This paper will discuss the ways in which the Other is produced and constituted in ethnography. I will examine recent accounts of Finnish ethnography by reading closely the methodological parts and descriptions of fieldwork. I will also discuss my own ethnographical work-in-progress in an anti-racist women’s project in Finland. How do the theoretical challenges of post-coloniality and post-structuralism reach the techniques/practices of knowledge production, in this case ethnography? Feminist ethnography has been concerned with “speaking” and “voices”: who speaks in ethnographic accounts, whose voice is heard and, for instance, the difference between speaking for and speaking to (see Spivak 1993 and Ahmed 1998). How does this “speaking” relate to the constitution of the Other, or following Sarah Ahmed, the stranger? Self-reflexivity is seen as a way out of these dilemmas. If self-reflexivity is taken seriously what kinds of effects does it have on fieldwork? What are the limits of self-reflexivity? Do the demands of self-reflexivity construct the researcher as an always conscious, autonomous subject?

My own ethnographical research is, on the one hand, about negotiations on womanhood and race/ethnicity in an anti-racist women's project in Finland, and, on the other hand, about the possibilities for feminist anti-racist work in the Finnish context. My questions concern the different gendered and racialised positions in the everyday-life of the project. How are they visible and how do they interplay with the hierarchies of these positions (including me as white researcher)? Despite of all feminist poststructuralist awareness, the research somehow includes a wish to "let the voices of these women be heard" or maybe a wish to tell a story different to dominant discourses in the society. How do the dilemmas of “speaking” and “voices” relate to my own research?