Architectural Potential and Indigeneity:
A conversation between Joar Nango and Rebecca Lemire

Rebecca Lemire

Joar Nango works across the fields of art and architecture, as part of a practice which explores the self-sufficiency, resourcefulness, and improvisational competence that is central to the Sámi way of living and creating on the land. Through this work, he is continually challenging formal representations of Sáminess' and western-based definitions of Indigeneity in relation to the design process. On the occasion of his exhibition at Gallery 44, Joar Nango and Rebecca Lemire sat down to speak about his work around Indigenous architecture, symbolism versus pragmatism, and how he would design a space based on Sámi self-governance.

Joar Nango:
I recently read an article about parliament buildings and the architecture of assemblages, and how these designs are connected to our ways of thinking about democracy. The article talked about distinct categories, and the graphics were very well done so you could easily spot the differences between countries such as Britain, Germany, Norway, etc. Looking at these categories, it made me think about Indigenous architecture as a way of rethinking architecture, or even re-thinking democracy and by extension, the world we have structured around us. There is such a huge potential within Indigenous architecture to reimagine these structures, because it is connected to a non-industrial way of living in and on the land.

The Sámi parliament, for example, is a semi-circle; a half lavvu building. It’s interesting because it implies that we have a democracy, which we don’t. We have a parliamentarian system but it’s completely subservient to the Norwegian system. There are no autonomous decisions being made on behalf of the Sámi people there. So in one way, it has a representational quality to it, but really it’s a way of distracting us to make us believe that we are succeeding more than we are. It makes me think about architecture in those ways but without being too direct about it, or being too verbal about it. I think that it would be a really great contribution to the world if we were allowed to keep our old ways of making decisions and created our own societies and parliaments surrounding our way of living. To this effect, architecture can be very productive in terms of considering differences, agreements and borders; all these strange categories that we put on ourselves as human beings on this planet.

Rebecca Lemire:
I’m not sure if that is entirely what you meant, but I think it made me think about Indigenous architecture as a way of rethinking architecture that there is an absurd amount of static symbols, such as the giant Lavvu. Indigenously on the other hand is an attitude, an evasive, pragmatic sort of approach to architecture. It represents an energy, a way of doing and thinking. It is a style that is not recognizable unless you really know the people who created it, and there is also an important humorous, anti-design element to it. That sort of philosophy, that lifestyle, became for me such an obvious alternative to more formal architectural representations. In many ways, it is about the rejection of categories that the outside observer tries to impose on you, and a way of showing resistance through re-appropriating the oppressors' style. Like the idea of 'oh you tell me to wear my shirt like that? I’ll wear it inside out just to annoy you'.

Then again, lets look at it from another point of view. In some cases, a recognizable form and self-representation are very important. For example, with the Sámi in Russia, the people there are working in a political context in which they are made invisible by the state. For them having the visibility and representation is very important.

Joar Nango, Ashtray at the entrance of the Sámi parliament that looks like the Sámi parlaments assembly hall, 2015

In relation to this, have you read the Rasquachismo Manifesto? It is an aspect of Chicano culture, which I learned about through a friend of mine that is about hybrids and mixing vulgarities as a sort of anti-aesthetic way of behaving. It’s about mish-mashing, using the knife and fork the wrong way just to create something new. The manifesto states that ‘Rasquachismo is neither an idea nor a style, but more of an attitude or taste. Taste cannot be codified as a system with a comparative proof.’ It’s a fantastic text. I see a big connection between this Chicano sensibility of hybridization and ‘non-taste’, and the role of the trickster in Indigenous mythology as an evasive, shit-disturber of sorts. I also see it as relating to the Indigenuity project I have been working on for years, which I think is really about anti-representation. I discovered, very quickly, when engaging with Indigenous architecture that there is an absurd amount of static symbols, such as the giant Lavvu. Indigenously on the other hand is an attitude, an evasive, pragmatic sort of approach to architecture. It represents an energy, a way of doing and thinking. It is a style that is not recognizable unless you really know the people who created it, and there is also an important humorous, anti-design element to it. That sort of philosophy, that lifestyle, became for me such an obvious alternative to more formal architectural representations. In many ways, it is about the rejection of categories that the outside observer tries to impose on you, and a way of showing resistance through re-appropriating the oppressors' style. Like the idea of 'oh you tell me to wear my shirt like that? I’ll wear it inside out just to annoy you'.

Then again, lets look at it from another point of view. In some cases, a recognizable form and self-representation are very important. For example, with the Sámi in Russia, the people there are working in a political context in which they are made invisible by the state. For them having the visibility and representation is very important.

Rebecca Lemire:
Are you also talking about the idea of starting with architecture, and having the political system flow from there? I’m not sure if that is entirely what you meant, but I think it might be fruitful to think about.

Joar Nango:
That’s also an interesting concept, but yes, to at least let them follow each other. I have been thinking about this alternative architecture, it would open up, creating this gigantic caravan tent; a space that would serve to counter that issue.

Rebecca Lemire:
By extension, the world we have structured around us. There is such a huge potential within Indigenous architecture to reimagine these structures, because it is connected to a non-industrial way of living in and on the land.

Joar Nango:
Yes, that is relevant in that we took ancient routes and lanes of traffic as a starting point for the installation. The border there between Finland and Norway is very new and you can really feel its effects on the communities. For example, part of the border was erected between these twin villages on the same riverbank that had always had a lot of traffic and exchange between them. We thought it would be interesting to look at the interaction between them and so we established an informal ‘wilderness tour’ - style shuttle to transport people across the border, negotiating and engaging in conversations with people. It’s interesting to think about the shuttle as a kind of flexible space. As we were moving between each twin village, we were engaging by storytelling, parties and gatherings, and we built various improvised structures in these places. At the gas station we used the plexiglass from the shuttle as a kind of flexible space. As we were moving between each twin village, we were engaging by storytelling, parties and gatherings, and we built various improvised structures in these places.
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Joar Nango is an architect with a degree from NTNU in Norway. He works with place-specific installations and self-made publications which explore the boundary between architecture, design and visual art. Thematically speaking, his work relates to questions of indigenous identity, often through investigating the oppositions and contradictions in contemporary architecture. Recently, he has worked on the theme The Modern Sámi Space through, amongst other things, a self-published zine series entitled Sámi Huksendáidda: the Fanzine, design project Sámi Shelters and the mixtape/clothing project Land & Language. He is also a founding member of the architecture collective FFB, which works with temporary installations in urban contexts. Joar’s work has also been exhibited internationally in places like Ukraine, Finland, China, Russia, Colombia and Bolivia. Next year he is invited to exhibit at Documenta 14 in Athens and Kassel.
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