oikeusministeriö.
- Valkeapää, Nils-Aslak 1971: Terveisiä Lapista. Helsinki: Otava.
- Valkonen, Jarno – Valkonen, Sanna – Koivurova, Timo 2014: Groupismi alkuperäiskansan määrittelyssä: tapaustutkimus Suomen alkuperäiskansakonfliktista. *Politiikka 3*. See version

<http://www.politiikasta.fi/artikkeli/kuka-saamelainen-alkuper%C3%A4iskansanm%C3%A4%C3%A4rittelyn-paradoksit>.

Valkonen, Sanna 2008: Poliittinen saamelaisuus. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Valkonen, Sanna – Valkonen, Jarno 2013: Pohjois-Suomen etnisten suhteiden uudelleen tulkintojen ongelmat. *Agon* 37–38, 4–5 and separate appendix.

References

- ¹ The Northern Sámi word *ráidu* means a string of reindeer.
- ² Ks. http://yle.fi/uutiset/ssnn_puheenjohtaja_olen_tyytyvainen_etta_teimme_taman_mielenosoituksen/7866722.
- ³ ILO-sopimus vedettiin pois käsittelystä.” Lapin Kansa 13.3.2015, ks. <http://www.lapinkansa.fi/Kotimaa/1194967086502/artikkeli/ilo-sopimus+-vedettiin+pois+kasittelysta.html>
- ⁴ http://yle.fi/uutiset/saamelaiskarajien_puheenjohtaja_eroaa_tehtavistaan_saamelaismaaritelman_takia/7858960.
- ⁵ Erkki Tuomiojan haastattelu Suomen Akatemian, Ulkoministeriön ja Tekesin Arktisessa seminaarissa Helsingissä 19.3.2015. Yle Uutiset 19.3.2015 ks. http://yle.fi/uutiset/tuomioja_ilo-sopimuksen_ratifointi_myos_seuraavaan_hallitusohjelmaan/7875117
- ⁶ See e.g. Aikio, Antti – Åhren, Mathias 2014: A reply to calls for an extension of the definition of Sami in Finland. *Arctic Review on Law and Politics* vol. 5, 1; Junka-Aikio, Laura 2014: Can the Sami speak now? Deconstructive research ethos and the debate on who is a Sami in Finland. *Cultural Studies* 2014, 2–28. Published online in 24 November 2014. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09502386.2014.978803>; Scheinin, Martin 2006: Ihmisen ja kansan oikeudet – kohti pohjoismaista saamelaissopimusta. *Lakimies* 1, 27–41; Heinämäki, Leena 2013: Saamelaisten itsemääräämisoikeus: konkretiaa vai sananhelinää? *Agon* 37–38, 22–25; Valkonen, Sanna – Valkonen, Jarno 2013: Pohjois-Suomen etnisten suhteiden uudelleen tulkintojen ongelmat. *Agon* 37–38, 4–5; Ravna, Øyvind 2015: Sami Rights to Natural Resources and Lands in Norway. *Polar Law and Resources*. Ed. by Natalia Loukacheva. Copenhagen: Norden, 63 – 77; Else Grete Broderstad, Implementing Indigenous Self-Determination. The Case of the Sámi in Norway. Edited Collection – Restoring Indigenous Self Determination. E-International Relations, May 3 2014 (assessed October 8th, 2014). <http://www.e-ir.info/2014/05/30/implementing-indigenous-self-determination-the-case-of-the-sami-in-norway/>.
- ⁷ Kolmen raati. Inarilainen 20.2.2013.
- ⁸ Mikkeli Näkkäljärvi: ILO suojaisi saamelaista kulttuuria. Inarilainen 1.4.2015.
- ⁹ Blog of Klemetti Näkkäljärvi 8.8.2011. <http://klemetti.blogspot.com> (erased 30.3.2015).
- ¹⁰ Tuulentie, Seija 2001: *Meidan vähemmistömmä. Valtaväestön retoriikat saamelaisten oikeuksista käydyssä keskustelussa*. Helsinki: SKS; Paakkonen, Erkki 2008: *Saamelainen etnisyyt ja pohjoinen paikallisyhteisö – Saamelaisten etninen mobilisaatio ja paikallisperustainen vastaliike*. Rovaniemi: Lapin yliopisto; Valkonen, Sanna 2008: *Poliittinen saamelaisuus*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- ¹¹ Joonas, Tanja 2012: The ILO Convention No. 169 in a Nordic Context with Comparative Analysis: An Interdisciplinary Approach. Rovaniemi: Lapin yliopisto.
- ¹² Aikio– Åhren 2014.
- ¹³ Junka-Aikio 2014.
- ¹⁴ Lehtola, Veli-Pekka 2012: *Saamelaiset suomalaiset – kohtaamisia 1896-1953*. Helsinki: SKS.
- ¹⁵ Schopenhauer, Arthur 2004: *The Art of Always Being Right*. London: Gibson Square Books.
- ¹⁶ See e.g. Tiedeyhteisö vetoaa saamelaismaaritelman puolesta. E.g. Inarilainen 5.6.2013 or http://yle.fi/uutiset/tiedeyhteisolta_vetoomus_hallitukselle_saamelaismaaritelma/6664208; Sammallahti – Lehtola: Avoin kirje Suomen eduskunnalle saamelaismaaritelma. Yle Uutiset 3.3.2015; Lehtola, Veli-Pekka – Valkonen, Jarno: Saamelaisia ei kuunnella lainvalmistelussa riittävästi. Pääkirjoitus: Vieraskynä. Helsingin Sanomat 27.4.2015.
- ¹⁷ Koskinen, Inkeri 2015: Researchers Building Nations: Under what conditions can overtly political research be objective? Recent Developments in the Philosophy of Science: EPSA13. Eds. Uskali Mäki, Ioannis Votsis, Stéphanie Rupy, and Gerhard Schurz. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 129-140.
- ¹⁸ See e.g. Ravna 2015, 63-64.
- ¹⁹ See Sammallahti, Pekka 1998: *The Saami languages – an introduction*. Kárášjohka: Davvi girji. 10-14.
- ²⁰ See <http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/kaannokset/2003/en20031086.pdf>.
- ²¹ Olthuis, Marja-Liisa – Kivelä, Suvi – Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove 2013: *Revitalising Indigenous Languages. How to Recreate a Lost Generation*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- ²² Suomen saamelaisnuoret ry: Tietoa saamelaisista ks. <http://www.ssn.fi/>

²³ Blog of Klemetti Näkkäljärvi February 2, 2012. <http://klemetti.blogspot.com> (erased 30.3.2015).

²⁴ About the Sámi identity, see Eidheim, Harald 1997: Ethno-political Development among the Sami after World War II: The Invention of Selfhood. In Gaski, *Sami Culture in a New Era*, Davvi Girji OS, 1997; Lehtola, Veli-Pekka 2004: Sámi people – Tradition in Transition. Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press, 86-87.

²⁵ Hansen, Lars Ivar – Olsen, Bjørnar 2014: Hunters in Tradition. An Outline of Early Sámi History. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 123-139.

²⁶ Lehtola 2004, 80-84.

²⁷ Suomen saamelaisnuoret ry: Tietoa saamelaisista ks. <http://www.ssn.fi/info/tietoa-saamelaisista/>.

²⁸ Kuokkanen, Rauna 2009: Achievements of Indigenous Self-Determination. The Case of the Sami Parliaments in Finland and Norway. In: Indigenous Diplomacies. Ed. J. Marshall Beier. New York: Palgrave, 97–114; Selle, P. – Semb, A. J. – Strømsnes, K. 2013: Citizenship Identity among Norwegian Sami in Core Sámi Areas. In: Citizenship Studies Vol. 17, No. 6–7, 712–727; Stokke, Hugo 2012: Rethinking social citizenship: the case of the Finnmark Act. In: Judification and Social Citizenship in the Welfare State. Ed. by H. S. Aasen, S. Gloppen, A.-M. Magnussen and E. Nilssen. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 241–260.

²⁹ See Permanent Participant Article Series: Saami Council in: Arctic Council official web page <http://www.arctic-council.org/index.php/en/environment-and-people/arctic-peoples/indigenous-peoples-today/589-permanent-participant-article-series-saami-council>; Anaya, S. James 2011: The situation of the Sami people in the Sápmi region of Norway, Sweden and Finland. A report of the Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. UN Human Rights Council, New York 2011, also jamesanaya.org/country-reports/the-situation-of-the-sami-people-in-the-sapmi-region-of-norway-sweden-and-finland-2011; Permanent Forum: Origin and Development in <http://undesadspd.org/IndigenousPeoples/AboutUsMembers.aspx>.

³⁰ See e.g. Henry Minde 2008: The Destination and the Journey: Indigenous Peoples and the United Nation from the 1970s through 1985. In: Indigenous Peoples: Self-determination, Knowledge, Indigeneity. Ed. by Henry Minde. Eburon Academic Publishers, Delft 2008, 49–86; Minde, Henry – Nilsen, Ragnar 2003: Conclusion. In: Indigenous Peoples: Resource Management and Global Rights. Ed. by Svein Jentoft, Henry Minde & Ragnar Nilsen. Eburon Academic Publisher, Delft 2003, 297–309.

³¹ About the history of Sámi delegation and Sámi parliament, see Lehtola, Veli-Pekka 2005: *Saamelaisten parlamentti. Suomen saamelaisvaltuuskunta 1973–1995 ja Saamelaiskäräjät 1996–2003*. Inari: Saamelaiskäräjät, 25–39

³² About Alta conflict, see e.g. Andersen, Svein S., - Atle Midttun 1985: Conflict and Local Mobilization: The Alta Hydropower Project. *Acta Sociologica* 4; Paine, Robert 1985: Ethnodrama and the 'Fourth World'. The Saami Action Group in Norway, 1979-81. *Indigenous Peoples and the Nation-state: 'fourth World' Politics in Canada, Australia, and Norway*. Ed. Noel Dyck. St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1985; Somby, Ande 1999: The Alta-Case: A Story About How Another Hydroelectric Dam Project Was Forced Through in Norway. *Indigenous Affairs* 3.4, 56-63; Lars Martin Hjorthol 2006: *Alta - Kraftkampen som utfordret statens makt*. Oslo: Gyldendal; Minde, Henry 2005: The Alta case: From the local to the global and back again. *Discourses and Silences: Indigenous Peoples, Risks and Resistance*. Ed. by Garth Cant, Anake Goodall & Justine Inns. Christchurch: University of Canterbury, 13–34.

³³ Lehtola 2005, 25–39.

³⁴ Lehtola 2005, 43–119.

³⁵ Saamelaisasiain neuvottelukunnan tiedote ”Ehdotus saamelaislaiksi ja erinäisten lakien muuttamiseksi” 18.6.1990. SKA.

³⁶ Saamelaisasiain neuvottelukunnan tiedote ”Ehdotus saamelaislaiksi ja erinäisten lakien muuttamiseksi” 18.6.1990. SKA.

³⁷ Letters to editor, e.g. Urpo Huhtamella: ”Saamelaislakiluonnos ihmetyttää Inarin erä- ja kalamiehiä”, *Lapin Kansa* 17.7.1990; ”Saamelaislaki uusi sortolaki”, *Lapin Kansa* 12.7.1990; *Lapin Kansa* 1.12.1990; ”Minne menet eteläafrikkalainen, minne menet saamelainen?” *Lapin Kansa* 26.2.1991; Martti Peltomaa: ”Kunnes saamelaislaki heidät erottaa...” *Lapin Kansa* 1. 3. 1991; ”Saamelaislakiesitys”, *Lapin Kansa* 13.2.1991; *Pohjolan Sanomat* 1.12.1990.

³⁸ Interview of Matti Morottaja by the author.

³⁹ *Lapin Kansa* 28.3.1991; *Pohjolan Sanomat* 28.3.1991; *Lapin Kansa* 24.5.1991.

⁴⁰ Minutes of Sámi Delegation 26.2.1993 and 26. 2. 1994, Sámi Parliament Archive; Sámi Delegation to the Minister of Justice, Hannele Pokka 21.4.1993. Sámi Parliament Archive; *Kaleva* 8. 3. 1993.

-
- ⁴¹ Ks. Lehtola 2005, 145–148.
- ⁴² Lehtola 2005, 147–148.
- ⁴³ ”Saamelaislakiluonnos ihmetyttää Inarin erä- ja kalamiehiä”, Urpo Huhtamalla’s letter to editor Lapin Kansa 17.7.1990; ”Saamelaislaki uusi sortolaki”, letter to editor Lapin Kansa 12.7.1990.
- ⁴⁴ Interview of Heikki J. Hyvärinen.
- ⁴⁵ Pohjolan Sanomat 22.10.1994.
- ⁴⁶ Sari Pelttari-Heikka: ”Saamelaisten itsehallinto etenee hiljalleen.” Pohjolan Sanomat 10.12.1994.
- ⁴⁷ Jaakko Tahkolahti: Inhoa ja pelkoa Saamenmaassa. Hiidenkivi 9/1997.
- ⁴⁸ Hannele Pokka: Saamelaistoimikunnan mietintö – Samekomitens betankande. Helsinki: Oikeusministeriö 2001; about the news concerning the proposal see <http://www.kaleva.fi/uutiset/pohjois-suomi/maaherra-hannele-pokka-pahoillaan-perinneriitelysta/449481>.
- ⁴⁹ See Lehtola 2005, 153–167.
- ⁵⁰ Maanomistustyöryhmän selvitys saamelaisten kotiseutualueen maakysymyksessä. I osamietintö. Saamelaiskäräjät 2002, 3–5.
- ⁵¹ Maanomistustyöryhmän selvitys saamelaisten kotiseutualueen maakysymyksessä. I osamietintö. Saamelaiskäräjät 2002, 3–5.
- ⁵² Olli Muttilainen: ILO:n sopimuksen n:o 169 ratifiointiedellytyksistä Suomessa. A speech in Sámi Parliament seminar 17. 4. 2008.
- ⁵³ Pääkkönen, Erkki 2008: *Saamelainen etnisyys ja pohjoinen paikallisyhteisö – Saamelaisten etninen mobilisaatio ja paikallisperustainen vastaliike*. Rovaniemi: Lapin yliopisto, 105–106.
- ⁵⁴ Vahtola, Jouko – Enbuske, Matti – Hiltunen, Mauno – Nahkiaisoja, Tarja – Joonas, Juha 2006: *Yhteenvedot ja tiivistelmat Lapinmaan maa- ja metsäoikeudet -tutkimuksesta*. Helsinki: Oikeusministeriö.
- ⁵⁵ Olli Muttilainen: ILO:n sopimuksen n:o 169 ratifiointiedellytyksistä Suomessa. A speech in Sámi Parliament seminar 17. 4. 2008.
- ⁵⁶ Hiltunen 2012, 292–293.
- ⁵⁷ Olli Muttilainen: ILO:n sopimuksen n:o 169 ratifiointiedellytyksistä Suomessa. A speech in Sámi Parliament seminar 17. 4. 2008.
- ⁵⁸ Ks. Magga 2007; Magga 2014.
- ⁵⁹ 99 kysymystä ja vastausta ILO 169 -sopimuksesta. Helsinki: Vähemmistövaltuutettu 2014.
- ⁶⁰ About the Finnmark law, see e.g. Ravna, Oyvind 2015: Sami Rights to Natural Resources and Lands in Norway. *Polar Law and Resources*. Ed. by Natalia Loukacheva. Copenhagen: Norden, 63 – 77.
- ⁶¹ 99 kysymystä ja vastausta ILO 169 -sopimuksesta. Helsinki: Vähemmistövaltuutettu 2014.
- ⁶² Lehtola 2005, 147–151.
- ⁶³ YK:n julistus alkuperäiskansojen oikeuksista ja ILO:n yleissopimus nro 169. Helsinki: YK-liitto 2012.
- ⁶⁴ Pääkkönen 2008, 108.
- ⁶⁵ Niinistön kanta ILO-sopimukseen vesittyi. Inarilainen 11.1.2012.
- ⁶⁶ Speech of President Sauli Niinistö in the opening of Sámi Parliament, 3.4.2012 see <http://www.presidentti.fi/Public/default.aspx?contentid=245916&culture=fi-FI>.
- ⁶⁷ Emeritusprofessori ihmettelee presidentti Niinistön ILO-puhetta. Inarilainen 18.4.2012.
- ⁶⁸ About the discussion about colonialism in Finland, see Lehtola, Veli-Pekka 2015: Sámi Histories, Colonialism, and Finland. *Arctic Anthropology*, Vol. 52, No. 2, pp. 22–36.
- ⁶⁹ Speech of Klemetti Näkkäläjarvi in the opening of Sámi Parliament 3.4.2012.
- ⁷⁰ ”Lappia uhkaa sotatila, jos ILO-sopimus hyväksytään.” Yle Lappi 18.4.2013, see http://yle.fi/uutiset/lappia_uhkaa_sotatila_jos_ilo-sopimus_hyvaksytaan/6584285.
- ⁷¹ Yle Uutiset 19.4.2013 http://yle.fi/uutiset/koskinen_ilo-keskustelu_kuumenee_turhaan/6587750.
- ⁷² Uhkaava ilmapiiri huolettaa saamelaisnuoria. Inarilainen 29.5.2013.
- ⁷³ Suoma Sami Nuorat: Suomen saamelaisnuorten lausunto saamelaismaaritelma 8.5.2013. Ks. <http://www.ssn.fi/2013/05/suomen-saamelaisnuorten-lausunto-saamelaismaaritelma>.
- ⁷⁴ Kuulumisia Boahhtevuhta-konferenssista 14.–15.8.2013. See <http://www.emaileri.fi/g/1/84267/22058852/233890/2134/848/5>.
- ⁷⁵ Kuulumisia Boahhtevuhta-konferenssista 14.–15.8.2013. See <http://www.emaileri.fi/g/1/84267/22058852/233890/2134/848/5>.
- ⁷⁶ YK:n julistus alkuperäiskansojen oikeuksista ja ILO:n yleissopimus nro 169. Helsinki: YK-liitto 2012.
- ⁷⁷ Camilla Busck-Nielsen saamelaisasioiden vastuuvirkamieheksi. Yle 15.8.2013, ks. http://yle.fi/uutiset/camilla_busck-nielsen_saamelaisasioiden_vastuuvirkamieheksi/6778900.
- ⁷⁸ 99 kysymystä ja vastausta ILO 169 -sopimuksesta. Helsinki: Vähemmistövaltuutettu 2014.

-
- ⁷⁹ ”Stubbin hallituksen tavoitteena ratifioida ILO 169 syksyllä.” http://yle.fi/uutiset/stubbin_hallituksen_tavoitteena_ratifioida_ilo_169_syksylla/7311639. 19.6.2014. YLE.
- ⁸⁰ Oikeusministeri Anna-Maja Henriksson: Kenenkaan oikeuksia ei haluta heikentää. Inarilainen 29.10.2014.
- ⁸¹ Ministerio: Suomen kadet ovat sidotut alkuperäiskansojen ryhmähyvaksynnän suhteen. Yle Lappi 16.10.2014; Saamelaiskäräjät tukee Ilo 169-sopimuksen ratifiointia. http://www.samediggi.fi/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=953&Itemid=39&lang=finnish 30.10.2014.
- ⁸² Committee report 1973:46, 6.
- ⁸³ Sámi Parliament act 17.7.1995/974: 25 § (30.12.2002/1279), see <https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/1995/19950974>.
- ⁸⁴ E.g. Tanja Joona: Alkuperäiskansamäärittelyn monet haasteet. Kaleva 12.7.2013.
- ⁸⁵ Outakoski 1957.
- ⁸⁶ Sámi affairs committee report. Helsinki: Komiteanmietintö n:o 12 1952.
- ⁸⁷ See Lehtola 2000, 145–148.
- ⁸⁸ Nickul 1968.
- ⁸⁹ Sámi Parliament act 17.7.1995/974: 25 § (30.12.2002/1279), see <https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/1995/19950974>. According to the Sámi Parliament act, the electoral committee displays the electoral register or the information contained in it, excluding the personal identity codes, once in an electoral term at least five months before the next election. It is on view during 10 consecutive weekdays at least three hours a day. According to the law, ”everyone has the right to examine the electoral register and the documents related to its creation during the time the electoral register is displayed. The electoral register and the documents related to its creation must not be handed over for copying or photographing, nor should any copies of them be given. However, a person included in the electoral register has the right to receive an extract of his or her information included in the electoral register free of charge. Confidentiality does not prevent giving information in the electoral register to a person who needs the information for clarifying his or her right to vote.”
- ⁹⁰ Sámi Parliament act 17.7.1995/974: 25 § (30.12.2002/1279), see <https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/1995/19950974>.
- ⁹¹ Oinas 1999, 245.
- ⁹² Pohjolan Sanomat 5.7.1990.
- ⁹³ Pekka Aikio’s interview; Oinas 1999, 247. Documents from 1875 still aroused discussion later. Neo-Lapps considered it a fabricated year, see e.g. Kari Kyrö: Maaginen vuosiluku 1875. Inarilainen 19.1.2011. – Heikki J. Hyvärinen has stated that the director of Oulu provincial archives commented in a newspaper article in 1996 (Lapin Kansa and Helsingin Sanomat 18.3.1996) that the 1875 land register and later documents had no entries of Lapps. He did not rectify information that had circulated in publicity; the information was passed on to Kristian Myntti’s research in 1997, commissioned by the ministry of justice, and to Myntti’s doctoral thesis on the political status of minorities in 1997. A deposition from Oulu provincial archives to the electoral committee of the Sámi Parliament 11.5.1999 established, however, that Lapps were listed in both land and tax registers from 1875 and subsequent documents all the way to the 1948 population register. Sámi Parliament general principles for complaints to the electoral register. Sámi Parliament meeting minutes 11. – 13.7.1999. Saamelaiskäräjien arkisto (SKA).
- ⁹⁴ Jaakko Tahkolahti: Inhoa ja pelkoa Saamenmaassa. Hiidenkivi 9/1997.
- ⁹⁵ Tapani Matala-aho: Asiantuntijalausunto saamelaiskäräjille mahdollisen saamelaismäärittelyn muuttamisen vaikutuksista saamelaisväestön määrään Suomessa. Clarification commissioned by the Sámi Parliament in 2013. See http://www.samediggi.fi/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=224&Itemid=10&mosmsg=Yrit%20E4t+p%20E4%20st%20E4+sis%20E4%20n+ei+hyy%20E4ksytyst%20E4+verkko-osoitteesta.+%28www.google.fi%29.
- ⁹⁶ Heikki Hyvärinen: Lausunto saamelaiskäräjien vaalilautakunnalle Korkeimman hallinto-oikeuden päätöksistä saamelaiskäräjien vuoden 2011 vaaleissa. SKA.
- ⁹⁷ Lauri Hannikainen: KHO:lla selvä linja saamelaisen määrittelyssä. Lapin Kansa 13.10.1999.
- ⁹⁸ Jouni Eira: Liian alkuperäistä alkuperäiskansaan. Hiidenkivi 1/2000.
- ⁹⁹ Heikki Hyvärinen: Lausunto saamelaiskäräjien vaalilautakunnalle Korkeimman hallinto-oikeuden päätöksistä saamelaiskäräjien vuoden 2011 vaaleissa.
- ¹⁰⁰ Heikki Hyvärinen: Lausunto saamelaiskäräjien vaalilautakunnalle Korkeimman hallinto-oikeuden päätöksistä saamelaiskäräjien vuoden 2011 vaaleissa.
- ¹⁰¹ See e.g. <http://yle.fi/uutiset/3-8647255>.
- ¹⁰² Sarivaara 2012.
- ¹⁰³ Sarivaara 2012. About criticism concerning Sarivaara, see e.g. Junka-Aikio 2014, 18–19.

- ¹⁰⁴ Erika Sarivaara: Juhlapuhe Salla-päivillä 19.7.2012 ks. <http://www.sallawiki.fi/wiki/Juhlapuheet>.
- ¹⁰⁵ Erika Sarivaara: Juhlapuhe Salla-päivillä 19.7.2012 ks. <http://www.sallawiki.fi/wiki/Juhlapuheet>.
- ¹⁰⁶ <http://www.lapinkansa.fi/Lappi/1194747258092/artikkeli/vaitos+statukseton+saamelainen+potee+tuskaa.html>.
- ¹⁰⁷ Jorma Erkkilä: Saamelaisuudesta käynnissä kova kiista. Helsingin Sanomat 26.3.2012.
- ¹⁰⁸ Erika Sarivaara: Saamelaismääritelmän tulkinnan ongelmallisuus. Inarilainen 4.4.2012.
- ¹⁰⁹ Klemetti Näkkäläjärvi: Saamelaiskäräjistäkö eräänlainen Lapin liitto? Inarilainen 12.12.2012.
- ¹¹⁰ Pirita Näkkäläjärvi: Polveutumistaktiikka uhka saamelaisille. Helsingin Sanomat 23.4.2012; Lapin Kansa 25.4.2012. The debate on Sarivaara's doctoral thesis became heated when the Sámi University College in Kautokeino in Norway granted the Israel Ruong acknowledgement to Sarivaara. Five Sámi associations, Sámi Council and the chairman of Finland's Sámi Parliament objected to this grant, because they considered Sarivaara non-Sámi, but the college maintained its decision. See http://yle.fi/uutiset/saamelaisjarjestot_vastustavat_sarivaaran_palkitsemistä/6638420; http://yle.fi/uutiset/paatos_sarivaara_saa_israel_ruong_-stipendin/6651909.
- ¹¹¹ About criticism concerning Sarivaara, see Junka-Aikio 2014, 18–19.
- ¹¹² Alkuperäiskansan jäsenten tunnistamiseen liittyvistä vaikeuksista ja väärinkäsityksistä, see Aikio – Åhren 2014.
- ¹¹³ Arto Enojärvi: ”Kelpaan Norjan saamelaiskäräjille, mutta en Suomen.” Letter to the editor, Inarilainen 6.5.2013.
- ¹¹⁴ Erika Sarivaara: Saamelaismääritelmän tulkinnan ongelmallisuus. Inarilainen 4.4.2012.
- ¹¹⁵ Jorma Erkkilä: Saamelaisuudesta käynnissä kova kiista. Helsingin Sanomat 26.3.2012.
- ¹¹⁶ Tapani Matala-aho: Asiantuntijalausunto saamelaiskäräjille mahdollisen saamelaismääritelmän muuttamisen vaikutuksista saamelaisväestön määrään Suomessa. Clarification commissioned by the Sámi Parliament in 2013. See http://www.samediggi.fi/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=224&Itemid=10&mosmsg=Yrit%20E4t+p%20E4%20st%20E4+sis%20E4%20n+ei+hyv%20E4ksytyst%20E4+verkko-osoitteesta.+%28www.google.fi%29.
- ¹¹⁷ Pekka Sammallahti: Muistio saamelaismääritelmästä oikeusministeriölle 26.4.2013. See http://www.samediggi.fi/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=224&Itemid=10&mosmsg=Yrit%20E4t+p%20E4%20st%20E4+sis%20E4%20n+ei+hyv%20E4ksytyst%20E4+verkko-osoitteesta.+%28www.google.fi%29; see also Sammallahti 2013.
- ¹¹⁸ Internet discussion 13.3.2015, see <http://takku.net/article.php/2015031211540290>.
- ¹¹⁹ Oula Antti Labba: Čavga suomelašmeroštallan – Tiukka suomalaisuusmääritelmä. Lapin Kansa journal column LK 08.04.2013.
- ¹²⁰ Oula Antti Labba: Čavga suomelašmeroštallan – Tiukka suomalaisuusmääritelmä. Lapin Kansa journal column LK 08.04.2013.
- ¹²¹ Árvaleaddji: Kiista Suomessa: Kuka saa olla suomalainen? Saamen kuvalehti 14/2014 reports on the backgrounds of the dispute April 5, 2014, see <https://arvaleaddji.wordpress.com/2014/04/05/kiista-suomessa-kuka-saa-olla-suomalainen/>
- ¹²² Saamelaiskäräjälakityöryhmän mietintö, OM 55/2013, available in its entirety at http://oikeusministerio.fi/fi/index/julkaisut/julkaisuarkisto/1382513081296/Files/OMML_55_2013_MIETINTO_196_s.pdf.
- ¹²³ ”Muistakaa saamelaiset jatkaa hakuprosessia!” Letter to the editor, signed by Inarinmaan Lapinkyläyhdistys ry and Metsä- kalastaja- ja tunturisaamelaiset ry, Inarilainen 1.4.2015.
- ¹²⁴ See <http://mikkokarna.puheenvuoro.uusisuomi.fi/143050-saamelaiskarajien-legitimiteettiongelma>. See also Häkkinen's own <http://jaska.puheenvuoro.uusisuomi.fi/109086-saamelaiset-vastaa-uuslappalaiset>.
- ¹²⁵ See *Inari – Aanaar: Inarin historia jääkaudesta nykypäivään*. Ed. by Veli-Pekka Lehtola. Inari: Inarin kunta (2003), vii–viii.
- ¹²⁶ Tuominen, Marja 2010: Pohjoisen kulttuurihistorian paikat ja haasteet. In: *Kulttuurihistoriallinen katse*. Eds. Heli Rantala ja Sakari Ollitervo. Turku: Turun yliopisto, 309–337.
- ¹²⁷ Stoor, Maritta 1999: Kyllä mie ite tiän kuka mie oon. In: *Pohjoiset identiteetit ja mentaliteetit I*. Rovaniemi: University of Lapland, 75.
- ¹²⁸ About the concepts of Sámi and Lapp, see Lehtola, Veli-Pekka 2009: Saame-sanan juuria suomalaisessa julkisuudessa. In: *Ei kiveäkaan kääntämättä. Pentti Koivusen juhlaKirja 2009*. Eds. Janne Ikäheimo – Sanna Lipponen. Oulu: Oulun yliopiston arkeologian laitos.
- ¹²⁹ Pääkkönen, Erkki 2008: *Saamelainen etnisyys ja pohjoinen paikallisyhteisö – Saamelaisten etninen mobilisaatio ja paikallisperustainen vastaliike*. Rovaniemi: Lapin yliopisto, 216–220.
- ¹³⁰ Pääkkönen 2008, 95.
- ¹³¹ An oral notion by Teuvo Lehtola, Inari, to the author.
- ¹³² Jaakko Peltomaa: Vain kieli erotti Savukosken ja Kutturin toisistaan. *Inarilainen* 5.12.2012.
- ¹³³ Hiltunen, Mauno 2012: Alkuperäiskansasta uuslappalaisiin ja kveeneihin – kamppailu Lapin historian tulkinnoista. *Faravid* 36. Oulu: Pohjois-Suomen historiallisen yhdistyksen vuosikirja, 292–293.
- ¹³⁴ ”Tietoa saamelaiskeskusteluun. Lapin todistettävien alkuperäislappalaisten

- jalkelaisten keraamia tutkimustuloksia paattajille.” A handout 1997, 4–7.
- ¹³⁵ Ibid, 7-9.
- ¹³⁶ Ibid, 9-10.
- ¹³⁷ Hiltunen 2012, 287–288.
- ¹³⁸ Hiltunen 2012, 287–288.
- ¹³⁹ Erika Sarivaara: Juhlapuhe Salla-paivilla 19.7.2012 ks. <http://www.sallawiki.fi/wiki/Juhlapuheet>.
- ¹⁴⁰ Hiltunen 2012, 292–293.
- ¹⁴¹ Olli Muttilainen: ”ILO:n sopimuksen n:o 169 ratifiointiedellytyksistä Suomessa.” A speech in the Sámi Parliament seminar April 17, 2008.
- ¹⁴² Sammallahti, Pekka 2013: Saamen maa ja saamen kieli. In: *Ealli biras – Elävä ympäristö. Saamelainen kulttuuriympäristöohjelma*. Eds. Päivi Magga and Eija Ojanlatva. Inari: Sami museum, 56–59.
- ¹⁴³ <http://hirvasrumpu.blogspot.fi/2013/04/lappalaiset-ja-saamelaiset.html>.
- ¹⁴⁴ <http://hirvasrumpu.blogspot.fi/2013/04/lappalaiset-ja-saamelaiset.html>.
- ¹⁴⁵ Hiltunen 2012, 288.
- ¹⁴⁶ Hiltunen 2012, 296.
- ¹⁴⁷ See Lehtola, Veli-Pekka – Korhonen, Kuisma – Alenius, Kari – Mantila, Harri 2015: Approaches to Transcultural Encounters. In: *Transcultural Encounters*. Eds. Kari Alenius – Veli-Pekka Lehtola. Oulu: Pohjois-Suomen historiallinen yhdistys, 5–6.
- ¹⁴⁸ Lehtola, Veli-Pekka 1997: *Rajamaan identiteetti. Lappilaisuuden muotoutuminen Lapin kirjailijoiden tuotannossa 1920-1944*. Helsinki: SKS.
- ¹⁴⁹ See Lehtola 1997, 35-40.
- ¹⁵⁰ Lehtola, Veli-Pekka 2012: *Saamelaiset suomalaiset. Kohtaamisia 1896–1953*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura, 34.
- ¹⁵¹ See Lehtola 1997, 40-42.
- ¹⁵² See Lehtola 2012, 22–26.
- ¹⁵³ Lehtola, Veli-Pekka 2000: *Nickul. Rauhan mies, rauhan kansa*. Inari: Kustannus-Puntsi, 125–134.
- ¹⁵⁴ Lähteenmäki, Maria 2001: Kotini on vanha siida. In: *Suomalaisen ja saamelaisen Lapin rajankayntia keskiajalta nykypäivaan. Suvaitsevaisuus*. Ed. by Mikko Lahtinen. Helsinki: Tanner-akatemia, Vaino Tannerin säätiö 2001.
- ¹⁵⁵ Saarinen, Heli 2011: *Valkoisen peuran myyttinen Lappi*. Rovaniemi: Lapin yliopisto, 164-165.
- ¹⁵⁶ Lehtola 1997, 39.
- ¹⁵⁷ Enbuske, Matti 2008: *Vanhan Lapin valtamailla. Asutus ja maankäyttö Kemin Lapin ja Enontekiön alueella 1500-luvulta 1900-luvun alkuun*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura, 345-346.
- ¹⁵⁸ Erika Sarivaara: Saamelaismääritelmän tulkinnan ongelmallisuus. *Inarilainen* 4.4.2012.
- ¹⁵⁹ Kansanedustaja ILO-sopimuksesta: ”Tama on kulttuurimurha.” *Suomenmaa* 23.12.2014.
- ¹⁶⁰ Heikki Hyvärinen: Kitin ankarat vaatimukset. *Lapin Kansa* 5.4.2012.
- ¹⁶¹ *Inarilainen* 17.7.2013.
- ¹⁶² Sammallahti 2013, 56–59.
- ¹⁶³ Katja Hirvasho: Metsäsaamelaisuutta jäljittämässä *Lapin Kansa* 14. 6. 2013.
- ¹⁶⁴ Koivulaakso – Brunila – Andersson 2013, 114–115.
- ¹⁶⁵ Schopenhauer 2005, 11–22. About the theory of so-called bullshit, see Frankfurt 2006; more generally Achenbach 2015, Heikkinen – Hurme 2008, Nieminen 2015, Schopenhauer 2005, Uschanov 2010.
- ¹⁶⁶ Uschanov 2010, 180.
- ¹⁶⁷ Vuontis-Kalle: ”Muisteluksia Enontekiöltä.” *Pohjolan Sanomat* 9.3.1991.
- ¹⁶⁸ Esim. Pekka Sammallahti: ”Saamelaisista, historiasta ja oikeuksista”. *Lapin Kansan* alakerta 24.6.1992; Pekka Sammallahti: Entiset lappalaiset nykyisiä saamelaisia. *Helsingin Sanomat* 11.3.1995; Sammallahti 1996. Sammallahti also published a set of letters to the editor in the *Inarilainen* newspaper 1995–1996.
- ¹⁶⁹ About the history of the Sámi word in Finnish publicity during the 20th century, see Lehtola 2009.
- ¹⁷⁰ Uschanov 2010, 188–189.
- ¹⁷¹ Jaakko Peltomaa: Vain kieli erotti Savukosken ja Kutturan toisistaan. *Inarilainen* 5.12.2012.
- ¹⁷² Uschanov 2010, 62.
- ¹⁷³ Pääkkönen 2008, 254.
- ¹⁷⁴ Uschanov 2010, 137.
- ¹⁷⁵ Nahkaisoja 2006, 187–189; Lehtola 2010, 128–129.
- ¹⁷⁶ Linkola 1985, 182.
- ¹⁷⁷ Jouni Kitti: Porosaamelaisten tulo Suomeen, see <http://www.elisanet.fi/kitit/jkitti/suomi/misc/porolappalaiset.html>.
- ¹⁷⁸ Jaakko Peltomaa: Vain kieli erotti Savukosken ja Kutturan toisistaan. *Inarilainen* 5.12.2012.

-
- ¹⁷⁹ Jouni Eira: Lapinkylistä suurporonhoitoon. Lapin Kansa 20.2.2000.
- ¹⁸⁰ ”Esi-isämme osasivat turvata oikeutensa.” Inarilainen 19.4.2004.
- ¹⁸¹ Kolmesoavista Kemijärvelle 165 vuotta. Inarinmaa 30.4.2008.
- ¹⁸² Uhkaava ilmapiiri huolettaa saamelaisnuoria. Inarilainen 29.5.2013.
- ¹⁸³ Hannu Kangasniemi: Kommentti Kyrön sammakkokeittoon. Inarilainen 11.3.2009.
- ¹⁸⁴ Nahkiaisoja 2003, 226–227.
- ¹⁸⁵ Olavi Aikio: Pohjoisen asuttamisen alkuperäisasukkaat. Lapin Kansa 6.6.2001.
- ¹⁸⁶ Pekka Pekkala: Lappalaisten ja saamelaisten oikeuksista. Inarilainen 26.1.2011.
- ¹⁸⁷ Ivalojoen, Kyrön, Peltojärven ja Suontavaaran Lapinkylien selvityksessä ”Tietoa saamelaiskeskusteluun. Lapin todistettavien alkuperäislappalaisten jälkeläisten keräämiä tutkimustuloksia päättäjille.” Handout 1997, 22–41. According to the handout, there have been “enquiries” among old Lapp families in Enontekiö, Inari and Pohjois-Kittilä if the grandparents of the people living at the time of the 1962 interview had spoken the Sámi language. ”Everyone was convinced of that.”
- ¹⁸⁸ Pekka Pekkala: Lappalaisten ja saamelaisten oikeuksista. Inarilainen 26.1.2011.
- ¹⁸⁹ Pekka Pekkala: Lappalaisten ja saamelaisten oikeuksista. Inarilainen 26.1.2011.
- ¹⁹⁰ 30 Ivalojoen, Kyrön, Peltojärven ja Suontavaaran Lapinkylien selvityksessä ”Tietoa saamelaiskeskusteluun. Lapin todistettavien alkuperäislappalaisten jälkeläisten keräämiä tutkimustuloksia päättäjille.” Handout 1997, 4–7.
- ¹⁹¹ 30 Ivalojoen, Kyrön, Peltojärven ja Suontavaaran Lapinkylien selvityksessä ”Tietoa saamelaiskeskusteluun. Lapin todistettavien alkuperäislappalaisten jälkeläisten keräämiä tutkimustuloksia päättäjille.” Handout 1997, 4–7.
- ¹⁹² Metsäsaamelaisuudesta Katja Hirvasaholle ja muillekin. Inarilainen 21.8.2013.
- ¹⁹³ Metsäsaamelaisuudesta Katja Hirvasaholle ja muillekin. Inarilainen 21.8.2013.
- ¹⁹⁴ Eljas Pohtila: Suomalaiset ovat pieni alkuperäiskansa. Näkökulma. Lapin Kansa 13.4.2012.
- ¹⁹⁵ Homer Simpson citation, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KF6SNxNIV08>. Unlike Homer Simpson, Harvey Krumpet has stated: ”Facts don’t disappear, even if they are ignored.” Burke 2004, 134–135.
- ¹⁹⁶ Sanna Valkonen: Eamiálmoga nuppástuvvi sajádat – Alkuperäiskansan muuttuva asema. Kide 4/2012.
- ¹⁹⁷ In more detail, see Lehtola – Länsman 2012.
- ¹⁹⁸ Anu Avaskari: Inarinsaamelaiset ry esittää inarinsaamelaisille omaa lakia. Inarilainen 12.4.2012; Anu Avaskari: Inarinsaamelaisten oikeusturva laajentuu. Inarilainen 6.11.2013. According to the association, the municipal quota system of the Sámi Parliament is the reason why the representation of Inari Sámi is proportionally smaller than that of the Sámi from other municipalities.
- ¹⁹⁹ Matti Morottaja: Inarinsaamelaisten oma laki periaatteessa hyvä ajatus. muttei ongelmaton. Yle Sápmi 29.1.2015, see http://yle.fi/uutiset/matti_morottaja_inarinsaamelaisten_oma_laki_periaatteessa_hyva_ajatus_muttei_ongelmaton/7767855.
- ²⁰⁰ See http://yle.fi/uutiset/inarinsaamelaisten_yksityishenkiloiden_adressin_keraaja_puhuu_asiasta_ensimmaista_kertaa_julkisuudessa/7527741.
- ²⁰¹ Anarâškielâ servi tuárju ILO 169 -sopâmuš ratifisistem – ”ILO ličijalmolávt pyeri sâmikulttuurân já sâmmiláid” see http://yle.fi/uutiset/anaraskiela_servi_tuarju_ilo_169_-sopamus_ratifisistem_ilo_licij_almolavt_pyeri_samikulttuuran_ja_sammilaid/7865915.
- ²⁰² Anarâšah-searvi sivahuvvo identitehtasuoládeamis, Yle Sápmi 27.5.2015. See http://yle.fi/uutiset/anarash-searvi_sivahuvvo_identitehtasuoladeamis/8020943.
- ²⁰³ See e.g. <http://veikkovaananen.blogspot.fi/search?updated-min=2014-01-01T00:00:00%2B02:00&updated-max=2015-01-01T00:00:00%2B02:00&max-results=30>.
- ²⁰⁴ P. R. P.: Inarin lapinkylien suvuista. Inarilainen 22.3.2006.
- ²⁰⁵ Teuvo Lehtola’s mention.
- ²⁰⁶ Lehtola 2012, 41–49.
- ²⁰⁷ Sammallahti 2013, 29.
- ²⁰⁸ Jaakko Peltomaa: Keitä me olemme ja mistä tulemme? Editorial. Inarilainen 30.7.2008.
- ²⁰⁹ Erkki Lilja: Kyröläisten läntinen tienhaara I–III. Inarilainen 18.6.–2.7.2008.
- ²¹⁰ Hely Johanne Kyrö: Tietämättömät ulkopuoliset väärensivät Ivalon historian. Inarilainen 30.7.2008.
- ²¹¹ Hely Johanne Kyrö: Tietämättömät ulkopuoliset väärensivät Ivalon historian. Inarilainen 30.7.2008.
- ²¹² Hely Johanne Kyrö: Tietämättömät ulkopuoliset väärensivät Ivalon historian. Inarilainen 30.7.2008.
- ²¹³ Jaakko Peltomaa: Keitä me olemme ja mistä tulemme? Editorial. Inarilainen 30.7.2008.
- ²¹⁴ To be precise, Turi stated: ”It has not been said of the Sámi that they had come here from anywhere. Sámi have been local inhabitants throughout the Sámi land.” In his book (1910), Turi spoke only about Swedish and Norwegian Reindeer Sámi, but in the Lapp discussion, also chairman of Inariland Lapp village association, Yrjö Mattila, stated that Turi had referred specifically to Inari Sámi with his sentence. Letter to the editor, Inarilainen 1.4.2015.

-
- ²¹⁵ Kari Kyrö: Erikoinen tiedeyhteisö. Letter to the editor in Kaleva 29.6.2013.
- ²¹⁶ Hannu Kangasniemi: Kommentti Kyrön sammakkokeittoon. Inarilainen 11.3.2009.
- ²¹⁷ Text messages Inarilainen 26.3.2009.
- ²¹⁸ Kari Kyrö: Eino Kuokkasen keittämä sammakkokeitto ei maistu inarilaisille. Inarilainen 26.2.2009.
- ²¹⁹ Kari Kyrö: Eino Kuokkasen keittämä sammakkokeitto ei maistu inarilaisille. Inarilainen 26.2.2009.
- ²²⁰ E.g. Hely Kyrö: Kolmen raati. Pitäisikö ILO-sopimus ratifioida? Inarilainen 11.1.2012.
- ²²¹ Jouni Eira: Lapinkylistä suurporonhoitoon. Lapin Kansa 20.2.2000.
- ²²² Maria Lähteenmäki: Kotini on vanha siida. Suomalaisen ja saamelaisen Lapin rajankäyntiä keskiajalta nykypäivään. Suvaitsevaisuus. Ed. Mikko Lahtinen. Helsinki: Tanner-akatemia, Väinö Tannerin säätiö 2001.
- ²²³ http://yle.fi/uutiset/rasistiset_liikkeet_nostavat_paataan_suomessa/6624461.
- ²²⁴ Correspondence with Veikko Väänänen 28.9.2010.
- ²²⁵ Veikko Väänänen: Rasismiväitteestä tutkintapyyntö poliisille. Lapin Kansa 30.9.2010.
- ²²⁶ Resolution of the Office of the Prosecutor General 14.11.2011.
- ²²⁷ MP on the ILO convention: ”Tämä on kulttuurimurha.” Suomenmaa 23.12.2014.
- ²²⁸ Ulla Järvi: Mediajulkisuus valikoi mielitietynsä. Editorial. Tieteessä tapahtuu 3/2015.
- ²²⁹ Lehtola 2012, 453-457.
- ²³⁰ See Lehtola 2012, 330-347.
- ²³¹ Tuulentie 2001, 29-32.
- ²³² Lehtola 2012, 294.
- ²³³ The following proposal is based on the documents of parliamentary plenary sessions and committees in 2014-2015, the most important of which are ”Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle laeiksi saamelaiskäräjistä annetun lain ja rikoslain 40 luvun 11 §:n muuttamisesta” (HE167/2014vp). Parliament plenary session 11.11. 2014. VP (Valtiopäiväasiakirjat); ”Hallituksen esitys eduskunnalle itsenäisten maiden alkuperäis- ja heimokansoja koskevan yleissopimuksen hyväksymisestä sekä laeiksi yleissopimuksen lainsäädännön alaan kuuluvien määräysten voimaansaattamisesta ja Metsähallituksesta annetun lain muuttamisesta” (HE264/2014vp). Parliament plenary session 2.12.2014. VP (Valtiopäiväasiakirjat), included speeches can be found on the parliament web pages, see <http://puheenvuorot.kansanmuisti.fi/sanat/saamelaisk%C3%A4r%C3%A4j%C3%A4/syote>.
- ²³⁴ HE167/2014 in plenary session 94/2014, 8.10.2014. VP.
- ²³⁵ HE 264/2014 in plenary session 122/2014, 2.12.2014. VP.
- ²³⁶ Anna-Maja Henriksson 8.10.2014. Plenary session 94/2014, VP.
- ²³⁷ See e.g. http://www.iltalehti.fi/eduskuntavaalit-2015/2015040519472380_eb.shtml.
- ²³⁸ Markus Lohi’s, Heikki Autto’s and Johanna Ojala-Niemelä’s speeches 2.12.2014. Plenary session 122/2014, VP.
- ²³⁹ Scheinin: Hallituksen ILO-ehdotus ei poista saamelaisten maa- oikeuksia. Yle Sápmi 12.11.2014, see http://yle.fi/uutiset/scheinin_hallituksen_ilo-ehdotus_ei_poista_saamelaisten_maa- oikeuksia/7620371.
- ²⁴⁰ Anna-Maja Henriksson 2.12.2014. Plenary session 122/2014, VP.
- ²⁴¹ Markus Lohi’s, Simo Rundgren’s and Heikki Autto’s speeches 8.10.2014 and 2.12.2014, VP.
- ²⁴² See also <http://veikkovaananen.blogspot.fi/search?updated-min=2014-01-01T00:00:00%2B02:00&updated-max=2015-01-01T00:00:00%2B02:00&max-results=30>.
- ²⁴³ Eeva-Maria Majjala 2.12.2014. Plenary session 122/2014. VP.
- ²⁴⁴ Simo Rundgren’s speeches 23.9.2014, 8.10.2014 and 11.11.2014. VP.
- ²⁴⁵ Maria Tolppanen 2.12.2014. Plenary session 122/2014. VP.
- ²⁴⁶ Laki saamelaiskäräjistä 17.7.1995/974: 25 § (30.12.2002/1279), see <https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/1995/19950974>.
- ²⁴⁷ Simo Rundgren’s speeches 23.9.2014, 8.10.2014 and 11.11.2014. VP.
- ²⁴⁸ Maria Tolppanen 2.12.2014. Plenary session 122/2014. VP.
- ²⁴⁹ Simo Rundgren 24.6.2014. VP.
- ²⁵⁰ Simo Rundgren’s speeches 23.9.2014, 8.10.2014 and 11.11.2014. VP.
- ²⁵¹ Maria Tolppanen 19.2.2014. VP.
- ²⁵² Katja Hänninen 2.12.2014. Plenary session 122/2014. VP.
- ²⁵³ Astala citation. Tuulentie 2001, 174.
- ²⁵⁴ MP on the ILO convention: ”Tämä on kulttuurimurha.” Suomenmaa 23.12.2014.
- ²⁵⁵ E.g. Rundgren’s speeches 23.9.2014, 8.10.2014 and 11.11.2014. VP.
- ²⁵⁶ Pääkkönen 2008, 217.
- ²⁵⁷ See <http://www.iltasanomat.fi/kotimaa/art-1288785773626.html>.
- ²⁵⁸ Pohjolan Sanomat 6.2.1993.
- ²⁵⁹ Veikko Isomursu: Maa- oikeudet hiertävät kaikkialla. ILO:n alkuperäiskansasopimus on enemmän tienviitta kuin tarkka ohje. Kaleva 5.5.2008.
- ²⁶⁰ Päätoimittajalta: Saamelaiskäräjälakia hiotaan vielä pitkään. Inarilainen 15.10.2014.

-
- ²⁶¹ Työelämä- ja tasa-arvovaliokuntalausunto 12/2014. VP.
- ²⁶² See <http://nra.fi/?s=&cat=16&year=&monthnum=&day=> (Lapland Special).
- ²⁶³ Jouni Kitti: Tämä ja eilinen päivä Ylä-Lapissa. National Rifle Association website n:o 1203341, see http://testi.nra.fi/arkisto/120331-tama_ja_eilinen_paiva_lapissa.html.
- ²⁶⁴ Ari Martin Laakso's statement to the parliamentary equality committee 4.11.2014, see www.facebook.com/ari.laakso.92.
- ²⁶⁵ Agriculture and Forestry Committee statement 40/2014. VP.
- ²⁶⁶ Eduskunnan tasa-arvovaliokunta vaatii statuksettomia saamelaisia ILO-etujen piiriin. Lapin Kansa 17.2.2015.
- ²⁶⁷ Constitutional Law Committee report 12/2014. VP.
- ²⁶⁸ Constitutional Law Committee report 12/2014. VP.
- ²⁶⁹ Suomen saamelaiskäräjät pyytää YK:lta apua, Yle Sápmi 28.4.2015, see http://yle.fi/uutiset/suomen_saamelaiskarajat_pyytaa_yklt_kansainvalista_apua_olemme_erittain_pettyneita_suomen_valtioon/7958791.
- ²⁷⁰ Saamelaisorganisaatiot pyytävät YK:n jäsenmailta apua Suomen saamelaisille. Yle Sápmi 30.4.2015, see http://yle.fi/uutiset/saamelaisorganisaatiot_pyytavat_ykn_jasenmailta_apua_suomen_saamelaisille/7963898.
- ²⁷¹ Väitteet Suomen ihmisoikeusloukkauksista saamelaisia vastaan pyyhittiin pois. Yle Sápmi 19.5.2015, see http://yle.fi/uutiset/vaihteet_suomen_ihmisoikeusloukkauksista_saamelaisia_vastaan_pyyhittiin_pois/8000376.
- ²⁷² Lapin Kansa 15.3.2015.
- ²⁷³ Pertti Virtanen 6.11.2014. Plenary session 94/2014, VP.
- ²⁷⁴ Lehtola 2005, 35.
- ²⁷⁵ Johanna Ojala-Niemelä's speech on the Sámi Parliament act amendment 8.10.2014, see <http://johannaojala-niemela.fi/2014/10/09/johanna-ojala-niemela-sd-puheenvuoro-aiheeseen-hallituksen-esitys-eduskunnalle-laeiksi-saamelaiskarajista-annetun-lain-ja-rikoslain-40-luvun-11-%C2%A7n-muuttamisesta-8-10-2014/>.
- ²⁷⁶ Markus Mustajärvi 8.10.2014. Plenary session 94/2014, VP.
- ²⁷⁷ Maria Tolppanen 8.10.2014. Plenary session 94/2014, VP.
- ²⁷⁸ Markus Lohi 8.10.2014. Plenary session 94/2014, VP.
- ²⁷⁹ See e.g. Lantto 2000, 275-290.
- ²⁸⁰ Pääkkönen 2008, 218.
- ²⁸¹ Tuulentie 2001, 137.
- ²⁸² See Lehtola 2000, 154-201.
- ²⁸³ Helena Sahavirta: Saamelaisvastaisuus noussut Ruijassakin. Kaleva 10.5.1997.
- ²⁸⁴ See e.g. Jouni Kitti: Analyysi saamelaisten maa-oikeuksista, see National Rifle Association website <http://jounikitti.fi/suomi/maaoikeudet/analyysi.html>.
- ²⁸⁵ Nils-Henrik Valkeapää's 50th anniversary interview Lapin Kansa 1.11.1993.
- ²⁸⁶ Magreta Sara's speech in the Yleisradio A-Stream program, transcribed by HommaForum, see <http://hommaforum.org/index.php?topic=81488.5;wap2>.
- ²⁸⁷ See Lehtola 2012, 180-182.
- ²⁸⁸ Author's personal observation.
- ²⁸⁹ Rastas 2009, 56-57.
- ²⁹⁰ Keskinen – Rastas – Tuori 2009, 9.
- ²⁹¹ Marja Nousiainen: Vaikenemisesta vuorovaikutukseen, uudenlaista viestintää. Kaleva 11.7.2013. The act on the openness of government activities, administrative law and local government act regulate the activities of civil servants. Civil servants are obligated to promote information availability and good information management, civil servants are obligated to respond to proper inquiries concerning their own activities and communicate even about pending issues. Civil servants are advised to follow the media regularly and, when necessary, rectify incorrect information appearing in publicity. According to Nousiainen, sanctimonious wishes mostly remain on lawbook pages, because many civil servants do not act in a way obligated by law.
- ²⁹² Jorma Havula: ”Paras viestintästrategia voi olla täysi hiljaisuus.” Kaleva 9.5.2015.
- ²⁹³ Kurtén 1982, 28.
- ²⁹⁴ Janne Saijets 27.1.2012, see <http://www.aamulehti.fi/Kotimaa/1194715988026/artikkeli/puheenaihe+saamelaisilla+on+syy+korottaa+aanensa+kurja+kohtelu+on+totta.html>.
- ²⁹⁵ Sammeli Heikkinen: Kenen maa? Vihreä Lanka 13.12.2013.
- ²⁹⁶ A-Stream 19.4.2014. Yleisradio.
- ²⁹⁷ Magreta Sara's speech in the Yleisradio A-Stream program, transcribed by HommaForum, see <http://hommaforum.org/index.php?topic=81488.5;wap2>.
- ²⁹⁸ See e.g. Elina Venesmäki: Raja-aitojen maa. Suomen Kuvalehti 14/2014, 43.

- ²⁹⁹ Anna Morottaja's Facebook (public) 2.3.2015, see <https://fi-fi.facebook.com/pages/Anna-Morottaja-Saamelaisk%C3%A4r%C3%A4jien-j%C3%A4sen/234791433233845>. Morottaja published the same writing in the Inarilainen newspaper 4.3.2015.
- ³⁰⁰ Riku Lavia: Minä, saamelainen. Lapin Kansa 3.2.2013.
- ³⁰¹ Reetta Tornensis: Muuttuvatko saamelaiskuvat? Praavda 1 / 2015; e-mail to the author 14.4.2015.
- ³⁰² Kuokkanen 1999.
- ³⁰³ Paluumuuttaja kokee etnostressiä. Helsingin Sanomat 29.7.2012, see <http://www.hs.fi/ihmiset/a1343445415131>.
- ³⁰⁴ Kolumni (Xia Torikka): Moderneja saamelaisnuoria vaivaa etnostressi. YleX 26.2.2015, see http://yle.fi/ylex/uutiset/kolumni_moderneja_saamelaisnuoria_rasittaa_etnostressi/3-7831348.
- ³⁰⁵ Rasmus 2010, 54–56; see also Rasmus 2008.
- ³⁰⁶ Kolumni (Xia Torikka): Moderneja saamelaisnuoria vaivaa etnostressi. YleX 26.2.2015, see http://yle.fi/ylex/uutiset/kolumni_moderneja_saamelaisnuoria_rasittaa_etnostressi/3-7831348.
- ³⁰⁷ Saamelainen potee joskus etnostressiä. Yleisradio Yhteiskunta 28.3.2014, see <http://yle.fi/aihe/artikkeli/2014/03/18/saamelainen-potee-joskus-etnostressia>.
- ³⁰⁸ Reetta Tornensis: Muuttuvatko saamelaiskuvat? Praavda 1/2015.
- ³⁰⁹ Alapuro 1993, 5–6.
- ³¹⁰ Sammeli Heikkinen: Kenen maa? Vihreä Lanka 13.12.2013.
- ³¹¹ Riku Lavia: Minä, saamelainen. Lapin Kansa 3.2.2013; Magreta Sara's speech in the Yleisradio A-Stream program, transcribed by HommaForum, see <http://hommaforum.org/index.php?topic=81488.5;wap2>.
- ³¹² Sivistyslautakunta saa pohtia Saamelaiskirjaston nimeä. Inarilainen 21.8.2013.
- ³¹³ http://yle.fi/uutiset/keskustan_valtuustoryhma_haluaa_muuttaa_saamelaiskirjaston_nimen/6775951.
- ³¹⁴ See Lehtola 2005, 40.
- ³¹⁵ See Ravna 2015.
- ³¹⁶ Comment to the author from a person from East Lapland 12.2.2015.
- ³¹⁷ Anonymous comment, Eeva-Maria Majjala was not accepted to the Sámi register. Pohjolan Sanomat 8.3.2015.
- ³¹⁸ Jarno Valkonen to V-P Lehtola 30.4.2015.
- ³¹⁹ Riku Lavia: Minä, saamelainen. Lapin Kansa 3. 2. 2013.
- ³²⁰ Kolmen raati: Petteri Morottaja. Inarilainen 11.1.2012.
- ³²¹ Riku Lavia: Minä, saamelainen. Lapin Kansa 3.2.2013.
- ³²² See https://www.ufpe.br/nepe/publicacoes/publicacoes_10.pdf.
- ³²³ Jarno Valkonen's e-mail to V-P Lehtola 30.4.2015.
- ³²⁴ Statement from the Sámi Youth of Finland 8.5.2013. See <http://www.ssn.fi/2013/05/suomen-saamelaisnuorten-lausunto-saamelaismaaritmasta/>.
- ³²⁵ Lehtola 2012, 292.
- ³²⁶ Professori: Tässä tilanteessa ei kannata kuluttaa resursseja ILO-sopimukseen ja saamelaiskäräjälain avaamiseen, Yle Sápmi 29.5.2015, see http://yle.fi/uutiset/professori_tassa_tilanteessa_ei_kannata_kuluttaa_resursseja_ilo-sopimukseen_ja_saamelaiskarajalain_avaamiseen/8028893.
- ³²⁷ Oaidnu: Odda ráddehusprográmma šlunduda – dahje de motivere hábmet áibbas odda sámí politihka. Yle Sápmi 28.5.2015, see http://yle.fi/uutiset/oaidnu_oa_raehusprogramma_slunduda_dahje_de_motivere_habmet_aibbas_oa_sami_politihka/8023262.
- ³²⁸ Coulthard 2014, 151–179.
- ³²⁹ See Lehtola 2005, 170–171.
- ³³⁰ E.g. Uusi kirja pohjoismaisesta saamelaissopimuksesta, University of Lapland bulletin 12.2.2013, <http://www.ulapland.fi/Suomeksi/Ajankohtaista/Uutisarkisto/2013?ln=jtd201ib&id=babaf378-3cfd-42a8-aa87-811bd0b0bc8a>.
- ³³¹ Metsähallitus pilotoi uutta toimintamallia Hammastunturilla. Metsähallitus 18.10.2012. See <http://www.metsafi-lehti.fi/metsahallitus/metsahallitus-pilotoi-uutta-toimintamallia-hammastunturilla/>.
- ³³² Karjalainen 2015, 154–166.
- ³³³ Puuronen 2011, 151.
- ³³⁴ Pääkkönen 2008, 217.
- ³³⁵ See https://www.facebook.com/suohpanterror/timeline?ref=page_internal.