

Abstract: This chapter discusses the ways in which the Sámi and their host states were framed during the final phase of Lappological research (1923–1954). Was the state still the only source of legitimate historical knowledge in studies of the history of the Sámi during this period? Did the subject positions of the Sámi change? Selected works by Väinö Tanner, O. A. Johnsen, Gutorm Gjessing and Helmer Tegengren are organized in pre- and postwar cohorts and compared with one another. At the end of the time period studied, the dominant frame was still the state, both as a source of historical information and as the guiding agent framing Sámi history. The subject positions of the Sámi had changed only slightly. They remained in the position of the weakest non-state actor. The evolutionary and racial frames had almost vanished from the studies, and past state policies were coded as ‘unfortunate.’ These shifts were intended in the first instance to construct a more benign state, rather than empowering the Sámi; their emancipation into having a full voice in research was hindered by many residual pre-war discourses.

16

CHANGING STATES, CHANGING SÁMI?

Framing the state and the Sámi in studies of history in Finland and Norway 1923– 1954

Jukka Nyysönen

Introduction

The Second World War is usually perceived as a turn towards ‘democratic’ values in European and Nordic historiography. This was achieved by abandoning the most aggressive forms of social evolutionism that had demarcated and hierarchized cultures in neat series, favouring the historian’s own nation. Somewhat paradoxically, recent studies have indicated that in the years following the Second World War, the role of the nation-state in historical inquiry in the Nordic countries was, in fact, strengthened (Eichle 2002; Heine et al. 2012; Jussela and Markkola 2012; Sorrius 2012). What about studies of Sámi history; did any change take place there?

History as a scholarly discipline has political roots, aims, uses and consequences and therefore serves an political identity function in national discourses. This awareness of social and ideological ties has not been abandoned in the post-narrativist era, either: Sámi history, like any other form of scientific research, does not escape the discursive dimension or the intertwined political contexts. These contemporary aspects are imbued with the political and offer discursive tools with implications for the

16 Changing states, changing Sámi?

interpretations and narratives produced by historians (Dahl, 1992; Erkkila 2013; Kinnunen 2015).

In addition to the impact of the social on scholarly activity, research in turn impacts the social. Historical inquiry may be perceived as the production of societal knowledge and the production of political and societal texts. Texts achieve their potency by being grounded in historical reality and through the (forward-looking) construction of the society they are studying (Norrina 2013). The same goes for the production of the subject positions: Research is, to a great extent, an exercise in the power of definition, or enacting Sáminess, constructing both the ‘researching self’ and the object of scholarly activity, the Sámi (Linnarsson 2013).

This chapter analyzes transformations of knowledge systems and shifts in the ideals of knowledge that lead to new epistemic values and new knowledge (politics) (Melton 2013). Concerning Lappology – research on the Sámi undertaken by majority researchers – the case examined here is interesting because the expected rupture is simultaneous with slower, ongoing genre-internal paradigmatic change. Before the Second World War, the place of the Sámi in the hierarchies constructed in research was almost without exception the lowest (Lehtola 2013). The expected change, which the rupture caused to hierarchy building and to subject positions in research, has been less studied. There was a change in research politics: A more pluralistic normative tone could be expected than the old one, which had perceived state sovereignty as a source of legitimate historical knowledge, delimiting and attributing subject positions to the historical actors. In what follows, the depth of this change will be assessed according to whether there were any changes in pre-critical frames of historical inquiry: Did the frame of historical inquiry shift from political (nation)-state to a more open and pluralistic society? (See Norrina 2020). How did political change reflect the way the states involved were positioned in relation to the Sámi in historical studies? (cf. Hequet *et al.* 2013). Did the subject positions of the Sámi change?

I have chosen to study the following works in this chapter: *Antropogeografiska studier inom Petsamo området. 1, Skoltlapparna* [Human Geographical studies in the Petsamo region. 1, the Skolt Lapps, 1929] by Väinö Tanner; *Finmarkens politiske historie aktnæssig fremstillet* [The Political History of Finnmark presented in documents, 1923] by O. A. Johnsen; *The Changing Lapps* (1954) by Gutorm Gjessing; and *En utdöd lappkultur i Kemi Lappmark. Studier i Nordfinlands kolonisationshistoria* [An Extinct Lapp Culture in Kemi Lappmark, studies in the colonization history of Northern Finland, 1952] by Helmer Tegengren. They all cover a long historical period and focus on relations between the Sámi and the Crown/state, enabling a comparison of change over time in the national historiographies. This choice of works is not limited to historical studies, but also includes geographical and ethnographic/anthropological studies. This is

16 Changing states, changing Sámi?

because not many historical studies are available, and human sciences demonstrated a strong historical focus during the study period before the shift towards a synchronic approach among, for example, social anthropologists during the 1970s (Madsen 1994). Cross-national comparison is possible to a certain extent since all the scholars operated in the intersection of the Lappological field and academia proper, with a more stringent national frame. The scholarly network was not strong since academic and political venues were not yet fully established (the Saami Council was established in 1956), but the emergent networks are evident in mutual referencing. Methodological nationalism might have been a constitutive source for historical inquiry, more so than the transnational networks, and the comparison is used mostly to emphasize the specific in Finnish and Norwegian studies of the Sámi (Norheim 2014; [Erdemir 2007: 313](#)).

Methodologically, I seek to make a comparative analysis of the occurrences of hierarchizing framings and transformations of the implications of this framing (subjectifying/hierarchizing/rights-generating). The implications of the subject positions (subject-citizen) and space for the Sámi voice are studied as well.

The pre-war studies – Väinö Tanner and O. A. Johnsen

Finnish historiography had a deep engagement with nation and state building, locating long historical roots of national sentiment and Finnishness ([Kivimäki 2021](#); see also Alakorva *et al.* in this volume). Historical studies of the 1920s are defined by the partial bankruptcy of social Darwinism. Darwinism was a progressivist movement within national sciences, displacing God as the prime mover in history and situating the struggle, selection and viability of nations in historical terminology. Evolutionism was easy to couple with the developmental and dominant political philosophy in Finland, the Hegelian-Snellmannian philosophy of history, which located the state as the highest level of polity in history. In the 1920s, faith in linear development suffered a blow in the turmoil of the Finnish Civil War of 1918. What remained was a (Darwinian) struggle between rationalities and will, favourable and wrong choices made in the course of history, with no pre-determined ending in sight. The building of the nation was still what historians studied, as well as the gathering thematic and conceptual frame of historiography. Darwinism had an immense cohesive force in Finnish sciences: It influenced numerous disciplines and became a way of demonstrating competence and progressivity in academia (Ahtiainen and Tervonen 1996). It had a deep influence on Tanner, whose historical vision was framed by Darwinian terminology, evident in his ponderings on the potency of the Sámi peoples and his doubts expressed about Finnish competence – for example, in the administration of the Petsamo region.

16 Changing states, changing Sámi?

A geologist and Finnish Swede, Tanner wrote *Antropogeografiska* before he was nominated as a professor in geography at the University of Helsinki in 1931. The book is a multidisciplinary study with a human geographical theoretical frame. Tanner's aim was to chart the people, their semi-nomadic adaptation, history, politics, viability and administration, as well as the socio-economic crisis of the three Skolt Sámi *sijdds* in Petsamo, which at that time formed part of Finland (see also Joste in this volume). The political agency of the Skolt Sámi was constructed in a groundbreaking way through the analysis of the *norröds/(siid)sdåbbar*, an organization responsible for Skolt Sámi *sijdd* administration, which divided the usage rights of the fishing waters and lands between families. The functionalist perceptions of the *sijdd* as a unity of people bound by kin ties to the terrain they were utilizing, as well as allocating and using the resource zones in an orderly, organized manner, are some of the most culturally sensitive contributions for which Tanner is credited (Koskunen 2014; Hanne 1924). Tanner wrote against Lappologist research that reproduced imagery of the Sámi 'wandering aimlessly in the mountains' (e.g. Tanner's patron and professor predecessor, J. E. Rosberg) or airing diffusionist hierarchies of culture (e.g. his critic Karl Bernhard Wiklund; see Nyssönen 2018).

Tanner's book has a programmatic aim of presenting the Skolt Sámi in a positive light. The Skolt Sámi were, however, ravaged by external conditions and cast into poverty. Among these forces was modernity, which resulted in immediate positionings of the Skolt Sámi in the hierarchies in the book. The book contains an unresolved tension between the idea of the inevitability of modernization, with the loss of the traditional subsistence form, and Tanner's purist advice regarding the blessings of semi-nomadic reindeer herding as the original, most suitable and 'correct' form of herding. The book suffers from poor editing and numerous contradictions: History, for Tanner, is at certain periods both an enabling and a hindering factor in creating a 'happy' society for the Skolt Sámi. It affords either isolation and slow evolution or stagnation and no tools with which to survive in the modern world (Tanner 1924).

Tanner writes in numerous aggressive ways about the Skolt Sámi: Their racial foundation was lacking in many ways, but Tanner credited them with the status of a viable people, capable of entering the modern world. In prehistory, the *siidas* demonstrated a varying capacity to resist the colonization of stronger neighbours, but it was the good will of the latter, and natural barriers, which had sustained the Skolt Sámi *sijdds*; Tanner studied their political system through the discourse of lack (Thomas 1994, 72), as institutions of lesser sophistication. The book is framed by the modern world and state parameters, within which the Skolt Sámi compared unfavourably and towards which they seemed to need to be guided. The states (Russia, Finland, the Scandinavian countries) provide rights- and capacity-generating frameworks, but Tanner was incapable of placing them

16 Changing states, changing Sámi?

in stable hierarchies, due to his oppositional stance against his own mother country. Tanner abandons his aggressive tone towards Russia, for example, as he begins to compare its policies favourably with Finnish ones. The book is imbued with identity politics, in which the only stable position is the lowest, the Skolt Sámi (Johnsen 1999).

Norwegian historians produced histories of 'progressive evolution,' leading in a deterministic manner to the genesis of the democratic nation-state. A tendency to represent the twists and turns of development as being justified and necessary is detectable. Historians cultivated the concept of a medieval free peasantry as guaranteeing the success of the project of independence. During the 19th century, the Sámi were portrayed as insignificant, small, stray folk who could not resist the expansion of Norse folks or stand in the way of peasant agricultural expansion. Although the most national romantic fervour of attributing Norwegian sentiment to the medieval peasant gave way to a more stringent scholarly approach in the early 20th century, the state continued to dominate the framing of historical inquiry: Marxist-oriented social and economic history was used to illustrate the consolidation of a strong independent state (Bahl 1997; Nordby 1991). The corpus of Johnsen, mostly concentrating on political history in the period of Danish rule (1380–1814), belongs to this historiographical tradition.

O. A. Johnsen was commissioned to write the political history of Finnmark by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which wished to obtain historical knowledge of the borders of Finnmark. In doing this, Johnsen aimed to delegitimize the historical claims of Sweden and Russia regarding the disputed territories. The Sámi are portrayed as suffering under foreign rule: during the 16th century, as the Swedish Crown began to reach out to the Arctic Sea coast, the Sámi appear in the text protesting unlawful taxation by Swedish officials and demanding the substitution of Swedish bailiffs with Norwegian officials. The narrative in the book is the border demarcation, the genesis of Finnmark as Norwegian territory and its administrative organization during the Middle Ages and the early modern period. As a result of this development, the Sea Sámi became 'Norwegian subjects.' The Sámi received their share of historical agency, as it unfolds in the sources, as a valued target for taxation (not necessarily due to the monetary value of the taxation, but because of power politics as an indicator of territorial claims); as trading partners; and as somewhat unreliable partners in times of war. Johnsen distances himself from the aggressive and belittling ways of writing about the Sámi by means of short, direct citations from the sources, using quotation marks. Johnsen uses racial terminology (half-Sámi, *halvfinner*, non-mixed Finnish folk, *ublandet finsk folk*) every now and then (Johnsen 1994).

The Sámi are given the role of an active subject from whom loyalty is demanded, yet making complaints to the officials of the numerous kingdoms

16 Changing states, changing Sámi?

that are engaged in negotiating the borders which will cross the Sámi lands. The Norwegian officials appear to be on the side of the Sámi as they resist sometimes violent (Swedish, and later Russian) taxation in Finnmark. The Sámi appear to affirm their devotion to Norway and testify to the ‘correct’ demarcation of the border, usually to Norway’s benefit. As the Danish-Norwegian exclusive dominion over the Sea Sámi became established, the Sámi appear as Crown officials and sheriffs (*lendsmann*) in local Sámi villages. The text is formalist, true to sources and factual; it lacks characterizations of the Sámi and, therefore, any aggressive tone (Johnsen 1923).

As border negotiations commenced between Sweden and Denmark, the Sámi emerged in the role of ‘witnesses,’ informing Crown officials about the border. The Sámi do not appear as holders of rights; of the two codicils attached to the Treaty of Strömstad (1751), the one dictating the borders of the kingdoms is examined more thoroughly than the Lapp codicil regulating the Sámi right to cross-border nomadism. This brief mention is followed by a lengthy chapter on the Sámi’s subject-like position and belongingness to the Norwegian realm through taxation. Johnsen’s interpretation regarding Sámi ‘possession of [their] own taxed lands’ followed the 18th-century interpretation of the Crown officials: It indicated subject-like relations with the Kingdom of Norway (Johnsen 1923).

In the case of the border demarcation between Russia and Norway in 1826, the Sámi occupied similar subject positions – as a potentially disloyal threat (shifting sides to Finland?), as a vanguard movement proving Norwegian claim to the territory and as a Norwegian subject enjoying rights granted by the State of Norway. The borders between Sámi territories, indicating usage rights, had restrictive power only regarding the usage rights of other Sámi groups (Johnsen 1923). There is no major difference here between Johnsen and Tanner, for whom the formalistic view of borders allowed the Skolt Sámi to have no excessive historical agency and for whom, as well, state borders were the highest in the hierarchies. Neither Tanner nor Johnsen returned to Sámi issues in their later production *in extenso* (Kommensfeldt 1964).

Research on the Sámi after the Second World War – Gjessing and Tegengren

In recent times, Astri Andresen has dealt with the Norwegian Sámi research right after the Second World War in the greatest depth. In a country otherwise in a state of bliss following its liberation, sections of researchers found a source to question the nature of the state of Norway in the need to deal with the consequences of Norwegianization policies (lasting from c. 1850s to 1950s). Research on the Sámi and the historical narratives cultivated took part at a critical turn, in which the Sámi were a weaker nature

16 Changing states, changing Sámi?

folk instead of weaker race, the first settlers and bearers of a valuable yet still-threatened culture. All these new representations and positions were rights generating, no longer threatened by evolutionary downfall but by the Norwegian state and society. What had to be changed and administered was the policy of the state of Norway and no longer the cultural condition or level of civilization of the Sámi. A paternalistic sense of 'duty' to protect the Sámi, even those of 'guilt' and 'debt,' appears in the texts and in parts of the political discourse as well (Larsen 2014). There are examples of studies intended as a denial of social evolutionism (Gjessing 1948), but in what follows, I shall examine whether there are any residual traces of the old paradigm and whether the framing showed signs of change.

Archaeologist and ethnologist, professor and chairman of the Ethnographical Museum at the University of Oslo, Gutorm Gjessing is the only example in this selection of a scholar who engaged politically in Sámi issues later in his career. In *Changing Lapps* (1954), Gjessing followed the historicizing methods of Malinowski in trying to elicit the functions of the Sámi cultures in Finnmark. For (Larsen 2014), the Sámi were not the original population in the north but had wandered from the east at some point in time. Gjessing, however, credits the Sámi with first-occupant status: The 'first Norwegians' (he uses this term in a willingly anachronistic fashion) did not enter an 'un-owned country,' but 'Sameland.' He interprets the Stone Age slate culture as a Sámi culture, attributing to it cultural potency due to material findings far south of Finnmark. Race studies are present in the book in a modified form: 'Somatically,' the Sámi constitute a group of their own, not that of 'Mongols.' Gjessing uses the findings and interpretations of the ill-famed osteological studies by Kristian Schreiner (in one of which Gjessing participated), as well as the blood-type studies by the Oxford University Lapland Expedition of 1950, proving a mixing of races and traces of 'Nordic' and 'East-Baltic' races in the Sámi. Contacts had intensified during the Viking Age (c. 800–1050), but cultural loans were to the benefit of the Norwegians, learning ways to tend their cattle from the Sámi, who were, in addition, more efficient hunters and boat builders than their neighbours. Gjessing proves wrong the scornful depictions of the Sámi and lists of negative characteristics ascribed by Amund Helland and briefly describes the establishment of the 'heavy-handed' Norwegianization policy in schools and its revision taking place in the 1950s (Gjessing 1954).

The hierarchies return later in the book, and the direction of cultural loans changes as they become detectable in everyday life. Gjessing's main motif is the disappearance of the social and moral cohesion provided by the *siida* in encounters with the modern world and the Norwegians. As Norwegian settlement began, the Sámi were driven farther up into the heads of the fjords; they gave up their semi-nomadic life and took up farming. This approach is relational: The Sámi and the Norwegians are depicted in bilateral networks of trade and exchange. Another repeated theme is the (lack of)

16 Changing states, changing Sámi?

'European-American techniques,' without which the Sea Sámi nonetheless miraculously prosper, even without enjoying 'any particular consideration' from the Norwegian authorities. The crisis of hunting wild reindeer and the genesis of nomadism are represented, on the other hand, as intentional adaptation, or 'indirect acculturation.' A recent deep reorganization of herding is, in turn, the result of 'enormous European economic development' in communications and transport. A self-sufficient economic system is giving way to the monetary economy; many branches of Sámi culture, such as handicrafts, are 'gradually decreasing,' and herding has grown more extensive. Families no longer follow the herds, milking has stopped, cars and 'radiotelephony' are used in seasonal moves etc. All this will result in a deep social change within the kinship ties in the *siida* system and in moral dissolution in the form of an increase in reindeer theft. The change is implied to be unwished for, but stagnation, or a return to simpler ways, is not an option according to Gjessing: He writes enthusiastically about state-led modernization efforts in education, reindeer-herding and handicrafts (Gjessing 1954). The space to (enact) Sáminess appears nonexistent, and all the choices available to the Sámi appear harmful.

Evolutionist thinking is evident in the search for 'superior' positions in the relations between clearly demarcated ethnic groups. In Gjessing's study of the Sea Sámi and other groups residing in Laksefjord, the early disintegration of the *siida* administration – in favour of Danish administrative structures – is followed by an analysis of the Russian Pomor trade, which was more beneficial than trade with merchants in Bergen. The latter was preferred by the Norwegian fishermen (in growing debt) while Pomor trade created a niche of flexibility, lucrateness and partial Sámi superiority. This was quite a typical way of dealing with the hierarchies and methodologies of evolutionist thinking at that time: They had not yet been gotten rid of, but the Indigenous folks were placed higher within them. Efforts to study in earnest Indigenous rationales as contextual and value-free are of a later date. Gjessing ends his analysis of the Sea Sámi by representing them as people left behind and not equipped to follow technological and economic developments, encountering a foreign bureaucratic system as well as attacks on every aspect of their culture. They were striving to become acknowledged as Norwegians, something which the near-racist Norwegian population thought had been achieved by only a very few. Technical-mechanical developments form a strong hierarchizing parameter for Gjessing, something that he perceived as stunting the Sea Sámi's horizons of expectation and which added to the aspects of symbolic violence in the discourse launched in his text (Gjessing 1954).

In his discussion of the reindeer Sámi of Karasjok and Kautokeino, Gjessing credits traditional means of living with creating a cultural safe zone against Norwegianization policies and in relation to the local Norwegians. Gjessing is surprised by how the Sámi have managed to sustain their socio-

16 Changing states, changing Sámi?

economic system, despite the commercialization of the reindeer meat markets, which to him signifies disintegration. The *siida*, for Gjessing, is weak: It had not been necessary for Scandinavians entering the Sámi domicile to break down the political structure (*siida*). This same weakness has resulted in a weak economic and political consciousness, 'foreign' to the Sámi, which has led to difficulties in integrating into the new economic system and to the unavoidable 'further disintegration' of the traditional society. One possible solution, if wisely conducted, might be the introduction by the government of cooperative forms of herding, which had long presented a feasible solution in Finland (Gjessing 1954). In addition to the pre-modern ways of life and connected ideologies and ideas, the Sámi, according to Gjessing, are locked in a pre-political trap that stops them from acting on the threat and/or adapting to it. Modernization equals disintegration, but non-change is impossible, and it is the government which has to present a solution. The Sámi are no longer disappearing, but there are structural weaknesses in their psychological set-up, one that secures the superiority of the state and which the Sámi are failing to engage.

Finnish historiography was actively re-envisioned after the war, due to the need to banish demonizing animosity towards 'our new friend' the Soviet Union, as well as visionary, expansionist nationalism. Scientific, non-visionary, non-zealous, neutral empiricism became the rule (Ahtainen and Tervonen 1996; Haapala and Markkola 2017). Professor of ethnology/cultural history at the Abo Akademi Helmer Tegengren's study of the 'Forest Lapps' and of the settlement of the Kemi Lappmark is a historical study of colonization and cultural contact, with numerous ethnological comparisons (Brett 1991). The Sámi are the ones 'escaping' as the Finnish settle and conquer the Lappmarks. Nature structures the Kemi Lappmark: Tegengren agrees with diffusionist Wiklund that wild reindeer wanderings were the origin of the hunting society, but the form of the society is also credited to the Sámi themselves, not to outside folks (Tegengren 1954).

The approach is 'source-positivistic,' building on empirical material from sources; the discussion as to whether the Sámi were 'poor' follows information from tax sources. The reason for Sámi poverty is no longer racial, but due to the great demand for fur in Novgorod/Russia and in Sweden and consequent over-hunting (Tegengren 1954). Even though Tegengren echoes the old discourses and reproduces the old hierarchies and discourses of the lower, even primitive, Sámi, he also has the capacity to describe the historical and discursive landscape in a way that reveals Sámi socio-economic and cultural potency – more so than Johnsen, but in a way in which Tanner had already proved himself capable.

Of the themes introduced to Finnish research in the greatest depth by Tanner, the societal organization of the Sámi is discussed and discovered in the early organization of small hunting groups. Swedish sources produced by Crown officials guide Tegengren's pen, to the same extent but with a

16 Changing states, changing Sámi?

different bias to that of Johnsen. The Swedish Crown ‘protected’ the Sámi from overt taxation and misdeeds on the part of Crown officials, in order to keep the Sámi loyal and the Swedish Lappmarks populated. But even if the Lappmarks were not yet threatened by settlement of ‘foreign folk elements,’ the grim destiny of the Lappmarks had already been sown in the 16th century: Contact with (stronger) neighbouring powers entailed the overuse of resources and the beginning of a two-century-long slide towards the fulfilment of the narrative set out in the title of this book. The incapacity of the Sámi to turn to other means of living, which were ‘unknown’ to them, also contributed to this destiny. Another effect of Tegengren’s use of Crown sources is a representation of the Sámi as targets of taxation and the use of Crown imagery and Crown parameters. This involved perceiving and representing the Sámi as sociocultural anomalies – e.g. viewing the mobility of the Lapp villages as undesirable, as it threatened the borders of the Swedish Kingdom and the superiority of the Crown (Tegengren 1954).

As settlement began in the 17th century, the Sámi were forcibly displaced by more numerous and more powerful Finnish settlers. The crucial element in the narrative is now formed: The ‘uneven struggle’ between ‘higher’ Finnish settlers and the Sámi led to the disappearance of the original hunting and fishing culture. The slash-and-burn economy and consequent evolution towards sedentary forms of agriculture were decisive blows. Tegengren writes decidedly against the parallel theory as being an unfortunate choice that left the Sámi with two choices – to retire to the north or to change their means of livelihood and assimilate with the Finns. An emerging vicious circle accelerated the process: Since the wilderness was now unused, it led to new waves of settlement. Complaints sent by the Sámi to Crown officials about the Finnish intrusion resulted in a rather weak agency, constructed by means of protection on the part of the officials; the Sámi were ‘not totally defenceless.’ This protection was rendered futile by a simultaneous policy of advocating settlement, by its straightforward character (no recompense was ever intended to be payable to the Sámi for the fishing waters or land) and by the beginnings of the clerical integration of the Lappmarks. The blame for this is apportioned to the Crown’s actions and settler choices of forms of subsistence (Tegengren 1954), and no longer solely to the ‘weakness’ or poor (racial) disposition of the Sámi.

The change of livelihood to Finnish sedentary cattle farming resulted in ‘misery,’ ‘rupture’ and a ‘dissolution’ of the old winter village and the wandering way of life. There are weak echoes of the old paradigm in Tegengren’s dramatic rhetoric, also in the chapter discussing cultural encounter and cultural change, in which the Sámi showed a lesser ‘ability to adapt.’ At times, Tegengren manages not to use diffusionist terminology in describing the multidirectional process of folks adopting numerous subsistence sources. The exchange resulted in multiple-source forms of subsistence, with tame reindeer as an element of Finnish and Sámi

16 Changing states, changing Sámi?

households alike. Evolutionist terminology returns to the book as Tegengren cites old literature about the Sámi reindeer herders 'sinking into' the status of reindeer hands and poverty. The same happens in a discussion about how the hunters who find themselves in the 'lower cultural stratum' have no pressing need to take on the herding of tame animals if resources are abundant and in a passage dealing with the possible evolution of herding towards semi- and full nomadism (Tegengren 1933).

The historical evidence presented is ruthless and does not justify any other narrative. The age-old hierarchy reproduced in the narrative – that of the weaker, lower and primitive Sámi – is left intact in the book. In one sense, the approach has changed: The book is void of the colourful lists and metaphors of folk characteristics used to hierarchize folks. This was also the case concerning the Sámi, the Russians, the Karelians, the Swedes and the Finns, none of whom Tegengren harnessed to such identity-political usage as Tanner did. Tegengren's work is thus a good example of Finnish postwar non-nationalist historical inquiry, written under a new political constellation after the lost war. Diffusionist reasoning occupies the major portion of the book, however: Tegengren credits the rationalization of herding explicitly – with source evidence (a 1767 discussion in the court in Sodankylä on the organization of a roundup and tame reindeer herding) – to the Finnish settlers, and he credits the milking of reindeer to the Scandinavians. (Early on, Tegengren's writing was influenced by Austrian diffusionist cultural history, which focused on global cultural dissemination and operated with cultural spheres and cultural contact as their methodological starting points; see Stora 1991.) Tegengren places the milking economy higher than nomadic forms of herding and ends up stating that the adaptation of the milking economy was key to the survival of the Forest Sámi in Torne Lappmark and that not doing so was a fatal flaw for the Kemi Sámi, continually stranded in primitive conservatism and hunting (Tegengren 1933). In spite of this, his approach to the Crown/state is critical as Tegengren shows an emerging tendency to write compassionately about the 'vanishing' or 'death' of Sámi culture. This was well suited to the postwar Finnish political climate, constructing a 'good' state by criticizing the old policies.

Conclusions

The evolution of tendencies in Sámi historical studies between the 1920s and the early 1950s proceeded in contrary directions in different countries: In Finland, from critical to naturalized, with a critical undertone; in Norway, from naturalized to critical. Both the postwar researchers imagined a more democratic state: Gjessing by criticizing Norwegianization, Tegengren in an effort to present a less aggressive, compassionate approach to vanishing Sámi culture. The state could no longer take the place of the 'claimant,' as Norway did for Johnsen. The rupture in Finnish national sciences meant that

16 Changing states, changing Sámi?

the expanding, arrogant state vanished, including from Tegengren's book; this solved the problem of personal dissonance with which Tanner had had to struggle. The dissonance emerges in the text by Gjessing, in which Norway is demonized as a state, but presented simultaneously as a source of the technical-modern, thus communicating the handicapped lower position of the Sámi. The problem of modernity has troubled Sámi research since then. Modern traits can be an initial source of uncertainty and confusion for researchers; they lure, at worst, a normative tone into research reports. The modern can be a source of romanticizing constructions of Sámi identities along the pre-modern-modern binary or result in the Sámi being blamed for fraud when the researcher's expectations of encountering a 'nature folk' are not fulfilled. The modern pluralization of Sámi society through education (a simultaneous source of assimilation) and ethnopolitics, or the lack of a unified political front, have been other matters demanding explanation.

The pre-critical frame, affecting the way in which the Sámi past and future were represented, is still 'the state' in all of the texts: in Tanner's, state intrusion prevailed yet was handicapping and 'wrong'; in Johnsen's, it was predetermined; in Gjessing's, state intrusion revealed the lesser political status of the Sámi; and in Tegengren's, it assimilated them. This frame left the naturalized potency of the state unquestioned.

The subject positions of the Sámi changed only slightly. Their subject position as the weakest non-state actor remained, but what changed more dramatically was the source of the 'weakness': The evolutionary frame had weakened, and any perceived innate characteristics of the Sámi did not suffice as the sole explanation. The state-pronounced formalist frame strengthened, revealing the unfortunate state policies and restricting Sámi political potency. This new, more rightful frame was rights generating, but it also restricted the kinds of rights the Sámi could legitimately claim; the claims could not go beyond those granted by citizenship of the current state in which they lived.

The way of explaining the condition of the Sámi changed as well: In the last phase of Finnish Lappology, or at the beginning of Finnish historiography on the Sámi, the Sámi are still 'dying.' For Tegengren, blaming the majority and Crown action for the poor conditions was a way of showing his leaning towards the postwar political climate. 'Lapp blood' in the 'blending of blood-types' was no longer a hierarchizing factor but a matter of 'ethnic individuality' in a process of change, due to, for example, intermarriage (Tegengren 1933). These are the first signs of a paradigm change in the researcher's discursive and methodological toolkit, as well as in research politics, which materialized fully in the 1970s and 1980s.

In Gjessing's case, the passages most tainted by the old paradigm are those building on old Lappological studies. The Lappological studies were not yet targeted for commentary (let alone deconstruction), and the authors were in most cases still alive, in the midst of a paradigm change of their

16 Changing states, changing Sámi?

own, the ‘sins’ still fresh in the memory, too close in history to be opened to true critical scrutiny. This may be the way that transnational scholarly networks were performative at the time – they were bringing forth old knowledge for contemporary use and source-critical scrutiny while their research political problematizing was not yet topical. The Lappological school of scholars, which was beginning its paradigmatic turn into Sámi studies, was not yet ready for this, but a distance was clearly manifested by using direct quotations and crediting the knowledge directly to the pre-war scholars. This comes close to being a case in which the economy of scholarly credibility flows along channels of familiarity, i.e. the practitioners of independent core groups are likely to know one another well, and the pragmatic and moral consequences of distrust and scepticism are likely to be high (Kivimäki 2011).

The traditional Lappological method of citing the old texts doubled the majority voice in the books, further amplified by the choice of an empirical or ‘source positivist’ approach, in which the voice of the central authorities would dictate in part the progress of history. In Finland, Tegengren’s book is more coherent than that of Tanner in its guiding vision of the Sámi as weaker, but this in itself is a residue of the old paradigm. Most of the time, Tegengren presents ‘factual’ knowledge about the socio-economic organization of the Sámi, filtered through historical source criticism and a racializing grid, and does not comment on how correct or suitable/appropriate they are regarding the Sámi, much as Tanner did. However, this still results in a near-total absence of Sámi voices. The function of the Sámi claims of Crown protection in Johnsen and Tegengren show a slight change, from a proof of the benevolence of the Norwegian system of governance (Johnsen) to a proof of Sámi weakness (Tegengren). This kind of straightforward methodology concerning the Sámi voices in the sources remained dominant well into the 1980s (Kivimäki 2011); since then, the research field has become methodologically more attentive to the Sámi voices in the sources and their involvement as actors in their own history (Kivimäki *et al.* 2023; see also Alakorva *et al.*; and Lehtola in this volume).

This comparison shows that the rupture-like change in the ideological context had different consequences in different research traditions. In Finland, the rupture had a muting effect, and the scholars avoided openly apologetic research. In Norway, the tone was more openly revisionist and political, intended to turn the state from celebrating the liberation of the nation to considering the remaining flaws in its democracy. The Norwegian scholarly discourse resulted in an earlier and broader front in trying to change the Sámi policies (Andriessen 2011). Both of these shifts were intended in the first instance to construct a ‘better,’ more benign state, which may be taken as further proof of the dominant frame. The change concerning

16 Changing states, changing Sámi?

the Sámi was undone; their emancipation into having a full voice in research was still hindered by many residual pre-war discourses.

Notes

References

- Ahtiainen, P., Tervonen, J. and Herlin, I. 1996. *Menneisyyden tutkijat ja metodien vartijat: Matka suomalaisen historiankirjoitukseen* [The Researchers of the Past and Guardians of Method: A Journey into Finnish Historical Inquiry]. Helsinki: Suomen historiallinen seura.
- Andresen, A. 2016. Vitenskapene og den nye samepolitikken (1945–1963) [Sciences and the new Sami policy]. *Historisk tidsskrift*, 95(3), pp. 405–435.
- Dahl, O. (1959) 1992. *Norsk historieforskning i det 19. og 20. århundre* [Norwegian Historical Inquiry in the 19th and 20th Centuries], 2nd ed. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Erkkilä, V. 2015. Jalmari Jaakkola – menneisyyden näkijä, Historiankirjoituksen poliittisuudesta ja estetiikasta [JJ – Visionist of the past, on the political and the aesthetics of historical inquiry]. *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, 113(4), pp. 361–372.
- Fuchs, E. 2002. Introduction, provincializing Europe, historiography as a transcultural concept. In: E. Fuchs and B. Stuchtey, eds., *Across Cultural Borders, Historiography in Global Perspective*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, pp. 1–28.
- Gjessing, G. 1948. *Individ og samfunn hos naturfolk* [Individual and Society among Natural People]. Oslo: Olaf Norli's forlag.
- Gjessing, G. 1954. *Changing Lapps, A Study in Culture Relations in Northernmost Norway*. Monographs on Social Anthropology No. 13. London: Department of Anthropology, London School of Economics and Political Science.
- Gunaratnam, Y. 2003. *Researching Race and Ethnicity: Methods, Knowledge, and Power*. London: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Haapala, P. and Markkola, P. 2017. Se toinen (ja toisten) historia [The other(s) history]. *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, 115(4), pp. 403–416.
- Heiret, J., Ryymin, T. and Skålevåg, S. A. 2013. *Innledning* [Introduction]. In: J. Heiret, T. Ryymin and S. A. Skålevåg, eds., *Fortalt fortid, Norsk historieskriving etter 1970* [Narrated Past, Norwegian Historical Inquiry after 1970]. Oslo: Pax Forlag, pp. 8–34.

Formatted: Norwegian (Bokmål)

Formatted: Finnish

Formatted: Finnish

16 Changing states, changing Sámi?

- Johnsen, O. A. 1923. *Finmarkens politiske historie atkmæssig fremstillet* [The Political History of Finnmark, Presented in Documents]. Kristiania: Dybwad.
- Kuukkanen, J.-M. 2015. Why we need to move from truth-functionality to performativity in historiography. *History and Theory*, 54(2), pp. 226–243.
- Lakomäki, S., Aalto, S. and Kylli, R. 2020. Näkymättömissä ja kuulumattomissa? Saamelaiset ja koloniaaliset arkistot [Out of sight and out of earshot? The Sámi and the colonial archives]. *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, 118(4), pp. 438–450.
- Lehtola, V.-P. 2012. *Saamelaiset suomalaiset, kohtaamisia 1896–1953* [The Sámi Finns, Encounters 1896–1953]. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Minde, H. 1994. *Samenes histories om etterkrigshistorisk forskningsfelt* [Sámi History as a Post-war Research Field]. Etterkrigshistorisk register, nr. 18, Bergen: LOS-senteret.
- Mulso, M. 2018. History of knowledge. In: M. Tamm and P. Burke, eds., *Debating New Approaches to History*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, pp. 159–187.
- Nordby, T. 1995. State- and nation-building. In: W. H. Hubbard, J. E. Myhre, T. Nordby and S. Sogner, eds., *Making a Historical Culture, Historiography in Norway*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, pp. 181–209.
- Norring, P. 2018. *Eli F. Heckscher, Eino Jutikkala ja pohjoismainen yhteiskuntahistoria* [E.F.H., E.J. and the Nordic Social History]. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Helsinki, Faculty of Humanities.
- Norring, P. 2020. *Suurvalta-ajan valloitetut alueet suomalaisessa ja ruotsalaisessa historiantutkimuksessa* [The conquered regions of the Swedish Empire in Finnish and Swedish historical inquiry]. *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, 118(2), pp. 178–190.
- Nyysönen, J. 2015. Väinö Tanners uföruttedda karriär – från statsexpert till emigrerad professor [The unexpected career of VT – from state expert to emigrant professor]. In: J. Thylin-Klaus and J. Tidigs, eds., *Historiska och litteraturhistoriska studier 90, Årsbok för Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland*. Helsingfors: SLS, pp. 135–170.
- Nyysönen, J. 2019. Cultural heritage of the Sámi in Finnish national histories 1894–2009. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 15(4), pp. 340–348.
- Rasmussen, S. 2016. *Samisk integrering i norsk og svensk kirke i tidlig nytid – En komparasjon mellom Finnmark og Torne lappmark* [The Integration of the Sámi in the Norwegian and Swedish Church in the Early Modern Period – A Comparison between Finnmark and Torne Lappmark]. Doctoral Dissertation. UiT – Norges arktiske

Formatted: Norwegian (Bokmål)

Formatted: English (United States)

Formatted: Finnish

Formatted: Norwegian (Bokmål)

Formatted: Norwegian (Bokmål)

16 Changing states, changing Sámi?

universitet, Fakultet for humaniora, samfunnsvitenskap og lærerutdanning.

- Shapin, S. 2010. Cordelia's Love: Credibility and the Social Studies of Science. In: *Never Pure, Historical Studies of Science as if it was Produced by People with Bodies, Situated in Time, Space, Culture, and Society, and Struggling for Credibility and Authority*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 17–31.
- Sommerfeldt, W. P. 1954. *Professor O. A. Johnsen's forfatterskap* [The Authorship of Professor O. A. Johnsen]. *Sjuende-Mars-bibliografene*, Oslo: Norsk bibliografisk bibliotek.
- Storå, N. 1993. Nordisk etnologi [Nordic ethnology]. In: S. Widén, ed., *Åbo akademi 1918–1993, Forskning och institutioner II, Humanistiska fakulteten. Teologiska fakulteten* [Å A 1918–1993, Research and Departments II, Faculty of Humanities, Faculty of Theology]. Åbo: Åbo Akademi förlag, pp. 191–208.
- Susiluoto, P. 2003. Two Skolt Geographies of Petsamo during the 1920s and 1930s. In: F. Möller and S. Pehkonen, eds., *Encountering the North, Cultural Geography, International Relations and Northern Landscapes*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 75–101.
- Tanner, V. 1929. *Antropogeografiska studier inom Petsamo-området. 1, Skolt-Lapparna* [Human Geographical Studies in the Petsamo Region. 1, The Skolt Lapps]. Helsingfors: Societas Geographica Fenniae.
- Tegengren, H. 1952. *En utdöd lappkultur i Kemi Lappmark, Studier i Nordfinlands kolonisationshistoria* [An Extinct Lapp Culture in Kemi Lappmark, Studies in the Colonization History of Northern Finland]. Åbo: Åbo akademi.
- Thomas, N. 1994. *Colonialism's Culture, Anthropology, Travel and Government*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Turchetti, S., Herran, N. and Boudia, S. 2012. Introduction, have we ever been 'transnational'? Towards a history of science across and beyond borders. *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 45(3), pp. 319–336.

Formatted: Norwegian (Bokmål)

Formatted: Norwegian (Bokmål)

Internet sources

<https://tieteentermipankki.fi/wiki/Folkloristiikka:diffuusioteoria> [Accessed 17 November 2020].

Lappmark was an administrative unit for taxation, defined by the Swedish Crown. Lappmark was divided into villages, or *siidas*. (17–19).

The war began as a war of independence, a campaign to drive the remaining Russian forces from Finland, waged by patriotic right-wing "White" troops. Following a "Red" coup in southern Finland, the conflict escalated into a war between White troops and left-wing Reds. Following the Red defeat, terror

16 Changing states, changing Sámi?

campaigns on both sides and a post-war campaign of punishments and incarceration, the patriotic right-wing intelligentsia, to which the historians belonged, had to abandon their conviction that the working classes would have shared their patriotic vision of the state and nation as unifying entities (Ahtiainen and Tervonen 1996, 62–63).

- Diffusionist thinking, in its hierarchical form, credits the capability of creating culture only to higher cultures while the lower cultures are deemed capable only of development through a top-down diffusion of cultural loans (<https://tieteentermipankki.fi>).
- The theory presented by Governor Graan was intended to promote the settlement of the Swedes and Finns in the Lappmarks. According to theory, Sámi reindeer herding and sedentary land use could exist side by side. Since this theory was based on examples from Ume Lappmark, with different agricultural forms of subsistence, the policy failed, due to the juxtaposition with a slash-and-burn economy (Larsen 1953, 75–87).