From relations to dissociations in spatial thinking: Sámi 'geographs' and the promise of concentric geographies

ARI AUKUSTI LEHTINEN

Lehtinen, Ari Aukusti (2011). From relations to dissociations in spatial thinking: Sámi 'geographs' and the promise of concentric geographies. *Fennia* 189: 2, pp. 14–30. Helsinki. ISSN 0015-0010.

This article critically examines the currently popular renewal in human geography inspired by relational thinking. Particular emphasis is directed to formulations informed by the philosophies of immanence. It is argued that this tendency carries the risk of being narrowed into cursory excursions on the immediate geographies of what happens. The article is consequently concerned about the resulting scholarly indifference when it comes to socio-spatial discontinuities and circles of particularity. It is also shown in what type of settings the 'immanent relationalism' becomes a too general view to explain satisfactorily the earthly co-being of humans and non-humans, and presents alternative 'lines of flight'. The case study focusing on the indigenous Sámi in the European North exemplifies the nuances of cultural domination versus decline in a multilingual milieu whereupon some criteria for identifying particular place-making under the general pressures of all-inclusion are formulated.

Keywords: Sámi homeland, geographies of difference, comparative reading, 'geographs', polyglot interfaces, relational and concentric spaces

Ari Aukusti Lehtinen, Department of Geographical and Historical Studies, University of Eastern Finland, P.O. Box 111, FI-80101 Joensuu, Finland. E-mail: ari.lehtinen@uef.fi

Introduction: geographies of withdrawal

Ä´kkel Sámi, one of the Eastern Sámi languages spoken on the Kola peninsula, crossed the threshold of extinction in December 29, 2003 when the last native speaker, Marya Sergina, passed away (Rantala 2011: 188). The drama of the event occurred without much public attention. Northernmost Europe will experience similar tragedies in the near future, too, as several of the neighbouring Sámi languages are currently only spoken by a few elderly persons. In time, perhaps, only the Northern Sámi will survive, the language spoken by the most numerous of the Sámi communities, much concentrating in northern Norway. This process is not only a particular phenomenon characterising the extreme North of Europe but is common globally (Howitt 2001; Maybury-Lewis 2003; Heikkilä 2008; Saugestad 2009). These losses cannot be regarded as natural and unavoidable but rather as consequences of social and environmental changes put forward and accepted by the surrounding society. They are thus, undeniably, supported by our silent acceptance, if not ignorance or indifference.

By losing minor language communities we also lose affordances for learning from those cosmologies that deviate from the currently vital ones. Their particular geographies are lost. What is also at stake is the gradual erosion of our multilingual affluence, both in general, at the level of humanity, and within specific marginal culture milieus, such as the Sámi homeland in Northern Europe, where communication has by necessity, due to lingual fragmentation and heterogeneity, been grounded on polyglot skills. The polyglot communities mirror the geopolitical changes of the past. The surrounding regimes that have come for taxes, natural resources and military strongholds, for example, have brought along their lingual premises. Human co-being is often characterised at these

URN:NBN:fi:tsv-oa4405

type of cultural interfaces by continuous multilingual border-crossing. Vocabularies and modes of expression are enriched by shared inspiration, which can be witnessed, for example, in the high number of loaned words (see e.g. Häkkinen 2004). This co-being also, inevitably, proceeds through frustration: renewed spaces of lingual competence tend to marginalise certain more traditional sections of communities (Bladh 1995; Andersen 2004; Herman 2008; Fryer 2009). In addition, communication often becomes incomplete while, for example, translations only partially catch what is initially intended (Keisteri 1990: 32–47; Haila 1997: 130–133; Häkli 2003; Rautio-Helander 2004; Sidaway et al. 2004; Setten 2006).

The occasional comfort achieved through guidance from neighbouring languages is thus often in multilingual cooperation accompanied by regret about losing something important when using loaned words. Debate about mistakes and biases in translations frequently arises in literature and toponymic research, for example (see Andersen 2004; Baschmakoff 2007: 12–13; Myers 2009). These types of concerns bear witness to nuances of expression that are at risk of being lost when moving from one lingual domain to another. Sometimes, while translating, pleasing conceptual equivalents are almost, if not completely, impossible to find. Moreover, at times dictionaries seem to mislead us in the search for precise correspondence. Particular geographs, that is: customary descriptions of our surroundings (Dalby 1993, 2002; Häkli 1998; see also Tanner's 1929a 'geographical concepts') simply cannot always be exported. Geographical lexicons and nomenclatures, including the logics of naming and mapping, vary between lingual groups, as does the sense of seeing changes in the environment (Schanche 2002; Ruotsala 2004: 42). Finally, in certain moments of interlingual border-crossing, one might sense a meeting of epistemic orientations that do not resonate (Tanner 1929b; Susiluoto 2000: 16; Heikkilä 2008: 58–85).

The dialogue between inspiration and frustration is thus a perpetual part of daily communication along polyglot interfaces. Both affections serve as a reminder of discontinuities, or the existence of non-communication (Bateson & Bateson 1987; Ketola et al. 2002), in human co-being. Thus, lingual skills, perhaps the most relational of all human modes of co-being, stand, paradoxically, as proof of radical discontinuities. This remark has, or at least should have, implications in geographical research design. By focusing on these non-linkages we can, for example, highlight events of confusion grounded on a sense of loss due to (partial) non-resonance in multilingual milieus. We then become sensitive to geographies of incoherence, impairment and withdrawal. This is, as is argued in this article, not easy in contemporary human geography where dissociations tend to be shadowed by those approaches that are attracted by continuous evolution of linkages and relations. In general, and this is what I want to highlight first and problematise below, the broadly shared and celebrated immanent-relational ontology has systematically ignored discontinuities and withdrawal, if not treated them as anomalies, or remnants from the past, not deserving any proper examination. Therefore, I intend to show where and in what type of settings the relational extensiveness turns too broad and panoramic a view to satisfactorily explain human co-being on earth.

In addition, I will sketch out the contours for an approach that pays attention to those concentric aspects of human co-being that, as I will demonstrate, need to be recognised in order to be able to identify and examine the events of non-communication, annihilation and withdrawal. Consequently, I argue below for more scholarly appreciation when it comes to the corners of particularity; that is: particularities that do not follow the more general processes which evoke them.

Events of non-resonance, traces of withdrawal

British sociologist Rowland Atkinson (2009) is concerned about the ignoring of spaces of rest, decline, despair and loneliness that lie all around us, but which are partially invisible by virtue of their separateness. He discusses how much of socio-spatial studies, while favouring assumptions about the extensions of connectivity, tend to amplify the marginalisation of those outside these connections. He then, after exemplary illustrations of human isolations, such as secret cities of Russia, use of human disappearances in Latin America as a tool of political terror, missing millions of the 1991 UK census and home withdrawals of teenagers in Japan, concludes by worrying that "there is a danger that the new limits to the world have been defined within corporate frames and information technologies" which indicates "social inequalities and an unevenness of distribution which rides past the relevance and presence of those social groups

and fractions for whom such changes are only perhaps relevant in terms of their potential to exclude. His key question is simply, "[h]ow can we begin to conceptualize non-linkages, absent ties, broken networks and unwired 'dead' spaces" (2009: 308–309)?

The specific history of geographical thinking explains much of the current omission of socio-spatial separation and non-linkages in human geography. Gradually, while observing the troubles of spatial fetishisms of the past generations of geographers, arguments for the non-existence of any enclosures or outsides (see Massey 2005: 163–176) have gained increasing popularity. Critical reflection of this type of general all-inclusive relationalism is rare and, when it emerges, it almost in concert supports all the central assumptions and premises of relational orientation (see Castree 2004; Sparke 2007; Braun 2008; Gonzales 2009 Jones 2009). The inspiration shared by many relationalists is not always explicit, but it can in many cases be traced down to the philosophies of immanence, especially those set forward by Baruch Spinoza, Arne Næss and Gilles Deleuze. At the bottom of all this is the commonly held belief that there is no outside.

Immanence thinking is an alluring alternative to all those geographers who feel annoyed with the exceptionalist excursions of the disciplinary past, ranging from the development of various types of abstraction, both spatial and social, to studies of regions and scales as such. A clear parting from the disciplinary past, clothed in the promise of profound renewal, is at stake and it is now done through conceptual loans from the philosophers of immanence (see e.g. Hipwell 2004; Braun 2006; Thrift 2008; Jansson 2009). This latest philosophical reflection in geography is challenging, as most renewals are, due to the need for thorough reflection about the associative elements that are brought along with the promises attached to imported concepts.

Kirsten Simonsen (2004), a Danish geographer, brought up the question of incompatibility while worrying about the renewal in spatial thinking in geography based on a conviction that the fibrous, wiry and capillary-like character of contemporary society cannot be captured by the notions of levels, layers, territories, spheres, structures and systems. Current fascination for such spatial concepts as flows and fluids, when raised to the status of 'ontology', 'paradigm', or characteristics of society, tend to "reimagine spatial form as self-referential and indifferent to social content" (Simonsen 2004: 1337). The new vocabulary has, she admits, added much to the understanding of contemporary society by "[p]ointing out the significance of process at the expense of structure, mobility at the expense of embeddedness, and connectivity at the expense of enclosure" (2004: 1335). There is much that is good and supportable here, she argues, but continues with concerns about the non-reflective use of these concepts. According to her, these conceptual loans bring along a naturalisation of spatial processes, underlined, for example, in metaphorical associations with phenomena such as ice flows, waves of water and so forth. This concern, in other words, focuses on discontinuities and incompatibilities between textual communities, including paradigmatic communities of research: we should not leave them unexamined, Simonsen seems to argue, no matter how passionately we head toward progress and the potentials of disciplinary renewal.

The new spatial vocabulary, when applied without proper reflection regarding its theoretical and political implications, carries according to Simonsen the risk of guiding geographers toward non-social thinking. Some geographers have warned about the return of flat earth ontology in a similar vein (see e.g. Smith 2005a; Domosh 2010). The reasons for the popularity of non-social thinking are manifold, but one cannot ignore the Spinozist inspiration, leading geographers toward studies of continuous emergence and mobility within one single world of plenitude. Today, to continue Simonsen's list of neologisms, geographers identify assemblages (Braun 2002, 2008; Hipwell 2004; McFarlane 2009; Rocheleau & Roth 2007; Thrift 2008; Dalby 2010) or assemblagescapes (Hadi Curti 2009), planes of immanence (McHugh 2009), forces of affect (Thrift 2008: 220–254), event sites or events of places (Massey 2005: 140), emergent cartographies (Kitchin & Dodge 2007), lines of flight (Doel 1996), mobile associations (Urry 2000; Bæhrenholdt 2007), interworlds and immanent spaces (Dewsbury & Thrift 2005), as well as forms of deterritorialisation (Hipwell 2004) and earthly immanencies (Jansson 2009) with high enthusiasm. Geographers are, consequently, increasingly quick to criticise any conceptualisations of social forces behind the flows of the constantly emerging.

Simonsen is thus worried about the non-reflection of incoherence inherent in conceptual imports. She formulates a problem that is common to

her in multilingual research settings while linking and comparing Scandinavian, Continental European and Anglophone *prosodias* of communication: particular metaphorical associations cannot fully be acknowledged while leaping across the boundaries of textual and paradigmatic communities. Conceptual loans are often inspirational, as was agreed above, but they can also appear as examples of risky enterprises due to ignored incompatibilities. For example, research grounded on analogical explanations, which is a manoeuvre imported from modelling approaches influenced by system-type of thinking (see Haila & Dyke 2006), is often problematic as it pushes towards identifying similarities at the cost of differences. When conducted without proper conceptual and political reflection, leaps between particular approaches and lexicons of paradigmatic communities run the risk of becoming indifferent to social content, as Simonsen fears, and, consequently, too general for the purpose of studying the pros and cons of contemporary changes in society.

The concern about the return of spatial abstractions, now clothed in conceptual renewals linked to immanent thinking, is further examined below. This is a place to rethink the role of spatial vocabulary we have grounded our thinking in human geography. To begin, some key promises and constraints of the Spinozist geography of immanence relevant in this setting need to be introduced. How has this conceptualisation of one single world of plenitude taken place in human geography? What types of metaphoric associations are brought along while learning to use the new vocabulary? Can this type of geographical rethinking avoid the traps of exclusiveness in its programmatic efforts to favour and celebrate any signs of all-inclusiveness? What are the constitutive strands of geography that emerge from within a systematic, and thus exclusive, ignoring of radical difference?

Immanence and its limits in geography

Immanent thinking in geography is part of the diversifying debate about the overall changes in life and working conditions due to increasing translocal interdependencies characterised by high rates of mobility and unpredictability. Humans, both as embodied individuals and a population in general, have according to this approach become units of immediate social change. Proper geographical categories, such as environment, region or scale, are seen as outdated as they cannot help in clarifying the general embodied change, including us all, now and everywhere, in the realm of population (Hänninen & Vähämäki 2000; Braun 2006; Sparke 2008: 427). Nigel Thrift (2008: 2–5), a British geographer, calls this focusing on the geography of what happens: human life is now seen as based on and in movement, and emerging in the 'onflow' of daily life. He also asks, "what it means to be human if human is understood now as process of situated flow within which human bodies are just one of the sets of actors" (2008: 226). Thrift speculates with the discarding of the notion of the social (2008: 252) and instead formulates a certain attitude to life as potential, exemplified by his "overall goal: to produce a politics of opening the event to more; more action, more imagination, more light, more fun, even" (2008: 20).

The emphasis of the potentials of unfolding in everyday life is central in immanent thinking, but it is also concerned with the spreading of the culture of endless contests and comparisons leading toward social uneasiness (Virtanen 2006; Atkinson 2009; Gonzales 2009; Jansson 2009). Individuals are, for example, increasingly at risk of being randomly replaced in their work places. Life paths become potentially adventurous, but also insecure. Individual humans find themselves incapable of escaping from the threat of continuous unruly displacement. Unpredictability is made a standard which offers you both excitement and uneasiness. This drama is seen by immanent thinkers as uniting humans into one universal population which is disorganised in its endless diversity (Koivusalo 2000; Hipwell 2004).

This diversification results in heterogeneity where no continuity of particular human associations exists. Human co-being is then characteristically universal and it does not emerge in the form of territorial formations such as ethnic neighbourhoods, industrial towns or nation states and it takes neither the shape of social movements nor civic campaigns. Accordingly, the controlling of population is regarded as impossible in territorial terms but it is instead furthered via the flows of the mass media reaching the 'onflow' of daily life, stimulating individual human minds and bodies all together (Vähämäki 2000; Thrift 2008).

Immanent thinkers see, as shown above, distinct modernist conceptions, such as territory, but also society, environment and nature, as misleading since they lean on abstractions maintaining dualistic ontology. Instead, such conceptions as

bodies, quasi-objects, non-humans, assemblages, actants, as well as performance, emergence volatility and inventiveness are, according to Bruce Braun (2008), a North American geographer, favoured because they point out dramatically different post-dualistic ways of conceiving the world. He also underlines that "[f]or a number of geographers it is precisely the conjunction of radical uncertainty in complex systems and the capacity of bodies for affect" that must inform our coping with contemporary environmental challenges (2008: 676). Braun further specifies that our politics of nature must invariably take a form of active experimentation due to our unawareness regarding what is about to happen.

This type of geography of what happens concentrates on the immediateness of emerging potentials. Immanence thinking aims at identifying the meeting of homogenising and heterogenising currents in all their complexity but does this by excluding any signs of radical dissonance. Discontinuities and non-linkages are simply overlooked. Separateness does not exist. In explicit Spinozist framework, difference appears as "the wisdom of the body" in a continuum of an unbounded 'whole' (see Hipwell 2004: 359–360).

Bruce Braun's Intemperate Rainforest (2002), which concentrates on the forest conflict in Clayoquot Sound, British Columbia, provides an example of the overlooking of the central epistemic differences attached to the conflict which is, explicitly, due to a stringent leaning on immanent-relational ontology. The book starts by an introduction to the studied setting by paying attention to disparities and divergent interests emerging as part of the conflict. Braun is concerned about what is left out while "multiple voices are made to speak in the name of the One" (Braun 2002: 5). He also remarks how the state's land use planning has not taken into account the spatial, environmental and economic practices of the indigenous groups living in the region. He is also convinced that particular concepts of nature, culture, indigeneity, modernity, and progress implicated in state practices have contributed to a series of failures and discursive displacements, that is: epistemic erasures, which have made it difficult to recognise the political presence and environmental practices of the indigenous peoples (2002: 7–8). However, soon thereafter, Braun leaves the question of disconnections aside and concentrates on the colonial rhetoric of industrial developers and wilderness preservationists. Historical marginalisation of indigenous groups is discussed within the framework of expansive geological surveys, forest-industrial development and wilderness tourism. Furthermore, details of indigenous modernity are brought up without any serious attempts of discussing about the sensitive setting at the interface between diverging epistemologies. They remain unexamined. This is, strikingly, not far from the omissions of the official planning Braun is criticising. The reason for ignoring the indigenous voices in Braun's analysis can be derived from his explicit approach. He leans on immanence thinking while arguing, for example, how metaphors such as "networks", "assemblages", "flows" and "intensities" are helpful precisely because they force us to think in terms of a web of relations and, moreover, they force us to pay more attention to temporal and spatial connections (2002: 13–20, 263–269). Non-linkages are not discussed here which becomes disturbing when, for example, comparing it to Karen Heikkilä's (2008) critical analysis of indigenous toponymy in BC under colonisation and re-colonisation. Contrary to Braun, she is able to find disconnections and withdrawal, but also potentials of seeing, and making things radically differently, from within the indigenous peoples' everyday settings under the totalising gaze of the (re-)colonists.

In general, as was exemplified above, discontinuities are frequently left unexamined while conceiving the world through attributes informed by immanent thinking. Zones of withdrawal remain broadly unrecognised. Concentrating on problems of fading away is then difficult, as is focusing on discursive displacements that have become fatal to some lingual communities or pushed them to the edge of extinction. We are unable to pay attention to the fact that lingual exterminations are not natural events in human co-being, instead, they result from our ignorance or indifference. Within the framework of immanent geography communities with unique locations and territorial particularities cannot be distinguished. There are no tools to identify distinct forums or actors that are linked, but not reducible to the streams of extra-territorial connectivity.

Immanence thinking and critical geography

Immanent thinking is not only a trend among Spinozist geographers. Similar tendencies can be

notified in critical leftist tradition in geography. Claiming rights to 'differential geographies' is often seen as synonymous to acts of apartheid, as Noel Castree (2004), a UK geographer, demonstrates in his review essay. As part of his sympathetic critique of relational approaches, he examines formulations favoured by a few key figures in anglophone critical geography such as Michael Watts, David Harvey and Doreen Massey. The essay grows into a thought-provoking listing of caricature expressions of localist dead ends celebrating "mythical internal roots" and "internally generated authenticities" (2004: 144–145), "*volkisch* myth of cultural purity" (2004: 152), "closed societies" and "parochial place-projects" (2004: 158), "atavistic autarchy" (2004: 161) and "xenophobic particularism" (2004: 163). The list paints in front of us a wilderness of extremists who are at odds with the premises of open and inclusive society. Castree summarises, however, that "defensive localisations", or "erecting 'strong' boundaries around places", should not necessarily be seen as regressive, or deemed acts of geographical folly. On the contrary, he continues in a compromising manner that "it is perfectly possible for inward-looking localisms to be founded on an explicit engagement with extra-local forces" (2004: 163). This type of Manichean listing of localist puzzles might support the construction of reasonable compromises bridging the two extremes but does a major disservice to any particular acts of concentric argumentation. His 'Differential geographies' is simply indifferent to geographies of dissonance and withdrawal. Consequently, his indigenous panorama of "some 300 million people worldwide" (2004: 154) seems to treat the indigenous concerns as a means of further canonising geographical avant-garde grounded on relational all-inclusion.

Tellingly, moreover, Castree et al. (2008), while presenting their relational interpretation of sociospatial difference, concentrate on crossing and bridging difference, even harmonising it (2008: 306). A 'Politics of propinquity' can only be undertaken in relation to a 'politics of connectivity, as they summarise (2008: 310), which claim fully shows their unwillingness to take into consideration any aspects of radical difference. These types of academic commentaries, while only producing hegemonic, and blindly concentric generalisations, seem to have no link to the ongoing struggles of survival under the shadows of all-inclusion. They themselves are, in fact, proof of radical non-communication.

On the other hand, Matthew Sparke (1998, see also 2005: 1–52), a US-based British geographer, while attempting to appropriate deconstructive arguments into a critical reflection of earth-writing, aims at becoming sensitive to 'other histories' beyond the hegemonic Metropolitan ones. His contrapuntal cartographies search for the potentials of counter-hegemonic cartography and he also, while articulating geographical responsibility, understands that, for example, the First Nations resistance can be taken as an example of how to progress in geographical renewal. Sparke's attempt is brave but in practice it only brings the indigenous issue into the (re)colonial court rooms. The difficulties of translating indigenous means of oral communication into more legitimate mapping techniques are brought up but without any serious cross-epistemic reflection. The reflection is, instead, saved for the purposes of decolonising the political geography of mapping. Sparke thus simply uses the indigenous issue as a case, or a tool, by which to push forward critical renewal of political geography. The instrumental installation surfaces most clearly in Sparke's concerns about the colonial conquest that, by manoeuvres of aesthetic enframing, served "to empty the landscape" (Sparke 1998: 477). The exporting of landscapes into (lingual) communities which are perhaps unaware of any measures of landscaping is a purely colonial act which geographers, over generations, have learned not to question. Landscapes are thought of as something eternal which can be identified everywhere. Hence, as is apparent, Sparke's is the world of cutting-edge geographers, and their near colleagues, who actively participate in transforming particular interface cultures into geographic monoplanes and who pick up interesting cases to serve as mediums in an academic contest. No serious attempt to understand radical difference, or the degree of non-communication between different histories, is carried out. Later Sparke (2008) formulates his relational-immanent ontology by arguing for "critical responsibility to resist the pathologization of place" by "exploring the territorial particularities in terms of extra-territorial globality" (Sparke 2008: 434). He is, of course, therefore, primarily concerned about the risks of romanticizing heroic resistance and autonomous communities – which stigmatisation, while resembling Castree's list of spatial closures and Doreen Massey's tendency to see all signs of non-thrown-togetherness as romance with bounded places

(Massey 2005: 161–176), makes him oblivious to signs of dissonance and withdrawal.

Doreen Massey, a British geographer, has in the 2000s enriched her critical relationalism with aspects of immanent thinking (see Massey 2005: 20–30). This emphasis is, again, problematic from any particularist or concentric points of view. If we rely on the all-inclusiveness of relational approaches and regard, "space as a simultaneity of stories-so-far" and "places as collections of these stories", as Massey (2005: 129) does while arguing for positive heterogeneity over negative difference (2005: 12–13), and if we favour coeval coexistence at the cost of internal fragmentation (2005: 52), we run the risk of ignoring the contemporary drama of cultural domination versus withdrawal. While celebrating the "coevalness of multiplicity of trajectories" (2005: 154) we simultaneously disregard signs of radical difference that could provide alternatives to the all-inclusiveness under the umbrella of positive co-existence (see Massey 2007: 405). In other words, by enthusiastically tracing signs of corresponding co-existence, that is, by systematically ignoring the lost and withdrawing aspects of human co-being, we tend to continue the colonial indifference to contemporary signs of difference. By hiding our uneasiness with unevenness and biases of communication, and by focusing on matters that serve our aims to imagine idylls of co-resonance, we contribute to the taming of dissociations. What is at stake then is what we see as shared and overlapping, which echoes in the communicative repertoire we have learned to appreciate. We are then at risk of disregarding the retreating aspects in our surroundings and, furthermore, we even tend to disregard our own disregarding.

Interestingly, Sara Gonzales (2009), while studying the official marketing of Milan, Italy, from within a relational perspective, summarises that the relational script alone leaves little room for alternatives (Gonzales 2009: 40). She concludes that an excessive emphasis by the local authorities on global connectivity risks losing sight of the particularities and uniqueness of places. According to her, paradoxically, most Milanese seem to become disconnected from the thoroughly connective governing of their city. Gonzales, a Basque geographer from UK, thus bravely raises the question of concentric co-being, including its radical non-communication with relational spatialities. She also guides the reader to think about the similarities between the positive all-inclusiveness of relational geographies and the programmatic openness of neoliberal politics of trade. The similarities are striking, if also under-examined by human geographers (see Massey 1999: 15; Castree 2004: 144).

Toward concentric geographies

Contrary to immanent-relational geographical thinking, detailed studies of non-communication and withdrawal in multilingual milieus can equip us with tools to compete against tendencies of cultural standardisation. Reflection of the consequences of our decisions within specific zones of intercultural change can deepen our understanding of the complex dependencies between domination and withdrawal, which then might help us to formulate tactics of everyday resistance.

The multilingual sensitivity favoured here aims at recognising, but not crossing or harmonising, both general dependencies and (local) particularities of social change. This view emphasises the contested nature of human co-being resulting in social mixtures of extensive interconnectedness and radical difference. These mixtures are, as will be shown below, forged by general relational pressure of continuous displacement and particular acts of community emplacement (Casey 1997: 16), or implacement (Heikkilä 2008: 7–11), according to inherited and adopted patterns. Consequently, human communities are seen in this view as developing along two complementary, if partially non-communicative, routes.

First, while following the premises of immanent thinking, human co-being can be seen as evolving along the impulses from within general changes in society. Accordingly, in research, it is central to identify the continuous emergence of potentials and risks in everyday settings. We can call this relational displacement. Human co-being, in the form of more or less temporary associations and communities, is simply seen as adapted to, but also adapting, the pulses of the surrounding society. Forms of human co-being, such as associations and communities, develop according to their own re-actions to the strain and forces of more general origin. Similarly, places become understood as "the general conditions of our being together" (Massey 2005: 154), they appear as intersections or events of wider trajectories of broader linkages, or they become re-conceptualised, for example, as moments of mobile locations, multi-

ple nodes, nomadic associations or translocal assemblages (Bæhrenholdt 2007; Blunt 2007; Rocheleau & Roth 2007; McFarlane 2009).

Second, human associations and communities can be identified as evolving through the gradual alteration of shared memories and practices grounded on the experience of belongingness. Now the concentric aspects of social change become central (Jürgenson 2004; Knuuttila 2005; Schwartz 2006; Baschmakoff 2007; Kurki 2007; Gonzales 2009). Social and spatial differentiation emerges in the diverging acts of participation and dissent which gradually transform the particular conditions of human co-being and communication (Kymäläinen & Lehtinen 2010). This differentiation can be documented, for example, by historical inter-lingual comparisons, as well as by examining the cultural confusions at the zones of resistance and withdrawal, attached to conceptual renewals and acts of re-naming in our everyday settings.

In the concentric view, social and spatial differentiation affects and is affected by changes in the communicative routines of communities (see Tanner 1929b; Heikkilä 2006: 88–141, 2008: 110–111). Renewal of community lexicons is seen as indelibly bound to the transformations in collective imaginary orientations which take shape, for example, via alterations of the central geographs that communities more or less purposefully lean on in their daily practices (Häkli 1998: 131–132; Mustonen 2009: 15–74). Lingual renewal is now regarded as either purposeful, when it is based, for example, on imported neologisms, or semi-conscious, when it evolves in rituals or by routine-type adaptation of conceptual and syntactic reforms (Connerton 1989). Sensitivity to this type of renewal pushes researchers toward comparative geographic studies that aim at identifying both the relational and concentric aspects of differentiation in human co-being.

Relational and concentric aspects of change are thus treated here as complementary and only partially resonating social and spatial categories, or developmental paths, both of which need to be followed if one wishes to understand the zones of resistance and withdrawal at polyglot interfaces. Then, overall stigmatisation of localists as promoters of geographical apartheid is simply unfeasible. The relational approach, when considering communities as moments of general plenitude, runs the risk of ignoring much of the potential co-enrichment in human co-being while becoming indifferent to radical difference. Bypassing the concentric side of human co-being quickly leads to blindness towards solutions which deviate from the generally agreed upon framework. The innate dynamics of communicative and imaginary interaction are then simply ignored, or deemed uninteresting, since the questions binding them have no general bearing. Approaches that favour general all-inclusiveness are therefore seen here as simply too panoramic to be applied in studies of the pros and cons of human co-being.

This article thus argues that the pitfalls of reflattening our ontological assumptions due to non-social simplifications and crude reduction (bound to the ridiculing of particularisms) can be avoided by approaches which are sensitive not only to resonating aspects of human co-being but also, and especially, dissociations between concentric and relational spaces in concrete polyglot settings. Signs of concentric unfolding, emerging from within the zones of radical dissonance, can then be treated as the founding events of social renewal. Communities are thus not only regarded as attachments or products of extra-terrestrial impulses but, instead, are seen as actors that are influenced by chains of memories and customs that respect the shared past.

Signs of radical dissonance are examined below within the context of Sámi politics and research. Particular attention is paid to concentric aspects of co-being. Difficulties of translation, both lingual and geographic, are underlined in order to clarify the dissociating and non-communicative elements at the specific epistemic interface in the European North.

Identifying dissonance: breaks between particular geographs

One way to value the necessity of attending to concentric spatialities is to analyse the (mis)matching of some central parallel geographs that form the shared and divided ground of spatial imagination among polyglot communities. This is done below by comparing some geographs of Sámi earthviewing to collateral concepts in Western geographic orientation. The aim is also to show specific problems and potentials of the Sámi as indigenous non-Indo-Europeans in contemporary Europe. The analysis of the Sámi concepts is by necessity constrained to the language of Northern Sámi which is the most widely-dispersed of the

Sámi languages, having approximately 20 000 speakers in the Nordic countries, mostly in Northern Norway. The first two comparisons of geographs serve as examples of cultural withdrawal under the influence of contemporary geographic colonialism and the second two illustrate the potential of Sámi geographs in questioning the scholarly canonisations of monoplane human geography.

Nomadic landscapes

The history of identifying and founding landscapes is long in the Nordic countries, and the convention has fuelled nation-building in each country, also dividing and assimilating the Sámi homelands (Jones & Olwig 2008). However, no simple equivalent to landscape or Scandinavian *landskap* exists in the Northern Sámi lexicon. One possible translation is *guovlu* which refers to a region under watch or sight, but which also points to collective land holdings attached to specific identifications of kin and land, emerging, for example, in family-bound regional articulations (Helander-Renvall 2009). Moreover, the concept of *siida*, which in general refers to the historical Sámi villages seasonally moving between summer and winter areas, and which today refers to local reindeer herding units, partially parallels with the Swedish *landskap* which is, for example, a territorial administrative unit. Siida however, while developed as part of seasonal mobility and adjusted to shifting conditions of nature, differs significantly from the *landskaps* harmonised under state governance (Helander 1999: 19; Heikkilä 2006: 267–287).

The Scandinavian *landskap* is also sometimes regarded as more or less synonymous to *eatnam* which is the concrete earthly setting, or the eventual subject of co-being, where the relations between humans and nature evolve, often encircling around rivers, fells or inland lakes. It is also a conveyor of local kin histories manifested in customs, cultural memorials, oral traditions and place names. In fact, the spiritual sensitivity, together with the intimate relations between humans and nature, makes the *eatnam* in Sámi geographic thinking the prior subject of land and life (Jernsletten 2002; Helander-Renvall 2009).

One can thus notice a profound contradiction between the institutions of landscaping and the institutions rooted to indigenous earthviewing and socio-spatial orientation in the Nordic North. Inaccuracies of translation exemplify the confusion among the Sámi while adjusting to the premises of landscapes. Adjustment is, however, accelerated by expectations of benefits in the form of official recognition which is often accompanied by a confirmation of some sort of cultural continuity (see for example Ingold 1976). This learning, accompanied by an unlearning of the customary manners of signification and intent, gradually radically renews the local routines of land and life. The particular articulations of *guovlu*, *siida* and *eatnam* adapt to the more generally applicable decrees of landscaping: they become displaced, and some older layers of earthviewing and earthly co-being gradually fade away.

Zones of wilderness, zones of withdrawal

The establishment of the wilderness parks in Upper Lapland, the northernmost Finland, in the early 1990s brought along environmental conceptions that were originally created as part of the Anglophone lexicons of wilderness planning. Accordingly, the outer extensions of the *siidas* under seasonal hunting, gathering and herding customs, that is *meahcci* in Sámi, were divided into areas of wilderness and commercial forests (Erämaakomitea 1988; Lehtinen 2006: 231–232; Raitio 2008: 216–222).

Meahcci refers to backwoods and wilderness in Northern Sámi. It denotes uninhabited terrains and areas of resources, but it also includes lands away from home that are under regular extensive use. The extension and meaning of *meahcci* varies according to what you are after. Ptarmigan lands differ from those preferred for gathering fuel wood, for example. It may, as Elina Helander-Renvall, a Sámi scholar from Upper Lapland, argues, serve as a "stretching of one's living room, a stronghold of identity maintenance" (Vadén & Tuusvuori 2007: 9).

The gradual transformation of *meahcci* into Western-type wilderness has become, due to the above-documented geographic differences, a cause of confusion in Upper Lapland. The strict territorial definition of official wilderness parks, constituted by specific ecological zones of vulnerability and including facilities for tourists, has overlooked the vulnerability of reindeer to increased pressure by humans and artificial infrastructure (Heikkilä 2006: 287–325). In addition, logging both inside and outside the wilderness parks has significantly weakened the value of central winter pastures for reindeer (Raitio 2008:

211–216; Riipinen 2008: 142–146). The tension between strict territorial governing and specific mobile needs of reindeer units is also exemplified in the difficulties to reach agreements about hunting regulations, concerning wolves and bears in particular, between the European Union and its northernmost provinces. Viewing nature at a distance is difficult for those to whom nature outside humanity is meaningless. Securing indigenous rights to land, which means guarantees that their concerns are not ignored by the cartographers of all-inclusiveness, is a central concern to the Sámi in the wilderness Lapland, and this cannot be separated from their claim for at least some degree of local autonomy, and thus honouring the particularities of *báiki*.

Horizontal placing

The Sámi *báiki* is the place that is recognised as one's home, farm, field or camp. It is a particular place for being safely together. It is an inhabited place that is one's home. It is also a familiar place where your ancestors have lived before you. *Báiki* is a territorial and temporal conception developed via kin relations and it contains elements of the familial past (Helander 1999: 11–12; Schanche 2004: 8). *Báiki*, on the other hand, differs from *sadji* which refers to a site, location or spot in general, without necessary denotations of dwelling or home-being. *Sadji* is also a place to sit or lie down and sleep (Helander 1999: 12). *Báiki* and *sadji* correspond to the differentiation between particular home place and placing in general but they also serve as geographs of the horizontal earth-viewing among the Sámi. The horizontal understanding of land and resources in Sápmi, the Sámi homeland, is grounded on certain rules of hunting and fishing, or practices of *bivdit*, that have developed symmetrical and reciprocal ties between humans and their surroundings.

Baiki refers to a concentric understanding of one's particular location. Of course, location is relational, as taking place in respect to others. The daily *báiki* is thoroughly linked to the surrounding world. These linkages are, according to Audhild Schanche, the director of the Sámi Institute in Northern Norway, horizontal by character and distinct from the vertical divisions of the Western imagination which lean on "asymmetry, hierarchy, unequal power relation, domination/subordination and supremacy/inferiority" (Schanche 2004: 1–2).

Similar type of contrasting remarks of dissociation are made by Tero Mustonen (2009), a Finnish geographer and advocate of the arctic subsistence communities who, in spite of applying Doreen Massey's relational terminology, identifies industrial one-company locations of isolation in the tundra. These locations have developed into enclaves of vertical interdependence which are, moreover, at risk of becoming dead spaces of industrial pollution. Therefore, Mustonen (2009: 5) concludes, Massey's approach "falls short of conveying the essentials of localities that are situated far away from power centres". He identifies the radical dissonance between Western post-urban formulations of all-inclusiveness and the "amorphous spatial understanding" (2009: 5) in particular communities of the extreme North.

The dilemma of dead space

Sámi *dilli*, as a translation of space, carries connotations to wide and open space but it emphasises the qualitative and potential aspects of human co-being. It emerges in such expressions as *til'la*, meaning state of health or mood, and *dilálašvuohta*, referring to pursuit and potential but also to an inspirational setting suddenly taking shape. It can also be translated as an event, then denoting special meetings or celebrations. Primarily, however, *til'la* refers to the state of affairs (Sammallahti 1989, 1993). In general, expressions and modifications of *dilli* cover a plenitude of meanings that refer to both distances and qualitative features of things, locations and events. *Dilli* and *til'la* are old German imports that originate from *Ziel*, which means aim or goal in contemporary German (Hirvensalo 1975: 284; Häkkinen 2004: 1313).

The fact that *dilli* is a German loan word which has, over time and space, developed into its current form exemplifies well the general relational interarticulation of lingual trajectories. The layers of conceptual loans in our daily vocabulary serve as proof of the complexity of the linkages behind our ethno-lingual identification (Häkkinen 2004: 6–16; Saarikivi 2002; Seierstad 2008: 102). Continuous processes of import, and the resulting lingual hybrids, become concrete, for example, in intergenerational relations when, at times, communication across generations becomes challenging due to diversified adjustments and modifications of our everyday vocabularies (Lehtinen 1993: 24–27; Anthias 2009; Semi 2010 143–145). Experiences of this type of difficulties stand as proof of

lingual dynamics and potentials, but they also expose something about the continuous loss of the more marginal layers of signification. And, of course, they tell us about the dominant directions of conceptual export and import in society.

Consequently, to argue for space that is not dead (Massey 2005: 13) is puzzling in the context of Sámi earthviewing. *Dilli* self-evidently carries promises of renewal, emerging in the qualitative impressions of *dilli* and from within notions of *til´la* or *dilálasvuohta*, leading us to think about spaces as events as well as potentialities. Translation problems such as these serve as reminders of cross-cultural discontinuity and they can be seen as moments of confusion in the zones of conflict in polyglot settings.

Tracing participation and withdrawal: three conclusions

The preceding excursion through a few central geographs of the Sámi associates this article with particular troubles along the polyglot interface in the Nordic North, but it also serves as an example of both the threats of lingual standardisation and the potentials of co-learning across epistemic divides. My first conclusion is simple, but also demanding: Geographers, if intending to avoid the re-flattening of their ontology, cannot afford being, or becoming, monolingual – neither individually nor within scholarly associations. Instead, continuous re-examination of the changes and variations of geographs in those lingual communities with which we are interconnected should be seen an integral part of making postcolonial geographies. Ignoring and ridiculing them is not far from parochial sectionalism that is considered by the relationalists as non-existing or at least out-dated. Ignoring and ridiculing them can also be interpreted as an expression of indifference toward those communities and cultures that live today at the edge of existence. Parallelly, disregarding discontinuities and non-communicative aspects in our geographic communication and considering particularities simply as moments of the general plenitude carries signs of determinism that are programmatically fortified against recognising any nuances of radical difference. I cannot distinguish this from the colonial manoeuvres of the past regimes of the West.

The above conclusion includes the concern that Western, and today: increasingly Anglophone, geographies carry traces of provincialism in their inwardlooking canonisation of the cutting-edge curriculum (about provincialism, see Entrikin 1991: 3–78; Häkli 1998: 132). The nomenclature developed accordingly is not entirely dissimilar from Audhild Schanche's (2004) sketching of the contours of Western geographic imagination, referred to above, which tend to lean on epistemological rankings that, despite ontological emphases on flows and fluidities, produce hierarchy, asymmetry, unequal power relation, domination/subordination and supremacy/inferiority. Schanche's critique can be read as an expression of the concern that much geographically important information becomes articulated without being recognised by the leading forums and that there is a systematic bias in this respect. This state of affairs was confirmed in the preceding excursion using Sámi words and concepts. What was also shown, I suppose, is that this type of asymmetrical production of scholarly leadership and hierarchy could easily be changed. The margins that are fading away could be included in the disciplinary renewal by simply emphasising those concerns and formulations in particular minor forums that share a willingness to contribute to the development of geographical curriculum. In any case, we do a major disservice to geographical advancement by ridiculing or regarding the conceptions and arguments that are at odds with the cutting edges of geography as uninteresting because of their differing rationales. Instead, radical differences could be seen as a potential inspiration for epistemological co-renewal. Language barriers, of course, limit our endeavours but, as was shown above, much of the marginal research on particular geographs is published in English, too, if only occasionally in the most distinguished journals. Especially, signs of discontinuities in polyglot communication can be seen as a central challenge, and direction, of co-studying. Why not aim at learning to learn from those under the threat of extermination, and to participate on this ground in collective efforts to slow down the acceleration of lingual extinctions?

This type of reorientation in human geography would significantly enrich our scholarly work and it would also show the areas of non-communication in geographical renewal. As was witnessed in this article, landscapes should not be treated as universally applicable means of regional coping. The Sámi *meahcci* is not imprisoned by the type of dualisms inherent in wilderness programmes – which only lately have been questioned by hybrid

geographers. The horizontal constitution of *báiki* favours concentric thinking that is, as underlined by many leading human geographers referred to in this article, discordant with relational approaches. Finally, the Sámi did not need to spend decades in symposia of critical rethinking to find that space, as *dilli*, is not dead.

If, as was concluded above, some inward-looking features of Western-Anglophone geography bear resemblance to provincial defence against multilingual challenges, the same phenomenon, if only in particular contrasting forms, is widely-cultivated in the margins. My second conclusion deals with provincialism in the Nordic North which is, as the case studies showed, developed into a means of supporting the dominating or expansive regime. In fact, this type of regime confirmation comes close to the Latin root of provincialism that is etymologically linked to submissive and conceding aspects of conquered territories, derived from the Latin *pro vincere* (Gordon 1980: 69). The case studies in this article showed how wilderness conservation by Finnish environmental authorities promoted Anglophone solutions of wilderness planning in Sápmi. The 'Western model' was a powerful means to overcome the alternative formulations favouring culturally sensitive environmentalism (see Lehtinen 1991: 135–142). In addition, as illustrated above, seeing some Sámi geographs as 'relatives' of landscapes was confusing, but also alluring for those at the interface between the Sámi and the 'southerners' as it helped to become recognised in the forums of the leading regime. This finding gains support from similar discoveries by a few critical scholars of the Nordic North. According to Tim Ingold, an anthropologist from the UK, the Scolt Lappish leadership was partially questioned by locals due to its too intimate cooperation with the Finnish statecraft (see Ingold 1976: 213–221). Thomas Mathiesen (1982: 83), a sociologist of law and rights from Norway, examined the potentials of the Scandinavian concept of *vanmakt*, roughly translated as obedience or mentality of escape, when analysing the background of the conflict between Sámi and the dominating regime in the hydroelectric development in Alta, Northern Norway (see also Pehkonen 1999; Howitt 2001: 280–299). Provincial opportunism is, as I would argue, a central constituent in the particular realisation of domination and withdrawal in the Nordic North.

Emphasising provincialism of the margins means focusing on the prevalence of particular opportunistic or phlegmatic, if not cynical, attitudes that tend to support the established relations of domination. Changes in the margins cannot be explained by general interdependencies alone. They can, instead, be considered as outcomes of tactics favoured by the provincial actors themselves. Particular features of adjustment, I dare to summarise, explain much of the speed and direction of general standardisation in contemporary colonies.

This conclusion, which critically studies the features of opportunism among the provincial actors, offers us tools for deepening our understanding of participation and withdrawal in the margins. Provincial attitude, in the form set out here, tends to confirm linkages that strengthen translocally articulated interdependencies. Provincialism favours standard solutions (see Lehtinen 2006: 200–208), which is manifested in the Nordic North in lingual development, but also in landscape design and resource extraction, as was shown above. The standard North is, if following Mustonen's (2009) argumentation, made of 'dead spaces' of industrial enclaves, and it also emerges in wilderness parks and municipal centres where multiculturalism has turned into ethnic decoration. The provincial standardisation is made concrete by folklorising or completely denying the particular pasts and by uncritically welcoming the demands of the dominating regime. From a provincial perspective, when facing the intense pressures of unruly displacement, the particular routines of polyglot communities look like remnants form the prehistoric past.

My third and final conclusion is inspired by the geographic potentials of particular geographs. By claiming that cultural withdrawal is a central geographical matter and that, due to radical differences between cultural geographs and cosmologies, discontinuities are unavoidable in human communication and earthly co-being, we can begin developing post-provincial geographies of multilingual milieus. These claims can help us to look forward to contribute to the opening of the creative potentials of relational and concentric co-being. Place can, for example, be regarded without pejorative connotations as a place of one's own, *báiki*. Moreover, especially in the previously mentioned concerns of familial well-being, it also extends toward such denotations as 'moments of denial' and 'critical participation' while purposefully avoiding progressions of (self-made) vulnerability. The horizontal character of *báiki* promotes initiatives of co-learning and it simultaneously

serves as a buffer against the impulses of unruly displacement. Place can therefore grow into a location of political campaigns, as the metonymic use of Alta in Sámi lexicon shows (see Howitt 2001: 280–299), and it can accordingly turn into a context of standardisation critique. Then it takes on the shape of a critique of continuous colonial domination, but it also self-critically assesses any signs of provincial *vanmakt*.

Placing is now horizontally connected to the potentialities of space as *dilli*, including both general and particular qualities. Places are seen as collections of translocal trajectories and events of throwntogetherness, but they are also understood as distinct locations, or settings, that function as emergent entities of their own, not reducible to the general processes contributing to their existence. The simultaneous and only partially resonating coformation of relational and concentric spatialities is now identified as the founding moment of societal renewal. The differentiation between the two spaces is epistemological by nature. This means, concentric placing includes options for radical critique and alternatives. It is a forum of seeing and doing things differently. The politics of place emerge, accordingly, wherever the concern about the conditions of communication and non-communication is present. It addresses the place of one's own that bears continuities through its potential to add differentiation.

Geographical views sensitive to concentric cobeing pay attention to the activity and passivity of individuals and their communities amidst general pressures of standardisation. The transformations of our daily routines are thus not regarded as direct outcomes of broader re-articulations reaching us as necessities, but as acts and events modified by choices in the concentric spheres of the communities themselves.

This article has argued that the geographical overplaying with neologisms imported from the Spinozist philosophies of immanence and increasingly also followed by critical leftist geographers, partially resulting in 'flat earth' descriptions, has limited our ability to identify and respect the shared concerns of land and life taking shape in the routines of general-particular change. This overplaying, if continued, will definitely constrain the development of scholarly co-learning in dialogue with the particular geographs and geographers of the margins.

By systematically ignoring the voices that take place beyond the leading arenas of geographical renewal and by selectively focusing on immediate appearances of 'geographies of what happens', as the geographers of immanence recommend, we run the risk of contributing to the degradation of the critical scope and social credibility of geography. All features of human community-building, including the variations of resistance against standardisation, are then simply drawn under the vision of all-inclusiveness. This type of rhetorical generalisation certainly does not resonate with the questions of participation and withdrawal the communities at the edge of extinction face in their daily routines. Signs of radical difference and resistance are therefore mostly ignored by geographers of immanence, if not treated as fascinating cases for paradigmatic canonisation. It seems the perspectives of domination are lost due to an anxiety of dualisms of any kind. Instead, idylls of coevals, openings of events and overall inventiveness are celebrated, as if guidelines for exclusively positive picturing of human and non-human cobeing on earth. While surrounded by a myriad of signs of social and ecological crises, both local and global, the geographers of immanent relationalism seem to remain thrilled of their search for "more action, more imagination, more light, more fun, even", as Thrift formulated above.

Emergence is, of course, "inventive through and through", thus "[it] must be understood as a property of the whole that is not shared by, or reducible, to its constituent parts", as Braun (2008: 669) argues, and underlines this by repeating it word for word a few pages later (Braun 2008: 675). This type of rhetoric, much echoing Spinoza's (1982: 244–245) views on the whole of nature and its parts, is however strained by the risks of mechanical simplification grounded on analogical thinking, leading us to ignore those features of social change that grow from within the emerging potentials of the constituent parts that are not reducible to the broader emergence to which they are interlinked.

The relational renewal remains, to summarise my focal point, elitist in geography if not co-developed in close contact with the drama and the dynamics of individual human communities in their daily settings. Instead of painting portraits of wishful optimism, we need to learn to recognise the differing tactics of participation and denial; dissensions in coping with resource exploitation and climate change in the margins (see e.g. Habeck 2002; Howitt & Suchet-Pearson 2006; Kjosavik & Shanmugaratnam 2007; Mustonen 2009), contest-

ed wisdoms of customary 'animal geographies' (see Ingold & Kurttila 2000; Konstantinov 2005; Fryer 2009), differing 'social natures' of domestication and exploitation (see Seppänen 1986: 75–102; Lehtinen 1991: 70–71) and dissociations in 'bioprospecting' (Nygren 1998). This conclusion is a request to all those who have found relational renewal inspiring to once more re-examine the polyhedral invitation inherent in the preliminary sketching of 'lines of flight' (Deleuze 1992: 23) and take distance from those academic contests motivated by cutting edge rankings and turn toward more participatory studies of particular geographies of dependencies, denials, non-linkages and withdrawals.

Finally, it is worth noticing that Mustonen (2009), while emphasising the constant merging of time and space among Arctic subsistence communities, comes close to Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess' Spinozist elaboration of 'mixed communities' created in the practical day-to-day bonding of humans and non-humans. This type of 'ethics of place' (see Smith 2001, 2005b) is marked by routines performing due respect and care to all its members, both animate and inanimate. The cooperation in Naess' community is not regulated by codified rules or norms but, instead, it takes shape in the daily events and occasions that bring into being what is regarded as ethically right (Naess 1979, 1998). In this way particular placing becomes the *potentia* of horizontal co-enrichment, thoroughly linked to the particular understanding of space among the Sámi. The Spinozist renewal in human geography can, and could, thus take shape and re-emerge in various forms and with several differing emphases. It is, however, as witnessed above, crucially dependent on the discipline and creativity of the scholars leaning on the original inspiration. How well do we know, honestly, *The Ethics* we are promoting? To what degree we are aware of the several geographically inspiring Spinozist traditions with radically differing emphases?

REFERENCES

Andersen S 2004. Saami place names and place-making in a minority-majority context. *Dieđut* 3, 122–134.

Anthias F 2009. Translocational belonging, identity and generation. *Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration* 4: 1, 6–15.

Atkinson R 2009. The politics of isolation. *Geografiska Annaler* B 91: 4, 299–310.

Bærenholdt JO 2007. *Coping with distances*. Berghahn Books, Oxford.

Baschmakoff N 2007. Cultural text, communality and the margin. In Baschmakoff N, Fryer P & Ristolainen M (eds). *Texts and communities*, 9–24. Aleksanteri Institute, Helsinki.

Bateson G & Bateson M C 1987. *Angel fears: an investigation into the nature of meaning of the sacred*. Rider, New York.

Bladh G 1995. Finskogens landskap och människor under fyra sekler. En studie av samhälle och natur i förändring. *Forskningsrapport* 95: 11. Högskolan i Karlstad, Karlstad.

Blunt A 2007. Cultural geographies of migration: mobility, transnationality and diaspora. *Progress in Human Geography* 31: 5, 684–694.

Braun B 2002. *The intemperate rainforest. Nature, culture and power on Canada's west coast*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Braun B 2006. Global natures in the space of assemblage. *Progress in Human Geography* 30: 5, 644–654.

Braun B 2008 Environmental issues: incentive life. *Progress in Human Geography* 32: 5, 667–679.

Casey E 1997. *The fate of place*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Castree N 2004. Differential geographies: place, indigenous rights and 'local' resources. *Political Geography* 23: 2, 133–167.

Castree N, Featherstone D & Herod A 2008. Contrapuntal geographies: The politics of organising across sociospatial difference. In Cox KR, Low M & Robinson J (eds). *The Sage Handbook of Political Geography*, 305–321. Sage, London.

Connerton P 1989. *How Societies Remember?* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Dalby S 1993. The 'Kiwi disease': Geopolitical discourse in Aotaeroa/New Zealand and the South Pacific. *Political Geography* 12: 5, 437–456.

Dalby S 2002. *Environmental security*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Dalby S 2010. Recontextualising violence, power and nature: the next twenty years of critical geopolitics. *Political Geography* 29: 5, 280–288.

Deleuze G 1992. *Autiomaa*. Gaudeamus, Helsinki.

Dewsbury JD & Thrift N 2005. 'Genesis eternal': after Paul Klee. In Buchanan I & Lambert G (eds). *Deleuze and Space*, 89–108. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.

Doel M 1996. A hundred thousand lines of flight: a machinic introduction to the nomad and scrumbled geography of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. *Society and Space* 14: 4, 421–439.

Domosh M 2010. The world was never flat: Early global encounters and the messiness of empire. *Progress in Human Geography* 34: 4, 419–435.

Entrikin N 1991. *The Betweenness of Place*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Erämaakomitea 1988. Erämaakomitean mietintö. *Komiteanmietintöjä* 39. Valtion Painatuskeskus, Helsinki.

Fryer P 2009. Urfolks rättigheter och rättvisa på Kolahalvöns landsbygd. In Elenius L & Ericsson L (eds). *Är vi inte alla minoriteter i världen?*, 183–198. Ordfront, Stockholm.

Gonzales S 2009. (Dis)connecting Milan(ese): Deterritorialised urbanism and disempowering politics in globalising cities. *Environment and Planning A* 41: 1, 31–47.

Gordon C (ed) 1980. *Power and Knowledge. Selected interviews and other writings by Michel Foucault*, 1971–1977. Pantheon, New York.

Habeck JO 2002. How to turn a reindeer pasture into an oil well, and vice versa: transfer of land, compensation and reclamation in the Komi Republic. In Kasten E (ed). *People and the land. Pathways to reform in post-Soviet Siberia*, 125–147. Dietrich Reimer Verlag, Berlin.

Hadi Curti G 2009. Beating words to life: subtitles, assemblage(s)capes, expression. *GeoJournal* 74: 3, 201–208.

Haila Y 1997. 'Wilderness' and the multiple layers of environmental thought. *Environmental History* 3: 2, 129–148.

Haila Y & Dyke C 2006. What to say about nature's speech. In Haila Y & Dyke C (eds). *How nature speaks: the dynamics of the human ecological condition*, 1–48. Duke University Press, Durham.

Heikkilä L 2006. Reindeer talk. *Acta Universitatis Lapponiensis* 110, Rovaniemi.

Heikkilä K 2008. *Teaching through toponymy*. VDM Verlag, Saarbrücken.

Helander E 1999. Sámi subsistence activities – spatial aspects and structuration. *Acta Borealia* 16: 2, 7–25.

Helander-Renvall E 2009. Personal information, May 22 [mimeo].

Herman D 2008. The aloha state: Place names and the anti-conquest of Hawai´i. In Berg L & Vuolteenaho J (eds). *Critical toponymies: The contested politics of place-naming*, 101–135. Ashgate, Farnham.

Hipwell WT 2004. A Deleuzian critique of resource-use management politics in industria. *The Canadian Geographer* 48: 3, 356–377.

Hirvensalo L 1975. *Suomi-saksa-suomi*. WSOY, Helsinki.

Howitt R 2001. *Rethinking resource management. Justice, sustainability and indigenous peoples*. Routledge, London.

Howitt R & Suchet-Pearson S 2006. Rethinking the building block: ontological pluralism and the idea of 'management'. *Geografiska Annaler* B 88: 3, 323–335.

Häkkinen K 2004. *Nykysuomen etymologinen sanakirja*. WSOY, Helsinki.

Häkli J 1998. Manufacturing provinces. In Tuathail G & Dalby S (eds). *Rethinking geopolitics*, 131–151. Routledge, London.

Häkli J 2003. To discipline or not to discipline, is that the question? *Political Geography* 22: 6, 657–661.

Hänninen S & Vähämäki J (eds) 2000. *Displacement of politics*. SoPhi, Jyväskylä.

Ingold T 1976. *The Scolt Lapps Today*. Cambridge University Press, London.

Ingold T & Kurttila T 2000. Perceiving the environment in Finnish Lapland. *Body & Society* 6: 3–4, 183–196.

Jansson K 2009. Tillsammans. Bidrag till den etniska boendesegregationens geofilosofi. *Geografiska regionstudier* 81. Uppsala University, Department of Social and Economic Geography, Uppsala.

Jernsletten J 2002. Sørsamisk landskapsforståelse i et religionsvitenskapelig perspektiv. *Dieđut* 1, 107–114.

Jones M 2009. Phase space: geography, relational thinking, and beyond. *Progress in Human Geography* 33: 4, 487–506.

Jones M & Olwig K (eds) 2008. *Nordic Landscapes*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Jürgenson A 2004. On the formation of the Estonians' concepts of homeland and home place. *Pro Ethnologia* 18: 1, 97–114.

Keisteri T 1990. The study of changes in cultural landscape. *Fennia* 168: 1, 31–115.

Ketola K, Knuuttila S, Mattila A & Vesala KM 2002. *Puuttuvat viestit*. Gaudeamus, Helsinki.

Kitchin R & Dodge M 2007. Rethinking maps. *Progress in Human Geography* 31: 3, 331–344.

Kjosavik D & Shanmugaratnam N 2007. Property rights dynamics and indigenous communities in Highland Kerala, South India. *Modern Asian Studies* 41: 6, 1183–1260.

Knuuttila S 2005. Samankeskinen paikallisuus. In Häyrynen S (ed). Kulttuurin arviointi ja vaikutusten väylät, 51–65. *Kulttuuripoliittisen tutkimuksen edistämissäätiö* (Cupore) 12, Helsinki.

Koivusalo M 2000. Biopolitical displacement and antinomies of biopolitical reason. In Hänninen S & Vähämäki J (eds). *Displacement of politics*, 116–159. SoPhi, Jyväskylä.

Konstnatinov Y 2005. From 'traditional' to collectivized reindeer herding on the Kola Peninsula: continuity or disruption? *Acta Borealia* 22: 2, 170–188.

Kurki T 2007. Historical prose and emergent community in Soviet Karelia. In Baschmakoff N, Fryer P & Ristolainen M (eds). *Texts and communities*, 39–48. Aleksanteri Institute, Helsinki.

Kymäläinen P & Lehtinen AA 2010. Chora in Current Geographical Thought. *Geografiska Annaler B* 92: 3, 251–261.

Lehtinen AA 1991. Northern natures. *Fennia* 169: 1, 57–169.

Lehtinen AA 1993. The fall of the forest villages. *Environmental Policy and Society* 1. Uppsala University, Uppsala.

Lehtinen AA 2006. *Postcolonialism, multitude, and the politics of nature*. University Press of America, Lanham.

Massey D 1999. *Power-geometries and the politics of space-time*. University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg.
Massey D 2005. *For Space*. Sage, London.
Mathiesen T 1982. *Makt och motmakt*. Korpen, Gothenburg.
Maybury-Lewis D (ed) 2003. *The Politics of Ethnicity. Indigenous Peoples in Latin American States*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
McFarlane C 2009. Translocal assemblages: space, power and social movements. *GeoForum* 40: 4, 561–567.
McHugh K 2009. Movement, memory, landscape: an excursion in non-representational thought. *Geojournal* 74: 3, 209–218.
Mustonen T 2009. Karhun väen ajast-aikojen avartuva avara. Tutkimus kolmen euraasialaisen luontaistalousyhteisön paikallisesta tiedosta pohjoisen ilmastonmuutoksen kehyksessä. *Publications in Social Sciences* 92. University of Joensuu, Joensuu.
Myers GA 2009. Naming and placing the other: power and the urban landscape in Zanzibar. In Berg L & Vuolteenaho J (eds). *Critical toponymies*, 85–100. Ashgate, Aldershot.
Naess A 1979. Self-realization in mixed communities of humans, bears, sheep, and wolves. *Inquiry* 22: 1–4, 231–241.
Naess A 1998. *Livsfilosofi*. Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.
Nygren A 1998. Environmental discourse: searching for sustainable development in Costa Rica. *Environmental Values* 7: 2, 201–222.
Pehkonen S 1999. "Tänne, muttei pidemmälle!" Altakamppailu ja Pohjois-Norjan monikulttuurinen maisema. *Rauhan- ja konfliktintutkimuskeskuksen tutkimuksia* 88, Tampere.
Raitio K 2008. "You can't please everyone". Conflict management practices, frames and institutions in Finnish state forests. *Publications in Social Sciences* 86. University of Joensuu, Joensuu.
Rantala L 2011. Story of the Ä´kkel (Akkala) Sámi. In Mustonen T and Mustonen K (eds). *Eastern Sámi Atlas*, 188–191. Snowchange, Kontiolahti.
Rautio-Helander K 2004. Treatment of Sámi settlement names in Finnmark in official Norwegian place name policy. *Dieđut* 3, 102–121.
Riipinen M 2008. *Sosiaalisen pääoman skaalaus*. Nordia Geographical Publications, Oulu.
Rochelau D & Roth R 2007. Rooted networks, relational webs and power connection: rethinking human and political economies. *Geoforum* 38: 3, 433–437.
Ruotsala H 2004. In the reindeer forest and the tundra. *Pro Ethnologia* 18: 1, 23–48.
Saarikivi J 2002. Kieli suojelee luontoa. *Vihreä Lanka* 7, 10.
Sammallahti P 1989. *Sámi-suoma sáthegirji*. Jorgaleaddju, Ohcejohka.
Sammallahti P 1993. *Saamelaissuomalainen sanakirja: Sámi-suoma-sámi*. Jorgaleaddju, Ohcejohka.
Saugestad S 2009. Besvärliga urfolksrättigheter i Afrika – fallet Kalahari. In Elenius L & Ericsson L (eds). *Är vi inte alla minoriteter i världen?*, 168–182. Ordfront, Stockholm.
Schanche A 2002. Meahcci – den samiske utmarka. *Dieđut* 1, 156–172.
Schanche A 2004. Horizontal and vertical perceptions of Saami landscapes. *Dieđut* 3, 1–10.
Schwartz K 2006. *Nature and National Identity after Communism*. University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh.
Seierstad Å 2008. *Groznyin enkelit*. WSOY, Helsinki.
Semi J 2010. Sisäiset sijainnit. Tutkimus sukupolvien paikkakokemuksista. *Dissertations in Social Sciences and Business Studies* 2. University of Eastern Finland, Joensuu.
Seppänen M 1986. Mikä luonnoista luonnollisin? Ihmisen "kolme luontoa" Keski-Andeilla keramiikan keksimisestä conquistadoreihin. *Kehitysmaantieteen yhdistyksen toimitteita* 16. Helsingin yliopisto, Helsinki.
Setten G 2006. Fusion or exclusion? Reflections on conceptual practices of landscape and place in human geography. *Norsk Geografisk Tidskrift* 60: 1, 32–45.
Sidaway JD, Bunnel T, Grundy-Warr C, Mohammed R, Park BG & Saito A 2004. Translating political geographies. *Political Geography* 23: 8, 1037–1049.
Simonsen K 2004. Networks, flows, and fluids – reimagining spatial analysis? *Environment and Planning A* 36: 8, 1333–1340.
Smith N 2005a. Neo-critical geography, or, the flat pluralist world of business class. *Antipode* 37: 5, 887–899.
Smith M 2005b. Citizens, denizens and the Res Publica: environmental ethics, structures of feeling and political expression. *Environmental Values* 14: 2, 145–162.
Sparke M 1998. A map that roared and an original atlas: Canada, Cartography, and the Narration of nation. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 88: 3, 463–595.
Sparke M 2005. *In the space of theory: postfoundational geographies of the nation-state*. University of the Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
Sparke M 2007. Acknowledging Responsibility For Space. *Progress in Human Geography* 31: 3, 395–402.
Sparke M 2008. Political geography – political geographies of globalization III: resistance. *Progress in Human Geography* 32: 3, 423–440.
Spinoza B 1982. To the most honourable and learned Henry Oldenburg from Benedict de Spinoza, letter 32, in part (written in November 20, 1665). In Feldman S (ed). *The Ethics and selected letters*, 244–246. Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis.
Susiluoto P 2000. Suomen ajan ihmismaantiedettä Petsamosta. In Susiluoto P (ed). *Väinö Tanner. Ihmismaantieteellisiä tutkimuksia Petsamon seudulta*, 3–17. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.

Tanner V 1929a. Petsamon alueen paikannimiä (Résumé: Les noms de lieux du territoire de Petsamo). *Fennia* 49: 3, 1–36.
Tanner V 1929b. Antropogeografiska studier inom Petsamo-området I. Skolt-Lapparna. *Fennia* 49: 4, 1–416.
Thrift N 2008. *Non-representational theory*. Routledge, London.
Urry J 2000. *Sociology beyond societies*. Routledge, London.
Vaden T & Tuusvuori JS 2007. Lappi paljastaa Suomen. *Niin & Näin* 14: 4, 7–10.
Virtanen A 2006. Taloudellinen elämä. In Jakonen M, Peltokoski J & Virtanen A (eds). *Uuden työn sanakirja*, 125–129. Tutkijaliitto, Helsinki.
Vähämäki J 2000. Displacing the means of political control. In Hänninen S & Vähämäki J (eds). *Displacement of politics*, 46–64. SoPhi, Jyväskylä.