



LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

The Politics of Health and Belonging

A Study of Bunadsgeriljaen



(Bunadsgerilja in a rowboat, 2019)

Renate Valaas Sørvik

Course: GNVM03

Autumn 2020

Genusvetenskapliga Institutionen, Lunds Universitet

Supervisor: Rebecca Selberg

Abstract

This thesis is an exploration of the merging of two discourses – nationalism and feminism – through a case study of the *Bunadsgerilja*, a social movement demonstrating against the shutdowns of maternity wards throughout the districts of Norway. The nationalist framing of the *Bunadsgerilja* and the tensions this bring with it, is explored using Yuval-Davis’s (2011) analysis of ‘politics of belonging’ as well as framing theory, feminist theories on gendered nationalism and intersectionality. This project seeks to understand what framing strategies are used by the *Bunadsgerilja* as well as what tensions between nationalism and progressive (feminist) politics can be identified in these strategies. Lastly, this thesis seeks to understand the potential effects of these framing strategies from a critical feminist perspective. The *Bunadsgerilja* aligns their framing to that of Norwegian nationalism, the regional affiliations and the specific femininity of the *bunad*, the center-periphery debate and the midwife tradition. This strategic framing leads to a reproduction of boundaries of who can belong as well as reproduce a rural identity with old gender stereotypes and a specific femininity. However, what this thesis shows is a progressive appropriation of national symbolism to gain equal health services and women supporting women in the districts.

Keywords: framing, belonging, feminism, gender, nationalism, Bunadsgerilja

Acknowledgements

This thesis was written during a very peculiar year. It was a year of a global pandemic, a year of important conversations (politically and personally), a year of solitude, and hopefully a year that will lead to changes. For myself, this year has been one of thesis work, deep friendships, time in nature, of knitting. But mostly, it has been a year I will always remember as *the* year of self-reflection and development.

A special thank you to my supervisor, Rebecca Selberg. I am so grateful for your guidance, your patience, your words of inspiration and encouragement. I left each conversation with a feeling of motivation and joy. It has been wonderful to experience your knowledge firsthand. Thank you!

This thesis would not have happened had it not been for my partner, Sindre. Your ability to calm me down in every situation is invaluable. From the bottom of my heart, thank you for all your love and wisdom. Thank you for always making me the most delicious meals and for giving me coffee in bed before you leave for work. You know the way to my heart is through food (and coffee).

A big thank you to my friends from Lund University. These years of studying has been incredible, thanks to you. I am so glad to have met you all. Thank you, Anna Charlotte, for being the other half of our duo. Thank you, Anette, Ane and Sunniva, my dearest friends. Lastly, I am grateful for my little sister, my mum and dad, my grandparents, as well as the rest of our family. We are a weird and wonderful constellation of both chosen as well as biological family members, and I am grateful for being a part of it.

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Thesis statement	5
1.2	Background	6
1.3	Previous research	9
1.3.1	Framing and nationalist discourses	9
1.3.2	Resistance against financial cuts.....	11
2	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	14
2.1	Framing.....	15
2.2	Belonging and the politics of belonging.....	16
2.2.1	The politics of belonging	17
2.3	Gendered nationalism and intersectionality	18
2.3.1	Biological reproducers of the nation.....	19
2.3.2	Explorations of intersections	20
3	METHODS	22
3.1	What is framing analysis?	22
3.2	Material.....	23
3.3	How have I chosen to do it?.....	24
3.4	Ethical considerations.....	25
3.5	Reflexivity	26
4	NORWAY’S PARADOXICAL POSTCOLONIAL NATIONALISM	29
4.1	Attributing blame.....	30
4.2	Understanding the concept of nation and nationalism in the Norwegian context	30
4.2.1	The Existence of a “Norwegian Postcolonial Nationalism”	32
4.3	Who belongs to the nation/who belongs to the movement?	33
4.4	Requirements of representation.....	36
5	THE STRATEGIC USE OF NATIONAL GARMENTS.....	38
5.1	Constructions of national symbols of belonging.....	38
5.2	The national costume – an expression of a particular, national identity.....	40

5.3	Preservation and celebration of national achievement - Who can wear a <i>bunad</i> ?	43
5.4	The <i>bunad</i> as a representation of a specific femininity	44
6	A FIGHT FROM THE PERIPHERY	47
6.1	The postcolonial idea manifests itself in the center-periphery debate.....	48
6.1.1	Centre-periphery	49
6.2	Midwife tradition	51
7	CONCLUSION	54
	REFERENCES	57



(*Bunadsgerilja on top of mountain*, 2019)

1 Introduction

During the last two decades, Norway has witnessed a political and economic trend in which privatizations, centralizations and mergers together with cutbacks have resulted in decreased accessibility of and quality in public healthcare (Hunshamar & Lien, 2019; Kvam, 2019). These developments have caused uproars among different segments of the population. One of the most vocal and, indeed, successful critics is a group which goes by the name the *Bunadsgerilja*. This “guerilla” movement, however, clothed in Norway’s national costume, the *bunad*—a costume which in the Norwegian context carries a “profound symbolic significance” (Eriksen, 2004)—did not initially form to combat such general and decades-long processes of privatization and centralization. The movement was ignited, as social movements often are, by a particular instance of such larger processes—a grievance which, one might argue, symbolizes the whole conflict between center and periphery altogether. What initially rallied the *bunad*-wearing activists was—in the context of a national struggle against centralization, or, indeed, a global struggle against the deprioritization of women’s health—a rather small conflict of the merger of two maternity wards in the small North-Western municipalities of Kristiansund and Molde.

However minor, such a merger would have significant consequences for the 56,000 people residing in the region.¹ Although the drive between the two maternity wards is “only” an hour and half, for those living in more rural parts, it could take more than three hours (depending on the ferries and traffic) to access such a ward. For women in labor, this would be, to say the least, both highly stressful and potentially very difficult (Eidhammer, 2009).

In order to mobilize the population for this cause, the *Bunadsgerilja*'s has efficiently utilized national symbols. The most striking visual feature is their use of the *bunad*, as illustrated in the image below (*Bunadsgerilja in front of the Storting*, 2019). As part of their activism, the guerilla uses social media to post pictures of activists in national costumes, posing on mountain tops and on locations that are well-known in the rest of the country. They also do stunt performances; organize demonstrations at hospital board meetings and outside of government buildings; they participate in the 1th of May-parade; some members of the guerilla have even quit their jobs in nursing or midwifery in protest (Hunshamar & Lien, 2019; Kvam, 2019). One of the guerilla's stunt performances consisted of rowing pregnant women around for five hours in a boat, the time it took to transport women in labor to the hospital back in the 1920s (Garden, 2019). The national costume has been used as a garment of protest in political disputes in Norway for 150 years (Kvam, 2019; Haugsvær, 2016; Jakobsen, 2014). National costumes were used as a sign of national identity during the period of the National Romantic movement of the late 19th and early 20th century, and as a sign of protest towards the elites and the union with Sweden (Jakobsen, 2014). Even in later years, the national costume has been used as a “symbol of Norwegianness, rootedness and regional origins” and wearing a *bunad* “is a statement about identity” (Eriksen, 2004). Norwegians own around 2,5 million national costumes, estimated to be worth around 30 billion Norwegian Kroner (Kvam, 2019).

¹ The most updated population data is taken from SSB, 2020a; 2020b.



(Bunadsgerilja in front of the Storting 2019)

As for the choice of name, a guerrilla (Norwegian: gerilja) can be defined as “an unofficial military group that is trying to change the government by making sudden, unexpected attacks on the official army forces” (Cambridge Dictionary, 2020). As an adjective, something or someone described as guerrilla means they are “using unusual methods to create or get attention for” ones “ideas, art, products, etc.” (Cambridge Dictionary, 2020). In terms of terminology, the word originates from the “duke of Wellington’s campaigns during the Peninsular War (1808-14), in which Spanish and Portuguese irregulars, or guerrilleros, helped drive the French from the Iberian Peninsula” (Cambridge Dictionary, 2020). Guerrillas have historically been called rebels, irregulars, or even barbarians and savages by opponents. Guerrilla warfare can take on many perspectives: “to the world it may be presented as liberating a country from a colonial yoke or from an invader’s rule; to the peasant it may be freedom from serfdom, from oppressive rents to absentee landlords, or from taxation; to a middle-class citizen it may be establishment or restoration of representative government as opposed to a military or totalitarian dictatorship” (Asprey, 2019). However, whether it is “real or artificial”, if it is “inspired by political ideology”, religion or nationalism, or “a genuine desire for a better life” – guerrilla warfare is often “fundamental in motivating people to armed action” (Asprey, 2019).

By successfully mobilizing the population, the *Bunadsgerilja* has turned into a nation-wide social grassroots movement, and now consists of around 100 000 members from around the country (Bjørnstad, 2019). The *Bunadsgerilja* is a people's movement, an uproar by the people, from the people, according to the movement's own description (Solvik, 2019e). The leader of the *Bunadsgerilja*, Anja Cecilie Solvik, has been wearing her *bunad* daily since the launch of the movement. In fact, she has committed to wearing the garment until the maternity ward in Kristiansund has been saved (Bjørnstad, 2019).



(The *Bunadsgerilja* posing on a bridge, 2019)

I was drawn to the *Bunadsgerilja* when I first noticed the news about their stunt performances. My immediate reaction was to send the images to my family, asking if they had heard of this group before. I grew up in a town located in the same region as Kristiansund, where the closure of a maternity ward initially led to the start of the *Bunadsgerilja*. I am familiar with the history of difficulties concerning the lack of access to health care facilities and the issues that arise when there is a great distance between cities with health service. Additionally, with several family members working in health care, as well as five years of experience as a seasonal worker in a public care facility, I am aware of the consequences that come with tight budgets, heavy

workloads, lack of a sufficient number of employees, low wages and a stressful work environment. I have, as have others, anticipated some type of uproar for a while.

When given some thought, it also struck me as unique and interesting the way in which the group presented itself. The name: *bunad*, a familiar thing associated with national history, tradition, and celebration of national liberation, and *Gerilja*, the Norwegian word for guerrilla, giving associations of war, riots, chaos. The gestures: fist held high; flexing muscles; frustrated, serious faces. The locations of demonstration: places of grandiose nature, monuments, the *Storting* (Parliament), locations that are well-known to the population, and carry a sense of national pride. And last, but not least: the garment they all were wearing, the *bunad*. I find the use of the *bunad* interesting in a group that calls itself feminist, seeing as how traditional, national garments are often used as political props by conservative groups whose outlooks are thought of as parochial (cf. Berlet 2011; Elgenius 2011). Indeed, as will be explored further below, the *Bunadsgerilja* illustrates a peculiar merging of two discourses—nationalism and feminism—which are often in opposition. This merging, however, is not merely a theoretical puzzle for the feminist researcher to solve; it is also a personal conflict in which my many positive associations with the garment itself—both symbolically and aesthetically—needs to be reconciled with how its symbolism and aesthetics serve to exclude those to whom such a costume signals exclusion rather than inclusion. Such a framing of the movement—the use of the *bunad* in the *Bunadsgerilja*—is, in other words, engaged in what Yuval Davis has powerfully conceptualized as “politics of belonging.” By critically investigating these frames, how, through them, discourses of nationalism and feminism are engaged and united, and how such frames have important consequences of inclusion and exclusion, we can better understand the specific politics of belonging the *Bunadsgerilja* engages.

1.1 Thesis statement

This thesis explores the *nationalist* framing of a *feminist* activist group, the Norwegian *Bunadsgerilja*, and the tensions between these two political formations detectable in the group’s official communication, primarily on social media (Facebook).

The purpose of this thesis consists of three elements:

1. To uncover the ideas that form the basis of the *Bunadsgerilja*’s practices of activism.
2. To critically explore the relationship between the group’s feminist politics and its reliance on national symbols to communicate their demands

3. To critically explore, from a feminist intersectional perspective, issues of belonging, inclusion and exclusion in relation to the movement's choice of relying on national symbols.

This thesis is based on feminist sociologist Nira Yuval-Davis's (2011) analysis of 'politics of belonging', as well as social movement research, particularly theories of framing (Goffman, 1974; Benford & Snow, 2000; Snow & Benford, 1988; Snow et al, 1986). The thesis explores how different strategies are used to construct a sense of belonging for the *Bunadsgerilja*. Framing theory is used to analyze the ways in which a sense of belonging is constructed by the *Bunadsgerilja*. My first research question is therefore:

What framing strategies are used by the Bunadsgerilja?

A central issue explored in this thesis deals with how the project of mobilizing a population through various framing strategies serves a political function whereby some are included and others are excluded. In order to understand this, I will rely on feminist theories on gendered nationalism (Farris, 2017; Enloe, 2014; Calhoun, 1997; Yuval-Davis, 1997; 2011) and intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991). As such, this project seeks to understand both belonging and the politics thereof, by answering the first, and the two following research questions:

What tensions between nationalism and progressive (feminist) politics can be identified in the strategies employed by the Bunadsgerilja?

How can we understand the potential effects of these framing strategies from a critical feminist perspective?

1.2 Background

In the 1960s, the Norwegian maternity wards peaked in the number of beds available for maternity care. Since then, the number of maternity wards has declined in Norway, seeing as the number of women giving birth in hospitals have increased. However, with great distance between hospitals, it has been necessary for the existence of maternity wards throughout Norway, in particular the Northern regions of the country (Thonstad, 2007, 190). In the 1970s and 1980s, the percentage of state-run hospitals increased (Thonstad, 2007, 193). The operation of hospitals has developed from welfare localism to centralized state-governance (Byrkjeflot & Grønlie, 2005). This has happened through a range of reforms. The government got more and

more involved in the control of resources during the 1990s. Amongst the reforms was the implementation of waiting-time guarantee in 1991, a financial system related to diagnosis (DRG-system) in 1997, the reform of unified management in 1999 and the free choice of hospitals in 2001 (Byrkjeflot & Gulbrandsøy, 2013, 474). In 2002, all publicly owned hospitals were transferred from the county council to the state, a centralization of ownership through what is known as the Hospital Reform (Thonstad, 2007, 193). The ownership is now run through a business model in which the roles are divided – the ownership role is executed through regulations, boards and business meetings while the second role concerns “making sure everything goes right” (Byrkjeflot & Gulbrandsøy, 2013, 474). This role is divided again between the regional enterprise, the health inspectorate, and the Norwegian Directorate of Health. The Hospital Reform was justified as a wish to have a stronger central government management, as well as a bigger local freedom of action (Christensen, Læg Reid & Stigen, 2004).

The reform was a typical New-Public-Management reform, inspired by management ideas and practices of the private sectors. The reforms that stemmed from the execution of this managerial or administrative ideology generally implied a “new public-sector focus on efficiency, structural devolution, disaggregation, competition” and management principles advocating “both decentralization (let the managers manage) and centralization (make the managers manage)” (Christensen & Læg Reid, 2007, 8). Yet, such a change had important political implications. A new-found focus on economy and efficiency conflicted with “political-administrative systems traditionally characterized by multiple goals and means, where economic aspects were only one of many considerations” (Christensen & Læg Reid, 2007, 15).

Moreover, the reforms accentuated the long-standing cleavages between Norway’s urban centers and the rest of the country. While hospitals in Norway have, indeed, traditionally not been centerpieces in conflicts between the center and the periphery—being to a large extent isolated from such conflicts—the reforms forced local hospitals, which that had previously only been involved in local struggles and competitions against each other for resources, to merge and work together in new cooperative relations (Byrkjeflot & Gulbrandsøy, 2013, 466). The conflicts of previous generations still existed, but hospitals were now supposed to cooperate on a tight budget across vast distances. This is how the *Bunadsgerilja* came to place. The Møre and Romsdal Hospital Trust operates the hospitals, institutions, and healthcare wards throughout the region in which the *Bunadsgeriljas* activism arose, and the Hospital Trust delivers health services to some 265 000 inhabitants across an area of about 15,000 square kilometers (Helse Møre and Romsdal, 2019). The board of the Trust has been struggling

financially for years, and in 2019 implemented financial cuts and mergers to become more efficient and sustainable (Reite, 2019). The trust spends over capacity to build a new hospital that will eliminate the financial struggles of the hospital services in the region, while not having sufficient finances for the daily operations (Reite, 2019). The inability to stabilize the economy has been heavily criticized (Bjerknes, 2019; NRK Møre and Romsdal, 2019). Employees have been interviewed saying they have reached their limits, that the work tasks are growing, and the resources are decreasing (Pedersen & Røsvik, 2019).

The initial phase for the formation of the *Bunadsgerilja* began in 2014, as artist Anja Cecilie Skogvik donated two artworks to the local hospital in Kristiansund as the news of the building of a new hospital had broadcasted – one of which was donated to the maternity ward (Solvik, 2019a). Symbolically, she had at the bottom of the painting written that the painting was not to be brought over mountains. When the decision was made to shut down the maternity ward, the artist wanted to do a stunt performance for the maternity ward in order to gain widespread attention of its closure. She posed in front of the painting for a photo, wearing her national garment, “flexing her muscles” (Solvik, 2019b). She posted the picture, encouraging others to join in. It started spreading, and people from the area were joining in – wearing their national garments, posing in front of local attractions, at work, on mountains, posting the pictures on social media, sharing the same posts of others doing the same. A grassroot movement had begun (Solvik, 2019c). Soon, people from other parts of the country were doing the same, supporting the movement in Kristiansund, as well as shedding light on similar situations throughout the districts. The movement grew bigger, resulting in torch light demonstrations, silent demonstrations outside of the government, weekly feature stories in newspapers, a Facebook page that grew in size daily, and public attention on the televised news as well as in other countries (Flem, 2019; Schistad, 2019; Kristoffersen, 2019; Kjølmoen, 2019; Løset & Skare, 2019).



(Anja Cecilie Solvik wearing a bunad and flexing muscles in the Kristiansund maternity ward, 2019)

1.3 Previous research

In the following section, I will provide an overview of the research field in which I place my thesis: research about framing of feminism and nationalism, and research about resistance of financial cuts in the welfare sector.

1.3.1 Framing and nationalist discourses

This thesis draws on recent research on overlaps between feminist and nationalist politics in different contexts. Several scholars have noted that women's and feminist movements are now increasingly relying on nationalist or 'patriotic' symbols and/or discourses. Jennifer Ramme (2019) investigates the framings of feminist and nationalist movements in Poland, and the links

“between patriotism, nationalism and feminism” (480). The author discusses a discursive shift from one where feminism and nationalism are in opposition, to one where feminist organizations include patriotism to combat right-wing nationalism. One example is that of the massive Women’s Strike in October 2016 against a legislative initiative introducing a total ban on abortion. The Women’s Strike deployed patriotic rhetoric and made use of “national symbols and categories of belonging” (Ramme, 2019, 469). Symbols of “female body parts were transformed into symbols of resistance and appeared on signs and banners, taking the battle over national symbols to another level, as it became a matter of popular feminist resistance” (Ramme, 2019, 475). The author investigates this discursive shift and asks what “it means for feminist politics and female solidarity when belonging is framed in different ways” (Ramme, 2019, 469). In Poland, feminist patriotism has been introduced into mainstream feminist public discourse, at the same time as there has been a general shift towards right-wing nationalism. The author understands belonging “first of all as an analytical category describing an organizing principle, which is formulated as an alternative category to that of “identity”” (Ramme, 2019, 470). The article “applies a critical perspective to the nationalization of feminist discourse and practices” (Ramme, 2019, 470). However, as Ramme argues, this shift in discourse does not “automatically indicate that feminism in Poland has in general turned patriotic or nationalist” (2019, 480). Rather, it teaches us that there exists no natural “contradiction between feminism and nationalism”, and that opposition to right-wing nationalism “might not necessarily indicate a critical stance towards nationalism per se” (Ramme, 2019, 480). The important result in Ramme’s research is that feminists and feminist organizations are not “immune to chauvinism, xenophobia, racism, nativism and all kinds of right-wing, identitarian ideologies” (Ramme, 2019, 480).

Similarly, in Phillips’ (2019) article on feminism and nationalism in Ukraine, the author examines “the active and important – yet rather overlooked – participation of Ukraine’s women in the 2013-14 Maidan protests, focusing especially on feminist initiatives that contributed to and grew out of the Maidan” (415). Maidan was a protest “rooted in the Ukrainian national idea, actively promoted by nationalist, far-right political parties” (Phillips, 2019, 415). Phillips (2019) suggests that the Maidan was “a productive space for Ukraine’s feminists, providing opportunities for the articulation of divergent yet reconcilable perspectives on women’s activism, social change, and national sovereignty” (415). Phillips’ analysis shows that the Ukrainian women were creative in the way they included women’s rights activism into nationalism and nation-building.

While one might be critical of how nationalistic symbols are incorporated into feminist struggles, it is nevertheless vital to also critically evaluate the supposed universality of feminism. Using postmodern concepts, Jacoby (1999) draws “from the Palestinian women’s movement as a point of entry into reconceptualizing the relationship between nationalism, feminism, and difference in the Middle East” (511). The author proposes that the notion of “a universal sisterhood is a privileged platform from which questions of power, justice, and difference *among* women are made relatively invisible” and that it is necessary to discuss the difference between “Western and non-Western feminisms” as well as various types of nationalisms (Jacoby, 1999, 521). I am inspired by this article as it powerfully demonstrates the challenge Palestinian women’s agency has to Orientalist accounts and take with me reflections on the positionality of each unique relationship between feminism and nationalism. Jacoby (1999) argues that more research needs to be done “to fully capture the different axes of female identity construction and their relationship to national and transnational feminist agendas”, and this is one of the goals with the study of the *Bunadsgerilja* (521).

This thesis thus builds on emerging scholarship on the relationship between feminism and nationalism, which has already established, through various case studies, the complex interplay between women’s participation in political processes, feminism’s role in contemporary popular movements across the globe, and the continuing significance of discourses of nationalism/patriotism.

1.3.2 Resistance against financial cuts

Another significant field of research relevant to this thesis is studies on the politicization of care. Selberg (2019) illustrates the “ways in which interest groups may take advantage of expanding opportunity structures in the wake of internationalization, all the while framing their arguments in ways that create resonance with national and nationalist discourses” (1). This is done through analyzing both the pro- and the anti-abortion movements in Sweden, examining the “arguments presented in courts and in print media to support and oppose the introduction of conscientious objection for healthcare workers in Sweden” (Selberg, 2019, 1-2). Selberg’s study shows that “interest groups and social movements are taking advantage of more open opportunity structures that follow from internationalization, whilst being able to successfully adapt frames to local contexts and pursue resonance with national self-image and nationalist imaginings” (2019, 21).

The opportunities provided to social movements by specific structures is explored by Granberg & Nygren (2017), who analyze “an episode of collective resignation” by Swedish nurses in the face of neoliberalism. The authors explore the “opportunities for collective action by specialist nurses that arise from healthcare restructuring” (Granberg & Nygren, 2017, 66). The local conflict studied in their article intersected with a gendered narrative on nursing, and the collective mobilization was framed in “terms of the improvement of women’s social position and expressed in gender-equality rhetoric” which resulted in “a sizeable raise for a group of mainly female workers; in this sense, collective resignation challenged established forms of gendering” (Granberg & Nygren, 2017, 66). This article connects to this thesis because of its use of frame analysis where the authors analyze the collective action frame, which is a similar method as to the one I will be using, as well as its focus on the situation of Swedish nurses in a neoliberal structure, which is closely related to the situation in Norway which led to the existence of the *Bunadsgerilja* in the first place.

Bengtsson (2018) presents and analyses “two cases of contentious collective mobilization in the Swedish contemporary society” as politicization of caring (164). The article “addresses gendered labour struggles and collective action following neoliberal restructuring of human service organisations” in contemporary Sweden (Bengtsson, 2018, 164). Bengtsson explores contentious mobilization among “different occupational groups working within welfare services and in the health care sector”, aiming to “present an argument as to why the concept of a politicization of caring is analytically useful in order for us to explore and understand the collective contentious mobilization that is taking place in Sweden” (Bengtsson, 2018, 164-165). This theory on “a politicization of caring allows us to acknowledge and explore collective mobilization and analytically relate this to relations of power involved with professionalism, proletarianization and gender” (Bengtsson, 2018, 178). For both cases, “the reason to mobilise has been to draw public and political attention to *deteriorated working conditions* following neoliberal restructuring of work organisations” (Bengtsson, 2018, 178). Bengtsson problematizes how gendered relations of power are related to care work, which is of inspiration when writing this thesis. Also, because the two cases of politicisation of caring “undertaken in these two cases can be understood as collective strategies aimed to safeguard a professional knowledge base and to negotiate a professional jurisdiction that involves empathy and a caring commitment for patients and clients in an increasingly hostile environment” (Bengtsson, 2018, 179).

My thesis contributes to the increasingly central feminist research tradition of politicization of care, by building on previous studies on movement mobilization centered on healthcare workers.

2 Theoretical framework

To answer the research questions posed in this thesis, I base my research on Yuval-Davis's analysis of 'politics of belonging' (2011) and on theories of framing (Goffman, 1974; Benford & Snow, 2000; Snow & Benford, 1988; Snow et al, 1986). This thesis attempts to explore and understand how different strategies are used to construct a sense of belonging for the *Bunadsgerilja*. I will first elaborate on theories on social movements, framing theories in particular, which will be an important tool both theoretically and methodologically for this thesis. The concepts I will use from framing theory will be thoroughly explained, before I move on to introduce Yuval-Davis's analysis of 'politics of belonging', which will be a guiding theoretical analysis for this thesis (2011). Yuval-Davis's proposes three analytical facets of belonging: social location, identification and ethical and political values. Contestations of the boundaries of these facets of belonging leads to the 'politics of belonging' – contestations of who physically or symbolically belongs to a certain group. This is of importance, seeing as framing strategies are used to mobilize members and supporters of the *Bunadsgerilja*, while also creating boundaries for inclusion and exclusion. To understand this creation of boundaries, I rely on feminist theories on gendered nationalism (Farris, 2017; Enloe, 2014; Calhoun, 1997; Yuval-Davis, 1997; 2011) and intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991).

What are social movements, and why do people study them? Social movements are distinct, social processes that consists of mechanisms through which actors engage in collective action. These actors share a *distinct collective identity* by which they are recognizable to others, they are linked by informal networks and are involved in discrepancies with opponents (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, 20). In other words, social movements are not just protest events, but the development of collective identities, and this goes "beyond specific events and initiatives" (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, 21). Social movement actors engage in "political and/or cultural conflicts meant to promote or oppose social change" (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, 21). A social movement process is "in place to the extent that both individual and organized actors, while keeping their autonomy and independence, engage in sustained exchanges of resources in pursuit of common goals" (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, 21).

There are several ways of studying social movements, however for the purpose of this thesis I chose to focus on framing theory as the theoretical approach that will help enlighten my investigation of the *Bunadsgerilja*. Framing theory can function both as a theoretical base for studying a social movement, but also as a methodological approach for *how* to study it. In this

thesis, framing theory is both my theoretical and methodological approach. This will be explained further in the next chapter on methods.

2.1 Framing

The framing perspective is a major dimension of the social movement theory (Johnston & Alimi, 2013, 453). Framing implies strategic efforts in order to organize experience conceptually, constructing meaning of ideals, interests, ideas and goals so that they cohere (Goffman 1974; Benford & Snow, 2000). The terms “frame” and “framework” are borrowed from Goffman (1974, 21) to “denote ‘schemata of interpretation’ that enable individuals to “locale, perceive, identify, and label” occurrences within their life space and the world at large” (Snow et al, 1986, 466). Actors within movements do signifying work – work which constructs meaning – which Benford and Snow defines as “the struggle over the production of mobilizing and countermobilizing ideas and meanings” (2000, 613). Movement actors are actively “engaged in the production and maintenance of meaning for constituents, antagonists, and bystanders or observers” (Snow & Benford, 1988). This signifying work is what social movement scholars call “framing” (Snow et al, 1986; Snow & Benford, 1988). The result of the framing is what is called “collective action frames” (Benford & Snow, 2000, 614). The concept of collective action frames was introduced by Snow et al (1986). and through collective action frames, “activists identify problems, diagnose their causes, propose solutions, and give reasons for collective action” (Reese & Newcombe, 2003, 294).

According to Snow & Benford (1998; 1992; Benford & Snow, 2000), collective action frames consist of two features: their action-oriented function and their interactive, discursive processes “that attend to these core framing tasks and thus are generative of collective action frames” (Snow & Benford, 2000, 615). Their action-oriented function, a social movement organization’s ‘core framing tasks’, is what need to be conducted by social movements “in order to achieve consensus and produce action” (Snow & Benford, 1988, 199). Snow & Benford (1988) suggests that there are three core framing tasks:

“(1) a diagnosis of some event or aspect of social life as problematic and in need of alteration; (2) a proposed solution to the diagnosed problem that specifies what needs to be done; and (3) a call to arms or rationale for engaging in ameliorative or corrective action” (199)

The first core framing task, diagnostic framing, consists of identifying a problem and attributing blame or causality (Snow & Benford, 1988, 200). The second core framing task, prognostic framing, consists of specifying what needs to be done: suggesting solutions, identify strategies, tactics and targets (Snow & Benford, 1988, 201). The third core framing task, motivational framing, consists of developing motivational frames that functions as a call to arms or *rationale for action* (Snow & Benford, 1988, 201). If the core framing tasks of the framing process is successful it creates frame resonance. This implies that the framing process is a strategic one.

For this thesis, the focus will be on strategic processes. By strategic processes, “we refer to framing processes that are deliberative, utilitarian, and goal directed: Frames are developed and deployed to achieve a specific purpose – to recruit new members, to mobilize adherents, to acquire resources, and so forth. Strategic efforts by social movement organizations to link their interests and interpretive frames with those of prospective constituents and actual or prospective resource providers were initially conceptualized as “frame alignment processes” (Snow et al 1986)” (Benford & Snow, 2000, 624). There are four basic alignment processes: frame bridging, frame amplification, frame extension, and frame transformation. For the purpose of this thesis, I will elaborate on just one of these, namely frame amplification. Frame amplification is the “clarification and invigoration of an interpretive frame that bears on a particular issue, problem or set of events” (Snow et al, 1986, 469). Frame amplification “involves the idealization, embellishment, clarification, or invigoration of existing values or beliefs. Given that one of the key factors affecting whether or not a proffered frame resonates with potential constituents has to do with the extent to which the frame taps into existing cultural values, beliefs, narratives, folk wisdom, and the like” (Benford & Snow, 2000, 624).

2.2 Belonging and the politics of belonging

In this thesis, I wish to explore, through the use of framing theory, how the *Bunadsgerilja* uses certain strategies to construct a sense of belonging. The idea of belonging has been studied in many different ways, but for this thesis I chose to follow Nira Yuval-Davis’ understanding of both belonging and the politics of belonging. According to Yuval-Davis, belonging is “about an emotional (or even ontological) attachment, about feeling ‘at home’” (2011, 10). People can belong in an abstract or in a concrete way, through personal identification or identification by others, but it is always a dynamic process (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 12). The notion of belonging can be separated in three analytical facets: social location, identification and ethical and political values. People belong to different social and economic locations, such as sex, race, class, nation,

age group, kinship group or profession, and this tends to “carry with them particular weights in the grids of power relations operating in society” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 13). This means that certain categories of locations have certain “positionalities along axes of power that are higher or lower than other such categories”, and these are often fluid and contested (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 13). However, these are not constructed only along one power vector of difference, which is why “the intersectional approach to social locations is so vitally important” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 13).

The second analytical facet, identification, are stories “people tell themselves and others about who they are” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 14). Identities can be individual or collective, they can be “reproduced from generation to generation” but always in a selective way, as they can “shift and change, be contested and multiple”, they can “relate to the past, to a myth of origin; they can be aimed to explain the present and probably; above all, they function as a projection of future trajectory” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 14). Yuval-Davis argues that identity narratives can be both verbal and constructed as forms of practices, embodied narrations, and these embodied narrations “are even more crucial in the construction and reproduction of collective identities” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 14). As identities are constructed, they also create boundaries. Butler (1993) argues that the “construction of identities depends on excess – there is always something left outside, once the boundaries of specific identities have been constructed. In this sense all identities are exclusive, as well as inclusive” (In Yuval-Davis, 2011, 17). Inclusion or exclusion is often “not mutual, depending on the power positionality and normative values of the social actors as well as, and in relation to, their cognitive and emotional identifications” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 17-18).

The third analytical facet, ethical and political values, concerns the way social locations and identities are “assessed and valued by the self and others” which can be done in “many different ways by people with similar social locations who might identify themselves as belonging to the same community or grouping” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 18). Talking about the boundaries, of how “identity and categorical boundaries are being/should be drawn” and the contestations around these boundaries, means moving on to the politics of belonging.

2.2.1 The politics of belonging

Yuval-Davis (2011) argues that the “politics of belonging” is not merely the construction of political boundaries, but also the political functions such boundaries serve: those that have the power to construct political boundaries are also involved in including some people or some

groups and others. Accordingly, defining who belongs and who does not is a highly political function which helps to construct different “hegemonic political projects of belonging” which represents “different symbolic power orders” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 19). Such symbolic powers are therefore crucial in political projects of belonging, especially as it “sometimes physically, but always symbolically, separate the world population into ‘us’ and ‘them’.” Moreover, the politics of belonging is not only involved in struggles to defined who belongs and who does not, but also what belonging *is*, “what is involved in belonging, in being a member of such a community” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 18-20). As she argues, in order to make sense of “the contestations involved in different constructions of belonging promoted by different political projects of belonging, we need to look at what is required from a specific person in order for her/him to be entitled to belong, or be considered as belonging, to the collectivity” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 20). As such, “in different projects of the politics of belonging, the different facets of belonging – social locations, identities and ethical and political values – can become the requisites of belonging and the delineation of boundaries” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 21).

Belonging, therefore, is not binary. One cannot simply delineate by drawing boundaries those who belong and those who do not. On the one hand, some who are categorized as belonging to a group might feel in some situations that they are and others that they are not. On the other, while some might define themselves as belonging to a certain group, others would have them excluded. To capture the complex relations that are involved in the politics of belonging, Davis highlights the importance of an “intersectional analytical perspective” by which “some of the differential effects that different political projects of belonging have had on different members of these collectivities who are differently located and/or with different identifications and normative value systems” is interrogated (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 200).

2.3 Gendered nationalism and intersectionality

The *Bunadsgerilja* is a social movement that came about as a result of politics that undermine reproductive work. This is what Nancy Fraser calls the “crisis of care” (Fraser, 2017). The “crisis of care” refers to pressures “from several directions that are currently squeezing a key set of social capabilities: the capacities available for birthing and raising children, caring for friends and family members, maintaining households and broader communities, and sustaining connections more generally” (Fraser, 2017, 21). Historically seen as women’s work, this work of “social reproduction” is “indispensable to society” (Fraser, 2017, 21). Fraser (2017) argues that the capitalist society undermines social reproduction, which causes a major crisis of care

and social reproduction in the broader sense (21). Studies on social reproduction is important to understand the historical and on-going undermining of the so-called women's work, and seeing as studies on this topic exists in plenty, this thesis will rather focus on understanding social movements and belonging – the answer to the “crisis of care”, exemplified through a study of the *Bunadsgerilja*.

2.3.1 Biological reproducers of the nation

A nation is “an idea, a powerful idea” (Enloe, 2014, 94). The basis of this idea is the “image of a collection of people who have come to believe that they have been shaped by a common past and are destined to share a common future”, often with a shared language and a feeling of being distinct from other groups (Enloe, 2014, 94). Benedict Anderson (1983) defines the nation as an imagined community, seeing as the members of a nation “will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (Anderson, 1983, 6). A nation is imagined as *limited*, seeing as it has “finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations” (Anderson, 1983, 7). A nation is imagined as a community, as a “deep, horizontal comradeship” (Anderson, 1983, 7). The nation exists in the minds of the members of the nation, viewing themselves as belonging to that nation. Calhoun talks about the “rhetorics of nations”, and sees nationalism as either a discourse, producing the idea of the nation, as a project pursued by social movements, or as an evaluation, political and cultural ideologies claiming superiority to other nations (Calhoun, 1997, 6). Yuval-Davis & Anthias (1989) argue for no difference between ethnic, racial and national collectivities – these collectivities have in common that they all construct their boundaries as a divide between ‘us’ and ‘them’. These boundaries are usually constructed around myths of common origin and/or common destiny.

In several ancient cultures, nations or cities are represented by the means of a female body. Women “have come to embody, or symbolize, the nation” (Farris, 2017, 69). By portraying the nation as a female body, the nationalist political project becomes naturalized (Farris, 2017, 69). Although the nation is an ‘imagined community’, a ‘powerful idea’, by portraying it as a female body or the body of a woman “from the people”, it becomes naturalized, which allows for and reinforces its naturalization (Farris, 2017, 69). This leads ultimately to what can be called gendered nationalism. According to Farris (2017, the representation of the nation embodied as a woman evokes notions “of “genesis”, “birth”, and the “ancestry”, thus operating as a powerful performative metaphor for nationalism’s invocation of myths of common origin, common

blood, and kinship” (70). Women have been “linked to the nation in a twofold manner: qua members of the collectivity, and therefore subjected to the duty of loyalty required from all members, and qua women, thus bearers of ascribed roles and distinct tasks, above all that of reproducing the nation” (Farris, 2017, 71). The identification of women “not as individuals but rather as “bearers of the collective” and “biological reproducers of the nation”” lies at the heart of nationalist projects (Farris, 2017, 72; Yuval-Davis, 1997).

2.3.2 Explorations of intersections

Intersectionality, “the relationships among multiple dimensions and modalities of social relations and subject formations” is, according to McCall (2005) the “most important theoretical contribution that women’s studies, in conjunction with related fields, has made so far” (1771). The term ‘intersectionality’ originates from Black Feminist scholar Crenshaw (1991), a feminist critical legal- and race theorist who argues that intersectionality originated as a challenge towards “white middle-class women’s dominance in the women’s movement and black men’s dominance in anti-racist organizations” (Christensen & Jensen, 2012, 109-110). Crenshaw argued for the explorations of intersections between race and gender, however, the concept of intersectionality ought to also be used to explore other issues such as “class, sexual orientation, age, and color” (Crenshaw, 1991, 1245).

In this thesis, intersectionality will be used as a guiding perspective of what is excluded from the framing of the *Bunadsgerilja*. Intersectionality is used here as a prism to critically investigate who belongs in groups relying on nationalist frames. While the thesis does not engage explicitly with race, or the intersections of gender, race and class, it does engage with the issues of gender and race implicitly through the concept of belonging in the nation. Yuval-Davis (2011) understands belonging as intersectionally produced. It is crucial to look at the exclusion and inclusion of the framing of the *Bunadsgerilja*, when researching it from the viewpoint of the politics of belonging. Edenborg (2017) argues that “since narratives of nationhood involve specific ideas of how ‘our’ women and men are, even persons perceived to linguistically, racially and ethnically qualify for national belonging, may be excluded insofar as they do not conform to the gendered and sexualized norms upon which the specific nationalism relies” (Mosse, 1985, Yuval-Davis, 1997 in Edenborg, 2017, 23).

In the analysis that follows this chapter, there will be a discussion about the colonial period of Scandinavia and the nation building process and the postcolonial Norway. I view the material from the perspective of intersectional theory and postcolonialism in the broad sense of the word.

Frame analysis is used as a guiding tool to understand the *Bunadsgeriljas* collective action frame. The collective action frame will be investigated through the concepts of the “core framing tasks”, mainly the prognostic framing and the motivational framing. By looking at the *Bunadsgeriljas* strategic framing processes, in other words, the frame amplification the *Bunadsgerilja* uses to tap into existing cultural values, beliefs and narratives, I will investigate how the activist group constructs a sense of belonging. This belonging excludes some and includes some. Theories on nationalism and gender will help me see how this can occur.

3 Methods

Following the definition by Della Porta & Diani (2006), the *Bunadsgerilja* can be classified as a social movement; social movements are distinct, social processes that consists of mechanisms through which actors engage in collective action (20). The actors share a *distinct collective identity* by which they are recognizable to others, as well as being linked by informal networks and involved in discrepancies with opponents (Della Porta & Diani, 2006, 20). As for studying social movements, there are several methods to choose from. The method of choice for studying the *Bunadsgerilja* in this thesis is framing analysis. As I explained in the theory section, framing theory can function both as a theoretical approach for studying a social movement, and as a methodological approach for *how* to study it.

3.1 What is framing analysis?

Framing analysis is the study of a social movement's frame. Every social movement has a frame – a conceptualization of a movement's ideals, interests, ideas and goals (Goffman, 1974; Benford & Snow, 2000). By studying a social movement's framing, one can better understand what the movement actually puts forth. In their attempts to create resonance, actors within social movements do meaning work, or signifying work, which Benford & Snow (2000) defines as “the struggle over the production of mobilizing and countermobilizing ideas and meanings” (613). The result of this signifying work, in other words the framing, is what Benford & Snow (2000) calls “collective action frames” (614). Through collective action frames, “activists identify problems, diagnose their causes, propose solutions, and give reasons for collective action” (Reese & Newcombe, 2003, 294). A social movement's collective action frame is ultimately what the movement works with to create resonance. In order to understand a social movement framing, one has to try to understand the material they put forth – what they are trying to achieve.

For a collective action frame to create resonance, or to achieve consensus, there are certain steps a social movement need to go through. One way of understanding a social movement's framing, is to trace and analyze these steps. This can be done by researching a social movement's action-oriented function: their core framing tasks (Snow & Benford, 2000, 615). Core framing tasks, when studied, will provide identification of the building blocks that make up a frame (Noakes & Johnston, 2005).

3.2 Material

Most of the data collected in this thesis was found from the *Bunadsgeriljas* official Facebook page and their official webpage. I gathered Facebook posts and comments from members and leaders of the social movement that had been posted between April 2019 to February 2020 (from when the movement first started publishing publicly to when I began gathering the material), as well as blog posts and official posts from their webpage from the same time period. In the first part of the process, I gathered official blog posts as well as posts from their webpage and their Facebook. Most of the material from the webpage (including the blog posts) are written by the leader of the *Bunadsgerilja*, Anja Cecilie Solvik. The blog posts are the leader's own reflection of the time in the *Bunadsgerilja*. Solvik, as the face of the group, has written and held speeches which have later been published on the web page. These speeches have been held in front of the Norwegian government building, as well as to protesters in the various protests in different parts of the country. The posts I have gathered from Facebook are published by for the most part activists in the social movement, but also by members and supporters. These have been anonymized for the purpose of keeping their identity private. The material is a mix of the activists' and members' own stories of the effects of a decentralized health care system, stories of not reaching the maternity ward or local hospital in time, stories about a massive workload for the employees of such institutions, birth stories, and arguments for why the local maternity wards and hospitals ought to continue their work in the districts. A great deal of the material that I have gathered includes support for the cause and arguments to why the social movement's existence and fight is important, supporters applauding the social movement for what they are doing and reasons for them to continue their work. Some of the material includes updates from around the country, in other places than the ones the *Bunadsgerilja* have been fighting for, regarding the situation of the maternity wards and local hospitals. These were then sorted into relevance. This will be further elaborated in the next section.

Facebook	Official website
83 comments	15 blogposts
38 individual posts	6 individual webpages

3.3 How have I chosen to do it?

In the first part of the process, I spent hours reading up on all the information I could find about the social movement. I reflected on which information could be useful for this thesis and landed on the information I found that was the members' own statements. I found it useful in the first part of the process to gather all the material into documents with the months and references intact. I focused firstly on identifying the core framing tasks of the group. I wanted to see which beliefs, images, values and symbols they employ, which is why this thesis focuses, for the most part, on two of the three core framing tasks: diagnostic framing and prognostic framing. In my first reading of the material, I noted one or two words for each unique post, comment and blog post. Each word ought to describe what the main point of each post was about. The material was then sorted into documents for each of the words most used: *bunad*, *nationalism*, *maternity ward*, *women's struggle*, *midwife tradition*, *solidarity*, *district politics*, *anti-establishment*. In order to identify the framing strategies for later investigation, I needed to sort the material into the two core framing tasks that will be the focus in the analysis: diagnostic framing and prognostic framing.

A social movements' frame is "developed, generated, and elaborated on not only via attending to the three core framing tasks" but also "by way of three sets of overlapping processes that can be conceptualized as discursive, strategic, and contested" (Benford & Snow, 2000, 623). If the core framing tasks of the framing process turns out to be successful, it creates frame resonance, which implies that the framing process has been a strategic one. Therefore, this analysis will not only focus on identifying the core framing tasks, but in order to answer the research questions also focus on the groups' strategic process, in particular frame alignment process. By strategic processes, I mean "framing processes that are deliberative, utilitarian, and goal directed: Frames are developed and deployed to achieve a specific purpose" (Benford & Snow, 2000, 624). Strategic processes by the *Bunadsgerilja* to link their "interests and interpretive frames with those of prospective constituents and actual or prospective resource provided", in other words frame alignment processes, have been my focus when developing this thesis further.

For my second reading of the gathered material, I moved on to reading academic articles and books on the topics that were recurring in the material on the *Bunadsgerilja*. This material helps strengthen my arguments in the analysis, as well as, in my opinion, being an important informative aspect of what the framings of the *Bunadsgerilja* consists of. There are four basic

alignment processes: frame bridging, frame amplification, frame extension, and frame transformation. For the purpose of this thesis, I chose to turn the focus towards frame amplification, as this frame alignment process involves the “clarification and invigoration of an interpretive frame that bears on a particular issue, problem or set of events” (Snow et al, 1986, 469). It involves “the idealization, embellishment, clarification, or invigoration of existing values or beliefs” (Benford & Snow, 2000, 624). In order for the *Bunadsgerilja* to enhance resonance with the Norwegian population, becomes a question of whether or not the social movement “taps into existing cultural values, beliefs, narratives, folk wisdom, and the like” (Benford & Snow, 2000, 624). As my research continued, I connected the material on Norway’s nation-building, history, and traditions to the topics I had found in my first reading of the material. I began to see a bigger picture of what belonged together and what was unique and stood out from the rest of the material. The results will be shown in the analysis.

3.4 Ethical considerations

The empirical material gathered for this thesis is found online, on the official, public internet site of the *Bunadsgerilja* as well as their public Facebook group, available for all to see. Gathering empirical material from these sites was an opportunity for me to gain valuable insight for this thesis – ideas, statements, thoughts, and debates that represents the framing of the activist group. However, gathering material from the internet also presents significant ethical challenges (Wolfinger, 2016, 1). For example, as to whether the comments, images, diary entries, and posts I gathered should be considered private or public when it is found on Facebook and on a website. For the *Bunadsgerilja*, the information published online is meant to reach out to the public, to gain followers and influence, to reach politicians and media attention. One could therefore argue that while users comment and post from their private profiles, it is not their profile being researched, but the statements they make in a public forum, with the intention of getting one’s voice heard. Although they post in a public forum, they have not consented to being researched. Franzke et al. (2020) and Wolfinger (2016) argues that in the internet sphere, there is no such thing as either private or public.

According to Franzke et al. (2020), one of the primary ethical requirements is “to avoid harm – to subjects as well as to researchers” (17). In order to protect the privacy and safety of the subjects of my research, I have taken these steps: I could initially have tried to obtain informed consent of the users I’ve gathered information from, however, that would be challenging,

impractical and time consuming. Instead of obtaining informed consent of the users, I will anonymize the gathered material through paraphrasing, as well as expressing the information I have gathered in summary form (Wolfinger, 2016 3-4). Another way of avoiding identification of the persons that have published on their Facebook page, is to store the research material securely (franzke et al., 2020, 9). Unfortunately, not all subjects may be able to be anonymous, such as the leader of the *Bunadsgerilja*. She is not aware of this thesis, nor have she given her consent to it being written. Yet, as a public figure that writes, speaks and *aims* to reach broadly with her mission, I will use her texts and speeches that she has published online, but in a thoughtful matter.

Ultimately, the most important step I can do to ensure ethical research, is to make sure the thesis is of high quality. I have been aware of, and paid close attention to, “developing and articulating research questions so as to take on board how method and ethics always interweave with one another” (franzke et al., 2020, 12). The gathered material is published with the hope of reaching out to a broad audience and cannot therefore be considered entirely private. There is a long tradition of research on social movements that gathers material without the movements’ consent, and a step towards ensuring ethical research is therefore being transparent about my process and development of this thesis.

3.5 Reflexivity

In this section, I will reflect upon my own position and role as a researcher. I will reflect upon which perspective I view the material from, as well as reflect upon my own subjectivity and how the perspective and subjectivity has shaped the research. When analyzing my thesis with the use of framing theory, what I study is the *outcome* of the strategic framing done by the *Bunadsgerilja*. What is important to be transparent about in this case, is that I am ultimately one of the people the *Bunadsgerilja* is trying to mobilize with its frame. What the *Bunadsgerilja* are fighting for, the right to health care such as safe pregnancies and births, can be argued as universal rights. The same goes for the problems they put forward, the lack of access to such health care facilities as maternity wards can be argued to be problems that anyone can face. However, it is different when the *Bunadsgerilja* frame their social movement with national symbolism, which carries with them an intention of who is to be mobilized – me, or people like me. As a feminist, I find myself being positively inclined towards the *Bunadsgerilja*, because

they do raise important questions. However, the framing of their social movement is so explicit that their boundaries of belonging becomes exclusionary.

When conducting research, it is essential to be self-reflexive – the way material is analyzed is influenced by who I am and what my views are as a researcher. Knowledge is always socially situated seeing as knowledge stems from experiences (Harding, 1992, 447). In this regard, I am influenced by the teachings of Haraway (1988) on situated knowledge and Harding (1992) on strong objectivity. Feminist objectivity means “quite simply situated knowledge” (Haraway, 1988, 581). Objectivity can only exist through the embodiment of knowledge. In other words, in this thesis I aim to try my best to be aware of my own positionality. To be aware of how my position enables certain perspective but also eliminates other perspectives, and how this affects my research process. I place myself in the tradition of feminist research that stresses the importance of partial stances and acknowledge that each has individual standpoints. According to standpoint theory, neutrality and an infinite vision is an illusion. Strong objectivity requires strong reflexivity, being transparent and reflexive about the knowledge production and taking into consideration the context within which this thesis and the data was created. Accordingly, the result will be affected by my theoretical choices as well as my personal presumptions about the social movement.

As my experiences and my cultural understandings make me have an almost intuitive understanding of what the *Bunadsgerilja* aims to do, my position in this research process is two folded. This also comes with certain disadvantages. This thesis is therefore, in some ways, an effort to expand my own field of vision. On the one hand, I find myself on the outside looking in, as a feminist researcher conducting research on a social movement that I am not participating in. On the other hand, I am very much on the inside: being Norwegian, identifying as a woman, born and raised in the area in which the *Bunadsgerilja* started their social movement. Because of my five-year experience working in a local health institution and having friends and family working in the health care, I am also emotionally affected by the challenges the health care in Norway is facing. I am both positions, because I am a researcher as well as a person that the *Bunadsgerilja* is trying to mobilize.

Feminist standpoint theory is based on the idea that oppressed groups have an epistemic advantage when analyzing oppressive systems (Harding, 2004; Haraway, 1988). Patricia Hill Collins (1986) illustrates what is meant by epistemic advantage when talking about the example of the Black woman working as a housemaid in a white family. The ‘outsider within’ position made it possible for some Black female domestic workers to see how racism functioned in

complex ways: their position in society was not a means of white people being smarter or better, but were instead the effects of living in a racist world (Collins, 1986, 14). Collins argues that Black women might draw upon their marginal positions within to generate a distinctive standpoint, and uses another example of sociology, to further exemplify the ‘outsider within’ positions. Collins argue that “where traditional sociologist may see sociology as “normal” and define their role as furthering knowledge about a normal world with taken-for-granted assumptions, outsiders within are liable to see anomalies” (Collins, 1986, 27). Black women’s experiences “highlight the tensions experienced by any group of less powerful outsiders encountering the paradigmatic thought of a more powerful insider community” (Collins, 1986, 29). Collins argues that black women are not the only group that can be outsiders within: “a variety of individuals can learn from Black women’s experiences as outsiders within: Black men, working-class individuals, white women, other people of color, religious and sexual minorities, and all individuals who, while from social strata that provided them with the benefits of white male insiderism, has never felt comfortable with its taken-for-granted assumptions” (Collins, 1986, 29).

In other words, my positions lead me not only to view the material from the standpoint of a researcher who is on the outside, but also from a set of eyes that are ‘inside’ the group. When done right, “outsider within status seems to offer its occupants a powerful balance between the strengths of their sociological training and the offerings of their personal and cultural experiences. Neither is subordinated to the other. Rather, experienced reality is used as a valid source of knowledge for critiquing sociological facts and theories, while sociological thought offers new ways of seeing that experienced reality” (Collins, 1986, 29).

4 Norway's Paradoxical Postcolonial Nationalism

“Women in national costumes bear the children that will keep the nation alive”²

The collective action frames of the *Bunadsgerilja* emerge, as Davis (2002, 7) puts it, through “an interactive and negotiated process” as the movement finds its strategies and reasons for action by “drawing on and modifying existing cultural beliefs and symbols” (ibid.). Framing is a way “of understanding” offered by the movement, and this understanding inspires and legitimates movement activity (Davis, 2002, 7). Framing works as a tool to draw new participants to the movement. This is done through efforts to align the frame with “the personal experiences, interests, and beliefs of potential participants” (ibid.). In turn, this process fosters a link between the participant’s personal identity and the identity of the movement. What this thesis aims to investigate is what types of framing strategies the *Bunadsgerilja* has used by looking at the movements’ core framing tasks. The three parts of the analysis will look at the diagnostic framing, the prognostic framing and the motivational framing of the movement, with a special focus on the strategies the movement have made to create resonance by aligning their framing to preexisting ideas. These ideas will be analyzed through theories of belonging, gendered nationalism, and intersectionality. In this first chapter, the diagnostic framing will first be dealt with, by looking at to whom and to what the *Bunadsgerilja* attributes blame. In the next section, the prognostic framing will be investigated, as the strategic framing of the *Bunadsgerilja* is in firsthand frame alignment to Norwegian nationalism. As will be explained, the Norwegian nationalism contains notions of being ‘the underdog’, a certain kind of postcolonialism that is also a paradox, since Norway is a country in the Global North, rich from oil reserves and free from imperial oppression.³ When the *Bunadsgerilja* frames their social movement to fit with Norwegian nationalism, they reproduce the nationalism, which in turn also reproduces images of who can belong to the nation/who can belong to the movement. This

² Comment from *Bunadsgerilja* activist on Facebook.

³ It is worth noting that the US president Donald Trump in 2018 made a distinction between two types of countries, a distinction that – while expressed in a tone not commonly heard publicly from elected officials - essentially mirrors colonial relationships in the world system (Grosfoguel 2011): “shithole countries” (such as Haiti, El Salvador and “African countries”) and countries from which it would be preferable for the US to get immigrants from, “such as Norway”. Although the remarks were widely labeled racist, they nonetheless speak to what Ramón Grosfoguel (ibid.) calls “global coloniality”, wherein Norway, despite its past as a former colony of Denmark and later Sweden, is a country within the center of global capitalist-colonial relations, putting its citizens in an elite position on the world scale.

creates tensions between the *Bunadsgerilja*'s feminist and progressive outlook and what it turns out they are representing and reproducing.

4.1 Attributing blame

The first core framing task, diagnostic framing, consists of identifying a problem and attributing blame or causality (Snow & Benford, 1988, 200). In this section, I will explain what the cause of anger is for the activists. As for the reason behind the *Bunadsgerilja*, and the problems they identify, see the background section above (1.2). This will not be discussed further in this analysis, as the main focus lies on the strategic framing.

One activist argues in a Facebook comment that the people of the nation are being treated badly by the economists – the economists have brutally interfered with a world they do not know nor understand. Activists on Facebook and the leaders of the movement blame the politicians of Norway, especially after the reforms that have come to be known as the New-Public-Management reforms. It seems to be a shared opinion that the Minister of Health, Bent Høie, is someone to whom much of the blame is directed, as is the Conservative Party of Norway (*Høyre*) which he represents, and the bureaucracy over which he presides. The Prime Minister, Erna Solberg, often receives negative feedback in the comment sections and in several posts on Facebook, for the way she has been responding to the activist movement, or for the lack of response. Many activists claim that the movement represent the grassroots in Norway, the true people's spirit, and many agree to the importance of fighting back against the threats to the districts, to the welfare services: neoliberalism, politicians from the capital deciding the future of the lives in the district, the elites that are forgetting about the fact that not all of the Norwegian citizens live in the bigger cities.

4.2 Understanding the concept of nation and nationalism in the Norwegian context

Prognostic framing involves specification of what is to be done by a social movement. Strategies and tactics create resonance and gains new members or supporters by doing frame alignment to preexisting ideas. As there are four basic frame alignment processes, this analysis will focus on one in particular: frame amplification. Frame amplification involves “the idealization, embellishment, clarification, or invigoration of existing values or beliefs”

(Benford & Snow, 2000, 624). Whether a social movement becomes successful and creates resonance has “to do with the extent to which the frame taps into existing cultural values, beliefs, narratives, folk wisdom and the like” (Benford & Snow, 2000, 624). To understand one of the strategies, namely the strategy of tapping into Norwegian nationalism, I will need to examine the specifics of this particular form of nationalism and the development of Norway as a nation-state and as a political entity. These are cultural values, beliefs, narratives which underpins the *Bunadsgerilja*'s framing, as will be shown throughout this chapter.

Identities are narratives, “stories people tell themselves and others about who they are (and who they are not)” (Martin, 1995 in Yuval-Davis, 2011, 14). One such story in the Norwegian collective narrative is the narrative of the “Norwegian postcolonial nationalism”, which originated in the centuries of being under Danish rule, as well as the near-century-long forced union with Sweden from 1814 to 1905. This narrative includes a collective feeling of being “suppressed”. Norwegian nationalism arose out of a protest against the two neighboring countries, and this protest was kept alive during the Second World War and the Occupation of the Nazis. This narrative functions as a background story for the remaining chapters in this analysis.

When examining the material that I gathered from Facebook, a recurring topic or theme was that of ‘nationalist thinking’. Activist from the *Bunadsgerilja* expressed themselves in the comment section, or created their own Facebook-posts, writing about how important it was to thank the Norwegian forefathers and the generations that came before us, while stressing the urgency to keep welfare services in the district for the future generations, seeing as having these welfare services had been of importance in the development of the Norwegian society. By shutting down such welfare services, a vital foundation of the nation would fall apart. Some of the activist expressed in the Facebook group how the Norwegians in general, and the *Bunadsgerilja* in particular, have a legacy to uphold. The theme of ‘nationalist thinking’ is, I argue, built upon the narrative of a struggle for national independence that is historically deeply rooted in the Norwegian society. A narrative that the *Bunadsgerilja* is upholding by their framing of the movement. In previous times, there has been a certain anti-colonial flavor to the nationalist movement. This still lingers and is being reproduced by the nationalist framing of the *Bunadsgerilja*.

4.2.1 The Existence of a “Norwegian Postcolonial Nationalism”

An empire is often understood as an oppressive political unit. The political unity of Denmark-Norway has not traditionally been categorized as an empire, but rather as a conglomerate, a double monarchy or similar wordings (Neumann, 2014a, 300). In his article, Neumann asks the question whether the relationship between Copenhagen on one side and Norway on the other is similar to the relationship between capitals and provinces in contemporary empires that Denmark too can be analytically called an empire (Neumann, 2014a). Empires can be defined as “political unities where the intermediaries who rule the peripheries have a central role in addition to different agreements with the center”, and where there is “an asymmetrical exchange ratio between center and periphery” (Neumann, 2014a, 305). For example, the center uses the strategy of divide and conquer to prevent the peripheries from developing bonds (Neumann, 2014a, 305). When talking about an empire as an oppressive political unit, Neumann suggests that it might come off as “politically combustible” to state that Denmark was an empire between 1389-1814. However, he argues that the relations between Copenhagen and Greenland, Tranquebar, Danish East Indies (today the U.S. Virgin Islands) and the slave forts on the coast of West-Africa had obvious traits of an empire (Neumann, 2014a, 303). Together with the growing sentiments of Norwegian nationalism throughout the 19th century, a perception of Norway as being a suppressed part of Denmark also grew (Neumann, 2014a, 303).

Iceland and the Faroe Islands are historically acknowledged as classic settler colonies, and the structure of the Icelandic and Faroese nationalism “show that they are directly inverted copies of Danish nationalism, with *ressentiment* of Denmark playing a key role” (Neumann, 2014b, 125). Norwegian nationalism was *also* an “inverted copy of Danish nationalism”, also with *ressentiment* as a key (Neumann, 2014b, 125). Norwegian history is, without a doubt, closely linked with the neighboring countries Denmark and Sweden, and there is no doubt that modern nation-building “in Norway commenced in relation to these”, as “a protest against remaining unrecognized in between the two rival kingdoms” (Elgenius, 2009, 107). In 1814, the Treaty of Kiel was signed. Denmark, which had been allied with France during the war, had to cede Norway to Sweden, which had sided with the victorious alliance (Elgenius, 2009, 107). A national assembly provided Norway with its own constitution, which was signed and concluded on 17th May 1814 (Elgenius, 2009, 107). A Danish prince, Prince Christian Fredrik of Denmark, was elected King of Norway. Provoked by this, “Sweden embarked on a military campaign against Norway in July and forced Christian Fredrik to abdicate as a condition of the cease-fire

agreement of the Convention of Moss in August” (Elgenius, 2009, 107). Later, in November 1814, the Swedish King Karl XIII was declared King of Sweden and Norway, and Norway was thus forced into a union with Sweden that lasted until 1905 (Østergård, 1997).

During the nation-building in Norway in the 19th century “a national history was written, national heroes identified, national costumes constructed and standardized, and national cultural and political institutions put in place” (Kolstø, 2006, 690). According to Eriksen (1993), when we want to understand the contemporary concern with Norwegian national identity, “we should keep in mind that the country’s history has been construed so as to distinguish it crucially from every other European country”, especially Sweden and Denmark (Eriksen, 1993, 2). Norway’s history as an independent nation-state is short. In June 1905, “the Norwegian parliament unilaterally abrogated the Union” and full political independence was achieved. In a “nation-wide referendum that same summer a staggering 99.95 per cent voted in favor of separation from Sweden” and a national unity had been established (Kolstø, 2006, 690). After Norway was officially an independent nation in 1905, “the idea that Denmark had usurped Norway and drained it of resources for four centuries became a stock in trade of history writing” (Neumann, 2014b, 126). This was an idea that was “featured in history textbooks in Norwegian schools, as well as in history writing, and still lingers” (Neumann, 2014b, 126). By the 1960s, the idea that Norway had been Denmark’s colony was firmly in place. This idea remains “a key ingredient in Norwegian nationalism”, and “most Norwegians still maintain a national identity not as *perpetrators* of imperialism, which they were in historical and analytical terms, but as imperialism’s victims” (Neumann, 2014b, 126). Neumann argues that from a postcolonial perspective, “Norway is performing historical wounds that they are not really entitled to perform, since they were not among those most heavily wounded”, and that “Norway cannot wash its hands of its imperial European past by appealing to an alleged subaltern position within the Danish empire before 1814” (Neumann, 2014b, 126). But, as Østerud reminds us, there was a certain ‘anti-colonial flavor to the national movements in the past’ (Østerud, 2005, 711).

4.3 Who belongs to the nation/who belongs to the movement?

At the core of the *Bunadsgerilja* frame is the idea of the Norwegian nation, and its history of fighting for independence against Denmark, Sweden, and even against the Nazi occupation. It is a strategic framing, seeing as the idea of the independent, small nation against the big,

threatening neighboring nations is an idea that is still being kept alive. One activist expresses in the Facebook group that ‘the fight for our future lies in our own hands! This protest should hopefully make our people wake up and see what we have to fight to keep!’. Another activist on Facebook claims that the *Bunadsgerilja* is not just a social movement, instead we should call it a resistance movement, not unlike the very resistance movements that fought for Norway during the Second World War. The idea of a nation is a powerful idea, an “image of a collection of people who have come to believe that they have been shaped by a common past and are destined to share a common future” (Enloe, 2014, 94). According to Enloe, this belief is usually “nurtured by a common language and a sense of otherness, of being distinct from groups around them”, and colonial rule “has provided especially fertile ground for nationalist ideas because it has given an otherwise disparate people such a potent shared experience of foreign domination” (Enloe, 2014, 94-95). This experience of foreign domination still lingers in Norwegian national tales and is exemplified in the framings of the *Bunadsgerilja*. The threats to the *Bunadsgerilja* is not the same threats as to the nation (threats of foreign domination), however political and cultural domination is considered a threat in both movements, and this will be discussed in chapter three. This can help “explain why boundaries of belonging become more salient and fierce when their hegemonic naturalness is challenged and why any social category and boundary can be – and often is – contested” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 91).

One of the Facebook activists from the social movement argues that the message of the *Bunadsgerilja* is relevant all over the country, seeing as the country is one, fighting together on a national basis. When the leader, Anja Cecilie Solvik, was first photographed outside of the Kristiansund maternity ward on April 1st, 2019, she asked people to put on their *bunad* and pose for photographs in strategic places in the region. The purpose was to gain attention about the ongoing threat to close the maternity ward in this specific area. As the movement grew larger, the message broadened to include other regions facing the same issues. The same activist expressed that this threat affects so many, and uniformed with the *bunad* that tells the story of who they are and where they are born, they are armored with brooches, stockings and shoes, with their hearts in the right place, fighting for what they hold dear with force, honesty and love – ‘beliefs can move mountains’. According to Enloe, “the experience of foreign domination can trump differences among people of diverse classes, varied skin tones, different regional affiliations, and perhaps even different religions and ethnicities” (Enloe, 2014, 95). This might have been the case for the *Bunadsgerilja* as well, but as I will show, the frame alignment to the Norwegian nationalism not only includes activists that recognize the affiliations, but is also

excluding all those who do not have the same sentiments towards it. The regional affiliations in Norway grew stronger after the independence and the win of the national movement in the 19th century and stands strong to this day. However, by framing the *Bunadsgerilja* in this fashion, what does it say about the boundaries of the social movement?

When strategically framing the movement as a somewhat nationalist movement, it is meaningful to discuss what this symbolizes. The *Bunadsgerilja* reproduces a nationalism that is based upon separating ‘us’ from ‘them’. It is boundary work, as Yuval-Davis describes it (2011, 18). When the *Bunadsgerilja* strategically aligns their movement with the Norwegian nationalism, they reproduce the image of an ‘us’ that need to protect themselves against the Others. They construct boundaries of belonging. However, these boundaries ultimately contain notions of nationhood, which leads to a reproduction of a nationalism that contains old values, assumptions, habits, and beliefs. Billig (1995, in Yuval-Davis, 2011) calls this type of labelling ‘banal nationalism’, pointing out that nations need to be reproduced continuously which is done through flagging of nationhood. It “involves selective processes of remembrance and forgetfulness; of hailing certain occasions, artefacts, personal attributes, particular heroes and celebrities, as well as certain territories and landscapes” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 92). The *Bunadsgerilja* does this by wearing the national garment, posing in front of well-known landscapes, using the national flag in their images, as well as by their choice of representation.

Activists calls the social movement a movement for the ‘coastal women’ – sisters in arms fighting for basal needs, and not for the right to drink café latte (referring to an image of women in big cities hanging out in cafes during their maternity leaves without a care in the world). Despite the initial claim that they are a politically independent organization, the activists state numerous times how the *bunad* is what brings them together, their stories and the images they create wearing the bunad is their *true identity*. They are ‘knocking on the doors of the politicians, dressed in the national garment, reminding them why they were elected: to serve and to take care of the Norwegian people’ (author’s translation). As with the Norwegian nationalism, the *Bunadsgerilja* frames their activism with boundaries of who belongs to them and who do not. This is done both as a matter of who are considered their ‘enemies’ or ‘opposition’, but also by who gets to represent the *Bunadsgerilja* in images, protest and in debates. In their images and in their protest, the activists are what one might see as ‘typical Norwegian women’, reproducing an image of what the ‘typical Norwegian woman’ is, although this differ from what the society looks like. When framing the *Bunadsgerilja* with nationalist

symbolism, they do not just construct boundaries through a narrative of belonging, but a politics of belonging which “sometimes physically, but always symbolically, separate the world population into ‘us’ and ‘them’” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 20). To understand this, Yuval-Davis argues that we need to “look at what is required from a specific person in order for her/him to be entitled to belong, or be considered as belonging, to the collectivity” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 20). The question that needs to be asked is not just ‘Who belongs to the *Bunadsgerilja*’, but also ‘Who belongs to the nation’? Billig (1995, in Yuval-Davis, 2011) argues that categorizations of nationalism always occur in a context of argument *vis-à-vis* other positions. The crucial “question is not the existence of the category but how it is constructed and where its boundaries pass” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, 91).

4.4 Requirements of representation

The requirements of belonging can sometimes, both for the nationalist project and for the project of the *Bunadsgerilja*, be difficult to achieve. The nation is, as Anderson (1983, 6) describes it, imagined. One example is the Facebook-comment comparing the *Bunadsgerilja* to the berserkers. One of the activists on Facebook mention this comparison, claiming the children of the *Bunadsgerilja* are as strong as the Berserkers. The Berserkers were wild warriors in the Viking Age, typically furious and unstoppable (Halvorsen, 2018). The activist argues that even the little ones know what is right, fighting like war heroes for the maternity wards, fighting for their own health, the health of their loved ones and their dear ones. Despite their size, they are as strong as the Berserkers. With statements like these, the boundaries are framed to be about ancestry. This creates a tension as to how the social movement originally says it wants to be – a feminist movement inclusive of all, despite background (ethnic origin, political background, regional affiliation).

However, there is a certain duality to the anti-colonial nationalism and the ‘exceptionalism’ within it. This is also present in the framing of the *Bunadsgerilja*. What it comes down to, is a question of who is excluded from the representation of both. In the Norwegian nationalism, there is a lack of explicitness of who belongs – and often the Sami population as well as people having migrated to Norway from other countries is ‘accidentally’ left out of the equation, or excluded all together. This is the same in the nationalist framing of the *Bunadsgerilja* – there is only one type of activists, and a lack of representation of activists with backgrounds other than ‘Norwegian’. Chatterjee (1990) argues that non-state national movements have a crucial role in the production, and therefore also the reproduction, of the nation (In Yuval-Davis, 2011, 87).

He argues that within anti-colonial nationalism is the creation of a ‘sovereign, true nation’, in other words an ‘authentic’ national culture. The ‘authentic’ national culture in Norway is constructed to be from the countryside, in other words, people from the districts. This phenomenon will be investigated further in the third chapter of this analysis. According to Michael Mann (2005) the “drive for homogenization has been central to all nation-building movements” and this drive has “gained strength under globalization” (In Yuval-Davis, 2011, 88). As “Yiftachel (2003) points out, in states controlling divided ethnic/national communities, the dominant community attempts to construct an ethnocracy, i.e. a state which systematically privileges it in terms of access to power, resources, and symbolic belonging” (in Yuval-Davis, 2011, 88-89). This is ultimately reproduced in the framings of the *Bunadsgerilja*, as their representation of activists consists merely of people from the dominant culture in Norway. However, the *Bunadsgeriljas* would most likely not agree to this. It is important to note that efforts are made by the activists to be more inclusive. Their leader, Anja Cecilie Solvik, emphasizes that all members are equally valuable, no matter if they demonstrate (with or without a *bunad*), donate money, or function solely as supporters of the group. She makes it clear that it is the number of members that counts. According to several members, a good *Bunadsgerilja* fights for others ‘from the heart’. They ‘use the heart as a weapon’ and insist on being inclusive. One activist posted on Facebook that for them, the *Bunadsgerilja* ought to be a dignified, yet powerful group, and that those who “discriminate others due to their sexuality, education, work experience or other things can make a separate group for this type of insults – women in *bunads* behave in line with their outfits” (author’s translation).

5 The Strategic use of National Garments

“Wearing a *Bunad* signifies power, it expresses solidarity and unity”⁴

In this chapter, the national flag and the national costume will be analyzed as symbols of belonging, which is reproduced by the *Bunadsgerilja* as they strategically use these objects as uniforms or symbolic traits to their social movement. As mentioned earlier, prognostic framing involves specification of what the social movement aims to do – which strategies and tactics they will use to create resonance and recruit new members. By doing frame alignment to preexisting ideas, or taps into existing cultural values or narratives, a social movement can become more resonant to their future members. As part of their prognostic framing, the *Bunadsgerilja* aligns their movement frame again to the Norwegian nationalism, but also to the Norwegian women, as the *bunad* is a strong symbol of their fight for independence. The movement is then in turn aligned to all the sentiments attached to this garment, a certain narrative of belonging which again is inclusive of some and exclusive of others. I ask the question: who can wear a *bunad*? This is because the *bunad* also involves regional affiliation and questions of economy. It is a traditional garment of rural identity and reproduces old gender stereotypes and a specific femininity.

5.1 Constructions of national symbols of belonging

In the 1830s, the first celebrations of the adoption of the 17th of May 1814 Constitution began. Ever since, it has been celebrated as one of the most dominant expressions of Norwegian national identity (Kolstø, 2006, 691). The popularity of the national celebrations “follows the structure of postcolonial countries where independence was achieved relatively late and nationhood is perceived as vulnerable” (Eriksen, 2005 in Elgenius, 2009, 116). Along with the constructions of a national identity, the constructions of national symbols took place. These national symbols were visible throughout the country and all year, but once a year they are

⁴ Comment from *Bunadsgerilja* activist on Facebook.

showed in mass – on the celebration of the country gaining its own constitution. It is “in the context of the enforced union with Sweden 1815-1905 that the celebrations commenced in honor of a separate *Norwegian* constitution” which identified Norway “as an independent nation and demonstrated resistance against Swedish dominance” (Elgenius, 2009, 108”). On the 17th May, “all towns and cities organize citizens’ and children’s parades” and the “children and their parents dress in their very best suit or dress, often a national costume, and sing the national anthem and other patriotic songs while they cheerfully wave the national flag” (Kolsø, 2006, 691). The celebration is still perceived as emotionally charged, a celebration that “reproduces a complex of national symbolism through large-scale processions and festivities throughout the country, which through repetition, claim to provide a link to the past” (Elgenius, 2009, 116). Elgenius (2009) explains the success of the Constitution Day by “its socio-political context and its development into a fully-fledged national day *before* statehood was achieved (116). In addition, Elgenius (2009) argues that the style change, “from guarded to joyful manifestations of nationhood” and “allowing for regional expressions alongside national representations” is of importance (Elgenius, 2009, 116).

The celebrations were “forbidden during the Nazi occupation (April 1940-May 1945) and this period has been argued to have a profound effect upon the meaning of the celebrations described as highly charged after the war and in the Cold War years (Mykland, 1996 in Elgenius, 2009, 112). The flag, the *bunad*, “along with the King’s monogram and some other patriotic emblems, became the most important symbol of resistance” (Kolstø, 2006, 692). When the 17th of May Celebrations were forbidden by the Germans, this further enhanced the mobilizing value of these national symbols. After the war, the ceremonial focus turned “towards democratic rights”, and when the discussions about membership in the European Community began, “disunity was again displayed as part of the celebrations” (Elgenius, 2009, 112). The restrictions on what was *truly* Norwegian and what was to be “allowed” in the celebrations was debated in 1972, such as the display of “some European Union flags”, which was met with protests. Again in 2008, discussions on what was “allowed” in the celebrations took place. Newspapers debated where “national flags other than the Norwegian flags should be allowed in parades on the national day” along with discussions on boundaries and symbols (Elgenius, 2009, 112). According to Elgenius (2009) “it is apparent that the national day in Norway continues to constitute a platform on which nationhood is debated, contested, negotiated, re-imagined and even re-invented” (113).



(Bunadsgerilja in national garment, waving the Norwegian flag, 2019)

5.2 The national costume – an expression of a particular, national identity

In the framing of the *Bunadsgerilja*, the symbolism that are usually associated with the Constitution Day is of importance. The newly established Norwegian flag became one of the crucial symbols “in the process of raising boundaries” in the time after the independence. Another symbol of national unity was the national costume – the festive regional costumes (*bunad*) worn both on the 17th of May Celebrations, in christenings and confirmations, weddings, on Christmas Eve, and in the *Bunadsgerilja* protests. Both the flag and the national costumes are symbols of national belonging that the *Bunadsgerilja* has used for mobilizing potential new activists and supporters. Following is an explanation to the history and character of the national symbol that is the *bunad*, as well as the narrative of a specific national identity that is attached to it.

In the official home page of the *Bunadsgerilja*, as well as in their Facebook page, expressions of sentiments about the *bunad* are made extensively. Without a doubt, the national garment has a big emotional value for both the activists, as well as others in the Norwegian society. Activists

of the group expressed on Facebook an attachment to the *bunad*, saying it is a very powerful outfit, as it expresses solidarity and unity. Some activists state that when wearing a *bunad*, they feel as if they are uniformed with something that reveals who they are and where they were born. In one Facebook post, one activist claim that wearing a *bunad* signifies dignity, and one should act accordingly. It signifies pride, strength, bravery and national character. Several activists even comment that wearing a *bunad* provides the wearer with a certain glow. Where does sentiments as these about this garment stem from? And what do the *Bunadsgerilja* wish to say by wearing it as a uniform for belonging to their movement?

The *bunad* is a regional costume which “consists of a double-shuttle woven woolen skirt/dress with a jacket and scarf for women and an embroidered three-piece suit for men” (Eriksen, 2002, 101-2 in Elgenius, 2009, 115). They differ “with the regions they represent but follow a similar design and whereas they highlight regional diversity they also reinforce – at least visually – the idea of national unity” (Elgenius, 2009, 115). An interest in Norwegian “peasant dress had already emerged by the eighteenth century”, and throughout Norway peasants wore “regionally distinct folk costumes that stood apart from high fashion” (Strand, 2018, 100-101). These folk costumes were “the peasants’ only style of clothing, which ranged from Sunday best to workwear”, but by the 1840s, the costumes “became a point of interest for local artists and foreign visitors alike and were soon adopted by people other than the traditional wearers” (Strand, 2018, 102). The term *bunad* did not yet exist, but the “concept of regional national costumes began to emerge” (Strand, 2018, 102). In the late 1800s, the concept of the *bunad* began to appear. By the turn of the twentieth century, “wearing a *bunad* was a strong sign of a woman’s support for Norwegian independence” (Strand, 2018, 104). The garment became “a powerful political symbol”, however, when “Norway became independent from Sweden in 1905, the interest changed from national to local” (Strand, 2018, 104). Women wanted *bunads* that “represented their home provinces, but not all regions of Norway retained a living folk costume tradition” (Strand, 2018, 104). Enter Hulda Garbord.

Garborg “argued the need for a truly Norwegian and regional form of formal dress” (Eriksen, 2004, 26). Garborg “collected and systematized what she saw as intact and useful regional *bunad* traditions, and designed some *bunads* herself”, however, she never “denied the syncretic and partly invented character of the new, traditionalist folk costume”, but rather “emphasized its role as a marker of rural, Norwegian identity”, seeing as most regions have their own type of *bunad* (Eriksen, 2004, 26). Garborg wanted “a costume made from Norwegian materials that was possible for most women to sew”, and as “a women’s rights activists, Garborg was also

preoccupied with the view that the *bunad* should be easy to wear and allow for free movement, and that the corset should be abandoned” (Strand, 2018, 104). Historical authenticity was not that important for Garborg, as she “sought to create costumes that catered to the taste of modern women yet gave the impression of being very old and traditional” (Strand, 2018, 106). This would give the wearer “the best of both worlds: a modern *bunad* in a style that was suited to modern aesthetic ideals yet based upon Norwegian tradition” (Strand, 2018, 106). The costumes “had to look authentic and convincing as symbols of Norway’s ancient traditions that went back much further than the *bunad*’s brief 100 years of existence” and is thus “primarily a symbol rather than an historical recreation” (Strand, 2018, 113). Its success “has mainly been achieved by being embraced as a Norwegian national sartorial emblem” (Strand, 2018, 113). *Bunads* are worn for the most part on 17th May, Constitution Day, but some also wear them on Christmas Eve, to weddings and christenings. However, *bunads* are not to be worn when not “appropriate”, such as funerals, seeing as *bunads* are “bright and joyful garments” (Eriksen, 2004, 26).

The *bunad* has, according to Eriksen, become an important, traditionalist symbol of modern Norwegianness, most of them “clearly related to regional and minority folk costumes from Central and Eastern Europe”, in addition to a German influence (Eriksen, 2004, 26). There is “a clear element of modern invention, which nobody denies, in the currently widespread use of *bunads*”, because of the obvious inspiration from Europe, and the garment had “to be reconstructed from historical sources” in order for it to signify adherence to roots and traditions” (Eriksen, 2004, 27). What is essential about the garment, and closely linked to the framing the *Bunadsgerilja* is presenting, is that it developed into a garment that “confirms Norwegian identity as an essentially rural one, where personal integrity is connected to roots and regional origins” (Eriksen, 2004, 26). It is also worth noting that the *bunad* is political. It has been used as a symbol of protest since its first occurrences. The national costume has been used as a garment of protest in political disputes in Norway for 150 years (Kvam, 2019; Haugsvær, 2016; Jakobsen, 2014). Gro Harlem Brundtland, former prime minister of Norway, wore a *bunad* “in what could be described as ostentatious display during the Winter Olympics at Lillehammer in 1994”, seeing as Norway would decide later the same year “whether to join the European Union” (Eriksen, 2004, 27). Brundtland was “the leader of the pro-EU government trying to persuade a skeptical population, and by wearing a *bunad* she seemed to try to convey the idea that there was no contradiction between being European and being a good Norwegian”, and as such, wearing it “must be read as a way of overcommunicating Norwegianness” (Eriksen, 2004, 27). The same had happened during the 1972 campaign of the opposition against EU-

membership, when the 'No'-movement "made open use of national and nationalist themes and symbols" (Kolstø, 2006, 692). The movement "was dominated by the political centre/left; while nationalism in the interwar period had been associated with the political right, it had now migrated towards the opposite pole of the political spectrum" (Kolstø, 2006, 692). Both sides of the political spectrum have been known for using nationalist symbols, such as the *bunad*, to further their case.

5.3 Preservation and celebration of national achievement - Who can wear a *bunad*?

Using the *Bunad* as a symbol of belonging to the social movement leads to questions of who can belong, or in other words, who can wear a *bunad*. In mere practical terms, it is important to reflect upon the financial and regional aspects of the garment. A *bunad* costs everything from 20 000 NOK to 50 000 NOK. Not only does this mean that there are tensions between who can own one, it also leads to questions of who can represent the *Bunadsgerilja* when their 'uniform' is rather expensive. The *Bunadsgerilja* also state that they welcome all, whether or not they are in possession of a *bunad*, but the representation of activists without one is lacking. There are supporters of the cause who state that they support the movement, but that they do not own a *bunad*. For the activists not in possession of a national costume, the *bunad* still functions as a symbol for Norwegian identity and therefore also for the activist group, which means that the national costume is a signifier of belonging both for the Norwegian nationalism and for the social movement.

In a debate in the national newspaper *Aftenposten*, Rabia Musavi asks whether she is Norwegian enough to wear a *bunad*, and "when is someone Norwegian enough?" (Musavi, 2019). Every year around the Constitution Day this debate takes place, and every year women wearing their hijab together with the *bunad* receive hate mails, death threats and the like. Musavi explains how she as a second-generation immigrant in Norway always wanted a national costume as a child, but that her parents never could afford one. As an adult, she visited stores, tried on *bunads* and expected to be dismissed by the personnel for not being the typical *bunad*-wearer. Instead, she was surprised at how welcoming and helpful they were, especially since the Internet flooded with negative attitudes towards black and brown women wearing the Norwegian national costume. Sahfana M. Ali wore a custom-made hijab with the signature embroidery of the *bunad* on the Constitution Day in 2016 (Lofstad, 2016). She received racist comments under a photo

of her on Facebook, and hate messages were sent from people making statements about Ali's Norwegianness, her faith, and 'her audacity'. She was accused of mocking the Norwegian people by wearing the garment. The right-wing media channel *Resett*, as well as the right-wing *Human Rights Service*, have published several articles about the combination of hijab and *bunad* (Halvorsen, 2020; Afsar, 2020). What is interesting is how the *Bunadsgerilja* have not taken a stand in this debate. When choosing to not have representation from people of various background, one could argue that the statement has already been made.

When choosing a *bunad*, most choose one from an area with which they have connections—either because their parents or grandparents come from this area, or because they are born there or have grown up there (Bunadrosen, 2020). Therefore, most *bunads* have regional affiliations. Activists of the group express on Facebook that there is an emotional attachment to this national costume. They state that it is a very powerful outfit, which stands for solidarity and unity. Some of the activists on Facebook state that when wearing the *bunad*, they feel as if they are uniformed with something that reveals who they are and where they are born, they feel as if they are armed with the brooches that are a part of the garment, armed with the support of generations before them, in addition to being armed with honesty and love while wearing it. Some of the activists argue that the history of the *bunad* and the pictures taken of activists wearing one represents a national identity, affiliation and roots, and love for the place of home for each *bunads*-wearing person. Some even say that the *bunad* is the Norwegian equivalent, only more stylish and with more history, of the yellow vests in France. Many of the activists argue that wearing a *bunad* is a reminder to the politicians that they are elected by the people and should work for the people. The *bunad* signifies rural identity and tradition, both for the Norwegian nationalism and for the *Bunadsgerilja*. However, this creates a distance between those who have connections to the rural parts of Norway and those who do not. It appears one can support the group, but not be an active member unless these criteria are met.

5.4 The *bunad* as a representation of a specific femininity

In their Facebook page and their web page, statements saying that wearing a *bunad* signifies dignity, and one should act accordingly, is found. According to the activists, the *bunad* signifies pride, strength, bravery, and national character, and wearing it gives the wearer a certain glow. It symbolizes the grassroots, a shared commitment, it symbolizes women bearing children for the nation to live on. Several activists on Facebook claim that the *bunad* is a grand and powerful symbol of female wisdom. Some of them reminisce of the past, when women sowed their own

at home, and kept them for special occasions throughout their lives, a garment that has been honored for generations and should continue to be honored. What does this say about the gendered aspects of the *Bunadsgerilja* ‘uniform’? Nationalism often reproduce notions of gender, whether it be old gender norms, stereotypes, or traits. What does it say about the *Bunadsgerilja* when they not only choose to align their movement with the Norwegian nationalism, but also use the national costume as a symbol of belonging?

As the *bunad* is a construction of a specific femininity, the *Bunadsgerilja* reproduce this patriarchal femininity and womanhood by using it as a symbol of belonging. The nation has been represented as the female body throughout history in several countries and cities, including Norway. According to Farris (2017), by portraying the nation as a female body, the national political project becomes naturalized (69). This leads ultimately to what can be called gendered nationalism. According to Farris (2017, the representation of the nation embodied as a woman evokes notions “of “genesis”, “birth”, and the “ancestry”, thus operating as a powerful performative metaphor for nationalism’s invocation of myths of common origin, common blood, and kinship” (70). Women have been “linked to the nation in a twofold manner: qua members of the collectivity, and therefore subjected to the duty of loyalty required from all members, and qua women, thus bearers of ascribed roles and distinct tasks, above all that of reproducing the nation” (Farris, 2017, 71). The identification of women “not as individuals but rather as “bearers of the collective” and “biological reproducers of the nation”” lies at the heart of nationalist projects (Farris, 2017, 72; Yuval-Davis, 1997). When the *Bunadsgerilja* aligns their movement with the Norwegian nationalism and uses the *bunad* as a symbol of movement belonging, they also reproduce this gendered nationalism and the old gender roles that comes with it.

At the same time as women was central to the nation as symbols and icons, they were also “relegated to the margins of the polity” (Farris, 2017, 71). This is, according to McClintoc (1997), the paradox of most national narratives: historically, the role of women within nationalist political project has been a “metaphoric” one, while men have had a more well-known role. In nationalist political projects, women have had a symbolic importance, not as subjects per se, but as “a social role established on the basis of the functions of the female body” (In Farris, 2017, 71). Women were not considered as individuals, “but as types” (Farris, 2017, 71). The *ideal* type of femininity “as an aestheticized and social construction, whose chief function lies in reproduction, became a powerful normative stereotype from the eighteenth century onward”, at the same time as the rise of nationalism occurred (Farris, 2017, 71). In

national rhetoric, the family was “the center of national community” and the household “the allegory of the private sphere where women allegedly find their appropriate role” (Farris, 2017, 71). The *Bunadsgerilja* uses the national flag and the national garment as their identification, their symbols of belonging, and ultimately aligns their frame to connotations around nationalism and sentiments attached to the history of the *bunad*. As the *bunad* is a garment of rural identity and patriarchal femininity, these are in turn reproduced when an activist group such as the *Bunadsgerilja* make it their statement piece. However, there is something to gain by doing this. The feminist point of the *Bunadsgerilja* is to align their movement to something recognizable, something that is well-known and in the Norwegian context associated with joy, independence, and solidarity. By using the national flag and the national garment as their symbol of belonging, the *Bunadsgerilja* might reproduce old gender roles - the childbearing woman in the nuclear family - but what they also do is gain momentum for their cause – equal health services to all citizens no matter their place of residence. In this way, the symbol use of the *bunad* by the activist group might be called a progressive appropriation of national symbolism.

6 A Fight from the Periphery

“The state is fleeing from its citizens, and the districts are being neglected”⁵

The *bunad*, as a symbol of the importance of districts in Norway, can be understood as a wise choice for the main goal of the *Bunadsgerilja*, seeing as what they are fighting for is proximity to maternity services in their local communities. This fight becomes a fight against centralization, against neoliberalism and the threat against “the real nation”, the “proper national identity” that was constructed decades ago. As mentioned in chapter one, empires can be defined as political unities with intermediaries who tactically use the strategy of split and divide, but also that of bonds: where one strengthens the relations of certain groups in the periphery to the center through material and symbolic goods (Neumann, 2014a, 305). The idea that Norway had been under an oppressive empire for 400 years, with intermediaries mostly in the capital and in the south of Norway, has manifested itself in a debate that has been central and crucial to the political landscape: the center-periphery debate. This debate is also a core idea of the diagnostic as well as the motivational framing of the *Bunadsgerilja*. The sentiment of being the “underdog”, or as I previously called the “Norwegian postcolonial nationalism” is manifested in the ongoing, century-old debate, and this debate is crucial for the *Bunadsgerilja*’s cause. As with the previous chapters, the prognostic framing of the *Bunadsgerilja* is strategically aligned with something familiar and valuable in Norway – the belief that the ‘true Norway lies in the district’. In this chapter, I will explore this narrative further, by elaborating the center-periphery debate, and show how this debate is manifested in the frame alignment to the periphery in Norway as well as to the narrative of the midwife tradition. The *Bunadsgerilja* aligns their framing to the fight of the districts – the fear of political dominance from the center – as well as to the tradition of midwifery. This frame alignment reproduces notions of gender: old gender norms, traditional gendered division of labor and other gendered traits that will be elaborated further. In addition, the frame alignment to nationalism and the rural Norway creates a certain kind of feminism that is no longer about solidarity between women across borders, but rather women in the districts protecting each other. The third core framing task of the *Bunadsgerilja*, the motivational framing, is therefore ‘save the districts’.

⁵ Comment from *Bunadsgerilja* activist on Facebook.

6.1 The postcolonial idea manifests itself in the center-periphery debate

In the Norwegian nation-building and the construction of a national identity, the peasants were constructed as “being the real carriers of the nation” (Neumann, 2002, 93). Historically, local autonomy within the unitary state was already legally secured in 1837, and later the constitutional battles as well as the secessionist issue had a geographical aspect” (Østerud, 2005, 706). The center-periphery debate first started in the nation-building times, and local mobilization were often the case. National-liberal forcers “supported by farmers, teachers and liberal professors were strong in the rural areas”, and popular movements “like the language movement (struggling for a *new Norwegian* language standard closer to the spoken dialects and more removed from Danish influence), the teetotal movement and the Christian lay movements, were also expressions of local mobilization” (Østerud, 2005, 706-707). The conservative establishment – high-ranking civil servants and the commercial elites – were “closer to the institutions of the union and had its strongholds in the capital and other large cities” (Østerud, 2005, 706-707).

According to Sørensen (1994), there were three main lines of nation-building in Norway during the 19th century. The first main line was that of practical nation-building, a modernizing work of the society by tossing out old economic regulations and privileges and developing an infrastructure through official support and direct State intervention (Sørensen, 1994, 23). The second main line was that of political nationalism, which was expressed as resistance against the union with Sweden, “or rather what was perceived as Swedish dominance and Swedish encroachments on Norwegian sovereignty” (Sørensen, 1994, 24). The political party *Venstre* dominated the political scene from 1884, fronting political nationalism as well as political radicalism, and even republicanism (Sørensen, 1994, 24). The most “aggressive nationalism in Norway was leftist and democratic” whereas Swedish nationalism was perceived as “rightist and authoritarian” (Sørensen, 1994, 24). The third main line, and the one of most importance here, is that of cultural nationalism. The cultural nationalism was “evident at a wide range from the 1840s onwards” and was generally known as “National Romanticism”. The cultural nationalism was “a Norwegian national culture” which was “fostered and shaped in area after area, as a matter of “starting from, gathering and elaborating on, cultural raw material” (Sørensen, 1994, 24). This raw material “was present in Norwegian peasant culture on the local and regional level: fairytales, legends, songs and dances” (Sørensen, 1994, 24). These were “discovered, developed and proclaimed the common national heritage” (Sørensen, 1994, 24).

In addition, an “important topic was the old Norway’s ancient history”, and artists and composers “made rural culture their starting point” (Sørensen, 1994, 24).

The center-periphery debate has stuck ever since, and the rural Norway has been part of many discussions both politically and culturally. An example of the depth of this debate is the question of whether Norway ought to be a member of the European Union. Historical factors “played a major role in why Norwegians voted on the EU issue as they did” (Østerud, 2005, 710). Seeing as Norway had been “dominated by Denmark in the union originating in the fifteenth century and lasting until 1814 after which it became the junior partner in the union with Sweden until 1905”, there was a general sentiment that the country should keep their boundaries as is. Danish “cultural dominance prevailed amongst commercial and administrative elites up to the late nineteenth century, during which time there existed a cultural split between an urban upper-class Dano-Norwegian code and a peasant and farmer-based ‘Norwegian-Norwegian’ code” (Østerud, 2005, 710). Norwegian resistance “against political dominance by Sweden and cultural dominance by Denmark gradually mobilized the centre-left against elites with foreign orientation” and when “EEC became EU in the early 1990s, the Norwegian opposition against membership used the negative historical connotations of ‘union’ as a rhetorical asset” (Østerud, 2005, 710). This fright of political and cultural dominance still prevails and is at the core of the *Bunadsgerilja* framing.

6.1.1 Centre-periphery

The regional affiliations were strengthened during the union. Still today, “the capital is perceived as the ‘least national’ place in Norway because it still reflects the influences of dominant foreign elites from the colonial and semi-colonial past” (Østerud, 2005, 706-707). Activists argue on Facebook that proximity to health service are justifiable claims that all citizens regardless of geography should have. Activists want fair distribution of health services throughout the country, seeing as Norway is made up of relatively small cities. For years, despite centralization, there has been active district politics in Norway (Langøren, 2007, 1).

At the same time as the government has had goals to prevent or soften the centralization, the financial situation of the health services in the districts has been greatly affected by new policies and new reforms. If there is a wish to keep jobs and settlements in the districts, there needs to be a balance in the distribution between center and periphery. This is something about which

the *Bunadsgerilja* feels strongly. Activists both on Facebook and on their home page express sentiments of being treated unfairly because of their geographical position. They wish for the delivery services to remain in the districts, because the distances between each health facility is of great concern. Some of the activists on Facebook testify their own birth stories in detail, for others to get a deeper understanding of the struggles concerning distances. Stories about the constant anxiety, hoping that the weather would be good enough, the mountain roads would be open or that they would catch the ferry just in time for them to drive to the closest maternity ward or hospital at the time of the delivery. Stories about not making it in time, and having their baby then and there, in the car. Activists state that these issues of proximity to health services is about their safety and cannot be traded for sustainable bureaucracy growth and centralization. Decent local hospitals and nearby maternity services are of importance for all citizens not living in the big cities. They express concern for being ‘forgotten about in the districts’. They argue that the State is fleeing from its citizens, and they express feelings of helplessness, despair. Even though the *Bunadsgerilja* reproduce old narratives of belonging, they also produce a picture of a country where women take care of women in the districts. As local identity building is reinforced by the threats of globalization and neoliberalism, the *Bunadsgerilja* present a social movement that frames itself as a local source of resistance and protections for the smaller parts of Norway.

Some of the activists on Facebook argue that they will keep raising their voices and their fists till the fight for the district is won. They are tired of seeing money and efficiency being more important than human beings. They encourage politicians to take their share of the responsibility that is given to them as democratically elected officials. Facebook posts about the fight for the districts are in plenty – mostly about how the *Bunadsgerilja* came about to represent the people and women’s right to equal health service no matter their place of living. The *Bunadsgerilja* gathered in this grassroots activist group because the politicians allowed for the maternity wards to be shut down or relocated elsewhere, centralized. Some activists express concern that the patients, the care, and professional competence is forgotten and exchanged with fictive budgets that only works on paper, that leaves no room for the sick and needy. They want to keep fighting for what they hold dear, some even state that they wish for a national referendum on the future of Norwegian local hospitals. The *Bunadsgerilja* frames their movement as a nationalist, rural grassroots movement fighting for the survival of the districts. The motivational framing of the *Bunadsgerilja* is therefore just that: “Save the districts – where the ‘true Norwegians’ are”. As problematic as this might seem, there is also a strong sense of

solidarity between the people in the district that signifies that the district identity might just be that, a symbolic of identity and not necessarily boundary work to exclude others.

6.2 Midwife tradition

According to Farstad (2016), the first educated women in Norway were ‘women of the people’ (7). They came from all over the country, many of them even walked the great distances from their hometown to the capital to make a future for themselves. Farstad (2016) calls these women pioneers. The first formal profession open to women in Norway were midwifery. The midwife school were started in 1818, and midwives were also the first public female functionaries. In the 1900s the midwives were often the first elected females in the municipalities. Together with district doctors, they represent the beginning of a public health sector and the first germ of the welfare state (Farstad, 2016, 7). The municipality in which the *Bunadsgerilja* first started up, also happens to be the first county which established a publicly funded midwife service in the countryside in Norway, in 1784. The tradition of midwifery is strong in this part of the country. Møre and Romsdal was also the county which educated the most midwives, through giving grants for education (Farstad, 2016, 7). According to Farstad (2016), midwives came from the ‘bondeallmuge’ (the peasant class), and they were used to hard work and physical hardship of all kinds (117). It was the tough, strong, and physically hardened women of the peasant class that had what it took to become a midwife (Farstad, 2016, 117).

When aligning their movement to the tradition of midwifery, the *Bunadsgerilja* plays upon a narrative of labor, birth, and traditionally female work, which has existed in centuries in this particular area of the country. This narrative concerns the need for educated (historically female) helpers for women in labor in the districts. This alignment is strategic, as there exists a strong link between the center-periphery debate and midwives. Activists on Facebook tell stories of their own experiences as midwives, or of their encounters with this profession. They argue that it is a profession of strength, with highly competent professionals (mostly women) providing compassion, guidance, a toolbox for coping with life after giving birth. Some Facebook activists express that after years of being midwives, it is not the size of the maternity care that decides whether the profession is executed professionally or safely. That in smaller units, the patients experience being seen on another level. Activists claim that midwives continuously provide care throughout pregnancy and birth no matter the situation, and that the postnatal care provides improved health for both mothers and babies. According to the activists,

midwives are supposed to safeguard and promote the natural process of birth, and involve doctors when necessary, and several express the importance of this cooperation between midwives and doctors. Almost all the activists that talk about the importance of safe births on Facebook mention the crucial job the midwives do, and many say that this old profession is a noble one that should be kept alive. Midwives in the Facebook group express concern of the pressure at work, the extensive workload, and the worries about being too few people at work. They wish for the “neoliberal wind to turn” (author’s translation). Some tell detailed stories of shifts at work when luck and competence work side by side to make the “extreme shifts” possible (author’s translation). “We only have two hands and two feet” is a common statement, as midwives explain how the stress of having too many to look after in one shift is almost impossible to handle (author’s translation). They talk about concerns for tasks that are not handled as they should be when facing a stressful shift, such as reporting at the end of the shift correctly, because the hectic environment blurs details out. They push themselves to the limit and are tired of being called “angles with warm hands”, seeing as they appreciate these statements but would rather wish for compensation for their hard work (author’s translation). They are not satisfied with the salaries, they are not satisfied with the workload, they express exhaustion and anxiety. However, most of the midwife-activist say they love their careers as midwives.

In the prognostic framing of the *Bunadsgerilja*, they align their movement to traditionally gendered division of labor, where men are in the public sphere and women in the private or social reproductive. They also align their movement to traditional gender roles where the future depends on midwives and female bodies reproducing the nation. The alignment to nationalism reproduces the representation of a national, female body: “the nation becomes a source of identity and an object of dutiful commitment, on the one hand, due to its identification with the mother, the sister, the feminine familial principle that must be safeguarded; and, on the other hand, by means of its association with the natural nuclear family, that is, the “mother” and the “father” conceived in their hierarchical roles, body and head, motherland and fatherland” (Farris, 2017, 70). According to Farris, the representation of the female body in the nationalism also “evokes notions of “genesis”, “birth”, and the “ancestry”, thus operating as a powerful performative metaphor for nationalism’s invocation of myths of common origin, common blood, and kinship” (Farris, 2017, 70). One of the activists talk about the New Year’s speech of the Prime Minister of Norway in 2019, where she encourages women to give birth to more babies to keep the welfare state alive (NRK, 2019). The activist criticizes Solberg for this

speech, as the maternity ward in Kristiansund was shut down just a few months later. The activist claims that the Prime Minister is encouraging women to protect future generations, while ignoring the importance of educated midwives and actual places to give birth. According to Yuval-Davis, “the call for women, however, to have more or fewer children is hardly ever uniform to all women, from all class, ability and ethnic groupings” (1997, 130). The activist group is aware of this, making it a feminist point that equal maternity services should be a top priority.

It is interesting seeing how the *Bunadsgerilja* expresses feminist sentiments, while also aligning their movement to symbols of Norwegian nationalism. According to Enloe (2014), many feminists approach “nationalism with extreme caution” because “building alliances between women’s advocates in all of their country’s ethnic and racial communities is crucial for a vibrant, sustainable women’s movement” (88). As women have “served as symbols of the nation violated, the nation suffering, the nation reproducing itself, the nation at its purest”, women have not been equated as genuine participants “with their own ideas, goals, and skills” in the previous nationalist movements (Enloe, 2014, 88). Rather, women have been reduced to symbols of a national “us”, an “us” that has “strong potential to be exclusivist, even xenophobic” (Enloe, 2014, 88). The activists of the *Bunadsgerilja* talk about solidarity in many of their Facebook posts and comments. I find it important to ask: Solidarity for whom? Their social movement is constructed as a ‘us and them’-group, in many ways in the same manner as the nationalist political projects. However, the *Bunadsgerilja* construct their movement as one where they are against elites controlling female bodies in the districts, while they are also being exclusive as to who can belong to the movement and how far the movement discussion reaches. Ultimately, their framing creates tensions between being inclusive ‘to all’ and at the same time limiting their framing to a few. Their solidarity has clear cut boundaries, but their framing also gains from their boundary work. It becomes a question of women supporting women in the districts, for the rights to the same health care services as what is offered in bigger cities both nationally and globally.

7 Conclusion

Despite many Norwegians' claim to the contrary, Norway is not an exceptional country. Parallels to its nature, culture, and history—all of which form the basis of a narrative of Norwegian exceptionalism—can be found elsewhere. Nor, it should be stated, is the Bunadsgerilja an exceptional social movement. Their fight for women's health, their fight from the periphery against the center, and even their feminist invocation of nationalist symbols are all characteristics which the Bunadsgerilja shares with other social movements—both nationally and globally. Yet, as has been the core contention of this study, there is something about this particular movement in its particular national context which makes it particularly interesting from a feminist point of view. The specific form of nationalism on which the Bunadsgerilja draws—Norway's peculiar form of postcolonial nationalism—has been efficiently and skillfully linked to evoke past experiences of oppression. As has their invocation of the feminine body as a symbol of the nation which, in turn, has been coupled with the politicizing of care. And, importantly, despite—or, indeed, because of—their skillful coupling of feminist struggles to a past national cause against oppression and domination, the Bunadsgerilja has brought on a vital (unintended) consequence of excluding those who are most vulnerable to the effects of cutbacks. These three things that make this particular movement worthy of study, I have argued, are best grasped by combining frame analysis with feminist intersectional theory.

The thesis therefore began by asking, firstly, what framing strategies are used by the Bunadsgerilja? In the first chapter of the analysis, the Bunadsgerilja's link to this specific form of Norwegian nationalism and its paradoxical relationship to a post-colonial positionality was investigated. Norwegian nationalism, it was argued, arose out of a protest against their neighboring countries, Sweden and Denmark, after centuries of being subdued by either or both. What makes this form of nationalism particularly peculiar or paradoxical is that, despite this lingering sentiment of being 'the underdog', Norway is today a country of wealth and prosperity, much due to oil reserves and a social democratic government. Nevertheless, this spirit of being the subdued is still something by which many Norwegians identify. After the merging of the maternity wards, the Bunadsgerilja strategically aligned themselves to, and framed their whole movement on, this form of Norwegian postcolonial nationalism in order to gain momentum for their cause. In the second chapter of the analysis, it was discovered that

one of the particular ways in which the Bunadsgerilja strategically framed this form of nationalism was by aligning their movement frame to the bunad and the sentiments attached to this garment, including the fact that it is a garment associated with strength, solidarity and pride. As a garment that works as a symbol of independence, the Bunadsgerilja strategically associated their movement to that symbolism in order to create a powerful visual effect, mobilize the Norwegian population for their cause, and to be put on the map politically. Lastly, in the third and final chapter of the analysis, this thesis found that the Bunadsgerilja strategically framed their movement to that of the center-periphery debate and the fight of the district, with the fear of political dominance that underpins this debate, as well as to the tradition of midwifery, which is strong in the rural parts of Norway.

What the Bunadsgerilja signifies is, in other words, a unique way of mobilizing national sentiments for a feminist cause. The thesis was, therefore, centered around a second question: namely, what tensions between nationalism and progressive (feminist) politics can be identified in the strategies employed by the Bunadsgerilja? What I found was that when the Bunadsgerilja framed their social movement to that of the Norwegian nationalism, they ultimately reproduced images of who can belong – to the nation in general and to the movement in particular. The reproduction of this specific narrative of belonging creates boundaries which are inclusive of those for whom the bunad and the Norwegian struggle for independence is central to their identification as Norwegians, but excludes many Norwegians who do not. The Sami population, as well as people having migrated to Norway from other countries, are ‘accidentally’ left out of the equation or excluded all together. The ‘authentic’ national culture in Norway is constructed to be peripheral; the true Norwegians are those who reside in and come from the districts. When the Bunadsgerilja aligns their framing to the bunad, they reproduce this rural identity from which the bunad comes, as well as the old gender stereotypes and the specific femininity this garment presents. Additionally, when the Bunadsgerilja attaches their framing to the center-periphery debate and the midwife tradition, they reproduce a specific version of the ‘rural woman’ centered on old gender norms and traditional gendered division of labor. All in all, this frame alignment creates tensions between the Bunadsgerilja’s feminist and progressive outlook and what it turns out they are representing and reproducing.

The strategies the Bunadsgerilja have utilized, and the tensions to which they have given rise, have had, to be sure, political repercussions. The third and final question was therefore centered on understanding the potential effects of these framing strategies from a critical feminist perspective. I found that the Bunadsgerilja's symbolic use of the nationalist discourse, the bunad, the alignment to the center-periphery debate and the midwife tradition creates boundaries of who can belong to the group, of who is included in their solidarity and their fight for equal health services, but that there is something to gain by strategically framing their movement in such a way. When the Bunadsgerilja aligned their framing to something well-known—associated with positive sentiments such as independence, solidarity, and celebration—and although such a framing reproduces outdated gender roles, one might call the framing a progressive appropriation of national symbolism to gain momentum for equal health services across the entire country, not only in urban centers. Their solidarity does not cover all women or all people, but in the end, what it comes down to, is a social movement of women supporting women in the districts. It is a movement, one might argue, that strategically excludes in order to include.

References

- Afsar, H. (2020) *Bunad og hijab*. <https://www.rights.no/2020/05/bunad-og-hijab/> [16.11.2020]
- Anderson, B. (2006 [1983]) *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Asprey, R. B. (2019) *Guerrilla warfare*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/guerrilla-warfare/The-post-Cold-War-period> . [30.10.2020]
- Benford, R. D. & Snow, D. A. (2000) Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 26:1, 611-639.
- Bengtsson, A. R. (2018) Collective mobilization among welfare professionals in Sweden – the politicisation of caring. In Sowa, F., Staples, R. & Zapfel, S. (eds) *The Transformation of Work in Welfare State Organizations: New Public Management and the Institutional Diffusion of Ideas*. 164-181. London and New York: Routledge.
- Berlet, C. (2011) Taking tea parties seriously: corporate globalization, populism, and resentment. *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology*. 10:1, 11-29.
- Bjerknes, S. S. (2019) – *Vi må kjempe for det vi har kjært*. <https://www.nrk.no/mr/-vi-ma-kjempe-for-det-vi-har-kjaert-1.14380342> [12.02.2020]
- Bjørnstad, M. G. (2019) *Bunadsgeriljaen: Derfor har Anja gått med bunaden nesten hver dag siden April*. <https://www.kk.no/livet/derfor-har-anja-gatt-med-bunaden-nesten-hver-dag-siden-april/71733998> [28.01.2020]
- Bunadrosen (2020) *Fremgangsmåte ved kjøp av bunad*. https://www.bunadrosen.no/fremgangsmaate_ved_kjop_av_bunad [16.11.2020]
- Byrkjeflot, H. & Guldbrandsøy, K. (2013) Både hierarkisk styring og nettverk: *En studie av utviklingen i styringen av norske sykehus*. Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning. 54: 4, 463-491.
- Byrkjeflot, H. & Grønlie, T. (2005) Det regionale helseforetaket – mellom velferdslokalisme og sentralstatlig styring. In S. Opedal & I. M. Stigen (eds.) *Helse-Norge i støpeskjeen – søkelys på sykehusreformen* (pp. 198 – 217). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Calhoun (1997) *Nationalism*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Cambridge Dictionary (2020) *Guerrilla* <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/guerrilla> [18.10.2020]
- Christensen, A. & Jensen, S. Q. (2012) Doing Intersectional Analysis: Methodological Implications for Qualitative Research. *Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*. 20: 2, 109-125.
- Christensen, T., P. Lægveid & I. M. Stigen (2004). *Performance Management and Public Sector Reform: The Norwegian Hospital Reform*. Working Paper 17. Bergen:

Stein Rokkan Centre for Social Studies.

- Christensen, T. & Lægreid, P. (2007) Introduction – Theoretical Approach and Research Questions. *Transcending New Public Management – The Transformation of Public Sector Reforms*. England: Ashgate Publishing.
- Collins, P. H. (1986) Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought. *Social Problems*. 33:6, 14-32.
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1991) Mapping the margins – Intersectionality, identity politics and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*. 43:6, 1241-1299.
- Davis, J. E. (2002) *Stories of Change*. Albany, SUNY Press.
- Della Porta, D. & Diani, M. (2006) *Social Movements: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Dolonen, Kari Anne (2019) *Kvinner i bunad «kødder» man ikke med*.
<https://sykepleien.no/2019/05/kvinner-i-bunad-kodder-man-ikkemed> [12.05.2020]
- Edenborg, E. (2017) *Politics of Visibility and Belonging: From Russia's "Homosexual Propaganda" Laws to the Ukraine War*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Eidhammer, T. (2019) *Få oversikt: Dette er kutt-planene til Helse Møre og Romsdal*.
<https://smp.no/nyheter/2019/01/09/Få-overiskt-Dette-er-kutt-planene-til-Helse-Møre-og-Romsdal-18216468.ece> [24.01.2020]
- Eglenius, G. (2009) Successful Nation-Building and Ceremonial Triumph: Constitution Day in Norway. In David McCrone & Gayle McPherson (eds). *National Days: Constructing and Mobilising National Identity*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Enloe C. (2014) *Bananas, Beaches and Bases. Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: California University Press.
- Eriksen, T. H. (1993) Being Norwegian in a Shrinking World: Reflections on Norwegian Identity. In Anne Cohen Kiel (ed). *Continuity and Change: Aspects of Modern Norway*. Scandinavia University Press.
- Eriksen, T. H. (2004) Keeping the recipe: Norwegian folk costumes and cultural capital. *Focaal – European Journal of Anthropology*. 44, 20-34.
- Farris, S. R. (2017) *In the Name of Women's Rights: The Rise of Femonationalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Farstad, A. (2016) *På liv og død: Distriktsjordmødrenes historie*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.
- Flem, S.S (2019) *Fakkemarkering mot helsekutt*.
<https://www.smp.no/nyheter/2019/01/10/Fakkemarkering-mot-helsekutt-18223042.ece>
[24.01.2020]

- franzke, a. s., Bechmann, A., Zimmer, M., Ess, C. and the Association of Internet Researchers (2020) *Internet Research: Ethical Guidelines 3.0*. <https://aoir.org/reports/ethics3.pdf> [02.09.2020]
- Fraser, N. (2017) Crisis of Care? On the Social-Reproductive Contradictions of Contemporary Capitalism. In Bhattacharya, T. (ed) *Social Reproduction Theory – Remapping Class, Recentering Oppression*. London: Pluto Press
- Garden, V. A. (2019) *Bunadsgeriljaen med et nytt stunt: Ror høygravid kvinne til Kristiansund*. <https://www.vg.no/nyheter/innenriks/i/4qOPgR/bunadsgeriljaen-med-et-nytt-stunt-ror-hoeygravid-kvinne-til-kristiansund> [28.05.2019]
- Goffman, E. (1974) *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of the Experience*. New York: Harper Colophon.
- Granberg, M. & Nygren, K. G. (2017) Paradoxes of Anti-austerity Protest: Matters of Neoliberalism, Gender, and Subjectivity in a Case of Collective Resignation. *Gender, Work and Organisation*. 24:1, 56-68.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2011) Decolonizing Post-Colonial Studies and Paradigms of Political-Economy: Transmodernity, Decolonial Thinking, and Global Coloniality. *TRANSMODERNITY: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic*. 1:1.
- Halvorsen, A. (2018) *berserker*. <https://snl.no/berserker> [06.01.2021]
- Hansen, S. (2020) *Hold den undertrykkende hijaben vekk fra bunad og norske tradisjoner*. <https://resett.no/2020/05/13/hold-den-undertrykkende-hijaben-vekk-fra-bunad-og-norske-tradisjoner/#> [16.11.2020]
- Haraway, D. (1988) Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*. 14:3, 575-599.
- Harding, S. (1992) Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is "Strong Objectivity?". *The Centennial Review*. 36:3, 437-470.
- Harding, S. (2004) *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Haugsvær, N. (2016) *Bunaden startet som en motkulturell bevegelse*. <https://www.aftenposten.no/osloby/i/6n8Rr/bunaden-startet-som-en-motkulturell-bevegelse> [28.01.2020]
- Helse Møre and Romsdal (2019) *Om oss*. <https://helse-mr.no/om-oss#om-helseforetaket> [12.02.2020]
- Hunshamar, C. & Lien, M. S. (2019) *Sa opp drømmejobben som jordmor i protest: - Det handler om liv og død*. <https://www.vg.no/nyheter/innenriks/i/naOB9n/sa-opp-droemmejobben-som-jordmor-i-protest-det-handler-om-liv-og-doed> [28th of January 2020]

- Jacoby, T. A. (1999) Feminism, Nationalism, and Difference: Reflections on the Palestinian Women's Movement. *Women's Studies International Forum*. 22:5, 511-523.
- Jakobsen, S. E. (2014) *Før gikk rebellene i bunad*. <https://forskning.no/historie-kulturhistorie-kulturpolitikk/for-gikk-rebellene-i-bunad/561690> [28.01.2020]
- Johnston, H. & Alimi, E. Y. (2013) A Methodology Analyzing for Frame Dynamics: The Grammar of Keying Battles in Palestinian Nationalism. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*. 18:4, 453-474.
- Kjølmoen, P. V (2019) «Trenger mer penger, ikke omorganisering». <https://www.smp.no/meninger/ytring/2019/01/15/«Trenger-mer-penger-ikkeomorganisering»-18252111.ece> [27.01.2020]
- Kolstø, P. (2006) National Symbols as Signs of Unity and Division. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 29:4, 676-701.
- Kristoffersen, A (2019) «Massivt svik mot pasientene i Møre og Romsdal». <https://www.smp.no/meninger/ytring/2019/01/15/«Massivt-svik-mot-pasientene-i-Møre-og-Romsdal»-18252689.ece> [24.01.2020]
- Kvam, U. I. (2019) *Bunaden er et politisk plagg*. <https://www.vg.no/nyheter/meninger/i/Xg9AbW/bunaden-er-et-politisk-plagg> [28.05.2020]
- Langøren, A. (2007) Sentralisering – årsaker, virkninger og politikk. *Samfunnsspeilet*. 2, <https://www.ssb.no/offentlig-sektor/artikler-og-publikasjoner/sentralisering-aarsaker-virkninger-og-politikk> [27.01.2020]
- Lofstad, R. (2016) *Sahfana (37) fikk sydd bunad med hijab. Har utløst et skred av hatmeldinger og rasisme*. <https://www.dagbladet.no/nyheter/sahfana-37-fikk-sydd-bunad-med-hijab-har-utlost-et-skred-av-hatmeldinger-og-rasisme/60245126> [16.11.2020]
- Luka, M. E., Millette, M. & Wallace, J. (2017) A Feminist Perspective on Ethical Digital Methods. In Zimmer, M. & Kinder-Kurlanda, K. (eds) *Internet Research Ethics for the Social Age: New Challenges, Cases, and Contexts* (2017) New York: Peter Lang.
- Løset, I. & Skare, A. H (2019) «Pasientene i fokus». <https://www.smp.no/meninger/ytring/2019/01/15/«Pasientene-i-fokus»-18252110.ece> [25.01.2020]
- McCall, L. (2005) The Complexity of Intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. 20:3, 1771- 1800.
- Noakes, J. A. & Johnston, H. (2005) Frames of Protest: A Road Map to a Perspective. In Johnston, H. & Noakes, J. A. (eds), *Frames of Protest: Social Movements and the Framing Perspective*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1-29.

- Neumann, I. B. (2002) This little piggy stayed at home: why Norway is not a member of the EU. In Hansen, L. & Wæver, O. (eds) *European Integration and National Identity: The Challenge of the Nordic States*. 88-129. London: Routledge.
- Neumann, I. B. (2014a) Det danske imperium og 1814. *Internasjonal Politikk*. 72:3, 298-309.
- Neumann, I. B. (2014b) Imperializing Norden. *Cooperation and Conflict*. 49:1, 119-129.
- NRK Møre and Romsdal (2019) *Helse Møre og Romsdal 6. februar*.
<https://www.nrk.no/mr/helse-more-og-romsdal-1.12684392> [16.02.2020]
- NRK (2019) – *Lag flere barn, ber statsministeren i sin nyttårstale*.
<https://www.nrk.no/norge/statsministeren-bekymret-over-lave-fodselstall-1.14362212>
 [16.11.2020]
- Musavi, R. (2019) *Jeg gikk ut døren på 17.mai med en klump i halsen. Men aldri før har jeg fått så mye skryt fra fremmede*.
<https://www.aftenposten.no/meninger/debatt/i/kJdyw6/jeg-gikk-ut-doeren-paa-17-mai-med-en-klump-i-halsen-men-aldri-foer-har> [16.11.2020]
- Pedersen, G. & Røsvik, K. G. (2019) «Trygghet, kvalitet og respekt».
<https://www.smp.no/meninger/ytring/2019/02/12/«Trygghet-kvalitet-og-respekt»-18459645.ece> [28.02.2020]
- Phillips, S. D. (2014) The Women's Squad in Ukraine's protests: Feminism, nationalism, and militarism on the Maidan. *American Ethnologist*. 41:3, 414-426.
- Ramme, J. (2019) Framing Solidarity. Feminist Patriots Opposing the Far Right in Contemporary Poland. *Open Cultural Studies*. 2, 469-484.
- Reese, E. & Newcombe, G. (2003) Income Rights, Mothers' Rights, or Workers' Rights? Collective Action Frames, Organizational Ideologies, and the American Welfare Rights Movement. *Social problems*. 50:2, 294-318.
- Reite, T (2019) *Styret I Helse Møre og Romsdal Vedtok omstridd spareplan*.
<https://www.nrk.no/mr/i-dag-vedtek-helse-more-og-romsdal-omstridd-spareplan-1.14394736> [24.01.2020]
- Schistad, E. (2019) *Eit sviktande hjarte*. <https://www.smp.no/nyheter/2019/01/23/Eit-sviktande-hjarte-18303730.ece> [24.01.2020]
- Selberg, R. (2019) The midwife case and conscientious objection: new ways of framing abortion in Sweden. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*. DOI: 10.1080/14616742.2019.1608841
- Snow, D.A. & Benford, R. D. (1988) Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. *Int. Soc. Mov. Res.* 1, 197-218.
- Snow, D.A., Rochford E.B., Worden, S.K., Benford, R.D. (1986) Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 51, 464-81.

- Solvik, A.C. (2019a) *Forhistorie*. <http://bunadsgeriljaen.no/b/%E2%80%8Bforhistori> [15.03.2020]
- Solvik, A. C. (2019b) *Det første bildet*. <http://bunadsgeriljaen.no/b/en-god-ide> [15.03.2020]
- Solvik, A. C. (2019c) *Alt flyter fint*. <http://bunadsgeriljaen.no/b/alt-flyter-fint> [15.03.2020]
- Solvik, A. C. (2019d) *Sandnessjøen*. <http://bunadsgeriljaen.no/b/sandnessjoeen> [15.03.2020]
- Solvik, A. C. (2019e) *Appell ved Stortinget*. <https://bunadsgeriljaen.no/virkeligheten> [15.03.2020]
- SSB (2020a) *Kommunefakta, Molde (Møre og Romsdal)*. <https://www.ssb.no/kommunefakta/molde> [28.10.2020]
- SSB (2020b) *Kommunefakta, Kristiansund (Møre og Romsdal)*. <https://www.ssb.no/kommunefakta/kristiansund> [28.10.2020]
- Strand, S. (2018) The Norwegian *Bunad*: Peasant Dress, Embroidered Costume, and National Symbol. *The Journal of Dress History*. 2:3, 100-121.
- Sørensen, Øystein (1994) Nordic Paths to National Identity in the Nineteenth Century. *KULTs skriftserie* (Nr 22) 17-36
- Thonstad, M. (2007) Hva kan 150 års statistikk fortelle oss om sykehusenes utvikling? In Bore, R. R (ed.) *På Liv og død. Helsestatistikk i 150 år*. Oslo: Statistisk sentralbyrå.
- Wolfinger, E. (2016) «But it's already public, right?»: The ethics of using online data. *Data-driven Journalism*: n.pag. Print. [https://www.academia.edu/35203484/ But its already public right The ethics of using online data](https://www.academia.edu/35203484/But_its_already_public_right_The_ethics_of_using_online_data) [15.09.2020]
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1997) *Gender & Nation*. London: Sage Publications Ltd
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2011) *The Politics of Belonging: Intersectional Contestations*. London: Sage
- Yuval-Davis, N. & Anthias, F. (1989) *Woman – Nation – State*. Basingstoke: MacMillan.
- Østergård, U. (1997) The Geopolitics of Nordic Identity from Composite States to Nation-States. *Columbia International Affairs Online*. 1–25. <http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/osu01/> [15.03.2020].
- Østerud, Ø. (2005) Introduction: The Peculiarities of Norway. *Western European Politics*. 28:4, 705-720.

Pictures

Anja Cecilie Solvik wearing a bunad and flexing muscles in the Kristiansund maternity ward. (2019) [Online] www.bunadsgeriljaen.no [15.03.2020].

Bunadsgerilja in a rowboat. (2019) [Online] www.bunadsgeriljaen.no [15.03.2020].

Bunadsgerilja on top of mountain (2019) [Online] www.bunadsgeriljaen.no [15.03.2020].

Bunadsgerilja in front of the Storting. (2019) [Online] www.bunadsgeriljaen.no [15.03.2020].

Bunadsgerilja posing on a bridge. (2019) [Online] www.bunadsgeriljaen.no [15.03.2020].

Bunadsgerilja in national garment, waving the Norwegian national flag (2019) [Online] www.bunadsgeriljaen.no [15.03.2020].