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Sámi Prehistories
The Politics of Archaeology and Identity in Northernmost Europe
Throughout the history of archaeology, the Sámi (the indigenous people in northern Norway, Sweden, Finland and the Kola Peninsula in the Russian Federation) have been conceptualized as the “Others” in relation to the national identity and (pre)history of the modern states. It is only in the last decades that a field of Sámi archaeology that studies Sámi (pre)history in its own right has emerged, parallel with an ethnic and cultural revival among Sámi groups.

This dissertation investigates the notions of Sámi prehistory and archaeology, partly from a research historical perspective and partly from a more contemporary political perspective. It explores how the Sámi and ideas about the Sámi past have been represented in archaeological narratives from the early 19th century until today, as well as the development of an academic field of Sámi archaeology.

The study consists of four main parts: 1) A critical examination of the conceptualization of ethnicity, nationalism and indigeneity in archaeological research. 2) A historical analysis of the representations and debates on Sámi prehistory, primarily in Sweden but also to some extent in Norway and Finland, focusing on four main themes: the origin of the Sámi people, South Sámi prehistory as a contested field of study, the development of reindeer herding, and Sámi pre-Christian religion. 3) An analysis of the study of the Sámi past in Russia, and a discussion on archaeological research and constructions of ethnicity and indigeneity in the Russian Federation and the Soviet Union. 4) An examination of the claims for greater Sámi self-determination concerning cultural heritage management and the debates on repatriation and reburial in the Nordic countries.

In the dissertation, it is argued that there is a great need for discussions on the ethics and politics of archaeological research. A relational network approach is suggested as a way of opening up some of the black boxes and bounded, static entities in the representations of people in the past in the North.
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A note on language

In the dissertation, I use many words in Russian, which creates certain difficulties. There are several different systems of transliteration from the Cyrillic alphabet to the Latin. In this dissertation, I have chosen to use the Swedish system of transliteration. However, in certain situations I have used the English system, for instance concerning personal and place names with a well-known, established English spelling. I have also used the English spelling of researchers’ names, if their publications have been printed in English. In the list of references, I give both the transliterated form and the original form in Cyrillic. Consequently, readers can always transcribe the words using any system of transliteration.

There are several Sámi languages with different orthographies, which cause problems concerning how to represent Sámi words. In the text, I have attempted to use the North Sámi spelling. The denomination Sámi itself can be spelled in several different ways, as Sámí, Sami or Saami. In this dissertation, I have chosen to use the variant Sámi.
Introduction to the dissertation

“In our country, as is well known, live not only Swedish people”. So begins the article “Nationaliteterna i Norrland” (‘The nationalities in Norrland’) published in the late 19th century by the Swedish linguist K.B. Wiklund (1868–1934), who later in life was considered to be the foremost expert on all Sámi matters. Of course everyone knew that there were also Sámi (Lapps as they were called in those days) and Finns living in the northern parts of Sweden. The aim of Wiklund’s article was to answer the questions, considered to be of great current interest, concerning how long these foreign peoples had lived in Sweden, how large their settlement areas had been in the past and what future they could have in “our land”. Wiklund concluded that the Swedish nationality, in the forests of the Finn tracts as well as in the barren lands of Lapland, “advances everywhere, and advances with the right that the superior culture possesses over the inferior” and he ended the article with the wish that “the civilization, of which the Swedish are representatives, will at one time, as far as possible, extend all over our country” (Wiklund 1895:386; my translation).

These words by K.B. Wiklund are quite illustrative of the attitudes in Sweden towards the Sámi (but also the Finnish speaking population) – attitudes that in different ways interrelated with the understanding of “Sáminess” and the Sámi past – at a time when archaeology as an academic discipline was being formed.

Throughout the history of archaeology, the Sámi have been conceptualized as the “Others” in relation to the identity and (pre)history writing of the modern states. In line with this, the concepts of Sámi prehistory and Sámi archaeology have been, and still are to a certain extent, considered to be controversial and highly politicized concepts among many archaeologists in Sweden, in contrast to the neutral and unpolitical understanding of a Swedish prehistory and archaeology. It is only in the last decades that a field of Sámi archaeology that studies Sámi prehistory in its own right has emerged, parallel with a larger ethnic and cultural revival among Sámi groups. Within the Sámi ethnopolitical movement, and relating to the international indigenous peoples’ rights movement, claims have been raised for more cultural autonomy and self-determination and control over the cultural heritage management.

With this background, it is the aim of this dissertation to investigate the notions of Sámi prehistory and Sámi archaeology, partly from a research historical perspective and partly from a more contemporary political perspective. The dissertation sets out to explore how the Sámi, and ideas about
the Sámi past, have been represented in archaeological and other academic narratives from the early 19th century until today. It also aims to discuss the development of an academic field of Sámi archaeology, as well as the claims for more Sámi self-determination concerning cultural heritage management, which are at present most clearly manifested in the debates on repatriation and reburial.

On a more general level, the dissertation relates to current debates in archaeology and in other human and social sciences on themes such as the meaning and importance of archaeology and prehistory in different contexts in contemporary communities, the conceptualization of identity and ethnicity in archaeological research, as well as cultural heritage management issues, archaeological ethics and the roles and responsibilities of professional archaeologists.

Aims

In this dissertation, I intend to examine the concepts of Sámi prehistory and Sámi archaeology – and some of the historical, cultural and political contexts in which they function. This is done partly from a research historical perspective and partly from a contemporary perspective.

The main aim is to investigate how the Sámi people and ideas about the Sámi past have been portrayed in archaeological research from the early 19th century until today, and to examine some of the historical and contemporary conflicts, controversies and negotiations that have evolved around the notion of a Sámi past. My aim is further, with the starting point in the discourses on restitution, repatriation and reburial, to discuss issues concerning the right to define and control objects and representations of the past in the northern areas, issues with fundamental implications for the theory and practice of archaeology and cultural heritage management. In my view, these are important questions that need to be discussed more among archaeologists, not least when considering the historical marginalization of Sámi identity, culture and history and the troubled and ambivalent relationship between what is considered as Sámi and what is considered as Swedish.

The present-day Sámi settlement and cultural area, called Sápmi, also extends into the Kola Peninsula in the Russian Federation. Therefore, an additional aim of this study is to examine the views on the Sámi and their past within the academic and political contexts of the Russian Federation and the Soviet Union, contexts that in many ways differ quite substantially from the ones in the Nordic countries. This is an important aim for my study, as the level of knowledge about archaeological research and views on ethnicity and ethnogenesis in the Russian Federation and the Soviet Union is very low in Sweden and many other parts of Western Europe, although the present-day state boundaries on the North Calotte were completely irrelevant in the
prehistoric context and although this field of research can be very relevant also from a Swedish perspective. Furthermore, the example of Russian/Soviet archaeology, history and ethnography is interesting as a comparison, complement and partly as a challenge to the predominant discourses in the Nordic countries.

The aim of the dissertation is not first and foremost to write or rewrite the (pre)history of the Sámi, or to value and rank the different, sometimes opposing views on specific historical problems that have been put forth by various researchers over time. Rather, the aim is to explore, from a critical perspective, how Sámi prehistory has been studied, and to follow how spaces and places for Sámi prehistory have been constructed and deconstructed in the making, changing and un-making of images and narratives of the past – historical images and narratives that have been influenced by, and that at the same time have profoundly affected, the contemporary political views and governmental policies towards the Sámi communities.

One of the most important threads in the dissertation deals with the relationship between the notions of Sámi prehistory and Swedish prehistory, as well as the notions of Sámi archaeology and Swedish archaeology. Perhaps the most basic question of the study, from the Swedish perspective, can be formulated in the following way: Is there room for a Sámi prehistory in the archaeological narratives in Sweden? My wish is that the dissertation might inspire the readers to critically rethink the notions of Swedish and Sámi prehistory, and that it might initiate and stimulate discussions on the constructions and representations of the cultural heritage and the past, and the politics of place, identity and archaeology in the northernmost parts of Europe and elsewhere.

Outline of the dissertation

The dissertation consists of four interrelated main parts:

**Part One** “Networks of archaeology: Constructions of identity, ethnicity and indigeneity” introduces and explores some of the central theoretical issues of the dissertation concerning the construction and use of concepts of identity and ethnicity in archaeological research. I also discuss nationalist, internationalist and indigenous approaches to archaeology and the writing of (pre)history. The concept of indigeneity or indigenousness and the related concept of indigenous archaeology, which are very important in many contemporary discourses on Sámi identity, cultural heritage and history, are also critically examined. I conclude this first part of the dissertation with a discussion of some tentative ideas of a relational network approach to the problems of identity and ethnicity in archaeology, inspired in part by the so-called actor-network theory, as a basis for considering different ways of relating to the past, and as a way of trying to
overcome dualistic thinking and avoid homogeneous and bounded entities and essentialist “black boxes” when dealing with people in prehistory.

Part Two “Mapping the North in the West: Representations of Sámi prehistory and conceptions of Sámi archaeology in the Nordic countries” introduces the main question about the historiography of Sámi prehistory and gives a historical and contemporary background to the concept of Sápmi and Sámi identity and culture in the Nordic countries. In this part, I discuss the ways in which the Sámi people and Sámi prehistory have been portrayed in archaeological and other academic discourses from the early 19th century until today. The focus is primarily on research in Sweden, but I also compare with certain aspects of the research conducted in the other Nordic countries. More specifically, I examine four main themes, which have been central in the discourses on Sámi (pre)history: firstly, the origin of the Sámi people; secondly, South Sámi prehistory as a contested field of archaeological research; thirdly, the emergence and development of reindeer herding and pastoralism; and finally, Sámi pre-Christian religion.

Part Three “Mapping the North in the East: Archaeology and identity politics in the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation” examines the writing of prehistory and the views on Sámi prehistory in the eastern parts of Sápmi that are located within the boundaries of the present-day Russian Federation. In this part, I also discuss the construction of the so-called small-numbered peoples of the North and approaches to ethnogenesis and ethnohistory in ethnographical and archaeological research in the Russian Federation and the Soviet Union.

Part Four “Contesting the North: Sámi self-determination and the debates on repatriation and reburial” explores the demands for greater Sámi self-determination and control concerning cultural heritage policies. Here, I examine the debates on repatriation and reburial, from a Nordic as well as from an international perspective. I look at the historical background to the repatriation and reburial demands in Sweden and follow the negotiations in some concrete cases. Part Four is concluded with a discussion on how archaeologists have related to and handled the demands and challenges presented by indigenous and other groups in different parts of the world, in considerations and reflections on archaeological ethics.

Each of the four main parts is followed by a discussion, in which I conclude the examination and comment on the results of the study. In the dissertation, I analyze Sámi prehistory and archaeology along three main threads: the past as science, the past as politics and the past as administration. These analytical threads or levels are, I argue, closely interrelated, and I use the concept of archaeological networks to investigate how the threads are woven together in the archaeological approaches to the past. In the final concluding part, I try to
bring together the different threads in the dissertation and discuss some prospects for the future of archaeology in the North.

About the structure of the study

The historiographical study is based mainly on textual sources, selected because they in different ways deal with Sámi (pre)history and archaeology. The majority of these texts originate from archaeological discourses, but I also use texts from other academic contexts, such as historical, anthropological and ethnological texts, and some examples of popular scientific texts. Additional source material in the dissertation also includes archaeological material, archival material, court records, Internet sites and mass media sources. The historiographical study in Part Two is based primarily on source material from Sweden, but also partly from Norway and Finland. In the study in Part Three, the sources are mainly produced in the Russian Federation and the Soviet Union.

At the center of the study are the two contested concepts of Sámi prehistory and Sámi archaeology. The use of these concepts raises many principally important questions concerning the definition and naming of history. In this dissertation, it is not my aim to provide any new clear-cut definitions of the concepts of Sámi prehistory and archaeology, rather it is my aim to study how they have been used in different contexts and how they have been defined by different actors. This study is first and foremost not an examination of Sámi prehistory, but an examination of the study of Sámi prehistory. In the study, my intention is not to discuss these concepts in order to create new categories with specific criteria for inclusion and exclusion, but to investigate how the concepts have been debated and contested, and how they have been attributed with different meanings and used in various ways by the different actors.

The historiographical study could be described as a critical examination of the history of archaeological research. The study could also, in a sense, be described as a “political analysis” of the positions and responsibilities of archaeology in today’s society. It is partly inspired by post-colonial approaches and it applies a critical perspective on the constructions and representations of narratives and images of past and present events, identities and places. The study is also concerned with the relations of power, processes of empowerment and regimes of control and surveillance in the production of archaeological narratives and in the more general production and arrangement of space and time. In Part One, I suggest a relational network approach to identity and ethnicity, which is used in the dissertation also as a basis for discussing and analyzing the networks of archaeology – networks that stretch over time and space and enroll many diverse elements, for which the archaeologists attempt to speak, in the creation of images and narratives of the past and the present.
I

Networks of Archaeology

Constructions of identity, ethnicity and indigeneity
As stated in the introduction, the main aim of this book is to investigate the ways in which Sámi prehistory have been represented in archaeological research and how spaces for Sámi prehistory have been constructed, contested and debated in the archaeological discourses. However, when discussing the topic of Sámi prehistory and Sámi archaeology, one inevitably must confront and deal with some basic theoretical problems concerning the construction of identity, ethnicity, nationalism and indigeneity, and how these notions have been conceptualized and used in archaeological research. Identity has emerged in recent decades as a very influential approach in historical and archaeological research, and has become an important analytical concept in many studies of the past. My aim here is to analyze some aspects of the debates on these issues in archaeology and other human and social sciences, and to discuss some of my own views on the topic. In this part, I focus mainly on two interrelated aspects of the identity discourses, namely ethnicity and indigeneity. Indigeneity has been a central concept in recent discourses on Sámi (pre)history and cultural heritage. Therefore, I will examine the constructions of indigeneity or “indigenousness” and the relatively new notion of “indigenous archaeology”. These concepts have been lively debated internationally and are highly relevant and interesting also for the case of Sámi prehistory and archaeology. This first part of the book is intended as a framework for the discussions in the following parts, which will deal more specifically with the main questions concerning Sámi prehistory and archaeology.

As a starting-point for the study, I use the notion of archaeological networks in order to underline that the archaeological discourses are embedded in many different cultural, social, economic and political processes. Archaeologists work across time and space and create images and narratives of the past by linking together, and transforming, a wide variety of materials, places and ideas. Archaeology often plays an important role as a producer of raw material for narratives of group identities that are linked to the past and to the land. This network activity is also a political activity, with consequences for other people. My point of departure is that all ethnic, national and territorial concepts are part of networks of power, and that archaeologists need to be aware of the power play involved.

To conclude this first part, I will discuss some ideas on an alternative relational network approach to ethnicity and identity in archaeology, in order to try to overcome some of the fundamental problems with essentialism and the
sharp boundaries between peoples and cultures. I suggest that this network approach can be useful when discussing the images and narratives of prehistory in northern Sweden and Northern Fennoscandia, as an analytical framework for exploring the dynamics of prehistoric identities and the complexities in the connections between the present and the past.

In the examination in this first part of the book, one central aspect concerns the boundaries of the archaeological networks, what is inside and what is outside of the networks, and who is controlling and surveilling the boundaries. Which voices are allowed in the archaeological discourses, and which voices are silenced? These questions will be of fundamental importance in the following discussions on the representations of the Sámi past, and the archaeological approaches to this past.
Chapter 1. Ethnicity and identity in archaeological research

Ethnicity is often considered to be one of the most difficult concepts in the social and human sciences to encircle and define. It is likewise a controversial and contested concept within the academic world as well as in society at large. Ethnicity is controversial as it is part of a long tradition of external categorization, arranging and ranking of people in the present and the past, within evolutionary, ethnocentric, colonialist and racist frameworks of interpretation. It is also controversial because it is so intimately connected with political issues and agendas in the present, including nationalism, nationalism of previously colonized people, claims for indigenous and minority rights and self-determination, and, of course, because of the ethnic conflicts, ethnic cleansing and genocides that have drowned the word “ethnic” in blood.

At the same time, ethnicity is a very important concept in the history of archaeological research, touching upon the core of the subject that deals with questions of similarity, difference, essence and the categorization and definition of groups and domains. One of the most important goals of archaeological studies seen in a historical perspective has been to identify, define and name “peoples” in prehistory, through the study and categorization of distributions of material objects and sites in the landscape. It has also been one of the most important reasons and justifications for conducting archaeological research.

Ethnicity as an analytical concept and as a mode of collective identification has been the topic of many debates in anthropology and archaeology (cf. Banks 1996; Jones 1997; Eriksen 2002; Casella & Fowler 2004; Díaz-Andreu et al. 2005). The questions whether ethnicity could be a useful concept in archaeology, and if it is possible to trace prehistoric ethnic groups in the archaeological material, have also been raised in a number of publications in Sweden (e.g. Bågenholm 1996; Johnsen & Welinder 1998; Werbart 2002; Siapkas 2003; Welinder 2003, 2008). Furthermore, the relationships between nationalism and ethnicity and archaeological practice have been in focus in several collective works (e.g. Kohl & Fawcett 1995; Díaz-Andreu & Champion 1996a). Despite all the debates, ethnic, national and territorial concepts are still often used as black boxes in archaeology, as supposedly neutral and coherent containers for interpretations of other social and cultural processes.

In my view, ethnicity is a concept which needs to be discussed among archaeologists, not less as some might argue, but rather over and over again,
from new perspectives and with new approaches as the world around the archaeologists and subsequently the motivations and values of the archaeologists themselves change and transform. Because of the influence of ethnic categories in the world today, the idea of ethnic categorization, in academic circles and elsewhere, needs to be challenged, contextualized and critically examined.

“One-entities” and “black boxes”: the delimiting of culture and people

By turning names into things we create false models of reality. By endowing nations, societies or cultures with the qualities of internally homogeneous and externally distinctive and bounded objects, we create a model of the world as a global pool hall in which the entities spin off each other like so many hard and round billiard balls. (Wolf 1997 [1982]:6)

The pool hall metaphor, described by Eric Wolf in the citation above, is in many ways indicative of the traditional culture-historical approach in archaeology. Eric Wolf continues: “Thus it becomes easy to sort the world into differently colored balls, to declare that ‘East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet’” (Wolf 1997 [1982]:6f.). In the culture-historical approach, the delimiting and identification of archaeological cultures in the prehistoric record was of a fundamental importance. In this delimiting of archaeological cultures, sharp boundaries between the entities were, and are still, often drawn. The entities, in their turn, often become internally homogeneous and externally bounded and coherent, for the purposes of producing chronological schemas and overviews of the prehistoric cultural development, in a practical but at the same time oversimplified and mechanic fashion.

In the traditional culture-historical view on people in anthropology and archaeology there is, what I choose to call, a “one-entity syndrome”, representing a desire for a single operational unit for categorizing people, a unit in which language, cultural identity, material culture and sometimes biology are fused. This syndrome is visible in the many maps and schemes consisting of archaeological cultures that are fixed in space-time as bounded one-entities. Such one-entities are still part of some archaeological projects, for example in certain archaeogenetic studies (cf. Welinder 2003).

Bounded entities were (still are, in part, as we have seen) that period’s way of domesticating space-time, of fixing and stabilizing, or trying to fix and stabilize – for the task is an impossible one – meanings and identities in relation to time-space. (Massey 1999:42)
I use the concept of “black boxes” to denote such entities, for instance ethnic, national and territorial concepts, which assume apparently stable and obvious roles and positions in the archaeological networks, so that the connections and histories behind the concepts are made invisible (Latour 1987:2ff., 130ff.; cf. also 1999b). Black boxes are convenient containers, within which complex conditions and relationships can be summarized and concealed.

The concept of race has also been much debated in the discussions on ethnicity (see e.g. Wolf 1994; Jones 1997:40ff.; Fenton 2003; Orser 2004). The discussions have to a large extent concerned what can be called “scientific racism”, that is, racist ideas, attitudes and practices in different branches of science. Race has, as is well-known, played an important role in the categorization of people in the late 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. One particularly clear example of racist attitudes is the German archaeology before and during the Nazi years. Here, the work of the archaeologist Gustaf Kossinna and its influence in Nazi Germany is often mentioned (see further Veit 1989; Arnold 1990).

The racist legacy in anthropology, archaeology and other social and human sciences can be hard to deal with for contemporary archaeologists who do not wish to be associated with any ideas of that kind. However, I believe that it is very important for archaeologists to discuss these darker sides of the history of archaeology, because, on the one hand, these ideas might have influenced the structures of archaeology, and, on the other hand, because the image of archaeology among non-archaeologists might have been influenced by such ideas and practices. This is very much the case with the debates on repatriation and reburial of Sámi human remains in Sweden, which will be discussed further in part IV. The human remains, skulls and skeletons, were collected (dug up or plundered) from grave- and churchyards in the end of the 19th or the beginning of the 20th century in order to procure “genuine” skulls of the Sámi race which could be used in the racial biological research practiced in those days.

There is thus a long history of placing people into bounded categories such as tribes, races, peoples or ethnic groups. The use of clear-cut categories was rooted in a dualistic thinking about people and things. This mode of dualistic thinking involved the separation of people into specific categories and the use of strong dichotomies, such as male/female, homosexual/heterosexual, elite/non-elite, etc. (see e.g. Meskell 2001). As a way forward, Lynn Meskell has argued that archaeologists should strive to:

… break the boundaries of identity categories themselves, blurring the crucial domains of identity formation, be they based on gender, sexuality, kin, politics, religion, or social systems. Only through deconstruction of the domains we see as “natural” or prediscursive can we truly approach an archaeology of difference – real cultural difference and contextuality. (Meskell 2001:188)
Approaches to ethnicity

As I have already mentioned, ethnicity is a notoriously difficult concept to define. A multitude of different definitions of ethnicity have been suggested by researchers in different disciplines. Here, I will review some of the main lines in the discussions. The purpose is not to provide one single definition of ethnicity, but to show some of the breadth of the approaches to ethnicity in the human and social sciences.

The anthropologist Hal Levine has proposed the following definition: “Ethnicity is that method of classifying people (both self and other) that uses origins (socially constructed) as its primary reference” (Levine 1999:168). He thus sees ethnicity as a particular method of classifying people, which emphasizes origin: “We know we are witnessing instances of ethnicity when we observe people classifying people according to their origins. When the categories in use refer to something other than origins (e.g. sexual orientation, disability, etc.) they are not ethnic categories” (ibid.:168).

The working definition proposed by Siân Jones in her book *The Archaeology of Ethnicity* is a slightly broader definition, adapted for archaeological purposes. Ethnic identity is defined by Jones as “that aspect of a person’s self-conceptualization which results from identification with a broader group in opposition to others on the basis of perceived cultural differentiation and/or common descent” (Jones 1997:xiii). An ethnic group is defined as “any group of people who set themselves apart and/or are set apart by others with whom they interact, or co-exist, on the basis of their perceptions of cultural differentiation and/or common descent” (ibid.). Further, ethnicity is described by Jones as “all those social and psychological phenomena associated with a culturally constructed group identity as defined above. The concept of ethnicity focuses on the ways in which social and cultural processes intersect with one another in the identification of, and interaction between, ethnic groups” (ibid.).

The anthropologist Richard Jenkins has listed a number of characteristics that, in his view, describe the concept of ethnicity:

- Ethnicity is about cultural differentiation (bearing in mind that identity is always a dialectic between similarity and difference);
- Ethnicity is concerned with culture – shared meaning – but it is also rooted in, and the outcome of, social interaction;
- Ethnicity is no more fixed than the culture of which it is a component, or the situations in which it is produced and reproduced;
- Ethnicity is both collective and individual, externalized in social interaction and internalized in personal self-identification (Jenkins 1997:165)

It has been put forth that the processes of ethnicity carry a double nature. On the one hand, there is the attachment and the feeling of belonging and sense of ethnicity among the members of the group. On the other hand, there is the
view and description of their community by others, an attributed ethnicity (Rex 2002:94). It is often difficult or impossible to separate the two sides; in the representational politics of our contemporary world they become fundamentally entangled with each other.

In discussions on ethnicity, it is common to distinguish between a primordial and an instrumentalist approach. In the primordial perspective (Banks 1996:39ff; Jones 1997:65ff.), ethnic attachments are seen as essential, natural and universal, as an important part of human nature. Ethnicity is seen as something stable and durable that passes on through generations. Psychological aspects of individuals’ sense of identity and belonging are often central.

One example of what has frequently been described in the literature as a primordialist tradition is the field of Soviet anthropology and archaeology, where there was (at least from the 1940s) a strong focus on ethno genetic research, that is, on studies of the origin and ethnohistory of the different peoples of the Soviet Union (cf. Shnirelman 1995, 1996b; Tishkov 1997). Material culture, biology and language were often fused within the concept of ethnos. Archaeological assemblages and archaeological cultures were in many instances equated with ethnic groups, resulting in a mosaic of prehistoric cultures arranged in space-time as one-entities. I will return to this issue in more detail in part III. Here, it should just be noted that the image of Soviet anthropology and archaeology in Western literature has often been quite narrow and stereotypical, and that it needs to be expanded and reconsidered.

The instrumentalist perspective (Jones 1997:72ff; Eriksen 2002:53ff.), on the other hand, is a constructivist perspective, with ethnicity perceived as a dynamic and situational phenomenon. The emphasis is here put on the role of ethnicity in inter-group relations, on ethnicity as a form of social organization. In this perspective, ethnic groups are often seen as interest groups and ethnicity as an instrument for gaining access to economic or political resources. In its extreme form, such an instrumentalist perspective would imply that an ethnic group should not be seen as a community at all, but as a rational and purposive association (Rex 2002:95).

There has been a strong constructivist approach in historical and cultural research on ethnicity and nationalism in the last decades, which is rather well described in the titles of two of the most influential publications on this theme from the 1980s: Imagined Communities by Benedict Anderson (1983), and The Invention of Tradition edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (1983).

The division between primordialism and instrumentalism is certainly an oversimplification, regarding ethnicity as an analytical concept as well as ethnicity as a social reality, with most researchers positioning themselves somewhere in between the two extremes, or combining elements from both approaches. Studies of ethnicity also vary along the scale from focus on the individual to focus on the society, content or form, and between views on ethnicity as a general all-embracing theory or something of limited meaning and
relevance (Banks 1996:47). In recent years, approaches that try to avoid the
division of primordialism-instrumentalism have been discussed. Some of these
approaches may be called “relational”, as they focus on connections and
relations, as well as on the multidimensionality and fluidity of ethnic processes.

Ethnicity as an archaeological concept

The use of ethnicity as an archaeological concept has been much debated in the
academic community. The debates have concerned its usefulness as an
analytical concept, as well as the possibility of tracing prehistoric ethnic
processes and groups in the archaeological material. To apply theoretical
concepts, which have been constructed based on studies of living societies in
the modern world, onto prehistoric contexts also entails special challenges and
might require some rethinking and reconstruction of the original concepts and
their meaning.

In archaeological analyses, it has often been claimed that in certain
situations, such as situations of social or economic stress in the interaction
between different groups, manifestations of ethnicity might become stronger
and the signaling of ethnic identity might become visible in the pattern of
material culture (cf. Hodder 1979). Others mean that there is no way of
knowing how ethnicity would have functioned in prehistoric societies. Some
argue that it is impossible for archaeologists to reach peoples’ self-definitions
and self-understandings in prehistory, and have expressed serious doubts about
the possibilities of tracing ethnic groups in the past. Another view is that
ethnicity simply did not exist in prehistoric societies, as it is a phenomenon
closely related to the general historical developments of the last centuries and
more specifically to the development of modernism. Furthermore, the concept
of ethnicity has been criticized because it is too easily misused by present-day
groups for legitimizing political claims, and because it operates on a too
abstract level to have any real analytical significance (cf. review in Lucy 2005).

In the discussions on archaeology and ethnic interpretations of prehistoric
materials, one of the most central concepts has been the “archaeological
culture”. This concept and its theoretical foundations and political implications
have been debated extensively among archaeologists. For archaeologists, one
fundamental problem concerns, on the one hand, the possibilities to trace
different social or cultural formations in the archaeological material and, on the
other hand, the possibilities to understand the social or cultural meanings of
different patterns in the archaeological material. In a sense, the archaeological
culture has functioned as an intermediary between the material remains and the
social and cultural interpretations. It is important to remember that the concept
of archaeological cultures has played and still plays a central part in much of the
archaeological research conducted in the world. However, in recent decades the
traditional concept of archaeological cultures has been questioned and criticized by many researchers, especially in Western Europe.

A comprehensive criticism of the concept of archaeological cultures has been put forth by Stephen Shennan in the introductory chapter to the book *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity* (Shennan 1989). Archaeological cultures, he argues, have been seen as historical actors and as indicators of ethnicity and, thereby, they have assumed a political role of legitimizing the claims for territories and influence by present-day groups (ibid.:5f.). Archaeological cultures, defined as the unification of different categories of artifacts, are dismissed as imagined entities that confuse the analyses of social and historical processes. Shennan presents several arguments for this standpoint (ibid.:11ff.): a) Archaeological cultures have been considered as historical actors because they were supposed to correlate with other entities such as “tribes”, “societies”, “ethnic groups”. One can question the correlation, but also the existence of the other assumed entities. b) Spatial variation in the archaeological material is a result of all kinds of factors, working in different ways and in various combinations. Following this, archaeological cultures can not be treated as any “totalities”. c) In empirical studies of the distributions of different artifactual types, an enormous variation of overlapping patterns usually emerge instead of clearly defined entities. d) The origin and history of the concept of archaeological cultures also give plenty of reasons to be deeply suspicious of its existence as a real entity (ibid.).

In the archaeological literature, there is an abundance of archaeological cultures that have been given different names (see e.g. Werbart 1994 concerning the multitude of archaeological cultures in the Circum-Baltic region, describing and categorizing people approximately 3000–2000 B.C.). The names of the archaeological cultures have been created for specific reasons in different contexts by different archaeologists, but they are turned into one-entities when dotted on maps and used in interpretations of prehistory. Bozena Werbart has argued that archaeologists need to explore the relations between archaeological cultures and ideology, politics and ethics, and to critically examine the methods used to discern and delimit archaeological cultures. She asks if we really still need archaeological cultures (Werbart 2002:142). Others, such as Philip L. Kohl, argue that the problem is not the concept of the archaeological culture in itself, but the assumption that it is possible to move from the determination of archaeological cultures to the identification of past ethnoses which are seen as ancestral to the modern self-ascribed ethnic groups (Kohl 1998a:43).

In this context, the use of archaeological cultures for the organization and structuring of the archaeological material must also be considered. In large parts of the world, the concept of the archaeological culture is a perfectly normal construction, or analytical tool, used to make sense of a huge and very complex archaeological material. In small countries such as Sweden it is much easier to do without such concepts as archaeological cultures, whereas in large countries, for instance in the Russian Federation, it is much more difficult
considering the vastness of the field of study and the non-relevant interior administrative borders.

Ethnonyms mentioned in ancient and medieval written sources have played an important role in the writing of the history of the present-day peoples in Europe from the earliest days of historical research. Connections between present-day population groups and the ethnonyms have been constructed, and attempts have been made to determine the geographical area of their settlements, as well as which archaeological cultures the ethnonyms represent. The archaeologist Thomas Wallerström has stressed the importance of upholding a critical attitude to the identification of the ethnonyms that are mentioned in old written sources with present-day ethnic categories, as the content and meaning of these ethnonyms might have been very complex and often are very difficult to grasp today. According to him, there might be many other possible social and cultural identifications, often made by “outsiders”, behind these collective denominations, besides that of an ethnic group or a “people” (Wallerström 1997, 2004, 2006a, 2006b). Wallerström has also warned about interpreting the ethnonyms used by ancient writers in their description of the people in Northern Fennoscandia from a too simplified ethnic perspective, and he questions the identification of ethnonyms such as finn with a Sámi ethnic group. In the next part of the book, I will further discuss the issue of ethnonyms in early historical sources concerning northern Sweden and Northern Fennoscandia. There are also several other scholars who have attempted to critically examine and deconstruct the ethnonyms used in medieval written sources in Europe (see e.g. Pohl 1998; Curta 2001, 2007; Roslund 2001).

In the following parts, which deal with the prehistory and archaeology of northern Sweden and Northern Fennoscandia, I will return to the problems connected with the use of ethnicity in archaeological contexts and the identification of specific ancient remains as belonging to one or another ethnic group on several occasions.

Ethnicity and other forms of identity

In trying to understand past contexts and developments from an identity perspective, it is necessary to expand the analysis and to consider various aspects and forms of difference and similarity in the past, and how they may have related to each other. Therefore, in this section I will mention some ideas that have been put forth on how to bring more complexity and multidimensionality to the study of identity.

In the book De osynliga identiteterna – kulturell identitet och arkeologi (“The invisible identities – cultural identity and archaeology”), Bozena Werbart argues that archaeologists should use the concept ‘cultural identity’ rather than ‘ethnicity’ (2002:29ff.). She sees cultural identity as a wider and more dynamic
concept than ethnic identity. Cultural differences should be qualified, and the archaeologists should assume a more reflective way of thinking about differences (ibid.:44). However, I would add that the important issue is what kind of social reality the concepts refer to. Sometimes archaeologists also use “cultural identity” or other alternative labels as one-entities and black boxes, and the resulting visions of the past will thus be the same as before.

Archaeologists have often treated different aspects of social and cultural identities separately, for instance ethnicity, gender and class. In this context, the concept of intersectionality may be of interest. Intersectionality is a concept that has been discussed quite extensively in recent years, and which has gained in popularity among scholars who seek to find alternative modes of interpretation when dealing with identity politics and representations (see e.g. Staunæs 2003; Conkey 2005; McCall 2005; Valentine 2007). The concept has evolved among researchers in the fields of gender and feminist research. Intersectionality focuses on the interrelations and interactions between the construction of different axes of difference and inequality. Feminist studies have at times been criticised for ethnocentrism, and as a response intersectionality examines how gender, ethnicity, class and other modes of similarity and difference intersect and interact. The power dimension is very important in such an approach: “… social categories are tools of selecting and ordering. They are tools of inclusion and exclusion and they are tools of positioning and making hierarchies” (Staunæs 2003:104).

The concept of intersectionality is interesting for my present discussion because it focuses on various kinds of difference and inequality, and on the connections between different categories of identity. It could be used as inspiration for a more pluralistic and multifaceted approach, which takes the many interrelated, and sometimes contradictory, social, cultural and economic processes into consideration when discussing constructions of identity in the present and the past. Both the concept of “cultural identity” as discussed by Bozena Werbart and the idea of “intersectionality” can, I believe, be useful tools in order to avoid oversimplified and static representations of identities in the present as well as in the past.
Chapter 2. Nationalist, internationalist and indigenous archaeologies

As I have already stated, the concept of indigeneity is central in contemporary discourses on Sámi (pre)history and cultural heritage. In the claims for greater Sámi self-determination concerning cultural heritage policies, references are often made to the international indigenous rights movement and the discourse on indigenous peoples’ rights in international law. Therefore, it is necessary to examine the conceptualization of indigeneity and the discussions on indigeneity as an analytical concept in the human and social sciences in some length as a background to the following discussions. The notions of nationalism and internationalism are also relevant in the case of Sámi prehistory, and therefore I will also explore some aspects of nationalism and internationalism in archaeological research in this chapter. The development of academic archaeology has been closely interrelated with nationalist projects, and the representation of Sámi (pre)history has been closely connected with the development of the national (pre)histories in the Nordic countries. Various kinds of internationalist views have also been expressed in discourses on cultural heritage and history, and arguments based on internationalist or universalist views are often put forth in discussions on the ways in which ancient remains and artifacts should be managed and represented.

At the beginning, I wish to stress that I do not consider that there are any clear-cut archaeologies that are purely nationalist, internationalist or indigenous and that can be separated from each other. Rather, I use these denominations as themes around which to organize the discussion about the networks of archaeology and the construction of images and narratives of the past.

Nationalism and internationalism in archaeology

There is a very large and multifaceted body of scientific works devoted to the study of the nation, nationality and nationalism. The idea of the nation has generally been recognized as one of the most influential cultural and political ideas in modern history. Questions about the nation and its history and about nationalist movements have attracted the attention of many researchers in different human and social sciences in the last decades. The nation has been studied from many different starting-points and with different theoretical
approaches (see e.g. Anderson 1983; Hobsbawm & Ranger 1983; Woolf 1996; Smith 2000; Eriksen 2002; Leoussi & Grosby 2007).

Much of the debates have concerned what a nation is and when national consciousness has emerged in history. One point of view is that nationalism is a relatively recent socially constructed phenomenon, closely connected with the processes of modernity and the fundamental changes in society during the 18th and 19th centuries (see e.g. Anderson 1983; Hobsbawm & Ranger 1983). A different perspective has been put forth by Anthony D. Smith, an influential scholar in the field of studies on nationalism, which is often called the ethnosymbolic approach. This approach emphasizes different kinds of continuities between premodern and modern forms of group formation in which ethnic myths, memories, traditions and symbols play important roles. Smith has defined nationalism “... as an ideological movement for attaining and maintaining the autonomy, unity and identity of an existing or potential ‘nation’” (Smith 1996 [1989]:108; cf. Leoussi & Grosby 2007). Smith has also stressed that nationalists can not create a nation out of nothing: “To achieve their common goals – autonomy, unity, identity – there need to be some core networks of association and culture, around which and on which nations can be ‘built’” (ibid.).

Historical perspectives on nationalism in the development of academic archaeology, and other aspects concerning the interrelations between facets of nationalism and archaeological theory and practice, have been much discussed during the last decades and will therefore not be covered in any detailed way here. Many observers have pointed to the close connection, in many parts of the world, between nationalist projects and archaeology, and much has been written about the nationalist foundations and frameworks of archaeological research (see contributions in Kohl & Fawcett 1995; Díaz-Andreu & Champion 1996a; also Trigger 1984; Kohl 1998a; Smith 2001). In many studies, there has been a focus on the deconstruction of representations of nationalist prehistories, and many scholars have problematized and criticized the idea of the national paradigm in research.

Margarita Díaz-Andreu and Timothy Champion have suggested a number of reasons why archaeology has been so attractive to nationalist projects and movements in different parts of the world. First of all, the nation offers a seemingly natural framework and scale for archaeological studies. Also, the state has often been the main sponsor of archaeology and has been inclined to support research that reinforces its own identity. Furthermore, Díaz-Andreu and Champion have also pointed to some specific factors in the character of the archaeological material that can be useful for nationalist movements: that the archaeological material is very versatile and needs to be interpreted, that the archaeological record can be very old and therefore can be useful to demonstrate continuity in time (where no other sources are available), that the archaeological record is physical and can be used in museum exhibits and elsewhere to visibilize the past, and that archaeological sites and monuments
are spread in the territory of the nation and can be used as places for gathering people and manifesting the nation in the landscape (Díaz-Andreu & Champion 1996b:18ff.).

The history of archaeological research in Sweden and its relation to the Swedish nationalist project and the representations of the Swedish nation-state have been treated by several archaeologists and historians (e.g. Pettersson 2001; Jensen 2002; Ljungström 2004; Baudou 2004a; Petersson 2004; Widenberg 2006; see also contributions in Goldhahn 2005). From these studies, it is obvious that archaeology has evolved in close connection with the construction of “Swedishness” and that archaeology has been useful to place, or extend, this “Swedishness” in space and time. The ways in which notions of “Swedishness” have been treated in archaeological research, as well as the construction of a homogeneous image of “Swedish prehistory” and a national narrative of “Swedish archaeology”, are very relevant to the topic of this study. The Swedish-national narrative has also been the basis for the central institutions, such as the Board of National Antiquities (National Heritage Board) and the Museum of National Antiquities (Historical Museum) which have been responsible for the cultural heritage management system. In this centralized system, and in the fundamental structures of the cultural heritage management, there has been little room for other historical narratives and experiences, and Sámi and other histories and experiences have been marginalized or excluded. I will return to this complex of problems, which of course is much more multifaceted than I have presented it here, in the following discussions on conceptions of Sámi prehistory and archaeology.

As I have mentioned, there are disturbing legacies of previous colonialist and imperialist archaeological enterprises (see Trigger 1984; Gosden 2001, 2004). Some archaeologists have attempted to analyze and respond to these legacies in the form of a post-colonial archaeology, inspired by approaches in post-colonial theory:

The postcolonial world is characterized by its legacy of colonial structures – economic, politico-conceptual, cultural – remnants from a past colonial reality in nineteenth and early twentieth century imperial Europe and its colonies; and the post situation, where independent former colonies and colonisers alike are coping with the consequences of those past colonial times. (Källén 2004:25)

Much less has been written about the internationalist themes in archaeological research than about the relationship between archaeology and nationalist movements and ideologies. Still, there have been many ideas and representations in the history of archaeological research that could be described as “internationalist” or “universalist”.

The idea of a cultural heritage common to all of human kind is often put forth, not least in different political declarations. The internationalist ideas come in different forms and are based on different ideologies, with varying
visions and goals. In this context, it is important to mention the World Heritage ideology of UNESCO, with the promotion of a specific view on cultural heritage and its protection and preservation, which is very influential in the world today (cf. Eriksen 2001; Brattli 2009; Karlström 2009). One example is the UNESCO World Heritage Site of Laponia in the county of Norrbotten in northern Sweden, which is a combined natural and cultural heritage, formed on the basis of both the natural values of the area and the living Sámi reindeer herding culture. The universalist ideas have also been criticized from different points of view. One critique is that there simply is no “universal human being” and that the dominant groups all to often represent their own habitual thinking and prejudices as the universal thinking, which in turn serves to overshadow and make the other groups invisible (see e.g. Werbart 2002:32ff).

There are several contemporary movements and tendencies to promote cultural heritage studies, including archaeological studies, across the present-day national borders. One example is the European integration projects financed by the European Union, which influence views on cultural heritage and history in Europe in ways that have not yet been fully understood. In the northernmost area of Europe, which will be in focus in the following parts of the book, the Barents Region co-operation is another example of the construction of transboundary regions and scientific networks. After the fall of the Soviet Union, new sources of research funding have appeared, also for archaeologists. Funding has been directed to projects with explicit international and cross-boundary focus, projects that involve concrete collaboration between scholars from the Nordic countries and scholars from the former Soviet Union.

Indigenism in archaeology

At heart, archaeology is a colonialist endeavour. It is based on, and generally perpetuates, the values of Western cultures. Privileging the material over the spiritual and the scientific over the religious, archaeological practice is solidly grounded in Western ways of knowing the world. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, it is a truism that ‘doing’ archaeology is a political act and archaeologists routinely recognize that many groups have rights and responsibilities in the themes, materials and locations that are studied. Nevertheless, while the way in which archaeology is practiced is of great consequence to the world’s colonized peoples, the relationships between archaeologists and members of Indigenous groups continue to be unequal and asymmetrical. (Smith & Wobst 2005b:5)

Since the project of identity, whether individual or collective, is rooted in desires and aspirations that cannot be fulfilled, identity movements are open-ended, productive, and fraught with ambivalence. (Clifford 2000; after Domokos 2004:155)
A relatively new concept to archaeology, indigenousness (indigenism or indigeneity) has gained much influence in archaeological discourses in recent years. The notion of indigeneity and its interrelations with archaeological research are of great importance to the examination of the concepts of Sámi prehistory and archaeology, and the place for Sámi prehistory in the archaeological narratives in Sweden. Therefore, it demands a rather thorough review and critical examination. In this part, the discussions on indigeneity will be held on a more general level, while I will discuss the specific situation concerning Sámi indigeneity in the following parts of the book. The concept itself, with its theoretical foundations and its application in various situations around the world, raises many important questions.

The definition of “indigenousness” has been debated extensively within the frame-work of the different organizations and committees of the United Nations. However, there is not any generally accepted comprehensive and universal definition of what constitutes an indigenous population. Rather, it has been argued by representatives of indigenous groups that such a definition is not desirable. The situations of indigenous peoples in different parts of the world differ so much, that it would be impossible to find any universal definition without excluding some of the groups (Simpson 1997:22f.; cf. also Minde 2008).

However, some main points have been agreed upon in the international discussions. The generally accepted main points in a working definition of “indigenous people” can be found in the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention (ILO 169), adopted in 1989 by the International Labour Organization of the United Nations (see further Niezen 2003:36ff.; Johansson 2008:123ff.). According to the text of the convention, the ILO 169 convention applies to:

a. tribal peoples in independent countries whose social, cultural and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations;

b. peoples in independent countries who are regarded as indigenous on account of their descent from the populations which inhabited the country, or a geographical region to which the country belongs, at the time of conquest or colonization or the establishment of present state boundaries and who, irrespective of their legal status, retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural and political institutions (ILO 169, article 1, paragraph 1)

In the convention, it is further stated, and this is a very important point, that “self-determination as indigenous or tribal shall be regarded as a fundamental criterion for determining the groups to which the provisions of this Convention apply” (ILO 169, article 1, paragraph 2).
The ILO 169 convention has been ratified by among others Norway and Denmark. It has not yet been ratified by the Swedish state, although a future ratification is being analyzed by governmental agencies. The possible adoption of the convention has been controversial in northern Sweden; at the center of the debate are questions about which groups that are to be considered as indigenous groups and thereby, according to the convention, entitled to special rights to land and water.

Another widely cited working definition, in line with the ILO 169 text cited above, has been formulated in the UN report by José R. Martínez Cobo, the Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, entitled *Study of the Problem of Discrimination against Indigenous Populations* (Martínez Cobo 1986):

Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of societies now revealing in those territories, or parts of them. They form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop, and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions and legal systems. (Martínez Cobo 1986: paragraph 379)

Martínez Cobo further stressed the importance of self-identification in the establishing of membership in the communities:

On an individual basis, an indigenous person is one who belongs to these indigenous populations through self-determination as indigenous (group consciousness) and is recognized and accepted by these populations as one of its members (acceptance by the group). (Martínez Cobo 1986: paragraph 381)

Indigeneity is obviously a complex concept that can be difficult to define. In certain situations, it can also be difficult to pinpoint which groups or individuals that should be considered as being indigenous. There is a long history behind the concept, which should also be kept in mind and considered in discussions on indigenous peoples in the contemporary world (see Friedman 2008).

In the international discussions on the rights of indigenous peoples, the right to self-determination in the field of cultural heritage and other cultural rights have been very important themes. Questions about the protection and development of indigenous heritage and self-determination of indigenous peoples have been discussed in many international organizations, not least within the system of the United Nations (cf. Daes 1997; Simpson 1997; Hodgson 2002; see also discussions in part IV). In recent years, discussions on cultural and intellectual property rights of indigenous peoples have been of central importance (see e.g. Kasten 2004). As part of a larger current debate in
society on these issues, there have also been some specific discussions about cultural property issues in an archaeological perspective (e.g. Carman 2002, 2005; Nicholas & Bannister 2004).

In this book, I do not wish to emphasize primarily the legal rights perspective – which obviously is important in many ways, and has been treated extensively elsewhere (see e.g. Vrdoljak 2006; Lenzerini 2008) – but rather a perspective of responsibility and stewardship of the cultural heritage. With such a perspective, I believe it might be easier for archaeologists to engage with these issues, when the fundamental question is not about ownership of the past and its objects and representations, but about responsibility, stewardship and ethics, along with respect and understanding in the debates over contested cultural heritage and history writing.

One of the most prominent discussions in the field of indigenous cultural rights has been that on repatriation and reburial of cultural objects and human remains. But the debates have also concerned, for instance, access to sacred places and burial sites, and control over intangible resources, such as music, names, symbols, art, stories, traditions, rituals and knowledge, which are easily disseminated in the mass-media and on the Internet, and commercialized and exploited by the tourist industry. Here, there is potential for conflicts between collective and individual rights. There are also many critical questions about democratic values, freedom of expression and access to information and research which should be considered in this context. In part IV, I will return to the repatriation and reburial debates, and the consequences and challenges of these debates for archaeology and archaeologists in the Nordic context and elsewhere.

Discussion and critique of the concept of indigenism

In recent times, the idea of indigeneity and the promotion of an international indigenous movement have been critically debated and challenged by researchers in the social and human sciences. Some scholars have criticized the very use of the concept of indigeneity in academic discourses. It has been argued that the theoretical and conceptual foundation in much of the indigenous movement is based on an essentialist ideology, which emphasizes differences between ethnic groups and which is likely to create ethnic tension within groups and between groups (see Kuper 2003a, and replies to his argumentation in the same issue of *Current Anthropology*).

An essentialist ideology often entails expectations of a romanticized “authentic” indigeneity. There is a risk of supporting an oppressive authenticity, which separates between real indigenous people and less real people, causing problems of identity and legitimacy for members of indigenous groups who are living in urban and other non-traditional settings (Sissons 2005:37ff). Some scholars have also discussed the notion of a “strategic essentialism”, when indigenous groups intentionally homogenize their representations and identities.
to correspond with “Western” stereotypes in order to seek recognition and demand rights (cf. discussion and references in Hodgson 2002:1040).

The claims of indigenism are thus many times double-sided and ambiguous (Levy 2006). In my view, indigenism or indigeneity, although they are often considered as politically correct, should be explored and critically analyzed, like any other fundamental concept that are used in discussions on cultural heritage and prehistory.

What is the substance of indigenousness, and who are indigenous people? What arguments are given for their positive discrimination with respect to resources? And how do these arguments in turn come to affect the indigenous peoples who inevitably must construct their own identities in relation to public opinion, state legislation, and international conventions? (Beach 2007:4)

In order to illustrate some aspects of the contemporary debates on indigeneity as an analytical concept and on the phenomenon of the international indigenous movement, I will in the following review and comment the debate that has evolved around the article “The Return of the Native” by the anthropologist Adam Kuper.

In 2003, Adam Kuper published the influential article “The Return of the Native” in *Current Anthropology*, criticizing the concept of “indigenous peoples” and denouncing the indigenous peoples movement (Kuper 2003a). His article has sparked off a lively debate, which is still on-going among anthropologists, on indigenous peoples and indigenous peoples’ rights. The debate is informative as many of the main pro and contra arguments are represented in it, as well as many problematic issues. Therefore, I think it can be worthwhile to look more closely at this specific debate. First, I will refer to the arguments presented by Kuper. Thereafter, I will present some of the criticism against Kuper’s argumentation, and my own reaction to the article.

In the article, Kuper criticizes the rhetoric of the indigenous peoples movement. One basic assumption, Kuper maintains, is that descendants of the original inhabitants of a country should have privileged rights, or even exclusive rights, to its resources. He links this notion with ideas of right-wing parties in Europe, but drawn to even more extreme lengths, drifting towards racism. He argues that anthropologists should reject, and stop using, the concept of “indigenous peoples”. Kuper claims that the indigenous rights doctrine is not in line with much of contemporary anthropological theory, but few anthropologists dare to openly criticize it (see also Suzman 2003). Thus, there is a risk that anthropologists apply self-censorship in their research, consciously or unconsciously avoiding themes or problematic aspects that may go against the interests of the indigenous movement (Kuper 2003b:400). Kuper also criticizes the use of myths, and the insistence that these should be compared with historical or archaeological evidence (Kuper 2003a:391f.). On the other
hand, he also criticizes the use of Western modernist arguments to promote indigenous rights.

In the article, Kuper repeatedly returns to the importance of origins, and claims that the fundamental core of the indigenous peoples movement is connected to an idea of special peoples around the world who in essence are hunter-gatherers and nomads, and who represent a pre-industrial and pre-urbanized pristine and natural world. Indigenous is just a contemporary word for primitive. He also discusses the role of the UN, the World Bank, and especially the role of NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations) in the creation and promotion of indigenous peoples. This is done, he claims, on dubious grounds and with sometimes dangerous results. Kuper concludes that “the conventional lines of argument currently used to justify ‘indigenous’ land claims rely on obsolete anthropological notions and on a romantic and false ethnographic vision. Fostering essentialist ideologies of culture and identity, they may have dangerous political consequences” (ibid.:395).

The article by Adam Kuper has caused a lot of debate, and several anthropologists have responded to Kuper’s ideas. Some have expressed sympathy with the arguments presented by Kuper, while others have been very critical to his presentation. In his reply, James Suzman agrees with Kuper. He stresses that it is not always possible to identify who is indigenous and who is not, and that “a focus on indigenousness may well reinforce the very structure of discrimination that disadvantage these peoples in the first place” (Suzman 2003:399). The indigenous rights message, Suzman argues, may fuel ethnic tensions in Third World states, who have suffered under the colonial divide-and-rule policies and who are now trying to build a national identity (ibid.:400).

Justin Kenrick and Jerome Lewis, in a response to Kuper, argue that his polemic is misleading in several ways. Kuper’s argument is based on an inaccurate analysis of the history of the indigenous peoples’ rights movement: he presents a single stereotypical image of what is in fact a set of complex and diverse historical processes behind the movement (Kenrick & Lewis 2004). Indigenous peoples’ rights are not about individual rights contra collective rights, but about community rights in relation to nation-states in an international context (ibid.:8). Kenrick and Lewis writes that the “problem” of indigenous peoples will not go away, because the problem is not the indigenous peoples and the question of how to define them, and that “Kuper’s argument appears blind to the suffering of indigenous peoples and serves to reinforce the processes that seek to disempower them and deny their contemporary and historical experience of discrimination, marginalization and dispossession” (ibid.:9).

In response to the proposal by Kuper to eliminate the category of the indigenous in anthropological research, Jonathan Friedman maintains that the category is not an intellectual construct but a political-institutional reality, with a strong life of its own. “Social facts, after all”, Friedman writes, “are not the product of scientific procedure. They are the realities of our investigations”
(Friedman 2008:43f.). Some critics have suggested that the rejection by some anthropologists of the indigenous movement could be interpreted as representing a desire to re-establish the anthropological authority of the olden days (Robins 2003; Friedman 2008):

Kuper’s attack on indigeneity appears, paradoxically, to express a certain desire for authenticity, for a lost authenticity of which anthropologists were the masters. The apparent emotional engagement in this argument is related to the feeling of loss, a loss of order. The world that the anthropologists have lost is a world of ordered hierarchy in which the peoples that we studied were positioned clearly in their subservient positions, silenced and on display for our intellectual gaze. (Friedman 2008:44)

From my perspective, I am critical in several ways to Kuper’s argumentation in the article. As I see it, he is too eager to generalize and misinterpret the actions and statements of indigenous activists. Nevertheless, I agree that it is important to critically discuss the bases for the concepts of indigeneity and the consequences of their application and use in anthropological and archaeological studies. But it is also crucial to examine each case in its own right, and not to pass judgements based on superficial and generalized opinions.

I also believe that Kuper puts too much focus on origins and the need for a return to an unspoilt pristine past. His argument that the basis of the indigenous movement is the so-called “eternal soul” of the hunter-gatherer or nomad is, as I see it, to say the least very dubious, and certainly not necessary for the promotion of indigenous peoples’ cultural rights in our modern world. I feel that Kuper is too eager to romanticize and essentialize both indigenous peoples and the indigenous peoples movement; thereby, in fact, acting as a simplifying, romanticizing and essentializing anthropologist, resembling the ways of traditional anthropology that he himself heavily criticizes.

I agree that there is a real danger of self-censorship among scholars, but it should not be a question of either or. Rather, scholars should engage in debates on scientific ethics and on responsible and respectful relationships with different groups in society, at the same time as they stand up for what they believe is interesting and valuable with their scientific perspective. As I see it, there is a definite danger with using a too generalized concept of indigenousness in the debates, and accompanying generalized models or manuals for conceptualizing and addressing specific situations. Each case is special and different, although there might be more or less strong similarities, and each case should be addressed with regard to its specific historical, political, social and cultural contexts.
Indigenous archaeology

Potential for conflict is at the core of Indigenous archaeology, since this involves working with a living heritage in which other people have rights and responsibilities. That Indigenous groups have their own values and priorities immediately creates a working situation of complex interactions and potentially competing agendas. (Smith & Wobst 2005b:5)

“Indigenous archaeology” is a relatively new concept in archaeological terminology which has been promoted by certain scholars (see Conkey 2005; Smith & Wobst 2005a; Watkins 2005a). In this section, I will discuss some aspects of the debates on indigenous archaeology that can be relevant to my study. First of all, I wish to stress that I do not see indigenous archaeology as one thing, but as several diverse expressions that are interconnected through the indigenous peoples movement. There are certain strong actors in the field, who exert much influence over the representations of indigenous archaeology (for instance, the World Archaeological Congress, see further below), but there is no unified entity or movement of “indigenous archaeology”. Rather, there are many different understandings of what indigenous archaeology can mean.

Indigenous archaeology can be said to be conceptualized in contrast to the notion of “ordinary” or “normal” archaeology, which is often represented as being nationalist, colonialist and Western in character. It is in much a “counter-archaeology”, a means of self-expression, empowerment and emancipation, and as such it has a clear political agenda. One fundamental goal is often to “reclaim” the history of the group and to make one’s voice heard. It is based on a notion that there are certain values which transcend the idea of a “common cultural heritage of all human beings” and the idea that “the past belongs to everybody and that it cannot be owned or controlled by any particular group”. In that sense, it resembles nationalist archaeology. However, indigenous archaeology is also very firmly rooted in the global indigenous peoples movement and therefore also incorporates traits of internationalist archaeology (cf. also the discussion in Niezen 2003).

The phenomenon of indigenous archaeology is closely related to the colonial and postcolonial order of the world. Colonization, subordination, marginalization, vulnerability, protection and survival are key words in this context. However, some argue that there are many contradictions between current academic discourses on the postcolonial situation and many of the political and legal strategies of the indigenous rights movement in the struggle for control over heritage policies and cultural empowerment (see Gosden 2001).

Indigenous archaeology is understood by the anthropologist and archaeologist Joe Watkins as “archaeology done by and for Indigenous peoples” (Watkins 2005a:442). In his view, indigenous archaeology is a means
of providing an indigenous voice in the practice of archaeology and allowing alternative interpretations of the archaeological record (ibid.).

The problems and possibilities of working with approaches to the “indigenous past” have also been discussed by the archaeologist Charlotte Damm. She considers it important to work for future ways of overcoming the dichotomy between “us” and “them” (that is, between scientists and indigenous peoples) and the distinction between the perceived authentic and pristine indigenous history and the Western scientific history: “This may develop into a history that corresponds better to the reality of many individuals, who fail to recognize themselves in essentialist images of homogeneous cultures, being partly Inuit and partly Canadian, partly Sámi, but also Norwegian” (Damm 2005:84).

Charlotte Damm emphasizes collaboration, community involvement and dialogue in research concerning indigenous pasts: “A variety of perspectives enrich the contemporary understanding of the past and its meaning to present societies” (ibid.:84). However, she stresses that the call for multiplicity of perspectives on the present and the past “should not prevent us from collaboration, which carries potential for mutual understanding and a more complex knowledge of the past” (ibid.:85).

The World Archaeological Congress (WAC) has provided an important arena, and has equally constituted a very important actor, in the promotion of indigenous peoples’ cultural rights in relation to archaeological remains and material, as well as in the development of a global movement of “indigenous archaeology”. WAC has established a set of ethical principles and rules (see Internet WAC First Code of Ethics), which refer explicitly to indigenous peoples’ rights and the relationships between professional archaeologists and indigenous peoples, which should be binding for members of WAC. In these rules, WAC emphasizes informed consent, collaboration with and participation with the affected local and/or indigenous populations. The WAC code of ethics, and other similar attempts to develop principles for archaeological ethics, will be discussed further in part IV. The organization actively promotes and facilitates participation of indigenous delegates in the WAC Congresses,
which are arranged every fourth year and constitute major international gatherings for archaeologists.

Another example of the promotion of indigenous archaeology is the collective volume, published in the WAC book series “One World Archaeology”, called *Indigenous Archaeology – Decolonizing Theory and Practice* (Smith & Wobst 2005a). This book, it is stated in the introduction, “is groundbreaking, most strikingly because it is the first volume on Indigenous archaeology that has more Indigenous than non-Indigenous authors” (Smith & Wobst 2005b:7). In this book, there are poems intertwined with the articles, in an attempt to find a format for accommodating “scientific” as well as “indigenous” views and presenting alternative voices and interpretations. Many of the poems express the ambivalence of the indigenous scientist, in-between the gazes (cf. also Damm 2005:83f.).

The concept of indigenous archaeology no doubt evokes many critical questions. As with the concept of indigeneity itself, indigenous archaeology is not so easily defined and can be used in different ways for a variety of purposes. It is important to remember that any such concept with an ethnic content is not only including, but also excluding. It constructs new relations of power, with its insiders and outsiders. It can therefore, if not used with caution and reflection, become yet another instrument for the sorting and ranking of peoples into categories and hierarchies.
Chapter 3. Outline of a network approach to archaeology and identity

When working with archaeology in northern Sweden and on the North Calotte, one is inevitably confronted with the question of the ethnic identity of the people of the past in the region. As I have tried to show in the previous chapters, ethnicity is a complicated phenomenon which has often been used to create convenient black boxes and one-entities of complex and perhaps not always so convenient historical processes. It is a great challenge to avoid using simplified ethnic categories when discussing for instance Sámi prehistory. In my view, it is nevertheless very important for archaeologists to try to find other ways of approaching the prehistory of the North and the Sámi past.

In this chapter, I will attempt to explore and outline some ideas of a relational network approach to the construction of identity and ethnicity. My intention is to discuss an alternative approach, in order to avoid the one-entities and black boxes when discussing people in the past. First, I will discuss the theoretical movement that is often called Actor-Network Theory (in short: ANT), which is one source of inspiration for the relational network perspective. Then, I will examine some possible applications of such a perspective in archaeological research, and I will try to formulate some lines of thought on the conceptualization of identity and ethnicity in archaeology from a network perspective. This perspective will form a basis for the discussions on archaeological networks in the North in the following parts of the book. However, my intention is not to argue for a “network archaeology” or an “ANT archaeology”, but rather to explore an alternative approach which can be useful as one part of a more complex analysis of the past and the connections between the present and the past.
Actor-Network Theory (ANT) and archaeology

It is a theory that says that by following circulations we can get more than by defining entities, essence or provinces… a way for the social scientist… to travel from one spot to the next, from one field site to the next… (Latour 1999a:20f.)

ANT is not about traced networks, but about network-tracing activity… No net exists independently of the very act of tracing it, and no tracing is done by an actor exterior to the net. A network is not a thing, but the recorded movement of a thing. The questions ANT addresses now have changed. It is no longer whether a net is a representation or a thing, a part of society or a part of a discourse or a part of nature, but what moves and how this movement is recorded. (Latour 1996:378)

The network approach suggested in this book is in part inspired by the so-called Actor-Network Theory (ANT) and related approaches in sociology and human geography. Here, I do not intend to present any general description of this complex theoretical movement, nor to explore its roots in philosophy, but rather to focus on some aspects that might be relevant to the discussion in the dissertation. It should also be stressed that I do not attempt to do an “ANT study”, whatever that is; it will be obvious later in this chapter that it is not at all easily defined.

ANT is most commonly associated with the work of the French sociologist Bruno Latour. However, it has never been a unified and coherent theoretical program. The central ideas have been developed in many directions, and ANT has emerged as an influential approach to social theory in many of the social sciences. It was started within the field of science and technology studies as a way to critically examine the construction of science and knowledge (e.g. Latour 1987, 1988). Science was analyzed as a heterogeneous project in which both humans and non-humans participate and become interconnected in actor-networks (a deliberately contradictory term; Law 1999).

One of the aims of the theoretical approach was to reintegrate the domains of nature, society and language, which had been separated by modernism and postmodernism (cf. Latour 1993). The ideas from ANT have been used in order to overcome dualistic thinking and to break down traditional dichotomies such as human-animal, nature-culture, structure-agency and local-global (see Murdoch 1997). In some respects, ANT could be described as a way of following – following actors and exploring network connections. As a way of thinking, it is more focused on relations and connections than solitary entities, on performance and movement, circulation of entities and change rather than fixed, stable structures. It has also been characterized as a kind of ecological sociology and as part of a co-constructivist tradition (Murdoch 2001). Co-constructivism in this case means that the approach is not concentrated solely on social constructivism, that is, on analyses of social constructions of for
instance scientific knowledge. Rather, it focuses on co-construction, linking humans, animals, material things, technologies etc. in networks that are more or less durable and stable.

The element of power is central in the ANT project. Actors or actants, both humans and non-humans, are enrolled in networks through processes of negotiation and translation in the constant production and reproduction of networks (Hassard et al. 1999). Some actors successfully translate other actors’ wills or interests into a single will for which they speak, becoming spokespersons for the others (Latour 1987:70ff.). In a stabilized network, different actors apparently assume primordial and coherent roles and positions – they are turned into black boxes – and the supporting networks, the history, behind the actors are made invisible (cf. ibid.:2f., 130f.). However, networks can be both stable and unstable; sometimes actors refuse to assume their prescribed roles in the networks. The ANT project, in this respect, is about reality, power and resistance.

The ANT project itself has not passed unchallenged. Especially the early ANT studies have been criticized by many scholars. As has been pointed out, to follow an actor also means to share the blindness of that actor (Bowker & Star 2000:48f.). The early approaches have also been accused of creating a new all-embracing theory, a new grand narrative, and thereby of excluding the “Other” in the same way as those criticized by the ANT theorists (cf. Lee & Brown 1994). In more recent studies, questions of otherness and spaces between networks have been of central importance, and many researchers have extended the early ideas with new perspectives.

The founding figures of the movement have admitted to shortcomings of the theory and have addressed some misunderstandings of what it was first intended to be (Latour 1996, 1999a, 2005). In fact, Latour and others have declared that the project of ANT is over and that they themselves have moved on, if there ever was such a project in the first place (Latour 1999a; Law 1999).

… ANT is not a theory. It is this that gives it both its strength and adaptability. Moreover, we never claimed to have created a theory. In ANT the T is too much. (Callon 1999:194)

As a further complication, the word ‘network’ itself brings with it many associations, and can easily be misunderstood:

Really, we should say ‘worknet’ instead of ‘network’. It’s the work, and the movement, and the flow, and the changes that should be stressed. But now we are stuck with ‘network’ and everyone thinks we mean the World Wide Web or something like that. (Latour 2005:143)

However, the ideas and concepts live their own lives out of reach of their old masters and have been translated and enrolled in many other projects. I do not promote the use of ideas and concepts inspired by ANT as a ready-made
solution, but as one source of inspiration among others when studying the archaeological project, the relationships between the archaeologists and the objects they study, the representations and politics of heritage, and the uses of prehistory and history in different contexts.

Archaeological networks

A network approach could perhaps inspire the archaeological study in several different ways: as a way of following the archaeologists at work, in their travels through time and space and their mobilization of resources of heterogeneous character; as a way of following how remains from and references to other times are used in various, sometimes competing, discourses in today’s society; and as a way of following different configurations of reality and changing relationships among humans/animals/plants/supernatural beings/natural landscape features/artifacts through history, while avoiding some of the strict dichotomies such as nature-culture, human-nonhuman and living-dead.

When studying prehistory the researcher is attempting to arrange and manage networks within which many entities are enrolled and many relations established. The archaeological study could be described as a sort of “heterogeneous engineering” (Murdoch 1997). The archaeologist strives to situate her-/himself in a strategic “center of calculation” or “center of translation” in the network (Latour 1987:232ff.), trying to gather and execute remote control over the various elements in the network, acting as a spokesperson for the archaeological artifacts and sites. Countless elements figure in archaeological networks, for example archaeologists, artifacts, earth, developers, books, maps, laboratories, money, students, professors, excavators, typology schemas, phosphate samples, pollen grains, geological formations, legislation, local populations, radiocarbon dates, ethnographic examples, databases, GIS, animal and human bones, and many more. The network is composed of entities and connections that are heterogeneous in character, and its stability is dependent on support from many other networks inside as well as outside of the walls of the archaeological establishment.

Non-humans assume very important places in the archaeological networks, and they do not always behave and align themselves as the archaeologists would prefer. We might start our analyses with humans, or start with non-humans – in the end, they have often exchanged properties with each other. Archaeological artifacts change meaning in different contexts, the most obvious being the change of meaning from their prehistoric context to their present contexts in archaeological studies, museum exhibitions, newspaper articles etc. At the same time as the artifacts change roles and meanings they serve to connect the researcher or the newspaper reader with the past context (cf. the discussion on boundary objects, Bowker & Star 2000:296ff.). The objects bring
other times and spaces into what is here and now (Murdoch 1998:360), and carry with them narratives of the past.

It has been argued that such processes took place in prehistoric times as well. In an article about the historical construction of “Norrland”, Kjel Knutsson discusses the importance of the past in on-going constructions of identities, not only with regard to the prehistory of the population of today, but also with regard to ideas about the past and relations to the past among hunters and gatherers in central and northern Sweden at the time of the Neolithisation (Knutsson 2004). Knutsson examines reinterpretations of old technologies and renewed visits to old places as a way of inscribing the past in the present and creating narratives of origins and group identities. In the process of change in the social relations in the communities, the past was active as a structure and a resource. In reusing technologies of the past, the skilled lithic craftsperson 6,000 years ago acted in a sense as a modern researcher, collecting and translating relics from the past, characterized by a distant gaze (ibid.:65ff.; cf. also the criticism of this perspective by Ingela Bergman [2006] and the response by Kjel Knutsson [2007]).

One fundamental notion in many ANT studies is that non-humans have the potential to act, to assume roles as actors or actants, in different networks. They can act to conserve traditions and structures as well as act to bring about change. The importance of the material is further stressed as a fabric that makes networks durable across space and time. Societies are holding together not only through social relations but also through places, things and technologies: “Society is not what holds us together, it is what is held together” (Latour 1986:276; cf. also Latour 1991).

Among theoretically oriented archaeologists, there has recently been increased interest in materiality as heterogeneous relationships, sometimes inspired by ANT (cf. Olsen B. 2003, 2007b; Meskell 2005; Shanks 2007; Webmoor & Witmore 2008).

Contrary to the accusation of being too concerned with things… I claim that archaeology rather suffers from being undermaterialized. The materiality of past societies is mostly seen as the outcome of historical and social processes that are not in themselves material, leaving materiality itself with little or no causal or explanatory power for these processes. (Olsen B. 2003:90)

The changing relationship between animals and humans is another theme that is of great interest in this context. The role of animals is of major importance for our understanding of past societies (cf. Ingold 1994, 2002). Among prehistoric material remains of relevance from the North Calotte, one can mention representations of animals in rock art and stone tools, hunting pits, animal and fishing bones in hearths and cooking pits, animal sacrifices and the bear graves in the Sámi areas in northern Norway and Sweden (e.g. Myrstad 1997; Jennbert 2003; Fossum 2006:100ff.; cf. Günther 2009).
In contemporary society, on the other hand, there are several more or less radical movements that have scrutinized the relationship between humans and animals from different points of view. There is a lively debate on the value of animals, the treatment of animals and the roles that animals play in society, which attempts to explore and challenge the boundaries that have been constructed between humans and animals.

Furthermore, the role of “natural” features and places in the social worlds of prehistoric peoples is a topic that has been considerably discussed in archaeology in recent years (see Bradley 2000 and many works following up on that theme). Understanding prehistoric landscapes requires a method, or a way of moving, that is not blocked by the borders of our often very rigid conceptions of what is cultural, natural, supernatural, human and non-human. This is true also with regard to archaeological studies of religion and ritual. Recognizing the importance of non-humans in past and present societies would make us better equipped when trying to understand, or follow, different configurations of reality. In doing so, archaeologists of course can only hope to trace partial connections. The archaeologists are themselves part of the networks that they trace; therefore, archaeology will always be a partial and situated perspective.

A network approach to identity and ethnicity in archaeological research

Everything is somehow related and everything is in motion…
(Eidlitz Kuoljok 1999:15; my translation)

As discussed above, ethnicities and territories have often been treated as non-transparent black boxes and bounded one-entities in archaeology. This dualistic thinking, which has aimed to place all the elements of the world in separate boxes or categories, has powered “a model of the world as a global pool hall” (Wolf 1997 [1982]:6) where the “billiard balls” only bounce off each other and never truly meet, thereby facilitating a grammar for the separation and ranking of peoples. As an alternative, with some inspiration from the Actor-Network Theory project discussed above, I will discuss some tentative ideas of a relational network approach.

From the point of view of a relational network approach, ethnicity could be described as one way of connecting to others, not as a primordial attachment, nor merely as an instrumental strategy, but as one set of relationships among many others, one collective among other collectives. Certain sets of relationships may in certain situations become more important and be objectified in terms of ethnic essences and differences (cf. Jones 1997:92ff. and her discussion on Bourdieu’s concepts of habitus and doxa). Ethnic categories
are not given by nature, nor are they only socially constructed; in a sense, such categories might be described as co-constructed by heterogeneous associations and relationships.

Formation of networks of ethnicity involves both inclusion and exclusion, that is, both bonding within the collective and exclusion of others. Therefore, the nature of the boundaries of the networks becomes important: what/who is inside, what/who is outside and what/who may cross the boundaries. It is important to emphasize that the representations of ethnicity or ethnic groups are formed within, and simultaneously help to shape, relations of power. Identities and ethnicities are not chosen freely. Representations of ethnicity may be stable or unstable, and may be contested within the network. For instance, ideas about the ethnic representations within an ethnic group might not be shared by all its members, and the representations might be challenged by alternative interpretations. The sets of relationships are not static; they may change over time and in different circumstances, and the relationships may be understood and performed differently by different actors.

Networks of ethnicity build on other networks, for instance on cultural traditions, language or myths about the past – they are not constructed out of nothing (cf. discussion in Eriksen 2002:67ff.). Ethnic processes and ethnic representations are also related to other forms of identities and modes of difference, such as gender, age, class, religion and so on. It would be interesting to consider how great importance should be attributed to ethnicity in relation to other formations of identities and to explore these relationships more in depth in each instance.

One basic point that I try to make here, following the earlier discussions on Actor-Network Theory, is that the perspective can be widened from dealing only with relations between humans. Networks of ethnicity do not necessarily involve only people, but also for instance material culture, places and landscapes, ancestors and animals – and sometimes archaeological artifacts and locales. Identities are created not only in relation to other people, but in a play or a field with nature and the world around. Here it is possible to focus on the materiality of identity constructions, which is of course interesting from an archaeological point of view, and also on the significance of places and landscapes in the construction of identities. In this field the past is often important, as a resource and a structure, in the creation and re-creation of myths and narratives about group identity.

If such an approach were applied in archaeology, the emphasis would be on ethnic processes instead of on the delimiting and defining of ethnic groups, on intersecting and hybrid networks and boundaries instead of on entities – on identification as a process instead of identity as a thing (cf. Eriksen 2002), accommodating conceptualization of multiple, hybrid and creolized identities. In doing so, it might be possible to bypass some of the binary oppositions commonly used to capture difference.
The notion of heterological ethnicity as discussed by Johannes Siapkas, with inspiration from the works of Michel de Certeau (Siapkas 2003), is interesting in this context. Heterological ethnicity emphasizes the determining effect of scholarly and other discourses on the conceptualization of identities in the past: “Thus, ethnicity as a topic in the first place is an issue only because it is relevant to us” (ibid.:30). Many archaeologists have pointed to a perspective of practice, as a way of avoiding the essentialist structures of archaeological ethnicity. Microarchaeology (Cornell & Fahlander 2002) is one approach, aiming to overcome dichotomies and strong entities by emphasizing materiality and structurating practices, which is of interest in relation to the ideas discussed here. Fredrik Hallgren has discussed communities of practice, in which performance, participation and learning are seen as central aspects of cultural reproduction. Rather than being homogenous and coherent, culture can therefore be viewed as heterogeneous and divergent: “In the engagement in cultural practices and through the participation in various communities of practice, aspects of identity are formed” (Hallgren 2008:289). These, along with many other approaches suggested by other archaeologists, constitute examples of the ways in which contemporary archaeologists have tried to overcome the legacy of the one-entity syndrome in earlier archaeological research.

So is there any reason at all for using ethnicity in archaeology? While ethnicity is often declared irrelevant in archaeological studies, it could be argued – as is the case also with regard to gender – that such views tend to be held by people who are in privileged positions and who do not need to confront the structures of gender and/or ethnicity. The word itself could be changed to another word, but the role played by the concept will remain of importance in archaeological studies as long as it is important in the world around archaeology. Therefore, I believe that ethnicity must be discussed in archaeology, but from another starting-point than has usually been the case, with a grammar that would make it more difficult to turn to the past for simple opportune truths that can be used to legitimize domination and oppression.
In network space the distance between different elements is not constant and metric, but depends on the relations between the elements – a relational concept of space and time (Murdoch 1998). The archaeological mapping, the connecting and disconnecting of elements in networks, becomes part of a “power-geometry of time-space” (cf. Massey 1999), in which the production of space and time and the production of power are closely related. In my view, it is important for archaeologists to critically examine the networks of archaeology and the “power-geometry” of archaeological research, and to try to follow multiple translations of and conflicts over places and spaces in narratives of the past.

In this first part of the book, I have examined some of the central theoretical concepts and approaches that one inevitably is confronted with in the discussions on the construction and representation of Sámi prehistory and archaeology: identity, ethnicity, nationalism and indigeneity.

Ethnicity and identity may seem to be straightforward and easily understood – but perhaps only from an above-perspective, in the separation, classification and sorting of people. From within, the complexities of individual and group identities unfold. As I see it, ethnicity is not easy, but it can be made all too easy. Examples of that can be followed in many situations of conflict, in the worst instances involving violent ethnic conflicts and ethnic cleansing. Once again, the possibilities of manipulating identities and ethnicities stand out and make ethnicity a useful tool for different political agendas. It is, therefore, a relevant question to ask: What do archaeologists want to do with the concept of ethnicity?

I have used the concepts of “one-entities” and “black boxes” to describe the ways in which complex historical processes are unified in one basic, hegemonic entity (one-entity) and the connections and histories behind the entity are made invisible (black box). In my view, it is important to try to open up the one-entities and black boxes that are used in archaeology and to try to explore and critically examine the connections behind. However, it should be said that it is not always possible to know where the network that one is tracing ends, and how far one should follow the connections.

But then, is ethnicity at all important, is it not an unnecessary concept? As I will argue and exemplify later in the book, ethnicity is indeed important to many people in the world today. Therefore, in my opinion, ethnicity needs to be discussed and examined in archaeology, as part of the world that
archaeologists engage with and study. But, as I have argued here, it should be discussed from another perspective than the one that has often been used before, with another “grammar” that makes it more difficult to turn to the past for simple and opportune truths that can be used to legitimize domination and oppression.

Another central concept, closely related to ethnicity, is indigeneity. I have tried to explore some aspects of the construction of indigeneity, as well as the direction in archaeology that has grown in importance in recent times under the name of indigenous archaeology. The concepts of indigeneity and indigenous archaeology are, as is ethnicity, difficult to encircle and define, and as I see it there can be serious problems with a too generalized, global concept of indigenousness. It is important to realize that indigenous archaeology is not one unified approach to the study of the past, and that there is, and must be, considerable variation in its application in different parts of the world. In my view, it is likewise critical to understand that the indigenous discourse produces new relations of power and power structures, creating its own insiders as well as outsiders. The concepts of indigenous peoples and indigenous archaeology also run the risk of being turned into new black boxes, which might be arranged, manipulated and spoken for by other dominant actors.

Still, one must not forget that there are many legitimate reasons for the existence and promotion of the international indigenous peoples movement. There is a real and often painful history behind the wish of groups of people in different parts of the world to meet under a common banner. It is about real people, with real lives and real histories – it is not just an intellectual or academic construction. Indigeneity is a political concept, used for empowerment and emancipation by previously marginalized groups. As we have seen, it is a concept with growing importance in the field of archaeology, which I believe that archaeologists need to deal with, whether or not they are working directly with indigenous communities.

However, in the archaeological discussions on ethnicity and indigeneity, archaeologists should be careful not to generalize and simplify too much. Homogeneous and static images of the culture and history of specific groups of people, not least indigenous peoples, have been produced over and over again throughout history. I would suggest that archaeology, with its often long-term and deep historical perspective, can actually help to undermine such static and homogeneous views on history and prehistory, if the archaeological material is taken seriously.

In this part, I have explored a relational network approach to ethnicity in archaeology, which is focused on movement, dynamics and connections, associations and relations rather than on bounded and polarized entities and categories. Furthermore, this perspective points to the multitude of connections, between not only humans but also non-humans, which are involved in the construction of ethnicity. I suggest that such a perspective, with an emphasis on power relations, could be of use in the discussions on complex
and dynamic identities in the present and the past, also in situations with a contested cultural heritage and prehistory, as in northern Sweden and on the North Calotte.

In the following discussions, we will many times encounter the problems of ethnicity as an archaeological concept and the use of ethnicity in interpretations of the past. One important question is what the implications of the debates on ethnicity, as well as the international debates on the rights of indigenous peoples and the relationship between archaeologists and local and indigenous groups, might be in the Nordic and Swedish contexts, concerning the cultural heritage and history of the Sámi people.

In the next part of the book, I will turn to the primary area of investigation, Northern Fennoscandia and Sápmi, and the main topic of this study, the examination of the concepts of Sámi prehistory and Sámi archaeology from a research historical perspective and a contemporary political perspective. I will follow some of the networks engineered by archaeologists and other scholars, which involve the connecting and disconnecting of heterogeneous elements in the construction of images and narratives of the Sámi past.
II

Mapping the North in the West

Representations of Sámi prehistory and conceptions of Sámi archaeology in the Nordic countries
Part II of this book deals with the history of archaeology and the writing of prehistory in northern Sweden and Northern Fennoscandia. In this part, I will primarily focus on the concepts of Sámi prehistory and Sámi archaeology – two terms that have been, and still are to a certain extent, considered to be controversial and highly politicized among archaeologists in Sweden. The aim is to examine the representations of Sámi prehistory and the conceptions of Sámi archaeology, and to follow some of the connections and networks behind the concepts. The primary focus is on scientific texts written in Sweden, but I will also discuss some aspects of the research on Sámi prehistory and archaeology that has been undertaken in the other Nordic countries. Research on the Kola Sámi and the eastern part of Sápmi will be treated more specifically in part III.

Although the Sámi have constantly been constructed as the “Other” in relation to the idea of the national identity or national history, there has been a great deal of interest in this different, exotic and romantic “Other”. There is a vast amount of scholarly literature on the Sámi people and the cultural and symbolic “homeland” Sápmi, which has constantly grown through time. However, in Sweden the general knowledge about Sámi identity, culture and history is very limited among the public and, it must be admitted, among many in the academic world. The general impression is that very little is taught about the Sámi in schools in Sweden, which is also the case with many university courses.

In this part of the book, my intention is to examine how Sámi prehistory and Sámi archaeology have been constructed in the scientific narratives and to try to follow some of the connections with the changing social, political and economic contexts in the Nordic countries. I have chosen to focus on four main themes, which have been very central in the debates on Sámi prehistory and archaeology. The four selected themes are 1) the origin of the Sámi people, 2) South Sámi prehistory, 3) the emergence and development of reindeer herding and pastoralism, and finally 4) Sámi pre-Christian indigenous religion. I have selected these themes as they have attracted quite a lot of attention from different researchers over time and, moreover, have been the objects of scientific and political contention and controversy. Furthermore, they also illustrate different aspects of the networks of archaeology and the representations of Sámi history, as well as different sides of the changing relationship between what is considered as Swedish and what is considered as Sámi in the present and the past.
Before examining these issues, however, it is necessary to consider the geographical, cultural, political and historical backgrounds to the interest in Sámi prehistory and archaeology in the Nordic countries. First, I will discuss some of the geographical concepts that are used to describe the northern areas and also the contested issue concerning contemporary Sámi identity. Then I will examine some of the main threads in the representations of the Sámi through time, before I turn to the specific scientific discourses on Sámi prehistory and archaeology.
Figure 1. Map of northern Sweden and Northern Fennoscandia, with some important contemporary towns and some of the places mentioned in part II. Map by author and Karin Bengtsson.
One of the most dominant images of northern Sweden is that of the last wilderness and the pristine nature untouched by humans. The North has often been seen as something exotic, as a frontier to be conquered, or as a romanticized, idealized, virgin land – something essentially different from the South. In this context, the Sámi – the indigenous population in northern Norway, Sweden, Finland and the Kola Peninsula in the Russian Federation – have often been represented as a homogeneous, traditional and unchanged remnant of the past, especially in many tourist and popular cultural heritage representations (Saarinen 1997; Mulk & Bayliss-Smith 1999; Baglo 2001a, 2001b; Olsen K. 2003).

The conception of the far North in the history of European imagination has generally taken the character of a non-civilized periphery, a wilderness, dark, cold and dangerous, accompanied by negative stereotypes of the Sámi people. However, through European history, one can also follow a thread with more positive images of the far North and its people, from the hyperborean myth in the ancient world, through the images of the noble savage uncorrupted by civilization during the Enlightenment, up to the exotic and romantic visions of Sámi life in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and the glossy tourist brochures of today that market and commodify the simultaneously wild and peaceful, silent landscapes of Lapland, the home of the nature-loving Sámi. As Peter Davidson puts in his book about the notion of the North in literature, painting, mythology and popular imagination:

Two opposing ideas of north repeat (and contradict each other) from European antiquity to the time of the nineteenth-century Arctic explorers: that the north is a place of darkness and dearth, the seat of evil. Or, conversely, that it is a place of austere felicity where virtuous peoples live behind the north wind and are happy. (Davidson 2005:21)

In Framtidslandet (‘Land of future’), the historian Sverker Sörlin writes about the interest in Norrland and Sápmi during the period of modernization and industrialization in Sweden in the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century (1988). The aesthetic gaze and the economic exploitation were both driven by a far-reaching exoticism. Sápmi appeared as the unknown, yet not
conquered land, a territory waiting to be incorporated into the Swedish project of modernism and industrialism:

Interest in Norrland intensified during the later half of the nineteenth century, and by the turn of the century the phrase ‘Land of the Future’ had become common currency, applicable in the most diverse instances. In the press, magazines and novels, in travel reports and poetry, in parliamentary debates and committee reports – the praises of Norrland and her resources were being sung everywhere. (Sörlin 1988:264)

However, alongside such praises, more pessimistic notes were also heard, which were concerned with the negative consequences of the modernization and industrialization processes. Generally, Sámi culture and history did not fit into the image of this Land of Future. The Sámi were rather considered to be part of the past, a relic that had survived from another time.

In this chapter, I will explore some of the geographical and ethnic concepts used in descriptions of northern Sweden and Northern Fennoscandia. More specifically, I will introduce the concept of Sápmi and discuss some aspects of contemporary Sámi identity.
Norrland, the North Calotte and the Barents Region

The northern area of Sweden is called Norrland (there are three lands in Sweden: Götaland, Svealand and Norrland). Norrland, in the normal usage of the term, is shaped by the coast of the Gulf of Bothnia in the east, further north by the Torne, Muonio and Könkämä rivers bordering to Finland, in the west by the watershed in the Scandian mountain range bordering to Norway. The southern boundary of Norrland follows the southern boundaries of the provinces of Härrjedalen, Hälsingland and Gästrikland. There is also the border zone called the Limes Norrlandicus, approximately following the northern boundary of the provinces of Värmland, Västmanland and Uppland, a vegetation border which has been considered to be of cultural importance through the Stone, Bronze and Iron Ages, often interpreted as an important, sometimes as an ethnic, divide between hunters and gatherers in the north and farmers and stockbreeders in the south (see Zachrisson 1994b; Knutsson & Knutsson 2003; Hallgren 2008; cf. the overview of earlier discussions on Limes Norrlandicus in Loeffler 2005:29ff.). Norrland is, however, by no means any simple geographical concept; behind the seemingly uncomplicated and everyday term are many diverse networks, ideas and representations at work, and in constant change.

According to Trond Thuen, the east-west dimension on the North Calotte defines long-running ”traditional” cultural relationships that could be described as symmetric, while the north-south dimension, on the other hand, is characterized by center-periphery, asymmetric relations represented by the nation-states and their borders (Thuen 2002). These asymmetric relations can be seen as a part of the national project, especially from the middle of the 19th century onwards, which not only aimed at creating a national history but also entailed an ideology of ethnic purity and assimilation of the populations in the North in order to create a national homogeneity (ibid.:154ff.).

In 1993, the so-called Barents cooperation was initiated. The purpose was to define a special region, the Barents region, which incorporated the northern parts of Norway, Sweden, Finland and some of the northernmost areas in the European part of the Russian Federation. This region was supposed to be based on common historical connections that had been cut off by the boundaries of the contemporary states. The purpose was further to stimulate economic and cultural cooperation across the borders, especially across the border of the recently collapsed Soviet Union (ibid.:147f.). Through different grant schemas, the Barents region has today become of institutional importance also for archaeological research. In this sense, the Barents region can be said to be an example of regionalization and creation of identity from above (Elenius 2006b:14).

The historian Lars Elenius has outlined some features of development that the whole Barents region, in the four different countries, holds in common, all differences set aside:
• Peripheral localisation
• Sparse population in a large area
• Many ethnic minorities
• Delayed start of industrialisation, followed by a rapid industrialisation process
• Immigration of large groups of the nations’ majority people in the area
• Radicalisation of the work force and polarisation between radical and traditional groups
• A kind of “polar romanticism”, which a lot of modernising actors embraced regarding the northern dimension of each nation state
• Post-modern efforts to strengthen higher education
• A revitalisation process which many of the national minorities went through during the last part of the 20th century (Elenius 2006b:14)

Northern Sweden as an archaeological field of study

Northern Sweden was for a long time an almost white spot on the archaeological map. Most, almost all, of the excavations and surveys took place in the southern parts of Sweden, and the academic interest in the prehistory of the northern regions was low, which was evident for instance in the very small amount of archaeological literature devoted to northern Swedish prehistory (see e.g. Ekholm 1941:142f.; Loeffler 2005). The first large-scale systematic archaeological surveys and investigations took place in connection with the exploitation of many rivers in northern Sweden for hydro-electrical power from the 1940s to the 1970s (cf. Björnstad 2006). A great number of ancient sites were registered and a very large archaeological material, mainly from the Stone Age and the Bronze Age, was gathered during those decades. However, surveys were only conducted along those sections of the river systems that were directly affected by the building of dams. For instance, the eastern part of the county of Norrbotten where the Torne and Kalix rivers were not exploited for water power, or the huge forest areas in between the different rivers in northern Sweden as well as the mountain areas in the west, remained blank spots on the archaeological map (some exceptions did exist, see Christiansson 1980; Christiansson & Wigenstam 1980).

It is only during the last 20–25 years that systematic surveys for ancient remains have been carried out in the coastal regions of northern Norrland and only during the last 10–15 years in the inland and mountain areas. The results of these surveys have shown that there are great amounts of remains from different prehistoric and historic periods in all of these regions, for instance in the county of Norrbotten (see Edbom et al. 2001; Liedgren & Hedman 2005). However, prehistory in northern Sweden still remains much less explored than prehistory in southern Sweden. There are large areas that have not been systematically surveyed and documented, and in vast areas, ancient remains are
Noel Broadbent has discussed what could be called a “longitude 30 degrees – latitude 60 degrees syndrome” (see fig. 3), inherent in archaeological research in Sweden (Broadbent 2001; cf. also Loeffler 2005). Broadbent argues that the idea of “Sweden” has constantly been constructed and reconstructed with images and myths taken from the area south of the 60th latitude, thereby denying its northern identity. On the other hand, the 30th longitude has long been a compact barrier to the east, cutting Sweden off from its circumpolar context. It can be added that there has also been a boundary further west, based in part on language difficulties, separating Sweden and Finland. Broadbent suggests that the greatest potential in archaeological research in Sweden would be to recognize the circumpolar cultural and natural history and to try to understand the meeting and mixture of what he calls the circumpolar and European influences through history in the Nordic area and present-day Sweden (Broadbent 2001). The same has been argued by Kerstin Eidlitz Kuoljok, who stresses that there is a need for more historical and ethnological comparisons between the Sámi communities and other northern communities in Russia and Siberia, and for more knowledge of the research that has taken

at present threatened by large-scale destruction from activities of the forest industry.

Examples of the divide between what is considered southern Swedish prehistory and northern Swedish prehistory abound in the archaeological literature in Sweden and relate to any prehistoric period. One should, however, keep in mind that “south” and “north” here are not purely geographical terms (as latitudes), but rather mental concepts. At the same time, archaeological research in the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation remains little known among archaeologists in Sweden almost 20 years after the breakdown of the iron curtain, even though this research would be very relevant when studying prehistory in northern Sweden. Although the nation-state boundaries in northern Fennoscandia obviously are irrelevant with regard to the prehistoric societies, these boundaries have fundamentally formed and delimited the images of prehistory in the area. Archaeologists have earlier almost exclusively studied only their own national piece of the pie, resulting in a rather odd image of the past as a projection of the political situation of today. This situation has to a large extent been due to language difficulties and the problems of finding and accessing information about archaeological research and ancient remains in the other countries.

Earlier research has mostly focused on connections with “the south”, as the source of progress and civilization. However, the theme of eastern contacts in the prehistory of Norrland has been present, although it has not been investigated in any depth or in relation to the contexts of research in the east, for instance in the Russian Federation (see further discussion in part III).

There are several recent works that have dealt with the history of archaeology in Sweden (e.g. Jensen 2002; Baudou 2004a), and the history and current structures of cultural heritage management in Sweden (Grundberg 2000, 2004; Pettersson 2001). Therefore, these general issues on archaeological historiography and the structure of the cultural heritage management in Sweden will not be dealt with here in any detail, and readers interested in finding out more about those issues are directed to the works referred to above. The historiography of archaeological research in northern Sweden has also been discussed in several works (see e.g. Christiansson 1963; Baudou 1995, 1997, 2004a; Loeffler 2005; Grundberg 2006:213ff.).

In his doctoral dissertation in archaeology at the University of Umeå, David Loeffler has examined the prehistory writing of Norrland during the 20th century (2005). Loeffler has studied the coverage in several archaeological journals and a number of textbooks of northern Swedish prehistory as compared with southern Swedish prehistory (ibid.:109). The result shows that the prehistory and archaeology of Norrland has been much neglected and underrepresented throughout the 20th century (cf. also Hagström forthcoming). Loeffler formulates five points that, according to him, summarize the general tendency in much of earlier scientific writing about the prehistory of northern Sweden:
1) Norrland was inhabited relatively late.
2) Its population density was low, settlements sparse and of temporary duration.
3) Development in the North was retarded or completely lacking.
4) When changes do occur or progress is made, it is always initiated from without, most often from southern Sweden. And finally,
5) Norrland’s only contribution to the prehistory of the Nation amounts to provisioning its more progressive neighbour with various raw materials, *ad infinitum.* (Loeffler 2005:125)

However, new archaeological research in northern Sweden has strived to challenge the notion of Norrland as an area with a retarded and inferior cultural development, as well as the notion of northern Sweden as a homogeneous area with a uniform development. The archaeologist Per H. Ramqvist has proposed a division of northern Sweden into five regions, which were of relevance at least during the period from B.C./A.D. to 1000 A.D. (Ramqvist 2007; see fig. 4). He argues that the notion of one single Norrland region during prehistoric times is an incorrect and misleading conception, which overshadows the cultural, economic and political dynamics in the northern Swedish area. Ramqvist stresses that these five regions were not separated from each other by any fixed, impenetrable boundaries, but rather that the historical developments in one region also affected the others in different ways. No geographical part of northern Sweden was isolated from the outside world, but was in fact part of the larger historical processes in northern Europe during the first millennium A.D. (ibid.).

*Figure 4. A schematic illustration of the five different regions in northern Sweden, around B.C./A.D., suggested by Per H. Ramqvist: 1) the northern inland region, 2) the northern coastal region, 3) the southern inland region, 4) the middle coastal region, and 5) the southern coastal region. Ramqvist emphasizes that northern Sweden, *Norrland,* was not a homogeneous entity in prehistoric times, nor was it isolated from the outside world. From Ramqvist 2007:155.*
New archaeological research has also expanded the time frame of prehistory in northern Sweden, and has added much more information. Prehistory in the North has become considerably longer than what was believed earlier. Recent archaeological research, and new radiocarbon datings from archaeological sites in northern Sweden, has pushed the time of the deglaciation of northern Sweden back in time and has shown that the area was settled rapidly after the deglaciation, almost 10,000 years ago (see e.g. Bergman et al. 2004).

**Sápmi – land and culture**

The Sámi people is generally considered as the indigenous people of northern Norway, Sweden, Finland and the Kola Peninsula in the Russian Federation, although the political status of the Sámi vary between the different countries. The size of the present-day Sámi population is difficult to estimate, due to the lack of investigations and statistics, and depends on the criteria used, which may vary significantly. Estimates, however, vary between c. 60,000 and 80,000 (sometimes up to 100,000) individuals in total in the four countries. An approximate estimation of the number of Sámi people in the different countries could be as follows: about 30,000–50,000 in Norway, 15,000–25,000 in Sweden, 6,000–7,000 in Finland, and some 1,500–2,000 individuals in the Russian Federation (see e.g. Lehtola 2004:10; Svonni 2008:235).
The Sámi were earlier called Lapp (Lapps), an exonym used by non-Sámi peoples and the states that incorporated the lands of Sápmi within their boundaries, a term that in common usage often took on a derogatory meaning. Sámi, on the contrary (with some variance in the spelling, see note on language), is the term that has been used by the Sámi themselves. In official documents and scientific texts, the term Lapp was used up to the 1970s, when officials and researchers started to use the internal denomination Sámi.

Figure 3 shows what is today considered to be the traditional settlement and cultural area of the Sámi population, called Sápmi, as it is commonly represented in the literature. One should, however, be very cautious with well-arranged maps like this one. What do these boundaries really represent? The Sámi cultural consciousness is mapped in a two-way process, on the one hand empowering a Sámi cultural self-consciousness connected with “the land”, on the other hand presenting “the Sámi” as something separate, bounded and limited to a specific territorial area as part of a static, regulated map view, where each and every people has its place. The notion of Sápmi carries a potential for an alternative geography that stretches across the boundaries of the present-day nation-states, but comes with a form that fits well into the scheme of nationalist cartography (cf. Conrad 2004).

The borders of Sápmi have in fact been contested throughout history and have been the subject of many controversies, especially in the southern Sápmi area in Sweden and Norway, but also for instance along the northern Swedish coast. A map such as the one shown in figure 3 raises many questions. What influence does a map image like this one of Sápmi have on the archaeological imagination of the past? What is its effect on our understanding of Sámi prehistory? Is there, for instance, a Sámi prehistory along the coast of the Gulf of Bothnia (outside the area mapped as present-day Sápmi), or is Sámi prehistory only to be found in the interior areas in northern Sweden?

There is substantial evidence that the Sámi area was considerably larger in historical times than it is today. On the basis of historical records, such as tax documents, it can be shown that in the Middle Ages, Sámi communities existed in the entire area of Finnish Lapland, as well as in many places in eastern Finland and Russian Karelia (Itkonen 1948; Aikio 2003:39). Among Russian scholars it is generally considered that the Sámi area in today’s Russia was considerably larger in historical times than at present (Lukjantjenko 1990; Kotjkurkina 2004:54ff.). This idea is based in part on historical sources and place-names (Mullonen 2001). However, there are other researchers who have questioned the ethnic meaning of collective names such as “Lop” used in written sources and their relevance for the interpretation of archaeological finds from prehistoric times in Karelia (cf. Sjakhnovitj 2003; also Kosmenko 2007).

An alternative map image of Sápmi is presented in figure 5. Here, the Sámi area extends down to the coast of the Gulf of Bothnia and the South Sámi area is larger. This map has been drawn on commission from Samiskt Informationscentrum, or the Sámi Information Center, an agency under the
The Sámi languages belong to the Finno-Ugric language family, and the larger Uralic language group which also includes the Samoyed languages. Finnish and Estonian are two other Finno-Ugric languages, together with several languages in the northern parts of the Russian Federation. Figure 6 shows the approximate distribution of the main Sámi language areas. Usually, researchers distinguish between ten different Sámi languages that are spoken today, which were earlier often described as dialects. The Sámi languages are often divided into a western Sámi and an eastern Sámi branch. The western Sámi languages are North Sámi, Lule Sámi, Pite Sámi (or Arjeplog Sámi), Ume Sámi and South Sámi. The eastern Sámi languages are Inari Sámi, Skolt Sámi, Akkala Sámi, Kildin Sámi and Ter Sámi. Another common division is between three main language groups: East Sámi (Ter Sámi, Kildin Sámi, Akkala Sámi, Skolt Sámi and Inari Sámi), Central Sámi (North Sámi, Lule Sámi and Pite Sámi) and South Sámi (Ume Sámi and South Sámi) (Svonni 2008:234ff.).

Within the ten Sámi languages, there are also different varieties or dialects. The languages are usually not separated by any sharp boundaries, rather there is
a gradual transition between the languages (Kulonen 2005). The largest and most widely spoken of the ten languages is North Sámi, while the other languages are much smaller. The eastern Sámi languages have few native speakers today. Kildin Sámi is the largest of the Sámi language spoken on the Kola Peninsula and is used in newspapers and radio broadcasting in the region. The Ter and Akkala Sámi languages were in 1994 on the verge of extinction, as there were extremely few speakers left alive (Rantala 1994). The last native speaker of the Akkala Sámi language is reported to have passed away in 2003, leaving the language extinct. Pite Sámi and Ume Sámi also have very few native speakers and are at present seriously endangered (Svonni 2008:236).

The different Sámi languages, dialects or varieties are not always mutually understandable. This is an important reminder that the Sámi culture is not a homogeneous entity. This is also true in regard to cultural practices and the traditional means of production. Although the reindeer pastoralism of the inland and mountain areas has become an ethnic cliché (and in Sweden, in a sense, a legally defining ethnic trait; see below), only a small minority of the Sámi population in the four states is today working in the reindeer herding business.

Sápmi covers a large area with very varying topography and natural conditions, from the islands in the Atlantic Ocean off the Norwegian coast, across the alpine environment of the Scandes mountain range, the tundra of the Barents Sea coast, the vast forests and bogs in northern Sweden, the lakes and rivers in northern Finland to the tundra and taiga of the Kola Peninsula. The Sápmi area is rich in natural resources and mineral deposits. Therefore, much of the colonization and modernization processes in Sápmi has evolved parallel with the exploitation of these resources, such as large-scale forestry, mining enterprises and damming of the river systems for water power.

Who is Sámi?

Who is Sámi? This is a question which might seem easy to answer, but in reality is a difficult one. Intuitively, one would perhaps object that this is a personal matter for the individual and not a concern for the state or for that matter for any archaeologist. Strict definitions of the content of individual ethnicities would seem to be as unnecessary as they are inappropriate. However, the Swedish state has indeed been much concerned with definitions of who is Sámi. Although state interventions in Sámi identity politics started already in the late 19th century with the Swedish legislation on reindeer herding rights, the need for a clear definition of Sámi ethnicity in Sweden arose most distinctly when the Sámi Parliament was founded in 1993. Who were to be allowed to vote in the elections for the Parliament?
The Sámi Parliament Act in Sweden (*Sametingslagen*, SFS 1992:1433), was created with a strong focus on a language criterion in the definition of who would be entitled to register to vote in the Sámi Parliament:

2 § In this law, a person is regarded as Sámi if he or she considers himself or herself to be a Sámi, and
1. ensures that he or she uses, or has used, Sámi as a language at home, or
2. ensures that any of his or her parents or grandparents use or have used Sámi as a language at home, or
3. has a parent who is or has been admitted into the electoral register to the Sámi Parliament, unless the county administrative board has subsequently decided differently. (SFS 1992:1433, 1 kap., 2 §; my translation)

In Finland and Norway, the rules for entering the electoral register to the Sámi Parliaments are approximately the same as in Sweden, based primarily on language criteria. In the Russian Federation, where there is at present no Sámi Parliament, a different official system is in operation, which is based on self-ascription and self-definition. At the age of 16, all citizens of the Russian Federation determine themselves which nationality they belong to, for instance Sámi or Komi. It should be noted that there is a difference between citizenship, i.e. Russian citizenship (belonging to the Russian Federation), and nationality, such as Sámi nationality (belonging to the Sámi nation; see further discussions in part III).

Another definition, possibly conflicting with the definition in the Sámi Parliament Act, can be found in the Swedish Reindeer Act (Sw. *Rennäringslagen*). The first Reindeer Act was enacted in 1886. The current Reindeer Act was developed in 1971, and has afterwards been modified and revised on a number of occasions, most recently in 1993. The first Reindeer Act created the Sámi village system in Sweden. According to the legislation, only those who are members of a Sámi village (Sw. *sameby*) have the right to own and herd reindeer, and only *sameby* members are entitled to special rights to hunting and fishing. The other Sámi people were to be treated as Swedish people and the state actively worked for their assimilation into the majority population of the country (see Mörkenstam 1999, 2002; Amft 2000; Lundmark 2002:145ff.). It is important to note that this legislation on reindeer herding as an *exclusive* Sámi right and the very close association between Sáminess and reindeer herding apply to Sweden and not in the same way to Finland, Norway and the Russian Federation. In Finland and the Russian Federation, non-Sámi people may also own and herd reindeer.

In the Swedish legislation, Sámi women were discriminated. If a Sámi woman with reindeer herding rights married a Sámi man without reindeer herding rights or a non-Sámi man, her inherited rights to reindeer herding were lost for ever. This did not apply to the Sámi men, who retained their herding rights when marrying a non-Sámi woman or a Sámi woman without herding rights.
rights. This provision was in use until 1971, when the new Reindeer Act abolished the rule (Amft 2000:113).

According to the Reindeer Act of 1971, persons with reindeer herding rights were those of Sámi ancestry with a parent or grandparent who had reindeer herding as a steady livelihood. Furthermore, one must also be a member of a Sámi village. There is thus an ethnic criterion, Sámi ancestry, which is not defined more in detail, and also an occupational criterion. In the words of Hugh Beach this might generate a “phase-out clause”, as with each new generation of persons with Sámi ancestry but no herding occupation, reindeer herding rights will subsequently be lost (Beach 2007:8). This is of course an especially serious problem if reindeer herding is unprofitable and many herders are forced to quit the occupation.

The Sámi village is a very important institution in the Sámi community in Sweden. It is not only an economic association for reindeer herders, but also a social and cultural community. However, the Sámi village system is a closed, exclusive system, with a restricted membership according to certain rules. Membership in a Sámi village provides an obvious Sámi identity and a direct connection to the land, which can be more difficult to achieve for a person outside the system. Consequently, one of the most lively debated questions in the Swedish Sámi Parliament in recent years has dealt with what is called the “open Sámi village”, that is, a reformed Sámi village system that could include more Sámi individuals. The discussion about a more open, or enlarged, Sámi village was initiated already in the 1970s and was driven by different Sámi organization (Mulk pers.com.). Still, to this day, no agreement on a solution to this complex problem has been reached among the politicians.

Through the reindeer herding legislation, from the end of the 19th century until present times, the Swedish state has strived to define who is a Sámi. In this way, the Swedish state has excluded the majority of the Sámi from the Sámi village system and the reindeer herding rights, a policy that has caused serious conflicts within the Sámi population to this day. For those who were excluded, this has in many cases led to a series of identity problems and crises (see e.g. Isaksson S. 2001).

The stereotype of a typical Sámi – with reindeer wandering in the high mountains – has in large been constructed and manipulated by the Swedish state, and is still a strong image among the Swedish public. In the mass media, as well as in other contexts, it is common that the Sámi people and the reindeer herders are confused. Newspaper headlines about conflicts over grazing rights often read “The Sámi won (or lost) the case”, although it is the Sámi villages and the reindeer herders who had won/lost, or even “The Sámi do not have the right to graze everywhere”, conflating the Sámi people with the reindeer themselves (see discussion in Hällgren 2007). At the same time, the reindeer must be acknowledged as an important symbol for Sámi culture and Sámi identity, and the reindeer herding, in its changing forms, as a very important part of the Sámi cultural heritage.
Today, a large group of Sámi people live outside of Sápmi, for instance in southern Sweden, partly as a result of the general population movements in Sweden from rural areas to towns and cities and the economic decline in the interior regions of northern Sweden in the last 50 years. These individuals often occupy a different and ambivalent position within the Sámi community and do not fit into the stereotypical image of the authentic Sámi. The experience of a structural ”oppressive authenticity” is shared with other indigenous populations living in urban, non-traditional settings in many parts of the world (cf. Sissons 2005). There are also, naturally, many situations and experiences in life that do not fulfill the ideal representation of Sáminess. For example, there are many persons with one Sámi and, for instance, one Swedish parent, and many Sámi who do not speak the Sámi language of their parents or grandparents.

For the generation that grew up during the first half of the 20th century, with its nationalistic and racist ideas and discriminatory as well as assimilative policies and practices, asserting a Sámi identity was often difficult, and could lead to a considerably less favorable position in Swedish society. As a result of the negative attitudes towards and the social stigmatization of Sámi language and identity, and the formal as well as informal processes of assimilation working on different levels in society, many children of that generation who were brought up in the 1960s and 1970s never learned their parents’ and grandparents’ native Sámi language. These circumstances place many young people in a position which does not conform with the stereotypical representations of a Sámi identity. The internal identity work, self-understanding and positioning in relation to the others can at times be hard and difficult to manage for the individuals; the larger-scale societal, cultural and political processes encroach in different ways on the life-tracks of the individuals (for examples and discussions, see further Amft 2000; Olofsson 2004; Lasko 2006; Åhrén 2008).

To uphold an indigenous identity in contemporary society is not as straightforward and obvious as it might seem to be from a distance, but involves a lot of work. It is not hard to imagine that at times it can be difficult to act as an indigenous Sámi in the local context, with your neighbors, in your village or small town. Sometimes it might be easier to do so in an international context, for instance at scientific conferences or within the UN organization. One person may enter into several different identity discourses, which can at times collide (Olofsson 2004; Green 2008). The identity work involves processes of negotiation between the different identities, and the searching for connections, and expressions, to build upon.
Sámi prehistory and the Kven movement

The identity and history of the Sámi must, of course, be seen in relation to the identity and history of other population groups on the North Calotte and not in isolation. In northern Norway, there is a Finnish speaking minority population, the so-called Kvens. In northern Sweden, besides the majority population of the nation-state, the Swedish, there is also a large Finnish, or Meänkieli, speaking minority population in the county of Norrbotten (see Kuoppa 2002; Wande 2007).

In 1999, the Swedish Parliament passed a new legislation on minority rights in Sweden. In this legislation, Meänkieli received official status, with associated special rights, as a national minority language in Sweden, together with four other minority languages, Sámi, Finnish, Romani Chib and Jiddisch. The legislation also specified a language region, including the municipalities of Kiruna, Gällivare, Haparanda, Pajala and Övertorneå in the county of Norrbotten, where special rights to use Meänkieli for instance in contacts with different authorities are guaranteed. A corresponding language area for Sámi was also defined, which included the municipalities of Kiruna, Gällivare, Jokkmokk and Arjeplog in Norrbotten (Johansson 2008:216ff.).

The Finnish-speaking minority populations in Sweden and Norway have been subjected to many discriminatory policies and assimilation efforts from the Swedish and Norwegian State, including a repression of the native language in the national school policies. There are in fact many similarities with the Sámi as concerns the relationships with the State. For instance, in Norway the process of Norwegianization was directed towards the Sámi as well as the Kven population (Niemi 1997).

After the border between Sweden and Finland/Russia was drawn in 1809 along the Torne River, the population on the Finnish side subsequently became part of a new Finnish-speaking majority in Finland (which in turn constituted a minority population in the Russian Empire), while the population on the Swedish side of the river became a minority population in the “new” nation-state Sweden, speaking a minority language.

The Finnish-speaking minority population in the eastern part of Norrbotten was subjected to a campaign of Swedification. One expression of the assimilationist policy was to deny children the right to speak their native language in schools. These efforts, together with a general negative and demeaning attitude towards this population group, which did not fit very well into the image of a homogeneous Swedish population, led to a sense of inferiority among the population and feelings of shame for one’s origin and native language. The Torndalen region in northern Sweden has, during the last decades, also suffered much from a strong de-population and a high unemployment rate, which has further added to the sense of marginalization.

In the 1980s and 1990s, the so-called pan-Kven movement has evolved, most prominently in Swedish Torndalen, among the Meänkieli speaking
population in the border areas along the border to Finland. “Kven” was to a large extent a “new” ethnic concept in Sweden in the 1990s. In this ethnopolitical movement, the cultural heritage, language and identity of the Meänkieli speaking population have been promoted and revitalized (see e.g. Ryymin 2001; Elenius 2006a, 2007). This movement has, in many ways, entailed an empowerment of the local population and a new sense of pride in one’s origin and native language. There has also been an intense debate about what it means to be a tornedaling, about the role of Meänkieli for the identity of the local population, and about how the history of Tornedalen and the relationship with the Swedish state should be understood and presented. This debate, which has continued during several years, has involved many cultural agents but also many “ordinary” people who live or have lived in Tornedalen.

The debate can be followed in letters to the editor, chronicles and articles in the regional newspaper, which is published in Swedish and Finnish in the same edition, called Haparandabladet in Swedish and Haaparanmanlehti in Finnish. Some especially heated debates have concerned the language question, the role of the school system and the special boarding schools in the Finnish-speaking areas, as well as the role of specific individuals in the Swedification process and the accompanying policy of degradation of the local Meänkieli language in favor of the Swedish language. Something that should be mentioned in this context are the weekly chronicles by the author Bengt Pohjanen in Haparandabladet, which during the spring of 2009 have dealt with the process of Swedification of the Meänkieli-speaking population in Tornedalen and the role of the local Swedish-speaking elite, and have been the subject of much debate.

Among certain members of the movement, views on Kven history and prehistory have developed proclaiming the long historical continuity of the Kven people on the North Calotte. Consequently, there have been claims from some members of the group that the Kven population in Norrbotten should be considered as an indigenous population in the understanding of the text of the ILO 169 convention, and in line with the Sámi population (Elenius 2007; see also chapter 2), and that they therefore should be entitled to special rights to land and water. Proponents of the Kven movement have also objected to the ratification of the ILO 169 convention, as long as the Sámi groups are considered to be the only indigenous people in northern Sweden. The process of identity construction and ethnopolitical mobilization has, in some cases, evolved in opposition to and in conflict with the Sámi population in northern Sweden. In this process, old ethnonyms and old history writing are questioned and reinterpreted, creating new challenges for archaeologists and the discussions on indigeneity and indigenous archaeology (see Wallerström 2006a, 2006b, 2008). It should, however, be noted that the Kvens have not received any official status or general recognition as an indigenous people in Sweden, in the way that the Sámi have.

The troubled relationship between proponents of the Kven movement and Sámi groups, especially reindeer herders in the Sámi villages, is mainly a
question about rights to land and water, hunting and fishing. In some places in the eastern part of the county of Norrbotten, intergroup tensions have at times been running high. Archaeologists working in the area have been caught in the middle of the tensions and conflicts over land rights and the past, and have been approached – held responsible for real or imagined interpretations of the past – in different ways by local inhabitants, sometimes involving threats and accusations of various kinds (for some experiences of an archaeologist working in the county of Norrbotten, see Hedman 2007).

It is interesting to mention in this context, that there is a special system for reindeer herding in the Torne River and Kalix River Valleys, the so-called concession reindeer herding villages (Sw. *koncessionssamebyar*). In this system, landowners belonging to the non-Sámi local population are allowed to own reindeers, which are taken care of by Sámi reindeer herders in the *koncessionssamebyar* (see further Jernsletten 2007). This system reflects an alternative relationship between landowners and reindeer herders, which is less confrontational and more reciprocal, and according to some researchers reminiscent of earlier inter-group relationships among the population in northern Sweden before the state interventions and the state categorizations of the people in the region.

On the opposite page: Landscapes in Sápmi. From the top left: Lake Seidozero on the Kola Peninsula with the “Kuiva” figure on the mountain wall, the Torne River near Jukkasjärvi, a view of the landscape near Lake Torneträsk in the county of Norrbotten, the rapids Trappstegsforsarna in the county of Västerbotten, and the “Road to the West” towards Stora Sjöfallet in the county of Norrbotten. All photographs by author.
Chapter 5. Representing the Sámi – a short historical outline

In this chapter, I will examine some perspectives on the history of the Sámi – a history that, until very recently, constantly has been written from the “outside”. The historical perspective is very important to keep in mind when considering the contemporary demands for greater Sámi self-determination, and the assertion of Sámi historical perspectives. Here, I will focus on some of the most influential perspectives and ideas in the earlier academic discourses, and present some points of reference in time and some historical concepts, which are relevant to this study. The chapter is intended as a historical framework to the following more specific discussions on the constructions and representations of Sámi prehistory and archaeology. The focus in the following exposition will be placed on Sweden, but with some outlooks towards the other Nordic countries. I will treat the historical background as concerns the eastern part of Sápmi and the Kola Sámi more specifically in part III.

One of the main threads in any account of Sámi history must, inevitably, deal with the relationship to the states to which the Sámi people have belonged in an administrative sense, and the majority cultures and majority populations in these states with which the Sámi people have interacted in different ways. However, there is also another central thread in the representation of the Sámi, interrelated with the first, which deals with the Sámi ethnopolitical movement and the cultural and language revival during the 20th century. In recent decades, as part of this ethnopolitical movement and cultural revival, new representations based on self-definition and self-expression have challenged the old representations and modes of history writing.

The image of the Sámi as the “Other” has been very strong in all of the four countries, and the need to separate between the National Self and that of the Others has revealed itself in different contexts. There are, however, certain differences between the Nordic countries and the ways in which the relationship between the National and the Sámi has been represented. In Norway and Sweden, the minority Sámi population, as speakers of a Finno-Ugric language, has differed in an obvious way from the Scandinavian language speaking majority populations. However, in Finland, where the majority population speaks a related Finno-Ugric language, the separation regime between the National and the Other was nevertheless put into action. Or as Pertti Anttonen has described it (cf. Isaksson P. 2001; Anttonen 2005:137f.):
The Sami have been recognized as being linguistically related to Finnish speakers, but both genetic and cultural relationship to the Finns have been denied. In the making of Finnish national culture, the only symbolic role that has been designated to them has been that of the primitive Other. (Anttonen 2000:260)

The image of the Sámi as “nature” has been one especially strong theme throughout history, as the noble savage, or as the ignoble and wretched savage. The relationship between man and nature has also been of central importance in the popular imagery of the Sámi, although this relationship has taken on different expressions in different times (Mathisen 2004). Still today, the images of the Sámi as a nature people and of the ecological Sámi are strong, although there is also a counter picture which focuses on the modern reindeer herders as environmental bad guys.

Early written sources: ethonyms and the Sámi people

There are several notes in classical, late classical and early medieval texts that tell about a foreign and exotic people living in the northernmost areas of the world as it was known then, which is called names like ‘Fenni’, ‘Phinnoi’, ‘Skrithiphinoi’ and ‘Scerefennae’. These notes, written by the “civilized” people about the “uncivilized” nature people, have often been interpreted as describing the Sámi, a people living in the northernmost and darkest regions of Europe. However, critical voices have also been raised, questioning the ethnic content of the ethnonyms in the cultural contexts in which they were used and written down. In this section, I will take a closer look at some of the textual sources, which have constantly been referred to in discussions on Sámi history.

One of the most commonly referred sources is the book Germania by the Roman writer Cornelius Tacitus (approximately 55-117). The book written in the end of the first century A.D. tells about the lands and the peoples to the north of the boundary of the Roman Empire. Among the various peoples, he mentions the ‘Fenni’. In the book, Tacitus has the following to say about this people:

The Fenni are astoundingly savage and disgustingly poor; they have no weapons, no horses, no homes; herbs for food, hides for clothing, the ground for a bed; their only hope is in arrows, which in the absence of iron they tip with bone. The same hunt feeds men and women alike, for the latter are with them everywhere, and seek their share of the kill. Their infants have no other refuge from wild animals and rain except to be covered by some network of branches; hither the young men return, here is their haven when old. But they count their lot more blessed than groaning over fields and toiling over houses, pondering in hope and fear one’s fortunes and those of others; secure against men, secure against gods, they have attained the most difficult thing of all: to be in need not even of prayers. (Tacitus Germania, 46.3; Tacitus 1999:96ff.)
The more exact geographical location and the specific ethnic meaning of Tacitus’ ‘Fenni’ remains uncertain and has been much discussed over time (cf. Whitaker 1980; Tolley 2009:44ff.). However, the description shows that the term Fenni was in fact used by some Germanic-speaking peoples in the first century A.D., and it also tells something about the Roman attitudes towards hunting populations living in the mythical North. In the literature on the Sámi, this short text about the ‘Fenni’ has very commonly been presented as the oldest written source about the Sámi people, from more or less source critical perspectives (see e.g. Collinder 1953:24ff.; Ruong 1969:51; von Düben 1977 [1873]:349; Fjellström 1985:52; Kvenangen 1996:15; Zachrisson 1997a:159; Kjellström 2000:25; Lehtola 2004:16). In this context, it should be mentioned that the word Finn was the Old Norse name for the Sámi population, which was used in the Old Norse sources. Finn has also been used to denominate the Sámi population up to present times in Norwegian (see Valtonen 2007; cf. Mundal 1996, 2000).

Another ancient writer, the Greek astronomer, geographer and mathematician in Alexandria, Ptolemy (dead about 165 A.D.), tells about the ‘Phinnoi’ in his work Geographia, as inhabiting the northern part of the island ‘Skandia’ (cf. Tolley 2009:47).

Procopius, in the sixth century A.D., mentions the ‘Skrithiphinoi’ (often interpreted as ‘skiing Finns’), a tribe of Thule. In the sixth book of the History of the Wars, he describes Thule, and the ‘Scrithiphinoi’, in the following manner:

But among the barbarians who are settled in Thule, one nation only, who are called the Scrithiphini, live a kind of life akin to that of the beasts. For they neither wear garments of cloth nor do they walk with shoes on their feet, nor do they drink wine nor derive anything edible from the earth. For they neither till the land themselves, nor do their women work it for them, but the women regularly join the men in hunting, which is their only pursuit. For the forests, which are exceedingly large, produce for them a great abundance of wild beasts and other animals, as do also the mountains which rise there. And they feed exclusively upon the flesh of the wild beasts slain by them and clothe themselves in their skins, and since they have neither flax nor any implements with which to sew, they fasten these skins together by the sinews of the animals, and in this way they manage to cover the body. And indeed not even their infants are nursed in the same way as among the rest of mankind. For the children of the Scrithiphini do not feed upon the milk of women nor do they touch their mother’s breast, but they are nourished upon the marrow of the animals killed in the hunt, and upon this alone. Now as soon as a woman gives birth to a child, she throws it into a skin and straightway hangs it to a tree, and after putting marrow into its mouth she immediately sets out with her husband for the customary hunt. For they do everything in common and likewise engage in this pursuit together. So much for the daily life of these barbarians. (Procopius, Hist. 6.15.16-25; after Whitaker 1983:285)
Jordanes, in the early 550s, based his Gothic history on the history of the Goths by Cassiodorus, which is now lost. In a discussion on the island of Scandza, interpreted as the Scandinavian Peninsula, he tells about the ‘Screreffennae’:

There [on the island of Scandza] also are other peoples. There are Screreffennae, who do not seek grain for food but live on the flesh of wild beasts and birds’ eggs; for there are such multitudes of young game in the swamps as to provide for the natural increase of their kind and to afford satisfaction for the needs of the people. (Jordanes, Getica 3.20-21; after Whitaker 1983:290)

Paulus Diaconus, or Paul the Deacon, writes in his most famous work Historia Langobardorum (‘History of the Lombards’) about the ‘Scritofini’ or ‘Scritobini’:

The Scritobini, for thus that nation is called, are neighbours to this place [Germania]. They are not without snow even in the summer time, and since they do not differ in nature from wild beasts themselves, they feed only upon the raw flesh of wild animals from whose shaggy skins they also fit garments for themselves. They deduce the etymology of their name according to their barbarous language from jumping. For by making use of leaps and bounds they pursue wild beasts very skilfully with a piece of wood bent in the likeness of a bow. Among them is an animal not very unlike a stag, from whose hide, while it was rough with hairs, I saw a coat fitted in the manner of a tunic down to the knees, such as the aforesaid Scritobini use, as has been related. In these places about the summer solstice, a very bright light is seen for some days, even in the night time, and the days are much longer there than elsewhere and the nights too are longer, and this is because the further we turn from the sun the nearer the sun itself appears to the earth and the longer the shadows grow. (Paulus Diaconus, Hist. Lang. 1.5; after Whitaker 1983:296)

In “The voyage of Ohthere” from King Alfred’s Orosius, Ohthere’s voyage along the northern coast of Norway and further to the east is retold. This is a contemporary account by a Scandinavian traveler in the Viking Age, which was presented by the Norwegian Ohthere to the West Saxon king Alfred. Together with another account by another traveler, Wulfstan, the report of Ohthere’s voyage was found as an interpolation in the late 9th-century Old English translation of Orosius’ world history.

Ohthere said to his lord, King Alfred, that he lived furthest north of all Northmen [Norwegians]. He said that he lived in the northern part of the land, beside the West Sea. He said however that the land extends a very long way north from there, but it is all waste, except that in a few places here and there Finnas camp, engaged in hunting in winter and in summer in fishing by the sea.

He was among the foremost men in that land. … But their wealth consists mostly of the tax [tribute?] that the Finnas pay them. The tax consists of animals’ skins and of birds’ feathers and whale’s bone and of those ships’ ropes that are made from whale’s [or walrus?] hide and from seal’s. Each pays according to his
rank [or lineage]: the highest in rank has to pay fifteen marten’s skins and five reindeer’s and one bear’s skin and ten ambers of feathers and a bear- or otter-skin tunic and two ships’ ropes; each must be sixty ells long, one must be made from whale’s [or walrus] hide, the other from sealskin. (Bately 2007:44ff.)

In his report, Ohthere also mentions the lands of the ‘Cwenas’, the ‘Beormas’ and the ‘Terfinnas’ (see contributions in Bately & Englert 2007). It is not certain what these ethnonyms refer to, but it is important that several ethnonyms are mentioned, which could open up for multi-ethnic interpretations of the North Calotte in the Viking Age.

The ‘terfinna land’, mentioned in Ohthere’s account, has been compared with the Terski bereg, the Ter Shore, the southern shore of the Kola Peninsula, which has been known from the 13th century as the Novgorodian administrative area, volost, of Tre (compare also the Ter Sámi language) (see further Makarov 2007, also with a discussion on the land of the Beormas).

The name ‘Finnas’ is also referred to in the Old English poems Beowulf and Widsith. In the latter, also the dative plural form ‘Scridefinnum’ is mentioned. In several of the Old Norse sagas, ‘Finn’ and ‘Finnland’ are mentioned, in what would seem to be present-day Jämtland and Härjedalen and also further to the south. Furthermore, the Ynglingasaga mentions that several of the mythical Uppsala kings of the Ynglinga dynasty had sons with Finn women (Zachrisson 1994d, 2001). According to Inger Zachrisson, the contents of the Old Norse sources imply that the Sámi were a natural part of society and that the border between Sámi and Germanic peoples was not very sharp in Scandinavia (Zachrisson 2001:16; cf. also Mundal 1996, 2000).

So, in the end, what do all these ethnonyms mean? As has been mentioned above, researchers have applied many different perspectives. In my view, there are many critical aspects to consider. The archaeologist Thomas Wallerström has adopted a critical perspective on the ethnic interpretation of the ethnonyms, and has on several occasions elaborated on other alternative meanings of the ethnonyms than as ethnic groups (e.g. Wallerström 1997, 2004, 2006a, 2006b, 2008; see also e.g. Baudou 1974:30ff.). The archaeologist Carl-Axel Moberg has warned for the risk of practicing a kind of “archaeology of identification”, when the main goal of research becomes the establishment and identification of connections between present-day ethnic groups and ethnonyms used in written sources many centuries ago (Moberg 1985).

The missionary accounts from the 17th and 18th centuries

Some of the most important written sources about the culture and pre-Christian religion of the Sámi are the missionary accounts, or relations, from the 17th and 18th centuries. These texts have been especially important for the study of Sámi pre-Christian religious beliefs and practices. In this section, I will
briefly review some of these accounts, as they have been very influential in the subsequent representations of Sámi history.

Håkan Rydving has discussed the accounts of the missionaries, the interdependence of the sources and the relations between the different authors (Rydving 1995b, 2000). Rydving stresses the importance of a source critical perspective on the compilation of the texts, and a critical view on the temporal and regional relevance of the texts. Birgitta Fossum has discussed the missionary accounts from an archaeological perspective and has critically discussed the impact of the written sources on the understanding of the archaeological material (Fossum 2006:7ff.).

The majority of the texts were written during three periods: the 1670s, the period 1715–1731 and the 1740s–1750s. The first group of sources stems from the actions of the Swedish Collegium of Antiquities and the Swedish Chancellor, Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie, who requested the local clergy in the areas inhabited by the Sámi to collect information about the customs, livelihood, rituals and religious conceptions of the Sámi population. The accounts were intended to be used as source-material by Johannes Schefferus, professor at Uppsala University, in his monograph *Lapponia* which was first published in 1673 (Schefferus 1956 [1673]; see further below), although not all of the accounts arrived in time to be used by Schefferus. One rather curious reason behind the project to describe and publish the “ethnography” of the Sámi people was to counteract the rumors in Europe that the Swedish army had been using Sámi sorcerers during the Thirty Years’ War. This first group of texts include accounts by Samuel Rheen, preacher in Jokkmokk and Kvikkjokk, who wrote the first and most independent of the sources to *Lapponia*, Johannes J. Tornæus, vicar in Torneå, Olaus Graan, vicar in Piteå, Nicolaus Lundius, a clergyman of Sámi birth, and Gabriel Tuderus, clergyman in Kemi Lappmark in today’s Finland (for references to the different editions of the missionary relations, see Rydving 1995b, 2000).

The second group consists primarily of works written by missionaries working for the Danish-Norwegian missions among the Norwegian Sámi population. Most important was Thomas von Westen (1682–1727), who collected most of his material on Sámi religion among the South Sámi in Trøndelag in the 1720s. He died before he had completed his manuscript for the College of Missions in Copenhagen. His material was later used by other missionaries who wrote about the Sámi indigenous religion (Rydving 2000:22ff.).

The third group consists of sources compiled in the 1740s and 1750s (Rydving 2000:25f.). Pehr Högström (1714–1784) was a missionary and vicar in the new parish of Gällivare in northern Sweden during the 1740s. One of his most important works on Sámi religion is the book *Beskrifning öfwer de til Sweriges Krona lydande Lapmarker* (‘Description of the Lappmarks belonging to the Swedish crown’; Högström 1980 [1747]). Pehr Fjellström (1697–1764), clergyman in Lycksele in Västerbotten in Sweden, wrote an important work on
the Sámi bear ceremonies, which was published in 1755 (Fjellström 1981 [1755]). Knud Leem (1696/97–1774), professor of Sámi language at the Seminarium Lapponicum in Trondheim in Norway, published the large work *Beskrivelse over Finmarkens Lapper* (‘Description of the Lapps in Finnmark’; Leem 1975 [1767]) in 1767, although it was mainly written in the 1740s. The book contains a lot of material on Sámi religion, ethnography and language in Finnmark in northernmost Norway in the 18th century.

![Image](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

**Figure 7.** The title page of *Lapponia*, the classic monograph on Lapland and the Sámi people by Johannes Schefferus, first published in 1673 in Frankfurt. *Lapponia* has had a great impact on the notions of the Sámi and their culture and religion in the following centuries in Sweden and in Europe. From Schefferus 1956 [1673].

**Lapponia** by Johannes Schefferus

The book *Lapponia* by the scholar Johannes Schefferus (1621–1679) is the first classical monograph on the Sámi people, a work that became of a sort of “bestseller” of its time. It had a great influence on subsequent Swedish as well as international views and representations of the Sámi, their culture, religious practices and general ways of life. The book was first published in Latin in Frankfurt am Main in 1673. The Latin text was then translated into several European languages: English 1674, German 1675, French 1678 and Dutch 1682. Remarkably (and significantly), the book was not published in Swedish until 1956.

As discussed above, the book was based on information gained from the reports sent in by clergymen and missionaries who worked in the Sámi area. Therefore, the book can not be considered as a primary source, but the information in the book is nevertheless very valuable. *Lapponia* is important for this discussion not least because of the image of the Sámi people that it created.
and disseminated. It was also central to the spread of knowledge about the Sámi in Europe for a long time.

One of the aims of the publication was, as mentioned above, to counter the accusations and rumors that had spread in Europe, that the victorious Swedish army used Sámi sorcerers as support for the Swedish military campaigns. A Christian kingdom like Sweden could not accept such unworthy allegations, and the book was published in order to repudiate these claims. The publication’s aim was to describe the Sámi people and the Sámi ways of life, including Sámi religious life, as realistically as possible, and thereby demonstrate the absurdity of the accusations of sorcery in the Swedish army. However, contrary to this purpose, the book in fact reinforced the image of the Sámi as a people of sorcerers, as it was the chapters in the book which dealt with Sámi pre-Christian religion and rituals which met most interest and was most commonly read abroad (Pulkkinen 2005b:192). Furthermore, the book created a romantic image of the Sámi as a peace-loving primitive people, which would live on for many centuries.

Another problematic aspect of the book which has been pointed out, is that it presented an image of the Sámi people based entirely on the way of life and the traditions in certain areas, as the source material on which it was based was derived only from the Swedish Sámi areas. This image would serve as a model for both popular and scientific understandings of the Sámi for a long time, in which the Eastern Sámi and their culture and economy were not included (ibid.).

Colonization, missionary activities and exploitation of natural resources

The history of the Sámi has often been presented as a history of the incorporation of the Sámi people and the Sámi lands into the different states. This was a gradual process of colonization and Christianization that stretched over several centuries.

In the early 14th century, the Danish-Norwegian kingdom started to exercise control over the coastal areas of Finnmark. One of the main economic reasons behind the expansion was the thriving European market for Norwegian stockfish, with the Hanseatic League as trade intermediaries. Small Norwegian fishing stations and villages were established along the coast to the Varanger fjord, where in Vardo a church had been consecrated already in 1307 and where later a royal fortress, the Vardohus, was built as a strong symbol of Danish-Norwegian sovereignty. There were still no settled state borders in the area. In a treaty in 1326, the inland areas of Finnmark were defined as a "common” territory for the Danish-Norwegian, Swedish and Novgorodian
powers, which possessed equal rights to trade and taxation in that region (Niemi 1997:64f).

The question of the medieval colonization of northern Sweden, from an archaeological point of view, has been studied by some researchers. The problems of the medieval colonization of the county of Norrbotten, the establishment of sedentary settlements along the river valleys in the county and the integration of the region into the Kingdom of Sweden have been examined by Thomas Wallerström (Wallerström 1995a, 1995b). Leif Grundberg has investigated the processes of "Europeanization" during the medieval period in the provinces of Ångermanland and Medelpad (Grundberg 2006). The study is based on archaeological excavations and sources in the region, and aspects such as religious transition, parish formation, monetarization, trade specialization, urbanization and construction of administrative territories in these parts of northern Sweden are discussed.

The religious change and Christianization of the Sámi communities in Sápmi constituted a long process that stretched over several hundred years. This was a complex and dynamic process of contact and confrontation, during which the Sámi responses to Christianity of course changed and varied (see Rydving 1995a; 2004). There were some isolated and not very ambitious attempts of the Church to undertake missionary activities in the Sámi areas in Sweden already in the Middle Ages, but more thorough and systematic missionary campaigns were not initiated until the 17th and 18th centuries (see also above). One important step in the consolidation of the colonization and missionary process by the Swedish state and church was the establishment of parishes with their own churches and market-places in the inland Sámi areas of northern Sweden. Early in the 17th century, the Swedish king Charles IX (Karl IX) ordered the foundation of churches and market-places in Enontekiö, Jokkmokk, Arvidsjaur, Lycksele and Jukkasjärvi, as part of the politics of the king to strengthen the power of the Swedish kingdom on the North Calotte. These church places were to function as central gathering places for the Sámi populations in the area, where the activities of the state and the church connected with trade, taxation, legal and religious matters could be conducted during certain periods of the year.

In the campaigns led by the Church against the indigenous Sámi religion, the Sámi religious specialist, the noaidi, was seen as possessing evil or demonic powers. The missionary campaigns also included witchcraft trials in the 17th and 18th centuries (Granqvist 1998), and the collection and destruction of the Sámi ceremonial drums which were seen as dangerous and evil tools. In recent time, the Sámi drums which have survived in different museum collections, have been one of the most central items in the debates on repatriation of the Sámi cultural heritage, because of their very strong symbolic value and cultural and spiritual significance (see Duoddaris 2000; Westman 2002).

The projects of administrative colonization and Christianization in the Sámi lands were closely connected with economic interests and driving-forces, such
as opportunities for trading and taxation. Over time, trading networks were formed and market-places and ports were established (Hansen & Olsen 2004:237ff.). The Sámi populations were subjected to Swedish, Danish-Norwegian or Russian (earlier Novgorodian) taxation. In certain areas the Sámi population was subjected to double, or even triple, taxation. The history of colonization was also the history of the searching for and the exploitation of natural resources. An example of this is the exploitation in the 17th century of the Nasa silver mines, close to the Norwegian border in the county of Norrbotten, which involved the use of forced labor from the local Sámi population (see Fur 2006).

An important source material, which illuminates some of the views on the Sámi in the first part of the 18th century, derives from the travels in Lappland by Carl von Linné, the famous Swedish botanist and zoologist (von Linné 1965 [approx. 1732], 1977 [1737]). There are also a number of descriptions of Lapland written in the 18th century by foreign European travelers exploring the exotic far-away land of the Sámi. Among the many early depictions of the Sámi people made by travelers from foreign countries who were discovering and exploring the exotic Lapland, the image of the Sámi has been ambivalent. Both positive and negative images of the Sámi people were presented: the noble savage as well as the ignorant primitive savage appeared in texts and pictures. The views on the Sámi people and Sámi culture in Europe have been treated by several authors (see e.g. Rydving 1996; Hansson & Lundström 2008; Nencioni 2008). One phenomenon that has been discussed concerns the traveling shows and circuses with Sámi persons, often together with reindeer, as attractions in Sweden and in other European countries during the 19th century (see Broberg 1982; cf. Baglo 2001a, 2001b).

After 1809, when Finland no longer was part of the Swedish Kingdom but became part of the Russian Empire, the fear of Russian influence on the North Calotte increased in Norway and Sweden, and the Finnish-speaking Kvens as well as the Sámi population in northern Norway started to be seen as possible security threats. They lived in a sparsely populated border area, did not speak Norwegian and were only very loosely connected with the Norwegian state. Therefore, their loyalty to the Norwegian state could be questioned. As a result, an intense campaign of Norwegianization (fornorskingspolitikk) was initiated in northern Norway (see further Eriksen & Niemi 1981; Minde 2005). Not least within the school system, the Norwegianization policy was applied with full force.

The establishment of new settlements in the Sámi areas led to increasing conflicts over land and water resources, pasture, hunting and fishing. Later in time, large-scale exploitations followed of the lands and waters where the Sámi people lived. The forest industry has used large areas, which can no longer function as reindeer pasture. The damming of the rivers has flooded large pasture lands and destroyed traditional migration routes as well as possibilities for fishing. The building of roads and railways has also occupied large areas. All
of these activities have put a lot of pressure on the available areas for reindeer pasture, and the areas that can be used for reindeer grazing have shrunk dramatically over the years.

The complicated historical process in which the Sámi lost their land rights to the Swedish Crown has been discussed in several works, including the question of the so-called lappskatteland that were abolished or confiscated by the Swedish government, and the establishment of the sameby system in the end of the 19th century (see e.g. Lundmark 1998, 2002, 2008; Mörkenstam 2002; Lundmark & Rumar 2008; see also Korpijaakko-Labba 1994).

In general, it can be stated that the public recognition of the history of Swedish colonialism is very low in Sweden. The theme of Swedish Great Power expansionism, and Sweden as a colonizing power, in Lapland and in New Sweden in North America, has been treated by the historian Gunlög Fur. In her dissertation (Fur 1993), she has explored how the policies of the Swedish state towards the Sámi people were influenced by the Swedish colonial project in the New Sweden colony in present-day Delaware in North America, between the years 1638–1655. This has also been the theme of some of her later publications (e.g. Fur 2006). More recent post-colonial research has often viewed the colonization process as a more complex phenomenon than the earlier, quite simplified, dichotomy between the active colonizer and the passively colonized – a process which involves a multitude of complex relationships between the colonizers and the colonized, in which identities and cultures change and influence each other in sometimes unexpected and seemingly contradictory ways (see Fur 2006). In my view, it is very important to recognize the processes of colonization in northern Sweden. Without such a recognition it is difficult to understand many of the social and cultural phenomena in contemporary society, including the significance of the past and its objects. However, it is at the same time important to avoid a too simplified understanding of this historical process.

On the opposite page: Industrialized landscapes in Sápmi. From the top left: Construction work in the dried-out river bed below the Ligga dam along the Great Lule River, dead forests from industrial pollution in the vicinity of Montjegorsk on the Kola Peninsula, the iron mine in Kiruna in the county of Norrbotten, the Great Lule River with the Harsprånget dam rising in the background. All photographs by author.
Views on the Sámi in the late 19th and early 20th century

In Sweden, it is possible to distinguish between two different attitudes towards the Sámi population in the late 19th and the early 20th century. One was a segregationist policy, which had its expression in the so-called *lapp-skall-vara-lapp* ('Lapp shall be Lapp' or 'Lapp must remain Lapp') ideology, which was directed towards the reindeer herding Sámi population. The reindeer herding population was to be protected against the civilization, in order for them to survive as nomads in the modern world. They were not allowed to build permanent settlements, and a special school system, the so-called Nomad school, was established exclusively for the children of the herders who migrated with their reindeer. The other was a policy of assimilation, which was directed towards the Sámi who were not reindeer herders. In the policies of the Swedish government, these people were not considered to be real Sámi and they were supposed to be assimilated into the Swedish population, in part through active interventions, for instance within the school system.

The dominant paradigm for almost a century was an evolutionist-diffusionist approach, guided by notions of exoticism and romanticism. It involved evolutionist approaches and Social Darwinist ideas. The growth of physical anthropology, and its consequences in the past and in the present, is a theme that will be treated more in detail in part IV of this book. At the same time, one can talk about a notion of “devolutionism”: the idea that the Sámi culture was less developed, and that as a result of the increasing influences and loans from the more developed Nordic cultures, it would become weaker and degenerate and eventually completely disappear. This idea necessitated the systematic and large-scale collection and categorization of the artifacts, folklore and even physical specimens of the Sámi people, before it was all gone.

One example of the attitudes towards the Sámi population is the forced relocation of North Sámi families to the South Sámi areas. In 1751, the boundary between the Kingdom of Sweden and the Kingdom of Norway-Denmark in northern Scandinavia was settled in a treaty. An annex to the treaty, the so-called Lapp Codicil, regulated the rights of the Sámi population in relation to the new border treaty. The Lapp Codicil confirmed the Sámi people’s right to their traditional land and waters, and stipulated the right of the Sámi population to cross the boundary in connection with reindeer herding. The meaning and importance of the Lapp Codicil for later conflicts over Sámi land rights has been much debated (Errico & Hocking 2008:372f.).

With the change of status of Finland in 1809, from the Swedish Kingdom to the Russian Empire, border conflicts started to become a serious problem for the Sámi population, whose occupational areas stretched across the new state boundaries. In 1852, Russia decided to close the Norwegian-Finnish border for the Sámi herders and their reindeer. This decision did, however, not have the desired effect, and in 1889, Russia acted to close also the Swedish-Finnish border for reindeer herding. Because of these border closures, the loss of
grazing lands, and the resulting increase in reindeer herds in the Karesuando area in the northeasternmost part of Norrbotten, the Swedish authorities decided to move some of the reindeer herding families from that area to other areas where the pressure on the grazing lands was lower. The concerned families protested and refused to move, but some families eventually moved to other parts of Norrbotten after some disastrous winters when large numbers of their reindeer had perished (Lantto 2008:141ff.).

Following the signing of the Swedish-Norwegian reindeer grazing convention in 1919, which set a maximum number of reindeer allowed on Norwegian land from Sámi villages in Sweden, the Swedish authorities considered it necessary to move more Sámi families from the Sámi villages in northernmost Norrbotten. Since the lands in Norrbotten were occupied, the families were directed to lands in Västerbotten and even Jämtland. There were, once again, many protests and attempts to avoid the decisions, but this time the authorities applied a much stricter attitude and in the end the North Sámi families were forced to move to the more southern Sámi areas (ibid.:147ff.).

The forced relocation exemplifies the increased control and power over the economic and social life of the Sámi population by the Swedish authorities in the late 19th and early 20th century. The forced relocation of North Sámi reindeer herding families has later caused many problems, and has been one source of internal conflicts within the Sámi communities over land rights, especially rights to reindeer herding and fishing.

As an expression of the patronizing and protectionist approach by the Swedish state towards the Sámi population, the so-called lapp-skall-vara-lapp ideology gained support among politicians and scholars (cf. Kvist 1994; Lundmark 2002). This ideology was especially evident in the discussions on the education of the Sámi and the development of a new Sámi school policy in Sweden. When asked in 1906 to comment on the fact that two young Sámi in southern Lapland wished to participate in folkhögskoleutbildning (a Swedish system of Folk High Schools, devoted to non-formal, voluntary adult education) by the journal Dagny – tidning för svenska kvinnorörelsen (‘Dagny – journal for the Swedish women’s movement’), Vitalis Karnell, vicar in Karesuando parish and later inspector of the special Nomad schools, wrote the following:

When the Lapps begin founding associations and having their own newspaper, when they begin to acquire Folk High School education (folkhögskoleutbildning), then they are no longer Lapps and shall become the most wretched people one could imagine. The Lapps in the county of Västerbotten have accepted all of this and even started to build houses and settle down. Therefore they stand in front of their own destruction. (…) Do support and favor the Lapps in every way in their own trade, make them virtuous, sober people and give them the bare necessities of education, but do not let them taste civilization otherwise (…) That has never been and will never be of any blessing, Lapp should be Lapp. (Karnell 1906:47f.; my translation)
In 1908, Olof Bergqvist, the bishop of the Luleå diocese (which covers the northernmost regions of Sweden), summarized the view on the Sámi as passive and reliant on the support and direction of the State, a view which at that time was shared by many scholars and other experts on Sámi matters:

Just as the Lapps never played any outward political part, they have not had the capability to take any decisive initiative for the development of their interior conditions. The little culture they possess has been given to them from outside, i.e. from the peoples by whom they were subjected. Themselves they always played a more passive part and adapted themselves to the arrangements made by ‘authority’ for their benefit. (Bergqvist 1908:91; published in English in Lundborg & Wahlund 1932:9)

The concluding words by the leading lappologist (the traditional study of Lapland and the Sámi is often called lappologi or Lapp Studies, in contrast to the contemporary denomination Sámi Studies) K.B. Wiklund at the annual meeting of the Svenska Turistföreningen (“The Swedish Tourist Association”) in 1902, gives an expression of the “optimistic intent” of some of the lapp-skall-vara-lapp ideologists:

As long as the Lapps remain nomads, so long will Lapp customs, Lapp language and Lapp ways of thought, in short the Lapp nationality, continue to live in our country and not only as an ethnographic curiosity, but also as an economic factor of not so little importance. I do hope that the day when the Lapps will have disappeared still lies in the distant future! We certainly can not afford to lose them. (Wiklund 1903:44; my translation)

In an article in Geographical Review from 1923, directed to an international audience, K.B. Wiklund further stressed the pressing importance and the cultural and economic values of supporting and preserving the nomadic way of life of the Sámi, which I should add once again, was not the only way of life of the Sámi of that time or earlier times (e.g. the forest Sámi culture or the sea Sámi culture along the Norwegian coast):

Those who have not themselves seen the life of the Lapps and who do not know the conditions in their country often think it would be doing them a service to persuade them to give up their nomadic life and thereby “improve their culture”… A nomadic Lapp need not theoretically stand lower as regards culture than does a peasant living in the same tract. In fact one often sees the opposite: the nomad goes out into the world and sees more than the peasant does; he gains greater experience, more knowledge, better manners than does the settler bound to the soil in the mountain districts… That the finest flowers of culture cannot open or thrive in a Lapp tent is obvious; but it is just as impossible in the neighboring farmhouse. But no one for the sake of culture attempts to decoy the inhabitants of these farmhouses away from the wastes they live in to an uncertain fate in the big towns.

It should not take even the chance visitor to their territory long to discover that the Lapps are by no means “savages” and that it would be both unmerciful
and foolish to lure them away from a mode of life whose value both to
themselves and to the community at large casual observation gives no means of
estimating. (Wiklund 1923:241f.)

The historian Lennart Lundmark has suggested a connection between the lapp-
skall-vara-lapp ideology and the changed view on the Sámi origins at the end of
the 19th century (see chapter 7). Since the Sámi were now, according to the
new view, seen as late immigrants to the Swedish lands who had gradually
spread further to the south and only in late historical times had reached
Jämtland and Härjedalen, it became important to retain and contain the Sámi in
the mountain region and stop the spread of the Sámi population into the more
“civilized” (that is, settled) areas of Norrland (Lundmark 2002:75).

According to Veli-Pekka Lehtola, the ideas of Social Darwinism took root in
Finland later than in the other Nordic countries. After the independence of
Finland from Russia in 1917, a need to seek an independent identity as a state
developed. In the construction of a national Finnish identity, borders were
drawn against the old masters, the Russians and the Swedes, as well as against
the Sámi people within the nation (Lehtola 2004:46). Derek Fewster has argued
that in the dominant nationalist paradigm in the study of Finnish (pre)history,
the Sámi were seen as little more than a “natural obstacle”, which could easily
be excluded from the prehistoric Finno-Ugric fellowship (Fewster 2000:113f.).
In much of the nationalist representations of prehistory, the Finns were
portrayed as ethnically superior: “The Saami were not a threat, they were a
conquerable part of the nature, like the American Indian had been in the
United States” (Fewster 1999:16).

The mountain tourism (Sw. fjällturism) expanded in the end of the 19th
century: the exotic experience of the North was fuelled not only by visions of
the spectacular and unexploited natural scenery, but also by conceptions of the
Sámi mountain reindeer herding culture as something exciting, colorful and
fundamentally different from the emerging structures and habits of modern
society. The Swedish Tourist Association (Svenska Turistföreningen) was founded
in 1885 and focused from the beginning primarily on arranging tourism
activities in Lappland. The annual publication of Svenska Turistföreningen
contained many accounts of journeys in Lappland, in which the Sámi played an
important role (see Thomasson 1983).

Revitalization, cooperation and globalization

Another historical thread, which runs parallel or interwoven with the thread of
the relationship with the states and the views of the majority societies on the
Sámi, can be followed in the ethnopolitical “awakening” of the Sámi
population, the cultural revitalization movement and the creation of political
associations. This ethnopolitical struggle is a very important thread in Sámi
history and is also important as a background to the demands for cultural autonomy and self-determination today.

At the turn of the 20th century, an organized Sámi ethnopolitical movement emerged, and Sámi voices were raised in the public debate in Sweden. The strife for Sámi cultural and social revival, Sámi cooperation and self-determination has been a long struggle, which continues still today. Two studies that can be mentioned in this context is firstly the doctoral dissertation by the historian Patrik Lantto (2000), who has analyzed the ethnopolitical mobilization among the Sámi in Sweden 1900–1950, and secondly the doctoral dissertation by the historian Jukka Nyyssönen (2007), who has studied the Sámi ethnopolitical movement in Finland 1945–1990.

Among the individuals who pioneered the Sámi ethnopolitical movement in Sweden, one can mention, among others, Elsa Laula, the clergyman Gustav Park, the lawyer Torkel Thomasson and the teacher Karin Stenberg. Elsa Laula-Renberg (1877–1931), born Elsa Laula in the South Sámi area in Sweden, was a pioneer Sámi politician and writer and one of the founders of the Sámi ethnopolitical movement in the early 20th century. In 1904, she published the ground-breaking book entitled Inför Liv eller Död? Sanningord i de Lappskas förhållanden ('Facing Life or Death? Words of Truth in the Lapp Situation'; Laula 2003 [1904]). The book dealt with many current issues, including land ownership, education and political rights, and commented on the Swedish government policies of assimilation, the ideology of Social Darwinism and the contemporary discussions on the future survival or extinction of the Sámi people. Elsa Laula was also active in the creation in 1904 of the association of Swedish Sámi called “Lapparnas Centralförbund” ("The Central Association of the Lapps"), and in the organization of the first Sámi National Assembly in Trondheim, Norway, in 1917.

Gustav Park (1886–1968) was a leading member of the Swedish Sámi movement. Park was a clergyman and school principal in the county of Västerbotten, the first chairman of “Svenska Samernas Riksförbund”, SSR("National Union of the Swedish Sámi") from 1950, and the editor of the journal Samefolkets egen tidning. Karin Stenberg (1884–1969), from Västra Kikkejaur in the county of Norrbotten, worked as a primary school teacher, parallel with a life-long engagement for the cause of the Sámi people, especially the difficult situation of the forest Sámi population and their traditional livelihood and cultural expressions.

The first journal of the Swedish Sámi Lapparnes egen tidning ("The Lapps’ own journal") was published in 1904–05, and was later followed by the journal Samefolkets egen tidning ("The Sámi people’s own journal"), which was published from 1918 onwards. Another important part of the ethnopolitical movement was the emergence of Sámi voices in literature and poetry (cf. contributions in Brändström 2000). Two early examples that should be mentioned are the books Muittalus samid birra: En bok om lapparnas liv by Johan Turi ("A book about the life of the Lapps"; 1987 [1910/1917]) and En nomad och hans liv written by Anta
Pirak (‘A nomad and his life’; 1933), which was published in Swedish in 1933 and in Lule Sámi in 1937.

In 1918 in the town of Östersund, following the Sámi National Assembly in Trondheim in 1917, the first country-wide congress of the Swedish Sámi was organized. During this period, there were also some non-Sámi politicians who were actively working for the Sámi cause, such as the member of the Swedish parliament Carl Lindhagen (1860–1946). Lindhagen worked not only for Sámi rights, but was also very active in the movements for women’s rights and for international peace.

The first Sámi organization initiated by the Sámi themselves in Finland Sami Litto (‘Sámi Alliance’) was founded in 1945, during the evacuation to Central Ostrobothnia of the Sámi populations from the war-ravaged parts of northern Finland (Lehtola 2004:58; Nyysönen 2007:93ff.). During the post-war period, organizations for cooperation between the Sámi populations in the different countries were also established.

The 1970s was a time of an ethnic and cultural revival in many parts of the world, which also saw the break-through of a new generation of Sámi artists and authors, who re-represented and reinterpreted Sámi identities in a modern society (Lehtola 2004:95ff.). Among other cultural expressions, the tradition of songs and lyrics, the yoik (see Stoor 2007), had a renaissance.

One especially important event and a turning point in modern Sámi history was the so-called Alta controversy, the protests against the damming of the Alta River in the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s (see further Paine 1982). The Alta conflict was a very important moment in the ethnic revival and ethnopolitical struggle among Sámi groups in Norway. It was also a defining moment for the creation of a pan-Sámi identity and solidarity. The Alta conflict was an event of great importance for making the Sámi visible in the present and the past, and for a discussion in society on the Sámi as an indigenous population, and what kind of rights such an indigenous population might have.

In the 20th century, there have been several conflicts over land use in Sweden. One very important and extensive legal process was the so-called taxed mountains case (skattefjällsmålet) (see Svensson 1997). Also, since the 1990s there have been a number of court cases in Sweden in which Sámi villages have been sued by land-owners who claim that the Sámi villages do not possess the right to reindeer grazing on their privately owned land (see further discussion in chapter 7).

During the second half of the 20th century, several Sámi education and research institutes have been created, which play important roles for the development of research and education strategies and agendas based in the Sámi communities. The Nordic Sámi Institute (Sámi Instituhtta) was established in 1973 in Kautokeino, Norway, where also the Sami University College (Sámi Allaskuvla) was founded in 1989.
Today the Sámi populations in Norway, Sweden and Finland have their own Parliaments – called the Sámi Parliament (Sámediggi in North Sámi). The Sámi Parliament in Finland was the first to be founded, in the year 1973 (from 1973 to 1995, it was called the Sámi Delegation and had less decision-making power than the present-day Sámi Parliament). Norway followed in 1989, and lastly Sweden in 1993. It can be noted that there is no Sámi Parliament in the Russian Federation, although discussions are under way to establish a similar kind of popularly elected organ which could function in the Russian system (cf. Wessendorf 2005; Likhachev pers.com.). The Sámi Parliament in Norway possesses much larger influence than the one in Sweden. For instance, one can mention that the Sámi Parliament in Norway holds the responsibility for the management of Sámi cultural heritage, including prehistoric remains and Sámi museums, which is not the case in Sweden. The Sámi Parliament in Sweden constitutes on the one hand a popularly elected organ, with very limited powers, on the other hand a public authority, directed by regulations laid down by the Swedish Government. In 1977, the Swedish Parliament, Riksdagen, declared that the Sámi people was an indigenous people in Sweden. However, this declaration has not been followed up by any substantial changes in the policies of the state. For instance, the ILO 169 Convention has not been ratified, as it has been in Norway. Many would argue that declarations like this one are mostly empty words, with few or no practical consequences.

In the project of Sámi nation-building, a set of national symbols, which is commonly used by nations around the world, have been adopted: a flag, a national day and a national anthem. In August 1986, the Sámi flag was adopted by the 13th Nordic Sámi Conference, held in Åre, Sweden. The flag, in the colors red, green, yellow and blue, was designed by the Sámi artist Astrid Båhl from Skibotn, Norway. The Sámi national day was celebrated for the first time in 1993, on the 6th of February, in commemoration of the first Sámi Congress held in Trondheim, Norway in 1917, where Sámi from Norway and Sweden met to discuss common problems. The Sámi national anthem “Sámi soga lávlla” (‘Song of the Sámi People’ or lit. ‘Song of the Sámi Family’) was adopted by the Nordic Sámi Conference in 1986 and 1992. The lyrics of the national anthem had been written by the politician and author Isak Saba (1875–1921) and had originally been published as a poem in 1906, while the music was composed by Arne Sørlie.

In recent decades, Sámi representatives have taken an active part in many international organizations for indigenous peoples, and have played important roles in the global indigenous peoples’ rights movement. From the days of the “Perestrojka” in the 1980s, it also gradually became easier to establish contact and cooperation between the Sámi population in the Nordic countries and in the Soviet Union. The border barrier, physical and mental, slowly started to open up (see further part III).

The assimilation into the majority societies, the stigmatization of Sámi identity and the loss of the native language have caused many challenges and
threats. On the other hand, the processes of modernization, and later globalization, have also had the effect of strengthening the Sámi revitalization movement. This can be seen as a response to the threats of assimilation and the pressure on Sámi language and culture, encouraging integration and reinforcement of a collective Sámi identity (Seurujärvi-Kari 2005:336f.). In this process of revitalization, or creation, of a collective Sámi self-understanding, homogenizing representations and narratives were used, in order to “knit together” the fabric of “Sáminess” or “Sámihood”:

Improved communications and information networks have, together with pressure from outside, led to a growing feeling of solidarity among Sámi. There is a consciousness that all Sámi once again form a community, Sápmi, which the national borders and other historical events had destroyed.

The birth of an ethnic identity was only possible when the family and village based local identity of Sámi culture was exchanged for a general Sámi identity, a general Sámi feeling of belonging. A village and group identity changed to a feeling of ethnic community and solidarity. (Lehtola 2004:57)

New technology, and new ways of discussing and communicating, has provided further instruments for the empowerment of the Sámi indigenous discourse. Especially the Internet has created new spaces for communication and exchange of experiences among indigenous groups in different parts of the world. These opportunities, in turn, facilitate the making of new connections, fellowships and constellations. The Internet also provides spaces for discussions on Sámi archaeology and prehistory and opportunities to promote one’s ideas on, for instance, the prehistory of Sápmi.

The Sámi museums in the Nordic countries (Sámi museum here meaning a museum in some way controlled by Sámi groups, associations or the Sámi Parliament) play important roles within the local Sámi communities, as well as within the larger pan-Sámi community, as means of empowerment and as instruments in order to gain some influence over the representational politics as concerns the past, present and future of Sápmi and “Sáminess”. Among the Sámi museums in the Nordic countries one can mention Ájtte – Swedish Mountain and Sámi Museum in Jokkmokk, Siida Sámi Museum in Inari, Sámiid Vuorká-Dávvirat/De samiske samlinger in Karasjok, Saemien Siíte in Snåsa, Árran Lule Sámi Center in Drag and Varanger Sámi Museum in Varangerbotn. In Norway, the Sámi Parliament has since 2002 been responsible for the management of the Sámi museums. Sámi museums and their constructions and representations of Sámi identity and history have been examined in a number of publications (see e.g. Olsen 2000; Jomppanen 2002; Durrah Scheffy 2004; Keil 2004; Webb 2006; Krogh 2008). The Sámi museums also play a central role in the definition and representation of Sámi (pre)history, and they provide spaces for education, research and debates on historical problems from Sámi perspectives.
Several scholars have discussed how the images of the Sámi have been presented in tourist and popular scientific representations and how Sámi culture and history have been exhibited in the national museums in the Nordic countries (see e.g. Mulk & Bayliss-Smith 1999; Olsen 2000; Baglo 2001a, 2001b; Levy 2006). In 2007, a new permanent Sámi exhibition, called “Sápmi”, was opened at the Nordiska Museet (‘Nordic Museum’) in Stockholm, which attempted to explore the diversity in contemporary Sámi identities and also some of the political dimensions in the research on the Sámi (cf. Sápmi 2007). One example of a contested archaeological exhibition, which is very relevant in this context, concerns the museum Vuollerim 6000 år (‘Vuollerim 6,000 years’), located in the village of Vuollerim in the county of Norrbotten. In the early 1980s, a settlement site with some Late Mesolithic semi-subterranean house remains dating from about 4000 B.C. was discovered in Vuollerim (see Loeffler 1999). The discovery attracted a lot of attention, and a local museum was opened in 1991. However, the representations of the Stone Age people in the early exhibitions at the museum caused a lot of controversy in the 1990s. The controversies centered on the question of the ethnic belonging of the population at the Stone Age site, and some felt that the Sámi were excluded from the narratives and images of the past at the museum (Mulk & Bayliss-Smith 1999; Mulk 2002; cf. also Hagström forthcoming). In attempts to depict prehistory, the neutral and normal tends to become “Swedish”, so that the norm overshadows the “Other”, which is marginalized and made invisible. In my view, the case of Vuollerim demonstrates that the Stone Age, 6,000 years ago, is by no means unpolitical in northern Sweden today.
Chapter 6. Scientific discourses on Sámi prehistory and Sámi archaeology

The concepts of Sámi prehistory and Sámi archaeology have been, and still are to a certain extent, considered to be controversial and highly politicized concepts within the archaeology community in Sweden, almost a taboo for professional archaeologists (cf. Zachrisson 1994a, 2004a). There has been a tendency to promote ideas of a neutral cultural heritage and representations of Sweden as mono-ethnic in history and prehistory – ideas that have been questioned and challenged in the recent decades by different groups of people in the Swedish society, among them Sámi groups.

It is well-known that studies of ethnicity in general focus on minority groups and not majority groups (cf. Banks 1996:149ff.). Most archaeological studies of ethnicity in Sweden have consequently dealt with the northern part of the country and with the Sámi population. It is obvious that, in general, the Sámi are considered ethnic, while the Swedes are seen as non-ethnic, just normal Swedes. The normal – Swedish prehistory – need not to be explained, while the not normal – Sámi prehistory – constantly must be argued for and defended.

Throughout the history of archaeology, the Sámi have been conceptualized as the “Others”, in Sweden in opposition to the idea of a Swedish prehistory. In the emerging human sciences in the 19th century, the Sámi became a people without history, an ethnographic object, static and unchangeable, without potential for development, whereas the Scandinavian peoples were considered to be people with history, dynamic and progressive (Schanche & Olsen 1985; Olsen 1986). The research on the Sámi was therefore mainly a concern for ethnography and philology, while the historical and archaeological research and literature remained very limited well into the second half of the 20th century (Hansen & Olsen 2004:9ff.; cf. also overviews of research in Ravila et al. 1968). Some of the most disturbing elements in the history of research on the Sámi deal with the racial biological research, skull measurements and racist interpretations, and the excavations and plundering of cemeteries and burial sites for Sámi skeletons and skulls (see further part IV).

Research on “Sámi issues” has traditionally been conducted from the “outside”, which has meant that the research strategies and priorities have been formulated outside of the Sámi communities and that, consequently, many problems of importance to Sámi communities have not been prioritized (Utsi 2007:74ff.; cf. Stoor 2007:22ff.).
The history of the study of Sámi prehistory has been treated earlier in a number of studies, with different aims and directions. In Norway, the research fields of Sámi prehistory and Sámi archaeology have been explored and contextualized by several scholars from a historiographical point of view. Here, the works by Audhild Schanche (e.g. 2000), Bjørnar Olsen (e.g. Olsen 1986, 2000, 2004; Hansen & Olsen 2004), Schanche and Olsen (1985), Inger Storli (1986, 1993a), Anders Hesjedal (2001) and Cathrine Baglo (2001a, 2001b) are among the most important. In Finland, one can mention the research by Christian Carpelan (e.g. 2003, 2005, 2006) and Veli-Pekka Lehtola (2004; 2005). In Sweden, Inger Zachrisson is the archaeologist who has written most extensively about the contexts and politics of Sámi prehistory in the Swedish nation-state (e.g. 1993a, 1994a, 1997a, 2004a, 2004d, 2007), but the history of studying Sámi prehistory has also been treated by for instance Inga-Maria Mulk and Tim Bayliss-Smith (1999), Lars Forsberg (1995, 1996), Britta Wennstedt Edvinger (2002) and Evert Baudou (e.g. 2004a). More general perspectives on the history of archaeological research in northern Sweden have also been discussed by David Loeffler (2005) and Margareta Björnstad (2006). These studies on historiographical aspects of the study of Sámi prehistory form an important background to my own study.

In this chapter, I will present a short overview of the scientific discourses on Sámi prehistory and archaeology, from the early 19th century until the first years of the 21st century, in order to point to some of the main lines of development and some of the general structures of archaeological research in the Sápmi area. In the following chapter, I will undertake a more detailed examination of a number of central themes and contested topics in the discourses on Sámi prehistory.

The 19th century and early 20th century: from an indigenous to a foreign people

After the war in 1808–1809, Sweden and Finland were divided and a new boundary was drawn on the North Calotte. Finland was transformed into the Grand Duchy of Finland, as part of the Russian Empire. The period of the Swedish Empire, or Sweden as a European great power, had come to a definite end with the loss of Finland to Russia. This event also brought about changes in the constructions and representations of the identity of the Swedish kingdom, moving from a multicultural and multiethnic empire towards an emerging nation-state. The notion of Swedishness, and its close historical, cultural and linguistic relationships with the Norwegians and the Danes, evolved as the primary basis of the identity of the State and the Swedish society.
In 1537, Norway became a Danish colony and remained so until 1814, when it became a part of the Union of Sweden and Norway, as a result of the negotiations after the Napoleonic wars. In 1905, Norway became an independent nation-state, when the union with Sweden was ended. Finland, in turn, declared itself an independent nation in 1917 after the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia.

In this age of growing nationalism and romanticist attachment to the past, views on the Viking as a national hero and a symbol of the grand achievements in the past, on the Viking Age as a golden Scandinavian age and on the Viking heritage as a fundamental part of the Scandinavian national histories and mythologies proliferated in the Scandinavian countries (for more about the Viking Age national mythology in research, see e.g. Svanberg 2003; Wallette 2004; Hillerdal forthcoming). The interest in the remote past of the nation was also evident in the discussions on the earliest population in the Stone Age and the attempts to establish the ethnic belonging of this population (see Ljungström 2004 and discussions below).

As part of the national projects, the ethnographic and archaeological mapping of the territories of the nation-states served to appropriate and consolidate the territory within the boundaries of the nation-state and to normalize the contrast between “civilized” and “primitive”. As Inga-Maria Mulk and Tim Bayliss-Smith have put it:

> Until quite recent times, the acquisition of ethnographic and archaeological knowledge in Lappland was an integral part of the colonial process itself. The collection of artefacts and skeletons, old and new, and the recording of curiosities such as myths and vocabularies, was in a real sense the scientific parallel of the economic and territorial conquest that incorporated these lands and peoples of the north into the emerging nation states... Until well into the twentieth century, archaeology played its part in justifying the dominant nations’ stereotypes about Sámi culture and way of life. At the same time, of course, much that we can now use as valuable information was also recorded, through pioneer work in linguistics, anthropology, ethnography and archaeology. But there is no question that in much of the older literature we see portrayed, amongst other things, an image of the cultural landscapes of the north that is distorted to serve the interests of the outsider. (Mulk & Bayliss-Smith 1999:379)

In the 19th century, archaeology emerged as a scientific subject in the Nordic countries. One of the great early achievements was the development of the three-period system, Stone Age – Bronze Age – Iron Age, with its intrinsic notion of a clear cultural progression. The hunter-gatherers in the northern parts of Scandinavia did not follow this scheme of development and progressing civilization. As the Sámi did not fulfill the expectations, they were excluded from the historical narrative; in short, they became a people without history (cf. Olsen 1986:32). The Sámi were seen as primitive and primordial, rather as part of nature than culture.
In the end of the 19th century, in a society characterized by early industrialism, global imperialism and great internal social and cultural change, nationalist sentiments in the Scandinavian countries grew stronger and were combined with evolutionary theories, Social Darwinian and racial theories, which further accentuated the need to define the national identity, culture and history, and to establish its place in the evolutionary hierarchy of nations and peoples.

From having been seen by many scholars, in the early 19th century, as the indigenous population of the northern part or of the whole of Scandinavia, the Sámi became regarded, from the second half of the 19th century, as a foreign people that had immigrated relatively late to Scandinavia from the east (Storli 1993a; Hansen & Olsen 2004:20ff.; cf. also Pulkkinen 2000). It became important to distinguish between the Swedish or Norwegian prehistory and that of the others, which was perceived as having made no significant contribution to Scandinavian history. In the separation of the national from the other, dichotomies were applied, such as between Arctic Stone Age and Nordic Stone Age (cf. Storli 1993a; Furset 1994), Arctic/Eastern Bronze Age and Nordic Bronze Age (cf. Bakka 1976), and inland and coast in northern Sweden (cf. Bolin 1999) – thus defining two separate one-entities with few or no connection points.

The most central character in the study of prehistory in northern Sweden and in the early archaeological study of the Sámi past during the first half of the 20th century was the archaeologist Gustaf Hallström (1880–1962; cf. Baudou 1997). During his lifetime, Hallström published extensively, and his research interests included, among other things, burial sites in northern Sweden (1912a, 1931, 1944, 1945), Sámi sacrificial sites in northern Sweden (1932), and sacrificial sites and burial grounds on the Kola Peninsula (1921, 1922). One of his main contributions was the publication of the rock carvings at Nämforsen, by the River Ångermanälven (1960). Hallström’s publications also covered general issues relating to the prehistory of northern Sweden (1942) and the question of when the Sámi people had “immigrated” to Sweden (1929). I will return to Gustaf Hallström and his research on several occasions in the following chapters.

After the Second World War: modernization and assimilation

The drastic social and economic changes in Swedish society during the second half of the 20th century of course also affected the archaeological research in northern Sweden. The development and application of a modern cultural heritage legislation in Sweden, especially the new law on ancient monuments (Fornminneslagen) from 1942, would play a very important role for archaeological
research in the northern parts of Sweden. The period after the Second World War was characterized by large-scale archaeological field-work conducted in connection with the regulation and damming of many of the major river systems in northern Sweden for hydro-electrical power (see Biörnstad 2006; cf. also the similar situation in northern Finland, Carpelan 2004).

The large-scale research project called “Norrlands tidiga bebyggelse” (NTB), in English “Early Norrland”, was started in 1968 under the leadership of Evert Baudou and Margareta Biörnstad. The main aim of the project was to analyze and publish the enormous material from the archaeological investigations conducted in connection with the hydro-electrical projects along the Norrland rivers (Biörnstad & Baudou 1968). It focused on some fundamental issues, such as the chronology of the many thousands of settlement sites that had been registered, the systematization of the find material, and the settlement patterns of the prehistoric societies. The project had a strong ecological character and was fundamentally multi-disciplinary. One of the basic questions that the project set out to investigate was formulated in the following way: “When did the Sámi culture come [to Norrland] and how did it spread?” (ibid.:180; my translation). Although it failed to systematically publish all of the archaeological material and excavations, the project did initiate many new archaeological studies. Among the publications of the Early Norrland project, which dealt explicitly with Sámi (pre)history, one should mention the book *Lappish bear graves in northern Sweden* by Inger Zachrisson and Elisabeth Iregren (Zachrisson & Iregren 1974) and the book *Lapps and Scandinavians – Archaeological finds from northern Sweden* by Inger Zachrisson (1976).

Another important research project, “Nordarkeologi”, was also initiated in the 1960s under the leadership of the archaeologist Hans Christiansson (1916–2001). The investigations at the Stone Age site Bjurselet in Byske parish, Västerbotten, formed a starting-point for the project. Several other important sites were excavated within the project, such as Garaselet, Kusmark and Kungaudden. Intensive survey campaigns in the municipality of Arvidsjaur in the area between the Skellefte River and the Pite River were also carried out by the researchers in the project (see Christiansson & Wigenstam 1980).

These two projects have had a fundamental impact on later archaeological research in northern Sweden. Several doctoral dissertations followed as a result of the investigations initiated by the two projects, and a substantial number of the today active norrlandsarkeologer (“Norrland archaeologists”) have their background within the frameworks of the projects.

In 1963–65, the University of Umeå, located in the county of Västerbotten, was founded, as the first university in northern Sweden. As such, it assumed a special responsibility for archaeological research in the northern parts of the country, and its archaeological department (founded in 1975) has played a fundamental role in establishing a special field of norrlandsarkeologi (archaeological research devoted to the Norrland region). From the very beginning, the research and education at the department had a strong palaeo-
ecological profile. Evert Baudou was appointed as the first professor in archaeology at the new university. As a very active researcher also long after his retirement, he has been one of the most influential archaeologists in the post-war period in northern Sweden and one of the leading specialists in the prehistory of the area. As will be obvious in the following discussions, Baudou has also played a central part in the debates on Sámi prehistory and archaeology.

The establishment of universities in the northern regions in Sweden, Norway and Finland has constituted an important factor in the structure and direction of research on “northern” issues in general, and archaeological research in particular, during the second half of the 20th century. The University of Tromsø in northern Norway was officially opened in 1972. In the following decades, the department of archaeology at the University of Tromsø became the most important center for the study of Sámi prehistory in the Nordic countries and very influential in the formation of the field of Sámi archaeology, together with the Tromsø University Museum (which had been founded already in the 1870s and was incorporated in the University of Tromso in 1976). A large number of research projects devoted to Sámi history and prehistory have been initiated and carried out in these institutions in Tromsø.

One of the foremost investigators of the prehistory, especially the Stone Age, in northern Norway was Povl Simonsen (1922–2003), director of the Tromsø Museum and the first professor in archaeology at the University of Tromsø (see Hesjedal 2001:158ff.). In recent decades, the professor in Sámi archaeology at the University of Tromsø, Bjørnar Olsen, has been a central and very influential person in this field. In northern Finland, the University of Oulu was founded in 1958. At the university, there is an archaeological department and also a center for Sámi studies, the so-called Giellagas Institute. In northern Finland, there is also the University of Lapland in Rovaniemi (established in 1979), with the Arctic Centre, a research institution devoted to Arctic issues in a multidisciplinary and international perspective. In recent decades, one of the foremost investigators of Sámi prehistory in Finland has been the archaeologist Christian Carpelan, who has published extensively on the subject.

It should be noted that archaeological research in northern Sweden was not only conducted by the National Heritage Board (Riksantikvarieämbetet) and the university departments. It is also important to mention the archaeological work conducted by the regional museums in northern Sweden, for instance the county museums in Norrbotten, Västerbotten and Jämtland. The Ájtte – Swedish Sámi and Mountain Museum in Jokkmokk and the Silver Museum in Arjeplog, both in the county of Norrbotten, can also be mentioned. In recent years, several important archaeological research projects have been conducted at the Silver Museum, and in April 2009 a research institute was opened at the Museum, called the Institute for Subarctic Landscape Research.

Ernst Manker, curator of Lapp ethnology at the Nordic Museum, was a central figure in the study of Sámi ethnology during the post-war years. He
started the publication of the book series *Acta Lapponica*, in which many important and classic works in Sámi studies were published. Manker himself published several volumes in the series with relevance to the study of Sámi history, for instance on the Sámi ceremonial drums (1938, 1950), Sámi graves and burial customs (1961), and sacred places and *sieidi* sites in the Sámi landscapes (1957). Manker was also the author of a great number of popular scientific publications on the landscapes of Lapland and the Sámi ways of life, which were met with a large public interest.

The concept of a “Sámi Iron Age” was first suggested by Norwegian archaeologists in the 1950s and was in use from the 1960s to the 1990s. On the one hand, the concept, which covered a period of 1,500 years, added to the notion of Sámi prehistory as something static and homogeneous. On the other hand, the establishment of a Sámi Iron Age period entailed the recognition of a Sámi prehistory as a possible field of study for archaeologists and was thus an important step towards an academic field of Sámi archaeology (see Schanche 2000:80ff.).

**Sámi prehistory in the 1980s: new debates on ethnicity and archaeology**

During the 1980s there was a noticeable shift in archaeological research from questions about when and from where the Sámi immigrated, to questions about how, when and why Sámi ethnicity developed among the population in Sápmi. An important change in the understanding of the concept of ethnicity took place, based on Fredrik Barth’s instrumentalist approach to ethnic groups and boundaries (Barth 1969), which was driven firstly by Norwegian archaeologists at the University of Tromsø. One early example is the article by Else Johansen Kleppe in 1977 (Kleppe 1977). Another early example is the Masters thesis (*magistergradsavhandling*) in archaeology by Per Kyrre Reymert at the University of Tromsø (Reymert 1980). In the thesis, there is also a theoretical discussion about ethnicity and archaeological material. The archaeologist Povl Simonsen in Tromsø was also important in this process.

The book *Finner og terfinner*, published in 1983, by Knut Odner was the most influential publication, starting off a debate on Sámi ethnicity and the archaeological study of the emergence of Sámi ethnicity. The debate continued in 1985 in the pages of *Norwegian Archaeological Review* (e.g. Moberg 1985; Odner 1985; Olsen 1985; Zachrisson 1985), and in an issue of *AmS Varia* dealing with the topic of archaeology and ethnicity (Næss 1985).

A more radical criticism of the ethnocentrism in Norwegian archaeology, and a deconstruction of Norwegian prehistory writing and the representations of Sámi (pre)history, was put forward in the seminal paper by Audhild Schanche and Bjørnar Olsen called “Var de alle nordmenn? En etnopolitisk
kritikk av norsk arkeologi” (‘Were they all Norwegians? An ethnopolitical criticism of Norwegian archaeology’; Schanche & Olsen 1985; first published in 1983), and the article by Bjørnar Olsen in 1986 called “Norwegian archaeology and the people without (pre-)history: or how to create a myth of a uniform past” (Olsen 1986). I would argue that much of this critique against the representations of a uniform Norwegian past could also have been relevant as a critique against the ethnocentrism of Swedish archaeology and the notions of a uniform Swedish past:

As the birth of Norwegian archaeology was clearly associated with the conception of the Norwegian nation-state, its nationalist character can hardly be disputed. Its outspoken aim was to serve national-political interests; to ‘prove’ that Norway was a historical nation, despite 400 years of foreign rule. To achieve this aim properly, it was necessary to present a picture of a uniform and linear historical development. Shaped in the ideological image of the modern bourgeois nation-state, a myth of a uniform national past came into being. (Olsen 1986:35)

As a Norwegian archaeologist working in the Saami area, I have after a while realised that the utopian aim of writing an objective, ‘everybody’s’ (pre-)history for past and present inhabitants in Norway is an illusion… This is because an ‘everybody’s’ (pre-)history has conveniently been transformed into a Norwegian one, hidden behind the myth of a uniform Norwegian past… Accepting the importance of the past in the present, I suggest that there is a need for a Saami (pre-)history, also as written and used by the Saami to serve their own defensible social and political aims in the present. (Olsen 1986:40)

The shift in view on Sámi ethnicity and history took place in the context of the ethnic revival among Sámi groups, in which the Alta conflict – a conflict over the exploitation of the Alta River in northern Norway for waterpower – played an important role. It was especially among researchers in Tromsø, located in northern Norway, that the field of Sámi archaeology evolved during the 1980s (Hesjedal 2001:195ff.), which led to the publication of a number of new studies dealing with Sámi history and prehistory. As a consequence, research on Sámi prehistory was concentrated to the northernmost part of the country, even though the present Sámi settlement area stretches far to the south, thereby continuing the division between Norwegian and Sámi archaeology. A somewhat similar process might be observed in Sweden regarding the establishment of the department of archaeology in Umeå in the 1970s. The creation of a research institution in the northern part of Sweden meant a significant contribution to and advancement of the study of the northern area. At the same time, the separation of northern and southern archaeology in Sweden has in large part continued.

In the 1980s and 1990s, a debate on South Sámi prehistory took place among archaeologists in Sweden, a debate that attracted considerable attention in the archaeological community all over the country and that became one of
the key debates on ethnicity and archaeology, and prehistory and politics in Sweden. The two main actors in the debate were Evert Baudou and Inger Zachrisson. This debate is further discussed in the next chapter in the section on the origin of the Sámi and the section on South Sámi prehistory as a controversial field of study.

In 1991, the doctoral dissertation *Forest Reindeer Herding A.D. 1–1800* by Kjell-Åke Aronsson, the present director of the Ájtte – Swedish Mountain and Sámi Museum in Jokkmokk, was published at the University of Umeå. The dissertation investigated the development of reindeer herding by examining pollen analyses and C-14 datings from different sites connected with reindeer husbandry (Aronsson 1991). In 1994, Inga-Maria Mulk, former director of the Ájtte Museum, defended her doctoral dissertation *Sirkas* (Mulk 1994a) at the University of Umeå. The dissertation dealt with the social and economic organization of the Sámi community inhabiting the upper reaches of the Stora Luleälv (Great Lule River), in the county of Norrbotten. The time period covered was from about 1 A.D. to 1600 A.D., and Mulk emphasized the continuity in the territorial usage among the mountain Sámi population in the area. She presented and discussed the archaeological data from the area, which includes primarily settlement sites, dwellings, cooking pits, oven pits, food storage pits, and also hunting pit systems, sacrificial sites and graves. Most of the excavated sites had been investigated by Mulk herself. These two dissertations represented a new scientific interest in and new approaches to the study of the cultural and social landscapes of historical Sámi communities in northern Sweden, and categories of archaeological remains that had not been much studied earlier.

In 1993, Inger Zachrisson published a review of archaeological research on Sámi prehistory in Sweden in the first volume of the journal *Current Swedish Archaeology* (Zachrisson 1993), and in the following year an article on archaeology and politics in Central Scandinavia (Zachrisson 1994a). Two years later, Lars Forsberg published an overview of Sámi archaeology in Sweden during the period 1985–1990 in the same journal (Forsberg 1995). In another paper, Lars Forsberg discussed the study of early Sámi prehistory (Forsberg 1996). He identified certain problems in earlier research on Sámi prehistory, connected with the “fuzzy” use of the ethnicity concept. He argued that the simplified dichotomies of evolutionism/diffusionism and external/internal causes of change, which had been important points of dispute in earlier research on Sámi prehistory, should be abandoned and that more sophisticated models needed to be developed.

In 1997, a central work on Sámi archaeology, especially South Sámi archaeology, called *Mötet i Gränsland* (‘Encounters in Border Country’; Zachrisson et al. 1997) was published in Sweden. This collective volume, with contributions by Inger Zachrisson and a number of other researchers, explored prehistory in the South Sámi area in Sweden and Norway. The starting-point of the work was the excavations at Vivallen in Härjedalen and the so-called
Sámi archaeology in recent years: pluralism and internationalization

In the early years of the 21st century, a number of central scientific works in the field of Sámi archaeology have been published in Norway. Among these one can mention the book *Graver i ur og berg – Samisk gravskikk og religion fra forhistorisk til nyere tid* (‘Graves in scree and rocks – Sámi burial customs and religion from prehistoric to modern times’) by Audhild Schanche (2000), which was based on her doctoral dissertation at the University of Tromsø. Another publication, highly relevant to my own study, is the doctoral dissertation from Tromsø by Anders Hesjedal, called *Samisk forhistorie i norsk arkeologi 1900–2000* (‘Sámi prehistory in Norwegian archaeology 1900–2000’; Hesjedal 2001), which investigates the archaeological research history in Norway.

In 2004, the most comprehensive study up to now of Sámi early history was published, the book *Samenes historie fram til 1750* (‘Sámi history until 1750’) by the historian Lars Ivar Hansen and the archaeologist Bjørnar Olsen (2004; part of a two volume series on Sámi history). This book represents a milestone in the study of Sámi prehistory and early history. It also represents, in a sense, a new and more “mature” stage in Sámi archaeology, as it presents Sámi archaeology as an academic field of study on an equal level with other branches of archaeology. The book is based on new archaeological knowledge, it problematize the concept of ethnicity in archaeological research, and it strives to demonstrate the social and cultural variation and the historical dynamics in the Sámi communities. However, the book by Hansen and Olsen has also been criticized by Inger Zachrisson for focusing too much on the northern Sámi areas, and for the lack of information on the new archaeological research in the southern Sámi areas (Zachrisson 2005). Finally, I would also like to mention the doctoral dissertation from the University of Oslo *Samer i Østerdalen? En studie av etnisitet i jernalderen og middelalderen i det nordøstre Hedmark* (‘Sámi in Østerdalen? A study of ethnicity in the Iron Age and the Middle Ages in the northeastern part of Hedmark’) by Jostein Bergstøl (2008), which explores prehistoric and medieval settlements in more southern parts of Norway.

At the time this text is being written, there are several archaeological research projects that have recently been concluded or are still in progress in Sweden, Norway and Finland with the explicit aim to examine Sámi history from various perspectives, using a variety of methods and source materials.
Here, I will mention a selection of these studies as examples of some current trends in this field of research.

In recent years, a number of doctoral dissertations, which deal explicitly with Sámi prehistory, have been published at the Department of Archaeology and Sámi Studies, at the University of Umeå. In January 2007, Birgitta Fossum defended her doctoral dissertation *Förfädernas land – En arkeologisk studie av rituella lämningar i Sápmi, 300 f.Kr.–1600 e.Kr.* (‘The Land of the Ancestors – An archaeological study of ritual remains in the Sámi Area, 300 B.C.–1600 A.D.’; Fossum 2006), which deals with ritual remains from the Sámi region. Other recent doctoral dissertations from the University of Umeå include *Boplatser och offerplatser – Ekonomisk strategi och boplatsmönster bland skogssamer 700–1600 A.D.* (‘Settlements and Sacrificial Sites – Economic strategy and settlement patterns among the Forest Sámi 700–1600 A.D.’), by Sven-Donald Hedman (2003), and *Bosättning och resursnyttjande – Miljörarkologiska studier av boplatser med härder från perioden 600–1900 e.Kr. inom skogssamiskt område* (‘Settlement and Subsistence – Environmental archaeological studies of dwelling sites with hearths from the period 600–1900 A.D. in Forest Sámi Areas’), by Nina Karlsson (2006a).

In northern Norway, one research project is dealing with the so-called *mangeromstufter* (‘multiroom houses’), a category of archaeological remains that has been involved in discussions on Sámi social and cultural organization on the coast of Finnmark and Nord-Troms in the Middle Ages (Amundsen *et al.* 2003). The investigation of these remains has inspired new perspectives on Sámi Medieval history – perspectives focused on complexity and interethnic contacts to a greater extent than what was usual in earlier research (see Henriksen 2004; Olsen 2004).

Another example of contemporary research on Sámi (pre)history is the research project in the Báišduottar ( Fi. Paistunturi) area in northern Finland, conducted by Tarna Valtonen and Mikael Manninen (Manninen & Valtonen 2006; Valtonen 2006). The starting-point is a holistic approach to the study of the Sámi cultural landscape and the different layers of time within the living cultural landscape. In a recent doctoral dissertation in archaeology from the University of Helsinki, Antti Lahelma discusses the rock paintings in Finland, in part with a framework of interpretation supported by Sámi ethnographical material (Lahelma 2008; see also Fandén 2001). Ethnographical material on Sámi historical communities has also been used in connection with analyses of prehistoric subsistence strategies and settlement patterns in northernmost Finland (Halinen 2005). As in other fields of archaeological study, scientific methods have evolved in recent years and have assumed an increasingly important role in the study of the past in Sápmi. Some examples include osteology (Lahti 2006) and environmental archaeological methods (Karlsson N. 2004, 2006a). Other studies have discussed trees and plants and their economic, social and ideological significance in the northern societies (Bergman 2005).

One important trend in recent research has been the wish to expand the archaeological study to include the participation of the local population in the
research process, which is also part of a more general trend in archaeological research. Such a participatory archaeological approach has been employed in several research projects in different parts of the Sámi area. In the next chapter, I will discuss some examples of such collaborative projects in the South Sámi area. Other examples include work in northern Norway, for instance on-going research projects in Finnmark, in which participatory GIS approaches (PGIS) are being applied in the documentation of traditional knowledge and land use (Barlindhaug pers.com.).

Another prominent and fundamentally important trend in recent years has been the development of cross-boundary research within the Sápmi area. Research projects have been designed that stretch across the national borders and involve cooperation between archaeologists both from the Nordic countries and from the Russian Federation. One example of this trend is the “Network for Sámi Archaeology in the Western Barents Region”, also called SamiArc, which was started in 2006. Archaeologists from Norway, Sweden, Finland and the Russian Federation who are working with questions on Sámi prehistory participate in the network. Until this day, the SamiArc network has organized meetings, workshops, conferences and field-work and Ph.D. courses in Sweden, Finland, Norway and the Russian Federation. The importance of such meetings will be evident only in the future. It is, however, already clear that the SamiArc network has contributed to closer contact and dissemination of knowledge and experiences among researchers and Ph.D. students from the different countries, and that such initiatives might have much influence on future research on the prehistory of Northern Fennoscandia and Sápmi. Furthermore, the EU-financed projects represent a new kind of research funding opportunity, which promotes certain research directions, aiming at international cooperation and cross-boundary research designs.
Chapter 7. Debates in Sámi archaeology

Although Sámi prehistory and Sámi archaeology in large have been little studied in mainstream Nordic archaeology, certain themes have attracted more attention from archaeologists, historians and other researchers. A more detailed examination of these themes is necessary in order to follow the development of the idea of a Sámi prehistory and the conceptions of a Sámi archaeology within the networks of archaeology. In this chapter, I will review and analyze four selected themes in the academic debates during the last 150–200 years. The two main themes that will be examined here concern the origin of the Sámi people and South Sámi prehistory as a contested field of study. I will also examine two other common and important themes – the emergence and development of reindeer herding and pastoralism, and pre-Christian Sámi religion – although more briefly. I have chosen to concentrate on these four themes as they have been very central in the discussions on Sámi prehistory and as they illustrate different aspects of the representations of the Sámi past and the controversies and negotiations over the study of this past. Each of the four themes also reveals central elements in the historical constructions of “Sáminess” and “Swedishness” and the relationship between the two spheres in the archaeological narratives. Furthermore, they illustrate the changes in the views on the Sámi and the Sámi past over time. The analysis is based mainly on sources from Sweden, but also to some extent on sources from Norway and Finland.

The origin of the Sámi – the search for origins and authenticity

The origin of the Sámi people has been one especially consistent theme in the history of scientific interest in the Sámi. At times, it has been the dominant theme, overshadowing other ways of studying and understanding the Sámi past. Throughout the centuries, many ideas and views on the origin of the Sámi have been put forward by different researchers – lappologists, historians, archaeologists, linguists and anthropologists – who have connected various older sources and new findings in their search for origins. Moreover, the origin of the Sámi has very often been presented as being a great mystery and a riddle waiting to be solved.
Two general views of, or lines of thought on, the origin of the Sámi can be followed through time: one regarding the Sámi as relatively late “immigrants” to Scandinavia, the other viewing the Sámi as a “native” or “indigenous” people with a very long history on the North Calotte and possibly larger areas in the Nordic countries and in northern Europe.

Why then this great and continuous interest in the origin of the Sámi? In general, archaeology has been much concerned with questions of origins, continuity and authenticity. It is important that the Sámi have been the Swedish “Other”; in a sense, it is the notion of the different origin that separates the Sámi from the Swedish. It becomes a theme that pervades the very notion of a Sámi prehistory; in some sense, Sámi prehistory becomes foremost a matter of origins. Here, the concept of authenticity is central: Sámi prehistory must be “pure” and “authentic”, otherwise, it is not Sámi prehistory. The same regime of purification and authentication has, however (and hardly surprisingly), not been applied to the notion of Swedish prehistory.

In the following, I will discuss the ideas on the origin of the Sámi, starting with some of the earliest “pre-scientific” views on the subject, and then continuing with subsequent and current views and ideas in the academic research tradition, primarily among archaeologists, but also among linguists and geneticists.

There was a wide, and with today’s eyes quite wild, range of what Risto Pulkkinen calls pre-scientific views on the origin of the Sámi people, including giants, dwarfs, Scythians and other more or less mythical creatures (see Pulkkinen 2000, 2005a; also Kvandahl 1925).

In the book Lapponia, originally published in 1673, Johannes Schefferus (see also chapter 5) wrote that the Sámi were descended from the Finns. In his view, the Sámi had been forced to leave their homelands in Finland on several different occasions in history, because of external pressure and aggression, such as the attacks, taxation and forced Christianization by the Swedes and Russians in the Middle Ages. The Sámi people, or parts of the Sámi people, were thus forced to migrate further north to their present homelands. Therefore, they became known as ‘Lapps’, which according to Schefferus would have meant ‘the expelled’. Schefferus argued against those other scholars who considered that the Sámi stemmed from the Russians or the Tatars. He explained the differences between the languages, ways of life and physical appearance of the Sámi and the Finnish peoples with adaptation to new circumstances and physical environments (Schefferus 1956 [1673]:79ff.).

Autochthons or immigrants?

From the early 19th century, in many ways until the 1980s, the debate on the origin of the Sámi people has, as stated above, evolved around two major, and opposing, perspectives: the indigenous/native and the immigational. In the debate, the views on the relationship between the Sámi and the majority
national (ethnic) groups have been of central importance. Furthermore, the views held by the researchers on the formation and character of ethnicity/identity, and the possibilities to trace ethnic groups/peoples in prehistoric times play an important role.

One of the central figures who promoted the theory of the Sámi as the indigenous population of Sweden was Sven Nilsson (1787–1883), professor in natural history at the University of Lund and a fellow of the Swedish Academy of Science (for more details on the life and work of Sven Nilsson, see Hegardt 1997:92ff. and Christensson 2005). One of his most influential works was the book *Skandinaviska Nordens Ur-Invånare* (‘The aboriginals of the Scandinavian North’; Nilsson 1838-1843), which was originally published as a series of booklets between the years 1838 and 1843. Among other things, Nilsson studied crania from Stone Age megalithic tombs in southern Sweden, which he considered to be of Sámi origin, on the basis of presumed similarities in appearance between the crania in the Stone Age graves and examples of modern Sámi crania. In his point of view, the Sámi were the *urinvånare*, the aboriginal population, of all of Scandinavia:

We have thus by meticulous comparisons established that the skulls, which we have so far seen from the oldest of the ancient graves, exhibit a striking resemblance with those of the Lapps – a tribe of people now living only in the northernmost parts of the country. The differences that we have discovered indicate only incidental and individual variations. There is thus every reason to assume that the Lapp people is the last remnant in our North of that tribe of people who built all of these graves and manufactured and used the tools of stone, animal bone, etc. which are kept inside the graves. (Nilsson 1838-1843: second chapter, 10f.; cf. 1866:105, note 1 (second edition); my translation)

However, he added in a foot-note in the second edition of the book that although these facts were indisputable, they were also insufficient, and that he would argue that in some passage graves there were also skulls which seemed to belong to the Indo-Germanic tribe (Nilsson 1866:105, note 1; cf. also the preface).

The theory presented by Sven Nilsson became known as the *storutbredningsteorin* (approx. ‘the theory of the wide distribution’). According to this theory, the ancestors of the Sámi people had in the oldest times inhabited large parts of northern Europe, and had later been pushed further and further to the north by the expanding groups of Germanic people. Nilsson thus concluded:

The Lapps, now expelled to the remote and wild mountain areas, are the last remnants of that people in our Scandinavian North. Consequently, they did in the oldest of ancient times inhabit not only the southern parts of this country, but also the rest of northern and western Europe: Denmark, northern Germany, the English Isles and perhaps even some part of France, etc., since, in all these countries, there appear similarly manufactured stone tools and grave chambers
constructed in the same way as the ones in our country, where crania have been found which, according to what we have proven here, completely resemble those of the Lapps. (Nilsson 1838-1843: second chapter, 12; my translation)

In the fourth chapter of the book, Nilsson compared the information on the dvärgar (‘dwarfs’) of the Old Norse sagas and Scandinavian folk tales with the historical Sámi people, and declared it to be his conviction that “the Dwarfs of the ancient sagas are people belonging to the polar tribe, the Lapp people” (Nilsson 1838-1843: fourth chapter, 7; my translation). Later in the same chapter, he summarized the arguments for the parallel between the mythical dwarfs and the real Sámi people. He explained, however, that these arguments did not primarily deal with what the Sámi actually were like in reality, but rather with how they were considered to be and how they were described by their neighbors. Here follow some of the points that supported his idea, which also give a sense of some of the contemporary derogatory attitudes towards the Sámi people:

1) The Lapps are small and ugly with a broad mouth and short legs. In the ancient sagas, the dwarfs and psylingar [approx. ‘mythical little people’; my note] are described in precisely this manner…
4) The Lapps are cowards; they are not suitable for becoming soldiers. The dwarfs of the ancient sagas are portrayed as being extremely cowardly…
7) The Lapps enjoy collecting shiny metals, especially silver… In the folk tale, the Dwarfs are also described as rich in silver…
8) The Dwarfs were believed to master sorcery. People believed the same of the Lapps… The Lapp people were considered as, and are still seen by many, as a magical people. (Nilsson 1838-1843: fourth chapter, 15f.; my translation)

Anders Retzius (1796–1860), the famous anatomist and inventor of the so-called cephalic index, which was used to categorize human races as long-headed (‘dolichocephalic’) and round-headed (‘brachycephalic’), supported the storutbredningsteorin formulated by Sven Nilsson. In his view, the original population of brachycephals (the Sámi) had been replaced or pushed to the north by the expanding, more highly advanced dolichocephalic population (the Nordic people). At a meeting of natural scientists in Stockholm in 1842, he declared his support of Nilsson’s theory:

It is considered that the Lapps have inhabited large parts of Russia in the oldest times. Professor Nilsson has in his classic work Skandinaviska Nordens Ur-Invånare with such a multitude of evidence proven that the Lapps have also inhabited southern Sweden, that there can hardly be any well-founded objections against this. (Retzius 1864:29; text originally published in 1842; my translation)

However, Sven Nilsson was not the first to express views on the Sámi as the original inhabitants of the Scandinavian countries, or possibly even larger European areas. In the 18th century and in the first part of the 19th century, a
number of researchers, or learned men, put forth similar views on the Sámi as the first inhabitants of Sweden or Scandinavia, for instance Johan Ihre (1707–1780), Jacob Fredrik Neikerter (1744–1803) and Erik Gustaf Geijer (1783–1847). At this time, because of the perceived similarities between the Sámi and the Finnish peoples and the fact that they could both be referred to by the old ethnonym ‘Finn’ in the early textual sources, the hypotheses concerning Sámi and Finnish origins often merged into one common theory about the Sámi and Finns as the aboriginal population in Scandinavia.

Erik Gustaf Geijer, professor of history at Uppsala university, member of the Swedish Academy, philosopher, politician and one of the leading members of the Romantic and nationalist movements in Sweden, expressed in his works on the early history of Sweden the view that the Finns and the Sámi were the indigenous, or aboriginal, peoples in the territory of Sweden (Geijer 1873 [1832], 1874 [1825]; cf. Bringéus 1966:146f.; Fjellström 1977). Similar ideas on the Sámi as the oldest inhabitants of Norway were expressed by, for instance, the Norwegian historians P.A. Munch (1810–1863) and Rudolf Keyser (1803–1864).

One rather peculiar example of the view of the Sámi as the oldest population of Scandinavia can be found in the work Bohuslåns historia och beskrifning (‘The history and description of Bohuslän’) by Axel Emanuel Holmberg. In this work, Holmberg discussed the inhabitants of the island of Malmön outside of Sotenäs in the province of Bohuslän on the West Coast of Sweden. He saw this group of people as a remnant from an ancient population, related with the contemporary Sámi, which would have survived unchanged in isolation until the early 1800s on this small island close to the coast (Holmberg 1867:11f., 231f.; cf. also Wiklund 1947:8f.). The population on the island was, at that time, generally called Malmöbarnen (‘the children of Malmö’) or Malmöpyttarne (‘the tiny people of Malmö’). The arguments presented by Holmberg for the “unmistakable resemblance to our Lapps” were that the Malmö population consisted of short, rather ugly, stupid and shy people, with dark skin and a special shape of the cranium (Holmberg 1867:11).

From about the middle of the 1860s, there was a change in the view on the Stone Age in northern Fennoscandia, which was related to a changed view on the Sámi as the oldest inhabitants of Scandinavia, as well as of northern Sweden. Much of the debate concerned the so-called skifferkultur (‘slate culture’) or, as it was also called, the Arctic Stone Age, which was characterized by the finds of slate objects from primarily the Neolithic in northern Sweden and Norway (see Christiansson 1963; cf. also discussions on the issue of race in Almgren 1914:61ff.).

The Swedish archaeologist Hans Hildebrand (1866) and the Norwegian archaeologist Oluf Rygh (1872, 1876, 1885) argued that the Stone Age culture in northern Sweden and northern Norway were independent of the Stone Age in southern Sweden (see also Storli 1993a:11ff.). Slate artifacts were seen as special signs of the northern Stone Age culture. Similar artifacts were known
from Finland and Russia and therefore the slate artifacts in northern Norway and Sweden were considered to be of eastern origin. Oluf Rygh came to the conclusion that in Norway and Sweden there had been two Stone Age cultures and two Stone Age peoples. The northern culture was named the Arctic Stone Age and, according to Rygh, it represented the ancestors of the Sámi people (Rygh 1876:178).

Oscar Montelius (1843–1921), the influential Swedish archaeologist, well-known internationally for his typological method, emphasized that at the time of the study by Sven Nilsson very few skulls from the Stone Age were known, and that the majority of finds that had come into the light since then showed little or no resemblance to Sámi skulls. Thus, Montelius argued, although some of the Stone Age skulls may exhibit some resemblance in form with Sámi skulls, the conclusion must be that at least the main part of the population in the Stone Age in southern Sweden could not be related to the present-day Sámi population (Montelius 1874:106). However, Montelius agreed with Oluf Rygh that the slate objects in northernmost Sweden most likely belonged to a Stone Age Sámi population. In his words, the slate objects were “memories of the Lapp’s Stone Age” (Montelius 1874, 1876). He still maintained this view in later works, when most of the other archaeologists had abandoned it (see e.g. 1919:74ff.).

One of the major, classical works on the Sámi from the 19th century is the description of Lapland and the Sámi people, Om Lappland och lapparne, företrädesvis de svenske. Ethnografiska studier (‘On Lapland and the Lapps, especially the Swedish. Ethnographical studies’) by Gustaf von Düben, published in 1873. Gustaf von Düben (1822–1892), professor in anatomy and physiology at the Caroline Institute in Stockholm, was active in many social, political and scientific contexts in Swedish society during the second half of the 19th century. In the mid-1860s, he started working on a catalogue of the collection of Sámi skulls that was kept at Karolinska Institutet (‘Caroline Institute’) in Stockholm, with the intention to include a short ethnographical description of the Sámi. However, his interest in the Sámi grew, and he decided to travel to Lapland to personally investigate and document the life and culture of the inhabitants of the North. The first travel took place in 1868 to Lule lappmark, with the company of his wife Lotten von Düben (1828–1915), who during their travels took some of the first and thus very valuable photographs of the people living in Sápmi. The second travel was made in 1871 to Arvidsjaur, Sorsele and Jokkmokk (see further Garnert 1977 and Broberg 1989).

Om Lappland och lapparne was very influential during the decades that followed, and one chapter dealt with the oldest history of the Sámi, their immigration and spreading in the Nordic countries (von Düben 1977 [1873]:348ff.). The main theory which was elaborated in the book was that of the Sámi as immigrants from the east. von Düben also dismissed the theory of the ancient great distribution of the Sámi, storutbredningsteorin, which had been propagated by Sven Nilsson. He wrote that he “can not accept the probability
or even the possibility that the aboriginal people in southern and middle Sweden, which are mentioned in our sagas and legends, could have been Lapps” (ibid.:398; my translation).

The exposition in von Düben’s book about the prehistoric times, here meaning all of Sámi history until then recent times, was primarily based on the early written sources (see chapter 5) and later historical documents, but also on some linguistic data. There was a long section with attempts to interpret the notes on ethnonyms by Tacitus, Jordanes, etc., and to determine what peoples the ethnonyms referred to and where these peoples had lived. Gustaf von Düben suggested that the Sámi immigration to Scandinavia might have taken place in connection with the large upheaval among the peoples around 700–400 B.C., “when the Scythians roamed around in middle and eastern Russia” (von Düben 1977 [1873]:402; my translation).

The change of views on the Sámi past, and the place of the Sámi past in the national history writing, in the end of the 19th century has been discussed by Inger Storli (1993a) and Ole Jakob Furset (1994). Furset has discussed how the use of slate was distinguished as a “foreign” ethnic Stone Age in Scandinavian archaeology around 1867–1912, and how this “foreign” sphere was incorporated into the Norwegian and Swedish cultural identity and heritage during the period 1912–1925 (Furset 1994). Furset sees the interpretations of the Arctic Stone Age as an expression of a Western colonial view. The “primitivism” of the Arctic Stone Age, in comparison with the more advanced
southern culture, was not compatible with the Norwegian archaeologists’ self-understanding as a western cultural people. The Sámi, on the other hand, fitted much better into this primitive conception (ibid.:92f.).

Although it was known that slate artifacts had been found over all of Norway, a lot of effort was placed on finding distinctions between the north and the south, where the slate material played the role of defining and delimiting the Arctic Stone Age culture, separating it from the southern Scandinavian Stone Age culture. Inger Storli has interpreted this as a way of avoiding that Norway was included into the area of the Arctic Stone Age, and thereby into the northern circumpolar and Sámi cultural spheres (Storli 1993a:17). Instead, there was among scholars and other cultural and political agents a strong wish to connect Norway with southern Scandinavia, to make Norway a true European nation. And by isolating the Arctic Stone Age culture, it was possible to ignore any substantial contribution of the Sámi to the history of Norway and Scandinavia (ibid.:7).

However, the interpretation of the Arctic Stone Age as Sámi was challenged in the early 20th century. Ole Jakob Furset has discussed how the Sámi, in the beginning of the 20th century, disappeared out of prehistory and as an indigenous population of Scandinavia. The idea of the Arctic Stone Age as carried by a Sámi population which had immigrated from the east was seen as not very well founded empirically. The whole of the Neolithic was instead brought into a Norwegian ethnic definition; in Furset’s view, a change from the prehistory of the ”others” to ”our” prehistory (Furset 1994:93f.; cf. also Opedal 1996).

In 1909, in the influential book Den Arktiske Stenalder i Norge (‘The Arctic Stone Age in Norway’), the Norwegian archaeologist A.W. Brøgger (1884–1951) claimed that the Arctic Stone Age could not have been carried by the ancestors of the present-day Sámi (1909:163ff.). He based this position on the assumption that the Sámi had never practiced such an advanced stone technology as the slate industry, neither was it known that the Sámi had ever practiced such a widespread ceramics production or rock carving, which was known from the Arctic Stone Age area: “It seems, beforehand, unreasonable to assume that the Lapps, whose culture is bound to the semi-domesticated reindeer, would have had the time and motive for developing such a pottery and stone industry as the one that we are dealing with in this work” (Brøgger 1909:165; my translation). The idea that there was no continuity from the Arctic Stone Age to the present Sámi population subsequently became the dominant one in research.

One of the most influential scholars in the history of the study of the Sámi people in the early 20th century was K.B. Wiklund (1868–1934), professor of Finno-Ugric languages at Uppsala University (see Karlsson 2000). For several decades, Wiklund was the Swedish expert on the Sámi, their culture, history and present situation, and he published very extensively on the subject. He served as an expert in a large number of State enquiries and committees on all kinds of
questions concerning the Sámi population. In his activities as a scientist and an expert, Wiklund was a strong proponent of the *lapp-skall-vara-lapp* ideology (Karlsson 2000:41ff.; see also chapter 5).

During his lifetime, K.B. Wiklund put forth several different theories on the origin of the Sámi population in the Nordic countries in a number of publications (e.g. 1895, 1899, 1908, 1923, 1925, 1928, 1932, 1937, 1947). As the foremost contemporary expert on Sámi matters in Sweden, the ideas of K.B. Wiklund on the prehistory and the origin of the Sámi people became very influential among researchers but also among policy makers and the public at large. It can be informative to follow the development and changes of his ideas a little bit more closely.

In his early works, Wiklund displayed an acceptance of a long Sámi history in the northernmost parts of Sweden. He stated that the Swedish people had *not* been the first inhabitants in the northernmost parts of the country. “The Lapps had already for a long time wandered around here as fishers, hunters and nomads, and it was in their land that the Swedes settled, gradually driving the Lapps up from the coastal area and spreading Swedish language and Swedish culture, or rather Norse language and Norse culture” (Wiklund 1895:369f.; my translation). At the same time, Wiklund strongly opposed the *storutbredningsteori* of Sven Nilsson and others, and stressed, on the contrary, that it was certain that the Sámi had immigrated to Scandinavia from the northeast and that there had been a migration from the north to the south in historical times (e.g. 1895, 1899), as Gustaf von Düben had stipulated in the 1870s. It was not possible to speak of any “pushing” of the Sámi to the north by the expanding Scandinavian peoples, except for the expelling of the Sámi population groups from the coastal areas of northern Sweden and many areas of Lapland by the new settlers. In this connection, he emphasized that very many people from the Swedish or Finnish farming population in Lapland had Sámi blood in their veins. Furthermore, Wiklund supported the idea that the Sámi had spread south of the province of Lapland only in late historical times (with reference to Yngvar Nielsen’s theory of the late immigration of the South Sámi to their present settlement area in Jämtland and Härjedalen and adjacent areas in Norway; Nielsen 1891, see also the next section on South Sámi archaeology). He considered that the Sámi had come to the middle of Jämtland in the mid-16th century and to Härjedalen not until the middle of the 17th century. It was only in “our days” that the Sámi had been fully established in Idre in the northernmost part of the province of Dalarna (1899:3f.; cf. also 1925, 1928).

In 1925, Wiklund wrote that historians and archaeologists could not contribute much to the question of when the Sámi first had appeared in “our North”. Linguistics, on the other hand, could give some valuable information through the analyses of loan words. The Sámi had since the first contact with the Scandinavians borrowed a multitude of words from them. “The Scandinavians stood, even in this distant past, on a much higher cultural level than the Lapps and had a lot to give and loan to them” (1925:109; my
Now he considered it to be certain that the ancestors of the Sámi had immigrated to the Scandinavian Peninsula from the north and that they had done this after the point in time when the ancestors of the Germanic peoples had come to Sweden from the south. He concluded the article by stating that “it is evident that the stamland (‘homeland’) [of the Lappps] should be placed in the northern and interior parts of Finland and the adjoining parts of Russia, from where the Lappps in a distant past started to spread to the north to the Arctic Ocean and later onto the Scandinavian Peninsula” (ibid.:114; my translation).

In a later article “The Prehistory of the Lappps” published in the first volume of the book The race biology of the Swedish Lappps (1932), Wiklund discussed the idea of a language change, that the Sámi sometime in history had shifted from an earlier unknown language to the Finno-Ugric language that they now spoke. Based on linguistic material, he suggested that the earliest contact between the Scandinavians and the Sámi had occurred in the northernmost areas of the Scandinavian Peninsula, most probably in present-day Norwegian Finnmark, about the middle of the first millennium B.C. (cf. also 1908; 1923:224f.). At that time, he considered that it was not very likely that the Sámi had yet got very far beyond the present-day Swedish boundary. About the language change of the Sámi he wrote:

In anthropological respects the Lappps are clearly and markedly distinct from the Finno-Ugric peoples proper, and it is inconceivable that they can have differentiated anthropologically from these in the relatively brief space of time that is here in question. Therefore, they must have changed their language… Naturally this change of language could not have come about if the Lappps had not got into a constant and intimate dependence upon a superior people which had penetrated into their country, and in the course of a very long period, probably several centuries, dominated them in all phases of life. (Wiklund 1932:12f.)

Wiklund then attempted to answer where this “primeval home of the Lappps” was located and when the language change took place in that area. On the basis of loan-words, he stated that the change should have taken place in the Bronze Age or a very early period of the Iron Age. He found it likely that the change of language of the Sámi occurred in the regions to the north of the Karelian Isthmus and the shores of the Lake Ladoga, that is in the interior of Finland and the adjacent districts in Russia, from approximately 62° N lat. to 65° or a little more. Most probably, the “Proto-Lappps”, as he called them, had adopted the language of the so-called “Chudes” (mentioned in Sámi traditions and in Medieval sources in Russia), a supposedly Baltic-Finnic people that had expanded to the north into the lands of the Proto-Lappps, possibly driven by the needs of an expansive fur trade. The area where the change occurred could not have been very large, nor could the number of the Proto-Lappps have been high. There were few, if any, traces left of the language that the Proto-Lappps had
spoken. It was also possible that the Chudes had “pushed” the Lapps or Proto-Lapps northwards towards the Arctic Ocean (Wiklund 1932). At the same time, Wiklund declared that it was not possible to answer where the “Lapp race” had developed (long before the language shift) – comparative linguistics could not answer this question, maybe archaeology would be able to give some answers in the future – but it should be in a territory effectively isolated by natural borders, perhaps in the forelands of the Carpathian Mountains or in the Southern Ural Mountains, but any such suggestion was pure guesswork, he maintained (ibid.:14).

One central argument in Wiklund’s reasoning was that the Sámi (Lapps) were anthropologically very different from the Nordic peoples as well as the Finnish. In fact, he claimed that it had not been possible to establish anthropological connections between the Sámi people (“race” is the concept used by Wiklund) and any other known people on earth. In short, the Sámi people was a separate and unique entity. Therefore, he concluded, the Sámi people must have endured a very long time in a strictly isolated area, with continuous inbreeding within the group and limited contacts with other groups (1947:3ff.).

In the 1930s, at the end of his life, he put forth a new theory on the origins of the Sámi, much in contradiction to these earlier ideas. According to this new theory, the ancestors of the Sámi had lived in all of Scandinavia during the last interglacial, and during the cause of the latest Ice Age they would have lived, “wintered”, on the ice-free edges along the northern coast of the North Atlantic and Arctic Ocean (Wiklund 1937, 1947; cf. also Ekholm 1938:16ff.). He suggested that the so-called Komsa culture, which had been discovered in northernmost Norway and which he considered to be of a glacial date, was upheld by what he called proto-Lapps. This theory would explain why the Sámi showed such unique anthropological traits, as the proto-Lapps would have been isolated for thousands of years.

After his death, Wiklund’s theory of the wintering of the Sámi along the Arctic Ocean was criticized, on the basis of new post-glacial datings of the so-called Komsa culture in northernmost Norway, and also ridiculed. Ernst Manker writes: “… so it happened that Wiklund, who during his lifetime had been one of the sharpest and most feared critics, after his death himself fell victim to the hardest form of criticism, that which manifests itself in a pitying ridicule” (Manker 1951:225; my translation; it should be noted that Wiklund’s theory was mainly published posthumously).

In his study on the views of K.B. Wiklund on the Sámi, Christer Karlsson has argued that the publications by Wiklund on the history of the Sámi was an expression of a process of “Swedification” of the Sámi past, which takes place at the same time as the paternalistic and discriminatory lapp-skall-vara-lapp ideology was promoted in Swedish society (Karlsson 2000:58). In the writings of Wiklund, the role of ethnic Swedes increased over the years, while the role of the Sámi, and their prehistory, was more and more reduced. It was through
the assumed all-embracing cultural borrowings from the Nordic and Swedish peoples that Sámi culture had developed. This perspective on the Sámi as passive recipients of culture from the superior Swedish was an influential mode of thinking, which was shared by many other contemporary scholars and which also became influential in archaeological research. Karlsson concluded his overview of K.B. Wiklund’s history writing with the following words:

The historical writing that stands out in the works by Wiklund appears afterwards in many ways more as identity construction for a majority than as a description of the historical circumstances of a minority. Thus, it is not the history of the Sámi that is being written by Wiklund, but that of the Swedish. (Karlsson 2000:58; my translation)

In a very influential article published in 1929 with the title “Kan lapparnas invandringstid fixeras?” (‘Can the time of the immigration of the Lapps be established?’), the archaeologist Gustaf Hallström (1880–1949) wrote that he was convinced that the Stone Age culture in Norrland was upheld by a Scandinavian people – not by any Sámi or proto-Sámi people. However, he admitted that there were very large gaps in the present knowledge – which also made it difficult to prove his theory – and that it would take many years of intensive and focused research to fill those gaps (Hallström 1929:52). Contrary to von Düben and Wiklund, Hallström referred primarily to the archaeological material, and he was in many ways a pioneer in the archaeological study of northern Sweden.

As concerns Sweden, matters on the whole turn out in such a way that the Stone Age of Norrland and Lapland should be seen as a direct offshoot of the southern and middle Swedish Stone Age, and that no other race or races than those who had lived in southern or middle Sweden should be imagined to have lived in Norrland and Lapland. Further, that judging from the archaeological material, no traces exist of any form of culture or type of tool that can be derived from the Lapps or the ancestors of the Lapps. (Hallström 1929:56; my translation)

Concerning the oldest settlement areas of the Sámi, and their immigration to present-day Sweden, Hallström stated the following in the article:

For the present, I would like to place the oldest demonstrable settlement area of the Lapps in northern Finland (possibly also in the neighboring areas to the east and south-east). It is possible, but far from proven, that they existed in these regions already in the time period corresponding to the Scandinavian Late Stone Age and Early Bronze Age. However, it seems reasonable to express the possibility of their presence from the beginning of the Late Bronze Age (from c. 1000 B.C.).

From these Northern Finnish regions, in the end of the Bronze Age or at the latest in the beginning of the Pre-Roman Iron Age (about 500 B.C.), there was a strong expansion of the Sámi areas to the west and the south-west, judging from
the finds all the way to the regions of the Ume River, but probably even further to the south. (Hallström 1929:88; my translation)

Hallström maintained the view on the late immigration of the Sámi through his later works (e.g. 1942:210f.): “It is my belief that this population [that according to him had immigrated to northernmost Sweden from the east in the Pre-Roman Iron Age; my comment] were the Lapps” (ibid.; my translation). He considered it possible that the forest reindeer, because of the climate deterioration in the Pre-Roman Iron Age, were forced to migrate to the west and the south and that the Sámi as reindeer hunters had followed after the reindeer.

The idea of the immigration was still used in the work by Evert Baudou, published as late as in 1974, called “Samernas invandring till Sverige ur arkeologisk synpunkt” (“The immigration of the Sámi to Sweden from an archaeological point of view”; Baudou 1974). In this work, Baudou based his treatment of the subject on the findings of the large-scale investigations in connection with the exploitation of the rivers in northern Sweden, which at that time was being analyzed within the multidisciplinary project “Norrlands tidiga bebyggelse” (“Early Norrland”). As mentioned above, one of the main questions for the project was to investigate when the Sámi culture had come to Sweden and how it had spread (ibid.:30; cf. Biörnstad & Baudou 1968:180).

Baudou’s starting point was to determine the time of the immigration – that an immigration actually had taken place in reality was more or less taken for granted – and he examined the different alternatives. He admitted that the exact time for the immigration could not be established yet; the prehistory in Norrland was very complex, and many more studies were needed (ibid.:45). Nevertheless, he concluded the following in his study:

> In my opinion, the most probable hypothesis, based on the archaeological findings, is that the ancestors of the Sámi immigrated to Norrland during the period 1800–500 B.C., and that their connections with the east are also indicated in the finds from the period 500 B.C.–500 A.D. (Baudou 1974:43; my translation)

Although the immigration approach was the most dominant one in archaeological research until the 1980s, other perspectives were also suggested by some researchers in the 1940s-1960s. For instance, the archaeologist O.B. Santesson suggested that the Sámi had lived in Norrland already during the Stone Age. He expressed this view in his work on the so-called T-shaped slate tools from the Neolithic in northern Sweden, which he considered to be “magical tools” and possible prototypes for the Y-shaped hammer of antler used for beating the Sámi drums: “As the Lapps still inhabit the area up there, it is most likely that the unknown (främmande) slate people actually were Sámi. It is, however, not impossible that they were Ur-Finns or some other people” (Santesson 1941:28f.; my translation).
The perspective on the Sámi as the first inhabitants of northern Sweden was further supported by Ernst Manker, the well-known lappologist at Nordiska Museet in Stockholm. In 1951, in a short exposition over theories of the origin of the Sámi people, he put forth the idea that the earliest human migration into northern Sweden came from the northeast, as the so-called proto-Sámi people followed herds of wild reindeer in the early postglacial period (Manker 1951:229). In later works, he still adhered to the same view. He interpreted the new archaeological findings from the surveys of the National Heritage Board and the investigations carried out by the Nordiska Museet as showing that there was a much stronger continuity from the Stone Age to the Iron Age than what had earlier been assumed. In his view, this new knowledge further supported the view of a northern prehistory without any large discontinuities and immigrations (Manker 1960:289ff.).

In the words of the archaeologist Hans Christiansson (1916–2001), it was probable that the same “tribe” has lived in northern Scandinavia throughout prehistory since the earliest settlement, but with a constant influx of influences and people, from the south as well as the east. He saw no reason to assume any later large-scale immigration of people or change of population in the area. Christiansson also stressed the enormous geographical size of Sápmi (Samelandet) and its great internal variation. In his view, migrations should reasonably have taken place also within this large region (Christiansson 1969a; cf. also the same basic message in 1980:157). In 1961, Christiansson had stressed that the question about when the Sámi had come to Norrland, despite all of the discussions, remained unsolved and that most of the sameteorier that had been suggested earlier were not properly substantiated but relied mainly on pure hypotheses (1961:176ff.).

However, the idea of the Sámi people as a group of relatively late immigrants to Sweden is by no means dead today. Among the public, one can still often hear the question: “When did the Sámi come to Sweden?”. It is also common to claim or suggest that the Sámi have lived in Sweden from a certain period in time, thereby implying an immigration. As one example Dagens Nyheter, which is one of the largest daily national newspapers in Sweden, on the Sámi national day in February 2004, chose to state in an article that the Sámi had lived in northern Scandinavia since the first centuries A.D., without problematizing the question in any way (Larsson Meyer 2004). One of the most common questions from non-academics, especially older people, that I have met since I started with my dissertation project is precisely that one: “But when did the Sámi actually immigrate to Sweden?”, or alternatively: “Do scientists know from where the Sámi have come to Sweden?”. This is obviously a perspective that many people in Sweden have internalized, most probably due to what they once upon a time have learned in school, and as a result of the attitudes towards the Sámi people in scientific and popular scientific publications over the years.
The contemporary version of the view that the Sámi should be seen as the descendants of the first inhabitants in Sápmi after the last glacial period could be exemplified with the following citation from the foreword by the archaeologist Inga-Maria Mulk in the booklet *Laponia – Lapplands världsarv* (‘Laponia – the Lapland World Heritage’), referring to the Laponian area in the county of Norrbotten:

The Sámi have lived in the area for thousands of years and have gained their subsistence from reindeer herding, hunting and fishing. The first people settled here at the same time as the inland ice sheet melted away some 10,000 years ago. They followed the edges of the ice sheet and immigrated from different directions. No one knows for certain exactly where they came from, how they looked and what language they spoke. According to new findings maybe all in northern Europe spoke an early form of a Finno-Ugric language. No matter what we call the people who lived here during the Stone Age, they are the forefathers of today’s Sámi. (Mulk 2000:5; my translation)

One important basic fact, which should not be forgotten in these discussions, is that all the people living on the North Calotte are descendants from some immigrants, as all of the region was populated by people moving in, from different places at different times, after the inland ice sheet had melted away. However, the idea of the *first people* is still very strong and has, as we have seen, been much debated – and this debates continues. Being *first* is still invested with much value and importance, which is obvious in many of the contemporary conflicts over land and cultural rights.

The debates from the 1980s: the emergence of Sámi ethnicity

In the early 1980s, there was a major change in the tradition of studying the Sámi past. This change took place in connection with the Sámi ethnic and cultural revival, which was most clearly manifested through the Alta conflict in the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s in Norway, and its multifaceted aftermath. The focus was shifted from the questions of when and from where the Sámi had immigrated to questions about how, when and why a Sámi ethnicity was formed. In many ways, the 1980s stand out as a turning point in the archaeological approaches to Sámi history. Once again, it was the origin of the Sámi people that from the beginning occupied the central place in the renewed discussions on the Sámi past. The renewed debates evolved at first among archaeologists in Norway, but spread after some time also to Sweden.

The archaeologist Povl Simonsen in Tromsø was one of the first who systematically criticized the immigration paradigm. In 1975, Simonsen wrote that the old question “When did the Sámi immigrate?” was not possible to answer, as it was wrongly posed in the first place: “The Sámi did not immigrate, but through a process which stretched over at least 4,000 years, a population emerged in the central areas of the North Calotte which some 2,000 years ago
appeared as the first Sámi” (Simonsen 1975:506; my translation). At the same time, he also cautioned against too simplified understandings of such a very long process (ibid.:506ff.).

In 1983, the book *Finner og terfinner* (‘Finns and Terfinns’) by the anthropologist and archaeologist Knut Odner (1924–2008) was published in Norway. The book attracted a lot of attention and it became very influential, but also criticized, in much a focal point in the following discussions. It raised many important, and difficult, questions, which were to inspire many of the studies on the prehistory of the Sámi that followed. In *Finner og terfinner*, Odner presented several hypotheses about how and why Sámi ethnicity evolved and how it was maintained through interaction with other ethnic groups (1983; cf. also 1985, 1992). Odner was inspired by Barth’s instrumentalist views on ethnicity (see chapter 1), ideas that would become very influential in the discussions on Sámi ethnicity in the 1980s. According to Odner, the vocabulary and the loan-words in (hypothetical) Proto-Sámi indicated that the Sámi developed as an ethnic group specialized in hunting in the early Iron Age, around 1 A.D., in relation and opposition to the Finns who were mainly farmers, probably in the area of the Finnish Bay. Sámi ethnicity was adopted by several different, earlier separate groups of people and gradually spread over the area that has been settled by the Sámi in historical times, and was continually maintained by interactions with Finnish and Germanic groups. Odner stressed that the content of the interethnic relationships changed over time. After A.D. 1600, the Scandinavian states and the majority populations start to exert a stronger economic, political and religious pressure on the Sámi communities, and stronger material symbols of Sámi ethnicity developed as a result of the situation of stress during that time. Ethnicity, according to Odner, could be understood as an informal organization which, with the help of different symbols, established and maintained a common social and cultural form. Furthermore, ethnicity constituted an important principle for the organization of relations, not least economic relations, between different groups (Odner 1983, 1985).

The methods used by Odner and his hypotheses on when and how Sámi ethnicity was developed were at the time criticized on many points by several researchers. In 1985, Odner presented his hypotheses in an article in *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, which was followed by comments by different researchers. For instance, the linguist Knut Bergsland criticized Odner’s use of linguistic methods, which he considered to be incorrect and unreliable (Bergsland 1985). Odner was also criticized by Inger Zachrisson for his assertion that it was unlikely that there had existed a Sámi population in the Viking Age and Early Medieval Period in the provinces of Jämtland and Härjedalen in Sweden and the adjacent areas on the Norwegian side of the border, and that the Sámi population would have expanded to the south only after the Black Death in the end of the 14th century (Zachrisson 1985a). In her opinion, this idea was not supported by the archaeological and historical material, which indicated a more
ancient Sámi presence in these areas, and also in areas even further to the south in Central Sweden (see the discussion on South Sámi prehistory below).

In a response to the article by Odner, Bjørnar Olsen also presented a critique of Odner’s hypotheses on the emergence of a Sámi ethnicity (Olsen 1985). Olsen criticized Odner’s linguistic interpretations, as well as his use of the archaeological material which was, in his view, not in line with new research results. Furthermore, he questioned Odner’s focus on economic reasons (competition for resources leading to economic differentiation and specialization) behind the process of ethnic categorization. In the response, Olsen also put forth his own idea about the emergence and development of the Sámi ethnicity (Olsen 1985:16f.). In his view, ethnic processes leading to the formation of Sámi ethnicity among hunter-gatherer groups in Northern Fennoscandia had developed already during the Bronze Age and the Pre-Roman Iron Age. In this theory, the contacts between hunter-gatherer groups in Northern Fennoscandia and communities in central and eastern Russia, as evidenced by finds of metal objects (such as the so-called Ananino celts), played an important role. During this time period, there existed a relatively homogeneous ceramic tradition in Northern Fennoscandia, the so-called asbestos-tempered ceramics (cf. also Carpelan 1979; Jørgensen & Olsen 1988; Forsberg 1996), in which there were some eastern stylistic traits, such as the textile impressions. The ceramics and the metal finds were seen, by Olsen, as indications of a context of interaction, similar to the ones described by Odner. The asbestos-tempered ceramics developed, according to Olsen, into an ethnic expression, or symbol, for the hunter-gatherer societies (Olsen 1985).

In the 1980s, Evert Baudou re-entered the debate, with a partly new perspective. Now Baudou criticized his own article from 1974 where he had argued for the probability of an immigration of the Sámi people to Norrland between 1800–500 B.C. (see above). In the earlier work, he had not at all defined the concept of ethnicity and a far too diffusionist view had been applied (Baudou 1988:9). Instead, inspired by the work of Frederik Barth on ethnic groups and boundaries (1969), and the discussions in Norway following Knut Odner’s book (1983), Baudou developed a hypothesis about the emergence of an early Sámi and an early Germanic ethnicity in northern Sweden in the first millennium B.C., and the development of a cultural border between Upper Norrland and Middle Norrland, which he considered to have had an ethnic significance (see e.g. Baudou 1988, 1989a, 1989b, 1990, 1995; fig. 9):

It is not possible to explain in detail how the ethnic changes have taken place in Norrland. But I hold it to be a very probable hypothesis that an ethnic categorization has taken place in Norrland during the first millennium B.C. and that this is related to circumstances in historical times. The categorization implies the development of an early Sámi ethnicity in Northern Norrland and an early Germanic ethnicity in Middle Norrland and Southern Norrland. (Baudou 1988:13; my translation)
According to Baudou, in the Late Neolithic and the Bronze Age there were two large cultural areas in the Nordic countries, one in northern Fennoscandia with connections to the east and one in southern Scandinavia with relations to central and western Europe (Baudou 1989a). During the Early Bronze Age all of Norrland belonged to the northern area. However, from around 800 B.C. there is a division between Upper Norrland and Middle Norrland; a cultural border was formed through the northern parts of the provinces of Ångermanland and Jämtland (Baudou 1995:104ff.). The area to the south of the border is directed more towards the south, i.e. Middle Sweden, while the area to the north of the border is more connected towards the east. The border would have been relatively stable from c. 800 B.C. up to the Middle Ages. He stressed that the early Sámi and Germanic ethnicities in Norrland are not the same as today, but that the two populations have gradually “continued” into the historically known groups. Baudou also suggested that the genetical ancestors of the Sámi might have lived in the same area in Northern Norrland, but that they were not the ethnic ancestors of the Sámi (Baudou 1988:9ff.).

The hypothesis of Baudou was in part based on the distribution of the Säräisniemi-2 ceramic ware and so-called Ananino bronze axes and moulds (Baudou 1989b; cf. Bakka 1976; fig. 10). Baudou interpreted this border as an ethnic border: north of the border an early Sámi ethnicity developed, while an early Germanic identity was formed south of the border (Baudou 1989a, 1995:110ff.). According to Baudou, this border formation might have emerged as the result of situation of stress in the meeting zone of cultural and economic influences from centers in southern Scandinavia and centers in the east, especially the so-called Ananino culture in the Volga-Kama region in Russia.
(Baudou 1989a). Here, he referred to the theory of Ian Hodder on the importance of situations of stress for the formation of ethnicity and borders between groups of people (cf. Hodder 1979; Baudou 1989a:179, 1994:19). The idea of increased contacts with areas to the east in present-day Russia, as proposed by Baudou, can be compared with the work of Eva Hjärthner-Holdar who has discussed an increase in eastern contacts from around 1000 B.C. in eastern Middle Sweden (Hjärthner-Holdar 1998). Although the eastern contacts were inscribed with central importance in the theories on the emergence of an early Sámi ethnicity, very little was actually said about the eastern contexts, or what kind of scientific construction that the often referred to Ananino culture represented (for an overview of the study of the Ananino cultural group, see Kuzminych 2000a; cf. also Koryakova & Epimakhov 2007:252ff.). Furthermore, there was an apparent lack of any deeper discussions on how the contacts would have functioned in the prehistoric communities. This case illustrates the difficulties of accessing information about archaeological remains as well as the classification and categorization systems in Russia, which prevailed in the 1980s and still exist to a certain degree. The idea of the asbestos-tempered ware as an ethnic symbol, which would have in some way “united” this enormous geographical area, has also been discussed and criticized by several other archaeologists (e.g. Forsberg 1996; Bergman 1998; Bolin 1999).

![Figure 10. Decoration and vessel shapes of asbestos-tempered ware. The ceramics has played an important role in the discussions on ethnic processes in Northern Fennoscandia in the first millennium B.C. and the first centuries A.D., for instance by Evert Baudou and Bjørnar Olsen. Picture from Hulthén 1991:43.](image-url)
In the 1980s, not only archaeologists discussed the origin of the Sámi population and put forth theories on the subject. According to the theory proposed by the ethnologist Phebe Fjellström in her monograph *Samernas samhälle i tradition och nutid* (‘Sámi society in tradition and in the present day’; 1985), the Sámi population “originally” consisted of two different population groups, one western group, living in the inner parts of Swedish Lapland and the northernmost part of Ångermanland, who spoke a language unknown today (“proto-Lappish”) and another eastern population group, which after about 2000 B.C. arrived in Sweden from some eastern area. Fjellström called the eastern group the “asbestos people”, who according to her probably brought with them an ancient Finno-Ugric language: “With the merging of the two groups, the Sámi people emerge on the scene of history” (Fjellström 1985:140; my translation).

After the 1980s, discussions on the origin of the Sámi population have continued. However, the available archaeological source material and other information on the prehistoric period, from scientific analyses of different kinds, on the North Calotte have increased very much since the beginning of the 1980s. Any theories on the prehistory of the Sámi must now take into consideration a much larger and much more complex source material than earlier. One very important new dimension in the recent discussions derives from the development of population genetics and DNA-analyses. Not surprisingly, many geneticists have shown a great interest in the Sámi people with its “mysterious” and “unsolved” origin. In this way, the Sámi continue to be distinguished through their origin in the 21th century.

**Sámi languages and Sámi origins**

Language and ethnicity is a pair of concepts with a deep but somewhat troubled relationship. It has often been assumed that language and ethnicity go very closely together, even that they are the same, but the complexity of the relationship has also been emphasized by many researchers. For a long time, scholars in linguistics have been preoccupied with the search for Sámi origins, and the relationship between the Sámi and other peoples, first of all Finno-Ugric and Uralic peoples. In this section, I will examine some of the lines of thought that have been derived from linguistics, or put forth by linguists, on the question of the origin of the Sámi. The Finno-Ugric scholarship, and Sámi historical linguistics, is indeed a vast and complex field, and the aim here is of course not to review all of the contributions to this theme, but rather to present some angles on the complex relationship between origins and language.

Linguistic data has very often been used in theories about the origin of the Sámi which have been presented by archaeologists, for instance by Knut
Odner, a case which has already been discussed above (Odner 1983; cf. also Fjellström 1985:112ff.; Sammallahti 1989).

There is a lively research tradition of Finno-Ugric, and Uralic, historical and comparative linguistics. In this research field, many studies have been devoted to questions about the development of and relationships between different Finno-Ugric languages, including the history of the Sámi language(s). Many different theories on the origin of the Uralic peoples and the location of their assumed ancestral homeland have been suggested and debated since the 19th century (cf. Nanovfszky 2004). The origin of the peoples and the origin of the languages have often been discussed within the same framework of analysis, as two sides of the same coin.

In the Nordic countries, this field of research has been most active in Finland (for instance, on early contacts between Uralic and Indo-European, see contributions in Carpelan et al. 2001; cf. also Saarikivi 2006 on Finno-Ugrian substrate in northern Russian dialects). In Finnish research, there has been a trend to find a synthesis of the results of archaeology and comparative linguistics. Often language, ethnicity (sometimes also genetics) and archaeological cultures (commonly based on ceramic styles) are interconnected in various ways, creating prehistoric entities, which in turn become historical actors. However, there is no clear consensus among researchers on many of the central issues.

In Finland, the question of the origin of the Sámi is further complicated as it is closely intertwined with the question of the origin of the Finns (Nuñez 2000; Vilkuna 2001). In the archaeological research in Finland, the theme of eastern contacts has been of great importance, not least with regard to the identity and origin of the Finnish population. It was recognized, already during the early 18th century, that the Sámi and Finnish languages were related to the Finno-Ugric and Samoyed languages in present-day Russia (Larsson 1996; Vilkuna 2001). In the 19th century and in the early 20th century, several Finnish archaeologists conducted field-work and studied collections of artifacts in Russia and Siberia, in the search for the Finno-Ugric homeland and a Finnish national identity (Fewster 1999, 2006; Salminen 2003a, 2003b, 2006, 2007).

The archaeologist Milton Nuñez has discussed the settlement of Finland after the Ice Age, and also earlier research on the origin of the Finns (Nuñez 1987, 1989, 2000). According to Nuñez, it is possible to place the theories about the origin of the Finns in one of two major groups:

1. Those that see the Finns and/or FU [Finno-Ugric] language arriving in Finland 1200-6000 years ago. They generally rely on the concepts of the FU family trees, ancestral homelands and migrations, though other spread mechanisms have been suggested lately.
2. Models that see the ancestors of the Finns, possibly already speaking dialects that eventually evolved into the modern Finnish and Saami, occupying the country as it was being liberated from the Scandinavian icesheet some 10000 years ago. (Nuñez 2000:61)
One of the central problems has been to determine the character of the relationship between the Sámi languages and the other Finno-Ugric (especially Baltic-Finnic) languages, and the importance of this relationship for the interpretation of the origin and ethnohistory of the Sámi people. Two “theories”, one stressing the non-Finno-Ugric origin of the Proto-Sámi, the other on the contrary stressing a Finno-Ugric origin, can be distinguished (Kert 2003:43ff).

The Finnish archaeologist Christian Carpelan has discussed the origin of the Sámi people, using archaeological, linguistic and genetical data, and has constructed and presented theories on Sámi ethnohistory in several works (e.g. Carpelan 1975, 1993, 2003, 2005, 2006; Carpelan & Parpola 2001).

According to some researchers, it is probable that the Sámi languages of today stem from a Proto-Sámi language, which descended from a Finnic-Sámi, or Early Proto-Finnic, stage, and further back to an Ur-Sprache, the so-called Proto-Uralic, from which all present-day Uralic languages have developed. To date these different language phases has naturally been a very difficult task, and has relied to a large part of archaeological evidence for cultural change and external influences. Some estimates by researchers in historical comparative linguists have been that Proto-Uralic emerged about 8000–6000 years ago, and Proto-Sámi during the first millennium B.C. (see Carpelan 2005).

In an article from 2003, Carpelan suggests a division of the prehistory and early history of the process leading to Sámi cultural identity into five stages. This division is based in part on his interpretations of linguistic data. The five stages that he suggests, and he stresses that these are overlapping chronologically to a certain extent, are the following: the Archaic era c. 7900–3600 B.C., the Formative era c. 3900–1800 B.C., the Proto-Sámi era c. 1900 B.C.–300 A.D., the Early Sámi era c. 250–1300 A.D., and finally the Sámi era about 800/1300 A.D. to the present times (Carpelan 2003:22ff.).

The linguist Ante Aikio has criticized the earlier attempts to connect different archaeological cultures from before the Early Iron Age with Sámi ethnicity and language, and has presented an alternative model of interpretation based on results from comparative linguistics (Aikio 2004a, 2004b, 2006). Aikio argues that the loanword strata in the Sámi languages do not conform to the idea of a long Sámi ethnic continuity in Lapland. In his view, the evidence suggests that the Proto-Sámi language and Sámi ethnic identity first emerged at more southern latitudes and did not spread to the present area until the Early Iron Age (cf. also the theories of K.B. Wiklund on the language change of the “Proto-Lapp” population in the area north of the Karelian Isthmus and Lake Ladoga; cf. Wiklund 1932, and above). Thus, Aikio concludes that any archaeological culture in Lapland before the Iron Age would be best characterized as non-Sámi (Aikio 2004b).

Aikio criticizes the theory of the spread of an earlier predecessor of the Sámi languages in the area from southern Finland to Northern Fennoscandia which has been connected with the distribution of asbestos-tempered ceramics (see
above), as this theory, in his view, does not correspond with the linguistic chronology of the later spread and divergence of the Sámi languages (Aikio 2003). However, he also adds that in order to understand the prehistory of the Sámi: “one must recognise that, while the origin of Sámi languages ultimately lies somewhere around and beyond Lake Onega, the Sámi people genetically descend, to a large extent, from the peoples who first colonized Lapland at the end of the Last Ice Age some 11,000 years ago” (ibid.:40). Thus, Aikio emphasizes language shifts in prehistory, and he concludes: “The main question that scholars in the field will have to tackle in the future is the following: when and why did the Sámi people come to speak Sámi, a language that ultimately originated far to the south and east of present-day Sápmi?” (ibid.).

Genes, origins and ethnicity

Another research field, which has grown in recent years with the advances and increasing interest in genetics, is the study of population genetics and the movement and interaction of “peoples” in prehistoric times (see e.g. Renfrew & Boyle 2000). Here, the concept of origin is very central, as well as the concept of authenticity, and many questions on the delimiting of people and culture are brought to the fore.

In such genetic studies, the history of certain genes and mutations is investigated. There are obvious problems with transferring the interpretations from the level of molecules to the level of peoples and ethnic and linguistic groups. The time frame is also an issue that may cause confusions between experts on natural sciences and experts on human and social sciences. Still, this is a research field under strong development, which interests many archaeologists and which undoubtedly will affect archaeological research considerably in the future, also concerning Sámi prehistory.

From the 1950s, a large number of studies have been devoted to different kinds of genetic markers in the Sámi population, such as blood groups and enzyme groups. Most of these studies showed a greater difference between the Sámi and the Swedish population and a higher similarity with the Finnish population (Johansson 2006:13). From the mid-1990s, several studies based on mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) have been initiated, often with the express aim to understand the origin and the position of the Sámi people.

One of the most central researchers in the early genetic studies of the Sámi has been Lars Beckman, who has discussed Sámi physical anthropology and genetic history in a number of publications (e.g. Beckman 1964, 1979, 1994, 1996). Sámi genetical history has also been treated by several other researchers (see e.g. Niskanen 2002; Sajantila 2003; Tambets et al. 2004; Johansson 2006; Ingman & Gyllensten 2007). As many other researchers, the famous geneticist Luigi Luca Cavalli-Sforza has written about the place of the Sámi people in relation to the European peoples:
The Saami are genetically European, but they also have affinities with non-Europeans, probably as a result of their trans-Uralic origins. Their European genetic resemblance suggests that their Uralic origins are partly masked by admixture with North Europeans, or vice versa. In any case, the European genetic element predominates. Other European Uralic speakers (e.g., Finns and Estonians) appear almost entirely European genetically. (Cavalli-Sforza 2001:116)

In an article by Tambets et al. (2004), the result of a large-scale research project on the Sámi genetic heritage is presented. Maternally inherited mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) as well as paternally inherited Y-chromosomal variations were used in the study. Samples from the Sámi population were compared with samples from populations in Europe and Siberia. In this study, it was found that the origin of two of the predominant Sámi mtDNA haplogroups, U5b1b and V, was most likely in western Europe, rather than in eastern Europe. Another haplogroup, H1, found among the Sámi was virtually absent in Samoyed and Ob-Ugrian populations, but present in western and central European populations. According to the authors, the Y-chromosomal variety of the Sámi also pointed to a European ancestry. They suggest that the large genetic separation of the Sámi population from other European population groups might be best explained by assuming that the Sámi are descendants of a narrow, distinctive subset of Europeans (ibid.).

We conclude that the phylogeography of mtDNA and Y-chromosome variants that correspond to the maternal and paternal gene pools of the Saami does not provide any evidence for the Saami population arising among the northernmost Uralic-speaking populations – Siberian Ugric and Samoyedic speakers – or among any other aboriginal Siberians. The Samoyeds are the least genetically close to the Sámi among the people of the Uralic language family, whereas nearly all of the mtDNA and Y-chromosomal heritage of the Sámi can be adequately explained within the European pools of the two haploid genetic systems. (Tambets et al. 2004:677f.)

According to the authors (there are in total 46 authors of the article), this reconstruction corresponds with the spread of Ahrensburgian and Swiderian Mesolithic technologies in northern Europe, which might be linked with the post-Last Glacial Maximum colonization of the northern parts of Europe (Tambets et al. 2004:678).

In many studies on the genetical history of today’s ethnic groups, there is a display of examples on what could be called a simplified understanding of the notion of origin. There are reasons to question the cultural concepts used and the understanding of the social and cultural processes of ethnicity in many of the studies, which are performed by experts in the natural sciences. There is generally a lack of further discussions on the historical significance of the results of the genetic studies and, unfortunately, several examples of very simplified conclusions on ethnic groups and ethnic processes in history.
In the book *DNA, etnicitet, folk och folkvandringar* (‘DNA, ethnicity, peoples and migrations’), the archaeologist Stig Welinder discusses archaeogenetics and presents a criticism of the applications of genetical methods on archaeological studies and not least of the understanding of culture and ethnicity among researchers interested in historical genetics, as it is expressed in many of the studies (Welinder 2003; cf. Renfrew & Boyle 2000).

In the article “Genetiken går vilse i kulturen” (‘Genetics go astray in culture’; Larsson 2009), the archaeologist Åsa Larsson critically examines the use of historical and cultural concepts in genetical research. According to Larsson, cultural concepts that have been created by archaeologists for the purpose of structuring the archaeological material are often used in a very uncritical way by geneticists and other natural scientists. For instance, a human skeleton originating from the Stone Age can be proclaimed to belong to the people of the *trättbägarkultur* (‘Funnel-beaker culture’), which in fact is a pure archaeological construct – there was never a *trättbägarkultur* people. Furthermore, natural scientists too often are unaware of recent archaeological research and base their conclusions on outdated archaeological conceptions. In this way, physical and cultural relationships are mixed-up and archaeological concepts receive a new meaning that the archaeologists had not intended.

An additional problematic issue that I would like to mention here concerns the selection of individuals who are supposed to represent the various peoples involved in the research scheme (who is an authentic Nenets or Sámi?), as well as the selection of genes (which gene is specific for the authentic Nenets or Sámi people?) – and furthermore how the researchers cope with specimens that do not conform with the scheme (what about the Nenets or Sámi individuals who do not fit the standards?). In my mind, these are issues which should be seriously addressed, and not least importantly explained to the non-initiated public. Otherwise, there is a great risk that the research results might be misunderstood and mis-represented, in the mass media as well as by other researchers.

Sámi perspectives?

No one has heard that the Lapps would have come here from any other place. The Lapp has been an ancient inhabitant everywhere here in Lapland, and when the Lapp in the olden days lived here along the shore of the sea, there were not any other settler by the sea shore, and in those times the Lapps lived well. And the Lapps in former times have lived everywhere on the Swedish side. In those days there were no farmers anywhere: the Lapps did not know of any other people than themselves. (Turi 1987 [1910/1917]:5; my translation)

Johan Turi (1854–1936), the author of the text cited above from the book *Muittalus samid birra: En bok om samernas liv*, expresses a Sámi perspective on the question of the origins. In the previous sections in this chapter, I have
examined the changing views on the question of the origin of the Sámi. To conclude this examination, I will present some notes on Sámi oral traditions relating to origins.

There are some oral traditions about the origin of the Sámi that have been recorded in different places and from different time periods. It is important to note that the histories told by Sámi people have been transferred by other narrators, with their own pre-conceptions, interests and agendas. The oldest sources, from the 17th and 18th centuries, were compiled by missionaries and clergymen who had been sent out into the Sámi lands by the church and the state with the intention to convert the Sámi to Christianity and to combat and conquer what was at that time considered to be heathen beliefs and practices. It is also important to consider the situations in which the narratives were recorded, who the informants were, etc. Thus, there are many troublesome questions about the representativity and contexts of the narratives, but it is nonetheless important to present some of the sources in this context.

The missionary and vicar in the parish of Gällivare in northern Sweden Pehr Högström (1714–1784) wrote in the 1740s that “some Saami state that their ancestors in the old days owned all Sweden; but that our [‘Swedish’] forefathers have conquered them and reduced them more and more” (Högström 1980 [1747]:39; translation from Zachrisson 1997b:371):

Saami and Swedes were one people from the beginning, brothers; but a violent storm grew and one of them got afraid and tried to hide under a board. His offspring became Swedes, and God turned the board into a house. But the other, who was more fearless and did not want to flee, became the ancestor of the Saami, who still live under the open sky. (Högström 1980 [1747]:48; translation from Zachrisson 1997b:371)

Knud Leem (1696/97–1774), professor of Sámi language at the Seminarium Lapponicum in Trondheim in Norway, told in his work Beskrivelse over Finnmarkens Lapper (‘Description of the Lapps in Finnmark’) published in the 1760s that the Sámi themselves claimed that they were the first inhabitants of Scandinavia, who had been pushed further to the north by other people who had arrived later (Leem 1975 [1767]:3, note 2; after Zachrisson 1997b:372).

According to the Russian anthropologist N.N. Volkov, in Kola Sámi oral tradition, there are no stories about any migration of the Sámi people to the Kola Peninsula from any other place (Volkov 1996 [1946]:113). Volkov himself considered the earlier migration theories to be false and unsupported by the factual material. He was convinced that the Sámi is an autochthonous people:

In conclusion, we have to state that the migration theories (in which Sami were called “the recent exiles to the North”) are in contradiction with the facts. Even if the owners of the rock paintings, settlements, and burial places were not the direct ancestors of contemporary Sami, they were still ethnically close. Sami
culture has to be identified as the remnants of the ancient culture of the people from Eastern European forest shelter-belts. (Volkov 1996 [1946]:117)

In the ethnographic records there are also some examples of myths and narratives of descent and origin among Sámi groups (see e.g. Drake 1918:306). One example is the Mjanndasj myth, which has been recorded among Kola Sámi groups (Tjarnoluski 1962, 1993; cf. Sergejeva 2000b:174f.). One should also mention the poetry of Anders Fjellner (1795–1876) about the “Sons of the Sun” (see Lundmark 1979).

South Sámi prehistory – contested archaeology

Since 1970, I have worked with Sámi archaeological material, at first from an undisputed Sámi region – in Sweden, that means the area north of the Ångerman River. However, in 1984 I managed to demonstrate the existence of a Sámi burial field from the 11th–12th centuries much further south, at Vivallen in the northwestern part of the province of Härjedalen (excavated in 1913). In doing so, I upset the research community. (Zachrisson 1991:9; my translation)

One especially controversial field of study has been the South Sámi area in central Sweden. The South Sámi area is located closer to the Swedish “heartland” than northern Sápmi, and therefore, perhaps, closer to the border between what-is-considered-Swedish and what-is-considered-Sámi. In the citation above from the year 1991, the archaeologist Inger Zachrisson expresses her experiences from the study and active promotion of South Sámi prehistory. Zachrisson is the archaeologist who has been most active in the study of South Sámi archaeology in Sweden, with many publications, and who has in many ways personified the struggle for an academic acceptance of South Sámi prehistory.

The situation is of similar character also in the western part of the South Sámi area, which is today located on Norwegian territory. While the study of a Sámi prehistory in northern Norway, as has been discussed above, became an accepted field of archaeological study (a respectable field; cf. Olsen 2004), this was not the case with South Sámi prehistory in Norway (Hesjedal 2001:225ff.). Furthermore, among researchers working with Sámi (pre)history, the northern and eastern Sámi area has often been viewed as the central Sámi area, from where different elements of culture and language have spread (cf. Bergstol 2007:19).

There have also been discussions on Sámi influences yet farther south in Sweden, and contacts between Sámi and Norse/Germanic cultures. For instance, Inger Zachrisson has argued for the presence of Sámi influence/population in the northern part of the county of Uppland. As an example, in many of the boat graves from the Vendel Period (c. 600–800 A.D.)
in the county of Uppland there are finds of birch bark. In some of the famous boat graves from Vendel and Valsgärde in Uppland, long “mats” of birch bark in several layers sewn together, covering the burials, have been preserved. Zachrisson has interpreted these as being “Sámi” (Zachrisson 2001). Some DNA-analyses from Uppland, possibly (but problematically) indicating Sámi presence in the region in the Iron Age, have also been discussed in this context (see Price 2002a:237).

In the 1987 issue of *Bebyggelsehistorisk tidskrift* (‘Journal of Settlement History’), Evert Baudou and Inger Zachrisson, among others, debated the character of the ethnic groups in Middle Norrland (Baudou 1988; Zachrisson 1988). In the 1990s and the early 2000s, Baudou and Zachrisson met in the court rooms, as expert witnesses for the two parties, in the so-called *sedvanerättsprocessen* or the reindeer grazing case in Härjedalen (see below). The discussion between the two archaeologists has also continued after that period (see Baudou 2002, 2004b; Zachrisson 2004b; cf. also von Stedingk & Baudou 2006).

Here, I will discuss some of the issues and places that have been in the center of the controversies. The case of South Sámi prehistory is important because it involves many contested issues concerning ethnicity and archaeology, but also because it pin-points some of the scientific difficulties of studying Sámi (pre)history. Furthermore, it illustrates the efforts to create spaces for Sámi (pre)history in local as well as academic discourses. As I have
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*Figure 11.* Map of the South Sámi area in Sweden and Norway, with some of the places mentioned in this section. Map by author and Karin Bengtsson.
already implied, the case of South Sámi archaeology also poses many challenging questions about the character of the boundary between “Sámi” and “Swedish” prehistory.

The theory of the late arrival of Sámi groups in the South Sámi area

In the late 19th century, a theory of the late arrival (or “immigration”) of Sámi groups to the contemporary South Sámi area was developed, which fitted well with the new view on the Sámi people as immigrants from the east. A central role was played by the Norwegian historian and geographer Yngvar Nielsen (1843–1916). In 1891, he published an article called “Lapparnes fremrykning mot syd i Trondhjems stift og Hedemarkens amt” (‘The advancement of the Lapps to the south in the diocese of Trondheim and the county of Hedmarken’; Nielsen 1891). In the article he put forth his theory that the Sámi population in the Róros area advanced into this area only in the late 17th or in the 18th century, a theory that has often been named fremrykkningsteorien. He based his theory on the lack of written sources describing an earlier presence of Sámi groups in the region, as well as on the claimed lack of Sámi place names, sacrificial sites and burials, and traditions from pre-Christian times in the area.

Fremrykkningsteorien was for a long time an accepted view on the South Sámi among lappologists and archaeologists (see e.g. Wiklund 1895, 1925, 1928; Brogger 1909; Hallström 1912a:140; Collinder 1932:65; Hvarfner 1962:169f.). According to this view, there simply did not exist any Sámi prehistory in the
present-day South Sámi area, at least not south of Frostviken in northern Jämtland.

However, this theory has been much discussed and criticized in the 20th century, especially since the 1970s (cf. Jünge 1996, 2005). Several researchers, such as the professor in Finno-Ugric languages in Oslo, Knut Bergsland, have objected to the theory (Bergstøl & Reitan 2008:10ff.; Ljungdahl & Aronsson 2008:5). In an article published in 1970, Knut Bergsland claimed that the Sámi had lived further south during the Middle Ages than what was known from later historical times (Bergsland 1970).

Nevertheless, up to recent times, several historians and linguists in Norway and Sweden have supported the theory of the late arrival of the South Sámi groups to their present areas, for instance the Norwegian historians Jørn Sandnes and Kjell Haarstad (see e.g. Sandnes 1973; Haarstad 1981, 1992; cf. also Odner 1983). As another example, the linguist Gösta Berg claimed in 1983 that there was no linguistic proof for a Sámi presence in the mountain areas of Middle and Southern Jämtland or in Härjedalen before the mid-16th century, although he admitted that more thorough research of the Sámi place-names in these areas were needed (Berg 1983).

In the large recently published work Trøndelags historie (‘The History of Trøndelag’), the idea of the fremrykkningsteorien was still put forth as a credible alternative (see Dybdahl & Bull 2005:156ff., 264ff.; cf., however, Alsaker et al. 2005:101ff., with a more nuanced discussion on the concept of ethnicity in the first volume of the ‘History of Trøndelag’). In the second volume of the history book, most of the focus has been on written sources and archaeological remains have been ignored to a large extent. The reason for the lack of sources is described in the following way:

The Sámi lived off hunting, collecting, fishing, reindeer herding and trading and had very simple habitations. They have not affected and changed the natural environment in the same way the farmers have. It is therefore very difficult to trace Sámi settlement sites. The fact that the Sámi were nomads who moved freely across the national boundaries obviously does not make it easier to find their living places. (Dybdahl & Bull 2005:156; my translation)

After its publication, the book has been the object of extensive criticism for the one-handed reliance on the old theory of the late arrival of the Sámi population in the region and the idea of the encroachment of newcomer-Sámi on the farmers’ lands (see Fjellheim 2007:88f.).

On the other hand, there are several recent archaeological studies that have questioned and criticized the theory of the late arrival of the South Sámi population (see e.g. Zachrisson et al. 1997; Aronsson 2004; Bergstol 2008; Bergstol & Reitan 2008; Ljungdahl & Aronsson 2008). According to the researchers involved in these studies, there is a much longer Sámi history and prehistory in Jämtland and Härjedalen and the adjacent areas in Norway and
Sweden than what has been accepted earlier, a history which has been revealed in new archaeological surveys and excavations. They claim that there is, in fact, a substantial amount of archaeological remains that can illuminate the Sámi history in the area. One fundamental point of argument is that the historically known Sámi culture has evolved from the hunter-gatherer culture in the region. It is moreover argued that there has been a lack of knowledge and investigations of the archaeological remains, and the earlier dominant ideas on the ethnic history of the region have contributed to the invisibility of the traces of an old Sámi history.

A large part of the debates in Sweden has concerned the ethnic attribution and meaning of the so-called lake-graves (insjögravar) or hunting-ground graves (fängstmarksgravar) from the Iron Age, and the Viking Age and Early Medieval settlement and burial site at Vivallen in the province of Härjedalen (Zachrisson et al. 1997, 2004a; Price 2000). In the following, I will take a closer look at the archaeological remains and material from these sites. It is this kind of source material that archaeologists work with, and it is in relation to this material that any interpretations of prehistoric ethnic identity in the region must be examined.

Vivallen

The Vivallen settlement and burial site in the county of Härjedalen has been one of the most discussed sites in the South Sámi area. It has been described as a key site for the understanding of South Sámi prehistory; however, its meaning and importance for the larger picture of cultural identities and interethnic relations in the area during the Viking Age and the Early Medieval Period have been much debated.

Figure 13. Map of the location of the Viking Age and Early Medieval settlement and burial sites of Vivallen, in Tännäs parish in the county of Härjedalen. Map by author and Karin Bengtsson.
The site of Vivallen is located in Tännäs parish in northwestern Härjedalen, some five kilometres to the northwest from Funäsdalen at a fäbod site located about 650 meters above sea level (see figs. 13-15; cf. also Sundström 1989). In 1909, the burial ground was accidently discovered and in 1913 the burial ground with 20 graves from the 11th and 12th centuries was excavated by the archaeologist Gustaf Hallström (see Hallström 1944). In line with the prevailing idea of that time (the theory of the late “late immigration” of the South Sámi groups to Jämtland and Härjedalen; see above), the burial ground had been interpreted as Norse, or Swedish.

However, in the beginning of the 1980s, Inger Zachrisson started to look at the material from a new perspective, and was startled by the many similarities of the material found in Vivallen and the material culture from the more northern Sámi areas. In order to do more research on this problem, the Sörsamiska projektet (“South Sámi Project”) was initiated by Inger Zachrisson and the Norwegian archaeologist Guro Syversen, together with the osteologist Elisabeth Iregren and the archaeologist Jan Sundström (see Zachrisson et al. 1997; Zachrisson 2007:138). The project was a collaboration between the Historical Museum in Stockholm, the County Museum of Jämtland in Östersund and Universitetets Oldsaksamling in Oslo.

During the new field-work in the years 1984–86, an earlier unknown settlement site was discovered, located about 70 meters to the northwest of the
burial ground (Zachrisson et al. 1997:117ff.). At the settlement site, remains were found from a káta (a traditional Sámi building) with a rectangular stone-filled hearth of the type usually named “Sámi hearth” (see Hedman 2003), with unburnt reindeer bones, which could be dated to about 800 A.D. Another hearth of a similar type was dated to the 13th century. Bones from reindeer and sheep/goat were found during the excavations. During the field-work, a previously unknown inhumation burial was also discovered and excavated (see Sundström 1989).

At the grave field, in total 21 skeletal graves have been excavated. The corpses were shrouded in birch-bark, a burial custom which is known to have been used by the Sámi in historical times. The grave-goods exhibited the same kind of combination of Sámi, eastern and northwest European artifact types as has been found at the Sámi sacrificial sites in the northern Sámi areas (Zachrisson 1989, 2007:139ff.). One grave that has attracted special attention is the so-called Grave no. 9. This burial contained a skeleton osteologically determined as a male but with grave goods associated with both female and male attributes. The person in the grave has been interpreted as a possible Sámi ritual specialist, a “shaman” or noaidi (Zachrisson 1997a:62; see also Price 2002a:271f., 277f.).

Vivallen has played a central role in the discussions on South Sámi history; not least as a symbol for a historical South Sámi identity, and as a door-opener for South Sámi archaeology. The site has also been debated in the court case concerning the right to reindeer grazing in Härjedalen, which I will discuss later below.

One recent discovery in the adjacent area of Norway is of great importance in this context. In 2006, a Viking Age settlement site with four stone-covered rectangular hearths arranged in a row was discovered by the Lake Aursjøen in the municipality of Lesja in the Dovrefjell area (see Bergstøl 2008:141f.; Bergstøl & Reitan 2008). Each of the four hearths had a larger stone placed at one end of the hearth, which are interpreted by Bergstøl and Reitan as so-called boaššu-stones (a common trait in the traditional Sámi dwellings with great social and religious meaning). In their view, the settlement site with the hearths at Aursjøen possesses all of the central characteristics of the settlement sites with hearths arranged in rows, which exist in large numbers in the whole Sámi area but which have no parallel in the Norse tradition (Bergstøl & Reitan 2008:25). Therefore, Bergstøl and Reitan interpret the remains at Aursjøen as traces of a Sámi settlement, according to the datings from the first half of the Viking Age. The implication of the discovery is not only that the Sámi settlement area in prehistoric times was larger than previously believed, but also that the contacts between the Norse and the Sámi groups probably were quite extensive in the Viking Age. In their view, the conflicts over land rights between farmers and reindeer herders that are known to have existed in the South Sámi area in historical times should not be projected back in time, to periods with as it
seems very different, and probably much more positive and reciprocal, patterns of exchange and interaction (ibid.:27).

The discovery at Aursjøen received a lot of attention in the mass-media in Norway, and it has become a very important eye-opener for archaeologists who do field-work in the surrounding areas: if there is one such Sámi site this far south in Norway, there almost certainly exist other similar sites in the region (Bergstøl pers.com.). It is well-known for any archaeologist that it is extremely difficult to see something which one does not recognize, but when you know what to look for, a new landscape opens up in front of you.

Hunting-ground graves

The so-called hunting-ground graves is nowadays a commonly used collective denomination for several categories of Iron Age graves, mainly within the interior of central and southern Norrland, Dalarna and central eastern Norway, an area that to a large extent coincides with the present-day South Sámi area (fig. 16). It was the archaeologist Martin Gollwitzer who suggested the denomination hunting-ground graves (fångstmarksgravar) as a common category for the lake-graves (insjögravar) or forest graves (skogsgravar) primarily in Jämtland, Härjedalen och Dalarna and the mountain-graves (fjellgraver) in the central mountain areas of Norway, especially Oppland and Hedmark (Gollwitzer 1997:32f.; cf. 2001). Researchers in Norway and Sweden have long recognized certain similarities between the two groups of graves, but partly because of nation-state boundary and its effect on delimiting the scope of research, the graves have been separated into different categories. Gollwitzer argued that the lake-graves and mountain-graves could be seen as variants of the same phenomenon (ibid.).

The category of the lake-graves covers a large geographical area and a long time period. Within the material, it is possible to distinguish at least two different phases, an older group of graves, and a younger one. The older phase, from c. 200 B.C. to 550 A.D., is characterized by stone-settings with varied geometric shapes, circular and triangular, with cremation burials and sometimes with raised stones. The graves are often gathered closely together in grave fields, located on promontories or islands in lakes (Zachrisson 1997a:195ff.). The younger phase, from the Late Iron Age and Early Medieval Period, is less easily defined and consists of primarily round graves, sometimes in the form of mounds with inhumation burials. Birgitta Fossum has discerned three groups: the first from the Pre-Roman Iron Age – Roman Iron Age, which equals the older phase, the second from the Roman Iron Age – Vendel Period, which constitutes a middle group, and the third from the period c. 800–1200 A.D., which equals the younger phase (Fossum 2006:89ff.).

The hunting-ground graves in the province of Dalarna have been discussed by several different researchers (e.g. Hallström 1931, 1945; Serning 1962, 1966:87f.; Zachrisson 2004c). As examples of insjögrävfält in Dalarna, one can
mention the burial field Vindförberg, located on a narrow promontory in the lake Oresjön in Ore parish, the burial ground Getryggen by the lake Amungen on the boundary between Rättvik and Alfta parishes, and the burial ground by Hästnäset on a promontory in the lake Horrmundsjön in Transtrand parish. For Gustaf Hallström, who had registered and excavated several of the burial grounds, it was unthinkable that the “forest barrows” in Dalarna, as he named this group of graves, which were located so relatively close to the central agricultural areas of Dalarna and which showed close contacts in between the two areas, could belong to any other population than the population of the central agricultural area (Hallström 1945).

There are also stone-settings further north in Sweden, in the interior of the Västerbotten and Norrbotten counties, which have been revealed to contain cremation burials and which could be interesting in this connection (Fossum 2006:97ff.). This phenomenon is still not very well-known, although there has been some interesting work done on these remains. One example is a stone-setting on an islet in Lake Uddjaur, Norrbotten county, investigated in 2003 by the Silver Museum in Arjeplog. The burial was C-14 dated to the Roman Iron Age (Liedgren & Johansson 2005). Another interesting cremation burial was discovered at a settlement site in Njallejaur in Östra Kikkejaur, Norrbotten county (Hedman 2003:92ff., 231). The Iron Age burial custom of the interior regions of Norrbotten and Västerbotten is still little known, and the connection with the burial customs in the South Sámi area has not been much discussed.

Here, I will focus mainly on the graves on the Swedish side of the border, which earlier have been named insjögravar, or ‘lake-graves’ in English. The lake-graves have been much debated in Swedish archaeology, and most of the debates have concerned the ethnic belonging of the graves. Many different opinions and theories about the ethnic meaning of the graves have been

Figure 16. The approximate distribution of the co-called hunting-ground graves, also known as lake graves, forest graves or mountain graves, in Norway and Sweden. These graves and burial grounds have been the subject of much discussion among researchers on their ethnic attribution. From Bergstol 1997:89.
presented during the years, from ecological-functionalist as well as constructivist perspectives (see e.g. Selinge 1979; Bolin 2001; von Stedingk & Baudou 2006; Ramqvist 2007:164f.; Welinder 2008). According to Per H. Ramqvist, the fact that settlement sites connected with the graves have not been discovered makes it more or less impossible to determine the ethnicity or cultural identity of the people who constructed the graves (Ramqvist 2007:164). It is no exaggeration to say that for many archaeologists in Sweden the lake-graves have become the most obvious symbol for the complex of problems concerning the relation between Sámi prehistory and Nordic or Germanic prehistory in the Iron Age.

The discussions on the lake-graves have in much been based on different views on the modes of subsistence, and the economic relations, of the population in the interior of central and southern Norrland during the Iron Age. In a recent publication, Evert Baudou and Henrik von Stedingk have questioned the idea that a traditional hunter-gatherer culture existed in the interior of Central Norrland during the Iron Age (2006). The argumentation is in part based on several series of pollen analyses and osteological material from domestic animals, which according to the authors indicate extensive forest grazing in the region. They also see the low-technology iron production as a key element in the economy of the area. Furthermore, they emphasize a common conceptual world reflected in the graves in the coastal area as well as in the interior region (including the so-called hunting-ground graves) – and they conclude that these are all elements of an early capitalistic system that was developing in Central Norrland in the Iron Age (ibid.; cf. also Baudou 2002).

The debates have in much centered on the question if the burial grounds were Sámi, Germanic/Nordic or maybe something else. Behind the original question of determining whether the graves were Sámi or not, there are also some more fundamental and theoretically challenging questions: Is it possible to determine the ethnic belonging of these burial grounds? If so, how would it be determined? And what is actually an ethnic belonging of a burial ground?

![Figure 17. Map of the location of the burial ground Krankmärtenhögen in Storsjö parish in the province of Härjedalen. Map by author and Karin Bengtsson.](image)
In the following text, I will briefly discuss two of the most famous burial grounds, Krankmårtenhögen in the county of Härjedalen, which represents the early category of lake-graves, and Långön in the county of Ångermanland, which represents the later category of lake-graves or hunting-ground graves.

Krankmårtenhögen, a representative of the early group of insjögravfält, is the name of a famous and much discussed burial ground located in a beautiful setting on a ridge by Storsjön (‘Great Lake’) in the county of Härjedalen (see figs. 17-18). The burial ground was excavated in 1964 by the National Heritage Board, as part of the lake regulation investigations in connection with the exploitation of the river systems for hydro electrical power. Among the local population, a legend had been recorded about a Sámi man named Krankmårten, who once upon a time in the past had been laid to rest on this ridge. Krankmårten was actually a historical figure, known from written sources as a wealthy Sámi man, who lived in the 17th century and who owned large lands in the area.

During the excavation on the ridge, some 30 graves were discovered, as well as a Stone Age settlement site and an Iron Age deposit consisting of tools and weapons. The graves were constructed as stone-settings, the majority with a triangular form, some with a round or irregular form. In most of the triangular graves, erected stone slabs marked the corners; in the middle of the graves, there were sometimes flat stone slabs or large round stones. The buried
persons had been cremated, and the burnt bones were in some cases gathered, probably in some kind of box, indicated by findings of resin used for sealing the joints of the boxes. On top of the graves were large deposits of elk and reindeer antlers. On one of the graves, dated to around 175 A.D., remains from at least four individual reindeers and 12 individual elks were found (Zachrisson 1992:24). The C-14 datings indicate that the burial ground was used between 200 B.C. and 200 A.D. (Ambrosiani et al. 1984).

Another burial ground of the older type is the one at Smalnäset, situated in Lake Lossen in Tännäs parish in the province of Härjedalen (see fig. 19). Here, some 35 circular and triangular stone-settings were excavated in 1956 in connection with the damming of the Ljusnan River (see Ambrosiani et al. 1984:9ff.). The graves contained cremation burials of men, women and children and have been dated to about 100 B.C.–100 A.D. On the top of some of the graves, fragments of antlers from elk and reindeer were discovered. The burial ground at Smalnäset is today completely inundated, due to the raising of the water level of the lake.

Evert Baudou has dismissed the connection between Sámi ethnicity and the burial grounds at Krankmårtenhögen and Smalnäset. Instead he has interpreted them as connected with a Germanic culture and ethnicity, in line with his border theory (Baudou 1988:14f.; cf. also 2002, 2004b, above on Sámi origins). The burial ground at Långön (‘Long Island’), in the Hoting Lake, Tåsjö parish, is located in the northwestern part of the county of Ångermanland (see figs. 20-21). On the long and narrow island, archaeologists have found settlement sites from the Mesolithic until at least around B.C./A.D., hunting

![Figure 19. Plan of the burial ground Smalnäset in Lake Lossen in the province of Härjedalen, dated to about 100 B.C.–100 A.D. The burial ground is today completely inundated because of the damming of the lake. From Ambrosiani et al. 1984:9.](image-url)
pits and a burial ground from the 10th–12th centuries, with 11 registered and excavated burial mounds in a row on the southern part of the island, one in the northern part and an additional mound on a cape on the mainland nearby (see Zachrisson 1994c). The graves contained both cremation burials and inhumation burials.

In August 1906, Professor K.B. Wiklund from Uppsala reported that there were several burial mounds at the site, and that finds of charcoal, human bones and some artifacts of slate had been discovered at the site. It was known that many of the graves had earlier been plundered. In the fall of 1906, the archaeologist T.J. Arne excavated some of the graves (Arne 1926). The remaining graves that had not previously been archaeologically investigated were excavated in 1952 (see Hvarfner 1957:39ff.). In some graves were found traces of wooden coffins apparently made of tree trunks with finds of bones, remains of textiles (wool and linen), jewelry, weapons and tools. There were also traces of birch-bark in some of the burials. Among the finds can be mentioned a purse made from the skin of a lizard of the species *Varanus bengalensis* or *Varanus salvator*, which lives on the Indian subcontinent, so-called oriental bronze mountings from the 10th century, annular brooches and six silver coins, some of which had punched triangular suspension holes (a feature that they share with the hundreds of coins found in Sámi sacrificial finds from northern Sweden; Zachrisson 1984:18ff., 1994c; cf. also 2006).

The ethnic belonging of the graves has been much discussed. The grave constructions are of a typical Nordic appearance, while the geographical location in the “hunting-grounds” far from agricultural areas and the composition of the grave goods have been seen as indicating a Sámi origin. The similarities between the grave goods from the Långön burials and the ones at Vivallen (see above) have been pointed out by several researchers. According to local traditions, the burial ground had been constructed by a Sámi population.
(Ambrosiani et al. 1984:63). In the view of T.J. Arne, however, the graves did not belong to a population of Sámi origin:

The population which lived in the Hoting area, appears still at the end of the 11th century to have been pagan or at least not to have had opportunities to bury their dead in consecrated earth. The neighboring province Jämtland would already have been Christianized at that time, if one is to believe the information on the Frösö rune stone.

It is evident from the finds that we are not dealing with a population of Lappish origin, as has been guessed earlier. They were without a doubt Scandinavians. And the culture shows close attachment to the Swedish culture, especially as it was formed in the area by the Baltic Sea. (Arne 1926:101; my translation)

The graves at Långön have been interpreted by Sverker Jansson and Harald Hvarfner as belonging to Nordic new settlers during the colonization of the interior of Middle Norrland (1966:43ff.). Inger Zachrisson has, in opposition to this view, interpreted the burial ground as Sámi, in line with the burial ground at Vivallen (1994c). Ambrosiani et al. indicated that the most probable alternative was that Krankmårtenhögen, Smalnäset and Långön are the burial sites of fångstfolket (the hunter-gatherers) of the forest regions, who could probably be seen as the ancestors of the present-day Sámi (1984:62f.).

Figure 21. The graves on Långön in Lake Hotingsjön in the province of Ångermanland. The burials have been dated to about the 10th–12th centuries. From Hvarfner 1957:41.
Archaeology in the legal courtrooms: The Härjedalen case

In the 1990s, archaeology was brought to the courtrooms and the question of South Sámi prehistory and archaeology entered the spotlights once again. The long-running reindeer-grazing court case, or customary law case (sedvanerättsprocessen), in the county of Härjedalen attracted much attention in the archaeological community, as archaeologists acted as expert witnesses for the landowners’ and for the Sámi villages’ sides in a case where the question was to determine whether or not the Sámi villages possessed traditional rights to reindeer grazing in certain areas of Härjedalen (see Bohlin 2004; Zachrisson 2004d, 2007).

In 1990, some 500 private landowners and three large forest companies – Stora, Modo and Korsnäs – sued five Sámi villages in Härjedalen: Handsölsdalens, Idre, Mittådalens, Tåssåsens and Tännäs (nowadays called samebyar). In 1992, the forest companies withdrew after a settlement out of court. However, the process continued with the private landowners as plaintiffs.

The main court proceedings took place in 1995 in the District Court in Sveg and the landowners won the case according to the decision of the court in February 1996 (see Svegs Tingsrätt 1996). The Sámi villages appealed the decision, and in 2002 they lost once again in the Court of Appeals in Sundsvall (see Hovrätten för Nedre Norrland 2002). After this defeat, the Sámi Villages appealed to the Supreme Court of Sweden, where the appeal was rejected in 2004.

Following the rejection of the Supreme Court of Sweden to review the case, the Sámi villages have made an appeal to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg. In February 2009, the European Court of Human Rights decided to admit the case for examination and judgement (see European Court of Human Rights 2009). The court decided to try two of the complaints put forth by the Sámi villages: firstly, that the Sámi villages did not have an effective access to court, given the high legal costs of the proceedings, and secondly, that the length of the proceedings in the Swedish courts was unreasonable (almost 14 years). The outcome of the examination of the case against Sweden remains to be seen.

Behind these recent developments in the courts, there is a long history of discontent and opposition from local landowners, farmers, politicians and other actors against the reindeer herding Sámi communities in the provinces of Härjedalen and Jämtland (see Thomasson 2002, 2007; Lundmark 2008:112ff.; cf. also Fjellheim 2007 on historical conflicts between reindeer herders and farmers in the South Sámi area on the Norwegian side of the border). In the end of the 19th century, the pressure increased even further on the Sámi, who were seen as “intruders” on the farmers’ lands, a view that was in a sense legitimized by the fremrykkingsteorien that was propagated by researchers at that time (see above). One of the most well-known episodes is what was at that time
known as the “kulturkampen i Härjedalen” (‘the cultural struggle in Härjedalen’) in the end of the 19th century. The owner of the Ljusnedal bruk, William Farup, was in conflict with the reindeer herding Sámi population in the region. Farup was accused of leading the harassment of the Sámi population, including the illegal shooting of reindeer owned by the Sámi. The conflict received a lot of attention in newspapers as well as among politicians, and it was immortalized in the famous painting by the artist Johan Tirén called “Lappar tillvaratagande skjutna renar” (‘Lapps taking care of reindeer that have been shot’; 1892).

In the trial in Sveg, the two archaeologists Inger Zachrisson (expert witness for the side of the Sámi villages) and Evert Baudou (expert witness for the side of the landowners) took part in the court proceedings and a substantial amount of archaeological documentation was presented to the court. In the court, historical and linguistic experts were also heard. The “debate” that evolved between the two counterparts constitutes an interesting example of a conflict over history writing, but it also illustrates some of the problems connected with the use of ethnicity as an archaeological concept and the difficulties in trying to answer questions about ethnic groups and their boundaries in prehistoric times based on archaeological material. The case was divided into four parts, concerning the conditions before 1500, 1500–1880, 1880–1900 (the time of the first Reindeer Husbandry Acts), and during the 20th century. The archaeological experts were consulted in the first part. The following text is based on the documentation, pleas and judgements, from the legal process.

Baudou based his view on ethnicity on the theories of Fredrik Barth (see discussions in chapter 1 and earlier in this chapter). The overt ethnic signals are important, as they are the only ones “preserved” in the archaeological record from the subjective ethnic identities of prehistoric groups. Baudou thought that northern Sweden might very well have been ethnically very heterogeneous during a major part of prehistoric times, but that it even so might be impossible to trace this heterogeneity or fix the groups archaeologically. The reliability of defining an archaeological material as being Sámi decreases the further back in time from the historical sources you go, and if there is a clear break in continuity, it will no longer be possible to identify the ethnic group (Inlaga Baudou 1993). In one of the petitions, Baudou wrote that the prehistoric part of the process never should have been accepted, as archaeological problems can not be resolved by a court of justice (Inlaga Baudou 1994b; cf. 2007:170f.).

The denomination Sámi is used by some archaeologists from the first millennium B.C. about the northern hunting-gathering culture. Before that time, the culture is called proto- or pre-Sámi. In the year 98 A.D., the Sámi are for the first time mentioned in a written source (fenni in Tacitus; my comment). If one wishes to be on the safe side, the Northern Fennoscandian hunting-gathering culture could be called Sámi at least from this point in time. (Zachrisson 1992:6; my translation)
Zachrisson considered that the “boundary hypothesis” presented by Baudou (see discussion earlier in this chapter on the theme of the origins of the Sámi) was not sufficiently well-founded and asked for more information on the character of the boundary, its location and variation in space and time, how it functioned in the social and cultural contexts, etc. (Inlaga Zachrisson 1993, 1994). She interpreted the material differences, which existed between the groups to the north and to the south of the “cultural boundary” as differences within a Sámi society. Zachrisson contrasted the Nordic settled farming regions in Medelpad with the fångstkultur (“hunting culture”) regions in Härjedalen and western Jämtland, and concluded that the differences were so substantial that there must have been two different ethnic groups. She thus argued that there were two different groups in Middle Norrland during the Iron Age and Early Middle Ages, that is, a Sámi culture and a Nordic culture (Inlaga Zachrisson 1993; cf. further Inlaga Zachrisson 1995a, 1995b).

Baudou objected to the conflation, as he saw it, in Zachrisson’s argumentation of subsistence economy with ethnicity. Nordic people could also carry out intensive hunting, and be buried in the hunting grounds, he claimed. He further criticized Zachrisson for her uncritical use of ancient and medieval authors, and maintained that it is very problematic to know what actual meaning they had put into the different ethnonyms. The names were seldom connected to specific places and one could not determine how large areas the groups would have inhabited (Inlaga Baudou 1993, 1994b).

The archaeological material that was discussed derived mainly from the Iron Age. One important archaeological category was the so-called insjögravar or fångstmarksgravar, for instance the burial grounds Krankmårtenhögen and Långön. The insjögravar have been discovered mainly between the rivers Dalälven and Ångermanälven, and have been dated to from about 200 B.C. to about 1200 A.D. (see discussion above). Baudou considered the external construction of the graves, which coincides with the Nordic burial custom in Mälardalen in Sweden and in certain regions in Norway, to be an ethnic signal, and argued that the graves could have belonged to Nordic groups. He saw the deposits of antlers on the graves as a reflection of a hunting-based form of subsistence. The distribution of the burial grounds was also consistent with his “boundary hypothesis” (Baudou 1988:14f.; Inlaga Baudou 1993; see discussion above in the section on the origins of the Sámi). Zachrisson, on the other hand, considered the insjögravar to be Sámi, on the basis of certain finds, such as the depositions of crania and antlers from elk and reindeer, but foremost because of the location of the burial grounds within a typical context of the fångstmarkskultur (“hunting ground culture”). She saw the external construction of the graves as a loan and an influence from the Nordic cultural sphere (Zachrisson 1992:22).

During the trial, another central point of discussion between the two archaeologists concerned the burial ground and settlement site at Vivallen in northwestern Härjedalen (with datings from between about 800 A.D. and 1200
A.D.; see discussion above). Both Zachrisson and Baudou considered Vivallen to be Sámi, because of the burial customs and because of the assemblage of finds which shows great similarity with the material from the Sámi sacrificial sites further to the north in Sápmi. Zachrisson argued that there was Sámi continuity from Vivallen to historical times, when written sources attest to the presence of Sámi groups in the area. One should, according to her, assume continuity until the opposite could be proven (Inlaga Zachrisson 1993). Baudou, on the contrary, considered Vivallen to be an isolated phenomenon, without known predecessors, contemporaries or followers. For Baudou, Vivallen represented a Sámi group which had moved from northern Norrland during a period of expansion in that area, and he maintained that it was not possible to prove Sámi continuity in Härjedalen until historical times (Inlaga Baudou 1993, 1994a; cf. further Inlaga Baudou 1994c, 1995).

In the verdict, the District Court in Sveg stated that the only matter that Baudou and Zachrisson agreed on was that the settlement and burial site at Vivallen was of Sámi origin. Otherwise, Baudou had strongly questioned the scientific value of the research presented by Zachrisson. Therefore, the Court declared that it was not possible, from the review of the archaeological documentation, to judge with any degree of certainty whether there had existed an early Sámi culture before the 16th century in Härjedalen and if this culture had continued until the end of the 16th century (see Svegs Tingsrätt 1996).

During the years that the case was handled in the District Court, there was a lot of media coverage of the trial, and not least of the statements and testimonies of the archaeological expert witnesses, in the local newspapers as well as in the Sámi newspaper Samefolket (see further Åkerström 1999:16ff.).

To the proceedings in the Court of Appeals in Sundsvall in 2002, Inger Zachrisson submitted additional documentation on behalf of the Sámi villages, based on new archaeological field-work and research, not least from the sörsamiska projektet and other surveys in Härjedalen (see above and in the next section). Evert Baudou replied Zachrisson in a written statement (see Hovrätten för Nedre Norrland 2002). Concerning Vivallen, he claimed that the osteological and archaeological material pointed to a mixed population, both biologically and culturally (consisting of both Sámi and Norse). He stressed the multicultural aspect, the uncertainty of archaeological interpretations, and that ethnic and cultural identities change over time, which make the establishment of historical continuity very problematic. In the District Court in Sveg, he had called Vivallen “probably Sámi”, a statement he no longer supported. Baudou also discussed the toponymical material in Middle Norrland, which he saw as Nordic. In his view, the language spoken in the area of the insjögravar in the Iron Age was most probably Nordic. Evert Baudou and Inger Zachrisson also gave oral statements and were questioned during the main proceedings of the Court of Appeals in Sundsvall (ibid.).

As has already been stated above, the Sámi villages side lost also in the Court of Appeals. In the verdict, the court noted that Zachrisson and Baudou
had presented differing opinions concerning the question if there was a Sámi culture in Härjedalen before 1500, but the court “finds no reason to value one of the opinions above the other” (ibid.).

The presence of Sámi populations in the southern part of Sápmi in the Iron Age and Early Middle Ages has been contested in this juridical process. The Sámi groups are thus forced to define themselves and their presence in history. The attempts by Sámi groups to assert their cultural heritage and make visible their history are then often termed as a misuse of archaeology. The Sámi are seen as interest groups who are using ethnicity and the past as instruments for economic gains. In contrast, the use of history by the landowner groups is usually not analyzed and criticized along the same lines.

In the court cases in Sweden, the burden of proof has been placed exclusively on the side of the Sámi villages to demonstrate that they possess the rights to reindeer grazing that they are practicing. In contrast, in the similar so-called Selbu case in 2001 in the South Sámi area on the Norwegian side of the border, the Supreme Court of Norway decided to place the burden of proof on the side of the landowners who had sued the Sámi villages and who consequently had to demonstrate that the Sámi villages did not possess the rights to reindeer grazing, which they in that case failed to do (Thomasson 2007:77).

In general, one can conclude that the *sedvanerättsmålet* has had a negative impact on the relations between the Sámi and the non-Sámi population, and especially between the reindeer herders and the landowners, in the region. Furthermore, it is indeed very problematic to use archaeological arguments in a court of law. To act as an expert witness is compulsory if you are requested to do so, and the statements have to be given under oath in front of the court. The court room is definitely not a favorable arena to carry out constructive academic discussions and to debate interpretations of the archaeological material. Inger Zachrisson has described the awkward and unpleasant situation, from which has also followed an unfortunate focus on the individual archaeologists: “The actions of the Swedish state are shameful… Archaeology becomes politics, and we archaeologists become pawns in the game” (Zachrisson 2004d:58; my translation; cf. also Baudou 2007:170f.). Indeed, among archaeologists in Sweden, the court case has often been portrayed as a battle between the two archaeologists Zachrisson and Baudou, who have been made representatives of two opposite views on South Sámi prehistory. The court case might have locked the positions and created an opposition that otherwise perhaps had not been as accentuated.

In this case, an on-going archaeological discussion about prehistory was brought into legal proceedings concerning land rights; it is an example of how the archaeological past(s) can be used in present-day conflicts. The Härjedalen case certainly shows that archaeology is part of society and the conflicts of society, and that archaeological knowledge can be put to trial – archaeologists can be summoned to court and be forced to, under oath, defend their academic
position on a contested issue – in very real circumstances with very real consequences.

Many voices have been raised that the issue of Sámi land rights and the possibilities to continue with reindeer herding in the future is not primarily a question to be settled in court, but must involve an active engagement from the government of Sweden which would involve the Sámi villages, the landowners and other stakeholders in a serious discussion and negotiation. In the end, considering the history behind the present-day situation, it is hard not to see the responsibility of the Swedish government to act and handle the chaotic legal situation and help to settle the conflicts. The role of the government is also crucial for the prospects of normalizing the relationship between reindeer herders and landowners.

There have also been court cases in other parts of northern Sweden where the right of Sámi villages to reindeer pasture has been contested, in line with the Härjedalen case (cf. Levinsson & Melin 2005; Ljungdahl & Aronsson 2008). A similar court case is the one in the Nordmaling area in the county of Västerbotten. In 1998, some 100 landowners in Nordmaling sued the three Sámi villages Umbyn, Vapsten and Ran. However, in contrast to the Härjedalen case, the Sámi villages won in the District Court of Umeå in 2006. The decision was appealed by the landowners, but the Sámi villages won again in the Court of Appeals.

New perspectives on South Sámi (pre)history

In the end of the 1990s and in the first years of the 2000s, several cooperation projects involving archaeologists and the local Sámi populations have been initiated, such as archaeological surveys in cooperation between professional archaeologists and the local Sámi villages in Jämtland and Härjedalen, for instance Ruvhten Sijte and Njaarke (Wennstedt Edvinger & Winka 2001; Ljungdahl 2003, 2007a, 2007b; cf. Virdi Kroik 2001, 2007). Here, for instance, reindeer herders take part in the surveying of the landscapes, bringing to the project local knowledge on old sites and the movement patterns of the reindeer in the landscape, thereby creating an exchange of experience and knowledge and a dialogue about the cultural landscape – which adds another dimension to the archaeological study. The court cases questioning the right of Sámi villages to reindeer grazing in certain areas (see above), is also an important background factor in these projects (see Ljungdahl & Aronsson 2008).

The major difference in comparison with the earlier surveys in the mountain area is that the Sámi villages themselves, and on their own initiative, have worked with the documentation and the surveys. Today, the maps over the surveyed Sámi villages look completely different than before the projects, with masses of cultural remains. A completely new cultural landscape has emerged, which has been unknown to the majority society, where this area has been called a wilderness! (Ljungdahl 2007b:32; my translation)
In 2005, the documentation project “Att spåra sin historia” (“To trace one’s history”) was initiated, in which all of the Sámi villages in the county of Jämtland and the Idre Sámi village in the county of Dalarna took part. The basis for the documentation consisted of field surveys, but also interviews with elderly people who carried knowledge and traditions about the living conditions and reindeer husbandry of past times. The project was concerned with both material and immaterial traces from the Sámi historical landscapes. The ultimate aim of the project, according to the archaeologist Ewa Ljungdahl, was to write an “entirely new version of the history of the Jämtland and Härjedalen Sámi” (Ljungdahl 2007a:33; my translation; cf. also Jillker 2003).

The Njaarke project was started in the middle of the 1990s. The Njaarke Sámi village is located in western Jämtland. Jan Persson, chairman of the Njaarke Sámi village, describes his sentiments regarding the revived interest in the historical remains in the Sámi village, here cited by Ewa Ljungdahl:

“The documentation of its own history has been a boost for the entire Sámi village and that is something that I am proud of. As I see it, this is the only positive thing that has happened to us in the last ten years. Otherwise we have mostly been fighting an uphill battle. In addition, we have got a renewed sense of identity and self-esteem… When we, more than ten years ago now, started to survey our lands, the expectation was to find remains that were two hundred, maybe three hundred years old. When we today, ten years later, have come well on the way – but we are far from finished – we know in any case that there has been reindeer herding on our lands in three different millennia. I hope that other Sámi villages will experience that feeling, it can not be described, it must be experienced. One gets a completely different view of the lands, one never feels alone, one always wanders on ancestral grounds.” (Citation in Ljungdahl 2007a:33; my translation)

In 2007, the association “Sökarna – Ohtsedäjjah” was founded by some of the participants in the earlier projects (see Internet Sökarna). The aim of the association was to work for the documentation and registration of Sámi cultural traces in the landscape and to spread knowledge about these remains. The association has arranged surveys, field-trips and seminars and manages a database of Sámi cultural and historical objects.

The Interreg project “Saemieh Saepmesne – I det samiska rummet” was started in the fall of 2008, and will continue at least until 2011. The project is based on a cooperation between Saemien Sijte in Snåsa, Norway, Gaaltje in Östersund and Västerbottens museum in Umeå, both in Sweden. The aim of the project is to document and visibilize the South Sámi cultural landscape. Within the project, many different studies are conducted, such as archival studies, interviews with local people, studies of map and toponymical material and surveys and registrations of cultural objects and practices. The participation of the local Sámi communities in the different parts of the project is a fundamental principle, upon which the whole project idea is developed (see further Internet Saemieh Saepmesne).
In recent years, researchers have also started to study the presence of Sámi culture along the coast of the Gulf of Bothnia, a region usually considered to be outside of present-day Sápmi and that has generally not been considered as having been inhabited by Sámi people in prehistoric times (cf. discussion in chapter 4). In this connection, historical sources about Sámi people in the province of Hälingsland and other provinces have been reviewed by the researchers (Wennstedt Edvinger & Ulfhielm 2004; cf. also Svanberg 1999; Westerdahl 2008). Some of the archaeological remains along the coast that have been discussed include circular stone features, stone circles or ring-shaped enclosures, which have been interpreted as Sámi sacrificial sites of a similar character as those documented in northern Norway (Wennstedt Edvinger & Broadbent 2006). Noel Broadbent and Brita Wennstedt Edvinger have undertaken archaeological excavations at Hornslandet, on the sea shore outside of Hudiksvall in the province of Hälingsland (Broadbent 2006; Wennstedt Edvinger & Broadbent 2006). At this site, several hut remains (so-called tomtningar) and other constructions were investigated. Several other sites with tomtningar have also been investigated along the sea coast, for instance at the island Stora Fjäderägg in Holmön parish and at Grundskatan, Lövånger parish, both in the county of Västerbotten. At the Grundskatan site, a possible bear grave has been discovered in a cairn in the corner of a tomtning by the sea shore (Broadbent & Storå 2003). The hearth in the hut was dated to 1110 ± 110 BP and the bear bones were dated to 1080 ± 45 BP, and the occupation of the hut and the burial of the bear have been interpreted as being contemporary (Wennstedt Edvinger & Broadbent 2006:37).

Noel Broadbent has argued that the Sámi settlements in the Iron Age were more widely spread than what has earlier been accepted and that the economy was more diversified than the historical and ethnographical sources indicate. In his view, “there are strong grounds for considering the archaeology of coastal Sweden as relevant to Saami prehistory and for examining the disappearance of the Saami from this region as a consequence of Scandinavian expansion in the Late Iron Age and Medieval periods” (Broadbent 2006:13).

The discussions on when the Sámi “appeared” in the South Sámi area have by necessity dominated earlier research, and there has been little room for scientific discussions on the actual historical development of the South Sámi communities (Bergstol 2007:19f.). A change of perspectives is perhaps visible in the recent discussions by a younger generation of archaeologists, where the relationships between “Sámi” and “Germanic/Nordic” in the Iron Age and Early Middle Ages have been reinterpreted and the strict ethnic boundaries of these spheres have been questioned (cf. e.g. Price 2000, 2002a; Bergstol 2004, 2005, 2007, 2008): it is not just about “Sámi” or “Germanic/Norse”, but maybe about something more, perhaps something in-between? In these works, an understanding of ethnicity as a dynamic and fluid phenomenon is evident, which reflects the theoretical discussions in archaeology on ethnicity as an
archaeological concept since the 1980s as well as the fundamental criticism of ethnicity as an archaeological concept (see discussions in part I).

In Jostein Bergstøl’s doctoral dissertation *Samer i Østerdalen? En studie av etnisitet i jernalderen og middelalderen i det nordøstre Hedmark* (‘Sámi in Østerdalen? A study of ethnicity in the Iron Age and Middle Ages in northeastern Hedmark’; Bergstøl 2008), the central aim is to explore the possible prehistoric background of the southernmost Sámi present-day settlements in Norway. On the basis of an extensive archaeological material from this region, he concludes that there is continuity between the hunting population which can be traced in the material from the Early Iron Age and the Sámi settlements which appear in the historical records from the 16th century. He stresses, however, that the boundaries between the Sámi and Norse cultures were not clear-cut and constant, as there are traces of contact, exchange and elements of hybridization. When the farming settlements were established in the area, the Sámi population intensified the use of the mountains and became more dependent on the reindeer as a resource of livelihood. Bergstøl has stressed that the South Sámi historical development should be studied in the light of the developments in other Sámi as well as in Norse communities. In his view, it is precisely this position in-between that makes South Sámi history so interesting (cf. Bergstøl 2007:25).

Other researchers in Norway have also discussed and problematized interethnic relationships and the idea of ethnic dualism in the South Sámi area and other adjacent areas in southern Norway (see e.g. Amundsen 2005 on ethnic relations, cultural dualism and cultural contacts in the Neolithic and the Bronze Age in the county of Hedmark; Dunfjeld-Aagård 2005 on the representation and status of Sámi history in the coastal area of Ytre Namdal in the county of Nord-Trøndelag from the Late Iron Age and forward; and Gjerde 2008 on the ethnic interpretation of round and oval house foundations from the Late Iron Age and the Medieval Period in the Hallingdal district in the county of Buskerud).

In a recently published book *Jämtarna och samerna kom först* (‘The Jamts [i.e. the inhabitants in the province of Jämtland] and the Sámi came first’), the archaeologist Stig Welinder discusses archaeology in the Iron Age in the provinces of Jämtland and Härjedalen and critically examines the question “Who was first?” (Welinder 2008). He concludes that the question is not possible to answer, because it is incorrectly asked in the first place. Welinder’s book thoroughly exhibits and demonstrates the complexities involved in the attempts to discern and identify representations and processes of identification in the prehistoric archaeological material in Jämtland and Härjedalen.

So, to conclude the discussion on South Sámi archaeology, I would say that from a theoretical and practical perspective it constitutes a very interesting archaeological field of study. The debates have in much concerned cultural contacts and cultural encounters and the formation and development of identities, especially ethnic identities, in the past. When talking about the Iron
Age and the Medieval Period in the South Sámi area, it is in my view obvious that we are not dealing with any monolithic and homogeneous cultural or ethnic entities, which can be described in simplistic terms. The debates have also concerned the right to a history, a history that has earlier been denied, by historians as well as by other actors in society. This situation is of principal importance for archaeology in other contexts as well, and I would propose that there is a lot to learn from the discussions on South Sámi prehistory also for archaeologists working in other areas.

The emergence and development of reindeer herding and pastoralism

Reindeer and reindeer herding, as we have seen in the earlier discussions, belong to the set of the most powerful images and symbols connected with the Sámi people. Reindeer husbandry has functioned as an ethnic symbol, a legally defining trait imposed from outside by the Swedish State, and as a stereotypical notion of “true” Sáminess. Considering the central importance of reindeer herding to notions of Sámi culture and identity, it is hardly surprising that debates on the emergence and development of reindeer herding and reindeer pastoralism have been intense in the study of Sámi history. It is, therefore, important to examine some central threads of this theme here.

There is a large amount of works that deal with this issue in different ways (see e.g. Hultblad 1968; Lundmark 1982; Wallerström 2000; Andersen 2005, and further references below). Many different theories on the emergence of reindeer herding and Sámi pastoralism have been put forth. In the following text, I will follow some of the lines of thought and some of the controversies involved. The discussions reveal some of the ideas on Sámi societies and the historical dynamics in those societies during the Iron Age, Middle Ages and Early Modern Times.

Figure 22. Layers of time in the landscape. In the foreground, an ancient hearth. In the background, wooden fences of a modern reindeer corral. Mossaudden in the municipality of Kalix, Norrbotten. From Aronsson 1995:20.
In 1991, *Forest Reindeer Herding A.D. 1–1800*, the doctoral dissertation in archaeology by Kjell-Åke Aronsson was published, an important work in this field (Aronsson 1991). In the dissertation, Aronsson argued that domesticated reindeer herding emerged at a much earlier point of time than had earlier been assumed, already from the beginning of the first millennium A.D. The argument was based on a series of pollen analyses and C-14 datings from a number of sites, compared with pollen analyses from known grazing and milking sites for domesticated reindeer. The analyses also showed a marked rise in domesticated reindeer herding from the 17th–18th centuries, which is in line with the evidence from historical sources. In recent years, several other works that deal with this research problem have been published, by, among others, the doctoral dissertations by Sven-Donald Hedman (Hedman 2003) and Nina Karlsson (Karlsson N. 2004; also 2006a, 2006b).

**Stalo-foundations and social change**

One category of archaeological remains that has been frequently discussed in relation to the theme of Sámi reindeer herding is the so-called Stalo-foundations (in Swedish they are called *Stalotomter* or *Stalotomtningar*). The Stalo-foundation is a special kind of physical remains from constructions of dwellings located in the high mountain areas. The Stalo-foundations are usually round, oval or rectangular with a slightly lowered floor level, a surrounding low wall and a hearth in the middle of the floor area (see fig. 24). They are often found in groups of some 3–8 or more foundations. The known distribution of these
remains in Sweden stretches from the area around Treriksröset in northernmost Sweden to Frostviken in the northern part of the county of Jämtland. Around 430 Stalo-foundations have been registered in Sweden and around 40 have been found in Norway, according to a recent estimate (Liedgren et al. 2007:1277). There is a rich Sámi oral tradition about Stalo, which has been documented in several works (see Drake 1918:310ff.; Pirak 1933:186ff.; Manker 1960:217ff.; Fjellström 1985:396ff., 446f.).

The dating of the Stalo-foundations in the mountain areas has been debated. In a recent study by Liedgren et al., radiocarbon datings of charcoal from 22 Stalo-foundations at 12 sites in Adamvalldá in the county of Norrbotten showed a chronological span between A.D. 640 and A.D. 1180. 12 of the foundations at 9 sites could be dated to the Viking Age, A.D. 800–A.D. 1050. It was the opinion of the authors of the study that the earlier conventional dating-span of Stalo-foundations was too wide and that the house foundations were mainly constructed during the Viking Age (Liedgren et al. 2007).

The cultural and ethnic belonging of the Stalotomter has also been the topic of much debate. The question has concerned whether they were built by Norse people or by Sámi people. According to the view of Rolf Kjellström, ethnologist and the successor of Ernst Manker as curator of the Sámi collections at the Nordic Museum in Stockholm, the Stalo-foundations had not been built by Sámi people. He has discussed these ideas in several works (Kjellström 1975, 1976, 1983, 1997; cf. also Wepsäläinen 2008). He based his study on three main source categories: Sámi Stalo traditions, Stalo place names, and the Stalo-foundations. Kjellström claimed that the supposed similarities between the construction of the Stalo-foundations and the known Sámi dwellings were few, and that the Stalo-foundations more probably had originated in the Nordic cultural contexts (Kjellström 1983:230f.). In his view, the builders of the Stalo-foundations had been Nordic people coming from Norway, where they had their permanent settlements. The activities of these people in the mountain areas would have included hunting, trading and taxation of the Sámi population.

A similar idea had already been put forth by the ethnologist Sigrid Drake (1878–1930) in the early 20th century: “According to another tradition, Stalo would have had his dwelling inside these rings. Thus, they would represent old dwellings… However, the people who once lived there were no characters from a tale, but most probably simply Germanic people” (germaner; Drake 1918:317; my translation).

However, most of the researchers working with the Stalo-sites today agree that these remains belong to the history of the Sámi population groups that have inhabited and utilized the mountain regions where these sites have been found. Still, the Stalo-foundations have caused much debate among the researchers working with Sámi prehistory. The remains have been one of the focal points in the debate on the development of Sámi reindeer herding and the
role of wild reindeer hunting in Sámi communities in the Iron Age and the Middle Ages.

According to the archaeologist Inger Storli (Storli 1993b, 1994, 1996), the Stalo sites were traces of Sámi reindeer pastoralists. She pushed the dating of the introduction of domesticated reindeer herding back to the Viking Age. Storli argued that a differentiated Sámi society had existed already in the Late Iron Age, which was in contrast to the then dominant view that the Sámi had lived as egalitarian hunters, fishers and gatherers until the emergence of reindeer pastoralism in historical times (cf. above).

Another perspective has been presented by the archaeologist Inga-Maria Mulk in several works (Mulk 1993, 1994a, 1996, 2005a, 2005b; Mulk & Bayliess-Smith 1999). According to Inga-Maria Mulk, the Stalo-foundations do not constitute remains from early reindeer pastoralism in the mountains. Rather, they were built and used by Sámi hunters, who utilized the mountain areas for hunting wild reindeer, in order to engage in the flourishing and profitable international fur trade.

The differing perspectives of Storli and Mulk led to a lively debate in Norwegian Archaeological Review in 1993 about the interpretation of the stalotomter and the development of reindeer pastoralism (Storli 1993b and comments on the article; Mulk 1993). The debate continued in the journal Acta Borealia in 1996 (Mulk 1996; Storli 1996).

In recent years, several new studies have examined the vegetation history in the mountain areas, combining archaeological studies with different scientific analyses at Stalo sites, thereby contributing to the contextualization of the sites (e.g. Liedgren et al. 2007; Karlsson 2008; Liedgren & Bergman 2009). Liedgren and Bergman suggest that the Stalo-buildings were used during the winter by Sámi reindeer herders who stayed in the mountain area throughout the year (2009:23).

The present Sámi village (sameby) system in Sweden, developed by the State from the late 19th century, which regulates the right to own and herd reindeer, is at present one of the most contested aspects within the Sámi communities. In many ways it constitutes an insider-outsider system, which sorts the Sámi
population into different categories with different legal rights to land and water resources. It has been suggested that the early datings for the introduction of Sámi pastoralism can be seen as a “past-as-wished-for” for the present-day reindeer owner establishment, for the protection of their land rights, as Mulk and Bayliss-Smith put it (Mulk & Bayliss-Smith 1999). On the other hand, it has also been suggested that the narrative of a long history of hunters, fishers and gatherers fits better with the “central Sámi myth” of the ecological and egalitarian Sámi culture and society (Hesjedal 2001:221; Olsen 2004).

Following the point made by Nina Karlsson in her doctoral dissertation, the debate about the emergence of reindeer nomadism could be described as a dispute over definitions (Karlsson 2006a:156). What is reindeer nomadism, and how should one classify the different forms of subsistence that existed in different times in Sápmi? Most researchers would probably agree that tamed reindeer were used for various purposes, for transportation and as decoys in the hunting of wild reindeer, already long before the 17th century. The question is how many domesticated reindeer that are needed in order to be able to talk about reindeer nomadism? Should the older forest Sámi reindeer herding system, with its varied subsistence system that depended on many different resources, be considered as reindeer nomadism? It can be argued that the image, in effect a time-less image, of Sámi reindeer nomadism to a large extent has been influenced by the extensive reindeer nomadism of later historical times.

In a sense, the reindeer and the reindeer herding have functioned as a kind of ”boundary object” (see chapter 3), as a trait which joins different times and places in networks; the boundary object serves to connect the present with the past. The reindeer in prehistoric and early historical times has taken on some of the qualities that the reindeer possesses today and has possessed in later historical times. Therefore, traces of reindeer herding also become a strong argument for actual Sámi presence in prehistory, as has been exemplified in the court cases in the South Sámi area that I have discussed above.

The historical developments in the Sámi communities have been complex and heterogeneous. It is easy to over-simplify the social, cultural and economic processes involved in the development of Sámi societies in the Iron Age, Middle Ages and Early Modern Time, and to create an illusion that the history is only about a transition from one mode of “traditional hunting society” to another mode of “reindeer husbandry society”. It becomes more and more clear that the hunting society itself was not homogeneous and undifferentiated (Hansen 1996), and that, therefore, there is a need for more focus on the regional and temporal variation in the study of the evolving social, cultural and economic forms in the Sámi societies.
Sámi pre-Christian religion

The indigenous religion of the Sámi has attracted a lot of attention by researchers from several different disciplines throughout the centuries, and has been one of the main reasons for the study of Sámi (pre)history. Here, I will only briefly mention some of the most important threads concerning the study of Sámi pre-Christian, or indigenous, religion, and discuss how archaeology with its special methods and sources has contributed to this study. The field of study of Sámi pre-Christian religion is indeed very extensive and it would be impossible to cover it in any detail here (see further e.g. Mebius 1968, 2003; Bäckman 1975; Bäckman & Hultkrantz 1985; Rydving 1995a, 1995b; Schanche 2000; Price 2002a; Fossum 2006; Mulk & Bayliss-Smith 2006; Eidlitz Kuoljok 2009). Also, there is a multitude of theoretical and methodological problems connected with the study of past religions that can not be dealt with here. The theme of Sámi pre-Christian religion is nevertheless essential to include in our discussion, since it has been a most central focus in the interest of scholars and others. It has also, through the centuries, constituted an important element in the exoticizing of the image of the Sámi people and Sámi history, as something different, mysterious and somehow dangerous.

Much of the present-day knowledge about Sámi religion derives from religious history studies of the written source material, with the missionary accounts from the 17th and 18th centuries taking central position as the most important source category (see chapter 5). The images of Sámi religion that have emerged have often been of a uniform and invariable religion. There is a tendency that historians of religion have displayed an antipathy towards using archaeological material, especially if the archaeological material is not in line with the information obtained from the written sources (Fossum 2006:16). Some of the advantages of the archaeological source material are, as Birgitta Fossum writes, that it facilitates a long-term perspective, as well as a focus on regional variation, and that it is a primary source material, in a sense an imprint of the practitioners themselves (ibid.:1), a result of the actual practices and events in the past.

The fact still remains that the image we have of Sámi religion comes from what it might have looked like in the 17th and 18th centuries, after the introduction of reindeer herding in many areas, and after the Christianization of parts of the population – an image also influenced by what the clergymen wished to hear and what Sámi men dared to tell. (Fossum 2006:16; my translation)

Concerning the material remains from the Sámi areas, research has been largely focused on a few categories of remains, which have functioned like focal points in the debates on Sámi religion. There has been a tendency in the research to concentrate on specific places and specific objects, instead of the larger contexts in the landscapes. One of these focal points has been the Sámi sacrificial sites, which have received considerable attention from researchers.
(some early archaeological examples: Qvigstad 1926; Hallström 1932; some more recent examples: Mulk 2005a; Okkonen 2007; Odner 2008). There were many different kinds of sacrificial sites and other sacred places in the Sámi cultural landscapes, which were used in different ways and by different groups in the communities (Mulk 1994b, 1996). A special group of sacrificial sites in northern Sweden, earlier often called *samiska metaldepåer* (‘Sámi metal depots’), which have received particular attention because of the very rich find material at the sites, are characterized by large deposits of metal artifacts and have been dated primarily to the period 1000–1350. The artifacts found at these Sámi sacrificial sites have been analyzed and published by Gustaf Hallström (1932), Inga Serning (1956) and Inger Zachrisson (1984).

Certain elements in the Sámi religious and spiritual beliefs and practices have attracted special attention in the outside world over the last centuries, not least the accounts concerning sorcery and divination, the worship of *sieidi* and the figure of the religious specialist the *noaidi*. The drawing in figure 25, which was originally published in Johannes Schefferus’ Lapponia (1956 [1673]), has ever since that time been one of the most commonly reproduced images of Sámi pre-Christian rituals.

In archaeological research, graves and burial practices usually play a central role in discussions on prehistoric religious ideas and ritual practices. One important work concerning Sámi religion and burial customs is the book *Graver i ur og berg* (‘Graves in scree and rocks’) by the archaeologist Audhild Schanche (2000). The doctoral dissertation by the Finnish ethnologist Nils Storå *Burial Customs of the Skolt Lapps* (1971) can also be mentioned in this context. In the section above on South Sámi archaeology, I have discussed the so-called hunting-ground graves (*fångstmarksgravar*) in the interior of Central Scandinavia, which have been lively debated among researchers. In general, it can be stated that the burial customs in the interior regions of Upper Norrland (in the counties of Västerbotten and Norrbotten) during the Iron Age as well as earlier periods is very little studied and remains largely unknown (see Liedgren 1994; Liedgren & Johansson 2005). The notion of “Sámi burial customs” has often, as is the case with many other aspects of Sámi material and spiritual culture, been treated as a homogeneous cliché, determined by the material expressions found in historically known, and ethnographically described, Sámi contexts. However, some researchers have emphasized the importance of considering the geographical, temporal and cultural heterogeneity in Sámi burial customs (see Svestad 2007; Fossum pers.com.).

One special category of ancient remains, which is part of Sámi history, consists of the so-called bear graves (Fossum 2006:100ff.). These are part of what is often called the Sámi bear ceremonialism or bear cult, which in turn is related to a larger circumpolar complex of religious and spiritual beliefs and rituals associated with the bear. In Sweden, about 16 bear graves have been discovered this far, in Norway some 27 graves. Several of the burials have been C-14 dated. The datings stretch over a period from about 200 A.D. to 1650
A.D., with a concentration of datings in the Late Viking Age and the Early Medieval Period (ibid.).

Several researchers have discussed the bear graves in Sweden (see e.g. Manker 1957; Janson & Hvarfner 1966; Zachrisson & Iregren 1974; Zachrisson 1980; Mulk & Iregren 1995; Wennstedt Edvinger 2000; Norberg 2001; Broadbent & Storå 2003; Fossum 2006) and in Norway (see e.g. Myrstad 1997; Schanche 2000; for more on bear ceremonialism in Siberia, including the archaeological record on bear cult, see contributions in Gemujev et al. 2000). The written sources have been treated by Carl-Martin Edsman (1994). Here, the account of Sámi bear ceremonies by the clergyman Pehr Fjellström from the 18th century is a central source (Fjellström 1981 [1755]). In this context, it is also interesting to note that there are other kinds of animal burials that appear in many different prehistoric times and places, which in turn makes the Sámi example of the bear burials important also in a larger picture (see Jennbert 2003).

Some archaeologists have examined the prehistoric rock art in Northern Fennoscandia from a frame-work of Sámi mythology and religious beliefs and from a perspective of shamanism (see Fandén 2001; Lahelma 2008; cf. contributions in Price 2001). Recently, Helena Günther has published a critical review of earlier attempts by archaeologists to interpret rock art within a shamanistic framework (2009; cf. also Eidlitz Kuoljok 2009:72f.).

The relationship between Scandinavian and Sámi religions has been a much discussed theme in studies of the history of religions in Sweden (see Rydving
In earlier research, the predominant view was that religious ideas had been transferred or borrowed from the Norse to the Sámi, but never in the other direction. As a matter of fact, one of the main reasons for studying Sámi religion in the first place was to examine the originally Norse religious beliefs that had survived among the Sámi groups after they had disappeared among the Scandinavians. From the 1930s, another perspective was put forth by some scholars, who considered that spiritual ideas and practices, on the contrary, had been borrowed from the Sámi to the Norse population, not least in the sphere of seiðr (Price 2002a:233).

Emphasizing Viking Age Scandinavia as a border region between the Germanic world and the circumpolar, arctic world, and the mutual impact of Scandinavian and Sámi religious beliefs, Neil Price has pointed to the notion of a common spiritual heritage in the northern areas:

The possible shamanic overtones of Óðinn’s powers have been recognised for more than a century, embracing the complex beliefs in transformation and shapeshifting and the northern thought-world of spirits and supernatural communication. Though there is still fierce debate on the subject, it now seems increasingly likely that [Scandinavian] seiðr was firmly a part of this circumpolar shamanic sphere, evolving not under the influence of Sámi religion but alongside it, as part of the common spiritual heritage of the north. (Price 2008:248)

Throughout history, as we have seen earlier, there has been a strong interest in the exoticism of the Sámi people. Sámi “heathen” religion and Sámi “sorcery”, which was something that the Sámi people for a long time had been renowned for in the European countries, have played an important role in the general exoticizing of the Sámi people. But it is also clear that some researchers have emphasized the heterogeneity and the variation in religious beliefs and practices within the Sámi area. They have pointed to the possibilities, if one takes the archaeological record seriously, to investigate expressions of Sámi pre-Christian religion in more detail and from new perspectives, which might challenge the old stereotypical images of the primitive and timeless “heathen” Sámi.
In this part of the book, I have followed some of the networks of archaeology, in the mapping of the North and especially in the making of Sámi prehistories in the Nordic countries, with a primary focus on Sweden. As I have discussed in part I, the archaeologists themselves are part of the networks that they trace. We have seen how researchers have enrolled actors and elements of heterogeneous character into networks – hybrid in nature, often homogeneous in representation. In the organizing and ordering of the past, the researchers seek to transform their vantage points into centers-of-translation, or centers-of-interpretation, where the movement of the elements in the networks can be surveilled and controlled.

In the research historical analysis, I have examined four main themes that have been of special importance in the study of the Sámi past. They all illustrate different aspects of the construction of the images of the Sámi and the relationships and boundaries between what is considered as Swedish and what is considered as Sámi. At the same time, they illustrate the potential for new knowledge, re-interpretation and change. These themes, and other research on the Sámi, as well as the more general attitudes in society towards the Sámi, have also by necessity affected and influenced the Sámi self-images and self-identification.

The first theme, the origin of the Sámi, has also been the most discussed theme. As we have seen, the answer to the question about the origins has changed over time, from the view of the Sámi as an autochthonous population in the first half of the 19th century to the view of the Sámi as immigrants from the east in the end of the 19th century, which lived on until the 1970s and 1980s, when the view on the Sámi as an indigenous population grew strong. In recent times, genetical research has also tried to answer the question about the origin of the Sámi with the help of DNA-analyses. It is obvious that there is still a great interest in the “mysterious” origin of the Sámi people. There has been a need to define the place in space and time for the Sámi in Sweden, which can be seen as a need to define, delimit, contain and control the “Other” who lives within “our borders”. In the discussion on the origins, the Sámi have constantly been constructed as a homogeneous entity with one single origin, as a one-entity which has, more or less, always been the same.

The second theme, South Sámi prehistory as a contested field of study, has also demonstrated the historical need to define, delimit and contain the “Other”. It has also shown the importance of the past today, and how
important consequences archaeological research may have in certain situations. The most drastic example concerns the court cases on land rights in which archaeologists have taken part as expert witnesses with archaeological research as arguments. At the same time, the analysis of South Sámi prehistory has also pointed to the possibilities of discovery, change and transformation through the archaeological approaches to the past. Furthermore, it has illustrated the potential for empowerment of the local communities through archaeology with a participatory approach, as in the examples of the survey projects involving many members of the Sámi villages in Jämtland.

The third theme, the development of reindeer herding, has pointed to the importance of the reindeer as a symbol and a defining trait of Sáminess, in the historical narratives as well as in contemporary politics, not least regarding the contested allocation of land rights. The fourth theme, Sámi pre-Christian religion, illustrates the construction of the exoticizing images of the Sámi. The Sámi have through the centuries been constructed as a nature people, more closely connected with the natural and supernatural forces. The pre-Christian religion of the Sámi has also been seen as a “clue” to the pre-Christian past of the majority populations, as it was assumed that the Sámi had preserved many loans from the prehistoric Norse religion into historical times. Therefore, by studying the Sámi religion it was possible, to a certain extent, to actually study the pre-Christian religions of the majority populations.

The representations of the Sámi, and the idea of a Sámi prehistory, have changed and varied through history. One aspect has, however, constantly been the same: the Sámi have been described as the “Others”, and they have been described and defined as such from the outside by non-Sámi researchers, writers, politicians, clergymen etc. As we have seen, many of the representations of the Sámi and the Sámi past have been “adjusted” in order to suit the needs of the Norwegianization and Swedification policies. However, in recent years more Sámi voices have been heard in the discussions on Sámi history and prehistory, and demands for a new politics of the past have been raised. This theme will be further explored in part IV, where I will examine the demands for Sámi self-determination in cultural heritage issues and the debates on repatriation and reburial.

One fundamental aspect that should not be forgotten in this context is the limited perspective of archaeology and the lack of archaeological information on large areas and many time periods in the Sápmi region. It is obvious that there are huge gaps in the knowledge about the past in Sápmi. Furthermore, one basic characteristic of archaeological research is that it is constantly producing new source material, through excavations and surveys, which was previously completely unknown and maybe totally unexpected, which can then be used to reconsider, challenge and rewrite the history, and to form a basis for new understandings of the past. Here is, thus, a great potential in the archaeological approach to the past.
The number of researchers engaged in the field of prehistoric research in northern Sweden has always been quite limited, and a few authorities, placed in strategic positions with control over resources and the flow of information, have over time exerted great influence on the research field as a whole. Basic ideas, such as the idea of the relatively late immigration of the Sámi population to Sweden, have therefore been able to live on for a long time, relatively unchallenged.

In the discussions on Sámi prehistory and Sámi archaeology, it is important to keep in mind the very problematic nature of the concept of ethnicity that I have discussed in the first part of the book, as well as the power relations involved in the representations of ethnicity. I also believe that it is very important to keep in mind the limited perspective of archaeology. Archaeologists simply can not answer all of the questions that are asked about the past. Several researchers have opposed to the interpretations of the prehistory of northern Sweden from a dualistic ethnic perspective and have asked for more nuances in representations of identities in the past. As part of this critique, Thomas Wallerström has expressed the need for critical thinking in the interpretation of the ethnonyms used in historical sources:

De-colonising concepts like Finne and Lapp is as necessary as de-constructing “Swedish”, “Norwegian” or – recently – temporal concepts like “Viking Age” with all its nationalistic connotations masking a vast cultural heterogeneity. Deconstructing basic concepts like these is to realise how categorisation influence our thinking, as well as how categories were constructed within political settings. (Wallerström 2006b:109)

In the history of research, there are many instances when “Sámi prehistory” and “Swedish prehistory” have been constructed as discrete and bounded entities, or one-entities, which would never truly meet. From the discussions on the research history in this part of the book, it is possible to suggest two separate lines of association, along which representations of the past have been connected in Sweden. One line follows the path “east – north – foreign – uncivilized – dangerous – Sámi”. The other follows the path “west – south – familiar – civilized – safe – Swedish”. However, in the South Sámi area, researchers have started to open up the earlier closed entities and have become interested in the spaces in-between, in the meeting, exchange and hybridity of culture and identity. I argue that we should stop treating what-is-considered-Sámi and what-is-considered-Swedish as taken for granted black boxes and separate one-entities, and instead view and analyze these identities as sets of heterogeneous relations involved in many different networks stretching over time and space.

Research, for instance in anthropology and history, is increasingly focusing on the variation and diversity of “Sáminess” in the present as well as the past, and its varied and changing expressions. Lars Ivar Hansen and Bjørnar Olsen
have stressed the importance of avoiding a single-minded relational perspective, which would imply that the only interesting events have taken place in the meeting between the Sámi and the non-Sámi, which has been a very common theme in research. Instead, researchers should also focus on the internal dynamics and processes of Sámi communities and on encounters between different Sámi groups and interests (Hansen & Olsen 2004:15). Furthermore, I would argue that more studies devoted to aspects of gender and social status – the organization and transformation of differences – within the prehistoric communities in Sápmi could contribute much to the discussions on Sámi history, from new challenging perspectives. In this shift of attention, I believe that there is a great potential for future studies in Sámi archaeology.

In my opinion, it is important to recognize the diversity and dynamics of the societies in northern Sweden in prehistoric times. We must realize that Sáminess is not just one thing. Nor is there only one Sámi history, but many Sámi histories and prehistories. In such a way, we might be able to open up some of the black boxes in northern Sweden and Northern Fennoscandia and to build a foundation for more realistic and sensitive images and narratives of the past in the North.
III

Mapping the North in the East

Archaeology and identity politics in the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation
Sápmi – the present-day traditional cultural or settlement area of the Sámi population – stretches across the nation-state borders of Northern Fennoscandia into the northwesternmost part of the Russian Federation, the Kola Peninsula. Therefore, the study of Sámi history and prehistory has also been part of what is in many ways a different research tradition compared with the Western European and Nordic traditions.

The study of the Sámi people in easternmost Sápmi, their culture, language and history started in the days of the pre-revolutionary Russian Empire, grew stronger during the era of the Soviet Union, and has since its fall continued in the present-day Russian Federation. With the drawing of the Iron Curtain in the 20th century, the Sámi populations were split, and so were the researchers. This boundary – whether political, social or economic – between the Sámi in the Nordic countries and the Sámi in Russia has continued to be one of the strongest boundaries in Sápmi.

The divide between East and West which cuts through the scientific community has continued after the fall of the Soviet Union, even though there have been attempts to reach across the gap. Although much highly relevant archaeological research has been conducted in the Soviet Union and later in the Russian Federation, the knowledge about this research and its scientific and political contexts is very limited among archaeologists in Sweden, as well as in many other western countries. Therefore, it is important for me to look into some of these contexts here, in order to better understand the conditions for archaeological research in the Sámi area in the Russian Federation. In order to understand, and contextualize, the research on Sámi history in the Russian Federation and the Soviet Union, it is also necessary to discuss more general questions on identity construction, science and politics in some length and detail. Therefore, the structure of this part will be somewhat different than in part II.

In this part of the book, the aim is to explore prehistory writing and identity construction in the northern areas and to follow some of the networks of archaeology, in the contexts of the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation. This is a very large and complex field of many interrelated issues, and I can not attempt to cover all of these. Instead, I will focus on those issues that are relevant to the aims of my study. However, I find it important to look into these issues, as they are of relevance to archaeologists also in Sweden, and as the archaeological research conducted in the Soviet Union and the Russian
Federation remains so little known in Sweden to this day. This part is intended as a complement and comparison, in part as a challenge, to the discourses in the Nordic countries that I have analyzed in the previous part.

It can not be stressed enough, that my intention is by no means to claim that there is one Soviet archaeology or one Soviet view on ethnicity (a perspective which is unfortunately too often implied). On the contrary, my aim is to show that there have been many different Soviet archaeologies and views on ethnicity. Also, I would like to stress that the division between part II (“Mapping the North in the West”) and part III (“Mapping the North in the East”) is necessitated by the political history and boundaries, especially in the 20th century. With this division, I do not intend in any way to imply that the eastern Sámi are less Sámi or less important than the western Sámi, or that the eastern and western Sámi should be treated separately. On the contrary, with the writing of this part I strive to include also the history of the Kola Sámi in the general history of the Sámi.

An additional comment that I would like to make is that I do not wish to imply that archaeology in the East is more political than archaeology in the West, although it might seem so in the different ways that the presentation of the two parts are made. Archaeology has been, and still is, embedded in political, economic and cultural processes in the West and in the East, but these historical processes have been different. The example of the history of archaeology in the Russian Federation and the Soviet Union is useful for illustrating some general problems of political control over archaeological research as well as the issues of ethnopoltics and the construction of nationality and indigeneity.

In the beginning, it is important to point out that the Sámi population in the Russian Federation is a very small population group (about 2,000 individuals according to the census in 2002), especially when seen in the light of the total amount of the population in the Russian Federation (at present about 142,000,000). The Kola Peninsula is also a rather small area located far away from the centers of power in the Federation, although with a highly strategic location and with very valuable natural resources. However, the Sámi are considered to be part of the northern indigenous peoples, or the so-called small-numbered peoples of the North, and despite its size the Sámi population group has been the subject of many researchers’ attention through the years. This attention has mostly been concerned with ethnography, linguistics and the general questions of the origin of the Sámi, as well as the relationship between the Sámi and other Finno-Ugric and Uralic population groups. Therefore, I will discuss the writing of Sámi (pre)history also in the context of the northern indigenous peoples, or as they are often called, the small-numbered peoples of the North.
Figure 26. Map of the northwestern parts of the Russian Federation, with some of the places mentioned in part III. Map by author and Karin Bengtsson.
Chapter 8. Identity, archaeology and the peoples of the North

In this chapter, I will examine the history of archaeology and the importance of prehistory in the identity politics in the Russian Federation and the Soviet Union. The aim of the chapter is to analyze some of the main lines of development and major changes that have taken place in archaeological research and in the construction of ethnicity and indigeneity. Such an examination, although by necessity limited, is important as a basis and framework for the understanding of the representations of Sámi prehistory and the roles of archaeology in today’s Russian society. First, I will examine the construction of the category of the indigenous peoples of the North in Russia and Siberia and part of the historical context. Thereafter, I will focus on archaeological research as a changing field of study in the Soviet Union and in post-Soviet Russia. I will also investigate the notions of ethnos and ethnogenesis in archaeological and ethnographical research and the political and ideological impact of state and party policies on research in Soviet times.

The indigenous peoples of the North

“Northern” is not only a geographical concept. In contemporary Russia, for example, northern identity has become extremely important for narody severa, the peoples of the North, in their common battle for economic, political, social, and cultural rights. Forgetting their linguistic differences, the Samoyeds, Khanty, and Mansi (or Tungus) among others, simply emphasize being “northern peoples” and feel great togetherness and solidarity with other minorities. (Pentikäinen 1994:375)

The Russian Federation is the world’s largest country, stretching from the Baltic Sea in the west to the Pacific Ocean in the east, and from the Tundra by the Arctic Ocean in the north to the deserts of Central Asia in the south. It is a highly heterogeneous country, with differing climatic and natural conditions. It is also a multiethnic country, with a multitude of peoples, cultures and languages within its borders (see e.g. Hosking 2002, 2006; Malakhov & Osipov 2006). Consequently, its history is very complex and multifaceted, and almost always contested.
When discussing Russian identity, it is important to realize that the word “Russian” has two different meanings in the contemporary Russian language: rossijskij and russkij. Rossijskij refers to the citizenship in the Russian Federation, while russkij refers to the Russian nationality (other nationalities of citizens of the Russian Federation can be for instance Sámi, Karelian or Komi). This is a fundamental difference, which is often lost in the English or Swedish translations (Franklin & Widdis 2004; cf. Tolz 1998).

The current federal division of the Russian Federation, with a large number of federal subjects belonging to different categories with varying autonomy, such as republics (with a titular nationality, for example Karelian or Komi), oblasts (provinces), krais (territories) and autonomous okrugs (autonomous districts), is in part based on the ethnic classification and division of the population that was conducted after the Revolution during the 1920s. In this process, the different “peoples” of the Soviet Union were supposed to receive their “own” administrative territories within the hierarchy of administrative subjects that made up the Union (see Slezkine 1994a, 1994b). The writing of (pre)history has been intimately connected with the multiethnic administrative structure of the Soviet Union and later the Russian Federation, and the

*Figure 27.* The approximate geographical location of some of the northern indigenous peoples in the Russian Federation. It should be noted that this map view is a simplification of a very complex and heterogeneous ethnic situation, involving indigenous, scientific and political classification of the peoples and their core cultural areas. Note also that many of the small-numbered indigenous peoples in southern Siberia and the Far East are not included in this map. The Sakha (Yakut), Komi and Karelians are not part of the group of the small-numbered peoples, as their populations are larger than 50,000 and they form the titular nationalities of the Sakha, Komi and Karelian Republics. Map made by author and Karin Bengtsson. The approximate location of the small-numbered peoples is based on maps in Slezkine 1994:xvi; Kohler & Wessendorf 2002:16f.; Sokolova 2004:16f.
meaning of the past in the present has become more important in times of instability and change in the political system (cf. Shnirelman 1996a).

The Sámi population in the Russian Federation is considered to be one of the “small-numbered” indigenous peoples of the North (Slezkine 1994a; Vakhtin 2002; fig. 27). As mentioned in part II, the Sámi languages belong to the group of Finno-Ugric languages. In northern Russia and western Siberia, there are several other Finno-Ugric peoples, such as the Komi, Mari, Khanty and Mansi (Taagepera 1999). Together with the Samoyed languages, for instance Nenets and Nganasan, they form the larger Uralic language family.

Table 1. The official Soviet list of the 26 “Small Peoples of the North”, here presented in order of size established in the 1989 census. Alternative names that have historically been used for these peoples are also given. (Names and numbers according to Balzer 1999:234)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnonyms</th>
<th>Population 1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nentsy (Samoyed, Yurak)</td>
<td>34,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evenki (Orochon, Tungus)</td>
<td>30,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khanty (Ostiak, Ugra)</td>
<td>22,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eveny (Lamut, Tungus)</td>
<td>17,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chukchi (Luoravetlan, Oravedlan)</td>
<td>15,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaitsy (Nanei, Goldy)</td>
<td>12,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koriaki (Nymylan, Chavchuven)</td>
<td>9,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansi (Vogul, Ugra)</td>
<td>8,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolgany (Sakha)</td>
<td>6,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nivkhi (Gilyak)</td>
<td>4,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sel'kupy (Ostiak-Samoyed)</td>
<td>3,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ul'chi (Nanei, Mangun)</td>
<td>3,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itel'men (Kamchadal)</td>
<td>2,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udegeitsy (Udekhe, Ude, Taz)</td>
<td>2,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saami (Lapp, Lopari)</td>
<td>1,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eskimosy (Yuit, Yupigit)</td>
<td>1,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuvantsy (Chukchi)</td>
<td>1,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nganasany (Tavgi, Nia, Samoyed)</td>
<td>1,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukagiry (Odul, Vadul, Omuk)</td>
<td>1,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kety (Yenesei Ostiak)</td>
<td>1,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orochi (Orochili, Nani)</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tofalary (Tofa, Tufa, Karagas, Altai Turk, Oirat)</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleyty (Unangan)</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negidalsty (El'kan Beienin)</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entszy (Eneche, Mady, Yenisei Samoyed)</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oroky (Ul'ta, Ul'cha)</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There may be some confusion as regards the terminology used in order to describe the northern indigenous peoples. In the Soviet period, the term *malye narody severa* (literally ‘small peoples of the North’; see table 1) was the official designation. In the Glasnost era, representatives of these peoples considered the word *malye* (‘small’ or ‘minor’) to be demeaning, and the term was replaced by the phrase *malotjislennye narody severa* (‘small-numbered peoples of the North’),
which since that time has been in common usage, also in scientific and legal texts (Slezkine 1994a:378). Different translations into English have been suggested. “Less-numerous peoples of the North” (Gray 2005:58f.) is one proposed translation. Another common translation is “small-numbered peoples of the North”, which is the denomination that I have chosen to use in this text. In recent times, anthropologists as well as representatives of the concerned peoples have discussed the usefulness of the term, and the usefulness of the categorization of the northern peoples itself (ibid.).

From the 1990s and onwards, “new” indigenous small-numbered peoples have been officially recognized by the government of the Russian Federation (Donahoe et al. 2008; see table 2). According to Donahoe et al., there are nearly 200 recognized “nationalities” within the Russian Federation of today. Approximately 130 of these could, according to Donahoe et al., claim to be “indigenous”. But only 45 peoples have been officially recognized as indigenous small-numbered peoples according to the legislation of the Russian Federation, which qualify them for the special rights and state support for indigenous peoples. As a further factor, the government has decided that only peoples with a maximum population size of 50,000 can be considered as small-numbered indigenous peoples.

Table 2. Indigenous small-numbered peoples in the Russian Federation, who have been officially recognized as “small-numbered peoples” by the State from the 1990s and onwards, in addition to the peoples mentioned in the table above. Population figures are given according to the data from the official census in 2002 in the Russian Federation. (Names and numbers according to Donahoe et al. 2008:1001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnonyms</th>
<th>Population 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kumandy</td>
<td>3,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shor</td>
<td>13,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleut</td>
<td>2,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abaza</td>
<td>37,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliutor (included in the Koryak category)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besermian</td>
<td>3,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelkan</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chulym</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izhora</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamchadal</td>
<td>2,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerek</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagaibak</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapsug</td>
<td>3,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soiot</td>
<td>2,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taz</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telengit</td>
<td>2,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubalar (Tuba)</td>
<td>1,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvan-Todzhin (Tozhu)</td>
<td>4,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veps</td>
<td>8,240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As is easily understood from this short introduction, there is a high degree of complexity in the discourses on indigeneity in the Russian Federation (cf. Sokolovskij 1998, 2004, 2008), a complexity which is further increased in discussions on the construction of ethnicity in a historical perspective.

The northern indigenous populations all share the historical experience of the Russian/Slavic colonization and the incorporation into the Russian empire, then the Soviet Union and at present the Russian Federation (Batyanova et al. 1999; cf. Ravna 2002). The notions of them as the “Others” and of their lived landscapes as a wilderness, combined with large-scale exploitations of natural resources in those areas, follow the same lines as with the Sámi in the Nordic countries. Yuri Slezkine has discussed the “Otherness” of the northern indigenous peoples in Russia:

… whereas the steppe nomads of the south have provided the Russian imagination, both popular and official, with some of its most enduring myths, the foragers of the “northern borderlines” have rarely threatened the settled/Christian/civilized world and have remained invisible in most versions of its past. Yet of all the non-Russian subjects of the Russian state and of all non-Russian objects of Russian concern, it is the circumpolar hunters and gatherers who have proved the most difficult to reform and conceptualize. From the birth of the irrational savage in the early eighteenth century to the repeated resurrection of the natural man at the end of the twentieth, they have been the most consistent antipodes of whatever it meant to be Russian. Seen as an extreme case of backwardness-as-beastliness or backwardness-as-innocence, they have provided a remote but crucial point of reference for speculations on human and Russian identity, while at the same time serving as a convenient testing ground for policies and images that grew out of those speculations. (Slezkine 1994a:ix)

According to some observers, the northern dimension has generally not been recognized as a very important part of the Russian identity, in contrast to the western, southern or eastern dimensions:

Although it is, by virtue of its geographical extension, the most northerly country on the face of the planet, Russia has never in history – neither in its self-definations, nor in its international positioning – based its governmental (national) ideology on its northern status. (Golovnev 2006:312; my translation)

It is well beyond our scope here to explore the complex history of the Russian colonization of northern parts of Russia and Siberia in any depth. The history of colonization of Siberia has been treated by James Forsyth in the book A history of the peoples of Siberia – Russia’s North Asian colony 1581–1990 (1992). Economic reasons, most notably the national and international trade in furs, provided some of the most important driving forces for the Russian expansion into the northern areas of Siberia.
The creation of Russia and the Russian Empire, with its vast land areas and multitude of ethnic groups, has been an important theme in Russian history writing and likewise an important part of the Russian self-image. One view on the colonization held by some pre-revolutionary Russian scholars was that the various non-Russian peoples in Siberia, Central Asia, the Baltic and the Caucasus had more or less voluntarily and rather peacefully entered the Russian state. In fact, they had not being subjected to the same kind of forced annexation or colonization that other European colonizing powers had practiced in foreign parts of the world (see further Hosking 2004:138ff.). According to the prominent Russian historian Sergej Solovev (1820–1879), the territory of Russia in the Middle Ages was “a huge virgin country, awaiting its population and awaiting its history: hence ancient Russian history is a history of a country colonising itself” (Solovev 1960:647f.; after Hosking 2004:138). This statement by one of the most important 19th century authorities on Russian history was an expression of the view on the “naturalized” “gathering” or “coming together” of the nation, its land and people. However, this view was opposed by many Soviet historians in the 1920s and 1930s, and more critical perspectives on the colonization processes have been presented in recent historical research. Furthermore, as has been pointed out by some researchers, the cultural and economic influence did not go only in the direction from the Russians colonizers to the colonized peoples, but also in the opposite direction (cf. Sunderland 1996). The process of colonization involved complex and ambivalent relationships between the different parties.

The North has played a special part in the public imagination, and an “Arctic myth” evolved in Soviet times. In the 1930s, the explorers of the Arctic regions of the Soviet Union were seen as public heroes (McCannon 1998, 2003). Also, the narrative of the “civilization project” in the North (Soviet in style), provided a strong and vigorous image of Soviet culture: the Soviet power was bringing civilization (schools, medical doctors, infrastructure, a collective class-less way of life, etc.) to the northern peripheries and the most marginalized of all peoples (cf. the “official” version of the peoples of the North and their historic road towards socialism, in Uvachan 1975). However, there was a darker side to the phenomenon of the Soviet North. As part of the repressive totalitarian system, large parts of the northern areas, for instance in the Komi Republic, were used as spaces for the resettlement of masses of deported people from different parts of the Union and for the establishment of Gulag prison camps, which were filled with convicts especially in the 1930s and 1940s. The rich natural resources in the northern areas provided one of the main reasons for the localization of the camps to these regions.

There are enormous natural resources underneath the Siberian taiga and tundra, as well as in the northernmost parts of European Russia. These resources are vital to the present-day national economy of the Russian Federation, and have provided gigantic revenues for the oil and gas companies and the Russian government. The situation of the Khanty population is one
example of the difficult situation of many indigenous peoples in Siberia. In the Western Siberian lands, where the Khanty people live, there has been a very heavy pressure on the lands from the oil and natural gas industry (see e.g. Kaupppala 2005). This has led to environmental degradation and problems for traditional land use by the local populations. There have also been reports of repeated instances of violence and other harassment against the local indigenous population in the post-Soviet period. Not least in the 1990s, with the breakdown of the legal system and the flourishing of a more or less uncontrolled capitalism which was in much based on the exploitation of the natural resources of the country, the indigenous groups whose traditional way of life “required” large geographical areas rich in natural resources came under attack (see Balzer 1999:153ff.).

In the state policies towards the northern areas and the northern minority populations, there have been alternating processes of traditionalism and preservationism, on the one hand, and modernism and modernization, on the other hand (Pika 1999:11ff.). The economic and social situation of these minority populations has been difficult, and they have often suffered from marginalization and discrimination. However, ethnopoltical movements for the improvement of the social and cultural conditions have developed since the fall of the Soviet Union (see contributions in Kohler & Wessendorf 2002; Wessendorf 2005).

Archaeology and conceptions of the Northern peoples in pre-revolutionary Russia

During the reign of Peter the Great (1682–1725), the country was turned towards Europe and underwent a process of “westernization”. The Tsardom of Russia was transformed into the Russian Empire and became a European power of great importance. In the 1710s, Peter the Great founded the first Russian museum, the Kunstkamera in St. Petersburg, which still exists today. Peter the Great also initiated the first systematic measures for the collecting and preservation of ancient artifacts, which were supposed to be sent to St. Petersburg along with descriptions of the places where the objects had been found. In the early 18th century, some of the first archaeological expeditions and excavations were also organized in Russia (Miller 1956:14f.; Dolukhanov 1995, 1996b; Tikhonov 2007:446ff.). Earlier, remains such as kurgans had been dug, or rather plundered, mostly in order to find valuable objects of gold. In the attempts by Peter the Great and his regime to “open a window to Europe” and to achieve a closer political and cultural integration of Russia into Europe, it was necessary to establish that Russia indeed was part of Europe and had always been so – a political idea that also affected the way that prehistory was studied and represented in the new Russian Empire. Not least the cities from
the classical period along the coast of the Black Sea, and Scythian and Sarmatian kurgans received a lot of attention.

From the beginning of the 19th century, a new trend appeared, marked by a growing interest in local cultural roots, which was inspired by Russian patriotism during and after the war of 1812 against the Napoleonic France. From the middle of the 19th century, a “Slavic archaeology” inspired by pan-Slavic nationalism also evolved in Russia (see further Shnirelman 1996b:221ff.). In 1846, the Russian Archaeological Society was founded in St. Petersburg. In 1859, the Imperial Archaeological Commission (IAC) was founded, which supervised all archaeological research in Russia and became the most important archaeological institution before the Revolution. The IAC was one of the foundations for organized archaeological research in Russia.

Before the Revolution in 1917, there was a strong empiricist research tradition in Russian archaeology, and there were many connections with the archaeological traditions in Western Europe. Large collections of archaeological artifacts were gathered in Moscow and St. Petersburg, and archaeological finds were exhibited at museums in different parts of the Empire. From 1809, Finland belonged to the Russian Empire as a grand duchy. During the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, Finnish archaeologists were active in the archaeological research in the Russian territories. Especially the question of the origin of the Finns, and the search for the original home of the Finns in the East, were engaging the Finnish archaeologists (see Salminen 2003a, 2003b, 2006, 2007; cf. Kemiläinen 1998; Fewster 2006). The independence of Finland in 1917, after the Bolshevik Revolution, did not stop the work of Finnish archaeologists in Russia, although it became more complicated. It was not until the mid-1930s that the Finnish research in Russia came to an end, when archaeology in the Soviet Union under the rule of Stalin was closed for western researchers.

The circumpolar region has attracted attention from scholars through the centuries. As we have seen in part II, there has been a continual interest in the northernmost parts of Scandinavia and the “exotic” people living there, the Sámi. There has also been a great deal of scholarly interest in the northernmost areas of Russia, Siberia and the Russian Far East. In much the same way as with the Sámi people in the Nordic countries, early travelers from different European countries wrote accounts and descriptions about the exotic and foreign peoples of the Russian and Siberian North. Early accounts of Samoyed and Ob-Ugrian peoples (the Khanty and Mansi are considered as Ob-Ugrian) portrayed these peoples as fantastical creatures, more or less mythical. However, as the colonization of Siberia by Russian settlers, fur traders and tax collectors increased, more detailed and realistic descriptions of the cultures and languages of these population groups started to appear in Russia and Western Europe (Leete 1999).

One classical anthropological expedition that should be mentioned in this context is the so-called Jesup North Pacific Expedition, which took place
during the years 1897–1902 (see Krupnik & Fitzhugh 2001). The Jesup Expedition was planned and organized by the anthropologist Franz Boas (1858–1942), considered as one of the most important founders of modern anthropology, under the American Museum of Natural History. The President of the museum, Morris K. Jesup (1830–1908), financed the expedition bearing his name with private funds. The aim of the expedition was to investigate the history of the native cultures and their relationships throughout the North Pacific Region, by extensive field-work and collecting of data. Some of the basic questions concerned the cultural and biological relations between Asia and the Americas, the origins and migration routes of the American Indians and Eskimos and the study of the material culture, ethnology and history of the many ethnic groups or native tribes that lived in the North Pacific Region (Fitzhugh & Krupnik 2001:2).

The Jesup Expedition is considered as one of the most ambitious and important anthropological expeditions, and it resulted in the publication of a number of important ethnographic works and reports on the different groups studied by the members of the expedition, for example *The Chukchee* (1904-1909), *Chukchee Mythology* (1910) and *The Eskimos of Siberia* (1913) by Waldemar Bogoras (Vladimir Bogoraz), *The Koryak* (1908) and *The Yukaghir and the Yukaghirized Tungus* (1910-1926) by Waldemar (Vladimir) Jochelson, and *The Kwakiutl of Vancouver Island* (1909) by Frans Boas, which were published in the official series of volumes. A large number of other works were also published on the basis of the field-work and material from the expedition (see Krupnik 2001). However, the final volume in the series, which would have provided a conclusion and a synthesis of the great number of individual studies and the enormous material, was never published.

During the field-work of the expedition, a large amount of valuable photographs were taken and large collections of artifacts were gathered. Members of the expedition also gathered skulls from graves and collected anthropometrical data, including head, face and body measurements, from over 2,000 individuals from the Northwest Coast and Siberian native groups (see Ousley & Jantz 2001).

The two Russian participants in the Jesup expedition, Vladimir Bogoraz (also known as Bogoraz-Tan; Americanized name Waldemar Bogoras; 1865–1936) and Vladimir Jochelson (also called Waldemar; 1855–1937), had both earlier in life been exiled to Siberia by the tsarist regime because of political and revolutionary activities, where they had started to do ethnological research among the indigenous Siberian population groups. Within the framework of the expedition, Jochelson conducted field-work among the Even, Koryak, Yukaghir and Yakut. Bogoraz worked among the Chukchi, Even, Koryak and Siberian Eskimo. After the Revolution, Bogoraz became a leading anthropologist in the Soviet Union and the director of the Institute of the Peoples of the North (*Institut Narodov Severa*) in Leningrad, which has played a
central role in research and education concerning the cultures and languages of
the northern peoples, including the Sámi.

The antiquarian and archaeological research in the pre-revolutionary period
has been treated by, among others, G.S. Lebedev (1992) and Aleksandr
Formozov (1986). Other important historiographical studies concerning the
period before and around the Revolution have been published by Nadezhda
Platonova. Platonova has discussed the developments in archaeological
research and the structure of the archaeological institutions in Russia during the
end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century (see e.g. 1989, 2008).

Archaeological research in the Soviet Union

The research and field-work that was carried out by archaeologists in the Soviet
Union was at the time, and has remained until today, largely unknown to
archaeologists in Western Europe. Soviet archaeology was what Bulkin, Klejn
and Lebedev in 1982 called “the great unknown” (Bulkin et al. 1982). The
concept of a Soviet archaeology is naturally a construction, by researchers
inside as well as outside of the Soviet Union. The concept has often been used
as a convenient black-box in works by archaeologists in Western Europe – for
instance in order to describe a primordialist approach to culture and ethnicity,
in opposition to an instrumentalist, more liberal, approach in most Western
European countries. On the contrary, after the fall of the Soviet Union many
Russian scholars have emphasized the similarities rather than the differences
between the two archaeological traditions (see e.g. Koryakova 2003).

Archaeology in the Soviet Union was, contrary to what many in the West
might think, a very large and active field of study, which underwent many
changes during the time of Soviet rule. There were a multitude of
archaeological institutions located in different parts of the vast country and a
very large number of professional archaeologists who carried out systematic
archaeological investigations. Furthermore, the publication of archaeological
works was very extensive. According to Pavel Dolukhanov, research was also,
at least during the period from the 1950s to the 1980s, reasonably well-funded
(Dolukhanov 1996a:1).

Here, in this short text, it is of course not possible to do justice to the
enormous multifaceted work of archaeologists in the Soviet Union or to
explore all the connections behind the black-boxed concept of Soviet
archaeology. However, I still believe that it is important to begin investigating
the structures and movements of archaeological research and interest in
prehistory and cultural heritage in the Soviet Union, as well as the images of
Soviet archaeology in the West and the relations between western and Soviet
archaeology. This is an important part in world history in the 20th century, and
therefore an important issue in the history of archaeology itself. The
ethnographic and archaeological research concerning the northern areas of
Russia and Siberia, including the research on the Sámi, was of course part of the larger development and change in Soviet archaeology and ethnography. Therefore, it is necessary to examine some central aspects of the Soviet archaeological tradition.

In a historical perspective, contacts between Swedish and Russian archaeologists have mostly concerned research on the Iron Age, especially the Viking Age – in much motivated by the Swedish interest in the Viking Age Scandinavian material culture remains in today’s Russian territory and the idea of a Scandinavian contribution to the founding of the first Rus’ state (see Jansson 2006; Svedin 2007). The “Varangian problem”, the debate on the ethnic roots – Scandinavian or Slavic – of the first Rus’ state has been the object of quite a lot of controversy over the years (Hillerdal 2006; cf. Duczko 2004).

Several researchers have discussed aspects of east-west contacts in prehistory, as concerns the northern parts of Sweden, although very few of these studies have discussed the eastern material, or the eastern contexts of research, in any greater depth (here, eastern primarily means Russian). Some of the contributions to the study of eastern contacts in the prehistory of northern Sweden include for instance contacts in the Mesolithic and the Neolithic (Christiansson 1969b; Falk 1997; cf. also Knutsson 2004), finds of flint objects or raw material originating from the area of present-day Russian Federation (Huggert 1984; Halén 1994b), finds of comb ceramics in Överkalix in the county of Norrbotten, especially at the excavated site Lillberget from around 4000 B.C. (Halén 1992, 1994a; Bennerhag & Färjare 2001), early copper finds (Huggert 1996), contacts in the Bronze Age (Tallgren 1937; Bakka 1976; Huurre 1986; Baudou 1989a; Kuzminych 1996; cf. also Hjärthner-Holdar 1998), and in the Viking and Middle Ages (Zachrisson 1987; Makarov 1991, 1992). There is also a very rich ethnographic material from the northern areas of Russia and Siberia which, together with the long tradition of ethnographic research in these areas (see e.g. Eidlitz Kuoljok 1985, 1991, 2009:49ff.; Sundström 2008), could be highly relevant to archaeologists working in the northern areas of Sweden and with Sámi history.

The main lines of development in Soviet archaeology have been discussed in several works in Russian (see e.g. Gening 1982; Tikhonov 2003; Formozov 2004). However, very few works on this topic have been published in other languages. The book *Archaeology in the USSR* by Mikhail Miller treats the first half of Soviet archaeology from the critical perspective of an émigré archaeologist (Miller 1956). In the book *Das Phänomen der sowjetischen Archäologie*, the well-known Russian archaeologist Lev Klein discusses Soviet archaeology and its different schools of thought (Klein 1997). The Russian anthropologist and archaeologist Victor Shnirelman has examined Soviet ethnicity theory and archaeology in the 1920s and 1930s in a number of articles in English (Shnirelman 1995, 1996a, 1996b).
In the spring of 1919, the Imperial Archaeological Commission was replaced by the Russian Academy for the History of Material Culture (see Platonova 1989). At the same time, it was declared that all historical and archaeological monuments in the Russian area were the property of the State (Dolukhanov 1993:150).

After the Revolution, some of the leading Russian archaeologists emigrated abroad. But, overall, in the first years of Soviet power, little changed in the methodology of studying the prehistoric material and many of the pre-revolutionary archaeologists continued their work in much the same way as before the Revolution. Until the end of the 1920s, the archaeological research was still in many ways in line with the archaeological tradition in Western Europe and there were regular contacts between Soviet and western archaeologists (Bulkin et al. 1982:274; Shnirelman 1995:124, 1996b:226). At the University of St. Petersburg, for instance, most of the archaeologists continued their work, although some had died during the Civil War or had emigrated (Tikhonov 2007:453f.). After the Revolution, the new Bolshevik leaders were more or less forced to keep some of the “bourgeois experts” and “bourgeois intellectuals” in order to keep things running. The experts and intellectuals were to be kept under surveillance but not too much harassed. There were simply not enough Bolshevik experts and scientists to run the necessary institutions. Anyway, in due time, when new experts and scientists had been trained in the new ideology, the old ones could be replaced (Fitzpatrick 1974).

In the second half of the 1920s, a new generation of archaeologists appeared, who were more Marxist-Leninist in mind, education and action. The new generation heavily criticized the older archaeologists:

First of all, they condemned the ‘creeping empiricism’ of the majority of previous archaeological studies and the preoccupation of the old generation with formal studies of artifacts, which came to be labelled … ‘naked artifactology’ … The Montelian typological method was abandoned as a product of bourgeois evolutionism which made fetishes of artifacts and improperly interpreted history in biological terms. (Bulkin et al. 1982:274)

At this time, a negative attitude towards hypotheses of cultural diffusion, migration and conquest as explanations of cultural change was wide-spread, and more or less required from an ideological point of view. Such ideas were seen as having unwanted political implications (Bulkin et al. 1982:275; Klejn 1994:75f.). The very term “archaeology” was declared to be bourgeois (Tikhonov 2007:454). A partly parallel development can be followed in the transformation of ethnography into a Marxist science (see Hirsch 2005:141ff.).

The developments in archaeology with the introduction of Marxist philosophy were part of a transformation of all of Soviet science and a reorganization of the scientific institutions in the country. Between 1929 and 1932, the Soviet leadership under Stalin demanded that all the branches of
V. I. Ravdonikas (1894–1978) was one of the central figures in the transformation of archaeological research during these years (Klejn 1997:228ff.). As an archaeologist, he conducted research on rock art sites in Karelia and excavated at the famous (Southern) Oleneostrovskij burial ground from the Mesolithic in Lake Onega. In the end of the 1920s and the beginning of the 1930s, he became much involved in the restructuring of the archaeological research according to the lines of the Marxist-Leninist materialistic understanding of the historical processes. One important article by Ravdonikas from 1930 is entitled “For a Marxist history of material culture” (1995 [1930]), which is indicative of the new direction of archaeological research. In the article, the old archaeology with its fixation on artifacts and formalist typology, represented by the legacy of the Swedish archaeologist Oscar Montelius, was denounced. Instead, a progressive program for a “Marxist history of material culture” was put forth. In the mind of Ravdonikas, a broad sociological approach should replace the narrow artifact-based approach, with complex methods instead of the simplified formal-typological method. The focus should be directed towards the productive processes from the point of view of a “critical history of technology”. Things should be studied in their social and natural environments, as results of the productive processes; the material remains should be studied in order to reconstruct the everyday life of past societies (ibid.:131).

Another proponent of the new Marxist history of material culture was S.N. Bykovskij (1896–1936). In an article entitled “On the class roots of the old archaeology”, Bykovskij also denounced many ideas and practices of the traditional archaeologists. Among other elements, he objected to the formal-typological method, which only studied the “surface” of things and did not attempt to go into the essence of the phenomena studied, as well as the simplified systematization and simple description of the archaeological material, and the tendency to study single isolated archaeological objects. He also warned for the illness of “artifactology” (vesitjevedenie) that still existed among some archaeologists in the Soviet Union: it was more comfortable and favourable, that is, socially safe, to study the things themselves and not the social phenomena that were reflected through the things. All of these elements had their roots in the old class society and the bourgeois ideology, and must be, Bykovskij stressed, thrown out from the Soviet science. Archaeology must be part of the class struggle: “Archaeological research is far from as ‘impartial’ and apolitical as it might seem at a first glance… it has its class roots, which should be uprooted by the joint efforts of the truly Soviet scientists” (Bykovskij 1995 [1931]:134; my translation).

The Soviet Union was officially created in 1922, consisting of several Soviet Republics. In 1924, the Russian Academy for the History of Material Culture changed names to the State Academy for the History of Material Culture
Its first director was N.Ja. Marr (1865–1934), who held this position until his death in 1934 (Miller 1956:46; Dolukhanov 1995:150; Klejn 1997:198ff.). Marr had great influence on linguistic, historical and ethnographical research in the Soviet Union, not least his ideas on autochthonous development, which ruled out diffusionism and migrationism as explanations of historical development.

One of the immediate consequences of the adoption of Marr’s theories by the young Soviet archaeologists was the total rejection of the concepts of cultural development which were at that time the prevailing paradigm in the West. Marr’s concepts were based on autochthonous development: hence, both diffusionism and migrationism were denounced as ‘bourgeois nationalism and racisms’. (Dolukhanov 1995:331)

Viktor Shnirelman, an anthropologist who has studied archaeological research and the uses of prehistory in the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation, has discussed how the early Soviet ideology of internationalism and universalism was replaced by a nationalistic ideology during the 1930s and 1940s (Shnirelman 1995). A nationalistic Russian archaeology, with a strong focus on the ethnogenetic history of the early Slavs, developed as a sort of defense against the threatening, expansionist German archaeology during the build-up to the Second World War (cf. also Brandenberger 2001). Ironically, many of the ethnogenetic concepts and methods were taken from its ideological enemy and transformed into the Soviet archaeology. However, although research was in much geared towards a Russian, or Slavic, nationalistic archaeology, the paradigm of ethnogenetic studies was available for all the various peoples of the Union and became useful in their search for origins and a place in the political/administrative power-play.

In November 1941, after the German invasion of the Soviet Union, Stalin held a speech at the Red Square in Moscow, in which he celebrated the memory of a number of pre-revolutionary Russian heroes, Aleksandr Nevskij, Dmitrij Donskoj, Kuzma Minin, Dmitrij Pozjarskij, Aleksandr Suvorov and Mikhail Kutuzov. These were all well-known Russian nationalist heroes, who in different centuries had defended the motherland against foreign aggressors. Although these individuals had been seen as defenders of the old regime or even as outright counter-revolutionaries in the pre-war Soviet history writing, they were now seen as positive examples to follow and were called “our great ancestors” by Stalin (Brandenberger 2001:278ff.). In the years following Stalin’s speech, this pantheon of Russian patriotic heroes appeared over and over again in a huge number of pamphlets, posters and slogans.

Stalin had earlier, in 1937, published a booklet in which he urged historians to write not only general history, but specifically the histories of the nations belonging to the USSR and of their interactions and connections with the outside world. During the 1940s, Marrism ceased to be applied in
archaeological research. Instead, the concept of ethnogenesis, which had been condemned by Marr’s theories, was revived, and several conferences on the ethnogenesis of particular peoples in the Soviet Union were organized (Shnirelman 1996b:233; Curta 2002:207). However, Marr was not formally expelled from the Marxist pantheon, “… so that Soviet ethnologists from various disciplines found themselves in a no-man’s-land between two worlds that had nothing to do with each other: the official blood-and-soil nationalism and the no less official socioeconomic Marrism” (Slezkine 1996:853). In 1950, a series of articles by Joseph Stalin were published in Pravda (20 June, 4 July and 2 August; see Stalin 1972 [1950]). These articles, in which Stalin denounced the linguistic theories of Marr, marked the definite end of the influence of Marr in Soviet science.

It is important to remember that during the Soviet period there was a strong political control, by the Communist Party, over the direction and fundamental ideology of science and research. The research environment was part of the centralized totalitarian system that embraced the whole society. Some key components of the system were control, organization and restrictions of both behavior and thought. Scholarly debate, for instance in the historical sciences, was in many ways restricted and circumscribed (see e.g. Sakharov 1996; Karlsson 1999; Wertsch 2002:72ff.). It is also of interest to note that the Soviet society, in theory, was considered to have been founded on a scientific basis: a scientific, Marxist-Leninist base, which pointed out the rightful and correct path of the community towards the complete victory and triumph of communism.

During the Stalin age, especially in the 1930s and 1940s, archaeology as scientific theory and practice was subjected to a large-scale and severe repression. This repression was part of the Stalinist purges that swept the entire society in those years and that terrorized and victimized millions of people in the Soviet Union. As part of these campaigns, a large number of archaeologists were officially denounced and removed from their positions in universities and institutes, and many were deported to the Stalinist prison camps (see Formozov 1998, 2004). As an example, S.N. Bykovskij (see above), who belonged to the new generation of Marxist archaeologists and was a follower to Marr, was imprisoned and later shot in 1936. In the 1936 issue of the journal Sovetskaja Etnografija (’Soviet Ethnography’), Bykovskij was brutally denounced (Sovjetskaja Etnografija 1936). He was accused of “scholastic pseudo-academic reasoning that turned scholars away from concrete research and destroyed archaeology as a discipline” (Shnirelman 1995:130; cf. also Slezkine 1991:483).

The repression hit hard against many other fields of the human and social sciences as well, such as ethnography (see Tumarkin 2002) and linguistics (see Alpatov 1990). The social and cultural experiments during the period of the New Economic Policy in the 1920s (NEP, 1921–1928; a period when some private property and enterprises were allowed and a certain sense of economic and cultural “freedom” prevailed in many sectors of society) came to an end.
with the introduction of the first five-year plan in 1928, the “Great Turn” of 1929–30 and the Stalinist cultural revolution of the 1930s. Leading intellectuals, scientists, writers, artists and many more belonging to the national minorities, such as the small-numbered northern peoples, who were often involved in the cultural revival of these groups in the 1920s, were also the targets of the purges; some intellectual circles were completely annihilated (cf. Taageperä 1999; Patrushev 2000). The field of Sámi studies was unfortunately no exception (see next chapter).

In the mid-1930s, Soviet archaeology became a more or less completely closed field of study for western researchers. The Finnish archaeologists who had worked with the archaeological material from Russia experienced increasingly more serious problems, until research became practically impossible to conduct (Salminen 2003b:111). For the well-known Finnish archaeologist A.M. Tallgren research became increasingly difficult, and after the mid-1930s he could not travel anymore to the Soviet Union (ibid.; cf. Tallgren 1936). At the same time, the possibilities for Soviet archaeologists to contact foreign archaeologists or to publish in other countries became severely restricted. After 1934, there were no more articles by Soviet archaeologists in Tallgren’s journal *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua*, which was devoted to archaeological research in northern Eurasia, and in 1938, the last volume of the journal was published.

Although still proclaiming to be Marxist in character, archaeological studies thereafter in general followed the cultural-historical paradigm with empiricism as the leading principle in theory and practice. Archaeological research concentrated on the systematization of prehistory by defining and delimiting territorial-cultural formations, continuing the empirical-positivist traditions founded in part by the well-known Russian archaeologists V.A. Gorodtsov (1860–1945) and A.A. Spitsyn (1858–1931) (see Kosmenko 2006:170).

In 1953, Stalin died, and with the speech by Nikita Chrusjtjov (Khrushchev) at the 20th Party Congress in 1956, the process of De-Stalinization began. The personality cult of Stalin was denounced, many of the individuals who had been victims of the repression during the Stalin era were rehabilitated and many political prisoners were freed from the Gulag labor camps. However, the omnipresent state-controlled system continued to function after the death of Stalin, and had great effect on research as well. For instance, the possibilities to publish research results in the Soviet Union were very uneven and depended to a large extent on the position and the personal contacts of the researcher (Kolpakov & Vishnyatsky 1990).

Bruce Trigger has pointed out a number of major achievements and contributions to world archaeology by Soviet archaeology, which were accomplished despite the often difficult circumstances in the totalitarian system. In his view, one of Soviet archaeology’s major contributions to world archaeology was the emphasis on *how* people had lived in the past, which was in part conditioned by the historical materialist interest in social organization and
the changes of the modes of production and the productive forces in prehistoric times: “Because of their concern with social change, Soviet archaeologists revived an interest in cultural evolution as well as associated concepts of development and progress, at a time when diffusionism was in the ascendant in North America and the rest of Europe” (Trigger 2006:336f.). As examples of the archaeological contributions resulting from this focus, Trigger mentions the pioneer achievements of S.A. Semenov (1898–1978) in the field of experimental use-wear analyses of stone and bone tools, and the early large-scale horizontal excavations, with detailed stratigraphical documentation, of settlements and other ancient sites which for instance led to the discovery of the first Palaeolithic dwellings in the world in the 1930s (ibid.:334ff.; cf. Dolukhanov 1995:330).

Primordialism, ethnos and ethnogenetic studies in Soviet archaeology and ethnography

During the Revolution of 1917, in contrast to their political opponents who stood for a “one and united” Russia, Lenin and the Bolsheviks used the slogan of the right to self-determination as a tremendously effective weapon in winning the non-Russian regions to their side. (Tishkov 1994:446)

During the 1920s, the Soviet government promoted the process of korenizatsija, or indigenization, as part of the decolonizing rhetoric of the new Bolshevik leaders. In this process, national territories, languages, cultures and elites were supported in different ways by the government (see Martin 2001:9ff.). Experts in ethnography played an important role in the categorization of the population and the creation of the ethno-administrative structure of the Soviet Union, as well as in the process of empowering the “new” Soviet ethnicities and transforming and developing them as part of the Soviet civilization (see further Eidlitz Kuoljok 1985; Slezkine 1994a, 1994b; Anderson 2000; Hirsch 2005). In this process, ethnicity and nationality were institutionalized and territorialized in the creation of ethno-territorial entities and ethnic institutions:

… during the All-Union Census of 1926, the ethnographer-consultants reported that the inhabitants of nonurban regions continued to identify themselves primarily in terms of clan, tribe, religion, or place of origin, while local elites attempted to manipulate the registration of nationality to advance their own agendas. By the early 1930s, however, a qualitative shift had occurred. Even rural and nomadic populations that previously had not exhibited “national consciousness” were describing themselves as members of nationalities – and were using the language of nationality to argue for economic, administrative, and political rights. Nationality had become a fundamental marker of identity, embedded not just in the administrative structure of the Soviet Union, but also in people’s mentalities. (Hirsch 2005:145)
It is important to keep in mind that class consciousness constituted a fundamental part of the ideology, and that conceptualizations of class and class struggle guided the state policies also towards the northern peoples:

“The internationalism of the proletariat” presupposes class consciousness and class thinking. It occupied a central place in the ideological re-schooling during the first half of the 1930’s: the Russian people were not identical with the Russian oppressors, and the oppressors were also to be found in the ranks of the peoples of the North themselves (“the clan aristocracy”, i.e. the kulaks, the shamans and the former clan elders). (Eidlitz Kuoljok 1985:159)

The theoretical basis for the scientific research was the official Marxist philosophy, based on dialectical and historical materialism, in great contrast to Western archaeology (Guljaev & Beljajev 1995:97ff.; cf. also Eidlitz Kuoljok 1985:13ff.). However, the relationship between the official philosophy and the methods of archaeology was not always straightforward, but rather ambiguous and paradoxical (Klejn 2004:206). In the book *Archaeology in the USSR*, A.L. Mongait has written about the superiority of the theoretical foundation of Soviet archaeology, according to the official ideology:

When, however, we speak of the superiority of Soviet archaeology, we have in mind not separate achievements or successes (of which there are not a few among workers in bourgeois countries) but that real superiority of which we are profoundly convinced: the superiority of method of our work, based on Marxist philosophy, which ensures the most objective uncovering of the historical past. (Mongait 1970[1955]:74)

And furthermore, in the words of Mongait and the official language of the Communist Party, concerning the role of history and archaeology:

Creatively mastering the great science of Marxism-Leninism, expanding and defining the methods of research, Soviet archaeologists will strive to reach that level of attainment in historical science at which ‘the science of the history of society (in spite of the complexity of the phenomena of social life) can be just as exact a science as say biology, and provide laws of development of society for practical application’ (*History of Communist Party, Short Course*, p. 109). (From Mongait 1970[1955]:74)

The fields of Soviet ethnography and archaeology have frequently been described as a primordialist tradition in the West. As discussed above, from the mid-1930s and the 1940s, the focus in Soviet ethnography and archaeology shifted towards the ethnogenetic research, that is, the study of the origin and ethnohistory of the different peoples of the Soviet Union (cf. Shnirelman 1995, 1996b; Tishkov 1997). It has been pointed out, however, that there is a long tradition of ethnogenetic research in pre-revolutionary historical research in Russia, starting already with the old Kievan Rus’ Primary Chronicle, a tradition
that was revived and renewed during Stalinist times (Kutjumov 2003:53ff., 93). Ethnogenesis in the Soviet context was understood “as a long continuing process of the emergence of the main characteristics of an ethnic community: physical appearance, language, cultural features and the like” (Shnielman 1996b:219), and ethnogenetic research was the study of these processes. Material culture, biology and language were often fused within the concept of ethnos. Archaeological assemblages and archaeological cultures were in many instances equated with ethnic groups, resulting in a mosaic of prehistoric cultures arranged in space-time as separate one-entities.

The concept of “ethnos” became the basic unit of ethnic classification for Soviet ethnographers in the period after the Second World War. The ethnos was defined “as the ‘essence’ or ‘sum total of stable ethnic features’ of a people, which were retained over generations, over the course of migrations, and through the various stages on the historical timeline” (Hirsch 2005:313). According to this view, an ethnos had both objective and subjective properties, and culture was seen as the main carrier of ethnos. Ethnos was to be studied from the perspective of historical materialism, “looking at past and present ethnic forms ‘in the making’” (ibid.:313f.).

The five-stage schema of socio-economic formations, through which societies passed in their historical development, comprised the stages of the primitive-communal, slaveholding, feudal, capitalist and socialist socio-economic formations. This idea of socio-economic progress permeated historical, ethnographical as well as archaeological research, and was seen as a law of historical development.

One of the central figures in later Soviet ethnography was Yulian Bromley (1921–1990), director of the Ethnographical Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in Moscow during the years 1966-1989 (see Lindstrom 1998; for more on the work and ideas of Bromley, see contributions by Russian scholars in Kozlov 2003). In his work, Bromley developed what was called a “theory of ethnos”, which was a developed form of the five-stage schema. However, Bromley also emphasized that all ethnoses were dynamic systems that had evolved in the course of history, and that “no ethnos is either eternal or immutable, but this does not contradict the fact that stability is a characteristic feature of ethnos” (Bromley 1974 [1971]:66):

Thus, ethnos in the narrow sense of the word and in the most general form may be defined as a historically formed community of people characterized by common, relatively stable cultural features, certain distinctive psychological traits, and the consciousness of their unity as distinguished from other similar communities. (Bromley 1974 [1971]:66)

During the last decades of the Soviet period, there was a quite lively discussion among archaeologists on the understanding of the concepts of “archaeological cultures” and “ethnos” and how they were interrelated (see e.g. Gening 1988;
Anikovitj 1989; Klejn 1991, 2004; Okladnikov 2003 [1973]). The debate has continued in post-Soviet times (cf. contributions in Goldina 2000 and Kotjkurkina & Kosmenko 2006). Questions about the ethnogenesis and ethnic history of different peoples have also attracted a lot of interest among the public, outside of the academic circles (Vitenkova 2006:139).

Ethnopolitics and archaeology in the Russian Federation

The fall of the Soviet Union was a dramatic and, for many people, painful and traumatizing chain of events. The process, its causes and consequences, is a complex issue which has been debated in many fields of study. Here, it is important to stress that this was a time of great change and transformation in the construction of collective and personal identities, ideas and symbols, material culture and ways of life – in society at large as well as within the academic community. It was a period of uprooting and dislocation for many in the former Soviet Union.

Archaeological research was of course deeply affected in many ways by the changes in society. Several archaeologists have witnessed about the hardships and the chaotic situation in the early 1990s (see e.g. Dolukhanov 1993; Guljajev & Beljajev 1995). The funding for archaeological research was severely cut down, and the privileges and resources that scholars at the universities and the Academy of Sciences had enjoyed were lost. Another loss, not so insignificant, was that of ideology and philosophy. Obviously, the fall of the totalitarian control system also meant new possibilities for contacts and exchange with archaeologists from other countries. At the same time, new problems arose for archaeologists who had earlier conducted research in parts of the Soviet Union that had now become independent states, with new ambitions for their own national histories and prehistories. Furthermore, the communication networks and institutional contacts that has existed within the vast former Union fell apart (see Dolukhanov 1993; Koryakova 2003:244).

After the fall of the Soviet Union, ethnicity appeared as a central factor in the political debates and positioning on the future administrative-territorial organization. After the disintegration of the Soviet Union, new countries were created, and a new wave of nationalism emerged, which has had effect also in the networks of archaeology. Also within the newly created Russian Federation, many different population groups turned in the early 1990s to the past and the remains from the past in their creation of new identities and in their negotiations on autonomy and self-determination (Shnirelman 1996a; cf. 2003b). Different groups of people tried to create new identities within the new social and political reality, by recreating or revitalizing a culture and history of their own. In some areas, this has led to conflicts between different groups over the past. In the former Soviet republics in Transcaucasia (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia), archaeological arguments have been used in connection
with armed conflicts, in order to legitimate territorial claims (see Kohl & Tsetskhladze 1995; Kohl 1998b; Shnirelman 2001). Concerning the Russian Slavic past, Sergey Plokhy has discussed some conflicting attempts to “nationalize” the ancient Rus’ past along the lines of the present-day national projects in Ukraine and in the Russian Federation, which reflect the deterioration of the official relations between the two countries (Plokhy 2006).

In many archaeological studies in the Russian Federation, it is still today an important aim to define the ethnic belonging of different archaeological cultures and to define the connections with the ethnic groups of today. The ethnogenetic paradigm still prevails in many studies. The archaeological research about the Finno-Ugric populations in the northern parts of the Russian Federation, although in a region more peaceful than the post-Soviet Caucasus and Transcaucasus regions, has been a research field where the search for the Finno-Ugric or Uralic “homelands”, the connection between archaeological cultures and languages and ethnic groups, and the connection between prehistoric assemblages of artifacts and present-day population groups have been important elements of the research agenda (see e.g. Patrushev 2000, and further discussions in the next chapter). Valerij Patrushev, a well-known archaeologist from Yoshkar-Ola in the Mari-El Republic, writes in his book on the early history of the Finno-Ugric peoples of Russia about specific Finno-Ugric cultures already in the Stone Age and the Bronze Age (Patrushev 2000).

The archaeologist E.N. Chernykh has criticized the re-writing of the pre- and early history of the Finno-Ugrian peoples in the Russian Federation, calling some of the writings of Valerij Patrushev chauvinist nationalist (Chernykh 1995:145). Maybe this phenomenon can be seen partly in the same light as the division between the neutral “non-ethnic Swedes” and the political “ethnic Others”, such as the Sámi, within the country of Sweden. After the fall of Communism, the Russian identity and self-understanding has been a field of much attention and debate. Part of the picture is also an increasing Russian nationalism, with examples of xenophobia and racism in society. The two wars in Chechnya and other conflicts in the southern parts of the Russian Federation in the Caucasus region have further contributed to the complexity of the picture.

On the opposite page: Pictures from Sápmi in Russia. From the top: Soviet-style appartement blocks in Lovozero on the Kola Peninsula, old wooden houses by Virma River in Lovozero, Lenin in Sápmi in the town of Lovozero, and a view of Lake Imandra on the Kola Peninsula. All photographs by author.
From the 1990s, an instrumentalist approach to ethnicity has spread among Russian ethnographers and anthropologists (inspired by the instrumentalist approach in the West that has developed since the 1960s, see discussion in part I), in contrast to the primordialist views on ethnops and ethnogenesis that dominated during the Soviet period (see Tishkov 2003; Kosmenko 2006:162f.). The instrumentalist approach emphasizes the situational and contextual aspects of ethnicity, as well as the centrality of self-identification and the interrelations with other communities. On the other hand, the predominant direction of archaeological research in the Russian Federation today is still very empirical in character. Theoretical speculations are often viewed with more or less suspicion by many researchers. In some way, maybe the history of archaeology and other social and human sciences in the Soviet Union with its political programs and obligatory expressions of obedience to the official line functions as a deterrent in this respect. Other explanations have, however, also been put forth. Ludmila Koryakova has pointed to the lack of financing in the period after the fall of the Soviet Union, which hit extra hard against theoretically oriented studies in archaeology (Koryakova 2003).

Today, archaeological research in the Russian Federation is also dealing with questions of protection and preservation of the archaeological heritage, as part of the more general discourses on cultural heritage in society. With the changes in society, new problems for the cultural heritage management, museums, archives and scientific institutions have emerged. Nikolaj Makarov, archaeologist and director of the Institute of Archaeology of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow, has drawn attention to the plundering and destruction of archaeological sites in the Russian Federation. In a publication on the subject, he has discussed the problem and has described a number of archaeological sites that have been plundered and damaged or destroyed (Makarov 2004). Grave-robbing is a particularly serious problem, as many artifacts are attractive on the national and international black market. For instance, grave mounds from the Late Iron Age in northwestern Russia are very vulnerable, as there is great demand/interest for Scandinavian Viking Age artifacts. The ancient remains (from the Classical period) in the southern parts of Russia are also very attractive for robbers. There are federal laws prohibiting destruction and excavations of ancient remains, but the possibilities of enforcing the laws are small.
In this chapter, I will focus more specifically on the question of the construction and representation of Sámi prehistory in the Russian Federation and the former Soviet Union. First, however, it is necessary to say a few words, as an introduction, about the historical background and the more general history of research concerning the eastern part of Sápmi and the Kola Sámi population.

Eastern Sápmi and the Kola Sámi: a short history and background

As has been mentioned earlier, the Sámi in the Russian Federation is a very small population group. In the census of 2002, the number of people who considered themselves Sámi was 1,991 (Donahoe et al. 2008:1001). The majority of these lived on the Kola Peninsula in the Murmansk Region, about 1,600 in the end of the 1990s (Loukjantchenko 1999:16; see also the discussion on the construction of indigenous populations in the Soviet Union/Russian Federation in the preceding chapter). The eastern Sámi population, who has a common history under Russian rule, is usually divided into four groups with four languages: the Skolt, Kildin, Akkala and Ter Sámi. Kildin Sámi is the largest group and the predominant language today, for instance in radio broadcasting and newspapers. The Ter and Akkala Sámi populations have been small minorities. The Akkala Sámi language is today considered extinct, and there are extremely few Ter Sámi speakers. In present times, the Skolt Sámi live in northern Finland, Norway and in Russia, and the Skolt Sámi language is also threatened by extinction (Sergejeva 2000b:155).

Here, a short outline of some of the main events and lines of development in the history of the Kola and Skolt Sámi will be presented. In the following, they will be collectively referred to as eastern Sámi or Kola Sámi. A review of the history of archaeological and ethnographical research in the Sámi areas in Russia will follow in the next section.

Throughout history, the main means of subsistence on the Kola Peninsula have been fishing and hunting, for wild reindeer or sea animals. Reindeer husbandry seems to have become more important from about the 17th century. However, reindeer herding among the eastern Sámi was mainly small-scale with
few reindeers (Lukjantjenko 1971; Sergejeva 2000a:11). From the 12th century, the Principality of Novgorod started to exercise influence over the northern shore of the White Sea. The control of Novgorod over the Kola Peninsula gradually grew stronger from the beginning of the 13th century. The Sámi area became a tax-paying region, belonging to political and economic sphere of Novgorod the Great (Usjakov 1972:21ff.; Sergejeva 2000a:16). From 1478, the territory of the Kola Peninsula came under the sovereignty of the expanding Moscow State. From the 15th century onwards, different censuses and surveys for taxation purposes were conducted by the government (Usjakov 1972:275ff.). As with the other northern areas, one of the main motivating factors for the early economic and political expansion was the profitable international fur trade. From the end of the 16th century, the coastal areas of the Kola Peninsula were regularly visited by tradesmen and seafarers from Norway-Denmark, England and Holland.

Orthodox missionaries started their work in the Sámi area around the end of the 15th century, after the establishment of the Moscow State. From this period in time, the political interests of the state and the missionary policies of the Orthodox Church were closely interrelated (Porsanger 2004:108ff.). Several monasteries were founded in the northern areas of Russia, also in the Sámi areas on the Kola Peninsula. The monastery on the Solovetskije Islands in the White Sea, which was established in the first half of the 15th century, became one of the largest monasteries in Russia and a very important religious, cultural, economic and military center in the northern regions – in the early years of Soviet power, it was transformed into an infamous prison for political dissidents. During the 16th and 17th centuries, the monasteries became the most powerful feudal landowners in the North. Behind the missionary activities in the northwestern parts of Russia, there was also the need to protect the border from the influence of the Lutheran faith in Sweden-Finland and Norway-Denmark (ibid.). Some of the orthodox missionaries have received a special place in the legends and oral history of the local Sámi population. The monk St. Trifon (1495–1583), who worked among the Skolt Sámi and founded the monastery of Peäccam (Petsamo) and the Church of St. Boris and St. Gleb by the Pasvik River near the border to Norway, is still remembered in the oral traditions and legends in the local communities in the region (ibid.:111ff.).

At least officially, practically all of the Sámi population on the Kola Peninsula had become Christians by the mid-18th century (Sergejeva 2000a:24). However, in many of the Sámi villages there were no churches, the parish priests visited the villages only very occasionally, and elements of the indigenous religious beliefs and practices survived after the conversion. The Christianization campaigns directed against many of the “heathen” population groups in the northern areas of Russia and Siberia often achieved only “partial conversion” and many non-Christian beliefs and practices have in part lived on into the Soviet and post-Soviet periods (cf. Balzer 1999:54ff.; Sundström 2007). After the fall of the Soviet Union, religious revivalist movements in the North,
in which pre-Christian religious traditions have been revitalized and transformed, have played an important role in the ethнополitical movement.

In the 1890s, reindeer herding families from the northern Izhma Komi population (a group of the Komi people), who had earlier lived in the valley of the Izhma River, moved to the Kola Peninsula after a disastrous breakout of a reindeer illness that killed huge amounts of reindeer and contaminated the pastures in the Izhma valley. They were thus forced to relocate their herds. The Izhma Komi had learned reindeer herding from the Nenets groups and became entrepreneurs in the reindeer herding business (Donahoe et al. 2008:1003). There were also Nenets people working as reindeer herders who moved to the Kola Peninsula along with the Komi reindeer owners. The Komi and Nenets greatly influenced the reindeer herding management on the Kola Peninsula in the following time period. The Komi reindeer herding was managed on a much larger and intensive scale for meat production, with much larger herds than the ones that belonged to the Sámi families (Chernyakov 1998:54; Konstantinov 2005:13ff.; Ruotsala 2005:132ff.). Today, there is a relatively large Komi population on the Kola Peninsula, and also some people with a Nenets identity.

The Russian Revolution, the creation of the Soviet Union and the policies of the new Soviet power on minorities and the small-numbered northern peoples have had great effect on the Kola Sámi. The processes of collectivization also reached the Kola Peninsula and the Sámi, Komi and Nenets reindeer herders (see Kiselev & Kiseleva 1987:67ff.; Vladimirova 2006:136ff.). From the end of the 1920s, several reindeer herding kolkhozes, collective farms, were created on the Kola Peninsula, which included Sámi, Komi, Nenets and Russian reindeer herders (with names such as ‘Red Tundra’ and ‘Forward’). The process of collectivization on the Kola Peninsula was not a straightforward process and did involve protests and resistance from the local population (see Ruotsala 2005). Protests against the actions of the Soviet regime, especially the forced collectivization campaigns occurred also in other areas in the northern regions, sometimes involving violent uprisings (Balzer 1999:99ff.; Leete 2005).

As part of the Tartu Treaty in 1920, the Skolt Sámi in the Petsamo District became part of the newly independent Finland, and yet another boundary was drawn through Sápmi. After the Second World War, when Finland lost the Petsamo District to the Soviet Union, the majority of the Skolt Sámi population in the area was relocated to settlements by the Lake Inari in northern Finland. The remaining Skolt Sámi on the Russian side of the border were forced to resettle far from the border in the interior parts of the Kola Peninsula. The Skolt Sámi became a minority within the Sámi minority in Finland, distinguished by their language, orthodox religion and different cultural and historical background (Lehtola 2004:66f.).

During Soviet times, the Kola Peninsula has endured a very heavy industrialization, including large-scale development of the mining industry and growth of many new industrial towns. As part of the process of industrialization, the population of the Kola Peninsula increased greatly with an
influx of people from many different parts of the Soviet Union. In certain areas, the environment as well as public health has been seriously affected from the industrial pollution.

The Kola Peninsula has become an important strategic area for the Soviet, and today the Russian, military. Large areas of the peninsula have been used and occupied by the military for different installations and practice grounds. The coastal areas of the Kola Peninsula are considered military areas, and access to the coastal areas is restricted for foreigners. This is also the case with large areas along the Norwegian and Finnish borders. In some areas, the military installations have forced the local people to move or have had negative effects on the possibilities for the local people to use the lands. The military activities have also caused problems for the environment, not least resulting from the nuclear technology used by the Navy.

In the 1960s, a number of villages and settlement sites on the Kola Peninsula that were regarded as being without prospects were simply abolished as settlements by the authorities and the population was removed to larger settlements, mostly to the town of Lovozero, which subsequently has had the largest population of Sámi people on the Kola Peninsula. The forced relocation of the population has caused deep scars in the lives of the local communities (see Bolsjakova 2005:60ff.). The state policy on resettlement and abolition of unprosperous settlement points also affected other areas of northern Russia and Siberia (cf. Grant 1995:124ff.). In connection with the resettlements in the 1960s, the small reindeer herding kolkhozes that had been founded earlier were joined together in larger sovkhozes (for instance “Tundra” and “In memory of Lenin”), which were state-run enterprises where the herders became paid employees (Konstantinov 2005:25ff.).

The social and economic situation for a large part of the Sámi population in Russia after the fall of the Soviet Union has been quite harsh and troublesome. There has been a high unemployment rate among the Sámi, the birth rates as well as life expectancy have fallen, and there have been very serious health problems, especially connected with a widespread alcoholism (Gutsol & Riabova 2002). This negative situation has, unfortunately, been shared with many of the small-numbered northern peoples (for a review of the contemporary situation of these population groups, see Tishkov 2004; Wessendorf 2005), and many of the other inhabitants of the northern areas of the Russian Federation.

During the 1980s, the social and political mobilization among the Sámi in the Soviet Union grew in importance (Loukjantchenko 1999:17). Two general Sámi organizations have been founded: The Association of the Kola Sámi (Assotsiatsija kolskich saamov) in 1989, and The Social Organization of the Sámi of the Region of Murmansk (Obyjjestvennaja Organizatsija Saamov Murmskoj Oblasti) in 1998. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the contacts with Sámi political and cultural organizations in the Nordic countries have increased. Since 1992, Kola Sámi organizations have participated in the work of the Saami
Council. At present, the foundation of a Sámi Parliament in the Russian Federation is being discussed by representatives of the Kola Sámi population.

Ethnographic and archaeological research in the Russian part of Sápmi

In this section, I will review some of the earlier ethnographic and archaeological research that has taken place in the Russian part of Sápmi. The aim is to contextualize the discussions on Sámi prehistory and ethnogenesis in the Russian Federation and the Soviet Union. As this research is generally little known in Sweden, I will discuss it in some detail here.

The geographical area of interest here covers mainly two administrative regions in the Russian Federation. One is the Murmansk Oblast on the Kola Peninsula, and the other is the Karelian Republic, which is located south of the Kola Peninsula. The present-day Sámi area lies within the Murmansk administrative region, that is, on the Kola Peninsula. However, as already mentioned, based on toponymic and historical sources, many researchers have argued that there existed a Sámi population in historic times that lived in a much larger area than at present, which extended far to the south in the Karelian Republic, possibly also to the east of Karelia (see e.g. Kert 1971:9ff.; Lukjantjenko 1990; Mullonen 2001; Kötkurkina 2004:54ff.).

Furthermore, there are several sites in Karelia that have been interpreted as Sámi sacred sites, with different kinds of raised stones and other stone constructions (see Manjukhin 1996a, 1996b, 2003). As we will see later, this view has also been contested by other researchers. On the Solovetskij Islands in the White Sea, famous for its important monastery founded in the 15th century that was used as a dreaded and infamous prison camp during the Soviet era, there is a multitude of archaeological monuments such as labyrinths, stone cairns and other stone constructions. On the islands, a number of burials have been interpreted as having been constructed by an earlier Sámi population in the White Sea basin (Lukjantjenko 1990).

As has been the case with the Sámi population in the Nordic countries, the early scholarly interest in the Sámi population on the Kola Peninsula primarily concerned geographical, linguistic and ethnographic issues, while historical research was reserved for the civilized nation-building peoples. Already in the 1720s, the first academic expedition to the Kola Peninsula was organized by the Russian Academy of Sciences, which had been founded by Peter the Great in his new city of St. Petersburg in 1724. In the early 19th century several books were published in Russia which contained descriptions of the Kola Sámi and their ways of life (see Sergejeva 2000b:158; Kosjetkin 2003:60f.). Among the researchers from abroad who traveled in the Sámi area and collected ethnographic information in the 19th century, one can mention scholars such
as the Finnish linguist and ethnographer M.A. Castrén (1813–1852), the founder of Finno-Ugric studies at the University of Helsinki, who traveled in the Kola Sámi area in 1841–42 (cf. Pasjkov & Tretjakova 2009), the Finnish linguist and historian Anders Johan Sjögren, and the Finnish linguist and prominent Finno-Ugric scholar Arvid Oscar Gustav Genetz (1848–1915). In 1886, Genetz traveled to the Kola Peninsula and visited Notozero and Suonnjel in the western part of the Kola Peninsula to study the Skolt Sámi and their language. Thereafter, he traveled to Ponoj in the easternmost part of the Kola Peninsula to study the Ter Sámi language. He also visited the Sámi population around the Lake Imandra. Genetz later published an important dictionary of the Kola Sámi languages and also translated a part of the New Testament into Kildin Sámi (Sergejeva 2000b:159f.).

During the second half of the 19th century, many Russian scholars showed an interest in the Kola Sámi and their language and folklore. The Russian Geographical Society (Russkoje Geografitjeskoje Obsjtjestvo), which was founded in 1845, organized several expeditions and studies concerning the northern peoples, including the Sámi. V.I. Nemirovich-Danchenko, who was a member of the Russian Geographical Society, wrote many books and articles on Sámi folklore and ethnography. In the book Strana Kholoda (‘The Country of the Cold’; 1877), Nemirovich-Danchenko confronted the view, expressed by some researchers, that the Kola Sámi did not have any folklore of their own:

One reason why I am interested in the Sami people of Murmann is that our scientists have held the view that the Sami do not have any folklore at all. I cannot believe that there is a nation anywhere that does not have its own stories or folklore. There is no such nation, as there are no human bodies without a heart. I could not discover why the Sami had been obscuring their rich and poetic folklore. Was this oppressed tribe afraid of strangers? Or were they too shy as a result of Russian merchants and Norwegians laughing at their stories and songs, and because our priests had labeled them as heathens and heretics? (Nemirovich-Danchenko 1877:195f.; translation from Sergejeva 2000b:161)

Another scholarly society of importance in this context was the so-called Imperial Society for the Devotees to the Natural Sciences, Anthropology and Ethnography (Imperatorskoje obsjtjestvo ljubitelej jestestvoznanija, antropologii i etnografii) in Moscow. In the publication series of the society appeared several studies of the Sámi. The most important publication was the large monograph entitled Russkie Lopari (‘The Russian Lapps’) by Nikolaj Kharuzin, published in 1890. Russkie Lopari was a broad fundamental work on the Russian Sámi, the standard work, which has had great influence on subsequent research. The work was based on an examination of all literature on the Sámi, in Russia and abroad. It was further based on material from the field-work of the author in the 1880s. However, Kharuzin’s field-work had been limited to the Skolt Sámi areas in the western part of the Kola Peninsula. Therefore, the Kildin, Ter and Akkala Sámi were mentioned much less in the book (Sergejeva 2000b:163ff.).
During the Soviet period a number of ethnographic and anthropological studies of the Kola Peninsula and the Sámi population were carried out (see Loukijantchenko 1999; Kosjetjkin 2003:63ff.). In the 1920s and the 1930s, many scientific expeditions to the Kola Peninsula were organized by different institutions in the Soviet Union (see Kuropjatnik 1999; cf. also Hirsch 2005:251). One important scholar in the study of Sámi folklore and religion was V.V. Tjarnoluskij (e.g. 1930, 1962, 1993).

The field of northern studies, including Sámi studies and its researchers, was also severely hit by the Stalinist repression in the 1930s. One example is the fate of the well-known scholar in Sámi studies D.A. Zolotarev. He was arrested in 1930 and sent to a labor camp. In 1932, he was released and worked for a period as a professor of anthropology and museum studies in Leningrad. However, in 1934, he was arrested a second time and was sent to a Gulag camp in Siberia where he died in the following year (Kuropjatnik 1999:122). In the end of 1937, the group of researchers who had been working on the construction of written languages for 14 of the small-numbered northern peoples, which included the Sámi, were arrested – which brought this groundbreaking work to an end (ibid.:123). Another tragic example is the scholar Vasilij Alymov (1883–1938), who was a very active researcher in the Sámi areas. Alymov was arrested together with several others in the process which is sometimes called the “Sámi conspiracy” (see Rantala 2006). After brutal interrogations, most probably involving torture, Alymov confessed to

Figure 28. A waterfall on the Tuloma River on the Kola Peninsula. Drawing from Nemirovitj-Dantjenko 1877.
the charges of having taken part in the conspiracy with the aim of creating a
separatist Sámi Republic. Alymov was executed in 1938. Some 30 other persons
were accused in the same made-up process, and many of them were executed
or disappeared without a trace (ibid.).

As in the Nordic countries, the Kola Sámi culture, language and history have
earlier been studied almost exclusively by non-Sámi researchers. Jelena
Sergejeva (later Jelena Porsanger), a Sámi researcher originating from the Kola
Peninsula, has described this circumstance with the following words:

One of the biggest problems concerning studies of Russian Sami folklore and
religion in general is that the Sami folklore material has never been studied by
scholars of Sami origin, nor have these studies reflected Sami opinion.
Nowadays, however, the situation is changing and there is a growing generation
of Sami researchers, mostly in the fields of Sami folkloristics and literary studies.
(Sergejeva 2000b:182)

The Kola Peninsula became the subject of archaeological investigation
considerably later than other regions of Russia (cf. Gurina 1973:45; Okladnikov
1996 [1950]). As Nina Gurina has put it, the very thought of the existence of a
prehistoric population in this remote and cold place seemed unrealistic to the
scholars. In the pre-revolutionary period some descriptions of stone labyrinths
and some old Sámi dwellings were composed (cf. Itkonen 1918), but no serious
archaeological investigations were undertaken, nor were any collections of
prehistoric artifacts gathered (Gurina 1997:8f.). In 1908 and 1910, the Swedish
archaeologist Gustaf Hallström traveled on the Kola Peninsula and also along
part of the Karelian shore of the White Sea (see Hallström 1912b, 1921, 1922).
Hallström traveled along the Tuloma River, along the coast of the Kola
Peninsula and also in the interior regions, for instance to Lovozero. During his
travels, he excavated, or plundered, several Sámi cemeteries, many of which
were still in use by the local population. He collected a large amount of
skeletons and skulls which he brought to Sweden to the anatomical collections
at Uppsala University. Hallström also took many photographs during his
journeys, which are of great importance today for research on Kola Sámi
culture and history (cf. Tretjakova 2006).

However, it was only in the 1920s that the first systematic archaeological
surveys and investigations of prehistoric sites were carried out on the Kola
Peninsula, and the first collections of prehistoric artifacts were gathered
(Gurina 1997:8f.). One very important archaeological site, which has been the
object of repeated archaeological investigations, is the Early Metal Age
cemetery at the Island Bolsjoj Olenij Ostrov (‘Great Deer Island’) on the
northern part of the Kola Peninsula, located in the Kola Bay about 12 km from
the Barents Sea and about 2 km from the town of Poljarnyj. The exploration of
the burial ground started in 1925, when members of the Imandra Expedition of
the Murmansk Biological Station discovered and investigated two partly
destroyed burials (Shumkin et al. 2006:42). In 1928, 11 burials were excavated by an expedition under the leadership of A.V. Schmidt from the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnology in Leningrad (see Sjmidt 1930). A.V. Schmidt also conducted surveys and small-scale excavations along the River Varzuga near the village of Kuzomen in the southern part of the Kola Peninsula, where he discovered several Stone Age sites (Gurina 1997:9). In 1934, several burials at the Bolsjoj Olenij Ostrov were destroyed during the land works by the Northern Fleet, which at that time was establishing its main base in the nearby town of Poljarnej. During this work, archaeological and osteological material from about 25 graves was recovered, but only a few artifacts have survived. What happened with the majority of the finds from the burials remains unknown (Shumkin et al. 2006:42). In 1947–48, archaeological investigations of ten burials were conducted under the leadership of the archaeologist Nina Gurina (Gurina 1973:49f., 1982:73ff.).

Since 1999, new investigations have been conducted on the Bolsjoj Olenij Ostrov by the Kola Archaeological Expedition from the Institute of the History of Material Culture (Institut Istorii Materialnoj Kultury) of the Russian Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg, under the leadership of Vladimir Shumkin (see Shumkin & Murashkin 2003; Shumkin et al. 2006; see also Internet Kola Archaeological Expedition, for maps, drawings, datings and other extensive sets of data from the excavation). During the years 2002–2004, nine new burials were discovered, of which four were collective burials. In the graves, a rich find material consisting of stone tools and bone and antler artifacts, some of which were decorated with geometrical motives, was discovered, along with fragments of ceramics. In total 16 new human crania were discovered during these excavations. The crania have been used for palaeo-anthropological and cranio-logical research, with the aim to reconstruct prehistoric ethnogenetic processes (Shumkin et al. 2006:51). According to the C-14 datings from the graves, the burials can be dated to the second half of the second millennium B.C. (ibid.). There was also a later burial at the same site, probably dating from the 19th century.

From 1935, another expedition headed by the geologist B.F. Zemljakov explored the Fisher Peninsula on the northwestern coast, near the Norwegian border. The aim was to search for “Arctic Palaeolithic” sites of the type that had been discovered and described by Anders Nummedal in the neighboring area of Finnmark in northern Norway. As a result of the work of the expedition, several Mesolithic and Neolithic sites were discovered and investigated and a relative chronology of the sites was elaborated (Shumkin 2000:212).

From the 1940s, under the leadership of the archaeologist N.N. Gurina (1909–1990) from the Academy of Sciences in Leningrad, systematic investigations started on the Kola Peninsula, leading to the discovery and investigation of several hundred archaeological sites, including settlements, burials and rock art sites (Murashkin 2005:148; cf. also Shumkin 1991). One
site of great importance that was discovered was the Neolithic and Early Metal Period settlement site Majak II, with a very rich material consisting of geometrically decorated bone and antler artifacts and animal sculptures and other well-preserved organic material (e.g. Gurina 1982:86ff., 1997:56ff.). Nina Gurina was the leading archaeological researcher on the Kola Peninsula until the 1980s, with a strong legacy in the field of archaeological studies on the Kola Peninsula continuing until present times (see the posthumously published work, Gurina 1997).

Several rock art sites have been discovered on the Kola Peninsula, for instance at Tjalmny-Varre along the Ponoj River in the middle of the Peninsula in 1973, and at the Fisher Peninsula on the northwestern coast in 1985 (see Shumkin 2000). In 1997, the first rock carvings were found on a number of islands in the Lake Kanozero along the River Umba. The rock art complex has been investigated by a team under the leadership of Vladimir Shumkin, and more than a thousand carved figures have been recorded (Kolpakov et al. 2008). The motives at Kanozero include whale hunting with boats and harpoons, bear hunting, anthropomorphs and elk and reindeer. On the basis of comparisons with other rock art sites, it has been suggested that the carvings at Kanozero were made during the Neolithic (ibid.:88).

The archaeological exploration and research on the Kola Peninsula has traditionally been conducted by archaeologists from St. Petersburg (formerly Leningrad), following the legacy of Nina Gurina. Vladimir Shumkin, senior fellow at the Institute for the History of Material Culture of the Russian Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg, and the head of the Kola Archaeological Expedition, has been the leading archaeologist in the Murmansk oblast in the last decades and has published extensively on the prehistory of the region, the ancient history and the ethnogenesis of the Sámi (e.g. Shumkin 1990a, 1990b, 1991, 1996a, 1996b, 2000, 2001; cf. also the Festschrift for Vladimir Shumkin, Sjajakhmetova 2007).

In the 1990s, after the fall of the Soviet Union, a new level of international research cooperation on the North Calotte became possible. The cooperation has taken place in particular between Russian and Norwegian and Finnish archaeologists, but also with Swedish archaeologists. As the resources for archaeological field-work have been limited, there are large areas of the Kola Peninsula that have not been surveyed by archaeologists, and there are many white spots on the archaeological map (which, I should add, is still the case in parts of northern Sweden). Anton Murashkin has emphasized the need for more archaeological research on the Kola Peninsula in order to better understand the ethnic history of the region (Murashkin 2005:151). Murashkin has also pointed out that it was only in the 1990s that research specifically focusing on finding medieval and historical settlements and other kinds of sites of the Kola Sámi communities was initiated; earlier, the focus had been only on prehistoric remains (ibid.:149). Vladimir Shumkin wrote in 2000, that “it should be admitted that the archaeological study of the region is still very far from its...
completion. This is especially clear if we speak about the central areas. Thus, the territory of Eastern Lapland will remain a very attractive field of action for more than one generation of archaeologists” (2000:214). The limited amount of archaeological research and knowledge about prehistoric remains on the Kola Peninsula is important to keep in mind when discussing the questions of Sámi prehistory and ethnogenesis.

Archaeological research has, of course, been conducted, more or less systematically, also in the other regions in the northernmost part of European Russia, in the Republic of Karelia (see Kosmenko & Kotjkurkina 1996 and Kotjkurkina & Kosmenko 2006), in the Arkhangelsk Region and the Nenets Autonomous Region (see e.g. Kuratov 2006), and in the Republic of Komi on the edge of the Ural Mountains (see Saveljeva 1997).

Views on the ethnogenesis of the Sámi in Russia

In the preceding section, I have discussed ethnographic and archaeological research in general in the Sámi areas in Russia. In this section, I will examine some of the central threads in the debates on Sámi ethnogenesis in Russia. Following the predominant paradigm of ethnogenetic research in the Soviet Union from the 1940s (see discussion in the previous chapter), the ethnogenesis and ethnic history of the Sámi people have been debated quite a lot among researchers in many disciplines, such as ethnography, linguistics, physical anthropology and archaeology. The ethnogenetic research methodology has been employed in research on the history of the small-numbered peoples of the North, including the Sámi (cf. Gurvitj 1975).

In Russia, the origin of the Sámi people has been a persistent theme, in a manner similar to the Nordic countries which we have seen earlier in the book. For a long time, there has been a great interest in this question, which was discussed for instance by Nikolaj Kharuzin in the book *Russkiye Lopari* (‘The Russian Lapps’; 1890:14ff.). The origin of the Sámi has often been described as something unknown, more or less mysterious, as a riddle to be solved by the archaeologists or ethnographers; furthermore, the origin of the Sámi has often been seen as some kind of key for understanding the origins of other peoples in the northern areas, and their interrelations. In the process, as in the Nordic countries, the Sámi themselves have in a sense become mystified and enigmatized.

In the theories of the ethnogenesis of the Sámi, Soviet or Russian researchers refer to a large collection of names of archaeological cultures, often based on the delimiting of ceramic styles and areas. The complexity of the classificatory schemas is quite high, and there are several methodological and taxonomic issues that must be put aside for now. The connection of archaeological cultures, languages and ethnic groups, as well as the correlation between prehistoric assemblages of artifacts and present-day ethnic groups, is
also a prominent feature in much of the archaeological research about the Sámi during the time of the Soviet Union and afterwards (cf. e.g. Shumkin 1990a; Aksjanova 1991; Manjukhin 2002; Kert 2003).

One theme that has been the object of discussions for a long time concerns the historical relationship between the Kola Sámi people and the other Finno-Ugric peoples in Russia and Siberia, and also the Samoyeds (especially the Nenets), not least on the basis of comparative linguistics (see further Kert 1971:7ff.; Eidlitz Kuoljok 1993:86ff.; Golovnev 2005:399f.).

For a long time, the origin and homeland of the Finno-Ugric, and Uralic, peoples in Russia and Siberia has been debated among historians, archaeologists, ethnographers and linguists (see overviews in Kuzminych 2000b; Kosmenko 2006:173ff.; cf. also Patrushev 2000). The ethnogenesis of the specific peoples have been treated in a large number of works (e.g. Moksjin et al. 2000 on the ethnogenesis of the Komi, Mari, Mordva and Udmurt peoples). The views of Soviet scholars on the origin of the Samoyed or Northern Samoyed peoples have been discussed by Kerstin Eidlitz Kuoljok (1993:24ff.) and Øyvind Ravna (2002:9ff.). The most common view among Soviet scholars was that the Northern Samoyed peoples had migrated to their northern settlement areas from southern Siberia in the Sayan Mountains region not very long ago in history, possibly during the period between 200 A.D. and 1200 A.D. Another view was that the Samoyed groups, on the contrary, had spread from the north to the south. A basic idea was that there had been an earlier population in the northern areas before the arrival of the Samoyed groups. This population (indigenous or autochthonous) spoke a non-Samoyed language, but according to some researchers possibly a Uralic language, could be seen as an “ethnic substrate” to many or all of the northern peoples, perhaps including the Sámi (Eidlitz Kuoljok 1991:30ff.; cf. Simtjenko 1975).

In Soviet times there was, and there still exists today, a lively branch of research focusing on the physical anthropology and craniology of the Sámi (see e.g. Zolotarev 1928; Aleksejev 1975; Gokhman et al. 1978; Benevolenskaja 1990; Khartanovitj 1998, 2001, 2006) and the racial history of the Sámi (e.g. Aleksejeva 1987; contributions in Aksjanova 1991). This field of research has included the collection and the study of craniological material from the Kola Peninsula and the study of the formation of the so-called “laponoid” anthropological type, defined in part on the basis of a specific complex of craniometrical traits and measures. These works are part of a larger interest in physical anthropology in the ethnogenetic study among Soviet and post-Soviet researchers (see e.g. Aleksejeva & Jablonskij 2002; Bagashev 2002). The strong scholarly interest in racial questions and craniology might seem strange and surprising to Scandinavian scholars. However, one should not forget that there is a strong interest in physical anthropology also in Scandinavia today, although under other denominations and with another terminology.

As in the Nordic countries, the discussion in Russia on the origins of the Sámi have largely circled around two main ideas: on the one hand, the idea of
the Sámi as the descendants of the most ancient population in Northern Fennoscandia, on the other hand, the idea of the Sámi as descendants of immigrants from somewhere in the East, and possibly also of an earlier non-Finno-Ugric population in the present-day Sámi areas (see Lukjantjenko 1980, 1990; Kert 2003). The theory of the eastern, or “Uralic”, origin has in much been based on linguistic hypotheses concerning the Uralic language tree, the “original homeland” and subsequent spread of the Uralic and Finno-Ugric speaking population groups to the west (Kosmenko 2006:174ff.). The settlement area of the Sámi population in historical times, and prehistoric times, is also a matter of much discussion and differing views, another phenomenon that is parallel with the situation in the Nordic countries, especially concerning the South Sámi area.

As I have already mentioned, the archaeologist Nina Gurina (1909–1990) was the most active and influential investigator of the prehistory of the Kola Peninsula in the Soviet period. In her publications, she has of course also dealt with the ethnogenetic processes of the population on the Kola Peninsula and the question of the origin of the Sámi population (e.g. 1982, 1997). In the book Vremja, vrezannoe v kamen (“Time, carved in stone”; 1982), Gurina stressed the continuity in the cultural development of the prehistoric population on the Kola Peninsula from the first inhabitants in the Mesolithic: “Thus, the absence of breaks in the archaeological source material shows, in our view, that the Sámi were formed on a local basis” (Gurina 1982:116; my translation).

In the posthumously published monograph Istorija kultury drevnego naselenija kolskogo poluostrova (“The history of the culture of the ancient population of the Kola Peninsula”; 1997), Nina Gurina has also discussed the problem of the origin of the Sámi population. She emphasized that ethnogenetic processes should be studied by ethnographers, linguists, physical anthropologists, historians and archaeologists in collaboration. However, the great lack of early ethnographic and osteological material from the Kola Peninsula made such cooperation much more difficult.

Gurina stressed that contacts with other nearby and more remote groups play an important role in the ethnogenetic processes in general. During the entire prehistoric period, the population on the Kola Peninsula had many cultural elements in common with the populations in Karelia, Finland and Norway. However, the closest contacts with Karelia could be seen in the southern part of the Peninsula, while the population on the northern shore and in the largest part of the interior regions had more cultural elements in common with the population in northern Norway. From the Neolithic, there were also some contacts with areas to the south-east, the Arkhangelsk and Vologda regions and the Komi Republic. However, in Gurina’s view, there was no evidence of contacts in prehistory with the population in the Kama and Ural areas. Thus, with reference to the apparent difference in material and spiritual culture between the population on the Kola Peninsula and in the Ural region throughout the prehistoric period already from the Mesolithic, Gurina
questioned the previously mentioned idea of a wide-spread Uralic substrate language and population in the Arctic and Sub-Arctic regions, which would have played an important role in the ethnogenesis of the Sámi, Nenets, Nganasan and other northern peoples (ibid.:130f.).

Nina Gurina emphasized that although the Sámi in the Soviet Union and the Nordic countries were generally considered as one special ethnocultural community (etnokulturnaja obytnost’), it was not a homogenous community. The many different languages and dialects witnessed about the complexity of the formation of the Sámi as a people. In her view, the Sámi ethnogenesis was a long and complicated process. Furthermore, she stressed the continuity in the cultural elements on the Kola Peninsula from the Mesolithic to the first millennium A.D. This situation indicates that there was a stable and undisrupted development of the community on the Kola Peninsula which, Gurina stated, could be considered as Proto-Sámi (ibid.:131).

The archaeologist Vladimir Shumkin, the most prominent contemporary archaeologist working with archaeology on the Kola Peninsula, has criticized many of the earlier interpretations on the origin of the Sámi people which have been put forth mainly by ethnographers as part of the ethnogenetic research paradigm (cf. also Shumkin 1990a, 1991 and the critique of Shumkin’s view in Eidlitz Kuoljok 1993:87f.):

Though the majority of ethnologists who study the distribution of ancient ethnic groups do not have a complete command of modern archaeological data, they often put into their works chapters devoted to the history of the Saami people. Very complex hypotheses about ancient migrations are put forward, quite distinct ethnic groups are taken into such a specific and highly problematic culture as the circumpolar one, which is believed to date from very early periods.

Only rarely archaeological and anthropological data are used properly, and often obsolete data is utilized. However, there are no doubts that these are first of all and mainly archaeological data which we need to elucidate the long period of the earliest history of the region’s ancient population. In many cases we simply have no other sources to study such a distant past. (Shumkin 2000:210ff.)

In an article from 2001, Vladimir Shumkin summarized three central points, according to his own view and research, regarding the discussions on the ethnogenesis of the Sámi and the role of the Sámi population in the history of the northwestern area of the Russian Federation (cf. also Shumkin 1996a):

1. The study of the culture of the inhabitants of Northern Fennoscandia shows, that from the most ancient times continuity has been preserved in some of the most important spheres of activities, that is, the development of the aboriginal collectives depended basically on internal factors.
2. The archaeological data, with sufficient certainty, shows that the population of Lappland never exceeded the bounds of Northern Fennoscandia. Conclusions about a past wide distribution of the Sámi (or Proto-Sámi) and their active participation in the ethnogenesis of other peoples do not correspond with reality.

3. The contemporary Sámi constitute the descendants of a palaeo-European population, which, despite numerous influences and assimilative processes, because of the long initial isolation could preserve, up to present times, its ethnic self-awareness, anthropological appearance and some cultural elements. (Shumkin 2001:20; my translation)

In the book *Proiskhozdenije Saamov* (’The origin of the Sámi’; Manjukhin 2002), the archaeologist Igor Manjukhin discusses the formation and development of the Sámi ethnos from primarily from an archaeological point of view, but also with references to anthropological, linguistic and toponymic research. He concludes the results from his study in the following way:

On the basis of complex studies of a wide range of anthropological, archaeological, linguistic and toponymic sources, it has been demonstrated that two genetic components took part in the formation of the Sámi: the pre-Finnic Europeoid population of the Textile Ceramics at the end of the Bronze Age, and the carriers of the Povolzhskaja culture of the beginning of the Early Iron Age, who were speaking an ancient Finnic language and exhibited both Europeoid and Mongoloid physical features. (Manjukhin 2002:223; my translation)

According to Manjukhin, the beginning of the Sámi ethnogenetic process was interrelated with the spread of the Povolzhskaja Culture to the northern areas in the VI–V centuries B.C. As a result of the interactions between the Povolzhskaja Culture and the local Textile Ceramics Culture, an ancient Sámi cultural-historical community started to develop. In his view, the Iron Age was the time of the maximum distribution of the Sámi people, and the area of the Sámi population started to decrease gradually from the 1st millennium A.D. in connection with the formation and expansion of other ethnic groups, such as the Baltic Finns, Germans and Slavs (ibid.). The archaeologist Mark Kosmenko has discussed the ethnic history of Karelia and its inhabitants, including the Sámi people (Kosmenko 1993, 2006), and has presented some different views on the Sámi ethnogenesis.

Within the framework of the two research projects “Historical, cultural and natural heritage of the islands of the White Sea” (2000–2002) and “Historical and cultural heritage of the Karelinan Shore of the White Sea” (2003–2007), archaeological field-work along the western coast of the White Sea was conducted in cooperation between the Karelian Research Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Petrozavodsk, the University of Tromsø and the University of Uppsala. In these projects, Russian, Norwegian and Swedish archaeologists took part in the field-work expeditions. The archaeological
surveys revealed many new sites with ancient remains along the coast and on the islands of the White Sea. For instance, several sites with stone constructions, such as raised stones and stone circles, were found (see fig. 30). These remains are in many ways similar to constructions found in the Sámi area in Finnmark in northern Norway. Also, burial sites with grave constructions in the shape of stone coffins were discovered. The stone constructions have been interpreted as remains from Sámi communities along the White Sea coast, as remnants of a “lost” Sámi cultural landscape along the shore (Manjukhin & Lobanova 2002; Price 2002b; also Lobanova pers.com.).

However, other researchers have objected to that interpretation. Mark Sjakhnovitj has adopted a critical approach to the idea of a large distribution of Sámi settlement in the Iron Age and Medieval Period (see e.g. Sjakhnovitj 2003, 2007). Sjakhnovitj has questioned the ethnic interpretations of the ethnonym “Lop” used in written sources from the Middle Ages, which has often been equated with the Sámi. He objects to the idea that the Iron Age and early Middle Ages in northern Karelia should automatically be called Sámi: “The hypotheses of the wide distribution of the Sámi ethnos in the Medieval Period in Karelia and its active participation in the ethnogenesis of the Karelians do not find support in the archaeological and anthropological material” (Sjakhnovitj 2007:243; my translation). This critical view has, as we have already seen, also been expressed by Vladimir Shumkin in several works (e.g. 1990b, 2001).

Figure 29. A labyrinth on the Olesjin Island, in the Kuzova archipelago, near Kem on the Karelian shore of the White Sea. Labyrinths have also been found on the Solovetskije Islands and on the Kola Peninsula. The meaning of these labyrinths has been much discussed (see e.g. Gurina 1982; Shumkin 2000; Manjukhin & Lobanova 2002). Photograph by Igor Georgievskij. From Lobanova 2007.
Concerning the archaeological remains along the White Sea Coast mentioned above, Mark Kosmenko has also rejected the proposed connection with Sámi communities, and has interpreted the sites with the stone constructions as well as the graves to be remains from historical Pomor communities inhabiting the coastal landscape of western and northern White Sea (Kosmenko 2007; Kosmenko pers.com.).

It can thus be concluded, from this discussion, that there is no single agreement among scholars on the ethnogenesis of the Sámi people or the earlier settlement area of the Sámi. There is also an embedded ambivalence between different concepts and categories of archaeological assemblages and archaeological cultures, and different ethnic labels. Any attempt to study Sámi (pre)history must take into account this complexity, variation and ambivalence; without it, Sámi (pre)history becomes something essentially static and petrified, and most unrealistic.

*Figure 30. Raised stones on the Bolsjoj Robjak Island along the Karelian shore of the White Sea. The meaning of these stones, as possible *sieidi*-stones as part of a past Sámi cultural landscape in the White Sea, has been debated among researchers in Russia. Photo by Igor Georgievskij. From Lobanova 2007.*
Although archaeology entered the scene rather late, there has been a long history of scholarly interest in the Kola Sámi population. As in the Nordic countries, this interest has been mostly ethnographic and linguistic. The field of Sámi studies has been part of larger contexts of research, on the one hand, the study of the northern peoples of Russia and Siberia, and on the other hand, the study of the Finno-Ugric and Uralic peoples. Even though the Sámi population in Russia is very small, and has been so in historical times, it has attracted much attention within these contexts.

The study of prehistory in the present-day Sámi area in the Russian Federation has been dominated by a small number of archaeologists, most prominently Nina Gurina and Vladimir Shumkin, although several other researchers, from Russia and from other countries, have contributed to the exploration of the prehistory of the Kola Peninsula by conducting archaeological fieldwork or publishing on the subject. The field of archaeological research on Sámi prehistory has likewise been limited, but it has also included areas in the Karelian Republic and some more archaeologists, primarily from Karelia.

As we have seen, there have been discussions among researchers in Russia on the origins of the Sámi, as well as on the earlier distribution of the Sámi settlement area. These basic questions resemble the most commonly debated issues in the Nordic countries, although the discussions are set in a different societal and scientific context. Two basic perspectives on the ethnogenesis of the Sámi in eastern Sápmi can be distinguished in the archaeological debates in Russia. The first one emphasizes the local, or internal, historical development on the Kola Peninsula, and the continuity, perhaps already from the Mesolithic to the Middle Ages, in the development of the Sámi communities. The other one, on the contrary, emphasizes the ethnogenesis of the Sámi as part of a much larger geographical area, from the Baltic Sea to the Volga region, and especially points to influences from the Volga region in the Early Iron Age as an important element in the formation of the Sámi ethnos. The second perspective thus embraces the idea of a much larger Sámi settlement area in the Iron Age and the Middle Ages than today, an area which was gradually reduced by the expansion of other groups of people, Scandinavians, Finns and Slavs. The first perspective is instead more inclined to see the Sámi settlement area in the Iron Age and the Middle Ages as limited to the Kola Peninsula. From this examination, it is also possible to discern a certain level of competition between
specialists from different fields of study, such as archaeologists, linguists and ethnographers. This competition illustrates different approaches to the past based on different categories of material, but it also points to the need of communication between specialists in different fields.

From the 1980s, there has been a growing Sámi ethnopolitical movement on the Kola Peninsula. After the fall of the Soviet Union, there have also been increasing efforts to bring the Sámi groups in the West and the East closer to each other, for instance within the Saami Council where the Kola Sámi organizations have become members. Partly in cooperation with archaeologists from the Nordic countries, a more explicitly defined field of “Sámi archaeology” has developed. International project funding has facilitated cross-boundary cooperation in Northern Fennoscandia. In these projects, in applications for funding and in conferences and workshops, the notions of “Sámi prehistory” and “Sámi archaeology” are often explicitly mentioned. Thus, it is possible to discern a somewhat similar development, albeit under different circumstances, since the 1980s in the Nordic countries and the Russian Federation/Soviet Union.

In this part, I have discussed some of the contexts of archaeological research, from a research historical perspective, in the Russian Federation, especially concerning the northern peoples and the Sámi people. It is, in my view, interesting to compare the different lines of development in archaeological and anthropological theory and practice between the Nordic countries and the Russian Federation. Archaeology has been embedded in many different social, cultural, economic and political processes – processes that have undergone radical changes during the 20th century. The Soviet rule, especially during the reign of Stalin, provides an exceptionally clear example of the dangers of totalitarian regimes. This is so not only as concerns general political matters and societal development, but also as concerns the fields of cultural heritage management and archaeological research. In my view, the history of archaeology, and of archaeologists, in the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation could be seen as an example that archaeology is not a politically and socially neutral activity – no matter what the archaeologists themselves would like to think about that.

Ethnogenesis has been a central concept in archaeological research in the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation. This research tradition has often been described as a primordialist and nationalist tradition, little influenced by the recent reflective and critical theoretical discussions in archaeology in the West. However, it is easy to oversimplify the case and to consider the ethnogenetic research only as a misuse of archaeology (as it has been done frequently). Firstly, the sheer size of the Russian Federation should be considered: a massive area of land with hundreds of different linguistic and ethnic groups. Secondly, perhaps the question should be asked, somewhat provocatively: Is there a self-assumed uniform identification behind the refusal of ethnic archaeology in Sweden, an identification that has excluded many.
minority groups in Sweden and that is typically connected with majority groups and their wish to uphold an ideologically neutral unity, on the conditions of and to the benefit of the majority?

There is certainly a lot of truth to the description of Soviet anthropology and archaeology as a primordialist tradition. Still, the reality has been much more complex. The analysis of the history of archaeological research in the Soviet Union has shown some of the complexities and changes over time in this matter and has pointed to some of the connections between ideology, politics and archaeology. This case, made into a lesson, is especially easy to grasp for Westerners as it concerns the Soviet Union – a totalitarian system, well-known for its ideological reign of power over research and the population at large. However, I would argue that the case of Soviet archaeology and ethnography has relevance, as well, for archaeological research conducted elsewhere in the world, for instance in the Nordic countries. It demonstrates some of the dimensions of the power-geometry that all archaeologists work in, and some of the dangers of totalitarian systems, in society as well as in science.

In this and the preceding part of the book, I have explored how images and narratives of a Sámi (pre)history have been constructed by archaeologists and other researchers. We have seen different views on, and some scientific disputes over specific problems relating to Sámi (pre)history. As this has been a small field of study, strong centers-of-translation, or centers-of-interpretation, have developed. However, these centers have, as we have also seen, been challenged by other actors, which will be the theme of the following part of the book.
IV

Contesting the North

Sámi self-determination and the repatriation and reburial debates
In the previous two parts, I have followed some aspects of the research history concerning Sámi (pre)history and Sámi archaeology in the Nordic countries as well as in the Russian Federation and the former Soviet Union. From these discussions, it is obvious that Sámi prehistory is not one thing, and that there are different ways of relating to, and valuing, ancient sites and remains in the Sápmi area.

Ancient remains in Sápmi are enrolled into many different networks, and different actors attempt to make the remains speak for them. Sometimes different networks and actors compete over the same sites and the same finds. In this part of the book, I will examine some of the issues involved in the meeting between different ways of relating to and valuing the past. At the center of the discussion is “the Grave”, as an archaeological object of study but also as a symbol for other values held by non-archaeologists. At the center is also “the Dead”, as a symbolic figure for the history or for the ancestors, but also as a very real material remain which must be dealt with in some practical way.

More specifically, I will discuss the movement for greater Sámi self-determination concerning cultural heritage policies and the struggle for, as it is often called, “the right to one’s own past”. Here, the repatriation and reburial debates, internationally as well as nationally, are of central importance. Furthermore, I will discuss how archaeologists in this situation have tried to deal with the demands from outside of the profession, in debates on the theory and practice of archaeological ethics. The current situation in northern Sweden is, in many ways, a difficult and challenging one for archaeologists working there, but in these challenges there are also, I believe, many possibilities for the development of archaeology as an academic subject and as a part of society.

I suggest that the challenges from outside the profession, and the resulting discussions on the positions and responsibilities of archaeology, could entail some prospects for renewal and revitalization in the field of archaeology. As many examples from other parts of the world have shown, archaeologists could gain much from collaborating and communicating with what is usually called “the public”. In the end, it is a question about what the roles and responsibilities of professional archaeologists should be, and about who should have the right to define and control the cultural heritage and prehistory in the northern areas.
In the last decades, groups of indigenous peoples in different parts of the world have claimed the right to greater control over their cultural heritage and the right to “reclaim” their pasts, as part of the process of redefining the old relationships between colonizers and colonized peoples. One of the most contested and controversial debates has concerned the treatment of the Dead. Many indigenous groups have demanded the right to decide the fate of the human remains of their ancestors, in many cases demanding the repatriation of skeletal remains and grave goods from museums and other institutions.

There are a number of reasons for the demands for reburial, but one of the most basic reasons deals with the view that the ancestors must be granted funerary rituals and ceremonies according to the cultural beliefs of the group (Hubert & Fforde 2002). Furthermore, the issue of self-determination is of central importance in the general discussion on repatriation. The repatriation and reburial debates do not only have implications for the theory and practice of archaeology and museology, but can be seen as part of many wider cultural, political, economic, legal and ethical issues in contemporary society.

In practice, there is a wide diversity of cases with different circumstances. Still, they are most often part of the legacy of the same history: that of conquests, colonialism, cultural evolutionism and racism, from which followed the collecting of skeletons and skulls by physical anthropologists, archaeologists and others, the plundering of cemeteries, the display in museums and circuses of exotic human “specimens”, and the general and systematic oppression and marginalization of indigenous or other peoples, which were considered to be primitive and inferior (see contributions in Fforde et al. 2002).

Although these issues have been discussed a lot among archaeologists in other parts of the world, and although the relationships between archaeologists and indigenous groups are of fundamental importance for the practice of archaeology in many countries (see e.g. Vitelli 1996; Dongoske et al. 2000; Thomas 2000; Fforde et al. 2002; Fforde 2004; Smith & Wobst 2005; Fforde & Hubert 2006), such issues have up to the present rarely been discussed among archaeologists in Sweden. This has been the case even though demands for repatriation of Sámi cultural heritage have been put forth for some time in the Nordic countries (see Duoddaris 2002; Edbom 2005; Harlin 2008a, 2008b). However, in recent years some researchers in Sweden have started to pay
attention to and discuss these issues and their consequences for archaeology. In this context one should especially mention Liv Nilsson Stutz, who has also studied the repatriation and reburial debates in the USA and in Israel (2007, 2008, 2009, in press). With the demands from the Sámi Parliament in Sweden in 2007, a broader discussion about repatriation and reburial has evolved for the first time among archaeologists, osteologists and museum workers in Sweden. I would argue that there is a lot to learn from the debates on repatriation and reburial, and that these debates deal with important questions concerning the bases and goals of archaeological research, the relationships between past and present, and the values and representations of the past in contemporary society.

Repatriation is, however, not only about the transfer of ownership or control over human remains or artifacts, it is also about traditional knowledge and other immaterial expressions and values. Furthermore, repatriation is not necessarily a question of ownership and property rights, but perhaps more a question of management, stewardship and responsibility. Repatriation can be seen as a process which involves a dialogue and an exchange of knowledge and experience between the different parties, as a process which does not only redistribute existing knowledge, but which might also create new knowledge and understanding among the participating parties.

The demands for repatriation and reburial by indigenous peoples are often presented with reference to international law and the universal human rights, as a legitimate part of the right to self-determination granted by different international conventions and declarations. Still, there are many critical issues that need to be discussed.

Figure 31. Map of Northern Fennoscandia with some of the places mentioned in part IV. Map by author and Karin Bengtsson.
In this chapter, the reburial and repatriation debates will be explored in an international context as well as in the Sámi context in Northern Fennoscandia. First, I will discuss some more general issues concerning Sámi cultural heritage management. Then, I will continue with a review of some of the international debates, especially within the framework of the United Nations on cultural rights and the rights of indigenous peoples to their cultural heritage and associated artifacts and human remains. Thereafter, I will take a look at the North American experience, with focus on the repatriation legislation in the USA and its implications for archaeological practice, before I turn my attention to the repatriation and reburial debates in the Sámi region. What are the consequences for archaeological theory and practice, and how should archaeologists react and relate to these demands?

Sámi cultural heritage management and the right to one’s own past

The right to a Sámi cultural heritage is about the right to interpret and define one’s history and one’s past. It is also about the right to manage and present one’s past in Sámi museums… That museums, institutions and governments cooperate with the indigenous peoples and meet their demands as concerns artefacts and human remains entails not only a physical return but also an act of reconciliation and recognition where the past is rehabilitated. It is not only a question of law and of who formally “owns” the sacred drums or Sámi crania, but to a much greater extent it is a question of ethics and morals. (Baer 2008:28f.; my translation)

Today, there is a growing acceptance that Saami prehistory is a legitimate field of study in its own right and that the formulation of research policies and ethics is the responsibility of the Saami themselves. (Schanche 2002c:47)

The Sámi people, as we have seen in the previous parts of the book, is generally considered as an indigenous people in Norway, Sweden, Finland and the Russian Federation (but with reservation as concerns the state policies, see discussions in part II and below). However, as we have also discussed in the first part of the book, indigenousness or indigeneity are not any simple concepts, and the reality behind the notion of indigenism is indeed very complex. What does it mean to be an indigenous people? What are the political consequences, and what are indigenous peoples’ rights? The current situation differs between the countries where the Sámi live. The Norwegian government has ratified the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, most commonly called the ILO 169 Convention (see chapter 2), while the Swedish and Finnish governments have not made up their mind but have continued to discuss and examine the issue for many years. Concerning the Russian Federation, the
political structure and the economic and social contexts differ significantly from the Nordic countries (see part III). In 2007, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples was adopted by the General Assembly. The Russian Federation refrained from voting, while the three Nordic states voted in favor. The Declaration proclaims the rights of indigenous peoples to self-determination, for instance in the fields of economy, culture and language, and it has become an important point of argument and support for activists and politicians striving for more Sámi self-determination.

During the last decades, Sámi politicians, cultural workers and activists in Sweden have strived to question and challenge the idea of a neutral cultural heritage and the representations of Sweden as mono-ethnic in history and prehistory. In recent years, questions have been raised about greater self-determination and control over cultural heritage issues in Sápmi for institutions based in the Sámi communities, as has been the case in Norway (Skandfer 2001; Mannela Gaup 2007:25ff.; cf. also Åhrén 1986). In Norway, *Samisk kulturminneråd*, under the Sámi Parliament, has been responsible for the management of Sámi cultural remains from 1994. From 2001, the Sámi Parliament has taken over the responsibility for the management from the *Samisk kulturminneråd*. The geographical area of responsibility stretches from the county of Hedmark in the south to the county of Finnmark in the north. In 2002, the Sámi Parliament also gained the responsibility for the management of the Sámi museums in Norway.

The debates on greater self-determination in cultural heritage issues have also included demands for repatriation and reburial of human remains, but also for the repatriation of certain categories of cultural objects of special importance (Edbom 2005; Harlin 2008a, 2008b). It is also a question about the organization of the cultural heritage management, museums etc., and a question of the extent of Sámi self-determination in cultural heritage policies, and the role and power of the Sámi Parliament in the resolution of these issues (see e.g. Mulk 2002).

It is central to remember that the concept of Sámi cultural heritage does not only involve the archaeological heritage, archaeological sites and artifacts, but also other aspects involving cultural landscapes, sacred sites, buildings, handicraft, language, folklore, traditional knowledge and more (see e.g. Magga 1990; Utsi 2007). Consequently, the debates on repatriation of the cultural heritage do not only concern material remains stored in museums and archives.

The question of Sámi cultural heritage management also contains a transboundary dimension. In the proposal for a Nordic Sámi Convention, which is being evaluated by the governments in the Nordic country, there are also provisions dealing with cultural heritage issues. The Sámi Parliamentary Council (Sw. *Samiskt Parlamentariskt Råd* – SPR) has also discussed and proposed measures for strengthening the idea and practice of mutual responsibility of the Nordic Sámi Parliaments and Russian Sámi organizations for the management of the Sámi cultural heritage (see Baer 2007).
The theme of the 19th Saami Conference of the Saami Council, which was arranged in Rovaniemi in Finland in October 2008, was cultural heritage. The Saami Council is a pan-Sámi organization, founded in 1956 (as the Nordic Saami Council), in which the major Sámi organizations from Norway, Finland, Sweden and the Russian Federation are members. The Council has worked a lot on the international level, within the international indigenous movement. At the Saami Conference in 2008, a declaration called the Rovaniemi Declaration was adopted. A large part of this declaration deals with issues on cultural heritage, and several of the provisions are directed against the exploitation of Sámi culture and symbols in the tourist industry. Other provisions deal for instance with language and traditional knowledge. Here are presented four of the points in the declaration that express some of the views of the Saami Council on the right to self-determination in the field of cultural heritage management (see further Internet Saami Council):

13. The Saami people has the right to own, control and develop its cultural heritage, both tangible and intangible, including its genetic resources, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions. The states shall respect this right, and implement it through national legislation and policies. Such legislation shall demarcate the sphere of the Saami cultural heritage, and direct any non-Saami that wishes to utilize elements of the Saami culture to relevant Saami institutions identified by the Saami ourselves. To further this right, the states shall also ensure that its own practices, and the private sectors’ practices, which can potentially affect the Saami culture, are only pursued following thorough assessments of the impacts on this culture.

15. The intention is not to establish absolute exclusivity to the Saami culture. The Saami are proud to share many elements of our culture, provided that we have consented to such sharing and that it is on our own terms.

17. Measures to protect the Saami cultural heritage shall respect that the Saami culture is a living, integral part of the Saami identity. It is first and foremost a cultural asset, and must never be frozen in any particular period of time.

21. States and their cultural institutions, such as museums, must be aware of and acknowledge the secret, sacred, spiritual and cultural meaning of Saami artefacts in their collections, such as interviews containing Saami storytelling, traditional music etc. Such objects should further be returned upon the Saami’s request. If the objects remain in the collection, they must be displayed in a culturally appropriate manner in accordance with the Saami people’s norms pertaining to such objects. (The Rovaniemi Declaration of the Saami Council, 2008; see Internet Saami Council)

As has been noted already several times, the official recognition of the Sámi as an indigenous people in Sweden does not carry through in any consistent way in the policy making of the Swedish government. The ILO 169 Convention has not been ratified, and the international discourse on indigenous rights has not
had any greater effect this far on the dominant political discourse in Sweden. Rather, as Peter Johansson concludes in his study of Swedish politics towards the Sámi during the years 1986–2005:

… the official discourse regarding the status of the Sami, during the whole period, is linked first of all to the international discourse on minority rights. Therefore one can also say that the official Swedish discourse regarding the Sami in political practice is that they constitute a “minority de luxe” rather than an indigenous people, despite the official recognition as an indigenous people. (Johansson 2008:302)

However, as Peter Johansson shows in his study, there have also existed counter-discourses during these years in the political world in Sweden that have challenged the dominant discourse. The proponents of the counter-discourses argue that Sweden needs to do at home what they expect others to do abroad:

These counter discourses have strived to change Swedish Sami politics to be more in accordance with the norms regarding indigenous peoples’ status and rights in international law. The alternative democratic discourse has tried to redefine the view on democracy to include special rights for the Sami and has argued that Sweden needs to ratify ILO convention no 169. (Johansson 2008:303)

In the process of reviving Sámi archaeology, some voices have also been raised, demanding that archaeology concerning Sámi history should be the exclusive responsibility of the Sámi themselves (for discussions on definitions of Sámi research and Sámi perspectives on research, see e.g. Lasko 1992; Kuokkanen 2000):

Also, some of the Sámi students studying archaeology at the University of Tromsø have demanded that in northern Norway there should be no further archaeological excavations before the Sámi archaeologists themselves can take over and perform this invaluable work. The Sámi with their insights into their own culture can help in the more accurate interpretation of archaeological results. New theories are needed about Sámi life and culture, and these are best formulated by the Sámi themselves because Sámi archaeologists and historians are the ones with the most direct and tangible link with Sámi ethnic identity. The time for this change seems to be ripe. (Aikio & Aikio 1989:128)

It should be noted, however, that this view is not shared by all Sámi activists and scholars. There are many variants of the views on Sámi empowerment and self-determination within the fields of historical and archaeological research; likewise there are different opinions on the definition of Sámi research and its position in relation to other fields of research (e.g. Lasko 1992; cf. also Damm 2005:82f).
Debates on the international level

The Sámi claims for cultural rights and control over cultural heritage issues have related in many ways to the international debates on indigenous peoples’ rights, not least within the United Nations system. Within the framework of international law and the human rights discourses, there have been long and extensive discussions on indigenous peoples’ rights. The United Nations, with its different organs and committees, has been a central arena for these discussions. In this field, the “UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples”, which was adopted in 2007, is a central document which will have influence on the international discussions.

After several decades of intense discussions, conflicts and compromises, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the “UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples” on September 13, 2007 (for more about the history of the long and complicated process in the international community behind the formulation and adoption of the Declaration, see contributions in Minde et al. 2007). In the General Assembly, 143 countries voted in favor, 11 abstained (including the Russian Federation) and four countries – Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States – voted against the adoption of the Declaration.

There are several Articles in the Declaration that are of interest to the discussion on indigenous archaeology and Sámi self-determination in the cultural heritage domain.

Article 11 of the Declaration states that:

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to practice and revitalize their cultural traditions and customs. This includes the right to maintain, protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures, such as archaeological and historical sites, artefacts, designs, ceremonies, technologies and visual and performing arts and literature.

2. States shall provide redress through effective mechanism, which may include restitution, developed in conjunction with indigenous peoples, with respect to their cultural, intellectual, religious and spiritual property taken without their free, prior and informed consent or in violation of their laws, traditions and cultures. (Article 11, UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples)

Furthermore, Article 12 declares that:

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to manifest, practice, develop and teach their spiritual and religious traditions, customs and ceremonies; the right to maintain, protect, and have access in privacy to their religious and cultural sites; the rights to the use and control of their ceremonial objects; and the right to the repatriation of their human remains.
2. States shall seek to enable the access and/or repatriation of ceremonial objects and human remains in their possession through fair, transparent and effective mechanisms developed in conjunction with indigenous peoples concerned. (Article 12, UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples)

Article 31 of the Declaration further elaborates on the rights of indigenous peoples in the field of cultural heritage, intellectual property and traditional knowledge:

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, as well as the manifestations of their sciences, technologies and cultures, including human and genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs, sports and traditional games and visual and performing arts. They also have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their intellectual property over such cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions.

2. In conjunction with indigenous peoples, States shall take effective measures to recognize and protect the exercise of these rights. (Article 31, UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples)

It should be noted that this is a UN Declaration and not a Convention, and therefore it is not strictly legally binding for the member countries. Still, this does not mean that the rights proclaimed by the Declaration are not reflecting already legally binding international law, which some researchers claim is the case (Åhrén 2007:127ff.). At this point in time, rather shortly after its adoption by the General Assembly, it is difficult to estimate exactly what impact the Declaration will have on indigenous self-determination in practice, how it will be implemented in the various member states and what consequences the reading of the provisions may have for the debates on cultural heritage management and archaeological research in indigenous contexts. Still, it should be obvious that the text of the Declaration will have some impact on the national policies regarding indigenous cultural heritage, also in the Nordic countries. In the future, the Swedish State will thus have to relate, somehow, to the stipulations of the Declaration. Without any doubt, the Declaration will be referred to in the coming debates by the proponents for more Sámi self-determination in the field of cultural heritage.

“The United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity” (CBD) may also be of interest in the context of the repatriation debate, not least as concerns traditional knowledge and practices (cf. Utsi 2007). Article 8(j) of the Convention reads as follows:
[Each Contracting Party shall, as far as possible and as appropriate:] Subject to its national legislation, respect, preserve and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and promote their wider application with the approval and involvement of the holders of such knowledge, innovations and practices and encourage the equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of such knowledge, innovations and practices. (UN Convention on Biological Diversity, Article 8(j); see Internet UN CBD)

The USA: NAGPRA, The Kennewick Man and other debates

In 1990, for the first time, native people were empowered to question mainstream American ownership of the Indian past, both literally and metaphorically. No longer were Indian bones found on public lands automatically defined as natural resources, as federal property to be safeguarded in scientific custody. No longer did science have a monopoly on defining the meaning of archaeology; instead, native groups were invited to assign their own spiritual and historical meanings to archaeological sites and their contents. (Thomas 2000:xxxvii)

The developments in the USA provide an interesting example, as a comparison to the situation in the Sámi areas in Europe. In the USA, there is a strong and far-reaching repatriation legislation that has been developed as a result of demands from the American Indian movement over several decades. The discussions, and the legislative solutions, have attracted a lot of attention and have been very influential in many other contexts, as a result of the strong position of the USA in the contemporary world. It can be argued that these discussions have constituted a dominant discourse, to which discussions on indigenous peoples’ rights and repatriation and reburial issues elsewhere in the world have had to relate in one way or another. The situation in the USA has been looked at by archaeologists and others as a positive example, or as an example of warning.

In the 1960s, an American Indian movement emerged protesting against archaeologists’ treatment of the American Indian cultural heritage, involving for example organized protests against excavations of burial sites and displays of American Indian human remains in museums (Watkins 2005b:340ff.). From the 1970s, groups of American Indians also started to address questions of the repatriation of certain human remains and artifacts from museum collections (ibid.).

The following discussions and controversies during the 1980s led to the passage of two important laws, which established procedures for the requests of repatriation of human remains and certain categories of artifacts, and
fundamentally changed the relationship between Native Americans and anthropologists and archaeologists.

With the passage of the National Museum of the American Indian Act (NMAIA) in 1989, the United States Congress established the new National Museum of the American Indian. Furthermore, the Smithsonian Institution was required to inventory, document, and, if so requested, to repatriate affiliated human remains and funerary objects to federally recognized Native American groups (ibid:344f.).

In 1990, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, known as NAGPRA, was adopted, and has consequently become the most well-known and debated legislation in this field (see e.g. McKeown 2002; Morenon 2003). The legislation requires all federally financed museums and institutions in the USA to inventory their collections of Native American material, and, if requested, to repatriate human remains and certain categories of objects (mostly grave goods and sacred objects) to Native American tribes. The law also covers inadvertent discoveries and intentional excavations on federal and tribal land, but not on privately owned land. Importantly, the legislation states that Native American tribes need to demonstrate “cultural affiliation” between the remains and the tribe before a repatriation of the remains may take place.

The passage of the new legislation gave rise to worries and fears among many museum workers, physical anthropologists and archaeologists that archaeological research would be restricted and censored, and that valuable museum collections would be destroyed. As an example of such worries, Clement W. Meighan (1992, 1996 [1994]) argues that there is a basic and universal scientific need to preserve evidence, for example skeletal remains, for future research that might use new methods and ask new questions, and also for the possibility to validate and evaluate earlier research: “Reburying bones and artifacts is the equivalent of the historian burning documents after he has studied them. Thus, repatriation is not merely an inconvenience but makes it impossible for scientists to carry out a genuinely scientific study of American Indian prehistory” (Meighan 1996 [1994]:212). In his view, reburial is a way of destroying basic research data, and he sees the reburial debate as a serious conflict between religion and science. He draws parallels with for example creationists who try to outlaw the teaching of evolution in some states in the USA, because it is in conflict with their religious beliefs. He concludes that archaeologists must sustain their rights and duties as scientists, and should not fall into the trap of cultural relativism and give way to irrational claims of cultural affiliation (Meighan 1992).

Responding to that kind of argument, Vine Deloria Jr. writes from the perspective of a Native American: “We have been the objects of scientific investigations and publications for far too long, and it is our intent to become people once again, not specimens” (Deloria 1992:595). With the constant arguments for the sanctity of science, “Indians were made to appear as if they
were looting the scientific heritage instead of receiving back the remains of loved ones who had been illegally and immorally taken from them a century or more ago” (ibid.:596).

Some of the problematic issues with the repatriation process include how to determine cultural affiliation, especially concerning remains of individuals who lived thousands of years ago, and how to deal with remains of unknown origin or contested cultural affiliation. Obviously there is a ground here for conflicts and clashes of conflicting values and interests.

One of the most publicized controversies in the USA has been the case of the so-called Kennewick Man (see Thomas 2000; Watkins 2005:352ff.; Burke et al. 2008). The Kennewick Man constitutes an illustrative example of the arguments for and against reburial and it highlights the problems of cultural affiliation and how far back in time the concept of cultural can be applicable. In 1996, an almost complete human skeleton was discovered by the Columbia River near Kennewick, in the State of Washington. Initially the skeleton was thought to be that of a murder victim or a European settler from the American colonial period, but the discovery of an ancient arrowhead embedded in one of the bones told another story. Subsequent radiocarbon dating showed that the skeleton was about 9,200 years old, one of the oldest skeletons found in the USA. Some scholars argued that the physical features of the skeleton were distinctly non-Indian, while Native American tribes of the area demanded the repatriation of the skeletal remains. The Army Corps of Engineers, which controlled the federal land where the discovery was made, seized the remains in order to comply with the NAGPRA. After that, a long battle followed in the mass media and in court between the Indian Tribes, who wanted to reburial the remains, and a group of scientists, who claimed that the skeleton was of paramount value to science and should be preserved for future studies. The question was also if NAGPRA could apply to human remains of such an old age. The debate and the arguments were at times heated and polarized, fueled not least by reporters and journalists (see Coleman & Dysart 2005). In the popular arena, the finds incited discussions on the first settlement of North America (on the common theme: “Who were here first?”), and certain groups used the finds to claim that the American Indians were not the first settlers of the USA (Thomas 2000). After several judgments and appeals, the last decision has been that the remains of the Kennewick Man could not be defined as “Native American”. Therefore, the remains were not subject to the provisions of NAGPRA and they could be used for scientific studies, however with certain restrictions (see Burke et al. 2008).

The Kennewick Man case has often been portrayed as a conflict between science and religion. In opposition to this view, David Hurst Thomas argues that:
... the pivotal issue at Kennewick is not about religion or science. It is about politics. The dispute is about control and power, not philosophy. Who gets to control ancient American history – governmental agencies, the academic community, or modern Indian people? (Thomas 2000:xxvii)

In the book *Skull Wars*, David Hurst Thomas (2000) explores the background to the controversy around the Kennewick Man, the history of the relationship between Euroamericans and Native Americans and the history of anthropology and archaeology in North America. It is a long and gruesome history, which must be kept in mind when discussing the current issues of repatriation and reburial and when confronting American Indian distrust of and discontent with archaeology and archaeologists.

Thomas emphasizes the power to name, which is reflecting the power to conquer and control. It started with Christopher Columbus renaming the islands and the peoples of the New World:

> More than any other single factor, the power to name, define, and conquer has fueled the skull wars. Naming is central to the writing of history, and history is a primary way we define ourselves. The power to name becomes the power to define one’s identity and very existence. (Thomas 2000:xl)

Although the Kennewick Man case has demonstrated conflicting values and interests among the parties involved, many argue that the Kennewick Man is an exception to the general more positive experience of the repatriation legislation (Ousley *et al.* 2005). There are many examples of positive and fruitful cooperation and partnership between professional archaeologists, museum curators and Native Americans (see e.g. Swidler *et al.* 1997; Dongoske *et al.* 2000). Many researchers agree that NAGPRA has been a positive experience on the whole (cf. Lackey 2006:162). E. Pierre Morenon concludes his review of the NAGPRA legislation and its impact on American archaeology in the following way:

> NAGPRA is not an aberration. It accurately reflects what archaeologists do today, and builds on a long history of preservation law. It is well within the mainstream of contemporary archaeological method and theory. What is most exciting, however, is not how the law came to be, or what archaeologists are doing now because of this law. As an archaeologist, it is exciting to contemplate a future in which Native Americans have a key role, a future in which archaeologists are less constrained by discipline-based research conventions and are free to explore a wider range of approaches, ideas, and ethical standards. NAGPRA creates conversations, tests our standards, makes us consider what we are and do, and (for those of us who wish) how we make sense of this world. (Morenon 2003:137)
Writing from the perspective of physical anthropologists, Ousley et al. discuss the impact of NAGPRA on physical anthropology in the USA (Ousley et al. 2005). Despite the initial fears that the NAGPRA legislation would lead to the destruction of the primary material and to severe restrictions on research, the legislation has not had such devastating effects on physical anthropological research. In order to determine the cultural affiliation of the human remains, osteological and DNA-analyses are frequently used. In many cases, Native American groups consult archaeologists for more information, for instance on the sex and age of the individual or details of the burial practices. Museums have also benefited from having to complete inventories of their collections. Furthermore, they argue that the repatriation legislation, in many ways, has developed and improved the relationships between Native Americans and physical anthropologists and museums workers (ibid.).

It must be recognized, however, that there are also problematic issues with the NAGPRA legislation, and that the relations between Native American groups and museums and universities are not always positive and constructive. New problems arise. In the last years, there have been political discussions on amendments to the legislation. One of the main issues has concerned the concept of cultural affiliation and what to do with bones that can not be defined and affiliated with any present-day federally recognized tribes.

It is also important to keep in mind that “Native American” is not any homogeneous entity, and that it does not represent one opinion and one interest only. There is of course a wide diversity of opinions among Native Americans as to how to deal with repatriation claims and the fate of the repatriated remains, which are not always necessarily reburied. There are also Native American anthropologists and archaeologists who work to combine indigenous perspectives with scientific ones in their research (see e.g. Dongoske et al. 2000; Smith & Wobst 2005a).

Moreover, and very importantly, NAGPRA has promoted a new practice of negotiations and consultations, and the creation of new institutional arrangements such as repatriation offices, joint-use committees and review panels, which have redefined the relationships between indigenous groups, museums and archaeologists (Brown 2003:247).

The discussion here has been focused on the USA, but similar debates about repatriation and reburial and the relationships between archaeologists and the indigenous populations have taken place also in other so-called settler or post-settler nations, for instance in Australia (see e.g. Turnbull 2002; McNiven & Russell 2005), New Zealand and Canada.
The repatriation and reburial issue in northernmost Europe

The repatriation and reburial debates are quite new debates in the Nordic context. There are, however, certain differences between the countries. In Norway, the discussions have been in progress for a longer time than in Sweden. For Swedish archaeologists, the demands from Sámi groups have become a challenge, which has led to worries for the future of archaeological research as well as hopes for new policies and ways of conducting archaeological activities in the future.

In June 2002, the conference “Who owns the cultural heritage?” (‘Vem äger kulturarvet?’) was arranged by Ájtte, the Swedish Mountain and Sámi Museum in the town of Jokkmokk in the county of Norrbotten. At the conference, questions about the management of the Sámi cultural heritage and its future were addressed (the papers of the conference are published in Duoddaríð 2002). Questions about the organization of cultural heritage management in Sweden and the other Nordic countries were discussed together with issues about the development of Sámi museums and institutions, and the possible transfer of control over the Sámi heritage from national agencies and museums to Sámi institution, including transfer of certain objects from museum collections. Audhild Schanche emphasized that the claims for repatriation should not be understood foremost as a discussion of the legal ownership of the Sámi heritage but rather about the responsibility for the heritage and its future (Schanche 2002b).

In 2006 and 2007, a project called “Recalling Ancestral Voices – Repatriation of Sámi Cultural Heritage” was conducted in cooperation between the Siida Sámi Museum in Inari in Finland, the Ájtte Museum in Jokkmokk in Sweden, and the Várjjat Sámi Museum in Varangerbotn in Norway (see Harlin 2008a, 2008b). The aim of the project was to gather information about collections of Sámi cultural objects in museums and archives in Norway, Sweden and Finland, and to create a database covering the material, which is available on the Internet (see Internet Sami Collection). The idea was to gather information on the different collections and their histories, and to make the information accessible for Sámi people and Sámi organizations, as well as for any other interested parties. In October 2007, as a conclusion of the project, a conference devoted to the theme of repatriation of Sámi cultural heritage was arranged in Inari, Finland, where researchers from the Nordic countries and abroad as well as representatives of all the Sámi Parliaments engaged in the debates.

In the following, I will first discuss the historical background to the repatriation and reburial issue in the Nordic countries, which is crucial to consider when discussing the contemporary claims and challenges. Then, I will examine the recent developments in Sweden, and briefly address the situation in the other Nordic countries and the Russian Federation. The chapter will be
concluded with a discussion on the consequences and implications for professional archaeologists and for archaeology as a subject.

**Historical background**

The racial scientists
measure heads
order the people
to get undressed

naked
in front of strangers
a merciless ignominy

the photographs show
a cruel oppression
in the name of research
everything is permitted

the hidden racism

(Rose-Marie Huuva, extract from poem in *Viiddat – divttat Sámis girjjis*, Huuva 2006:26ff; translation by Alan Crozier in Sápmi 2007:23)

For the purpose of understanding the debates on reburial and repatriation, it is essential to consider the history which underlies the demands from Sámi groups to repatriate certain categories of artifacts and to repatriate and rebury human remains that are at present kept at different museums and institutions.

Sámi cultural objects and skeletal remains have been collected for a long time by researchers and other collectors. Some of the most disturbing elements of this history deal with the racial biological research, skull measurements and racist politics (Evjen 1997; Schanche 2000:34ff; Isaksson P. 2001; Lundmark 2002; Schanche 2002c; Ljungström 2004; Furuhagen 2007), and the excavations and plundering of Sámi cemeteries and burial sites in order to procure genuine Sámi skulls for research and exhibitions (Schanche 2002a:99ff). The feeling of injustice, humiliation and pain inflicted upon the Sámi people by racial biologists and other researchers is reflected in the poem above by Rose-Marie Huuva, a Sámi artist and poet, who has been one of the leading activists demanding the return and reburial of Sámi skulls and bones that are currently stored in Swedish museums and archives.

The history of the collecting of bones and skulls is a part of the general history of collecting, of the creation of curiosity cabinets, exhibitions, museums
and archives, which stretches through the centuries. It is also a part of the history of interest in human evolution, biology, medicine, physical anthropology and racial biology, as well as a part of the history of the development of ideas on the division of humanity into different categories, peoples and races and the ranking of these categories in hierarchies of more- and less-developed, more- and less-civilized, more- and less-worthy-of-living-space in the emerging modern world.

In part II of this book, I have examined the history of the representation making of the Sámi people and of Sámi history and prehistory. The earlier research has had an effect on the policies of the State towards the Sámi population, and has also had an effect on the ways in which the Sámi themselves see and value historical and archaeological research today. The earlier research and the earlier attitudes towards the Sámi populations are therefore also important to keep in mind when discussing the repatriation and reburial issues.

As a symbol of the racial research and politics in Sweden, the State Institute for Racial Biology was founded as a governmental research institution in Uppsala in 1922, with Herman Lundborg as its first director (see further Furuhagen 2007). The scientific racial biological research built on the earlier representational politics of the Sámi as the primitive “Other” (cf. Baglo 2001a, 2001b).

One central person in the early history of skull collecting in Sweden was Anders Retzius (1796–1860), by some called the father of physical anthropology and the inventor of the so-called cephalic index, or skull index, which would be become very influential in the categorization of people in physical anthropology (cf. Lundmark 2002:20ff.; Fforde 2004:33f.). The cephalic index was based on the ratio between the breadth of the skull and its length. If the cephalic index of a skull was less than 75 it was categorized as long-headed or “dolichocephalic”. If it was over 80 it was categorized as round-headed or “brachycephalic”. Skulls with an index between 75 and 80 were seen as an intermediary form, called “mesocephalic”. It was established that the higher races, such as the Nordic, had longer skulls, while the lower races such as the Sámi were brachycephals. The idea of dolichocephals and brachycephals would soon run into serious scientific problems, but it has nevertheless exerted a great and enduring influence on both scientific and popular representations. At Karolinska Institutet (“Caroline Institute”) in Stockholm, Anders Retzius brought together a large collection of Sámi skulls. Gustaf Retzius (1842–1919), the son of Anders Retzius and a medical doctor, anatomist and member of the Swedish Academy, was another one of the central figures in the racial biological research of the late 19th and early 20th century. In the book *Crania Lapponica* (von Düben 1910), he described the contribution by his father to the collecting and studying of Sámi skulls in the following way:
However it was not until 1842 and only then owing to a lecture held by Anders Retzius at the Congress of Scandinavian Naturalists that same year, on “The Shape of the Crania in Northern Lands”, that the form of cranium peculiar to the Lapps was carefully described and distinguished from that of the Swedes, the Finns, the Slavs, and the Greenlanders. At that time, thanks to the assistance of pupils and friends, Anders Retzius had succeeded in obtaining for the Anatomical Museum of the Caroline Institute no less than 22 Laplanders’ crania. He had, moreover, owned and studied eight more such skulls, which, however, had passed by exchange to other museums. During the following years of his life, up to his demise in 1860, aided by former pupils who were doctors in Norrland and Lapland, he continued adding to his collection of Lapp Crania, even though there were great and many difficulties to be overcome. As, however these crania were greatly in demand for collections abroad, in exchange of which he could obtain other crania valuable for his investigations, one or other of the Lapp crania he had acquired were disposed of in this manner by Anders Retzius. (Retzius 1910:1)

Anders Retzius himself described the collection of Sámi crania at the Caroline Institute in Stockholm (see Retzius 1864:23ff.; text originally published in 1842):

Of the 22 existing specimens I have only used 16 for the present description, as the others are either from children, or of uncertain authenticity as they are unearthed from old churchyards. However, as concerns these 16 crania, I possess more detailed information regarding the persons’ name, age, etc. … The value of the crania is much enhanced by the information of their origin, a circumstance of so much more importance, as the Lapps are buried in the same churchyards as the Settlers, who are Swedish and Finnish. One understands how easily mistakes might be made in the collection of crania from such places. (Retzius 1864:23f.; text originally published in 1842; my translation)

In 1892, there was a fire at the Caroline Institute, which destroyed large parts of the collection of Anders Retzius, including the collection of Sámi skeletal remains. In a letter after the fire, Gustaf Retzius wrote: “The greatest loss is the excellent Lapp series, probably irreplaceable, which was procured by my father during a long period of years, and to which were added 17 skeletons from Lapp graves, bought by Düben from Nordvi” (from Ljungström 2004:427; my translation). The fire caused a serious break in the research on the physical anthropology of the Sámi and prevented Retzius from writing the comprehensive monograph on Sámi craniology that he had planned to do (ibid.:228f.).

Many researchers from different fields of scholarship, and explorers of different kinds, engaged in the search for Sámi skulls. Graves and churchyards were seen as fields of harvest; if the diggers did not possess too much caution and scruples, the harvest could be rich. There was also a substantial trade in Sámi skulls and bones, driven partly by economic reasons. In order to illustrate the contemporary attitudes of researchers and other collectors, I will in the
Johan Wilhelm Zetterstedt (1785–1874), entomologist, professor in botany at the University of Lund, a specialist on flies and mosquitoes – and one of the contributors to Retzius’ collection at the Caroline Institute – travelled in 1821 in the county of Norrbotten and in 1832 in the Sámi areas in the county of Västerbotten. In the book *Resa genom Umeå Lappmark i Vesterbottens Län, förrättad år 1832* (‘Travel through the Umeå Lappmarks in 1832’; Zetterstedt 1980 [1833]), he gave a short description of his efforts to find genuine Sámi skulls during this travels:

> During my travel in the Lappmark in 1821, I made many attempts, at the request of several persons, for the sake of comparison, to obtain a Lapp cranium; but all efforts in this respect were futile. Also, the procurement of one of those, in a land where superstition is as widespread as in the Lappmarks, is connected with the greatest difficulties. The skulls, which are unearthed from Lapp churchyards, are quite seldom to be considered as crania of real Lapps, as a much larger number of Settlers have been buried in the consecrated earth. This time I managed, albeit not without much trouble and considerable cost, to obtain not only one but two complete and genuine Lapp crania. I know that they will be welcomed and useful for scientific purposes, when I deliver one of the specimens to the Caroline Institute’s Collections in Stockholm, and the other to the rich and precious anatomical preparats collection in Lund, which nowadays belongs to the Academy there. (Zetterstedt 1980 [1833]:321; my translation)

Lars Levi Laestadius (1800–1861), vicar in Karesuando parish and later in Pajala parish in the northeastern part of the county of Norrbotten, is well-known as the founder of the Lutheran revivalist religious movement known as Laestadianism, which has had great religious, cultural and social impact in the Sámi area. Laestadius was also a recognized botanist and corresponded with several of the leading natural scientists of the era. As he was living in the far north, in the remote and exotic area of the Sámi population, he became a useful contact, who could provide information and various specimens for scientists in Sweden and in other countries who were interested in the northern flora and fauna and the Sámi people.

It is perhaps less well-known that Laestadius was also involved in the trade with Sámi skulls. In his dissertation about Laestadius as a natural scientist, Olle Franzén has presented several examples of the involvement of Laestadius in these activities (Franzén 1973:212ff.). In a letter to C.J. Sundevall in 1846, Laestadius asked Sundevall to tell professor Anders Retzius (or possibly his brother Magnus Retzius), that it was not so easy to get hold of a cranium from a newly born Sámi baby (which Retzius obviously had requested him to do). However, Laestadius expressed hopes that the district doctor in Haparanda, Dr. Wretholm, as a surgeon could assist in cutting the throat off a child corpse in the grave in Karesuando that remained open during the winter. In 1842, Anders Retzius thanked Dr. Wretholm for his assistance and mentioned that he
now had in his possession the cranium of a two-year-old Sámi girl (ibid.:212f.; see Retzius 1864:23, 28).

A cemetery that over time became something of a favorite spot for craniologists and other researchers who were looking for specimens of Sámi skulls was the old churchyard in Markkina, in northern Finland on the border to Sweden, where the Enonteki church had stood during the years 1661–1828. After the church had been moved to a new location, the Markkina cemetery became the target of several grave plundering expeditions, in some of which Laestadius himself took an active part, sometimes with resulting great harvests of skulls and bones. Laestadius apparently did not show much ethical or religious worry about the plundering of the graves (Franzén 1973:213f.).

In a series of newspaper articles, Laestadius wrote about the plundering of skulls during the French Recherche expedition (1838–1840, led by Joseph Paul Gaimard), when he acted as a guide and local expert for the members of the expedition in the Karesuando area (Norrlands-Posten 1838; unsigned articles, but attributed to Leastadius):

There, the President Gaimard, Dr. Robert and Dr. Sundewall found a great treasure, perhaps the best that they had found during their journey, namely two big sacks filled with Lapp skulls and human bones. The President himself eventually became very eager to collect every single piece of bone that emerged from the grave. (Norrlands-Posten 1838, no. 72; my translation)

Laestadius reported that there were worries that the local Sámi people would find out about the grave digging conducted by the members of the expedition at the old churchyard in Enonteki. At one occasion, a settler asked Laestadius if it was right to plunder the dead in such a way. At another occasion, as Laestadius and some natural scientists had visited the old churchyard with the aim to procure some more skulls, a woman asked him what would happen on the day of resurrection when the skulls were separated from the bodies by thousands of kilometres (Norrlands-Posten 1838, no. 72).

The Swedish archaeologist Gustaf Hallström (1880–1962) traveled, as I have already mentioned, in the Sámi areas on the Kola Peninsula in the years 1908 and 1910 (Hallström 1912b, 1921, 1922). During his travels, he conducted excavations at most of the cemeteries that he visited, many of which were still in use, in order to collect Sámi skulls and bones. Some of the graves were less than 50 years old, and offerings were still being made to the deceased. Hallström has himself described the excavations of the graves: “However, my observations are very uneven, because the Lapps did not want me to visit these places, why I often had to do this at brief moments or at unfavorable times” (Hallström 1922:163; my translation). Concerning one of the graves at the Lanjsuo Island, a grave island in Lake Imandra, he wrote: “One of the skeletons had still hair attached at the cranium, 40 cm long, underneath a woman’s hat. Furthermore, the head had been wrapped with a colored
headscarf, that is, the typical head dress for Lapp women in holiday clothes, hat and a headscarf wrapped around it” (ibid.:167f.; my translation). The skeletal parts, including 27 crania, were, after Hallström’s return to Sweden, delivered to the Anatomical Institution at Uppsala University, on whose behalf the collecting of human remains had taken place (ibid.:170).

In Norway, there is a long history of grave plundering, collecting of and trading in Sámi skulls. Some of the first archaeological excavations of Sámi graves in northern Norway were conducted by Andreas Georg Nordvi (1812–1892) from Mortensnes by the Varanger Fjord. In the end of the 19th century, Nordvi started a large-scale trade in Sámi skulls, which were at that time in great demand within the field of physical anthropology. Some of these skulls were sold to the anatomical collection in Oslo and others to different scientific institutions in England, Germany and, as mentioned above, Sweden, many of which had been dug up from churchyards (Schanche 2000:33f.). At this time, there were also many others, mostly non-archaeologists, who were engaged in the excavation of Sámi graves in northern Norway, as part of the search for genuine Sámi skulls. From 1914 to 1939, the Anatomical Institute in Oslo, under the leadership of K.E. Schreiner (see 1935:1ff.), conducted large-scale, systematic excavations of Sámi graves in northern Norway. Although there were many protests from the local population, a great number of churchyards from the 17th–20th centuries were more or less completely excavated, and hundreds of skulls and skeletons were sent to the anatomical collection in Oslo (Iregren 1987; Schanche 2000:43ff.; cf. Evjen 1997; Kyllingstad 2004).

Sometimes, it has been suggested that the grave plundering activities in Sápmi, and the search for Sámi skulls, was little more than a part of a general attitude at that time towards dead bodies and human bones, and that these activities therefore did not represent a very serious offense. However, it is mentioned several times in the original sources that the local Sámi populations did in fact protest, sometimes violently, against these grave-digging activities, and that the local population indeed was offended by these actions. Often the work had to be done in secrecy, or it involved bribes and deceit. Some of these protests and negative attitudes against the grave digging visitors have been recorded in the contemporary literature.

It was often hard to find workers who were willing to do the actual digging. In some preserved letters, the district doctor Bjarne Skogsholm who conducted excavations of Sámi graves in Finnmark, Norway at the beginning of the 20th century, talks about the discontent shown by the Sámi to the fact that their ancestors were not left to rest in peace, and that it was very difficult to find workers to the excavations, even if they were offered a lot of money (Iregren 1987:35).

Sophus Tromholt (1851–1896), a natural scientist originally from Denmark, spent many years in northern Norway studying the northern lights. During his stay in northern Norway, he became interested in the Sámi people, and became a very active ethnographic and portrait photographer. In the book Under the
Rays of the Aurora Borealis, from 1885, he described some of his experiences from the search for Sámi skeletons and skulls, including a story of the attempts by the local Sámi population to drown an intruding ethnographer in the Russian Sámi area:

In the autumn, by-the-bye, I unearthed a few skeletons in the old churchyard dating from this era, for the purpose of obtaining some Lapp *crania* for the Museum at Bergen, but besides bones and some remnants of Pulks, and the roofs built over them, I did not find a single object of the kinds which in pagan times were buried along with the dead from some superstitious motive or another.

I knew that some years ago a zealous ethnographer, who plundered a churchyard in Russian Lapland for the purpose of enriching his collection, had a narrow escape of being drowned. The infuriated natives set upon him, and ducked him several times in the icy waters of the river. In order not to run a similar risk, or cause any offence to the Lapps about me, I conducted my operations with the greatest secrecy, although I had the representative of the Crown at my side. My assistant, the Lapp gravedigger, was bribed to secrecy, and the remains – a complete skeleton and four *crania* – were transported to my residence in the middle of the night.

I must say I experienced some scruples in disturbing the old Lapps, where they had rested for two centuries at least; but what will not a savant submit to for Science? (Tromholt 1885:184f.)

The collecting of skulls and skeletal material in the Nordic countries was also part of a larger international context of collecting and trading with bones and skulls from different groups of people around the world (see e.g. Fforde 2004). At the time, there was an international scientific interest in the science of craniology, the measuring of morphological features of skulls, and an interest in understanding the development of human kind, which involved the establishing of the position of various peoples in schemas of development. The more exotic, and primitive, the people was considered to be – the more interesting were the “specimens” from that people.

Swedish researchers and travelers were also active skull-hunters in other parts of the world in the late 19th and the early 20th century. One case that has been discussed recently (see Hallgren 2003; Mjöberg 2006) concerns Eric Mjöberg and the plundering of skulls and skeletons in Australia in the early 20th century. After it had become clear that the skeletal remains that had been taken by Mjöberg were kept at the Ethnographic Museum in Stockholm, the discussions led to the repatriation of the remains to the local Aboriginal communities in Australia in 2004.

Eric Mjöberg (1882–1938) was a zoologist, ethnographer and adventurer. Mjöberg led two Swedish scientific expeditions to Australia, in 1910–1911 and 1912–1913. During the travels, the members of the expedition gathered large zoological and ethnographic collections. But Mjöberg also showed interest in the indigenous Aboriginal people, and was driven by a strong desire to collect
Aboriginal skeletons and skulls, and to bring them back with him to Sweden. Although it was prohibited by Australian law at that time to take skeletal material out from the country, he succeeded in doing so. Mjöberg apparently showed little understanding or respect for the wishes and values held by the local Aboriginal population in regard to their deceased relatives and their bodies. In his publications, he frankly described several occasions of grave plundering. In one passage in *Bland vilda djur och folk i Australien* (‘Among wild animals and people in Australia’), published in 1915, he described how he sought to find ways to grab the body of a recently deceased young man, whose funeral Mjöberg himself had attended:

> What an excellent opportunity for me, after some time had passed, to bring Sambo down from his airy bed and add his bones to my collection, I thought to myself. That would mean a complete skeleton. The Gods, however, wished differently.

> One beautiful evening I filled my Browning magazine, grabbed the gun over my shoulder, a linen bag under my arm and headed out to the burial site, located about two miles from a narrow forest path, treaded by the Natives …

> I had reached the airy bed of the youth … With the bag in my hand, I approach the burial tree, but I see nothing but the bed itself with the leafy branches turning yellow … I poke about in the branches, but not a single bone is to be found. Very disappointed, I climb down again and have a good long think.

> It was only some weeks ago that they buried him. As a rule, they do not move the remains of the dead until after several months. What could be the reason for the hurry at this occasion?

> Anyhow, here was no night work to be done, that was obvious. Disappointed and angry, I slowly departed home to my camp, ignorant of the fact that the Negroes knew more about me than I had realized.

> After a few days, I indirectly found out that they had moved the dead already on the fifth day after the funeral. This had happened because of the strong suspicions against me and because a rumour had spread rapidly among the Negro tribes along the river that, a week earlier, I had robbed one of their skeletons from a tree about twenty-five miles to the east.

> In the eyes of the blacks, this constituted a serious crime … It was obvious that the rumours and the suspicion had led to a great disappointment for me. I would have to exercise even greater caution during my coming skeleton hunts, as the Australian Negro is highly untrustworthy and in his superstition exceedingly fanatical. (Mjöberg 1915:295ff.; my translation)

As a contrast to the attitudes toward Sámi burials and Sámi human remains, I would like to mention some other archaeological excavations in Sweden and Norway that were conducted in the same time period as the grave-digging and the archaeological excavations described above. The examples that I would like to bring up concern the great burial mounds at Gamla Uppsala (‘Old Uppsala’) outside of Uppsala in the province of Uppland in Sweden and the ship burials in the mounds in Gokstad and Oseberg in Norway, which after their discovery became important symbols in the Swedish and Norwegian nationalist
movements. These sites, and the finds from the burials, are still considered to be among the most important prehistoric remains in the two countries. The ships, and other finds from the burials at Gokstad and Oseberg, are displayed at the Viking Ship Museum in Olso, a prime tourist attraction in the Norwegian capital. The site of Gamla Uppsala is also an important tourist attraction in the province of Uppland, and a museum, managed by the National Heritage Board, has been built by the grave mounds. These examples are interesting for our discussion because of the very different way the human bones discovered in the graves were treated in comparison with the bones from the Sámi burials.

The East mound at Gamla Uppsala was excavated in 1846–1847. In connection with the archaeological investigations, the human bones that were discovered in the burial were reburied in the mound (Lindquist 1936:145f.). The West mound at Gamla Uppsala was investigated in 1874. After the excavation, the burned human bones from the grave were reburied, although some samples were kept (ibid.:147).

The mound at Gokstad in Sandefjord, Vestfold was excavated in 1880 under the leadership of Nicolay Nicolaysen. In July 1929, after a restoration, the grave mound at Gokstad was re-inaugurated in the presence of the Norwegian king, many prominent guests and a large gathering of some 10,000–12,000 spectators. The professor in archaeology, Anton Wilhelm Brøgger, gave a speech at the inauguration ceremony (Bakken 1959). In the speech, he described how the bones found in the grave had been reburied in the preceding year:

A grave mound without a burial is like a church without an altar. People in the region demanded that the king was returned. We decided to do so. The bones of King Olav Gjekstadalv were placed in a coffin of lead, which was sealed… The lead coffin was placed in a cist made of Vestfold Syenite on June 16 last year. I do not think that anyone of those many who were here that day, will ever forget it. There were no great ceremonies, not many words. But it was a moment of deep and genuine feeling… Now the coffin lies deep down in the mound. King Olav once again rests in the mound at Geirstad. (From Bakken 1959:53f.; my translation)

The Oseberg mound, near Tonsberg, Vestfold was excavated in 1904–1905 under the leadership of Gabriel Gustafson and Haakon Shetelig. The Oseberg ship was discovered and excavated just around the time of the independence of Norway from the union with Sweden and became a strong symbol for the new independent Norway with its own glorious Norwegian past. In 1948, the bones of the two individuals in the burial, interpreted as two females, were reburied in the mound after osteological analysis (Arwill-Nordbladh 1998:35). Before the reburial, there was a long debate on the issue among scholars, and many objected to the plans of reburying the bones (see Holck 2009a). However, recently the bones have been re-excavated from the Oseberg burial for additional analyses (ibid.). In 2007, the mound at Gokstad was also re-opened.
and the burial was re-excavated in order to analyze the reburied bones (Holck 2009b).

What is the relevance of these witness stories of the grave plundering performed by archaeologists and other researchers in the 19th and early 20th century for archaeology and archaeologists today? In the argumentation used in favor of repatriation and reburial projects, the historical background – the methods of excavation and collection, the relationship between the grave-diggers and the local people concerned, as well as the larger racial biological ideological context – is constantly referred to and is seen as one of the strongest points.

However, another perspective on the historical background has also been put forth. For instance, the osteologist Elisabeth Iregren has stated that it is important to do actual physical anthropological research on the bones in the collections, as this research can provide information on earlier populations, their contacts, migrations and origins. In her view, it is important to conduct research on the bone material precisely because of the controversial and disturbing ways in which it was collected (Iregren 1987:36, 47). Iregren emphasizes that although the research context was racist in those days, it is no more (Iregren 2002). According to Liv Nilsson Stutz, today’s archaeological, and especially osteological, research in Sweden is often wrongly accused of being racial biological or racist by some of the activists in the debate (Nilsson Stutz 2007, 2009). This is, in her view, an unfair accusation that does not take into consideration the recent developments and critical discussions in archaeology and osteology.

The stories about grave plundering are individual stories, with their specific contexts and specific actors, but they are also undoubtedly part of a larger picture, of a way of approaching and dealing with burials and dead bodies that characterized the early archaeological, ethnological and physical anthropological research. But the fact that these activities were part of a larger picture – of a predominant attitude and way of thinking – does not automatically make it right and just. This history should not, and can not, be “negotiated away”. It is this way of thinking of and dealing with the dead that archaeologists today must face and, somehow, handle from our contemporary situations and perspectives.

The debate in Sweden

After having examined some of the historical background, I will now focus on the debate on repatriation and reburial as it has evolved in Sweden. The debate is, at present when this text is being written, very lively and there are many different actors involved: Sámi activists, politicians, different researchers in archaeology and osteology, the Sámi Parliament, the Historical Museum, Ájtte – Swedish Mountain and Sámi Museum, and others. It must be said that, as this is an on-going dynamic discussion, the outcome is still uncertain. Here, I will follow some of the threads of the debate and examine some of the specific
cases that have attracted attention. This debate is very important as it brings into focus the questions of Sámi self-determination in cultural heritage issues and the role of archaeological and osteological research, and pinpoints the need for dialogue and mutual sharing of perspectives.

Earlier, one of the most discussed issues has concerned the Sámi ceremonial drums, that were used in Sámi rituals and ceremonies and that were confiscated by the Swedish state in the 17th and 18th centuries as part of the missionary activities in Sápmi and the campaign against beliefs and practices related to Sámi pre-Christian religion. The surviving drums, which are kept in collections of museums in several European countries, have become an important symbol for Sámi identity and heritage, a symbol for the “drum time”, the time before the colonization and the Christianization, and has consequently been one of the focal points of the repatriation debate within the Sámi community (Duoddaris 2000; Westman 2002; see also Virdi Kroik 2007). When Ájtte – the Swedish Mountain and Sámi Museum in Jokkmokk was opened, a large collection of Sámi ethnographic objects were transferred from the Ethnographical Museum in Stockholm to the new museum in Jokkmokk (Mulk 2000:46). However, the most debated and publicized issue in recent years has concerned the skeletal material that is stored in many museums and archives in Sweden (see Edbom 2005).

The only example of an actual case of reburial of Sámi human remains in Sweden, until today’s date, concerns the skeletal remains from the so-called Soejvengelle’s grave in Tärna parish in the county of Västerbotten. As this is the first event of a planned reburial of Sámi human remains, and as it has served as a central point of reference in the following debates, it is important to discuss it here. This case also illustrates the possibilities of reaching agreements between local groups, heritage managers and archaeologists.

In 1950, Ernst Manker from the Nordic Museum in Stockholm conducted an excavation of the grave. The stone grave was located by a small stream close to the mountain Atoklinten, a mountain of special sacred meaning to the local Sámi community (see Sanell & Stångberg 2001). The grave construction above ground was built of stone slabs, leaning against each other, and was about 250 cm in length and 125 cm in width (see fig. 32). In the bottom of the grave, there was a layer of birch bark, on the top remains from an akkja and the bones of the deceased were in disorder. There was also some information that the grave had been opened and disturbed earlier. After the excavation, some bones were taken to the Nordic museum for osteological analysis. The analysis showed that the buried person was a man, about 160 cm in height, who died at an age of 30–40 years. The bones were kept at the Nordic museum until 1973, when they were transferred to the Historical Museum in Stockholm. In connection with the excavation, Manker promised in a letter to Nils Axelsson in Ström, who took part in the excavation, that the bones would be returned to their original place after the analysis. However, this did not happen (Manker 1961; Heinerud 2002:3,5).
A local legend about the Shadow Man, Soejvengelle, has been connected with the stone grave. According to the legend, which is reported by Ernst Manker, but had already been recorded earlier, the father of the Shadow Man was a Sámi man from Södra Storfjället who married a girl from Norway. Their first child was a big and tall boy – as tall as his shadow. However, he died in his youth, and was buried in a grave by the mountain Atoklinten (Manker 1961; Jillker 2001).

The Vadtejen Saemieh Sijte (‘Vapsten Sámi association’) became engaged in the question of the return and reburial of the remains. Anders Axelsson, the grandson of Nils Axelsson, was one of the persons who most strongly pursued the case (Elsvatn 2004:150). In 1999, the Sámi association turned to the Historical Museum with the request to return and rebury the bones from Soejvengelle’s grave, according to the promise given by Manker after the excavation in 1950. The Historical Museum agreed to return the bones, and the County Administration of Västerbotten decided to allow the reburial to take place, with the condition that a new archaeological investigation of the grave should take place before the reburial (Heinerud 2002:3; Stångberg 2005).

In 2001, a renewed archaeological investigation of the grave was conducted by Västerbottens Museum. The grave was found to have been rebuilt or disturbed several times, and a definite reconstruction was difficult to determine, although the reconstruction suggestion from 1950 was considered to be fully reasonable (fig. 32). At the excavation, some artifacts were found: an axe of historical type, a knife which can be dated to about the 15th century or later,
several coins which were all from the 20th century, two from before 1920, ten from the 1960s–1970s and two from the 1980s. All of the coins were found along the edges of the grave, often stuck in-between the stone slabs. There were also some additional finds of human bones, mostly small pieces, and some teeth (Heinerud 2002:6ff.). Before the excavation, one of the bones from the museum was C-14 dated to about the middle of the 15th century (460 ± 55 B.P., Ua-18196; Heinerud 2002:9). Thus, it seems probable that the grave that was thought to have been constructed in the 19th century, according to the legend of the Shadow man, turned out to be a burial more than 500 years old.

In October 2002, the reburial ceremony of the remains of the individual in Soejvengelle’s grave took place at the site of the original burial in Tärna. In order to prevent future disturbance or plundering of the burial, the grave pit was dug deeper into the ground than earlier (Elsvatn 2004:151). After the reburial, the stone coffin was carefully reconstructed according to the documentation from the 1950s (Heinerud 2004:2).

There are some other examples of repatriation from Swedish museums, but which have not concerned Sámi human remains or artifacts. The State Ethnographical Museum in Stockholm has had more experience from repatriation processes than any other Swedish museum. One case concerned the Totem Pole from British Columbia in Canada, which was kept at the State Ethnographical Museum in Stockholm and repatriated to the local Haisla community from where it had originated. The demands from the local community became the starting-point for a long process of cooperation and exchange of experiences, which, according to the Director of the museum, Per KakS, led to many unexpected positive consequences for the museum (KakS 2002).

Another case concerned the Aboriginal human remains that had been plundered from graves in Australia by Eric Mjöberg in the beginning of the 20th century, and which were returned from the Ethnographical Museum in 2004 in order to be reburied in Australia (Greenfield 2007:310ff.; see earlier in this chapter). Lotte Mjöberg, a relative of Eric Mjöberg, became involved in the process of repatriating the bones to the local Aboriginal communities in Australia and has consequently written a book in which she has described her own experiences and thoughts during the process (Mjöberg 2006).

In February 2008, the University of Lund returned two skulls marked as belonging to individuals of the Australian indigenous population to the Australian government. The information about the remains and their origin and history was very scarce, it was only known that the two skulls had been bought in London for the price of one pound at some occasion during the 19th century. A collection of human remains originating from the indigenous population on Hawaii is also currently planned to be repatriated from the Historical Museum in Sweden (see Statens Historiska Museer 2009b).

Another case involved the skull of a Jewish man named Levin Dombrowsky, who had died while in custody in Lund in southern Sweden in
the late 19th century. The skulls of the man was “collected” and brought to the anatomical collection of the University of Lund, as an example of a Jewish skull. In 2002, the skull of Dombrowsky, together with many other skulls, was shown at an exhibition at the Kulturen Museum in Lund. Members of the Jewish congregation in Malmö protested against the exhibition and the keeping of the skull, and requested that the skull should be removed from the collections of the museum and be buried according to Jewish customs. A debate evolved, not least in the local newspapers. In 2005, the President of Lund University, Göran Bexell, decided to grant the demands from the congregation. The decision of the President of the University was heavily criticized by the professor in osteology at Lund University, Elisabeth Iregren, but despite this Dombrowsky’s skull was delivered to the Jewish congregation and buried in Malmö later in the same year. The case has provoked discussions on the principles and consequences of repatriation of human remains from museums and research institutes (Berggren 2005; cf. also Rasmusson 2008).

The Swedish Church has also discussed the issues of repatriation and reburial, in the context of an on-going process of reconciliation between the Church and the Sámi people, following several centuries of more or less oppressive and discriminatory policies and actions of the Church towards the Sámi people. The question about the Sámi human remains in museums and other institutions has been identified as an extraordinary and constructive opportunity in the process of reconciliation (Ekström 2006:106ff.). In 2006, in the report Samiska frågor i Svenska kyrkan (‘Sámi issues in the Swedish Church’), the suggestion was put forth, that:

Remains of Sámi that can not be tied to any specific individual should be buried in a common grave within the Sámi area. The grave monument should be modeled as a memorial that confirms the excuse from the Swedish majority society – and not least from the Swedish Church – to the Sámi people and the wish for reconciliation with this people. (Ekström 2006:106; my translation)

In Sweden, there also exists a practice of reburying human bones that have been excavated from graves from medieval and historical times, for instance inside or outside churches or in abandoned Christian cemeteries (cf. e.g. Redin 1994; Iregren & Redin 1995). There are several examples from recent decades of such acts of reburial of bones from excavated Christian graves in different parts of the country, often with reference to ethical principles.

In March 2005, the Swedish government issued instructions to all State museums and universities to complete an inventory of their collections concerning any human remains from indigenous populations anywhere in the world. The inventory was to be finished by October 1, 2006 (commission U2005/3451/Kr). The Sámi Parliament has later objected to the fact that the Historical Museum in Stockholm did not fulfill the demands of the commission, as regards the registration of Sámi human remains in their
holdings. The museum listed Sámi human remains from Norway and Russia, but not from Sweden. The list included one skull from a child from Varanger in northern Norway, which had belonged to the anatomical collection at Uppsala University before it was transferred to the Historical Museum in 1997. The collection of skulls from Russia had been brought to the anatomical collection in Uppsala by Gustaf Hallström in 1910 and had also been transferred to the Historical Museum in 1997. This collection included 11 crania, from men, women and children, from three burial places on the Kola Peninsula, in Notozero, by Lake Imandra and by Lake Umba (Statens Historiska Museer 2006; Sametinget PM 2007:4).

In a report, a preliminary overview of Sámi cultural historical and archaeological material from present-day Sweden in museum collections in Sweden and other European countries has been presented (Edbom 2005). The report was part of a project with the aim to make an inventory of the Sámi collections in museums and to prepare for the possibilities for repatriation, with a special focus on ritual objects and skeletal remains. There were known collections of human osteological material from Sápmi, for instance, at the Historical Museum in Stockholm, the Osteological research laboratory at the University of Stockholm, the Historical Museum in Lund and at several regional museums in northern Sweden (ibid.).

The debate on these issues in Sweden was for a long time restricted to a small number of initiated participants. However, in the beginning of 2007, the debate started to come through also in the mass media. And, as often is the case, this also led to the spread of the debate and the issues at stake to a larger group of people. The discussion, earlier confined to a small group of especially interested and motivated people, now became a topic in society at large – in newspapers, radio, on TV, and elsewhere.

In 2006, the Sámi artist and poet Rose-Marie Huuva had written to the Swedish Sámi Parliament (see Skrivelse till Sametinget 2006), and again in early 2007 (see Skrivelse till Sametinget 2007), asking for a more active engagement from the Parliament in the question of the repatriation of Sámi human remains:

Behind each piece of bone, there is a human being. It is the skulls of our ancestors that are exhibited in museums and it is their skeletons that are stored in the depositories of the research institutions.

It is not worthy for us as a people, in the 21st century, to allow the “Sámi human osteological material” to continue to be at the disposal of research and racial biology. Other indigenous peoples have demanded and have retrieved the remains of their ancestors from Swedish museums and institutions.

… We have an obligation towards our ancestors to make sure that their remains are once again placed in consecrated ground, from where they were once robbed … I am of the opinion that it is the Sámi Parliament that should demand that all of the Sámi human remains at present in the possession of the Swedish State should be repatriated. (Skrivelse till Sametinget 2007:1f.; my translation)
In February 2007, the Assembly of the Swedish Sámi Parliament, based on a request formulated earlier by the Board of the Sámi Parliament (Sametinget Styrelsen 2007:21) and with reference to the petitions by Rose-Marie Huuva mentioned above, decided:

- to demand a full and complete identification of all Sámi skeletal material in all state collections. It is very clear that museums and institutions that were part of the Government instructions in some cases have not included the Sámi skeletal material from Sweden, for instance the State Historical Museum

- that the Sámi Parliament demands a survey of how museums and institutions have appropriated the material, that is, whether it was done by the opening of graves or in some other way

- that the Sámi Parliament demands a repatriation of the Sámi human remains. If it is not possible to identify the skeletal remains (the identity of the deceased) the Sámi Parliament should work for a repatriation and worthy reburial of the Sámi human remains in the area of origin (Sametinget 2007:30; my translation)

After the decision by the Sámi Parliament, a discussion started in the mass media in Sweden, for example on the “Argument” discussion program on Swedish Television Channel 1 (2007-03-27), as well as in several features in the program “Kulturnyheterna” (“Cultural news”) during the spring of 2007, a coverage that has continued since then. The professor of osteology at Lund University, Elisabeth Iregren, was the most outspoken of the critics of the demands for reburial. In the discussion for and against repatriation and reburial of Sámi skeletal remains, many arguments echoed from the reburial debates in the USA (see above), as the debate was structured around a conflict between representatives of a “scientific” archaeological perspective on human remains as objects of study and valuable source material that must not be destroyed, and representatives of a Sámi perspective on the specific human remains as ancestors who must be granted a decent burial. In short, the typical positions were established early on.

The minister of culture, Lena Adolphson-Liljerot, declared in a broadcast on “Kulturnyheterna” on Swedish Television, that she understood and sympathized with the arguments of the Sámi side and that she was prepared to support a process of repatriation of the skeletal material to the Sámi.

As a result of this debate, a working group was formed in 2007, with the participation of the Sámi Parliament, the Historical Museum and Ájtte – Swedish Mountain and Sámi Museum, with the aim to initiate a dialogue on the question of how to handle the Sámi human remains and sacred objects within the framework of the current legislation. The working group would try to find ways of proceeding forward with these questions and to develop a plan for the future of the collections at the Historical Museum. Elisabeth Iregren has also suggested the formation of a committee, in order to further discuss the different perspectives and find future solutions.
The debate was reignited in the beginning of 2009, on the Sámi National Day on February 6, when renewed demands for the return and reburial of Sámi skulls in museums were raised at a demonstration in Jokkmokk, during the annual market days. The protesters were not satisfied with the course of events and complained that the matter was being dragged out (SVT 090206; cf. Gustafsson 2009).

A few weeks later, the director of the Historical Museum, Lars Amréus, declared a willingness to partly comply with the demands from the Sámi Parliament. The museum would be willing to transfer the discussed skeletal material to the Ájtte – Swedish Sámi and Mountain Museum in Jokkmokk. The material would remain in the ownership of the State, and would not be reburied. Reburial would be possible, according to Amréus, only in the case of one skull from the parish of Lycksele in the county of Västerbotten, where there was clear written documentation of a Sámi ethnicity (SVT 090219; see also Statens Historiska Museer 2009a). Kjell-Åke Aronsson, director of the Ájtte Museum responded preliminarily in a positive manner. He declared that the museum in Jokkmokk could offer an ethically sustainable storage of the skeletal material and showed an interest in the idea of an ethical committee that could deal with future requests to study the human remains, at the same time indicating that he would prefer to see that the skeletal material was not reburied (SVT 090220).

In a letter to the editor in the journal Samefolket, Rose-Marie Huuva confronted the idea of a possible future management of Sámi human remains by Sámi institutions:

Historically, the Sámi have never been a skeleton-collecting people. Now that attitude is starting to change. If we take over the human remains from State museums and institutions in order to build our own Sámi skeletal collections, we will continue the crimes against our ancestors, and thereby the nation-states are spared from their postcolonial sense of guilt. (Huuva 2009:37; my translation)

During the spring of 2009, the debate in Sweden has focused on the 12 crania that were excavated in 1915 at the deserted cemetery at the old church site of Rounala (see fig. 33), and which are presently in the collection of the Historical Museum in Stockholm. It has also been discovered that there are several more crania from the Rounala cemetery in the collections of Uppsala University.

The Rounala church site is located close to the border to Finland, about 70 km northwest of Karesuando in the county of Norrbotten. The church of Rounala was probably the oldest church in the Torne lappmark region, but it has an unclear early history. However, it was early abandoned, and in the end of the 18th century the church building was moved from its original place (see Wiklund 1916). Today there are no buildings or roads in the area where the old church was located.
In the summer of 1915, excavations at Rounala were conducted by the archaeologist Eskil Olsson (1886–1915). The aim of the excavations was to procure the anthropological material from the old cemetery and to investigate any remains from the old market place adjacent to the church. The investigations were conducted on behalf of the Anatomical Institute at Uppsala University. Eskil Olsson passed away later in the same year, and very little documentation from the excavations is known to exist today. However, a short account of the excavations written by Eskil Olsson has survived (Museum Gustavianum Anteckningar 1915). At the time of the investigation, there were only a few foundation stones remaining from the old church, and there were some 20 hearths from old dwellings (kåtatomter) by the church. The graves were located to the south and the east of the church, and the dead were buried in rows with their heads to the east. At least some of the dead had been buried in sledges (pulkor). Except for some remains of wood, cloths and hides, there were no grave goods in the burials. According to Olsson’s account, two complete skeletons and 21 crania were delivered to the Anatomical Institute in Uppsala. Olsson also mentioned that some of the graves at the cemetery had been dug up by the länsman (local office-holder) Bäcklund in Muonio as early as 1880 (ibid.).
In March 2009, the archaeologists Thomas Wallerström, from the Norwegian University of Science and Technology in Trondheim, and Kerstin Lidén, from Stockholm University, approached the Historical Museum asking for permission to conduct certain analyses on the bone material from Rounala, including C-14 datings, as part of an ongoing archaeological research project (Wallerström pers.com.). There are indications from earlier datings that the burials at the cemetery could be considerably older than previously assumed, probably from the Middle Ages, which would open up new perspectives on the medieval history of the population in the area and the establishment of the earliest churchyards. The Historical Museum contacted the Sámi Parliament and Ájtte – Swedish Mountain and Sámi Museum for consultation in the matter. In their answer, the Sámi Parliament opposed the request (Sametinget 2009a). Ulla Barruk Sunna, administrative director at the Sámi Parliament, declared that the Sámi Parliament intended to request the transfer of ownership of the crania to the Sámi Parliament. Furthermore, she stated that the parliament intended to establish an ethical committee which would develop ethical guidelines for research on Sámi human remains, and that, awaiting the establishment of the committee, no research on the crania should be conducted. Barruk Sunna wrote that the crania from the old cemetery at Rounala, to the Sámi people “… represent the unsettled colonial past of Sweden against the Sámi population, in which the racial biological research used Sámi crania in order to measure the inferiority of the Sámi race in relation to the Nordic population” (ibid.).

Soon thereafter, in May 2009, the Sámi Parliament officially requested that the cranium from Lycksele and the crania from Rounala were repatriated from the Historical Museum and that the right to administer the remains was transferred to the Sámi Parliament (Sametinget 2009b). The Sámi Parliament expressed the wish that the crania from Rounala were deposited at the Ájtte – Swedish Mountain and Sámi Museum in Jokkmokk. It was also underlined that there was a much larger symbolic value in this matter than the mere question of formal, juridical ownership. In the request, reference was also made to the obligations of international law and the adoption of the above discussed UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

In their answer to the Historical Museum, Ájtte – Swedish Mountain and Sámi Museum, through the director Kjell-Åke Aronsson, maintained that the analyses on the skulls from Rounala could be conducted, as they were part of an ongoing research project and could complement earlier results. The great scientific value of the proposed analyses was furthermore underlined. However, in the answer it was suggested that no new research projects on Sámi human remains should be initiated until the questions of ethics and the future management of the human remains had been settled (Ájtte 2009).

In the beginning of June 2009, the Historical Museum sent a proposal to the Department of Culture, expressing the point of view of the Museum in this matter (Statens Historiska Museer 2009c). The museum agreed that the
ownership of the above mentioned skull from the parish of Lycksele could be transferred to the Sámi Parliament, as this was a medical specimen with limited scientific value. The museum also acknowledged the great symbolic value in the reburial of the skull. However, the museum maintained that the crania from Rounala should remain in the ownership of the Swedish state, as they possessed a great scientific value and should be available for future research. The museum also maintained that the old age of the human remains made it difficult to clearly determine their ethnic belonging. Although they should remain in the ownership of the state, the museum declared that it welcomed special arrangements for the storage of the remains, for instance at the Ájtte – Swedish Mountain and Sámi Museum in Jokkmokk (ibid.).

When a large collection of skeletal remains from the collections of the earlier Anatomical Institute at Uppsala University, kept at the Department of Medical Cell Biology, was transferred to the Museum Gustavianum (the university museum) in the end of 2008 and the beginning of 2009, the antiquarian Geoffrey Metz at the museum discovered that there were several crania from the Rounala excavation by Eskil Olsson in the collection. One part of this collection of human remains had already been transferred to the Historical Museum in the 1990s (with the skulls from Rounala, mentioned above, and other human remains). The other part had remained at Uppsala University, and there were plans to dispose of the material before it was decided to transfer the collection to the Museum Gustavianum. At the museum, the antiquarians discovered the Sámi human remains and recognized their importance (Metz pers.com.). At the same time, it was discovered that the collection also contained additional skeletal remains which were classified as Sámi. Geoffrey Metz with assistants is at present (September 2009) surveying the entire collection, and the information on its content is therefore very provisional. The collection contained at least five crania from Rounala, five crania from the Kola Peninsula, and one skeleton from the Varanger area in northern Norway. Moreover, the collection contained a number of more or less complete skeletons defined as Sámi, and several boxes of skeletal remains from Russia (Metz pers.com.).

In July 2009, the Swedish government officially decided that the above mentioned skull from Lycksele, which had been part of the anatomical collections at Uppsala University from 1867 and since 1997 in the Historical Museum, will be reburied. The debates concerning the crania from Rounala will continue, and the outcome remains to be seen.

Recently, another possible future case of reburial in Sweden has turned up on the agenda. This case concerns a grave located by the Lake Gransjön close to Frostviken in the northern part of the county of Jämtland, which was discovered and excavated in 1986. The burial, placed in a crack in the rock, had been covered with stone slabs, which at the time of discovery had fallen apart so that the human bones in the burial were visible. At the excavation, some grave goods, a chain made of brass, an axe and a knife of iron and some
fragments of birch-bark were found in the burial (see Sundström 1988). After the excavation, the finds and the bones were taken to the county museum of Jämtland in Östersund. Few analyses have been made, but based on the composition of the finds, the grave has tentatively been dated to the Late Medieval Period, around the end of the 15th century.

Demands for the reburial of the bones have been directed to the county museum by representatives of the Ohredahke Sámi village, where the grave was discovered. In an interview with the Sámi radio in early July in 2009, Anders Hansson, who is curator and head of the archaeological sector at Jamtli, the county museum of Jämtland, declared that the museum was positive to a reburial of the bones found in the Gransjö grave, which he considered without any doubts to be a Sámi burial (SR 090703). Hansson expressed an understanding for the demands. In his view, a reburial could have a great symbolic value, and could be a strong signal that archaeologist today work in a completely different manner than earlier in history, when the wishes of the local Sámi communities were completely disregarded. He considered it to be natural for archaeologists today to work in close dialogue with the concerned Sámi communities in any projects that related to Sámi heritage and history. Hansson also expressed a wish to conduct some additional investigations before the reburial, on the site itself and on the bone material. 20 years ago, there were few methods for analyzing bone material, but today it would be possible to perform many new analyses that could provide a lot of information on the buried individual, he told the reporter. The Gransjö grave is completely unique, and he saw this as a fantastic opportunity to gain more knowledge about the Sámi medieval history in the region, which is very little known. Hansson also admitted that, since only one reburial had taken place earlier in Sweden (the already mentioned Soejvengelle’s grave in Tärna), there were many unanswered questions about how to proceed with the actual act of reburial, and how to reconstruct the grave, which at the time of discovery was more or less opened, so that the bones would not be immediately destroyed. According to Anders Hansson, the reburial could take place in 2010 at the earliest (ibid.). When this text is being written, it is still not decided what will happen with the human bones from the grave by Gransjön, but the discussions are continuing (Ljungdahl pers.com.).

To conclude this section on the repatriation and reburial debates in Sweden, I once again wish to stress that these debates are part of a larger question concerning the organization of cultural heritage management in Sweden, as well as the scope of Sámi self-determination in this field. It is also important to remember that the debates do not concern only human remains, although this has been the central focus in Sweden and in many other places. Therefore, I will bring up one additional example which deals with Sámi sacrificial sites in northern Sweden (see also chapter 7).
Writing from a Sámi perspective, the archaeologist Inga-Maria Mulk has discussed the sacrificial sites and other sacred sites, as part of a living cultural context:

It is important to note that even today sacrificial places and seitse-stones carry a strong emotional significance. Furthermore, the knowledge of old Saami manners and customs have been passed down from generation to generation. Still to this very day there are Saami who have knowledge of old Saami popular beliefs, some of them practicing as medicine-men. Many Saami are also familiar with the sacrificial places of their ancestors, that is to say they know who or what family or sii³da was using a certain sacrificial place.

Accordingly, many Saami today experience a strong historical and social anchoring to the cult places of their ancestors. They are taught how to conceal the existence of these places, so that they will remain unknown to the uninitiated and so that the seitse-stones may stay where they belong. Thus, from a Saami point of view, there are no ambitions to submit the sacrificial places to investigations by archaeologists or any other scientists. (Mulk 1994b:130)

Many sacred sieidi-stones have, over the years, been taken away or have been destroyed by missionaries, lappologists, tourists and others. The memory of the removal, or theft, of the sieidi is in many cases still alive in the affected communities. One example is the sieidi in Sieberbuollda, which was removed from its original place by a private person and ended up in the collections of the Nordic museum in Stockholm, and which was later transferred to the Ájtte museum in Jokkmokk (see Kuoljok 2007:180ff.). In recent years, demands have been put forth that Sámi sacred places and burial sites should be protected and that their location should not be disclosed publicly. As a result of these demands, the exact locations of such archaeological sites are nowadays not always displayed on public maps over northern Sweden, although they can be made available for the purpose of research. The exact location of the sites is kept secret to the general public, in order to avoid or minimize the risks of plundering, vandalism and other kinds of disturbance to the sites.

In the summer of 2007, a course in the history of religions called “Fjällexkursion till samiska offerplatser” (“Mountain excursion to Sámi sacrificial sites”) was planned to be arranged by Uppsala University. The idea was to survey sacrificial sites and other ancient sites by the lake Torneträsk on the territory of the Gabna Sámi Village in the northern part of the county of Norrbotten. However, the Sámi village in question had not been informed or consulted about the course and the field-work that was intended to take place on their land, and after protests from the Sámi village the summer course was cancelled. The Sámi Parliament, through the administrative director Ulla Barruk Sunna, contacted Uppsala University about the course. In her letter, Barruk Sunna pointed to a number of research ethical issues connected with the planning of the course. She pointed out that the places which would have been surveyed and documented are part of the Sámi sacred cultural landscape with strong religious values and that they have traditionally been respected and
revered. Therefore, the Sámi Parliament criticized Uppsala University for not contacting or consulting Sámi representatives in the planning of the course: “The Sámi Parliament is of the opinion that Uppsala University in this case has not respected the value of the sacred places to the Sámi people” (Sametinget Kansli 2007; my translation). After having received this critique from the Sámi Parliament for the lack of information and consultation, the Vice-Chancellor of Uppsala University, Anders Hallberg, apologized on behalf of the University and assured that the University held the deepest respect for the Sámi people and their sacred sites and that this mistake would not be repeated in the future (Uppsala universitet 2007).

Here, I would like to clarify that I do not bring up the example of the summer course in order to argue that education and research on Sámi cultural landscapes should not be conducted at the universities in Sweden, but rather in order to underline the importance of considering issues of research ethics in advance, as well as the need to incorporate discussions on these issues in the university education.
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Debates in Norway

Among the Nordic countries, Norway is the country where the repatriation and reburial of Sámi human remains and Sámi cultural heritage has been most discussed, in part due to the relatively strong political and administrative position of the Sámi institutions in Norwegian society. In Norway, there is also a disturbing history of large-scale trade in Sámi skulls and extensive grave plundering of pre-Christian and Christian Sámi burials in the northern parts of the country. In my view, it is important to take a look at the situation and the agreements that have been reached in Norway, as a comparison to the current developments in Sweden.

The most famous example of a repatriation and reburial of human remains concerns the skulls of Mons Somby and Aslak Hætta. The two Sámi men participated in the so-called Kautokeino uprising in northern Norway in November 1852. During the uprising in the village of Guovdageaidnu or Kautokeino, houses were set on fire and a tradesman and the bailiff were killed and others were wounded. The uprising has been seen as the result of religious “delusion” derived from the Laestadian fervors among the local population, but it has also been interpreted as a kind of violent revolt against the authorities and the local upper class, and it has been a focus point in discussions on Sámi 19th century history (see e.g. Zorgdrager 1997; Lehtola 2004:40f.). Afterwards, several persons who had taken part in the violent events were given prison sentences. Mons Somby and Aslak Hætta, who were considered leaders of the uprising, were sentenced to death and were executed by decapitation. After the execution, the bodies of the men were buried outside of the churchyard in Kåfjord while their skulls were appropriated by the Norwegian State and sent to the Anatomical Institute at the University of Oslo, where they were incorporated in the anatomical collections.

Despite a long struggle by the relatives of the executed for the return of the skulls beginning already in the 1970s, the University of Oslo refused as they claimed to hold the legal ownership of the remains. Finally, after some press coverage of the story, the skull of Mons Somby was returned in 1996. But the skull of Aslak Hætta could not be found in the collections in Oslo. After some investigations, it turned out that his skull had been sent from Oslo to Copenhagen in 1856, in exchange for two Inuit skulls. Eventually the skull of Aslak Hætta was returned from Copenhagen (Schanche 2002b).

In November 1997, the skulls of Mons Somby and Aslak Hætta were buried by the church in Kåfjord in Alta, northern Norway, where their bodies had been buried, according to the tradition (Schanche 2002b). At the reburial ceremony, a clergyman conducted the burial, a bishop delivered a sermon, and the President of the Sámi Parliament in Norway, Ole Henrik Magga, as well as a representative of the Norwegian government gave speeches (Olofsson 2001:44).
In 2002, remains from more than 1,000 individual Sámi were stored at the Institute of Anatomy in Oslo in the so-called “Schreinerske Samlinger” (‘The Schreiner Collections’), most of which originated from Sámi churchyards in Finnmark (Schanche 2002c:56; Sellevold 2002; cf. Schreiner 1935). A special arrangement had been worked out for the storage of Sámi human remains in Norway, as well as for the study of these remains, which has been developed, following the Sámi demands, in cooperation between different parties and interest groups (Schanche 2002a, 2002c). According to the agreement, the Sámi remains were to be stored separately and with restricted access. It was further stated that the Sámi Parliament had the right to administer the remains, that permission for research on the remains must be obtained from the Sámi Parliament, and that the Sámi Parliament had the right to request the return or repatriation of the remains. The question of reburial was not discussed in the agreement; it was considered a matter for the Sámi Parliament to decide. It was, however, stated that relatives had the right to have remains returned that can be identified by name (Schanche 2002c:56; Sellevold 2009). Furthermore, a survey of the collection of Sámi human remains in the Schreinerske Samlinger has been undertaken in recent years (Sellevold 2009). In Norway, a special committee for the ethical evaluation of research on human remains, commonly called Skjelettutvalget (‘Skeleton committee’), has also been established recently (ibid.).

In Norway, a new interesting, and principally important, case has taken place recently. This case concerns the skulls and skeletons from Neiden, a small Skolt Sámi community in the easternmost part of Finnmark, close to the borders to the Russian Federation and Finland, which are kept at the Anatomical Institute in Oslo. At the time of the excavations in 1915, there were strong protests from the local community as well as the clergymen of the local Orthodox congregation (Iregren 1987:35). However, not all of the local Sámi population in Neiden wanted the reburial to take place. Some expressed the wish to wait, so that scientists could study the skeletal remains to find answers to questions about the history of the area and its population (Svestad pers.com.; cf. also Norendal 2008). The Sámi Parliament has, however, insisted that the human remains should be reburied, and it has subsequently been decided that the remains will be reburied in Neiden. This case presents an interesting ethical dilemma. Who should be allowed to decide what will happen with the skeletal remains, the affected local community with its diverse points of view or the central Sámi Parliament? The case of Neiden clearly illustrates the complexities involved in the debates on reburial. In my view, this example also underlines the importance of considering each and every case in its own historical and local context, as well as the importance of realizing that there can be considerable variation in views and interests within one group or local community.
Debates in Finland

In Finland, there have also been debates about the management of the Sámi cultural heritage and the role of Sámi self-determination in these issues. These debates have also concerned the future of the osteological and physical anthropological collections in Finland with Sámi human remains.

In the 1990s, it was discovered that the University of Helsinki held large anatomical collections of Sámi human remains from Inari, Utsjoki and Muonio, which had been gathered in the 19th and early 20th century. A discussion about these remains started in the Sámi community in Finland, and demands for reburial of the remains were put forth. In 1995, the University of Helsinki returned 95 skulls, which were reburied on the old Sámi cemetery island in Lake Inari (Harlin 2008a:196). Many of these skulls had been excavated from Sámi cemeteries by anthropological expeditions in the early 20th century and had been stored in the collections of the university (Lehtola 2005:84). Many Sámi burials were dug up at cemeteries as part of the Finnish physical anthropological research projects which sought to measure the form of the crania (see Isaksson P. 2000, 2001; cf. also Kemiläinen 1998), for instance on the old grave island in Lake Inari and in Savukoski (Isaksson 2000:198; cf. Näätänen 1936:47f.). Before the reburial in 1995, there was some debate in Finland about the proposal to rebury the skulls. Some more radical Sámi voices requested an immediate reburial, while others would have preferred to keep some of the skulls at the Siida Sámi Museum in Inari. Some researchers at the universities in Finland regretted that the reburial took place, and were sorry to lose the possibilities of future research on the human remains (Lehtola pers.com.).

Following this event, a “bone committee”, which involved archaeological, osteological, forensic, medical and museological experts, was appointed by the University of Helsinki in order to survey and analyze the Sámi human remains that remained in the collections. In 2001, the rest of the Sámi human remains were sent to Inari, where they were stored at the Siida Sámi Museum. According to the arrangement, the Sámi Parliament and the Siida Sámi Museum now share the responsibility for the administration and management of the human remains (Harlin 2008a:196).

The situation in the Russian Federation

In the Russian Federation, the situation as concerns the management of cultural heritage and the rights of indigenous peoples has had a somewhat different character than in the Nordic countries (see e.g. contributions in Kasten 2002, 2004, 2005). There has not been a debate in society on repatriation and reburial as we have seen for instance in the USA, or to a lesser extent in the Nordic countries. However, in recent years there have been some emerging discussions on these issues among Russian anthropologists and...
archaeologists, with inspiration from the debates in other countries and on the international level (see Anderson 2007).

As I have discussed in part III, ethnopoltical movements among the northern indigenous peoples have developed since the end of the Soviet period. Indigenous activists have been concerned about the protection of the cultural heritage in the northern areas, including sacred sites and graves (cf. CAFF 2002). Demands for larger cultural self-determination have also been voiced by representatives of many indigenous populations in the Russian Federation (see Köhler & Wessendorf 2002; Wessendorf 2005). However, the repatriation and reburial debate has not yet assumed such an important place in the indigenous movement as it has in the USA or Australia.

The attitudes among archaeologists are not always favorable to this kind of discussion. It is often considered as a political misuse of archaeology (to clarify, this view exists among quite a few archaeologists in Sweden as well). I have personally heard comments that it would be a “scientific crime” to rebury human skeletal remains, from well-established and well-respected archaeologists. There are also concerns that it might become “like in the USA” in Russia in the future. The reburial debate is seen by many as a “foreign” phenomenon, which sooner or later will find its way into the Russian context and cause many problems for professional archaeologists, physical anthropologists and museum workers.

A much debated find is the burial of the so-called Ice Maiden, discovered in Pazyryk in the Altai Mountains in southern Siberia in 1993. This burial is part of the very famous group of “frozen tombs” on the Ukok plateau in the Altai mountains (for more about the “frozen tombs” and the research conducted on the exceptionally well-preserved human and other organic remains, see contributions in Derevjanko & Molodin 2000). The tomb in question with the resting place of the Ice Maiden was dated to the 5th century B.C. The entire content of the burial chamber had been encompassed in permafrost. Because of these circumstances, the tattooed body of the buried female was very well preserved, along with her headdress and clothes and grave goods, which included six horses with harnesses. The remains from the grave were removed to Novosibirsk and Moscow for more detailed research. Some researchers claimed that the Ice Maiden was a typical representative of the Caucasian race, lacking Mongolian features. Representatives of the local people in the Altai region protested against the scientists, and demanded the return of the remains to the site where they belonged. The remains have not been returned, but certain limitations on archaeological research in the area have been put in action. This case can be seen as an example of a conflict between local populations and professional archaeologists, concerning the right to define remains from the past and about the right to exercise control over ancient sites and finds.

As has already been indicated, there is no repatriation and reburial debate in the Sámi area in Russia of the same kind as for instance in the USA or
Australia. However, there are examples that local people have protested against archaeological excavations on the Kola Peninsula. In September 2008, Oddasat, the Sámi news program on Swedish State Television, reported about protests against archaeological excavations near Lovozero, on the Kola Peninsula. Several local Sámi inhabitants expressed their concern and resentment towards archaeological excavations at a burial and settlement site, a place where they themselves and their relatives had lived before they had been forcibly resettled to the town of Lovozero. They were afraid that the old site would be destroyed, and were angry that the archaeologists had not asked the local Sámi population for permission to conduct the excavations (SVT 080917).

A more common theme concerns the rights of the Sámi population to self-determination. The discussions have concerned, for instance, the foundations of a Sámi Parliament and the protection of land and water rights, and the possibilities to influence land management projects, such as the creation of protected nature reserves (Likhachev pers.com.). Here, the question of the management of the Sámi cultural heritage and the management of sacred places also play a certain role. As always, the sites of cultural heritage importance are intertwined with the traditional usage of the landscape.

An attempt to conduct a participatory research case study on the Kola Peninsula is presented in the book *Sámi potatoes – Living with Reindeer and Perestroika* (Robinson & Kassam 1998). The aim was to map resources and resource utilization, and to create maps of the landscape that could be used for future land management, indicating for instance the occurrence of wild animals, fishing places, reindeer grazing areas, but also historical sites and sacred sites. All this was done in cooperation with the local population and local reindeer herders. Although it is stated that the entire text of the book has been accepted by the Russian Sámi Association in Lovozero, some local Sámi inhabitants have raised their voices to complain about the study, the way it had been conducted and the way in which the results were presented in the book, which they considered to be incorrect (Likhachev pers.com.). Regardless of who might be “right” or “wrong”, this case indicates the difficulty of conducting participatory research projects and also that such studies must be adapted to the special local conditions and circumstances.

Debates in Denmark and Greenland

In Denmark, the cultural heritage of Greenland, which became a Danish colony in 1775, has been at the center of the attention concerning repatriation (Nielsen 2002; Gabriel 2003). I include Denmark here, although the discussions have not concerned Sámi but Inuit cultural heritage, because it is important as a comparison and as an example of how agreements have been reached by the different parties.

The debates on repatriation in Denmark have concerned primarily human remains and cultural objects that originate from Greenland but that are kept in
Denmark. During the time of Danish sovereignty over Greenland, a very large collection of archaeological and ethnographical objects from Greenland was gathered in Denmark. Greenland is still formally a subject of Denmark, but enjoys a certain level of autonomy and self-governance, the so-called Home Rule (see Dahl 2005). At the time of printing of this book, there is an ongoing process for further self-governance for the population of Greenland. In 2009, new steps towards greater independence have been taken, through the passing of a law that transfers more control over natural resources, the judicial system etc.

Between the years 1984 and 2001, around 35,000 archaeological and ethnographic items were transferred from the collections of the National Museum of Denmark in Copenhagen to the National Museum of Greenland, while around 100,000 items from the collection were to remain in Denmark. The returned objects represented every distinguished archaeological culture in Greenland until AD 1900. Copies of archival sources and databases were also transferred to the National Museum of Greenland during the process (Grønnow & Lund Jensen 2008:185).

One case of reburial concerned the skeletal material that was collected by the Danish-led Fifth Thule Expedition of 1921–1923 in the areas of Naujat-Repulse Bay, Pond Inlet and Arctic Bay in Canada. In the early 1990s, demands from the local Inuit communities for the return and reburial of the human remains led to an official request of repatriation from the government of the Northwest Territories in Canada. The ethnographic and archaeological material from the expedition was kept at the National Museum of Denmark and the human remains at the Laboratory of Biological Anthropology at the University of Copenhagen. The collection consisted of skeletal material from 34 individuals, from the period 1200–1700 AD. The Museum and the University decided to grant the request. Some small specimens were kept for the purpose of possible future analyses, and the bones were returned to Canada where they were reburied in September 1991 (Hansen 1997:141f.). Human remains have also been returned to Greenland from institutions in the USA in the 1990s, such as the remains after some individuals of the indigenous population of Greenland who had been brought to the USA by Robert E. Peary in the late 19th century to be exhibited and who, after their death, had been skeletonized and incorporated in museum collections in the USA (ibid.:143f.).

Another case of repatriation of human remains from Denmark concerned the skeletal material that had been excavated by a Danish-American expedition in 1933 in the Chugach region in Prince Williams Sound in Alaska. In 1992–1993, material from the expedition that was stored in the Smithsonian Institute and the University of Pennsylvania in the USA was repatriated. The Chugach Heritage Foundation also turned to the National Museum of Denmark and requested the repatriation of the human remains from the expedition that was kept in Denmark. The request was accepted, and in September 1996, the human remains were reburied at four locations in Alaska (ibid.:144f.).
In February 2007, a conference devoted to the theme of repatriation was arranged by The Greenland National Museum and Archive in Nuuk in Greenland, in which anthropologists, archaeologists, representative of indigenous peoples, heritage managers and politicians from different countries participated (conference proceedings in Gabriel & Dahl 2008). This conference can be seen as yet another example of how important the questions of repatriation and reburial had become for research and museum institutions in many parts of the world.

Some archaeological perspectives

Liv Nilsson Stutz has studied the repatriation and reburial debates in the research project “Burials, Looting and Politics – The place of archaeology in the debate on legitimacy and identity in repatriation and excavation of burials”. In several publications, she has discussed some of the consequences of the repatriation and reburial claims for professional archaeologists and for the cultural heritage management sector. Although there have been many positive examples of repatriation projects, there are also several problems, which she argues must be considered as well.

Liv Nilsson Stutz has pointed out that the debates have revealed quite a lot of ignorance and prejudice among some of the stakeholders and the public concerning archaeological and anthropological research as it is conducted today. Archaeologists are rather often ridiculed in the debates and are called “looters” or “grave robbers”, the view on archaeology or anthropology is too often an outdated one, and current theoretical and methodological discussions are usually not reflected (Nilsson Stutz 2009:2). Nilsson Stutz emphasizes the responsibility of scientists to stand up for their research and for a humanistic critical view. This is in my view a very important point that should not be forgotten in the sometimes heated debates. In her opinion:

… we need to reserve the right to remain critical of all kinds of appropriation of the past. This does not mean that repatriation is always problematic, or even worse, wrong. However, the challenge is to strike a reasonable balance between people’s basic human right to their past and identity, and the potential abuse of this past and this identity to the detriment of others. (Nilsson Stutz 2009:161)

What is the difference between grave plundering and an archaeological excavation? And what was the difference 100 years ago? What criteria should be used? And does it actually matter? Can we reach a common ground, a common framework of understanding? At this point, it is necessary to take a closer look at how archaeologists have discussed graves and other ancient sites of special cultural and religious importance to people today. Therefore, I will in the following discuss the importance of graves as an archaeological object of
study in order to better understand the past. Thereafter, in the following chapter, I will turn my attention to the debates on archaeological ethics, that is the attempts by archaeologists to deal with the new situation in the world, where people are demanding respect for their dead and for their sacred sites, and where archaeologists no longer can act as if they do not care about the sensitivities and concerns of other people.

Where to put the remains of the dead is generally not a matter of functional expediency. The place of the dead in any society will have significant and powerful connotations within people’s perceived social geographies… Placing the dead is one of the most visible activities through which human societies map out and express their relationships to ancestors, land and the living. (Parker Pearson 2002:141)

Since the beginnings of archaeological practice and theory, graves have been, and continue to be, one of the most central source categories for archaeologists. In the perception of the archaeologist among the public, graves and grave-digging also assume a special, almost iconic position. As discussed above, grave archaeology is consequently, and logically, one of the most contested elements in archaeological practice.

Graves and burials, as physical constructions and social/cultural/religious phenomena, are in many ways central for archaeologists who are trying to understand past societies and cultures. Graves show different aspects and reflect other sides of the past societies than the ones reflected in for instance settlement sites. The material objects that can be found in graves are also many times of a different character than the ones found at settlement sites. The grave finds, the construction of the grave, and traces found from different practices performed in connection with the burial and the treatment of the dead body can tell about rituals, conceptions of life and death, maybe about religious ideas and practices. For the study of religion in prehistoric and early historic societies, graves and burials are often very important, not least when there are few or no written sources available.

The osteological material – that is, the human and animal bones – can tell many things about the ways of life and death of the ancient populations. For instance, through analyses on human bones it can be possible to find out about the age and sex of the dead persons, different wounds and diseases, handicaps, sometimes treatment of wounds and diseases and the cause of death. We can learn about the diet, about the treatment of old and sick individuals, and much more. New analytical methods, for instance different chemical analyses and DNA-analyses, can give a lot of information on the living conditions from the bones of the buried persons.

Graves have also played a very central role in the creation of prehistoric chronologies. Burials often contain closed contexts, where the objects have been deposited at one single occasion. Datings obtained from burials, absolute
datings such as C-14 datings as well as relative datings from combinations and series of grave finds, have had great importance for the establishment of chronologies all over the world.

In certain places and in certain times, graves may be the only, or almost only, available source for the study of certain time periods. Settlement sites may not be known and without the knowledge obtained from graves, little or nothing would have been known about that time period and the people who live there at that time. As an example, one can mention the excavations of so-called lake-graves (insjögravar) or hunting-ground graves (fångstmarksgravar) from the Iron Age in the South Sámi area, which have provided a lot of information on South Sámi history.

There is yet another aspect to be considered, which is often forgotten in the debates. A majority of the archaeological excavations that take place in Sweden each year, and in many other countries, could be classified as emergency excavations. They are undertaken because of different exploitations in the landscape, for instance the construction of railways, motorways or new shopping centers. If archaeologists had not excavated the ancient remains – including graves – in the areas of construction, the remains from houses, workshops, burials etc. would simply be destroyed, and pieces of human bones and skulls would be scattered in the debris from the construction sites or crushed to dust. Destruction of ancient remains is in fact a very serious problem in large parts of the world, in part due to uncontrolled exploitations and lack of legislation or means to implement existing legislation, in part due to deliberate plundering and illegal excavations of remains, not least burials, for the sole purpose of finding and stealing valuable artifacts. Here, archaeology and cultural heritage legislation play an important role to protect and, if necessary, excavate and professionally document the threatened remains.

Furthermore, it is not always obvious what constitutes a “grave” or a “burial”. Our present conception of a grave and a burial does not correspond very well with what we see in the archaeological record from many periods in prehistory. For instance, people were not always buried in constructions or in the ground. The human bones were sometimes treated very differently than today and some bones can be found in settlement sites or spread out in the landscape. Sometimes there were secondary burials, and so on in great variety. In this way, archaeology can also shed light on other ways of relating to and dealing with the dead body, and other ideas of life and death. Archaeology can thus give new perspectives on issues that are fundamental to the understanding of what it means to be a human being – but, in the process, archaeologists should be careful not to forget about the different ways of relating to and understanding death, and the dead body, that actually exist today.

It is equally important to recognize that archaeologists themselves are actually human beings – social and cultural beings – who have feelings and react in different personal ways when confronted with the remains of dead persons in graves or elsewhere. It is a fundamental misunderstanding that
archaeologists do not care and do not possess and express emotions in their work. As social and cultural beings, archaeologists remember, mourn and commemorate their beloved ones who have passed away as normal human beings, and these experiences and memories affect them in their work as well. However, these emotions are not always recognized and accepted among professional archaeologists, something I find a bit sad (see further discussions in Downes & Pollard 1999; Theliander 2003). In my view, archaeology also holds an existential dimension, and one can hardly practice archaeology without reflecting over the passing of time and human existence. Maybe these insights can become part of a foundation upon which a future common ground with other groups can be built, also when dealing with contested issues such as repatriation and reburial.
Chapter 11. Ethics and politics in the North

In the previous chapter, I have examined some of the demands for greater Sámi self-determination, as concerns primarily cultural heritage policies, as well as the current debates on repatriation and reburial from Swedish, Nordic and international perspectives. In this chapter, I will examine some of the responses to these demands and challenges, in the form of discussions on archaeological ethics. I will comment on some of the more general discussions on archaeological ethics and present some of the relevant codes of ethics and professional conduct that have been formulated by different national and international organizations. The focus will be placed on the codes of ethics which deal specifically with the treatment of human remains and culturally sensitive objects, and the participation of indigenous groups in the research process.

These discussions on archaeological ethics are of course highly relevant to the case of Sámi prehistory and the management of Sámi cultural heritage. In the writing and rewriting of the prehistory of northern Sweden, archaeologists face many challenges. In the earlier parts in the book, I have already mentioned several examples of controversies and ethical dilemmas in the northern areas that archaeologists, museum workers and other cultural workers meet. The repatriation and reburial debate can be seen a prime example of the administrative and legislative challenges that need to be addressed. Often, there is a strong connection with present-day conflicts over land rights. In chapter 7, I have examined the field of South Sámi archaeology, an example that demonstrates many of the difficult situations that archaeologists can face in a context with a contested cultural heritage, including being summoned to court in order to, under oath, declare one’s scientific position and argue for one’s standpoints concerning prehistoric times and archaeological remains.

As a conclusion, I will argue that it can not be sufficient to formulate well-meant codes of ethics, although they might play an important role in the professional community. Every case is different and must be dealt with in its own context. It is also necessary to realize that archaeology is embedded in different political processes and that the actions of archaeologists might have real consequences for people. There is thus, in my view, a need not only for discussions on the ethics of archaeology, but also on the politics of archaeology.
Discussions on archaeological ethics

As a response to the wishes and demands of indigenous and local communities in different parts of the world, and as a result of intra-disciplinary explorations into the theoretical foundations and the social and cultural impact of archaeological activities, archaeologists have started to discuss issues of the ethics in archaeological research, theory and practice.

There is today an extensive body of archaeological texts dealing with the ethics of archaeology (publications on these issues include among others Vitelli 1996; Swidler et al. 1997; Lynott & Wylie 2000; Renfrew 2000; Zimmerman et al. 2003; Karlsson H. 2004; Scarre & Scarre 2006; Cassman et al. 2007; Hamilakis & Duke 2007). The discussions have covered a wide range of issues. The topics of discussion have concerned, for instance, looting of cultural heritage and archaeological sites, stolen artifacts, plundered shipwrecks, spoils of war and illicit trade with artifacts. Discussions have also dealt with questions of cultural heritage management, and local and universal values and rights. Some of the most extensive, and heated, discussions on archaeological ethics have concerned the relationships between archaeologists and local, especially indigenous, population groups, and the attitudes towards the treatment of the dead in field-work, research and exhibitions. As we have seen in the last chapter, the repatriation and reburial debates have proven the pressing necessity of such considerations.

In recent years, there have been quite extensive discussions on the treatment of human bones among archaeologists (see e.g. contributions in Cassman et al. 2007). There have also been some discussions in Sweden on how archaeologists and osteologists could conduct research on human bones from an ethically sound and sustainable perspective (see Iregren & Redin 1995; Theliander 2003).

Furthermore, archaeologists have felt the need to formalize and document the standpoints and approaches to such issues. Consequently, several codes of ethics have been proposed and adopted by various archaeological associations in many parts of the world. In the following, I will review some of these codes of ethics and professional conduct, and I will discuss some of the issues at stake, especially the ones connected with the present discussion on multivocality, indigenous archaeology, treatment of human remains, and repatriation and reburial.

The World Archaeological Congress (WAC) constitutes one of the most important arenas for the discussion on indigenous archaeology and archaeological ethics. The World Archaeological Congress was established in 1986, and one of its main ambitions has been to promote multivocality, empowerment of indigenous and other disadvantaged communities, as well as discussions on the relationships between professional archaeologists and local and indigenous communities. In 1989 at the South Dakota Inter-Congress of the World Archaeological Congress, the so-called Vermillion Accord was adopted (see further Zimmerman 2002) with the following formulations:
1. Respect for the mortal remains of the dead shall be accorded to all, irrespective of origin, race, religion, nationality, custom and tradition.

2. Respect for the wishes of the dead concerning disposition shall be accorded whenever possible, reasonable and lawful, when they are known or can be reasonably inferred.

3. Respect for the wishes of the local community and of relatives or guardians of the dead shall be accorded whenever possible, reasonable and lawful.

4. Respect for the scientific research value of skeletal, mummified and other human remains (including fossil hominids) shall be accorded when such value is demonstrated to exist.

5. Agreement on the disposition of fossil, skeletal, mummified and other remains shall be reached by negotiation on the basis of mutual respect for the legitimate concerns of communities for the proper disposition of their ancestors, as well as the legitimate concerns of science and education.

6. The express recognition that the concerns of various ethnic groups, as well as those of science are legitimate and to be respected, will permit acceptable agreements to be reached and honoured. (Internet WAC First Code of Ethics)

The World Archaeological Congress has also adopted a "First Code of Ethics". In this code of ethics, it is stated that:

Members agree that they have obligations to indigenous peoples and that they shall abide by the following principles:

1. To acknowledge the importance of indigenous cultural heritage, including sites, places, objects, artefacts, human remains, to the survival of indigenous cultures.

2. To acknowledge the importance of protecting indigenous cultural heritage to the well-being of indigenous peoples.

3. To acknowledge the special importance of indigenous ancestral human remains, and sites containing and/or associated with such remains, to indigenous peoples.

4. To acknowledge that the important relationship between indigenous peoples and their cultural heritage exists irrespective of legal ownership.

5. To acknowledge that the indigenous cultural heritage rightfully belongs to the indigenous descendants of that heritage.

6. To acknowledge and recognise indigenous methodologies for interpreting, curating, managing and protecting indigenous cultural heritage.
7. To establish equitable partnerships and relationships between Members and indigenous peoples whose cultural heritage is being investigated.

8. To seek, whenever possible, representation of indigenous peoples in agencies funding or authorising research to be certain their view is considered as critically important in setting research standards, questions, priorities and goals. (Internet WAC First Code of Ethics)

Based on these general principles a number of rules for archaeologists have been formulated by WAC:

Members agree that they will adhere to the following rules prior to, during and after their investigations:

1. Prior to conducting any investigation and/or examination, Members shall with rigorous endeavour seek to define the indigenous peoples whose cultural heritage is the subject of investigation.

2. Members shall negotiate with and obtain the informed consent of representatives authorised by the indigenous peoples whose cultural heritage is the subject of investigation.

3. Members shall ensure that the authorised representatives of the indigenous peoples whose culture is being investigated are kept informed during all stages of the investigation.

4. Members shall ensure that the results of their work are presented with deference and respect to the identified indigenous peoples.

5. Members shall not interfere with and/or remove human remains of indigenous peoples without the express consent of those concerned.

6. Members shall not interfere with and/or remove artefacts or objects of special cultural significance, as defined by associated indigenous peoples, without their express consent.

7. Members shall recognise their obligation to employ and/or train indigenous peoples in proper techniques as part of their projects, and utilise indigenous peoples to monitor the projects. (Internet WAC First Code of Ethics)

The European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) has also formulated a Code of Practice, which was adopted in Ravenna in 1997 (see Internet EAA Code of Practice). The Code does not specifically mention indigenous peoples, and therefore, it differs significantly from the Code of Ethics adopted by the World Archaeological Congress. In the Preamble, it reads: “The archaeological heritage, as defined in Article 1 of the 1992 European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage, is the heritage of all humankind. Archaeology is the study and interpretation of that heritage for the benefit of society as a whole.
Archaeologists are the interpreters and stewards on behalf of their fellow men and women.” Two paragraphs in the Code, in much softer phrasing than the WAC equivalent, stipulate that:

1.4. Where preservation is impossible, archaeologists will ensure that investigations are carried out to the highest professional standards.

1.5. In carrying out such projects, archaeologists will wherever possible, and in accordance with any contractual obligations that they may have entered into, carry out prior evaluations of the ecological and social implications of their work for local communities. (Internet EAA Code of Practice)

In recent years, there have been some more general discussions on archaeological ethics also among archaeologists in Sweden (see e.g. Karlsson H. 2004). In 2000, the Swedish Archaeological Society formulated a number of principles to guide archaeological practice in the ”Svenska arkeologiska samfundets principer för god arkeologisk forskning” (’Swedish Archaeological Society’s principles for good archaeological research’; my translation). These principles are in much based on the EAA Code of Practice. However, two paragraphs have been added in the Swedish code, which are especially relevant to the relationship and cooperation between professional archaeologists and local and indigenous populations:

1.8. In the conduct of archaeological projects archaeologists shall, whenever possible and in accordance with contract agreements, take into consideration the ecological and social consequences of the investigation, in particular with respect to local residents and/or indigenous peoples.

1.9. Research that affects indigenous people requires special attention. When relevant, one should engage the local and/or indigenous people in the planning and execution of a project and provide meaningful experience and education in archaeology. Archaeologists should actively work for the development of local, regional and national expertise in archaeology. (Internet Svenska Arkeologiska Samfundet; English translation from Broadbent 2004:89)

The International Council of Museums (ICOM) has issued a Code of Ethics for Museums. Although it does not specifically address archaeological practice, it is relevant to our discussion since it regulates museum activities and sets a minimum standard for the professional conduct of museum workers. Below are presented some of the points that deal with culturally sensitive material, the return of cultural property and the relationships with contemporary communities:
2.5. Collections of human remains and material of sacred significance should be acquired only if they can be housed securely and cared for respectfully. This must be accomplished in a manner consistent with professional standards and the interests and beliefs of members of the community, ethnic or religious groups from which the objects originated, where these are known.

4.3. Human remains and materials of sacred significance must be displayed in a manner consistent with professional standards and, where known, taking into account the interests and beliefs of members of the community, ethnic and religious groups from whom the objects originated. They must be presented with great tact and respect for the feelings of human dignity held by all peoples.

6.2. Museums should be prepared to initiate dialogues for the return of cultural property to a country or people of origin. This should be undertaken in an impartial manner, based on scientific, professional and humanitarian principles as well as applicable local, national and international legislation, in preference to action at a governmental or political level.

6.5. Where museum activities involve a contemporary community of its heritage, acquisitions should only be based on informed and mutual consent without exploitation of the owner or informants. Respect for the wishes of the community involved should be paramount. (Internet ICOM Code of Ethics)

There are also some additional ethical principles and guidelines that address issues relevant to research projects involving indigenous peoples. One example is the so-called Akwé: Kon Guidelines, published in 2004 by the Secretariat of the Convention of Biological Diversity, which are described as: "Voluntary guidelines for the conduct of cultural, environmental and social impact assessments regarding developments proposed to take place on, or which are likely to impact on, sacred sites and on lands and waters traditionally occupied or used by indigenous and local communities" (see further Akwé: Kon Guidelines 2004).

The great challenge is of course how to apply these sets of rules and principles in practice, in a real situation with all of its complexities and ambiguities. After all, there is a great difference between words and declarations, and real behavior and concrete actions. There are many potential problems, such as how to identify who belongs to an indigenous people and who is their rightful representative, how to settle conflicts between archaeologists and other stakeholders, or how to deal with differing opinions and interests within an indigenous community. The meaning of certain key words, such as for instance “respect” or “recognition”, is open to discussion and may be interpreted quite differently in different contexts and by various stakeholders. The central concept of descendant communities can also be problematic to define (see e.g. Singleton & Orser Jr. 2003). And there is seldom only one opinion among the individuals who compose a “local community” or “descendant community".
An additional complex of problems is connected with the relations of power, which are always at work. Even though local groups of people might participate and become involved in research projects, the archaeologists usually possess masses of knowledge and various types of resources that the local people do not have access to. The projects are also most often under the administrative control of the archaeologists. Therefore, the special position of the researcher also entails a special responsibility. It should also be said that this problem of unequal power relations is acknowledged as one of the fundamental reasons for attempting to formulate principles of archaeological ethics in the first place. However, there is nonetheless a constant risk of slipping into the divide between “ideal” and “reality” and to fool oneself by not seeing the power play involved behind all of the good intentions. In the end, one of the central problems concerns how to balance the importance given to intra-disciplinary demands and demands from outside of the discipline; how to value and rank the scientific standards and responsibilities of the researcher in relation to other social and cultural standards and responsibilities.

Although there are many problems associated with the formulation and practicing of such codes of ethics, one should recognize that these principles and rules represent a wish and an effort to deal with problems that are central to archaeologists who are working with the histories of indigenous peoples and in contexts with a contested cultural heritage. Encoded principles and rules may at times be a blunt tool, but can be useful by raising the awareness of potential problems and by providing a supporting framework for the development of research strategies and designs. Such codes of ethics can also be important in the training of future archaeologists, and for the development of the professional identity of archaeologists and the sense of internal solidarity in the profession. Furthermore, they underline the importance and necessity of communication and interaction with other groups outside of the archaeological community; many of the problems that archaeologists face today simply cannot be solved among archaeologists alone.
Contesting the North: Discussion

It is only in the last decades that a Sámi archaeology that studies Sámi prehistory in its own right has emerged, parallel with a larger ethnic and cultural revival among Sámi groups. Within the Sámi ethnopolitical movement, claims have been raised for more cultural autonomy and influence over the cultural heritage management. In this process, traditional archaeology and cultural heritage management have been challenged.

In this part of the book, I have examined some of these challenges to traditional archaeological research in Northern Fennoscandia and some of the attempts by different actors to create new centers-of-translation or centers-of-interpretation and new spaces for Sámi history and prehistory.

The claims for respect of the dead and the return of the remains of perceived ancestors to indigenous and other groups of people have forced archaeologists to consider that there are different ways of relating to the past, and to rethink the ways in which they excavate, collect, study, store and display the remains of dead people. The debates on the repatriation of cultural objects and the reburial of human remains have been lively in many parts of the world, involving conflicts and controversies as well as examples of positive cooperation and mutual understanding. It is also a debate that changes over time, as new understandings are reached and old positions are renegotiated. Furthermore, it is clear that there are many different positions and opinions on repatriation and reburial also within the groups of researchers and indigenous peoples. In the USA, there is well-developed repatriation legislation, while in many parts of the world, for instance in Sweden, museums and archaeologists have only recently started to reconsider their policies on human remains from indigenous and other groups.

Another aspect that adds further complexity to the picture in northern Sweden concerns the Kven ethnopolitical movement in the eastern parts of the county of Norrbotten, which is promoted by a group of activists who have challenged many of the archaeological interpretations of the past and have questioned the exclusiveness of the indigenous status of the Sámi population. As I have stated earlier, the Kven (also known as Tornedal Finns) have not been accepted as an indigenous people in Sweden as the Sámi have been, although the Meänkieli language recently has been recognized as one of the five official minority languages in the country.

The situation in Norrbotten as concerns the different interpretations and competing narratives of the past is a clear example of some of the real
challenges for archaeologists in practice. The archaeologist Sven-Donald Hedman has described some of the difficult and challenging situations that archaeologists can face today in Norrbotten. The research results and the statements of individual archaeologists are interpreted and used by different persons and groups in ways that the researchers did not intend and that are not at all representative of their opinions. In certain situations, archaeologists encounter many heated feelings and different kinds of accusations. At times, even threats are directed against individual archaeologists. Consequently, many of the archaeologists feel that they need to be careful with what they say, and restrict themselves in certain situations, which in practice leads to a form of self-censorship (Hedman 2007; cf. also Wallerström 2006a). The usual question is often asked: *Who* were here first? The answer, already made, is often: *We* were here first.

The Russian anthropologist Viktor Shnirelman has discussed the personal attachments and loyalties of the archaeologists. He has pointed to the difference in positions and aims of, on the one hand, cultural actors including scholars and archaeologists and, on the other hand, those who are not involved in local politics. The cultural actors, in Shnirelman’s view, are those who choose, or are pressed, to be loyal to a specific cultural community due to their intimate bonds with that community, and who are highly vulnerable to the social and political environment, which may restrict their freedom of thought and action (Shnirelman 2003a:33). Although there is certainly a point in this reasoning, I feel that the view that archaeologists who see themselves as belonging to the majority group, with all of its silent allegiances, are not guided and inspired by any sense of belonging and loyalty to specific social and cultural community values is basically incorrect. The attachments and loyalties might not be explicit, but they are still there.

The question of ownership and control over culture and cultural heritage is a more complex issue than it might seem to be at first. In my opinion, one should rather talk about special responsibilities for the past than exclusive ownership of it. My past is not only my past, and your past is not only your past, but depending on our respective positions and experiences, we might hold different responsibilities. In the book *Who Owns Native Culture?*, Michael F. Brown has warned about the limitations and risks involved in a too strict cultural property legislation and “a world ruled solely by proprietary passions”:

> Advocates of Total Heritage Protection fail to offer a comprehensive vision of what the world will look like after they have imposed the institutions of surveillance, border protection, and cultural purification that some call for. They talk of respect, cultural survival, and economic justice for indigenous communities. These are admirable goals. All of us should work to advance them. Nevertheless, history suggests that the legal regulation of culture is at best a fruitless enterprise and at worst an invitation to new forms of manipulation by the powerful. As a Turkish proverb says, “A weapon is an enemy even to its owner.” (Brown 2003:252)
In my opinion, issues about the ethics and the positioning of archaeological research and field-work in relation to different groups in society need to be discussed more in-depth also by archaeologists in Sweden. One starting-point could be to discuss these issues in a more systematic way in archaeological teaching at the universities, involving both students and more experienced researchers (cf. Price 2004). Archaeologists should also be encouraged to search for and explore new ways of doing collaborative and participatory research and field-work, which involve people from the local communities where the research is conducted, with a critical mind.

However, when discussing indigenous cultural heritage, I believe that one should be careful not to simplify and homogenize too much. There might be a danger of treating the “indigenous heritage” as something homogeneous and static: in the Nordic perspective, of treating the Sámi cultural heritage as something unchangeable and homogeneous, separated from the heritage of other peoples, which leads to a static image of Sámi history, much like those produced earlier. Here, a critical discussion on how to view and conceptualize identities in prehistory must constantly be kept alive.

The repatriation and reburial debates have shifted the power relations in many parts of the world, leaving some unhappy and creating new possibilities for others. No matter how understanding and sensitive archaeologists are encouraged to be, there will still remain power dimensions involved in archaeological research and field-work. That is important to keep in mind when discussing archaeological ethics. For archaeologists, it is important to discuss the ethical codes that have been developed by different organizations, which I have reviewed in chapter 9, and to consider their relevance and possible application in the Swedish context. This is especially true for any members of the specific organizations, but also for other archaeologists.

As concerns the current demands for repatriation and reburial in Sweden, I think that it is very important to take a look at the situation in Norway and Finland, and also in Denmark as concerns the cultural heritage of Greenland. In these countries, different solutions and agreements on the management of human remains have been reached between the different parties. I am convinced that there is a lot to learn in Sweden from a comparison with the other Nordic countries. Furthermore, Sweden has voted for the “UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples”, which was adopted in 2007, with its very clear statements on the rights of indigenous peoples to their cultural heritage and the right to repatriation of human remains and culturally sensitive objects. In my view, the political system and the cultural heritage management system in Sweden need to seriously evaluate the consequences of the provisions of this declaration for the future policies on cultural heritage management in northern Sweden.

In this process, it is important to realize that the past is not only about science and politics, it is also about administration and legislation. As I see it, there are two sides to this problem. The first is a problem of structure, that is,
who should have the authority to make decisions in matters like this one, the Historical Museum, the Swedish government or the Sámi Parliament? The other side concerns the debate on what to do with the anatomical or osteological collections that actually exist today. In my view, it is extremely important to stress that this debate is needed regardless of the solution to the first problem, and that such a debate should involve all of the different stakeholders and parties, also the voices of those without power. However, the first problem, concerning the distribution of power, needs to be addressed, as it is at the very center of the whole debate.

As the examples from the USA show, the reburial debate may create new possibilities for the development of the subject of archaeology. There could be a lot to learn from the American experiences – it can also tell us something about the colonial, racist and elitist roots of archaeology, which is relevant also in a Nordic perspective. However, one should not forget about the differences between the USA and the Nordic countries. There are, for instance, differences in the legal systems and traditions, including the views on the concept of ownership and cultural property rights.

To conclude the discussion in this part, I argue that there is a need for more dialogue, and a need to construct new spaces for dialogues between the different parties. I believe that there are many voices that need to be heard. However, this does not mean that archaeologists should hide from the outside world and forget about, or keep as a secret, the value and potential of the archaeological approaches to the past. On the contrary, this value and potential should be shared with others in society. As I see it, archaeologists should listen a little bit more carefully to the voices that question and challenge what they do. On the other hand, it should be the responsibility of every archaeologist to explain and argue for the value of their field-work or research. After all, if archaeologists do not propagate what is interesting and important about archaeological research and archaeological analyses, who else would or could do it?
Conclusion: The Politics of Place, Identity and Archaeology in the North

Our life
is like a ski track
on the white open plains
The wind erases it
before morning dawns

(Paulus Utsi, “Our life”; after Gaski 1996:115)

Archaeologists work in the snow storm of time. We can not see everything, and we often lose sight of the tracks that we are following. But there are traces from the past out there, although time has erased some of the tracks in the ground.

In this dissertation, I have followed some of the networks of archaeology and some of the attempts to construct and de-construct spaces for Sámi prehistory. I have also examined some fields of contention and a number of controversies related to the concepts of Sámi prehistory and Sámi archaeology. From the previous discussions, it is clear that prehistory in northern Sweden is a complex and in many ways controversial field of study and that archaeological research is not unpolitical and without consequence to the people living in the area. In this situation, there exist many problems and challenges for archaeologists, but at the same time, I would argue, also many possibilities and prospects for the development of archaeology as a subject, both on the local and well as on a more general level. In this concluding part, in order to bring together some of the main threads of the dissertation, I would like to make some final comments and reflections on some of the central issues of the study.

Sámi prehistory and Sámi archaeology

Many archaeologists have argued that archaeology should not be misused by interests groups to legitimize their identity with references to prehistory, and that archaeologists should react to and oppose any such attempts. This is, however, a very complicated matter and the question might look quite different from the point of view of a majority population and that of a minority group. The historical background must be considered and can not be dismissed as
irrelevant, for instance when discussing Sámi (pre)history. As Janet Levy has put it:

For several hundred years, scientific and popular understandings of the Saami (or Lapp) past were the basis for discrimination and forced assimilation. It is bitterly ironic that just as the legitimacy of Saami identity is being acknowledged in the Nordic region, archaeologists put forth arguments, however well-intentioned, to stop use of the past for clarifying and strengthening that identity. (Levy 2006:145)

In my opinion, it is necessary to connect archaeology as a subject to the multiethnic past and present of Sweden, and to open up for the experiences and voices that were earlier silenced. In this process, however, I believe that it is important to resist the mystification of Sámi identity and to avoid essentialized understandings of Sámi culture, which might lead exactly to an impression of the Sámi as something homogeneous and unchanged, an ethnic stereotype (cf. Welinder 2003:128). One must be aware of the risk that Sámi prehistory and archaeology might become new one-entities and black boxes, which in turn overshadow the diversity within the entity and dominate the other voices and experiences that do not fit the expectations:

Thus depictions of the “time and space locked native”, are not expressions of multi-vocality and empowerment. Rather, they serve to reinforce existing networks of power while effectively dis-empowering the native voice. (Conrad 2004:185)

Sámi prehistory and Sámi archaeology are complex and contested concepts. As we have seen, the relationship between “Swedish” and “Sámi” has been complicated and troubled through much of history. The contemporary views on the Sámi population and the policies of the Swedish government towards this population have in different ways interrelated with the understanding and representation of the Sámi past. Part of this history has, as we have seen, involved the colonization, assimilation, discrimination and marginalization of the Sámi population, although there have also been many examples on the local level of interaction and cooperation as well as mutual dependency and respect between different population groups in northern Sweden. Although I have focused my analysis on Sweden, the same can be said about the other countries in Sápmi as well.

The concepts of “Sámi” and “Norse/Germanic/Scandinavian/Swedish” have formed two central, or nodal, points in the archaeological networks around which the discussions have been organized. As we have seen in part II, the concepts have been incorporated into different chains of association, and have been identified by certain elements or relationships. The two polarized concepts have functioned as one-entities, as single bounded units which may easily be organized and aligned in networks, and as black boxes, as convenient
containers within which complex relationships can be concealed, and which in
the networks appear to be homogeneous actors. As such, they can be easily
manipulated, arranged and ranked – and spoken for by researchers, politicians,
activists and other actors.

The concepts of Sámi prehistory and archaeology have been at the center of
the discussions in the dissertation. However, it is not easy to define Sámi
prehistory. Where are the limits for Sámi prehistory in time and space? Bjørnar
Olsen has suggested that: “No other demarcation of the Sámi past (fortid) can
be given than that it encompasses all that has concerned the Sámi and the Sámi
communities through time” (Olsen 2007a:216; my translation). Then, the
question is of course how to define the Sámi and the Sámi communities. In my
view, it is impossible to give any exact answer to that question. The concept
of Sámi archaeology is no less complex and contested than that of Sámi
prehistory. It can be defined from an exclusive ethnic perspective, as
archaeology conducted by persons who are themselves Sámi. This perspective
is supported by some activists, but is opposed by many others. Or it can be
defined in a more general sense, as archaeology, conducted by Sámi or non-
Sámi people, which investigates aspects of Sámi history.

Prehistory is traditionally defined as the time periods with no, or only very
few, written sources. According to this definition, prehistory spans a much
longer time period in Sápmi than in southern Scandinavia. Bjørnar Olsen has
recently criticized the concept of “Sámi prehistory” (Olsen 2004, 2007a), as it
might entail a sense of primitivism and backwardness, in opposition to the
notion of Swedish or Norwegian history. Instead, he suggests that one should
talk about Sámi history, a concept in which the prehistoric period is a part.
Although I agree with the points made by Bjørnar Olsen concerning this
question (prehistory is history), I also feel that there is, at least in Sweden, a
need to talk about Sámi prehistory (förhistoria) and not only about Sámi history
(historia). Otherwise, I see a risk of creating, or maintaining, an impression of
Sámi history as restricted to only the last few centuries. In general, Olsen
prefers to talk about Sámi archaeology, which would represent archaeological
research devoted to the study of history that is in some ways related to, and
relevant to, Sámi groups. According to his view, Sámi archaeology in northern
Norway could probably be meaningfully discussed only from the Early Iron
Age and forward (mid-1st millennium B.C.), when a set of material culture
expressions emerged that would develop into the historically known Sámi
culture (Olsen 2007a; cf. also discussions in chapter 7).

My aim has been to explore how the concepts of Sámi prehistory and Sámi
archaeology have been constructed, contested and debated within research. It
has not been my intention to construct any new clear-cut definitions of the
concepts. Part of the problem, and therefore also part of the solution, is the
tendency that Sámi (pre)history always has to be defined and defended, in a way
that the national (pre)histories have not been treated. Sámi prehistory always
has to be “pure” and “authentic”, in contrast to Swedish prehistory. This, I
would argue, constitutes an example of the structure of normality: the norm does not require any explanation, while the “Other” constantly needs to be defined and defended. But there are no pure, isolated prehistories. That would imply a static view on history, and in the case of Sámi history there is no evidence to support such a view. Maybe it is time to drop the purification procedure to which Sámi prehistory continuously has been subjected, and instead view Sámi prehistory as a dynamic historical phenomenon, which has not always been the same through time.

The two most central themes in the earlier discussions on the Sámi past, in the Nordic countries as well as in Russia, have been 1) the origin of the Sámi, and 2) the past settlement area of the Sámi people. I would argue that both of these themes to a large extent have developed as a result of the interest of the majority populations and the states to define, delimit and contain their “Other”. As K.B. Viklund asked in 1895 about the Sámi and the Finns in Sweden, which I have cited in the introduction to the dissertation: How long had these foreign peoples lived in Sweden, how large had their settlement areas been in the past, and what future could they have in “our country”? It is around these questions that much of the early interest in the Sámi past evolved.

Another central theme in the scholarly interest has concerned the exoticism of the Sámi, in which the pre-Christian indigenous religion has played a very special role through the centuries as the “heathen Other” of the Christian nations, beginning already in the 17th century with the descriptions of Sámi sorcery and divination. In the Sámi pre-Christian religious beliefs and rituals, which had “survived” in part into historical times, the clergymen, explorers and researchers could investigate the primitive, wild and dark sides of their own history, which were otherwise buried in the distant past. Furthermore, one of the most important threads throughout the history of the conceptualization of the Sámi from the outside, has been the image of the Sámi as “nature”. In the early research, the Sámi were constructed as a primitive, uncivilized nature people, and as such they could not possess a history. In short, the Sámi were constructed as a people without history, in contrast to the Scandinavian peoples who were seen as people with history, dynamic and progressive.

In my view, these are just a few of the reasons why it is so important to talk about Sámi history and Sámi prehistory in Sweden today. Otherwise, we run the risk of continuing to marginalize and make invisible the Sámi past. Furthermore, this piece of history, as part of the northern sphere with its spectrum of ways of life and world-views, also represents a very important contribution to the history and prehistory of the area which today is the country of Sweden, a contribution which through time has been marginalized or ignored. However, to state that some archaeological remains could be described as part of Sámi prehistory should not be seen as the end, but rather as the beginning of the archaeological inquiry of that aspect of history.

In these discussions, it is extremely important to realize that the Sámi is not one thing, but that Sámi identity can be seen and experienced in many different
ways, and that there is not only one Sámi culture or way of life. Therefore, it is not possible to speak of only one “Sáminess”, one “Sámi culture” or one “Sámi history”. Sámi history is not just about exclusive Sáminess, but also about interaction, meetings, mixture and hybridity. Here lies one great potential in future research on Sámi prehistory; to recognize and explore the diversity and variation in livelihood, social structure, culture and identity will help to open up the black box of “Sáminess” and the one-entity of “Sámi prehistory” and make it possible to follow and explore the connections and relations behind the concepts. To do so might also be a key to opening up the blackboxed “Swedishness” and the homogeneous images of “Swedish prehistory”, and to explore the many threads that make up the prehistory of today’s Sweden.

Naming (pre)history and the power to define

In all of the discussions and controversies that I have examined, one of the most central problems has concerned the power to name and the power to define. The (pre)history and the landscapes in the North have, during the last centuries, gradually been named and defined by the modern states, as Swedish, Norwegian, Finnish or Russian. Many of the struggles in northern Sweden and in Sápmi could be seen as struggles over the right to name and define. It is a question about the power and control over the images and narratives of the past in the present. Furthermore, naming is an integral part of the ways in which humans experience and represent the world around them, and it is closely connected with processes of identification and expressions of identity. In a sense, that which does not have a name, does not exist.

In the dissertation, we have seen many examples of the politics of naming people and the past in northern Sweden, concerning the Sámi population but also the Torneval Finnish (or Kven) population in the county of Norrbotten (see chapter 4). Another example concerns the so-called small-numbered peoples of the North in the Russian Federation (see chapter 8). What is a “people”? And who has the right to be an “indigenous people”? Naming places and landscapes is also central, as part of the construction of connections with the history of the land. The territorial dimension of archaeology makes it interesting and useful in such situations.

As I see it, the debates on Sámi (pre)history and archaeology can also be seen as a struggle between particularism (for instance, the cultural heritage of one specific group) on the one hand and universalism (for instance, the cultural heritage of all of humankind) on the other. Particularism and universalism are often seen as two opposites, with a constant tension between them. However, in my view, they can also be seen as two complementary and necessary sides of the same coin. The one does not necessarily rule out the other. A too strong emphasis on the universalist values might marginalize and colonize the Other, and a too strong focus on the particular might lead to chauvinism and self-
praise, but a dialogue between the two sides of the coin could create a dynamic field of discussion and interaction, in which there is room for both the unique and individual histories and experiences and the common human conditions, experiences and values.

“You can’t please everyone” is the title of the doctoral dissertation by Kaisa Raitio on conflicts in the management of forests in Finland (2008), a title that in a nice way sums up reality as it is. There are few easy solutions and even with the best of intentions one can not possibly please everyone. There are, and will continue to be, conflicting views and interests concerning the narratives of the past, and the important question is how to deal with these. It is of course very difficult to present any ready-made solution; as I have discussed, each case must be dealt with in its specific context with its special conditions. Nevertheless, this does not mean that archaeologists are helpless and therefore should ignore the political dimensions and conflicts. On the contrary, I feel that it is essential that we as archaeologists understand and respect that archaeology and prehistory are important not only to archaeologists. What is perhaps needed is a discussion on conceptions and methodologies for conflict management. It is far beyond the scope of this book to go in-depth into this matter, but I think that the examination in the previous parts of the book has clearly indicated the fundamental need for archaeological approaches to conflict management, in Sweden and elsewhere.

Prehistory is not – and must not be – only about sunshine and happiness. There are, as we all know very well, dark sides of human history that need to be critically examined. Therefore, historians and archaeologists can not be bound to present pleasing images of the past. In my view, one of the most important tasks for historical research (of which archaeology is part), and one of the most fundamental reasons for conducting such research, must be to critically examine the power and power relations, which are manifested in different shapes and on different levels in every community of human beings.

In the dissertation, I have argued for discussions on the ethics and politics of archaeological research, concerning the relationship between the professional archaeologists and the public, including local and indigenous groups. In part IV, I have specifically argued for discussions on how to treat human remains and other sensitive material remains from the past. This must be a continuous discussion, as there are no fixed sets of rules or manuals that can account for every possible situation. It is also important to recognize the risk of initiating and supporting new hegemonic discourses, which might dominate over and obscure other voices and histories. It must also be acknowledged that there are not two unified groups – scientists vs. Sámi – who hold the same opinions and cherish the same values. On the contrary, there is substantial variation within each of these constructed groups.

But what do archaeologists actually know about how people view and value ancient sites and monuments, and the artifacts and human remains from the past? Are people at all interested in the past, and why or why not? And how do
people actually view archaeology and archaeologists? In general, such questions have not attracted so much attention from archaeologists. In my view, it would be interesting to conduct more focused studies on this complex of questions in the context of northern Sweden and Northern Fennoscandia, in order to better understand the meaning and importance of prehistory and archaeology in different contexts in society.

The future of Sámi archaeology

So, what about the future for the study of Sámi archaeology? One important trend is the cooperation with local communities particularly in surveys of the cultural landscapes, not least in the South Sámi area (see chapter 7). These efforts are, in my mind, of great theoretical and methodological interest for archaeology at large. Another current trend is the increasing focus on international cooperation between researchers interested in Sámi (pre)history in the different Nordic countries and the Russian Federation. There is great potential in future cross-boundary research projects, especially when one considers how important the state boundaries on the North Calotte have been for the construction of the images of the past in the region.

As I see it, archaeology has a lot to contribute, also in situations with contested cultural heritage and history writing. Through its methods and its material, archaeology has a unique chance to tell important things about the past, and thereby also about the present. Furthermore, there are still vast white spots on the archaeological map of Northern Fennoscandia and Sápmi. There is much more to discover about the prehistory of the North, a fact which carries a strong potential for revision and reflection, and this is certainly true also with regards to Sámi prehistory:

The importance of … allowing the archaeological material itself to speak can therefore not be emphasized enough. We should… be open for the histories that the material can tell, and as far as it is possible, to meet it without prejudice. The Sámi history that thus emerges might be different from the safe, accepted and politically correct conceptions of what the Sámi society “really” was like. And maybe it will be a less pleasant history than the one about small, peaceful and egalitarian communities. But it goes without saying that it can not be the goal of historical research to please. And a “different” Sámi history of that kind will anyhow be a useful corrective to the reactionary alternative of immobile and frozen cultures that only melt and change when they meet the deprivations of modernity. (Olsen 2007a:221; my translation)

In my view, the often long-term and deep historical perspective in archaeological research might actually help to counteract some of the static and invariable images of cultures and peoples in the past that have proliferated earlier. In this context, it is important not to forget about the scientific
responsibility and accountability of archaeological researchers, which are related to their special position and their acquired knowledge and experience. Archaeologists need to be honest, and should of course not compromise with the basic scientific standards and demands. However, this should not be taken as a reason to hide oneself from the outside world, with all of its disturbing complexities and controversies, and to conduct research in isolation without taking into account the consequences of the research to other people in society. I would also like to add, that it is very important to realize that an acceptance of Sámi prehistory will not be “the end of history”. The critical examination of the politics of identity and archaeology must still continue, no matter what the archaeological approach to the past is called.

For a deliberative archaeology

In this final part, I have attempted to bring together some of the threads that I have followed in the dissertation. One thread has dealt with the Sámi past as science, another has dealt with the Sámi past as politics, a third thread with the Sámi past as administration and legislation. These threads are closely interwoven with each other, and in order to understand the meaning of Sámi (pre)history and Sámi archaeology today one has to take each of them into consideration. The scientific perspective has demonstrated the potential of archaeological research to create new knowledge about the past. The political perspective has shown how the past can be used in different situations for different purposes, and some of the consequences of totalitarian political systems on the freedom of research. Furthermore, the political thread has also dealt with the Sámi ethnopolitical movement, the demands for greater influence on the cultural heritage management and the discussions on the political and democratic rights of the Sámi population. Finally, the administrative perspective has dealt with the practical, organizational work, and the possibilities to reach agreements between different parties and stakeholders, in order to move forward. I have several times stressed the importance of discussing the ethics and politics of archaeology. Maybe we should ask ourselves: If archaeology is politics, what do we want to do with it?

In the dissertation, I have dealt with many highly complex and controversial issues concerning the politics of identity and archaeology and a number of infected conflicts over the narratives and images of the present and the past in the North. I have maybe not been able to answer all of the questions that I have asked, but I do believe that there are possible ways forward that might lead to better understanding and respect between the different actors and stakeholders and their respective histories, in which archaeology can play an important and positive role.

In the first part of the book, I have discussed a relational network approach as a way of overcoming some of the black boxes and one-entities, as well as
some of the strong oppositions and dichotomies, in the representations of the past. I believe that such a perspective can be useful in a situation with contested cultural heritage and (pre)history, for studying not only the past but also the connections between the present and the past. By following connections and relations, instead of delimiting and defining entities, it might be possible to open up some of the black boxes used in the representations of people in the past as well as in the present.

In this final part of the book, I would also like to argue for the need for approaches to deliberation in the field of archaeology, as well as the need to create spaces for such deliberative processes. A deliberative process can make room for many different voices and experiences, but at the same time it aims to reach a common ground on which to build future understanding and agreements among the different interest groups, stakeholders and communities which are affected by the archaeological research. One obvious example of a situation in which a deliberative approach is needed concerns the case of repatriation and reburial of Sámi human remains in Sweden. As I have stated above, one can not assume that all members of a group, such as “archaeologists” or “Sámi”, hold the same values and interests, which is also clearly illustrated by the case concerning the human remains from Neiden in northern Norway (see further chapter 10). But a deliberative approach could be useful in many other situations as well. Here, it should also be acknowledged that there are many attempts today to include participatory and collaborative approaches in archaeological research in many places in the world, including northern Sweden. Also, several museums in Sweden are working with local groups of people in the formulation of future strategies for their collections.

I do not suggest a deliberative approach as an easy solution. As I have discussed above, I do not believe that there are any such in contested and infected situations as the ones examined here. Moreover, one must not forget about the power dimensions involved. Furthermore, I do not imply that all archaeology should be “deliberative”, but as I see it, such an approach, with a strong focus on power relations, can be seen as both a great challenge and a great potential for archaeology as a subject.

Therefore, as a conclusion to this dissertation, I would like to argue for a deliberative archaeology, which is open to multiple perspectives and experiences and sensitive to the concerns of those who are affected by the research, and which is guided by a continual discussion on the ethics and politics of archaeological research, as well as by a critical discussion on how to view and conceptualize prehistoric, historical and contemporary human and non-human collectives and identities.

And, in the end, to sum up the study and reiterate one of my main points:

Sámi history is part of Swedish, Norwegian, Finnish, Russian, European and world history. If it is excluded, ignored, marginalized or assimilated, it is a loss not only for Sámi history.
Sammanfattning

Genom arkeologins historia har det samerna (ursprungsfolket i norra Norge, Sverige, Finland och på Kolahalvön i Ryska Federation) ständigt konstruerats som ”de Andra” i relation till den nationella identiteten och (för-) historieskrivningen i de moderna staterna. I den framväxande forskningen under 1800-talet betraktades samerna som ett lägre stående folk utan historia, i motsats till de historiebärande skandinaviska folken. Begreppen samisk förhistoria och samisk arkeologi har betraktats, och betraktas fortfarande till viss del, som kontroversiella och mycket politiska bland många arkeologer i Sverige, i motsats till den neutrala, normala och opolitiska förståelsen av svensk förhistoria och arkeologi. Det är först under de senaste årtiondena som ett forskningsfält som studerar samisk (för-)historia i sin egen rätt har vuxit fram, parallelilt med en etnisk och kulturell revitaliseringsprocess bland samiska grupper. Med hänvisning till den internationella urfolksrörelsen och internationell rätt har under senare år krav förts fram på större samiskt självbestämmande och kontroll vad gäller kulturarvsförvaltningen.

Denna avhandling undersöker skapandet och användningen av begreppen samisk förhistoria och samisk arkeologi, dels ur ett forskningshistoriskt perspektiv och dels ur ett mer samtida perspektiv som rör frågor om identitet, politik och demokratiska rättigheter. Syftet är att undersöka hur samerna och idéer om det samiska förflutna har representerats i de arkeologiska narrativen från det tidiga 1800-talet fram till idag. Syftet är även att studera framväxten av det arkeologiska forskningsfält som idag ofta kallas samisk arkeologi, liksom frågan om samiskt självbestämmande i kulturarvsfrågor och debatten om repatriering av samiskt kulturarv och återbegravning av samiska mänskliga kvarlevor som idag förvaras i olika arkiv och museer. I avhandlingen analyseras samisk förhistoria och arkeologi utifrån tre samverkande analytiska nivåer: det förflutna som vetenskap, som politik och som administration och förvaltning. Huvudfokus ligger på Sverige, men med utblickar mot den historiska utvecklingen och nutida situationen i Norge, Finland och Ryska Federationen.

Avhandlingen består av fyra huvuddelar:

1) En kritisk diskussion av etnicitets- och nationsbegrepp, liksom begreppet ursprungsfolk, och deras tillämpning inom arkeologisk forskning. Min utgångspunkt är att arkeologin är nära sammanbunden med många sociala, kulturella, ekonomiska och politiska processer i samhället och att arkeologer
bör vara medvetna om maktdimensionen i den arkeologiska forskningen. I denna del föreslår jeg ett relationellt nätverksperspektiv på etnicitet och identitet i syfte att undvika de slutna och statiska enheter (som jag benämner "en-enheter") i förståelsen av folk i forntiden och som ett sätt att öppna upp en del av de "svarta lådor" (som döljer komplicerade förhållanden och historier under en enhetlig yta) i representationerna av historien i Norr.

2) En historisk analys av representationerna av och debatterna kring samisk förhistoria inom den vetenskapliga forskningen, i första hand i Sverige men även till viss del i Norge och Finland, med fokus på fyra huvudteman: det samiska folkets ursprung, sydsamisk förhistoria som ett ifrågasatt och kontroversiellt forskningsfält, renskötseln och rennomadismens framväxt, och förkristen samisk religion. Dessa teman har varit mycket debatterade inom forskningen och visar på olika sätt hur bilderna av den samiska historien vuxit fram, ifrågasatts och förändrats i nära samverkan med samhälleliga och politiska processer, och i växelverkan med den allmänna synen på samerna i nutiden. Det är tydligt att mycket av den tidigare forskningen bedrivits i syfte att avgränsa och definiera ”det Andra” och att särskilja detta från ”det Nationella”. Men denna del visar också på potentialen i arkeologisk forskning att skapa nya kunskap och att revidera gamla uppfattningar om samisk historia som något homogent, statiskt och oföränderligt. Genom exempel från framför allt sydsamiskt område söker jag också visa hur arkeologi kan fungera som en källa för revitalisering och stärkande av de lokala samiska samhälleena och som ett utforskande av den egna historien och identiteten.

3) En analys av studiet av samisk (för-)historia i Ryssland, i första hand arkeologisk forskning på Kolahalvön och i Karelska Republiken. Trots att mycket relevant arkeologisk och etnografisk forskning har utförts i de nordliga områdena i forna Sovjetunionen och dagens Ryska Federationen är denna forskning mycket okänd bland arkeologer i Sverige. I denna del diskuterar jag också vissa utvecklingslinjer och förändringar i den sovjetiska och post-sovjetiska arkeologiska forskningstraditionen, liksom aspekter av konstruktionen av etnicitet och nationalitet och synen på ursprungsfolken i nordligaste Ryssland och Sibirien. Diskussionen visar på de politiska dimensionerna i forskningen och riskerna med en totalitär politisk eller vetenskaplig regimen.

4) En undersökning av kraven på större samiskt självbestämmande i kulturarvsfrågor, i synnerhet den idag högst aktuella debatten om repatriering av samiskt kulturarv och återbegravning av mänskliga kvarlevor. Denna debatt sätts in i ett internationellt perspektiv, och jag behandlar arkeologers försök att bemöta och hantera dessa krav genom diskussioner om arkeologisk etik. Jag argumenterar för att arkeologer och andra måste ta hänsyn till forskningshistorien och den koloniala historiska bakgrunden när man
diskuterar kraven på repatriering och återbegravning, och vidare visa respekt och förståelse för de människor som berörts och berörs av forskningen. Samtidigt måste arkeologerna enligt min mening stå upp för vad de anser vara viktigt med den arkeologiska forskningen och dela med sig av den kunskap och förståelse som härrör från det arkeologiska studiet av historien.

I avhandlingen betonar jag vikten av att inte betrakta ”det samiska” som en homogen enhet, vare sig i nutiden eller i historien. Genom att öppna upp de ”svarta lådor” som använts i förhistorieskrivningen i norra Sverige och på Nordkalotten kan man undersöka variationen och mångfalden i den samiska historien och i relationerna mellan olika grupper av människor, och därigenom bidra till en mer dynamisk och realistisk bild av historien: Samisk historia är en viktig del av svensk, norsk, finsk, rysk, europeisk och global historia – om den exkluderas, ignoreras, marginaliseras eller assimileras så utgör det en förlust inte bara för den samiska historiens skull. Avslutningsvis argumenterar jag för en arkeologi som är öppen för olika perspektiv och erfarenheter och som tar hänsyn till och visar respekt för de grupper som påverkas av forskningen. Undersökningen i avhandlingen visar att det finns ett stort behov av en kontinuerlig diskussion om arkeologins etik och politik, men även en kritisk diskussion om synen på och kategoriseringen av förhistoriska, historiska och nutida grupper av människor.
Sámi ovdahistorjját – Davvi-Europa arkeologijá ja identitehta


1) Kritihkalaš digaštallan sániin etnisitehtas ja nášuvnnas ja movt dat geavahuvvojit arkeologalaš dutkamis. Mu vuolggasadji lea abte arkeologiija lea sakka čadnon mánggaid sosíálaš, kultuvrralaš, ekonomalaš ja politihkalaš proseassaide servodagas ja abte arkeologat galggaše bures diehtit válddi dimenšuvnna arkeologalaš dutkamis. Dán oasis mon árvalan relašuvnnaš fierpmádatperspektiiva etnisitehta ja identitehta bealis. Dán vai garvá gártat giddejuvvon ja fásta ossodagaide (goščodan daid okta-ossodahkan) go áigu háhkat ipmárdusa dološ áiggiid olbmuide ja dát lea maid vuohki rahpat daid ”cåáhppe doasaaid” (maid siste leat moalkás oktavuodat ja dâhpáhusat jalgès asi duogábealde) mat ovddastit Nuorta guovlluid historjjá.

2) Historjjálaš analysa dain ovddastemii ja digaštallamiin sámi ovdahistorjjás diedalaš dutkamis, vuosttažettiin Ruotas, muhto maid muhton muddui Norggas ja Suomas. Guovddážis leat njeallje váldofátta: sámi álbmoga vuosttaš ássanbáiki, oarjánsámiiid ovdahistorjá mii lea dâvja digaštallon ja eahpiduvvon dutkansuorgi, boazodoalu ja ealjohtima bohccideapmi ja sámi oskku ovdal risttalaluvedoa. Dát fáttait birra leamaš ollu digaštallamat dutkiid gaskkas ja čajehit iešgudet láhkái movt govahallan sámi historjjás lea bohcciidan, eahpiduvvon ja rievdan go leamaš lagaš oktavuodain servodatlas ja politihkalaš proseassain. Dása lea maid dat almmolaš dálá oaidnu sápmelačcáiide leamaš váikkkuheaddii. Lea čielggas ahnte ollu ovdašas dutkamiin mii lea jodihuvvon leamaš dat ulbmil gáržžidit ja čielggadit ”daid earáid” ja ĺuoldit daid eret ”daid Našuvnnaláčcain”. Muhto dát oassi maid vuoseha arkeologalaš dutkama fámu dasa ahnte háhkat odda dieduid ja rievdadit dološ oainnuid mas sámi historjá livčče juoga mii lea homogena, fásta ja rievdameahttun. Erenoamážit ovdamearkkaiguin oarjánsámii guovllus geah/g255/g255alan vuosehit man láhkái arkeologija máhttá doåimbat gáldun eáškahttimii ja báikkálaš servodagaidunnemii ja maid dutkamuššan iežas historjjás ja identitehtas.

3) Čielggadeapmi dutkamušas sámi (ovda-) historjjás Ruosoššas, vuosttažettiin arkeologalaš dutkamiin Guoládatnjárggas ja Gárijiaš republihkas. Vaikk ollu deatalaš arkeologalaš ja etnologalaš dutkamuš lea dahkkon ovdašas Sovjet-lihtu nuortaguovlluin ja dálá Ruosoša váldegottis leat stuorra oasit dain barggin apmasat arkeologaid gaskkas Ruotas. Dán oasis mon digaštalan muhton ovdánahתיאlbgalaid ja rievdadusaid sovéjhtalaš ja mànja-sovéjhtalaš arkeologalaš dutkanarbevieruin, ja maid oainnuid etnisitehtas ja nášuvnnaid gullevásuhhti ja maid oainnuid eamiálbmogiin nuorttamuš Ruosoššas ja Siberias. Diagaštallan vuoseha dutkama politihkalaš viidodaga ja makač várat leat totalitearahlaš politihkain dahje diedalaš bággostivrejumis.
4) Suokkardeapmi gääbädusain stuorit sámi iešmearrideamis kulturárbažäldagain, erenoamážit dan mii odne lea oalle áigeguovdil, namalassii ruoktotbuktn sámi kulturárbbis ja oddasit häädäädeapmi olmmošlaš bázhahasain. Dán digáštallama heiven gaskariikkalaš perspektiivii, ja meannudan arkeologaid geahčcálemiid dustet ja vástdit daid gääbädusaid arkeologalaš etihkadjáštallamiid bokte. Čuoččuhan ahte arkeologat ja earát fertejít váldit vuhtii dutkamuša historjjá ja kolonialisttalal historjjálaš duogáža go lea sähk ruoktotbuktimis ja oddasit häädäädeamis, ja ahte gudnejahittit ja vuosehit ipmárdusa daidda olbmuide masa dutkamuš guoskái ja guoská. Seammás fertejít arkeologat mu mielas duostat čuoččuhit dan man sin mielas lea deatalaš arkeologalaš dutkamušas ja juogadit dan máhtu ja ipmárdusa mii vuolgá arkeologijija dutkamuša historjjás.

Čállosis mon deattuhan man deatalaš lea ahte ii govahala ”sámivuoda” dego okta homogena oassi, ii dolin iige odne. ”Čáhppes doasaid” rabadettiin mat leat geavahuvvon nuorta Ruotas ja Davvikalohtas máhttä guorahallat earuhusaid ja girjáivuoda sámi historjjás ja iešgudet olmmošjoavkkuid gaskavuoaid ja nu lähkkái buktit oasi mii addá eanet dynámalaš ja duohta gova historjjás: Sámi historjjá lea deatalaš oassi ruota, norgga, suoma, ruošsa, Europa ja måilmmi historjjás. Jus dat olgggustuvo, vajálduvvo, hilgojuuvo de dat lea dáamppo ii dušše sámi historjjá váras. Loahpálaččat ákkastalan dakkár arkeologii mii lea rabas buot lágan perspektiivade ja vásáhusaide ja mii váldá vuhtii ja gudnejahittá daid olmmošjoavkkuid maidda dutkamuš čuhocá. Guorahallan dán čállosis vuoseha ahte lea stuorrar dårbu digáštallamii arkeologijija etihka ja politihka birra mii bissu eallin, muhto maid kritihkalaš digáštallan das movt oaidná ja juohká ovdhistorjjálaš, historjjálaš ja maid dálá olmmošjoavkkuid.

Translation by John Erling Utsi
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