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Abstract

Memories are harder to erase than houses, people, countries. They are there, like a flowing plasma or a deep subterranean lake. We row around on this lake. Search for its shores, chart our own positions (Ursula Reuter Christiansen, from the book of her film “The executioner” (1971) as cited in Oliver-Smith 2010:163).

The topic of forced relocations is by far the most sensitive of those I have experienced being the member of an indigenous community myself. The Kola Sámi community historically has undergone various negative experiences, which have been discussed in a series of scientific and media sources. This refers to different periods, such as the Soviet economic policies, harsh political regime and repressions, prohibitions and negative attitudes to the public Sámi language use and cultural expression.

The current work addresses implementation of the Soviet policies of forced relocations on the Kola Sámi people and partially touches upon the occurred consequences. The importance of land attachment is vital for preservation of indigenous cultural heritage. The indigenous peoples can still practice culture and language on a daily basis, when they predominantly live in one territory, having close attachment to traditional lifestyle and lands. Disruption of this connection as in the case of involuntary displacements causes numerous negative consequences for the indigenous relocated communities. The Kola Sámi community faced the loss of their resource territories, disruption of traditional activities’ practice along with strong influences of multicultural environment on language and culture as the impacts of forced relocation policies. The change in geographical distribution of the Sámi settlements has also caused shifts in communities’ social organization and land use patterns.

This Master’s thesis describes and analyses the background and consequences of the relocation policies imposed on the Kola Sámi people. The forced relocations of the Kola Sámis in this work are presented in a two-staged process implying that the main policies, leading to gradual spatial rearrangement of the Sámi traditional settlement patterns and its further displacement. Another purpose of this work is to discuss the ways in which the Kola Sámi community was affected by the forced relocations. The decades of relocations represent a turning point in history of the Sámi community as associated with the new society-building patterns, restructuring traditional economies and need for active cultural and language preservation today.
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1 Problem statement and research methodology

1.1 Introduction

In the fall of 2010 I started the Master’s Program in Indigenous Studies at the University of Tromsø. My educational background was my first degree in Pedagogy and Romano-Germanic philology along with working experience in several projects related to indigenous issues¹, such as Kola Sámi languages documentation, indigenous competence- and institution building (e.g. the project on establishment of the Kola Sámi competence center) and development of the Sámi cooperation across the borders.² I am a member of the Kola Sámi community and therefore the choice of my research field was connected with my interest to the history of my people and my own family’s background.

Since the social knowledge about the Kola Sámi community is relatively low both outside and inside Russia, I had the opportunity to choose several research topics which would be relevant in the frame of the MIS program. It was quite a challenge for me to find the research topic which would be both valuable for the local community and interesting from the international perspective. The current study is relevant from the local perspective because the topic of the Sámi traditional settlement pattern – sijjt was quite seldom discussed and little research was conducted in Russia on the relocations of the Kola Sámi community in the period mentioned by the current study. The study is relevant from the international perspective because little information is published on the history of the Kola Sámi people with regard to community-oriented approaches. The current work will use the narratives of the community members apart from the written resources in order to restore the succession of discussed relocation processes.

1.2 Problem statement and research questions

If at one time ethnographers tended to romanticize traditional communities, placing them outside of history³, contemporary social and anthropological research is becoming focused on the historical and social influences of particular relationships. The aim of this project is to trace the impacts of a single policy event on the history of an

¹e.g. the Kola Saami Documentation Project. [online]. - URL: http://saami.uni-freiburg.de/ksdp/index.html, 20.05.2012.
²e.g. the Skolt Sámi culture across the borders. [online]. - URL: http://www.skoltsami.com/info_en.html, 03.03.2012.
³see Wolfe 1982; Fabien 2002.
indigenous people. This case study documents the policy of forced relocations on the Sámi\(^4\) people of the Kola Peninsula in Russia from the 1930’s -1970’s and analyzes its impacts on certain aspects of the community life, based on analysis of the data gained from the fieldwork interviews.

The main focus of the study will be a brief reconstruction of events from the 1930’s to the 1970’s – the period during which most of the forced resettlements occurred. Thus, this work will provide a better understanding of the policy of forced relocations and their consequences. However, one of the central ideas in the following thesis concerns the distribution of the Sámi settlements historically and the occurred social changes in result of the implemented relocation policies from the 1930’s– 1970’s.

In comparison to the large number of studies on Sámis in Northern Scandinavia, the Sámi community of the Kola Peninsula is relatively unknown both in Western Europe and in Russia. The main challenge to this study is the limited amount of literature on the forced relocations imposed on the Kola Sámi community in contrast to a large number of works devoted to reconstructing their society as it was in the 19th century. The works on Kola Sámi published during the Soviet period can be divided into two types. There are strongly politicized works whose intention was to demonstrate the benefits of social reforms on the Kola Sámi well-being.\(^5\) On the other hand, there are studies of folklore and material culture, placing Sámi culture firmly in the past. The topic of the relocations of communities, or indeed the effect of the Soviet economic policies on Sámi, has been the subject of limited number of studies.\(^6\) To adopt the language of historians of anthropology in Europe, many of the former studies tell us more about the “own cultural implications of the researches”, which as we know could be very different from the implications of the native people directly involved in a given event.\(^7\)

Due to the limited number of studies on the forced relocations of the Kola Sámi, the emphasis in the following thesis will be on oral texts gained from interviews of the community members. The time period of this study (1930’s -1970’s) reflects the period of time that many elderly informants remember and can comment upon. This also gives this study the quality of an urgent anthropological project due to the fact that a large number of people who experienced these relocations pass away every year.

---

\(^4\)The Sami people, also spelled Sámi or Saami. I will use throughout this thesis the term Sámi.

\(^5\)Kiselev 1987.


Another aspect that I would like to touch upon which was a challenge for me before the fieldwork and eventually found its resolution, was my ability to narrow down scope of the study. Unfortunately the scope of the following Master’s work does not allow descriptions of most processes in detail. The fieldwork showed that the policy of relocation affected Sámi people in many aspects of their life. However, the limited availability of time, which should be devoted to the fieldwork, plays its role in considering several main arguments, which are narrowed down to the three main aspects coming out from the data provided by community members. Narrowing down the scope of such a broad topic also constitutes a challenge, which is reflected by taking additional time for more thorough preparatory work with relevant written sources before carrying out the interviews with community representatives.

The main research questions the study pursued to attain are:

What were the reasons and background for the forced relocations of the Kola Sámi people?

In which ways did the forced relocations affect the Kola Sámi community?

1.3 Theoretical approach and prior research overview

Forced displacements and relocations in general, of indigenous peoples as well as other communities, are common throughout the world and have caused similar consequences and impacts. According to the World Bank statement many populations in the world as well as indigenous peoples had undergone serious impacts on their communities as a result of involuntary resettlement:

When the people are forcibly removed, production systems may be dismantled, long-established residential settlements are disorganized, and kinship groups are scattered. Many jobs and assets are lost. Informal social networks that are part of daily sustenance systems – providing mutual help in childcare, food security, revenue transfers, labour exchange and other basic sources of socio-economic support – collapse because of territorial dispersion [...] Local organizations and formal and informal associations disappear because of the sudden departure of their members, often in different directions. Traditional authority and management systems can lose leaders. Symbolic markers, such as ancestral shrines and graves are abandoned, breaking links between the past and with peoples’ cultural identity. Not always visible or quantifiable, these processes are nonetheless real.8

In the current study I found it necessary to address to the anthropological studies on involuntary migration and displacement, such as Cernea and Guggenheim (1993), Gray (1996), Chatty, Colchester (2002), Oliver-Smith (2009), Oliver-Smith (2010).

---

Addressing these studies allows us to look at the forced relocation discussed in this Master’s thesis on a broader scope worldwide. As soon as these studies are devoted not only to discussions of the forced relocations of indigenous people, but general human displacement, addressing to these works is valuable in order to differentiate the consequences, which are relevant from the majority populations’ perspective, and point out the post-displacement effects, specifically as applied to indigenous communities’ as in case of the Kola Sámi people.

I will also consider anthropological approaches to forced and involuntary resettlement in the Northern context. The research carried out in the field of *changes in the spatial distribution of economic activity and settlements patterns across the circumpolar North* [BOREAS 2011] will especially be taken in consideration. The study regards general considerations on the relocations, migration and settlement distributions in Circumpolar North, in particular the Northeast and Northwest of Russia, Alaska, Chukotka, Greenland and Eastern Canadian Arctic. These studies are necessary to account for the current thesis due to its relevance for the Northern areas and analysis of the situation of the forced relocations in the Kola Sámi discourse.

I take also into consideration the studies devoted to forced migrations due to construction of hydroelectric complexes and development-induced relocations. One of the studied areas of relocations on the Kola Peninsula – Voron’e - was affected by the building of a hydroelectric station. All in all the current study is represented by the three case study areas, which exemplify different categories in resettlement approaches. First- the rapid industrial expansion; second –connected with the military developments; and third - relocations bearing more of an administrative measure as part of economic policy. Thus, considering the above mentioned theories both on general human displacement and the forced relocations of indigenous people across the world and in areas of the circumpolar North is essential in order to evaluate the Kola Sámi situation within general scope of the resettlement studies and general theories in forced migrations in these areas. On one hand, this will allow observing the situation of the Kola Sámi community from a broader international level and on the other hand will approach the issue within its Northern perspective.

---

9Cernea, Guggenheim 1993; Oliver-Smith 2009; Chatty, Colchester 2002.
12Gutsol: 2007: 60.
In order to analyze the social consequences of forced relocations on the Kola Sámi, I have addressed the studies of post-traumatic community disorder in the native communities of Australia and America by J. Atkinson and Duran Duran. These theories reveal consequences of historically traumatic events on indigenous communities, such as psychological problems, self-destructive and abusive behaviors, and the relocation’s relation to identity and well-being. In my observations, the impacts experienced by the Kola Sámi community to a great degree resemble these theories’ consequences.

Though the Kola Sámi experienced similar effects to the communities discussed in the above mentioned studies of J. Atkinson and Duran Duran, their story is still poorly documented. The most recent work on the history of the Kola Sámi people mentioning forced relocations was done by Lukas Allemann (2010). He provides transcripts of interviews carried out on the Kola Peninsula in years 2006-2008. His work is devoted mainly to reconstruction of Sámi history since the 1920’s until the collapse of the Soviet Union. As Michael Riessler noted in his review of the Aleman’s work, *while other historians have far more material on the Kola Sámi society and history collected as Allemann, but all previous works represent either ideologically clouded view of the Soviet history and ethnography of the Kola Sámi culture, or they are only popular science works with particular local historical and ethnographic values [...] The most important outcome of his work is that the forced relocations between the 1930’s and 1970’s, the deepest decisive point in the life of Sámi during the Soviet Union, is represented.*

The work of Kiselev represents a full monograph in Russian on the history of the Kola Sámi community from the first written evidence up to the Soviet period. The work is useful in this study because it provides good information on the relocation routes and general discussion on the relocation measures of the Kola Sámi people as well as providing very good material on the history of the Kola Peninsula. However, Kiselev’s work, as has been previously mentioned by Michael Riessler, represents a strongly politicized Soviet work. The nature of politicization is expressed by the strong coverage on the benefits of the Soviet programs on the Kola Sámi society, which negatively affects the scientific analysis provided in this work. Therefore, strongly politicized information in this source is considered with special care.

---

13Riessler 2011:1; own translations. I would like to comment that the works and research used in this Master’s thesis are not all ideologically clouded. Apart Allemann the works Gutsol 2007, Gutsol 2007a is modern research, which does not promote the Soviet ideology unlike Kiselev 1987.
Another major work on Kola Sámi relocations was produced by Natalia Gutsol, Vinogradova S. and Samorukova A., researches of the Kola Science Centre in Apatity, Murmansk region. The book *Kola Saami relocated groups* was published in 2007 and represents good information. This work is devoted to the study of relocations of the Sámi people specifically on the Kola Peninsula in Russia. It is valuable to regard it in the course of following thesis as *The Kola Saami relocated groups* gives quite good statistical and historical data. The work represents more of the ethnographic descriptive data, which allows using information for deepening the line of analysis during the current study, however, it does not provide a full overview of all relocations and analytical approaches to the data. The mentioned work will be partially covered by the current work.

This Master’s study is different from the other works published on the forced relocations of the Kola Sámi people by taking the insider approach in the analysis of situation. I focus on the experiences of the community and on my vision as the community insider. The analysis provided in this thesis is thus represented from the point of view of the community insider.

### 1.4 Research materials and methodology

This thesis analyzes qualitative data within the disciplines of history and anthropology. Thus, the first part of the work to a greater extent addresses historiographical analysis of the Kola Sámi people relocation policy from the 1930’s – 1970’s. The second part of the thesis is devoted to the analysis of anthropological investigations on the project.

Different approaches in the course of data collection were used, such as individual interviews, informal conversation and participant observation.\(^{14}\) Empirical data was collected as a result of recorded interviews and archival work, informal discussions, and personal observation as additional sources. Basically the fieldwork can be represented with two types of data collection – written and oral sources. The first part of the fieldwork was devoted to the collection of written sources, necessary statistical and archival data. Analyzed written sources, taken into consideration are maps, archived materials, official documents, and scientific papers. Correspondingly, this part of the fieldwork addressed the analysis of written sources and historiographical descriptions, which were necessary for building up relevant implications and providing a basis for immediate critical analysis in the process of oral sources collection.

\(^{14}\)Berreman 2007:147.
The second part of the project was aimed at interviewing community members as well as data annotation. This part of the fieldwork was devoted to the socio-anthropological scope of the project, which constitutes emotional and social experiences of the community as applied to the given historical periods. In order to achieve the following results, statistical data collection and additional interviews of community members were primarily focused on those who experienced the policy of forced relocations and descendants of these groups, and who have been pupils of boarding schools and had undergone assimilation policy in education and social environments. However, when considering oral sources it should be taken into consideration that the memories of interviewees can be distorted through time and this data should not be considered as absolute historical truth.

1.4.1 Selection of the informants and interviewees

Informants were selected on the basis of three principles: age, the extent of their direct personal involvement, and location. In the course of the fieldwork I interviewed informants of both genders. First, I tried to choose informants who were born in the 1930’s -1940’s. Secondly, I tried to identify interviewees who were directly involved in relocations measures. In addition some community leaders were interviewed, all of whom are descendants of resettled groups. And finally, I concentrated my interviews on informants from three particular Sámi settlements: Varzino (Kildin Sámi. Arsjojk)\(^{16}\), Jokanga (Ter Sámi. Jovvkuj)\(^{17}\) and Voron’e (Kildin Sámi. Koardekg).\(^{18}\)

While referencing with the interviews, two options were offered: direct usage of the first names and family names, or anonymity. Most of my informants wished their names would not be mentioned with open access. Therefore, according to these considerations I will keep the opinions of informants anonymous. However, I will state the date of birth, original place of birth, and will use numbering in order to introduce them, such as for instance Informant A, Informant B, Informant C and etc. In the appendix application one will find the Metadata table, which gives an overview of all informants questioned during the fieldwork.

\(^{15}\)see also Alleman 2010a.

\(^{16}\)Varzino, settlement with reindeer herding state farm “Bolshevik”; note map 3 № 2. The name of the settlement further in this work is used in Russian in reference to the state archival documents.

\(^{17}\)Jokanga, settlement with reindeer herding state farm “Peredovoj put”/ “Spartak”; note map 3 № 3. The name of the settlement further in this work is used in Russian in reference to the state archival documents.

\(^{18}\)Voron’e, settlement with reindeer herding state farm “Dobrovolec”; note map 3 № 8. The name of the settlement further in this work is used in Russian in reference to the state archival documents.
1.4.2 Fieldwork data

The data collected in the course of fieldwork was recorded with a handheld digital recorder. In order to ensure the future possibility of storing the data in archives or other digital sources, all the interviews were recorded in WAV extension formatting. Thus, the high quality of file formatting will provide the opportunity of long-lasting data preservation in archives [KDSP 2011]. The files were uploaded to archives in order to preserve materials and store them in a safer digital source. The access to archive is restricted and files can only be used by me as the author of collected materials, which are stored with the names of informants and left anonymous.

My investigation was completely devoted to working with a particular age group. I was working with lists of the Sámi families with the help of a local Sámi assistant. Working with the local assistant from Lovozero, Ganna Vinogradova, considerably contributed to my ability to get in touch with the oldest generation of relocated community members. Unfortunately, there was no opportunity to meet people born in the 1920’s because very few of them are alive these days or are in a good state of health. Thus, the elders who were born in the 1930’s - 1940’s, the last generation that experienced the policy of relocations, were the target group for research. The previous generation has passed away and I was not able to find informants older than anyone born approximately in the 1930’s. The oldest informant was born in 1931.

Working with this particular age group of elders posed a challenge for me as there was a substantial age gap between me in a role of researcher and them in the role of informants. Additionally, some elders have a poor state of health that makes it more problematic to work intensively as it is a tiring process for them. The time was a crucial aspect of my fieldwork as I knew I was limited and restricted regarding timelines of the fieldwork. However, we managed to hold short interviews, working bit by bit for a short time for several days in a row. Another point, which arouse during the fieldwork is that some of the elder informants are not willing to speak on a tape recording; rather they prefer having informal conversations. I discussed in advance with interviewees their levels of comfort in using recording equipment. When the following was not possible I took notes only. Many elders do not perceive digital equipment as a tool and in these cases working with written materials works much better for them. For example, several of my informants shared a lot of written information and materials on the topic and it

went much better to do work with the hand written notes or by writing down the interviews from dictation. However, this type of work is obviously more time-consuming.

The total amount of collected audio data is 10 hours of recorded interview material. In the course of research fieldwork 11 interviews were carried out with people from 3 areas of relocations: Varzino, Jokanga and Voron’e. All of the three settlements were located along the coast of the Kola Peninsula. Varzino and Jokanga were located at the Northeastern part of the coast and Voron’e was located on the Northwestern coast of the Peninsula.

The choice for analysis of these particular geographical locations is predetermined by the following factor: the studied territory of the Kola coast is especially interesting as characterized not only by establishment and influence of the old Northern European trading routes and neighbors, but in particular by militarization of these territories. This factor, along with the implementation of the Soviet policies of industrialization in the whole region increased influence on the traditional settlement pattern causing different changes from the Eastern part of Peninsula.20 Until recently this factor mainly predetermined restricted access of the indigenous people to their lands and some of these territories were closed military areas with restricted access up to around the year 2010: unlike other parts of the Russian Arctic, the western Kola Peninsula was subjected to industrialization and militarization.21 Today some of these lands are opened again, e.g. Varzino, and some are still closed, e.g. Jokanga.

The two studied settlements on the Northeastern coast of the Kola Peninsula were affected by the relocation policy measures as were most other Sami villages. At the time, the situation of Voron’e occupies an exceptional position among the other settlements, as the elimination of this village was implemented in connection with industrial development, namely building the hydroelectric power station. Thus, the data provides an overview of both similarities and differences of the studied processes though they occurred relatively close to each other geographically allowing to a greater extent, the ability to trace the variation of relocation processes.

20Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2008:82.
21 ibid: 5.
1.5 My role: being a native researcher in own community

I myself have an indigenous background and speak both the majority language – Russian, and one of the local Sámi languages – Kildin Sámi. I am myself from a family that has been relocated. My family comes from the village Varzino and after the resettlement part of my relatives live in Murmansk and others live in Lovozero. To a great extent this knowledge and my own background allowed me to avoid communication problems with the interviewees and ambiguity in interpretations of the information.22

However, my research addresses an event in the history of a community which I have not experienced myself. One should also differentiate between being an insider of the community and an insider of a particular situation. I investigate the history of Sámi community in the light of the politics of the Soviet Union, however I was born in different conditions and political situations right after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Though I can be regarded as an insider of the community, I am still not an insider of the studied situation and it should not be assumed that I share equal roles with a community member who have never seen me before and our first communication is a research interview.

1.6 Outline of the thesis

This Master’s study is presented in six chapters. The first chapter provides an introduction and main outlines of the research aspects of the study. It is devoted to the main theoretical considerations and overview of previous research works on the topic. This chapter additionally describes the methodology I used, in particular methods of data collection, types of data, principles of informants selection and the relevant strategies in the field. It also briefly outlines definition of my own role along with some practical challenges I dealt with in the field and theoretically in structuring the thesis.

The second chapter deals with contextualizing the discourse of the study. It touches upon a unit of traditional Kola Sámi settlement and social organization, which in this work is represented by the term sijjt. The sijjt pattern was practiced on the Kola Peninsula prior to the start of the first Soviet policies in the 1930’s. This chapter provides a historical context of the study particularity with emphasis in geographical distribution of the Sámi settlements before the relocations.

Chapter three describes the relocations in chronology. This chapter provides information about the involuntary migration routes and relocations of the Kola Sámis from the years 1930’s - 1970’s. The provided data is composed of systematized written and oral data collected during the fieldwork along with my own analytical implications. It contains tables and statistical data which I compiled in the course of the study. It additionally deals with descriptions of the policy of forced relocations in the frame of the general Soviet ideologies and policies implemented to all indigenous peoples of Russia, thus framing the situation of the Kola Sámi people within the general scene of the national policy during discussed period.

Chapter four sets out a broader outline for examination of the described relocations. The description is mostly based on the oral data from interviews with community members and archival materials. It aims at depicting the relocations’ measures and bringing out personal experiences of community members relocated from their villages.

Chapter five addresses to the topic of relocations consequences. This chapter focuses on analysis of the in-depths interviews and some statistical data. It aims at discussing conditions after the relocations measures and its impacts on the Kola Sámi community.

Chapter six concludes the main arguments and findings of the study with special emphasis on the changes affecting the Kola Sámis after implementation of discussed relocation policies. It also provides the possible perspectives and proposals for the future research on the topic.
2 Contextualizing the Kola Sámi resettlement discourse

The chapter focuses on setting the context of the current study. The first paragraph is devoted to brief description of the notion *sijjt*, which is used by the community in the Kildin Sámi language as identical to the term “settlement”. In the early 1920’s -1930’s the Kola Sámi people practiced semi-sedentary pattern of residence, moving from summer to winter settlement – *sijjt*. Since the study is devoted to the resettlement, it is essential to provide the setting, which partially reveals the pre-relocation settlement pattern, existing on the Kola Peninsula. However, it is necessary to mention that the current Master’s work provides analysis of forced relocations themselves and most of the informants I interviewed during the fieldwork were born in the 1930’s (see the metadata list in appendix 1). Therefore the full dynamics of the *sijjt* patterns are not clarified by the current study.

2.1 Before relocations: the Kola Sámi settlement ‘sijjt’

The following paragraph of the thesis addresses the organization of the Sámi settlement system on the Kola Peninsula before the start of relocation measures. The arguments are based on the data from interviews with informants from the Kola Peninsula as well as written materials on the topic. The Sámi people in contrast to many other indigenous people of the world had semi-sedentary type of organization, practicing seasonal change of settlements. However, in the time of historical development a transition occurred from the existing patterns to the new living conditions, where the Kola Sámi people were placed after the relocations.

The Sámi on the Kola Peninsula until the 1930’s maintained kinship-based types of communities, moving from winter to summer seasonal settlements. During winter the Sámi lived in winter settlements and in summer moved together with reindeers to summer settlements in the inland part of the Peninsula or to the coasts, where the insects were not harmful for the reindeer. Furthermore in the start of winter, families gathered in the winter settlements. Winter settlements were constructed usually as one street with wooden houses and dwellings placed on the opposite sides of the street. The dwellings in winter settlements are known as ‘*toabh*’ Sámi. *toabh*, Rus. *tupa*, small

---

23 The main works, which I use in this chapter are Kiselev 1987; Kalte 2003; Gustol, 2007; Gutsol 2007a; Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2008; Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2009; Kalstad 2002; Kalstad 2009.


25 Informant A.

Sámi log dwelling with flat roof, in summer settlements people lived in ‘kuedt’ - Sámi kuedt’, Rus. vezha, Sámi dwelling on the frame of poles roofed with turf, and later around the 1930’s started to build big wooden houses.\textsuperscript{27} Population of the sijjt consisted of mostly Sámi people. The three studied settlements show the following population numbers. In 1718 Jokanga had a population of 66 people and 14 dwellings, in 1920, 139 people resided inVarzino and had 20 dwellings, in 1929, 105 people lived inVoron’e.\textsuperscript{28} The winter settlements changed their locations approximately every 25-30 years due to the necessity of finding new pastures for reindeers, when the territories exhausted their resources; at the same time summer settlements were usually permanent. There were also temporary spring and autumn fishing and hunting territories of each kin, people lived there in Sámi tents and some had ‘kuedt’.\textsuperscript{29} Sámi people migrated together with reindeers for seasonal work to settlements and places specifically allocated for these purposes. However, the spring and autumn places were not considered to be settlements, but rather as temporary places used mostly for fishing, where people stayed in tents. The reindeer started their migration in April and moved towards summer grazing fields. Thus, the people of Varzino moved to the summer settlements in May or the beginning of June for salmon seasonal fishing; afterwards they moved to the autumn places and then to the winter settlement. In the spring, they stayed at these places on their way from winter to summer settlement.\textsuperscript{30} Each large piece of land, which belonged to a village was divided according to the number of families in a settlement. The pastures and resource territories were distributed according to the long-established kinship traditions. Each family was allocated hunting and fishing territories, pastures, and moss fields large enough for the needs of survival, and these ancestral territories were passed to descendants by inheritance.\textsuperscript{31}

\textit{Villages were integrated along family lines, with villages sharing mates, resource territories and economic activities.}\textsuperscript{32}

One of the specific features of the traditional Sámi reindeer herding was free grazing of reindeers with autumn time collection of the flocks.\textsuperscript{33} However, in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, the western settlements as a rule practiced mixed economies along with fishing

\textsuperscript{27}Informant C.  
\textsuperscript{28}Mironova 2009:4, Gutsol 2007: 20.  
\textsuperscript{29}Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2009:222.  
\textsuperscript{30}Informant A.  
\textsuperscript{31}Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2008: 79; Kalte 2003:60.  
\textsuperscript{32}Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2009: 222.  
\textsuperscript{33}Konstantinov 2005:179.
and commercial transporting. The settlements in the local Sámi language are called ‘sijjt’ (in rus. ‘pogost’). Correspondingly, summer settlement in Sámi is called kiess’ sijjt and winter settlement tall’v sijjt. Sijjt refers to kinship-based communities as socioeconomic and cultural unit of the Kola Sámi settlement system. However, a number of studies do discuss if sijjt correlates with the Northern Sámi term siida, which is quite broadly used to talk about a settlement unit in the Sámi discourse.

### 2.2 Sámi ‘sijjt’ on the Kola Peninsula before the 1930’s

Active Russian influences on the Kola Sámi had already started in the 16th century with arrival of Christian missionaries. Up to the late 19th century almost all 1800 Sámis were members in the Russian Orthodox Church. The anthropologist Wheelersburg mentions that the pre-revolutionary government with the Orthodox church had negative impactson the Kola Sámi culture; one of the historians of the Kola Peninsula, Kiselev A.A. notes that the Christian influences on the Kola Sámi started almost one century earlier than the Sámi in Scandinavia: though the Christianity came to the Russian Sámi one hundred years earlier than to the Sámi in Scandinavia, however it didn’t reveal the situation in economic sense and household, at the time the whole notion of the Christianity was still strange and foreign for the Sámi people. Thus, the early Russian Empire developments emerged on the Kola Sámi with promotion of the Christianity, building first churches and monasteries, though without changes in the settlement spatial distribution, which continued up to 1917, when the monarchy was overthrown and started the Soviet period.

Another contemporary historian Kalstad mentions that up to the late 1930’s Sámis had their own system of law, social organization, and natural resources distribution known as sijjt, which was abolished up to the 1930’s with the start of the

---

34 Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2009:224; Informant B. 
35 in Kildin sámi: plural sijt, singular sijjt. 
36 rus. letnij pogost. 
37 rus. zimnij pogost. 
38 Sergejeva 2000: 9-12, Kalstad 2009: 24-28 
39 According to Wheelersburg, Gutsol “Sami pogosty may have been remnants of indigenous reindeer herding communities, called siida.” (2009: 222). They also mention that “nineteenth century Kola Sami pogosty exploited common pasture and inherited fishing and hunting areas within a defined territory through extended families as siida […] Besides having common social and economic interests, pogosty participated in a shared spiritual life and ideology.”(2008:79). 
40 Kiselev 1987:15. 
41 Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2009: 222. 
42 Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2008:80. 
state policy of industrial and economic centralization. In his book he provides a map of the Kola Sámi sijt from 1850-1900. At that time all of the Sámi settlements on the map below belonged to the territory of the Russian Empire.

Map 1. Territories of the Sámi sijt on the Kola Peninsula in 1850.

Pečengskoe obshestvo (sijt: Pac’jogk, Pecam, Muetk).

Ekostrovskoe obshestvo (sijt: Suenjel, Nuett’javvr, Sarvesjavvr, Akkel, Čukksuel, Maselk).

Voroninskoje obshestvo (sijt: Kiilt, Koardegk, Lejjavv’r, Arsjogk).

Ponojskoje obshestvo (sijt: Jovvkuj, Guoddemjavv’r, Limbes, P’enne, Sosnevke, Kintuš)
Table 1: Annotation table, including the names of the settlements. Karl Nickul (1977).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№ on the map</th>
<th>Name (in sámi)</th>
<th>Name (in russian)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N’javddam</td>
<td>Нэйдэн</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pac’jogk</td>
<td>Пазрека</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pecam</td>
<td>Печенга</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Muetk</td>
<td>Мотовский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kiilt</td>
<td>Кильдин</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Koardekg</td>
<td>Воронье</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lejjavv’r</td>
<td>Семиостровье/Левозеро</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Arsjogk</td>
<td>Варзино</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jovvkuj</td>
<td>Йоканыга</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Guoddemjavv’r</td>
<td>Куроптевский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Limbes</td>
<td>Лумбовка</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>P’enne</td>
<td>Поной</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sosnevke</td>
<td>Сосновка</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sueŋŋel</td>
<td>Сонгельский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nuett’javvr</td>
<td>Нотозеро</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sarvesjavv’r</td>
<td>Гирвасозеро</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Akkel</td>
<td>Бабинский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Čukksuel</td>
<td>Экостровский</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Masel’k</td>
<td>Пулозеро/Масельга</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lujavv’r</td>
<td>Ловозеро</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kintuš</td>
<td>Кинтуш/Каменский</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table is based on the following source: Karl Nickul (1977) from Kalstad 2009: 26.
As can be observed from the map in the late 19th century twenty-one sijjt were spread throughout the whole territory of the Kola Peninsula, starting from the Finnish border up to the very Eastern coast. However, in the course of certain historical processes some territories changed the jurisdiction. In particular N’javaddam sijjt became the territory of Norway as a result of the Norwegian-Russian border establishment in 1826. Later, after the first Soviet-Finnish War (1918 – 1920) under Jur’jevskij peace treaty between Finland and Russia in 1920, a piece of the Western part of the Kola Peninsula was transferred under jurisdiction of the Finnish state and the population moved to Finland. Finally the Soviet-Finnish War in 1939 – 1940 resulted in establishment of the Finnish-Russian border in 1944. Some of the Sámi were forcibly resettled from the border region, which also influenced cultural changes and change in geographical distribution of the Eastern Sámi group. Before the First October Revolution in 1917 about 80% of the Sámi still were moving from winter to summer sijt with the reindeers. During the pre-revolutionary period, the Tsarist control over the Sámi population allowed a greater degree of autonomy, while Sámis were living in sijt, then it was under the introduction of the Soviet order: the Sámi lived in relative isolation and the Tsarist regime gave them a wide berth of autonomy.

According to Kalstad, the Kola Sámi had their own administrative territory, which was called Kolsko-loparksaja volost [Kola-lapp district]. The volost was divided territorially into four administrative areas (s. map1), which consisted of several sijt. The following volost was managed by the assembly of the representatives elected by the Sámi people themselves, who negotiated with the government representatives. The assembly consisted of four elected representatives from each of the four areas, one elected representative from each sijjt and a representative of the Tsar government. The mapping below depicts the structure of the Sámi sijjt assembly and its place in the local governing. The study will not provide the detailed analysis of the structure, functions, and the role of the assembly in the national governing. The following visual aid is mentioned in order to demonstrate the existence and acknowledgement of the specific Sámi self-determination pattern, practiced on the Kola Peninsula in the late 19th century.

48 Neiden, a village located at the river Neiden, in the municipality of Sør-Varanger in Finnmark, Norway.
49 Kiselev 1987: 27.
50 Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2008: 81.
51 Kiselev 1987:30.
52 Kuljok 1987:74.
53 Kalstad 2002: 5.
Map 2. Russian-Sámi administration and the Sámi assembly (1867).
The assembly had an administration, which consisted of three people, who were recruited and paid by the assembly.\textsuperscript{55} The following system, being an autonomous governing pattern, provided protection of the Sámi cultural interests and traditional customary laws. In the 1870’s the Sámi customary laws were collected and in 1878 published in the book of Efimenko A.I. *Juridičeskije obyčai loparej*.\textsuperscript{56} The current book was aimed to provide assistance in governing and legal proceedings. The gathering of *volost* elected assembly was held annually on the 25\textsuperscript{th} of January of the old Gregorian calendar, which is the 6\textsuperscript{th} of February of our contemporary calendar. Kalstad mentions that the *volost* was established in 1866 and argues that it might be functioning some years after 1900 and up to the revolution time.\textsuperscript{57} The assembly solved economic, social, and family questions as well as dealt with handling conflicts between communities.

It is significant to touch upon the pre-revolutionary distribution of settlements on the Kola Peninsula. This Master’s study partially addresses the system of the Sámi settlements before the 1920’s and the harmful effect of the relocation measures on it after the 1930’s. The revolution in 1917 was a turning point in Russian history as well as in the history of all indigenous peoples of the Russian Federation and consequently the Sámi people. The main consequences of the October Revolution were the abolition of the monarchy, the collapse of the Russian Empire and rise of the Civil War in 1917-1923, leading to another historical stage in the country’s development. It influenced all spheres and sectors of the state, which consequently involved a change in national political attitudes and ideologies towards the indigenous people. Allemann and Kiselev set out two separate historical periods - situation of the Kola Sámi people before the October revolution and after.\textsuperscript{58}

### 2.3 Sámi settlements on the Kola Peninsula after the 1930’s

The study period from 1929 on is characterized by the state policy taking focus on intensive industrial and economic development of the country. The Soviet government argued that reaching the aim in establishing a socialist state and building a purely socialist society was not possible without overcoming the so-called ‘old patriarchal

---

\textsuperscript{55}Kalstad 2002: 5.
\textsuperscript{56}Efimenko, Aleksandra (1877): *Narodnye Iuridichesko obyachai loparei, korelov i samoiedov Arkhangelskoi gubernii* [Traditional Juridicial Customs of the Lapps, Karelians, and Samoeds of Archangel Province], St. Petersburg: Tip. V. Kirshbauma.
\textsuperscript{57}Kalstad 2009:31.
relations’, and ‘primitive’ cultural and economic situations of indigenous peoples in remote areas with the population dispersed around vast territories of the country. The previous forms of relations were to be substituted by new socialistic industrial relations by means of liquidation of private property and rapid growth of productive forces.\textsuperscript{59}

In practice, the liquidation of private property concerned with the policy of collectivization started in the 1930’s. The following policy focused mainly on two goals. First, was the intensive development of agriculture and profit from rural economies, such as producing food supplies for urban populations, and the supply of raw materials for the processing industry as well as agricultural exports. The main idea of this policy was to make rural economy a leading economic power in supporting the emerging industrial development, urbanization, and modernization of the country. Thus, stating from the 1920’s and up to the 1940’s, all over the country state collective farms \textit{kolhoz}\textsuperscript{60} were established. The individuals, who became members of state farms, were obliged to submit their private property to \textit{kolhoz}, which was a collective ownership enterprise established as an alternative to individual possessions. It concerned mostly all non-land individual assets, such as cattle, households, and pieces of land, etc.

Joint ownership presupposed centralization of all individual farming units into collective farms, which were easy for the state to control. All members of these farms worked for massive industrial production of local resource economies; for the Sámi and other indigenous people of the North it was mostly reindeer and fish. According to the economic census of 1926-1927 in the Murmansk province were 371 Sámi households, 85 of them sedentary and 286 nomadic. Around 40\% of the Sámi people were living in the coastal areas and were creating their livelihoods on the sea fishing while the rest were fishing on the lakes and rivers. The other activities were reindeer herding, pearls trade, and helping with reindeers in transportation of goods.\textsuperscript{61}

Secondly, forced collectivization was involved, i.e. deprivation of private property, what presupposed confiscations of land, property, monetary savings, etc. from \textit{kulaki}.\textsuperscript{62} These people were either arrested by prosecutors, resettled to the most unfavorable areas in their region, or relocated to the area far away from their regions, together with their families.

\textsuperscript{59}Odzial 2008: 16-19.
\textsuperscript{60}as well \textit{artel’, sovhoz} and etc.
\textsuperscript{61}Kallte 2003:57.
\textsuperscript{62}The term\textit{kulaki} applied towards welfare individuals, who did not want to join kolhozes, and others.
Political repressions affected almost every sijjt on the Kola Peninsula, where people were protesting from taking their private property to ownership of collective farms.\(^63\) Reindeer herders protested with destroying moss on the pastures and slaughtering their reindeers in order not to give them away to collective farms.\(^64\) In 1937-1938 the estimated number of Sámi people accused of 'counter-revolutionary' activity was 90 people, 40 of which were executed, the rest were sent to the labor camps or gulags. In most of the cases those prosecuted were the most skilled reindeer herders and the community leaders.\(^65\) The process of collectivization on the Kola Peninsula took almost 10 years, from 1929 and up to 1938-1940. However, at the start of the collectivization policy the Sámi still had some freedoms in relation to shaping their economies. For instance, certain private ownership of reindeer herds were allowed by the government after the early introduction of collectivization policies.\(^66\)

One of the purposes in the policy of kolhozes development specifically targeting indigenous peoples was to accustom nomadic peoples to a sedentary way of life.\(^67\) Therefore, the first relocations started with closing winter settlements and placing its population in summer settlements. However, the process was quite heterogeneous in respect of its reference to all Sámi groups of the Kola Peninsula. The smallest Sámi settlements were already being closed in the 1930’s; at the time some of the bigger communities were rearranged decades later in the 1950’s -1970’s. As the result of the Soviet policies in the 1930’s, sijjts were rearranged into 13 kolhoz settlements. As might be seen from the map below, kolhoz settlements received new names in Russian, for instance Killt sijjt was renamed to “Vpered”, Arsjogk sijjt received a new name “Bolševik”, in 1931 Muotke sijt received name “Tundra” and later in 1937 was changed to “Molodoj kommunist – internacionalist” etc. Therefore, the process of closing the Sámi winter settlements had already started in the 1930’s, with its primary objective to make the Sámi population stop their nomadic way of life and work for economy of the collective farms. The following map gives an overview of these settlements with the collective farms:

\(^{63}\)for more information on the soviet political repressions on the Kola Sámi see Rantala, Leif (2012): Repressirovannye sovetskie saamy/ Guoládatnjárgga sámit, geat šadde Stalina áíggí terrora oaffarin (eds.) V.V. Sorkažerđ'ev, Rovaniemi.
\(^{64}\)Informant C.
\(^{65}\)Kalstad 2009: 35; Allemann 2010: 89.
\(^{66}\)Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2008: 80.
\(^{67}\)Gutsol 2007: 6.

Tabel 2: Annotation table, including the names of the settlements, renamed from Sámi to Russian after establishment of the collective farms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Name of kolhoz (in russian)</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Name of settlement (in sámi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Vpered”</td>
<td>“Ahead”</td>
<td>Kiilt sijjt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Bol’ševik”</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Arsjogk sijjt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Peredovoj put”/“Spartak”</td>
<td>“Progressive path”/“Spartacus”</td>
<td>Jovvkuj sijjt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68 from Kalstad 2009: 35. The names are given in Russian, in parenthesis – the Sámi names.
69 The table is based on the following source: Kalstad 2009: 35.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>“Prosvet”</th>
<th>“Light”</th>
<th>Limbes sijjt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>“Sever”</td>
<td>“North”</td>
<td>P’enne sijjt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>“Put’ olenja”</td>
<td>&quot;The way of reindeer”</td>
<td>Sosnevke sijjt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>“Olenevod”</td>
<td>“The reindeer herder”</td>
<td>Kintuš sijjt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dobrovolec</td>
<td>“The volunteer”</td>
<td>Koardegk sijjt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>“Tundra”</td>
<td>“Tundra”</td>
<td>Lujavv’r sijjt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>“Krasnoe Pulozero”</td>
<td>“Red Pulozero”</td>
<td>Masel’k sijjt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>“Tundra”, “Molodoj kommunist – internacionalist”</td>
<td>“Tundra”, “Young communist-internationalist”</td>
<td>Muotke sijjt, before 1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>“Vosmus” (in Školt Sámi)</td>
<td>“First”</td>
<td>Muotke sijjt, after 1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>&quot;Jona&quot;</td>
<td>geograph. name</td>
<td>merged Akkel and Sarvesjavvr sijt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As might be observed from map 3, taking in consideration the map of *sijt* in the previous paragraph⁷¹, in the beginning of the 20th century the following *sijt* were eliminated: Lejjavv’r, Sueŋŋel, Guoddemjavv’r, Nuett’javvr. The sijt Akkel and Sarvesjavvr were merged into one *kolhoz*. Apart from this, the following industrialization efforts influenced positions of the settlements: the construction of the railroad in 1916 from Kandalaksha to the port in Romanov-on-Murman, which was

---

⁷¹ note map 1.
renamed Murmansk after revolution in 1917, and extensive mineral extraction, which has led to the alteration of ecological, demographic and settlement patterns.  

Thus, in the 1930’s -1940’s the winter villages were closed and most Kola Sámi people were settled in the places of their summer settlements, i.e. settlements were emerged into one. Though the people still called these new settlements sijjt, the underlying concept of it, as it was in the end of the 19th century, has changed. As Allemann mentions, the policy of the 1930’s resulted in a number of general changes in lifestyle of the Sámi people as well. First, reindeer became the property of the state collective farms and were grazed by employed brigades of reindeer herders. Second, women either followed reindeer herders in brigades as housekeepers, making them food and cleaning koavas – the Sámi summer tent, or stayed in houses in the settlements. The parents were working in the tundra and children lived in the boarding schools. Finally, extensive industrial development influenced the ecology of the region as well as fundamentally changed the settlement position of the whole peninsula. Wheelersburg, Gutsol and Lehtola address the changes in the early 20th century situation of the Kola Sámi people, such as introduction of the first Soviet policies and forced relocations, which resulted in disruption of the traditional Sámi sijjt pattern:

“The final destruction of the traditional system was the result of subsequent watershed events: collectivization, displacement of local groups of the Kola Sámi and the elimination of a significant number of traditional Sámi settlements and resource territories”.  

“The Soviet program ultimately led to the relocation/abandonment of Saami pogosty west of the Imandra Lake watershed”.  

“The fate of the Kola Saami in the 1900s was the most tragic of all…[as the] traditional siida collapse in the decades after the Russian revolution in 1917”.  

72 Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2008:82.  
73 Kiselev 1987: 32.  
74 Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2008:82.  
75 Gutsol 2007:10.  
76 Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2008: 80.  
2.4 Conclusion

This chapter focuses on setting the context of the current study. The first paragraph is devoted to brief description of the notion ‘sijjt’, which is referred to as the term “settlement” by the community in the Kildin Saami language. Since the study is devoted to the resettlement, it is essential to provide the setting, which partially reveals the pre-relocation settlement pattern, existing on the Kola Peninsula. However, it is necessary to mention that the current Master’s work provides analysis of forced relocations itself and most of the informants I interviewed during the fieldwork were born in the 1930’s. Therefore, the full dynamics of the ‘sijjt’ pattern are not clarified by the current study. Nevertheless, it becomes obvious that before the revolution in 1917, which had overthrown the Russian monarchy and gave start to the Soviet policy in the 1930’s, the Kola Sámi practiced a semi-sedentary pattern of residence with transition from seasonal work of summer vs. winter settlement. The described pattern characteristics changed historically as a result of the policies introduced by the Soviet government in the 1930’s and the 1950’s. The policies of the 1950’s and the relocation processes will be described further in the next chapters.

78note the metadata list in appendix.
3 The Soviet policies on the Kola Peninsula: closed Sámi settlements and relocations

The current chapter represents further discussion on the policies implemented by the Soviet government after the 1940’s. The first paragraph provides a general description of the views towards indigenous peoples of the Russian North after the introduction of the Soviet order. The last section of this chapter scrutinizes the implementation of both studied policies, in particular the policy of collectivization in the 1930’s-1940’s and the policy of economic centralization and amalgamation of collective farms in the 1950’s - 1970’s in relation to the relocation measures on the Kola Peninsula.

3.1 General views in relation to indigenous peoples of the Russian North after introduction of the Soviet order

The considerations on national issues of the small indigenous peoples of the Russian North, Siberia and the Russian Far East (KMNS) were regarded and accepted in the light of general conception in development of the whole country both theoretically and in practice. In 1924 the Committee of Assistance to Peoples of the Northern borderlands (also called Committee of the North) was founded. Its task was focused primarily on three main questions: native self-government, economic reorganization, and social enlightenment.

The question of native self-government appeared to be controversial as further planning of indigenous peoples’ questions concerned the following main considerations.

The first argument is based on the attitude of the state to indigenous autonomies, which were eliminated by the time of the start of collectivization policies in the 1930’s. It constitutes the idea that indigenous peoples should not live isolated from the progressive society. The development of each human society is determined by certain historical conditions and has always been heterogeneous in its nature. Therefore, different states and nations, being at different stages of development, influence each other progressively if they are not isolated. The glimpses of this idea are also found in the contemporary theory of globalization. An interesting parallel observation was made during a conversation with one of my informants, and the question on today’s

---

79 Grant 1995:72.
80 Odzial 2008: 15.
81 ibid:26.
The attitude of authorities to national Sámi questions was received the following answer: before we had the Soviet views, today we have the globalization.\textsuperscript{82}

The second idea concerns securing political equality of nations in multi-cultural state, liquidation of economic and cultural inequality by means of intensive economic, political and cultural development due to the influence of the progressive majority nation. Accordingly, indigenous peoples in these perceptions were regarded as primitive peoples: “wild aboriginals of the North”.\textsuperscript{83} Thus, in many scientific works by historians and authors of the Soviet era the Sámi people are approached as undeveloped in social and technical sense, an illiterate population whose survival was still dependent on primitive tribal economy, such as hunting, fishing and reindeer herding.\textsuperscript{84}

The Soviet views on development of the Kola Sámi people were relevant in publications up to the end of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, as in the instance of the Kozlov work (1987). The influence of politicization on scientific discourse has led to negative and distorted image of the Kola Sámi situation, placing them in subordinate and socially lower position in comparison to the majority:

“Due to 70 years of the Soviet policy the Sámi has made a giant jump from natural patriarchal structures to developed socialism, from incivility and barbarism to the light of knowledge, from poverty to material security. The Kola Sámi people today – a part of new historical community of people – the Soviet people. To all the successes in economy, culture and social life they are obliged to being a part of this particular community”.\textsuperscript{85}

3.2 The policy of economic centralization and amalgamation of collective farms (1950’s -1970’s)

In the beginning of the 1950’s the small indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East were still occupying vast territories across the country. However, they had not led isolated existence. Indigenous peoples were living under the jurisdiction of RSFSR - The Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic and almost everywhere their local economies\textsuperscript{86} were integrated into the national economy through the system of collective farms – ‘kolhoz’.\textsuperscript{87}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Informant B.}
\footnote{Odzial 2008: 18, 25.}
\footnote{Kiselev 1987: 20.}
\footnote{ibid: 195.}
\footnote{most economies based on land and water resources use, ex. reindeer herding, fishing.}
\footnote{Odzial 2008:43.}
\end{footnotes}
The period from the 1950’s -1970’s was determined by the policy of *economic centralization* introduced by Khrushchev.\textsuperscript{88} The Khrushchev policy was characterized by amalgamation of small cooperatives and collective farms into larger units. It literally meant “work on economic strengthening” of the collective farms. In order to achieve the aim of centralization of the local resources, it was decided to rearrange all small collective farms into a new joint form of the state farm – ‘*sovhoz*’.\textsuperscript{89} It presupposed that by joining several ‘*kolhoz*’ into one unit ‘*sovhoz*’, small *unpromising*, unprofitable farms were to be eliminated together with the settlements.

The situation with populations settled, dispersed, and scattered around the huge territories\textsuperscript{90} created additional inconvenience in the state’s attempts to control and subsidize the small settlements. Thereby, the high concentration of a population in the territory of one settlement would allow for an easier restructuring economy, avoiding additional problems and further investments in managing the organization of these settlements. The population was to be resettled to the larger locations.\textsuperscript{91} The idea of reducing the amount of settlements was based on implication of having fewer problems with coordination and products distribution for these settlements.\textsuperscript{92}

The above-mentioned policies affected not only indigenous peoples, but all populations in the Soviet Union. The policies of collectivization and centralization are especially known for their consequences which touched to a varying degree almost every individual in the country. Therefore, the implemented policies were not based on ethnic principles or nationalistic considerations towards the Sámi people, but rather were grounded on assumptions of purely economic profitability. However, the relocation policies and liquidation of *unpromising* villages were implemented in all regions inhabited by indigenous peoples.\textsuperscript{93} Thus, liquidation of small nation’s villages sufficiently affected their traditional way of life and cultures.\textsuperscript{94} Due to the fact that the same political principles and the same measures were carried out over the whole territory of small indigenous peoples in Russia\textsuperscript{95}, all these peoples share common situations and face similar consequences, such as a decline in their economies, negative

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{88}The Secretary General of RSFSR.
\item \textsuperscript{89}A joint unit of several *kolhozes*.
\item \textsuperscript{90}Odzial 2008: 44-45.
\item \textsuperscript{91}Allemann 2010:75; Gustol 2007:6.
\item \textsuperscript{92}Grant 1995:124-125.
\item \textsuperscript{93}ibid:125.
\item \textsuperscript{94}Kolpakova 2006:151.
\item \textsuperscript{95}small indigenous peoples is the term applies to population numbers less than 50,000 people.
\end{itemize}
impacts in social and cultural spheres, and language and identity loss in future generations.  

Though the objectives of the same measures were applied to all indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Russian Far East, the differences in the policy effects and the implementation gaps are observed in regions differently as preconditioned by specifics in local economic, climatic, territorial, cultural and social circumstances as well as the range of other probable factors. The discussed time frame can be described as a turning point in the national histories of all indigenous peoples in Russia: the period of the 1950’s -1960’s is the most important milestone in the history of development of indigenous peoples in USSR.

3.3 The forced relocations of the Sámi people on the Kola Peninsula

In the course of the current study I used a descriptive-analytical approach and this paragraph aims at structuring the relocation processes. This section will provide information about the involuntary migration routes and relocations of the Kola Sámis from the years 1931-1969. The provided information is compiled of systematized written and oral data along with the own analytical implications. The resettlement in this work is presented as a two-staged process implying that the above-described policies lead to the gradual spatial rearrangement of the stijt pattern and further displacement.

The Kola Sámi people were not resettled by a single relocation measure. It is necessary to delineate the two stages of relocations. The first stage occurred in the 1930’s -1940’s when the system of collective farms was introduced (background of the policy of collectivization is discussed in previous chapter). The second stage took place in the 1950’s -1970’s when the elimination of small unpromising settlements was carried out in order to centralize the Sámi population in Lovozero (background of the policy of amalgamation is discussed in previous chapter).

The result of the first stage of relocations, as was mentioned above, was that the winter Sámi settlements were eliminated and people were settled in their summer settlements. Five winter and summer stijt were eliminated. Most of the Sámi people stayed within their pasture territories, though they had to move to the summer settlements on a sedentary basis, where various facilities, such as schools, shops,

---

96 Ibid: 152, Odzial, 2008: 76.
97 Odzial 2008: 42.
98 Ibid: 42.
99 Laozerskij, Kildinskij, Songel’skij, Ekostrovskij, Motovskij (note map 2).
healthcare points, etc. were established. The people were engaged in reindeer herding and fishing at collective farms. The reindeers were considered the property of collective farms, however it was still possible to own the private reindeers \textsuperscript{100} as a part of collective property of the state farms.

The establishment of new settlements, e.g. Čal’mne Varre (1917), Krasnoščel’е (1921), Kanevka (1923), Čudz’javv’r (1934) during the 1920’s -1930’s considerably influenced the migration of Šami from the villages. The policy of the late 1930’s was oriented on joining the small Sámi sijt into bigger sedentary settlements, and for these purposes some people from the former sijt were relocated to the newly-established settlements. \textsuperscript{101} Some inhabitants were relocated to other villages to work on the new collective farms; at the time many of the Sámis remained in their summer settlements. Čal’mne Varre and Krasnoščel’е were founded by the Komi inhabitants, \textsuperscript{102} where after moving the Sámi residents became an ethnic minority.

The second stage of relocations was implemented in the 1950’s -1970’s, when collective farms and facility points in these settlements were eliminated. The biggest collective farm, the “Tundra” was situated in the village Lovozero. The reindeers were transferred from eliminated settlements to the farm “Tundra” and its population was resettled to Lovozero. The table below describes and systematizes most of the relocations of the Kola Šámi people, starting with implementation of the first relocations up to the resettlement to Lovozero. The table describes the total amount of relocations (12) within the time period of 40 years.

\textsuperscript{100} Alleman 2010:66.
\textsuperscript{101} Čal’mne Varre, Krasnoščel’е, Kanevka, Čudz’javv’r.
\textsuperscript{102} Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2008:81.
Table 3: The Kola Sámi forced relocations from 1931 – 1969.\textsuperscript{103}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>The reason of relocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1934</td>
<td>Lumbovka/winter settlement</td>
<td>Lumbovka/ summer settlement</td>
<td>Relocation/collectivization policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1950</td>
<td>Lumbovka/ elimination</td>
<td>Jokanga</td>
<td>Relocation/collectivization policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1938</td>
<td>Jokanga (Sámi. Jovvkuj)/winter settlement</td>
<td>Jokanga (Sámi. Jovvkuj)/summer settlement</td>
<td>Relocation/collectivization policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 1963</td>
<td>Jokanga (Sámi. Jovvkuj)</td>
<td>Kanevka, Sosnovka, Gremiha, Lovozero</td>
<td>Relocation/amalgamation policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 1933</td>
<td>Motovskij/ elimination</td>
<td>Titovka, Zapadnaja Lica</td>
<td>Relocation/collectivization policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 1931-1934</td>
<td>Kamenskij/ elimination</td>
<td>Čal’mne Varre</td>
<td>Relocation/collectivization policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 1938</td>
<td>Babinskij/ elimination</td>
<td>Jona</td>
<td>Relocation/collectivization policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 1937-1938</td>
<td>Semioostrov’e(Sámi. Lejjavv’r)/winter settlement</td>
<td>Varzino (Sámi. Arsjogk)/summer settlement</td>
<td>Relocation/collectivization policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 1935</td>
<td>Kildin/ elimination</td>
<td>Čudz’javv’r</td>
<td>Industrial-induced (construction of railway)/collectivization policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 1959</td>
<td>Čudz’javv’r/elimination</td>
<td>Lovozero (Sámi. Lujavv’r)</td>
<td>Relocation/ amalgamation policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 1963</td>
<td>Voron’e (Sámi. Koardegk)/elimination</td>
<td>Lovozero(Sámi. Lujavv’r)</td>
<td>Industrial-induced/ administrative (construction of hydroelectric power station)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{103} This table was compiled for the current Master’s study. The table is based on the following sources: Kiselev 1987, ADMR 1995, ADMR 2012, RUSARC 2013 and my own collected fieldwork data.
As may be observed from the table, some of the inhabitants were relocated several times. Hereby Lumbovka winter settlement was closed in 1934 and residents were resettled to the summer settlement; after in 1950 they were relocated to Jokanga and then in 1963 they were moved to Lovozero. The same pattern implying two displacements in the second stage might be observed with the Kildin settlement. The main areas of the relocations were the Middle and the Eastern parts of the Kola Peninsula.\textsuperscript{104}

According to the policy decision the Sámis were relocated to Lovozero, however a half of the population from Jokanga settlement preferred to move to Gremiha on the Barents coast.\textsuperscript{105} All in all as the results of the second stage of relocations were officially closed: Čudźjavv’r, Koardegk, Arsjogk, Jovvkuj and Limbes. The table of relocations provides the manner and purpose of resettlement, namely two types: policy-initiated and industrial-induced. The purpose of these relocations is important to regard in the current study as it provides basic understanding of the resettlement nature. Both policy-initiated and development-induced relocations (discussed in next paragraph) are similarly result in the displacement of the population from their habitual and resource territories, but in principle bear different motivational ideas. The purpose and background is discussed more closely in the next paragraph and is relevant in order to trace the diversity of the studied processes.

### 3.4 The background of relocations

Two of the studied Sámi settlements, Varzino and Jokanga, were closed by decision of the Murmansk Regional Executive Committee on 02.02.1962 Protocol № 48\textsuperscript{106} and one settlement – Voron’e was eliminated due to the construction of hydroelectric power station. According to the Murmansk Regional Executive Committee decision on 02.02.1962 Protocol № 48 was abolished the Sámi district\textsuperscript{107} and indigenous village councils were transferred under the jurisdiction of Lovozero municipality.\textsuperscript{108} The population from Varzino was relocated to Lovozero, however approximately the half of

\textsuperscript{104} Kiselev 1987:43.
\textsuperscript{105} Allemann 2010:74, Informant I.
\textsuperscript{106} GAMO. F 285, Op.4 d. 41 № 200.
\textsuperscript{107} The center of the Sámi district was Jokanga settlement. Arsjogk was under the jurisdiction of the Sámi district, RUSARC 2013.
\textsuperscript{108} GAMO.F 285, Op.4 d. 41 № 200.
the population from Jokanga moved to Gremiha.\footnote{The closed military town on the coast of the Barents sea, located 20 km away from Jovvkuj. [rus.Gremiha, or Ostrovnaja].} The village Voron’e was resettled to Lovozero in 1963 together with the relocated Sámis from the other parts of peninsula.

The introduced resettlement policies prioritized the rapid growth of national economic forces. Thereafter the policy relocations are often justified as being carried out in the interests of indigenous peoples\footnote{Gutsol 2007:50.} due to their aim towards the general growth of economic development and profitability. The specifics of development-induced relocations at this time concerns the displacements connected with industrial development, for instance constructions of the hydropower dams. As Cernea, points out there are different backgrounds for various relocation measures, but involuntary relocations caused by development projects are the direct outcome of a planned political decision to take land away from its current users [...] such schemes reflect basic political choices concerning who should gain and suffer from development.\footnote{Guggenheim, Cernea 1993:4.} The justification of relocation was based on considerations of the benefit to larger population while it was believed that only a small minority of people will suffer.\footnote{Gray 1996:104.} Thus, DFDR [development-forced displacement and resettlement] is an intentional decision of authorities, which is considered to be a progressive action, reflected by a national ideology of development, and are thoroughly planned and suited to the national ideologies on how industrial development should be carried out.\footnote{Oliver-Smith 2009:4-5.} Therefore, reasoning of the economic policies imposed on the Kola Sámis is not fundamentally different from the general values and priorities of economic profitability in development projects worldwide.

Elspeth Young in his study of economic development in connection to aboriginals in Canada and Australia stresses that the mainstream development thinking is based on the common notion that modernization and industrialization are the way for indigenous minority societies to reach the economic level perceived as standard of wealth and material well-being for the society on a whole. Young highlights that these theories often refer to such values in regard to industrial programs as overall increase of income, labor wages and material growth while other priorities are perceived as primitive, backward and archaic.\footnote{Young 1995:4.}
The relocation of the two studied settlements Varzino and Jokanga were a result of these introduced economic policies. The situation of Voron’e occupies a peculiar position among the other settlements as the elimination of this village was implemented in connection with building the hydroelectric power station. The territory of the village and pasturing territories were flooded under water in 1964 by the authorities. Additionally, in contrast to the two previous settlements, situated on the Northeastern part of the Kola Peninsula, Voron’e was located in the Northwestern part of the Peninsula. The Eastern part is characterized by closed military areas with restricted entrance rules,\textsuperscript{115} which complicated the access of the Sámi people from these areas to natural resources after the relocations. The Western part in its turn traces the involvement of industrial practiced, which hindered the access of indigenous peoples to these territories after the relocations as they were submerged under water.

3.5 Conclusion

The relocations gradually started from the 1930’s -1940’s, with the implementation of collectivization programs. The process was quite heterogeneous in reference to all the Sámi groups of the Kola Peninsula. The smallest Sámi settlements were already closing in the 1930’s, while some of the bigger villages were rearranged decades later in the 1950’s -1970’s. The structure of relocations can be indicated with two waves or stages, aligned with the mentioned policies: the policy of collectivization in the 1930’s -1940’s and the 1950’s-1970’s policy of economic centralization and amalgamation of collective farms.

During the first stage of relocations the Sámi winter settlements were eliminated in attempt to make a shift from semi-sedentary to sedentary way of life. The first collective farms were established in the summer settlements, where the Sámi settled on a sedentary basis within their traditional resource territories. When the policy of amalgamation was carried out in the 1950’s-1970’s the Sámi were already accustomed to sedentary life in summer settlements. The policy presupposed liquidation of the small collective farms as well as the summer settlements they were located in, causing change in the settlements’ geographical distribution and displacement from traditional territories, influencing daily living conditions, cultural and language environment.

\textsuperscript{115}Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2008: 5.
4 The Kola Sámi and the implementation of relocation policies

The previous chapter touched upon the two policies which framed the relocation practices carried out on the Kola Sámi community. The current chapter will provide descriptions and analysis of the three case studies on the forced relocations of the Kola Sámis. The focus of analysis will be devoted to the three Sámi settlements mentioned in the first chapter of the thesis: Varzino, Jokanga and Voron’e. Varzino and Jokanga will be discussed in one paragraph due to their similar backgrounds within the relocation policy, and Voron’e will be regarded separately as it was eliminated due to development-induced activity. The main focus of this chapter will concentrate on displacement of these three settlements. Emphasis will be placed on experiences of the community members who have been involved in relocation practices directly or indirectly.

4.1 Relocations of the three studied Kola Sámi settlements

During my fieldwork I interviewed approximately three informants per one settlement or study area. Two informants from Varzino were born in its summer settlement in times of the collectivization policies. The third, and oldest informant was born in the winter settlement before the implementation of collectivization policy and displacement to the summer settlement. These informants represent the last generation of the Varzino community. The other members have already passed away.\textsuperscript{116} The two informants from Jokanga represent the last generation who have been directly involved in the relocation processes. I conducted interviews with three informants born in Voron’e. These interviews represent the most sensitive data I have gained in the course of the fieldwork, perhaps due to the peculiarity of the situation connected with restricted land access issue because the village was flooded in result of the hydropower construction. The village was flooded in 1964 according to administrative decision of the Murmansk Regional Executive Committee.

The situations of the relocations themselves were different from the point of view of the informants. Though most of the informants stated that relocation measures were highly unnecessary and undesirable, Informant A expressed a different opinion: \textit{can you imagine how hard is to be nomadic? It is a hard life to move around. Here you have electricity, you don’t have to bring water, and you have hot and cold water. It was}

\textsuperscript{116}Informant C, Informant B.
already becoming very hard to live the nomadic way at times. At the time the Informant E stated: the apartment is comfortable, but it was fun to live there, even though a lot of work. But I do feel that I felt good in there, because I do not mind bringing wood, you bring it or they will bring, and so on. It was somehow better. At home, you live as you want to live.

This also shows that the opinions of the Sámi people are different in the respect that some of them critically expressed both the advantages and disadvantages of resettlement, which contributed to understandings of inner and underlying processes described in the analytical part of the study. The overall attitude of my informants to the relocations from their traditional lands is negative due to the numerous stated losses and psychological traumas. The interviews and personal conversations with the informants in general provide three main aspects, which appeared to be sensitive from their perspective. These aspects are land access and traditional resources use; well-being, housing and employment; and language use and assimilation. These aspects will be more closely touched upon in the next chapter of the thesis. In this chapter I would like to focus on the investigation and description of practical implementation of the resettlement measures, directly addressing experiences of the participants of the situation.

4.1.1 The resettlement of Jokanga (1963) and Varzino (1968)

The winter settlement Jokanga was located 100 km from the settlement Kanevka on the north-eastern part of the Kola Peninsula. The summer settlement Jokanga was situated 10-12 km from the Arctic Ocean on the left side of the river Jokanga. In 1927 the population of the settlement enumerated 165 people. During World War II on the Jokanga territory a military border zone was established, where the military troops were based. The reindeer were still migrating over these territories and some of the reindeer herders had to move to Čal’mne Varre settlement, and later they were resettled to Krasnoščel’e:

---

117 Rus. Kamenskij pogost, Kamenka; in Sámi. Kintuš; settlement with the reindeer herding state farm “Olenevod”; note map 3 № 7.
118 Zolotarev 1927:23.
119 Čal’mne Varre, Rus. Ivanovka is derived from the Sámi “čál’m” - eyes, “várr” – forest hill (translation. the eyes of the hill); earlier from the hill, which the name of village comes from, hunters were observing the wild reindeer. The village is located on the right bank of the river Ponoj. The settlement was founded in 1917 by Komi-Izhemtsy. According to the population census in 1926 it was inhabited by 266 persons, in 1938 - 216 people (both Sámi and Komi-Izhemtsy). By the 1930 the collective farm “Red Tundra”was established. During 1931-1934 Kintuš sijjt [Kamenskij pogost] was closed and the part of the population was relocated to Čal’mne
A: Why did you move from Jokanga?
Informant H: [...] because there was a military border zone established, and then [Čal’mne Varre.; author’s note] was closer to ours ... Reindeer were migrating, and in the resolution passes were issued. And we were given a pass to move us [in Čal’mne Varre.; author’s note] and not detain us reindeer herders. They had a special book for recording who went. This was during the war [...] then from Čal’mne Varre we moved to Krasnoščel’e.

The relocation of Jokanga village was implemented by the Murmansk Regional Executive Committee121 as the result of the amalgamation policy mentioned in chapter three of the study. The population of the settlement was supposed to be relocated to the Lovozero district. Some of the smaller settlements and state farms, such as Lumbovka village, were relocated twice:

Informant I: According to the resolution, the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the RSFSR from the 26th of December 1962, the village councils and settlements have been transferred to the Lovozero district and Gremiha was transferred to jurisdiction of the Severomorsk city council. Jokanga stopped functioning as a settlement. There was still the local branch of the state farm, my mother still worked there, and in 1961 everybody was already gone. In 1950, in connection with the amalgamation of collective farms Lumbovskij village council stopped functioning and its farm was moved to Jokanga.

A: Where did everyone go from Lumbovka village?
Informant I: They moved to Jokanga, and then from Jokanga some moved to Gremiha, some to Lovozero, and some moved where they were able to. Those who left were not provided with the new apartments, most people were not provided with housing, and the majority found jobs in Gremiha. When there was possibility, they lived in the barracks, because there was no private housing.

---

120 Krasnoščel’e, village of the Lovozero district. The village was located on the left bank of the river Ponoi, to east of the river mouth El’jogk, 30 km from the village Čal’mne Varre. It was founded in 1921 by the Komi herders from Lovozero. According to the population census in 1926 the village enumerated 78 persons and in 1938 - 192 people (Komi Izhemtsy). In 1930 the reindeer herding farm was organized since 1934 - the farm “Krasnoščel’e”. (Geographical dictionary of the Kola Peninsula, 1939:49).

121 In 1920’s Jokanga was the center of several villages and the central administrative point of the Jokangskij Village Council of workers, peasants and deputies of the Red Army and fishermen of the Ponoi volost in the Murmansk province of the Arkhangelsk County. On the 13th of June, 1921 in connection with the formation of the province, Jokanga became the national village council of the Ponoi volost in the Murmansk province. On the 1st of June 1936 in accordance with the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the RSFSR the Ponoi district was renamed the Sámi district. The Sámi district was abolished in 1963 by the decision of the Murmansk Regional Executive Committee on 02.02.1962 Protocol № 48. The Jokangskij village council became a part of the Lovozero district. (GAMO.Fund285,Op.4 d. 41 № 200).
Thus, those who were involved in the reindeer herding moved to Kanevka and Sosnovka\textsuperscript{122} in the 1930’s; and during the World War II to Čal’mane Varre, after moving from Čal’mane Varre they were moved to Krasnoshčel’e:\textsuperscript{123}

A: Was there an opportunity not to move from Jokanga, but stay to there?
Informant I: In Jokanga... how they could stay there? There was nothing. The collective farm took all the reindeer and sent them over to the Lovozero district. Herders with their reindeer left to Kanevka, other herders left to Lovozero, they were working there, and in 1962 Jokanga no longer existed. There was no sense to stay, as there was no production and everything was closed, shops, hospitals, schools; everything was eliminated so people did not live there anymore.

The rest of the population who stayed in Jokanga after the World War II moved to Lovozero or Gremiha, which is located twenty kilometers to the east from Jokanga. Approximately half of the population preferred to stay in Gremiha:
Informant I: At the time of resettlement I was studying in the Altai region. Because of the relocation there were many people who had no place to live and we moved to Gremiha where there was the least resistance. Then began the recovery, when barracks were built and housing was provided where it was possible. It was bad with housing, so everybody lived everywhere. When Gremiha started to be built, as a naval military base in back in 1932, attention was mainly paid to the construction of a naval base with its military significance. The people started staying there too and lived in dugouts, barracks, and then started the construction of civil buildings. The building of brick houses there had already begun in the 50’s and the old houses were gradually demolished.

In Gremiha, the displaced population was provided with a whole block house of flats after several years, which was called by the people “the Lapp house”. The displaced Sámi people received flats in this building and the members of the village knew that this house was the home of displaced Sámis:
Informant I: Well afterwards we were provided housing. The government resolution allocated all families one house, and the house is still there on the Osvobozhdenija street: it has been standing for 8 or 10 years. It was also called “The Lapp house”. Today people still call it that: “Where do you live? – they say, - “In the Lapp house”. So it was in such a way that we were allocated the housing. We received a 2-bedroom apartment in this house, and my sister got a 1-bedroom apartment. So that’s how it started.

The involvement and participation of the local community in decision-making processes in this case can be defined as passive participation and participation in information giving. Chatty and Colchester mention that these types or participatory components were often used in western measurements in the 1970’s -1980’s and often presumed that the local populations receive information about the decision that is about to

\textsuperscript{122}Rus. Sosnovka. In Sámi. Sosnevke; settlement with reindeer herding state farm “Put’ olenja”; note map 3 № 6.
\textsuperscript{123}Informant C.
happen or has already happened, when the announcement was made by the local managers. At the time, the response of the population was not taken into account and people had no opportunity to influence proceedings.¹²⁴

Informant I: They did not ask people if we wanted or did not want to leave, they closed the village by administrative decision and that was it, everyone had to move. So everybody left using reindeer, these people moved to Kanevka, others to Sosnovka, some to Lovozero. Everywhere they could move, they left to the places where they had relatives. No one asked the people, they went everywhere they could. There was a resolution of the government, so it should be executed. [...] Everything was liquidated there or sold, and a part of the farm household was passed to Gremiha. There [in Gremiha] cows were kept to produce milk for the kindergartens, and other cattle were harvested, so people left. Herders left immediately, they had nothing to be occupied with. No work, no farm. Without salaries, without anything, how would people survive?

The Sámi village Varzino was located on the coast of the Barents Sea near the mouth of the river Varzino. The residents of its winter settlement Semiostrov’e were resettled to the summer settlement Varzino, where the Semiostrovskij village council was established in 1942. In 1938 the total Sámi population of the village was recorded as 90 people. I have carried out interviews with the oldest natives from Varzino village and managed to receive data about the first wave of relocations on resettlement of the winter settlement to summer settlement in 1937-1938:

Informant C: We, Varzino Sámis, had two places where we spent more time. From the summer village we moved to the autumn place. What did we do- we were fishing in the lake, we did not pick mushrooms, but the blackberry we picked... sometime in August, September, October we began to move to the winter village. [...] But it was also a permanent residence place, it was not just temporary, so as everybody had these two homes... - was it bad the way we lived? But the winter village Semiostrov’e existed until around 1937.

A: Why it was closed? Why were people moved to the summer settlement?
Informant C: Well, how were we to manage the farm? Some of the people are here, some of the people are there. The way of life, which was normal for the Sámi, the life we were used to, to move with the reindeer, the Soviet government was not satisfied with... We lived here a bit, then lived there a bit... How were they to arrange the control? Maybe a person is gone to nowhere? Maybe he is in Semiostrov’e, maybe somewhere else. And when a collective farm was established, the Soviet system had already been established and, therefore, the farm chairman, secretary, was staff organized. And what formed was a basis for comprehensive farming - herding, fishing, cattle, and the conditions were created. Elementary schools would be there, medical points, and local authorities. [...] The collective farm worked until 1968.

Later, when all the people were relocated to the summer settlement on a permanent basis the collective farm “Bol’ševik” was established. This state farm dealt with fishing and reindeer herding activities for over 30 years. In connection with the

¹²⁴Chatty, Colchester 2002:11.
policy of amalgamation of the collective farms the settlement was eliminated in 1968. The decision of the Murmansk Regional Executive Committee on 31.01.1969 states the following background: In accordance with the amalgamation of the collective farms “Tundra” and “Bol’shevik”, resettlement of the members of the farm from the village Varzino to the village Lovozero, the decision of the Murmansk Regional Executive Committee on 31.01.1969 abolishes Varzinskij Village Council and all the settlements of the district are conformed to Lovozero District Executive Committee.125

In regard to participation of the Sámi from Varzino and the involvement of local community members in decision-making process, it resembles the previously mentioned situation regarding the elimination of the Jokanga settlement. The administrative decision on the elimination of the settlement presupposed the closure of existing social services and institutions, and the collective farm, where most of the local population was employed. This process involved mainly passive participation of the local community; the decision was made and announced to the population without reference to the response from them. In order to find new jobs, the population had to move at the time the houses were left in the village. The people with the small belongings were transported to Murmansk by ship and then by train to Lovozero, where they were supposed to be provided with new housing:126

A: How people were moving? Did they leave voluntarily?
Informant B: Well, how would you define voluntarily? The policy of the amalgamation led to the Arsjogk Sámis being relocated to Lovozero. It was easier to close the village, where people were still busy with work. They were involved in reindeer herding work, fishing, were working with mowing the hay, some people worked in the barn. The school operated, a medical point operated, i.e life was normal. Today, I can give the example of my brother. My older brother, he worked all his life, began to work when he was 12 years old with boat fishing, then with herding in the collective farm, with reindeer, he was a herder. When the village Arsjogk was resettled, the houses and everything were left there. Everything was left in Arsjogk, and somehow they transported their luggage [to Lovozero; author’s note] on the reindeer in the winter and I can say that neither he nor my mother received a meter of housing. My mother was a pensioner, but she was also forced to move.

The following extract from Zav’jalov’s article “There are still Aboriginals left” shows the important connection of the Sámi people to their ancestors’ lands and the

125 In connection with the abolition of the Sámi district and the decision of Murmansk Regional Executive Committee on 02.02.1963 № 48, the responsibilities of the Varzinsky Village Council was transferred to the Lovozero district of the Murmansk region. (GAMO.Fund285.Op.4 № 31).
126 Informant A, C.
unwillingness of some people to move from their lands: but the Eliseevys\textsuperscript{127} do not want to move. They feel good there: calmly and peaceably. Our ancestors are buried here and we will lay down here.\textsuperscript{128} The local people of the relocated Sámi do visit their lands. For instance the people from Varzino area organize summer camps and long visits to the place of the former village, living in tents and staying at the territory of the village for several weeks. They take their children and grandchildren to pass down the old stories and place names, which helps the transmission of the traditional knowledge and memory to future generations.\textsuperscript{129}

### 4.1.2 The construction of the hydropower station in Voron’e \textsuperscript{130}(1963)

The background of this relocation measure is different from the two Sámi settlements of the study. The specifics of the situation are connected with displacement due to industrial development, particularly with the construction of the hydro-electro dam (GES). The relocation of Voron’e happened in 1963. Cernea highlights that industrial development in the 1970’s caused harm to many communities across the world; it is necessary to mention that projects involving involuntary displacement of populations, especially due to industrial activities are still acute topic nowadays. Cernea provides statistics which show that in 1990 from 1.2 up to 2.1 million people were forcibly relocated as the result of hydro-electric dam constructions worldwide.\textsuperscript{131} In 1994 the World Bank review places the number at 4 million involuntary displaced by development projects.\textsuperscript{132} Informant D was directly involved in the relocation, sharing memories of the relocation process and how the resettlement was organized:

\textsuperscript{127}Eliseevy (family name) in reference to the old Sámi couple, the last residents of the neighboring village to Arsjoqk (2 km). They refused to move from their village and stayed to live there after the village was eliminated. The article «There are still Aboriginals left » describes how the old couple was surviving without infrastructure in the area, while only the border post and two abandoned houses still existed.

\textsuperscript{128}Zav’jalov J., «There are still Aboriginals left». The article of local newspaper, editor details unknown;(copy of the article is provided from the private collection of informant; for the document copy note appendix 3).

\textsuperscript{129}Informant A, Informant B.

\textsuperscript{130}\textit{Voron’e, Sámi, Koardegk} was located on the right bank of the river Voron’e in the middle outflow, where the river Lun’ flows in, 60 km away from the village Lovozero. One of the oldest Sámi sjijts (‘pogost’). In 1608 the settlement enumerated 6 vezha and 17 people of male gender. In 1930 the reindeer farm “Volunteer” was established. In connection with the flooding of the area out of Serebrjanskoje water reservoir (hydropower station GES-1) the population moved to Lovozero (in 1963). The name Koardegk, Voron’e originates from the name of the river Koardejogk, which flows out of Lovozero into the Barents Sea bay. The length of the river is 155 km and the width is up to 350 m. As a result of the construction of the Serebrjanskoje hydropower stations water reservoirs were formed Serebrjanskoje GES-1 and GES-2 (the river sections of 0 - 107 km and 107 - 129 km were filled in 1970 and 1972). (Geographical Dictionary of the Murmansk region, Murmansk institute of regional education development and competence training of pedagogical staff, 1996, p. 30).

\textsuperscript{131}inGray 1996: 99.

\textsuperscript{132}ibid: 99, from The World Bank review (1994).
Informant D: That was in 1958, when we built our new house, and in the 60’s authorities began to come here [from Lovozero; author’s note]. All they said is that a hydroelectric station will be built here and that we will be moved; everything here will be closed. They gathered a meeting, and then do you know what they did? They acted as if we ourselves requested to come here [to Lovozero; author’s note]. [...] They said that people say that we wanted to come here, which was cunningly done. Because when people are relocated, they are supposed to receive compensation. And they didn’t give a penny to us; they brought a tractor and transferred us like sheep, brought us here and stuffed us in the old center. There were 10 families and they had nowhere to place us. And then everybody went around looking for housing, everybody who could. We, three families, lived together for four years. [...] eight people. We set up two beds and a table, and when everybody was at home, we slept on the floor.

A: What was there a flat or house in this center?
Informant D: What flat, what house? We were lucky we were not on the street.
A: How were you transported?
Informant D: They [employees of the local administration] arrived on tractors, told us to load our things and that was it. So we loaded [...] An order was given and they arrived, loaded us and that’s it. They took us, resettled us and did not ask us much. The shop was removed, everything was removed; there was nothing left for living. Where to go? [...] I wonder now how we managed to go then? With such a heavy load on the river and we didn’t fall through the ice [...] We were going in winter, with tractors along the river.

According to my collected data, resettlement was carried out very quickly and the local population received notification that they were to leave the village as soon as possible. The relocation process itself took about one month and participation of the local population can be described as passive, involving the people as the passive actors, receiving short notice about the implementation of the decision. In the case of Voron’e village Informant D has described how the announcements about building the hydroelectric power stations were made and how the meeting with local people took place. However, these practices were a merely public scheme, which did not account for response from community members, or the damage and material losses for the population:

Informant E: It was only possible to transport with reindeer and in summer only by boat against the flow; there were no roads for cars. They did give a notice that in time that the settlement would be flooded and people who had built new houses before the flooding of the village were paid for their debts sometime afterwards. We were not warned... “here you are - moving to Lovozero, that’s it, there is a house is under contract for you, right now you have to settle somewhere”. We were relocated very quickly. They said “the shop will be closed, the school will be closed, the hospital will close, people will leave. Then everybody will leave the village anyway.” So everybody left. Within a month everything was closed.

The other matter of special concern raised by informants was their connection to the old graveyard, which was located on the territory of the village. Before the drowning
of the village was implemented, the graveyard was cemented in order to avoid putrefaction, which was a very sensitive event for the local population. The graveyard is an important sacred place of connection with the ancestors and those interviewed viewed the act of its cementing, as well as the drowning of their land, as a disruption of their access to their lands where their ancestors are buried. In order to visit the ancestors’ land the former population of Voron’e village has to obtain legal permission from the local administration:

Informant E: Who would allow going there? We ask for permission to visit the cemetery. Permission is required to go to the burial ground, and without it we are not allowed. I do not know why. We visit the cemetery even in groups. We receive permission and go there. A lot of our people are buried there, and then it was flooded away. And on the hill there is a monument now, even with all the names, but to go there we must still ask permission.

Though the territory has restricted access, people still travel there in order to keep the memory of their parents and grandparents alive; usually they organize in groups and obtain collective permission. The pictures below demonstrate the village before the resettlement and the local population, erasing the memorial store on the place of the drowned village. Unlike the Varzino settlement, where the land is still accessible to the relocated population, which is a factor for continuation of the cultural transmission, visiting the lands of Voron’e village caused stressful reactions among the community, leading to strong emotional dissonance especially in those who travelled there right after the relocation period:

Informant E: Why would you go there again? It is flooded, houses are gone, there's nothing. It is all blown up by water. All the houses are turned upside down, the cemetery is flooded, it's horrible. When I went there, I turned back half-way, because I felt like I was having a heart attack, so they turned me back. It was the first time I went there, because I lived there and worked there and so on, and now there are only trees, trees. [...] It looks terrible, it was scary at first, rotten trees, rotten planks, everything is floating all over the place, here and there you see a floating window, or doors. This is a real nightmare.

4.2 The Sámi relocated to Lovozero

The first written evidence of the Sámi village Lovozero\textsuperscript{133} appeared in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century. In terms of the population, numbers in Lovozero were regarded as an average Sámi settlement, which was located in the middle of the Peninsula. It did not play major economic role until the 19\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{134} Lovozero was an original Sámi settlement

\textsuperscript{133}in Sámi. Lujavv’r sijjt; in Russian.Lovozerskij pogost.
\textsuperscript{134}Gutsol 2007:49.
(located on the banks of river Virma) until the arrival of Komi population, who settled on the river Virma in the late 1880’s.\textsuperscript{135} The arrival of the Komi Izhemtsy with their reindeer flocks influenced the economy of the settlement towards the market relations.\textsuperscript{136} Lovozero became one of the biggest settlements in relation to population numbers, but it was no longer monocultural. By the 1930’s the population size of the Komi Izhemtsy was twice as high\textsuperscript{137} as the Sámi population and the state farm in Lovozero became one of the biggest reindeer herding farms. The relocations of the other Sámi groups to Lovozero were ultimately connected with Lovozero being a central settlement in regards to its reindeer resources and increased population numbers in reindeer herding communities.

The first group relocated to Lovozero was the Sámi from Čudz’javv’r (1959), Voron’e (1963) and lastly the Sámi from Varzino (1968 – 1969) were resettled there. All of these Sámi groups were supposed to be placed in one settlement. Table 2 shows the numbers of relocated Sámis from Čudz’javv’r, Voron’e and Varzino. I did not manage to find the statistics on how many Sámis moved from Jokanga, as they mostly settled in Kanevka, Sosnovka,\textsuperscript{138} Gremiha and a smaller portion moved to Lovozero because the village was already occupied by large numbers of Komi Izhemtsy and the local Sámi people.\textsuperscript{139}

\textbf{Table 4:} Table of relocated Sámi groups to Lovozero.\textsuperscript{140}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>At the time of resettlement in 1950-1970</th>
<th>Resided in Lovozero in 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Čudz’javv’r</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voron’e</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varzino</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the statistical data at the time of the relocations, the total local Sámi population in Lovozero was 435 people. Later in the 1960’s-1970s, 450 people were relocated from three settlements Čudz’javv’r, Voron’e and Varzino, which at that

\textsuperscript{135}Konstantinov 2005:174.
\textsuperscript{136}Gutsol 2007:49.
\textsuperscript{138}The official website of Lovozero Municipality, description of the contemporary settlements [online].- URL: http://mun.gov-murman.ru/local/gorlovozero.shtml, 04.10.2012.
\textsuperscript{139}Informant I.
\textsuperscript{140}Gutsol 2007: 49-50.
time was 27% of the total Sámi population in the Murmansk region. The following table shows the population of relocated Sámi from Čudżjavv’r, Voron’e and Varzino to Lovozero. An overall decline in the population of relocated Sámi people through the years is noticeable in the table. The relocated population decreased by two thirds by the year 2003. As Gutsol points out, the decline in population numbers can be explained by several factors. First, a number of resettled people left Lovozero after they were relocated. These were mostly persons of the working age, moving to the other places in search of jobs. Secondly, these numbers can be explained by the high mortality rates of the Sámi population after the relocations (discussed in the paragraph 5.4). Gutsol mentions that there are no exact statistics on how many people refused not move to Lovozero as a result of the relocations, but settled in other settlements of the Kola Peninsula, e.g. Teriberka, Krasnoščel’e, Kanevka, Sosnovka. Therefore these statistics do not include the entire relocated Sámi population and refers only to the relocated Sámis to Lovozero.

Lovozero is nowadays the central Sámi settlement in Russia and the place where the majority of the Sámi people still live today. Nowadays, the total amount of the Sámi population in the Murmansk region is 1599, which shows an overall decline since 2002, when the Sámi population was estimated at 1991 people. According to lists of two local Sámi organizations OOSMO (Public Organization of the Sámi in Murmansk Region) and AKS (Kola Sámi Association) the numbers of Sámi living in Lovozero was estimated at 870 people in 2007, or approximately half of the Sámi population on the Kola Peninsula. These numbers of the Sámis in Lovozero refer to the members of local organizations and do not include children and other members of the Sami community who are not the members of the Public Organization of the Sámi in Murmansk Region or the Kola Sámi Association; therefore the overall population numbers are presumably larger than stated in these lists.
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141 ibid: 62.
142 RNC 2010.
143 RNC 2002.
4.3 Conclusion

The current chapter provides a historiographical analysis of the relocation policies on the Kola Sámi people and its practical implementation provided by the three studied settlements. The implementation of relocation policies was regarded with account to the oral sources and opinions of the community members. The focus is on implementation of the policy of amalgamation of collective farms in the 1960’s -1970’s due to the availability of the data on this period.

When the amalgamation of collective farms was introduced, the Sámi settlements were eliminated. It presupposed that by closing all institutions of the social sector, which were built in these settlements during the time of collectivization policy, such as schools, shops and medical points that people were supposed to move elsewhere. The regional government decided on the location of the resettlement – Lovozero municipality. The involvement of community members in the relocation processes was passive, mainly carried out by information giving, in all of the three studied settlements. Relocated people received notifications on decisions by the authorities about the closure of their settlements without the opportunity to influence the decision-making process. The introduction of this policy refers to the final resettlement of the Sámi people from the whole Kola Peninsula to Lovozero and the displacement of the Kola Sámi local groups from their traditional settlements.
5 Brief analysis of the displacement consequences

In the current chapter three central issues were regarded, coming out of the literature analysis and fieldwork considerations in reference to the impact of relocations on contemporary developments in the Kola Sámi community. First of all, relocations predetermined restricted access of the Sámi people to their traditional lands for many years, influencing the practice of traditional activities, for instance reindeer herding and fishing in these areas. Secondly, I was concerned with the social impacts of the relocations with a special emphasis on the multicultural society and the ability of the community to adapt to rapidly changing conditions. Finally, I focused on the influence of the forced relocations on general aspects of community well-being, such as housing and employment.

5.1 Traditional activities and loss of access to indigenous resource areas

In this work I do not touch largely upon the changes which occurred in reindeer herding since arrival of the Komi population and up until the introduction of the state farms to the Kola Peninsula (see Konstantonov 2005). I mainly concentrate on the situation with reindeer herding and fishing after the first relocations, basing my assumptions on both oral and written sources.

The result of the policy of collectivization in the 1930’s -1940’s, when the Sámi were accustomed to the sedentary lifestyle\(^{144}\) with the establishment of the collective farms, led to all private reindeer being taken as property of the farms, with reindeer herders working as employees, jointly in the group of reindeer herding workers ‘brigade’. The Sámi men predominantly were involved in both the reindeer herding and fishing activities in brigades. The analyzed data shows that up to the 1930’s fishing and reindeer herding was practiced in the state farms by most of the Sámi men, while some of the women stayed home or followed the brigade as employees to assist with cooking and household chores in the tundra. Owning private reindeers\(^{145}\) was still allowed though private animals were herded together with reindeer of collective farms.

During the relocation process, the flocks from all eliminated farms were transferred to the cooperative farm “Tundra” in Lovozero and came under the control

\(^{144}\) Reindeer herding on the one hand is closely connected with the policy of relocations, but on the other hand has undergone first changes with the involvement of the policy in the early 1930s, which aimed at accustoming nomadic peoples of the North to a sedentary way of life. Thus, explaining the consequences of the relocation policies requires deeper analyses and broader investigation.

\(^{145}\) Allemann 2010:66.
and administration of Lovozero municipality. Several of my informants stated that employment positions at the “Tundra” were already occupied by the local reindeer herders from Lovozero, and that the reindeer herders from relocated settlements were no longer involved in reindeer herding and their private reindeer were herded by employees of the farm in Lovozero. The employees at “Tundra” were trying to preserve their ownership of private reindeer, but the meat was supposed to be delivered to the state for production, and were harvested first of all other reindeer from the other flocks. Therefore, in the process of transferring the reindeer from the other settlements and farms many people lost their private reindeer. The private reindeer of those who did not work in brigades gradually vanished, and nowadays reindeer herding is run by cooperative “Tundra” and most of the reindeer owners are workers of this enterprise.\footnote{Informant E.} Though there are reindeer which belong to a number of private persons still herding, the cooperative “Tundra” is oriented on production of consumer’s products and export. Thus, a very limited amount of people work in reindeer herding in comparison to the 1930’s -1970’s. The working places in “Tundra” are limited and consequently most of the people work at the steady jobs rather than in reindeer herding. Consequently, quite a small number of people have personal reindeer nowadays, apart from those who are involved in Sámi clan communities (obšiny) and cooperative farms.\footnote{Informant H.}

Fishing as well as herding was carried out in the brigades; however people could still fish for their own purposes. Thus, it was also possible to do private fishing.\footnote{Informant C.} After the relocations, as my informants revealed, fishing was strictly regulated by licensing and the Sámi populations relocated from the areas with access to salmon rivers who used to build their livelihoods on salmon fishing lost their opportunities to continue working with the salmon and had to restructure their livelihoods from river fishing to lake fishing.\footnote{Mainly one lake was accessible for the fishing purposes, lake Lujav’r (in Sámi).} After the relocations it was still possible to continue lake fishing;\footnote{e.g. cooperative farms “Tundra” in Lovozero and “Olenevod” in Krasnoščel’e.} after 1990 strong regulations on licensing were introduced and the local indigenous population felt it was extremely complicated to fit into the requirements of the license, where the size of the fish was evaluated in centimeters of length and height. The fishing patrol was introduced on the lake territory, which checked the lengths of the caught fish with a centimeter ruler. The mismatch of the parameters of the fish in several
centimeters could lead to fine penalty along with the confiscation of fishing tackles or other property, which patrols could consider as illegal.\textsuperscript{151} Therefore, fishing brought more material losses for the population than profit.\textsuperscript{152} However, it was possible to carry out fishing activity if the catch complied with the requirements of the attained license. The younger population is more involved in fishing than the older population as the older population still seems to be unaccustomed to the mentioned requirements.

Far more serious than the introduction of various paper requirements was the long-term leases of salmon rives for private entrepreneurs, which cut off the possibility of the local population to fish on these rivers. A number of salmon rivers in the indigenous traditional territories were rented for the purposes of recreational fishing on the basis of long-term leases for private actors with the sole rights to use river resources. The usage of these rivers was also strongly regulated by the Lovozero administration, which had the sole right to decide which persons attained licenses to fish in salmon rivers. Thus, the rivers Varzino and Sidorovka near the study area Varzino were leased to the sport fishing company. The extract below is taken from the text of an administrative decision on the leasing and regulation of access to these rivers:\textsuperscript{153}

\textit{The resolution of the Murmansk regional administration on 03.04.95 № 113, Murmansk: 1. To grant the right to the administration of the Lovozero district to transfer to individual use the rivers Varzino and Sidorovka on the basis of contract agreement for the winner of tenders – the private joint stock company “Vast nature” (Mr Pettersson) for a period of 5 years for the organization of recreational fishing [...] 3. To encourage the “Murmanryvod” (Mr Z.) to ensure proper control over the use of living aquatic resources in the rivers mentioned [...] , and to exclude cases of fishing licensing without the consent of the administration of the Lovozero district.}

Michael Robinson points out that indigenous subsistence with its reliance on fishing and gathering presupposes accessibility to the territories. There are 65 salmon rivers within the traditional Sámi territories of which the Sámi had a license to fish only in one of these rivers in the year 1995 because many rivers were leased to foreign companies. The largest salmon river Ponoj was leased to American-Finnish company “G. Loomis Outdoors Adventure”. The price of one week fishing travel was approximately 5,700 dollars;\textsuperscript{154} at the time the local population did not have access to
the river, which they previously used for subsistence. Michael Robinson provides the quotes from promotional video of the company:  
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I think [the Ponoj] is a paradise for fishing…it is full of salmon. I have never seen so many salmon in my life.

The Ponoj river is exclusively at our disposal, the Ponoj River being about 300 miles long, allows us to spread the beats so far apart that we measure our beats in miles. You can fish all day, never duplicate water throughout your whole week’s stay, and never see another person on the river.

No one else from the outside world is allowed to fish our river’s beat except our guests. Unlike some Kola rivers, locals are not allowed to fish the Ponoj. Standing out as the best of all Kola rivers, the Ponoj presents a remarkable combination of attractive size and amazing numbers [of salmon].

The relocations created additional challenges in accessibility for the relocated population to use resources in their traditional territories. First, they were relocated far away from their traditional places and they needed additional transportation to visit their lands; for instance Varzino and Jokanga, which could be reached only by ship. While people were living on the territories they could practice their traditional activities in these territories without additional need for transportation. They had boats and all necessary equipment in the villages and could utilize the rivers on a daily basis. After the relocations, people face additional challenges in taking long trips by ship and in the problem of lacking big fishing equipment such as boats. It is impossible to leave boats in these places, as in the case of the former village Varzino, there are no houses left and people usually live in tents when they are there. Furthermore, it is unrealistic to transport large equipment like boats with them when they traveled there.

Another serious challenge was caused by the involvement of third parties to use these resource areas, namely private companies. As stated by several of my informants, the leased rivers had guard patrols, which made sure that no one except personnel and customers of the company could enter the river territory, including the local population. The situation with fishing companies was especially relevant in the 1990’s. Thus, the relocated people around forty years after the relocations started to exercise their rights for fishing, while at the time reindeer herding is still a matter of concern for many Sámis. The cooperative farms “Tundra” and “Olenevod” are the two organizations dealing with reindeer herding on the Kola Peninsula today. Most private reindeer are owned by the workers of these cooperative farms, as has been mentioned earlier in the

paragraph, and many of the relocated Sámi lost their private reindeer as the result of relocations.

Nowadays the rights of the Sámi people to traditional land use and traditional activities are applicable and can be fulfilled only on the territories, which are recognized legislatively as territories of traditional residence and economic activities of the small indigenous people. This status recognizes the territory as Sámi traditional areas, thus providing the Sámi living in these areas special rights to the use of resources. The three areas studied in this thesis are not recognized as traditional resource areas and the displaced populations are not entailed with specific rights to resource use in these territories.

5.2 Transition of the Sámi from majority to minority

The eliminations of the Sámi villages and establishment of new settlements during the 1920’s -1930’s considerably influenced migration and ethnic proportions in the settlements. The elimination was oriented on joining the small collective farms into bigger ones, for these purposes people from the former villages were relocated to the newly-established settlements to work in new joint collective farms, but still most of the Sámis remained in their summer settlements. Čal’mne Varre and Krasnoščel’e were founded by the Komi Izhemtsy who migrated to the Kola Peninsula at the end of the 19th century. After moving to these settlements the Sámi population became an ethnic minority. This situation caused changes in shifting the majority Sámi settlement patterns to a multicultural environment.

D.A. Zolotarev, in the outcome of his expedition to the Kola settlements mentions that the introduction of such a powerful neighbor as Ivanovka is undoubtedly a threat to the existence of Kamenskij pogost, the further settling and quantitative growth of the Komi Izhemtsy with their reindeer is a threat to the welfare of the Lapps at all. Kamenskij Lapps have to think through the new conditions of their existence. They were cut off from Ponoj and joined with Lovozero and were therefore deprived of the right to participate in the salmon fishing on the river Ponoj.

Ethnic changes took place with the start of the elimination of the Sámi winter settlements and establishment of the kolhoz system as well as Soviet industrialization.
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158 Zolotarev 1927:22.
programs introduced on the Peninsula in the 1920’s. During the run of industrial programs cities such as Murmansk, Kirovsk, Mončegorsk, were built and became administrative centers of the region, the centers for mining, ironworks and military bases. The 1920’s was the period of high migration of the Ukrainian, Russian, Belorussian and other ethnic populations to the Peninsula as workers. Thus, in 1920, the total population of the Kola Peninsula was estimated at 14,000 people and in 1940 its population increased up to 318,000. The Sámi became a small minority at the time the total population of the Kola Peninsula consisted of 130,000 Russians, 2,100 Finns, 1,900 Sámi, 800 Komi and 15,000 other ethnicities. Nowadays as a consequence of labor migration from the 1940’s -1960’s about 100 ethnic groups inhabit the Kola Peninsula and the Sámi live as a small indigenous minority in the Lovozero district.

As might be noticed from map 2 in the late 1930’s there appears the differentiation of the settlements according to the principle of ethnic proportions, where the Sámi residents represent the minority. Most of my informants from the three studied Sámi villages pointed out that the settlements they were living in were ethnically dominant by Sámi residents, who used Sámi languages on a daily basis. The studied Sámi settlements had a majority Sámi population with the prevailing use of the Ter Sámí in Jokanga, Kildin Sámí in Varzino and Voron’e. The Russian or Russian speaking residents were mostly a few up comers working in medical points, local shops and schools. Most of the Sámi settlements enumerated up to 3 non-Sámi persons, such as teachers, shop assistants and medical assistants and a couple of Russian families, which normally could understand Sámi languages. The workers in the shop often used the Sámi language while communicating with the customers, at the time the teachers, medical workers and representatives of the local authority or state farm used Russian language.

After the relocations to Lovozero and Gremiha, Russian language became the main language of daily communication with majority population (Russian and other non-Sámi people), living in these settlements. Many Sámi people were no longer using their native Sámi languages as the main language of daily communication. One reason for that was discrimination, resulting in socio-psychological barriers of community
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161 Wheelersburg, Gutsol 2008:82.
162 Scheller 2013.
163 See the marking of ethnic differentiation of the settlements in the map 3; chapter 2.
164 Informant D, Informant I.
members in their use of the Sámi language in public places or when talking to their children. At the time, harsh assimilative policies pressed on the Sámi pupils in boarding schools and educational institutions (e.g. in Lovozero) resulted in many of them growing up Russian-speaking.\textsuperscript{165}

Thereby, in 1996 the Kola Sámi languages were included in the first edition of UNESCO Red Book of Endangered Languages as being considered under great threat of extinction. In the latest edition - UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger (2010) - the Kola Sámi languages are listed in the categories of severely endangered and extinct languages, e.g. \textit{nearly extinct} (Skolt Sámi), \textit{extinct language} (Akkala Sámi), \textit{critically endangered} (Ter Sámi), \textit{severely endangered language} (Kildin Sámi).\textsuperscript{166} It is also mentioned that the speakers of all these languages are being relocated from their language areas to Lovozero (see in 1-4, footnote 165), what directly impacted the drastically poor language situation of the Kola Sámis today.\textsuperscript{167}

Therefore, the final closing of the Sámi settlements and relocations to Lovozero influenced the transition from the Sámi majority settlement patterns to a multicultural environment, causing negative consequences for the Kola Sámi community, such as community’s marginalization, loss of a stable social and language environment, and disruption of continuous use of the Sámi languages. The prior structure of the Sámi society as it was in \textit{sijt} changed radically. The Sámi, living as a marginalized minority in the multicultural settlements, had to rapidly adapt their daily culture, occupations and living conditions to a new social environment.

\textsuperscript{165}Informant L.
\textsuperscript{166}1. Kildin Sámi was earlier spoken in many locations in the eastern parts of Kola County and the western parts of Lovozero County in central Murmansk Province, from which native speakers were concentrated (relocated; my own notes) to the county center Lovozero. Number of speakers – 787. According to the 2002 census the number includes a very small number of Skolt Saami and Ter Saami speakers (who shifted from use of Skolt and Ter Sámi to Kildin Sámi; my own notes). As cited in UAWLD 2010. Language code ISO 639-3 code (sjd).
2. Skolt Sámi is spoken today in Sevettijärvi region in Inari County in Lapland Province, Finland, mainly by people evacuated from former Finnish territory of Petsamo, now Pechenga County in Murmansk Province, the Russian Federation. The language was earlier spoken in the western parts of Kola County in western Murmansk Province, from where the speakers were translocated to Lovozero, the center of Lovozero County. It was also formerly spoken easternmost Finnmark Province of Norway, but nowadays is extinct in Norway. As cited in UAWLD 2010. Language code ISO 639-3 code (sms).
3. Akkala Sámi language was earlier spoken in the village of Babino in southern Murmansk Province, from which the speakers were translocated to Lovozero, the center of Lovozero County. The language was extinct in 2003. As cited in UAWLD 2010. Language code ISO 639-3 code (sia).
4. Ter Sámi was spoken in the eastern parts of Lovozero County in Murmansk Province, from where the speakers were translocated to Lovozero. The estimation of the number of speakers is based on recent reports indicating 6 or 11 remaining speakers. As cited in the UNESCO Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger, 2010. Language code ISO 639-3 code (sjt).
\textsuperscript{167}Sergejeva, 2002: 107.
5.3 Psycho-socio-cultural (PSC) aspects and adaptation of the community

The anthropologist Gray highlights that involuntary relocation causes countless problems for local communities. Economies are destroyed and production activities disrupted, giving rise to impoverishment, while social and cultural disintegration along with psychological stress leads to sickness and even death.\textsuperscript{168} He argues that many displacement projects focus on restoring the economic base or providing compensation of material losses, while the psycho-socio-cultural realm of the displacees is often neglected. The main aspect, which I would like to address further in the paragraph concerns the mentioned above aspects, which appeared to be obvious in my study during direct communication with informants and from research works used. I addressed the topic of psycho-socio-cultural (PSC) impoverishment inflicted by involuntary displacement\textsuperscript{169} to investigate and discuss not only material losses, which the community has experienced. I was interested to look at how the disruption of space and temporal organization of the pre-location culture influenced ability of the community members to work out new adaptive patterns to the changed cultural and economic conditions. Special attention was paid to how relocations influenced psychological and health state of displaced Sámi people.

The research of Kozlov provides quantitative analyses of mortality rates among the Sámi population in the period right after relocations from the years 1958-2002. The period of 1958-1968 corresponds to the time when the relocations were implemented and the next two decades represent the time when community was adapting to the changes in the region and post-displacement conditions in Lovozero. As Kozlov points out, the death rates among Sámis were higher than the death rates of Russian population, but the death rates of newborn Sámi children are lower when compared to the same rates of Russian children. In his study Kozlov points out that the high mortality rates of the Kola Sámi people due to external reasons (not natural death from age or disease) were especially high and were increasing to 50% in the 1970’s and the 1980’s. Kozlov mentions the two main triggers to the high mortality rates were the rise of destructive behaviors, such as alcohol and substance abuse, and negative psychological feelings prevailing among the Sámi adults of working age.

As Kozlov mentions, the word ‘negative’ is too soft to describe the situation of population when at a very high mortality rate HALF of all deaths are drowning,\textsuperscript{168} Gray 1996:99.\textsuperscript{169}Downing; Garcia-Downing 2009: 195.
poisoning, homicide and suicide.\textsuperscript{170} He argues that the reason for such statistics are caused by the inability of Sámi individuals to adapt to the new order of society. He underlines that maladjustment of community members was accompanied with feelings of hopelessness and indifference towards their lives and health. Besides, Kozlov mentions the poor emotional state towards their ethnic affiliation among younger Sámi generations in the 1980’s. He discusses ethnopsychological research conducted in value orientations among Sámi pupils of the boarding school in Lovozero, which noted their emotionally-negative attitudes to their own ethnicity.\textsuperscript{171}

**Table 5:** Mortality rates among the Sámi people of Kola Peninsula in 1958-2002.\textsuperscript{172}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mortality (total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general per year (approx.)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From external reasons (suicide, murder, accident) (%)</td>
<td>22,6</td>
<td>34,4</td>
<td>50,6</td>
<td>51,6</td>
<td>52,2</td>
<td>34,0</td>
<td>22,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In comparison with the Russian population (%)</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>13,7</td>
<td>14,6</td>
<td>15,1</td>
<td>14,6</td>
<td>10,7</td>
<td>14,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My informants told me that destructive behavior had predominantly affected male members of the community. The table above doesn’t present the gender division in numbers, but most of my informants stated that mostly men were affected by destructive behaviors. The relocation specifically affected men as they had always been involved in reindeer herding before the relocations and after the relocations those who had been involved in traditional activities lost their previous jobs. The cooperative farm in Lovozero had restricted number of working places mostly occupied by the local herders. Men who were previously involved in reindeer herding were left outside the traditional activity they were used to be engaged in. Many of them didn’t have a formal education and it was problematic to find a different kind of job than herding. The situation of the lack of housing was also a factor, which left many people in despair (lack of housing

\textsuperscript{170}Kozlov 2008: 80.  
\textsuperscript{171}ibid: 92.  
\textsuperscript{172}Kozlov 2008: 79.
and unemployment are discussed in the next paragraph). Some relocated people did not have place to live and simultaneously did not have a job. These factors triggered alcohol misuse and many people have passed away in result of accidents, homicide or suicide (also discussed in Jakovleva 2003: 39, Scheller 2013).

Informant F stressed that the lack of jobs and housing influenced the status of Sámi men to a greater extent than women. The Sámi men appeared to be of lower social status than Komi, Russians and others. In extreme situations Sámi women wanted to integrate into a new society as soon as possible and therefore preferred to marry Russians or Komi. It was common among the Kola Sámi to practice arranged marriages until almost the 1960’s. My informants told me that the men were used to marrying women from their villages and did not understand how to build relationships with women in a different manner. The poor economic situation was also a challenge for them to marry and make families, because men who were bringing food to families and building houses appeared to be without housing, jobs and education (education in its turn started to play bigger role in order to find new employment). The change of environment after displacement disrupted the marriage-patterns of the Sámi women.\textsuperscript{173}

The informants expressed true grief in this respect and stressed that the overall situation very much influenced the well-being of Sámi society on the whole. Ethnically mixed marriages increased cultural assimilation and disrupted the Sámi language transmission to children.

The anthropologists Atkinson and Duran Duran address the topics of Native American and aboriginal communities in Australia, which have undergone traumatic historical experiences in their histories, such as colonization, imposition of government policies and removal to reserves. They argue that the indigenous communities, which have experienced collective stressful events, can cause various negative problems among the members of such communities, such as self-destructive and antisocial behavioral problems, psychological morbidity, early mortality, homicide and suicide.\textsuperscript{174} Duran stresses that the negative effects of such traumatic events are transmitted from adults to younger generations, who often become victims of their parents’ despair, destructive, and self-abusive behaviors as in the case of the Kola Sámi.\textsuperscript{175}

According to my own observations, the trauma connected to relocations of the Kola Sámi groups from their traditional territories and the adaptation of the community

\textsuperscript{173}Informant F.
\textsuperscript{175}Scheller 2013.
afterwards (such as the boarding school system, integration into the multicultural society, and economic impoverishment) has similar consequences, which are mentioned by Duran and Atkinson. According to Halloran, indigenous people in Australia, Pacific, America, specifically Yupik, Eskimos, Navajos, Athabaskan Indians, and Hawaiian Natives, have all undergone negative consequences in the course of their histories, such as the loss of populations, lands, as well as personal and spiritual losses. Some also faced the same physical, social behavioral and psychological problems.\textsuperscript{176}

The forced relocations of indigenous peoples are common throughout the world and have similar consequences. In the case of the Kola Sámi it might be observed as an interconnection in various severe effects of relocations, which caused the decline of social well-being, leading to rise of destructive behaviors and high mortality, the emergence of cultural assimilation and poor language transmission. The final relocations to Lovozero caused a rough shift leaving a deep scar on the identity and cultural self-confidence of the Kola Sámi relocated people and their descendants. The Kola Sámi community was not able to integrate and adapt quickly to the rapidly and drastically changed environment.

\textbf{5.4 Well-being aspects: lack of housing and unemployment}

The anthropologists Downing and Garcia-Downing argue that the negative consequences of involuntary displacement extend far beyond the loss of land, subsistence, and loss of access to common resources (discussed in paragraph 5.1). In fact the involuntary relocations lead to displaced communities facing multidimensional risks, involving such negative factors as increased morbidity, landlessness, marginalization and social disarticulation (discussed in paragraph 5.2., 5.3), loss of physical and non-physical assets and sources, homelessness, food insecurity, loss of employment.\textsuperscript{177}

The previous paragraphs were focused on discussing consequences as landlessness and the loss of access to common resources, increased mortality, marginalization, and social disintegration. In this paragraph I will touch more upon the loss of employment and homelessness suffered by the Kola Sámi community in result of the forced relocations. My informants tell that that when the collectivization policy was over, though they were not already nomadic and lived in their summer settlements, they

\textsuperscript{176}Halloran 2004:7.
\textsuperscript{177}Downing and Garcia-Downing 2010:196-197; (see also McDowell 1996:33).
still lived on their resource territories and had everything needed for living in concern to social services, for instance in schools, shops, and medical points etc. The first step to relocating people was done by closing the social service points and announcing the closure of the village with the proposed option to move to Lovozero, where they were supposed to be provided with housing and jobs.\textsuperscript{178}

However, the quality of living changed after the relocations considerably as stated by most of my informants. In their traditional villages they were living in big family houses and after the relocation to Lovozero where they were provided with small flats for several families or old houses, where they were living for several years before they could receive a flat for one family. The system of the ‘housing queue’ - the system of waiting for the new housing to be provided, was introduced for the relocated people. While people were supposed to wait for the housing in a ‘queue’, they had to find a place to live on their own. In some cases they had to wait for more than five years before they receive own housing and many people passed away before their turn in queue. Therefore, some people were settling together with their relatives or family members in Lovozero or at those who have already received housing. It was common to live two to three families in a one bedroom flat. The people who were not lucky with relatives had to find the place on their own, and from my informants I heard stories, when certain people were living at their working places if they had job. One informant told me of an example of a relative who worked with horses at stalls and lived there.

The leader of the “The Kola Sámi Association” Jakovleva mentions that the Sámi people from different \textit{sijt} were coming to Lovozero and lived with several families in one apartment, while at the time the promises of the government to secure them with housing and jobs were left unfulfilled and forgotten.\textsuperscript{179} My informants from Varzino, Jokanga, and Voron’e also expressed that they had to abandon their houses and there was no opportunity to move their houses with them. The losses from abandonments of houses and assets were not covered financially and compensation was not issued. Many people didn’t receive housing on the new places and have to live everywhere they find a place. Because of the high death rates in this period many people died before they received housing.

The relocated herders had to find jobs outside their traditional activities; mostly they were offered seasonal work in haymaking which was time limited and

\textsuperscript{178} Informant B, Informant C, Informant D.  
\textsuperscript{179} Jakovleva 2003: 39.
consequently most of the people worked already in steady jobs rather than in reindeer herding. On the other hand, liquidation of small nation’s villages sufficiently affected traditional ways of life and cultures of indigenous people. First, fishermen, hunters and reindeer herders, who were working previously in liquidated collective farms and afterwards resettled from their lands, in many cases were not provided with stable occupations all year round and worked only on a seasonal basis. This also raised the problem of insufficient working places and unemployment among the resettled population. The research on the implementation of the same policy in the Russian Far East do not raise the issue of housing provisions for the new settlers, on the contrary, both researches Kolpakova and Odzial consider the question of ensuring the housing for indigenous people of the Far East at the time Sámi informants stress that a place to live was a problem for people relocated from several areas of the Kola Peninsula.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter is devoted to analysis of the main consequences on the Kola Sámi community after the implementation of the relocation policies. The chapter discusses a number of severe effects on social and economic life of the community after the second stage of the relocations in the 1960’s–1970’s. The consequences are discussed and presented in three aspects, which concern natural resources use and traditional activities, social impacts on the Kola Sámi culture, and community well-being after the relocations.

During the first stage of the relocations the Kola Sámi were still living in their traditional settlement areas and were able to use their resource territories daily. As a result of the second stage of the relocation and elimination of the traditional settlements, many relocated Sámis lost their continuous access to traditional resource areas and traditional activities in these areas. For instance, traditional salmon rivers of the relocated Sámi groups, e.g. Varzino and Jokanga, were quickly occupied by third parties, such as foreign sport fishing companies, which for many years prevented the local population from fishing in these rivers. Those who were involved in reindeer herding lost their jobs and reindeer due to the elimination of the collective farms and

180 Kolpakova 2006: 151-152.
181 Odzial 2008: 76, 153.
relocations. These consequences had negative impacts on the economic development of the Kola Sámi after the relocations.

The traditional Sámi settlements were still to a large degree isolated from other cultures in the 1930’s, than after the final eliminations of the Sámi settlements and relocations of the Sámi population to Lovozero. In Lovozero the Sámi people became a minority in a multicultural settlement instead of majority in their own traditional villages, both culturally and in terms of language use. The social environment in traditional villages was favorable for the cultural and language continuity. The unstable language environment in Lovozero and in other places has led to the very poor situation of the Sámi languages. The extinct Akkala and nearly extinct Skolt Sámi languages are by far the most dramatic examples of the severe impacts of the Soviet economic policies on the Sámi culture. The domination by Komi, Russians, and other non-Sámi populations in Lovozero put the Sámi people, previously a majority in their own settlements, on the unequal grounds of a relocated minority living in the post-displacement realm.
6 Conclusion

The following chapter focuses on final discussion and analysis of this Master’s study, based on presented fieldwork materials and theoretical approaches. The research questions and main assumptions of the study are discussed. The last paragraph provides my vision on possible perspectives of further research on the forced relocations of the Kola Sámi people and general reflections, which were not covered in detail in this Master’s thesis.

6.1 Background the forced relocations on the Kola Sámis

This study suggests approaching the forced relocations as a two-staged process leading to rearrangement of the pre-relocation settlement pattern—sijjt—and gradual displacement of the Kola Sámi people from the territories of their traditional inhabitance to one Sámi settlement - Lovozero. Thus, the structure and background of relocations in this thesis are indicated with two waves or stages, aligned with the implementation of the two discussed policies: the policy of collectivization (1930’s -1940’s) and the policy of economic centralization and amalgamation of collective farms (1950’s -1970’s). It is necessary to mention that the economic policies regarded in this study are ultimately not the only processes which predetermined the resettlement of the Sámi people in Russia and changes undergone by the Kola Sámi community from the 1930’s until the 1970’s. Militarization, rapid industrialization, and modernization of the Kola Peninsula played a central part in the described processes, pushing the Sámi people away from the North-Eastern and the North-Western parts of the Peninsula to the central inland. Some traditional settlements were eliminated for the reasons of industrialization, such as constructions of railways and hydropower stations, e.g. Voron’e village, or for the purposes of strategic military usage of territories and military bases, as in instance of Jokanga village.

In a quest to understanding impacts and consequences of these relocations, I focused on the changes which have been caused by the two presented stages of the above-mentioned processes. As was regarded in the course of the current thesis, before the relocations the Kola Sámi people practiced seasonal change of two residences in winter and summer settlements. However, during the first stage of relocations in the 1930’s-1940’s with elimination of winter settlements, the Sámi people were accustomed to a sedentary lifestyle in their summer settlements. The result of the first stage of
relocation on the traditional Sámi settlement pattern – *sijjt* - was disrupted. The Kola Sámi people were no longer moving with the reindeer from winter to summer settlements, but resided only in summer settlements, practicing traditional activities as employees at collective state farms. The second wave of the relocations in the 1960’s - 1970’s led to the summer settlements being closed and the people being relocated from the traditional territories of their historical inhabitance, resource use, and subsistence, what has caused the consequences discussed in this Master’s thesis.

### 6.2 The consequences of the forced relocations on the Kola Sámi community

After the final displacement of the Sámi people from their traditional settlements, many relocated reindeer herders were left outside their traditional activities, unable to have access to their resource territories and with a lack of possibilities for employment or other subsistence activities. These factors influenced the low social status of the community; at the time lack of housing and employment gave rise to economic impoverishment and poverty of the relocated groups. The crisis was triggered by marginalization and social disarticulation of the relocated Sámi communities. The feelings of hopelessness and despair of its members reflected in tendencies towards alcohol and substance abuse, leading to destructive impacts such as high mortality due to external reasons, e.g. as the result of accidents, homicides and suicides. These consequences in their turn predetermined negative attitudes of the non-Sámi majority towards the Kola Sámi community and low status of identity among Sámis themselves.

The Kola Sámi became a minority in a multicultural settlement instead of the majority in their own traditional villages. The environment in traditional villages was favorable for the cultural and language continuity because Sámi languages were used on a daily basis by majority Sámi residents of these villages. Therefore, relocations produced negative impacts not only in economic and social sense, but also impaired cultural and language transmission to the Sámi generations in the future.

The consequences of forced relocations can thus be approached as a multi-level issue, which have affected the Kola Sámi community in several important spheres of its development, from practicing traditional activities to the language situation, as well as at all the levels of its representations. The forced relocations first of all affected the relocated Sámi people on an individual basis, such as the community members experiencing the loss of housing and employment, and psychological stress caused by the disruption of the attachment to traditional lands. The resettlement produced impacts
on the situation of the Kola Sámi community in the general social sense, such as leading to economic impoverishment and poverty, high mortality among adults of the Sámi community, and marginalization. The Kola Sámi community suffered both losses of population due to the high mortality in the period after relocations and to the migration of the Sámi people to other regions, seeking better life conditions.

The topic of the forced relocations of the Sámi people can also be discussed on the national level as an example of one of the indigenous peoples’ of the Russian Federation, which have historically lost access to their traditional activities and territories as the results of introduced Soviet policies. In the Nordic perspective the forced relocations are an absolutely exclusive part of the history of the Kola Sámi people. Similar forced relocation policies have not been experienced by the other Sámi communities in Norway and Sweden. The situation partially touches the Skolt Sámi people and their relocations to Finland after the introduction of the Soviet state. Otherwise, the processes undergone by the Sámi community in Russia produce a separate perspective. In these new places the Kola Sámi people have had to change their day-to-day culture, occupations, and language, as well as work out new society-building patterns in order to adapt to the new living conditions. The situation the Kola Sámi community today has to be regarded and evaluated with the respect of the undergone processes. Therefore, in my view the history of the Kola Sámi people should be approached individually, rather than purely in reference to the Nordic Sámi perspective and position of the Sámi people in the Nordic countries.

If we look at the global and international scale, the situation of the Kola Sámi community will resemble many instances of the relocated indigenous communities in the Circumpolar North, particularly in Canada and Greenland (see BOREAS). The closing and relocation of their communities beginning in the 1920’s still arouses discussions on long-term consequences of the relocated indigenous peoples in both countries in an attempt to re-build their communities after the relocations. The main topics of these discussions have also been brought up in the current study, reflecting in particular the inclusion of local perspectives into decision-making processes, consequences of the economic policies, and the elaboration of the methods for making future relocations less traumatic and more easily overcome.

I conclude that the Kola Sámi community faced multiple risks as a result of the forced relocations which can be seen from several perspectives. The process shows its complexity and interconnection in many aspects of individual, social and political
representations. The forced relocation of the Kola Sámi people and its consequences should therefore be investigated more broadly in reference to national and international perspectives, which in their turn represents the exceptional situation of the Kola Sámi people’s experiences in the frame of the general Sámi and indigenous discourse.

6.3 Perspectives of research on the Kola Sámi

While working with the Master’s study I observed that the situation of the Kola Sámi is similar with other indigenous communities worldwide. I have addressed studies of post-traumatic community disorder in the native communities of Australia and America by J. Atkinson and Duran Duran, which propose solutions for the practical work on indigenous communities’ revival, guidance, and restoration of negative impacts of traumatic events imposed on indigenous communities. This perspective could be relevant to look at in the frame of the discussed issues on the Kola Sámi people. From my own observations, the Kola Sámi experienced a historically traumatic period, which was not accompanied by any support programs or practical models for the community revival or restoration of inflicted socio-economic damages. From my point of view the Kola Sámi community has undergone serious losses both in terms of economy and social integration and requires a more comprehensive investigation on the consequences of forced relocations. It may presuppose elaboration of models for mitigating the discussed negative impacts, which are still acute among the Sámi population of the Kola Peninsula today.

Moreover, the forced relocations and its impacts on the Kola Sámis have not yet been studied comprehensively. The consequences, discussed in this Master's thesis, show its complexity and multilevel structure, and require a more comprehensive investigation. The topic can also be observed from a larger international level and approached in the frame of general theories on resettlement and its consequences, e.g. Cernea, Gray, Oliver-Smith and others, which discuss various frameworks for mitigating social and economic impoverishment of displaced communities after forced relocations.

The period of relocations from the 1930’s until the 1970’s considered in this study is currently a topic of discussions and various assessments of different researchers. Therefore further research on the forced relocations of the Kola Sámi and its consequences today can contribute to analyzing new sources, generating new ideas, thoughts and opinions on the topic.
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### Appendix 1 Metadata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants</th>
<th>Year of birth</th>
<th>Original place of birth</th>
<th>Type of data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informant A</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Lejjavv’r (Arsjogk winter settlement)</td>
<td>Conversation (notes without recording)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant B</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Arsjogk</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant C</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Arsjogk</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant D</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Koardegk</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant E</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Koardegk</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant F</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Koardegk</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant H</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Jovvkuj</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant I</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Jovvkuj</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant J</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Lujavvr’</td>
<td>Conversation (notes without recording)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant K</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Lujavvr’</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant L</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Lujavvr’</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 Photos of the relocated settlements

The picture below illustrates the settlement of Gremiha, where the population from Jokanga settled after the introduction of the relocation policies in the 1960’s.

*Photo 1 Gremiha. The population from Jokanga was resettled to Gremiha, 1960 (private collection of one of my informants).*

The pictures below illustrate the traditional settlement of Varzino before the relocations and the place, where the former settlement was situated, after the relocations in 2001.

*Photo 2 The village Varzino, 1887 (private collection of one of my informants).*
Photo 3 The village Varzino before its elimination and relocations, 1964 (private collection of one of my informants).

Photo 4 The village Varzino, 1968 (private collection of one of my informants).
Photo 5 School and local administration building in Varzino, 1964 (private collection of one of my informants).

Photo 6 Graveyard in the village Varzino, 1960’s (private collection of one of my informants).
Photo 7 The reindeer herder of the collective farm “Bolshevik”, Varzino, 1960’s (private collection of one of my informants).

Photo 8 The reindeer herder of the collective farm “Bolshevik”, Varzino, 1960’s (private collection of one of my informants).
Photo 9 Varzino after the relocations, 2001 (private collection of one of my informants).

Photo 10 Varzino after the relocations, 2001 (private collection of one of my informants).
Photo 11 Varzino after the relocations, 2001 (private collection of one of my informants).

Photo 12 The group of community members from Varzino, visiting their lands after the relocations, 2001 (private collection of one of my informants).
Photo 13 My family and other community members, visiting Varzino after the relocations, 2001 (private collection of one of my informants).

Photo 14 Visiting Varzino in 2001 (on the photo: Anna Afanasyeva; private collection of one of my informants).
The pictures below illustrate Voron’e village in 1960’s before the relocation. The picture 6 shows the community members participating in erasing memorial monument on the land of former Voron’e in 2004.

*Photo 15 Voron’e before relocations, 1960’s (private collection of one of my informants).*

*Photo 16 Community members building a memorial to the village Voron’e, 2004 (private collection of one of my informants).*
Photo 17 The group of community members from Voron’e, building a memorial to the village, 2004 (private collection of one of my informants).
Appendix 3 Articles

Zav’jalov J. There are still Aboriginals left. The article of local newspaper, editor details unknown; (the copy of the article is taken from the private collection of one of my informants).