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Preface and Acknowledgements

This case study addresses the nature of the core-periphery power structure and how this unbalanced association influences our thinking. The scholarly consequences of this contingency is explored through an inquiry into how the prehistory of northern Sweden, a region known as Norrland, has been archaeologically interpreted and portrayed. A critical examination of the literature clearly reveals that there is a repetitious connection between the negative valorisation of Norrland’s prehistoric and historic past vis-à-vis the unfolding of those socio-political and economic circumstances that resulted in what has come to be considered the centre-South and the peripheral-North.

This study also takes note of the fact that the core-periphery power structure and its cognitive repercussions are not unique, either for Sweden or for the subject of archaeology as such, recognising that this case study is yet a further example of a recurring phenomenon that requires our utmost attention. This observation is substantiated by a number of publications, from the disciplines of literature, history, archaeology and ethnology, all of which, broadly speaking, are similar in nature, presenting conclusions that corroborate those reached here. Two have briefly been referred to in the body of this work, they are; Nelson Moe’s *The View from Vesuvius* from 2002, and Edward Said’s classic work entitled *Orientalism* which was first published in 1978. The other three are; Said’s *Culture and Imperialism* from 1993, Roy Preiswerk and Dominique Perrot’s *Ethnocentrism and History* from 1978 and Mikael Villström’s *Det autentiska Andra* (The Authentic Other) from 2002. These five studies, each from the perspective of their own subject, recognise and explore the embeddedness of the scholarly endeavour, noting its utility in maintaining, normalising and/or justifying inequalities over time and of many different denominations.

Two further publications that did not reach the attention of the author in time to be included into the body of this volume are Thomas A. Brady’s article from 1991 entitle *The rise of merchant empires 1400-1700*, and Bengt Liliequist’s dissertation from 2003 entitled *Ludwik Flecks jämförande kunskapsteori* (Ludwik Fleck’s Comparative Theory of Cognition). From the former one realises that Sweden’s early political, economic and territorial development conforms to that experienced by many European kingdoms. This includes the emergence of a centre or core area, made possible by the successful and unchecked exploitation of neighbouring regions, that soon came to be regarded as naturally peripheral. The sociology of the scientific endeavour according to Fleck is thoroughly presented and discussed in Liliequist’s penetrating work. And while I do agree that cognition is contextually conditioned, I regard reality as being independent of the thinker. This implies that real knowledge about the world is possible, despite our surrounding socio-historical environment(s). The limits imposed upon our thinking by socio-historical conventions can be circumvented through the application of novel theories and critical methods, of which this work is an example.

Last but not least, there is Evert Baudou’s *Den nordiska arkeologin - historia och tolkningar* (Nordic Archaeology - its History and Interpretations) which became available in November of 2004, just three months before the presentation of this work. As my advisor, Baudou explicitly refrained from discussing his work with me, in order that I might unencumbered pursue my own line of reasoning. However, this did not prevent him from generously introducing me to the works of many other authors, references of relevance which have greatly enhanced the ideas presented here.

It is regrettable that none of the publications mentioned above were properly sourced, their inclusion would have sharpened, rather than changed, the conclusions reached here. Of these, two are prominent. One is the realisation that Norrland’s present is the result of negotiable power relations and not the outcome of some unbending law of nature. The second, following from the first, is both an affirmation and an admonishment; only an acute and informed historiography, as opposed to self-indulgent heritage, provides knowledge about the past, and the present.

Ultimately realising that a certain amount of vacant space was bound to occur between sections and chapters, I decided, at the last minute, to indulge myself by filling these hitherto unused spots with illustrations of important prehistoric artefacts that are, in one way or another, mentioned in the body of this text. Thus you will find a conical microblade core depicted on the next page, a T-shaped implement on page 43, the Offerdal implement on page 44, a round-
butted axe on page 106, four points from the Rastklippan site on page 196, the harpoon from Örnsköldsvik on page 206, a handle core on page 249, a north-Bothnian axe on page 250 and the harpoon from Vibosjön, Hälsingland on page 253. If for no other reason, let them remind us what it is archaeologists do.

Work on this thesis commenced in earnest on the 1st of February 2001, although many of the questions it addresses have been contemplated, by others as well as myself, for some time. It was completed and presented four years and eighteen days later. Similar to many other dissertations, it turned out exactly as planned, despite the fact that it was originally conceived as something quite different. For the last two years, and on my request, Evert Baudou has been my advisor. I have long considered Evert to be one of the most knowledgeable and intelligent archaeologists of our time. My confidence in his abilities has been confirmed and I only wish that all graduate students everywhere could be as fortunate. I have also been favoured in having associates, colleagues, friends and family who, like Evert, have generously shared their knowledge, insights, thoughts, experiences and/or time, thus providing me with advise, information, assistance, inspiration, encouragement, additional ideas and perceptions, novel avenues of awareness or a renewed sense of purpose and understanding. In this capacity, running the obvious and familiar risk of forgetting all too many, I would like to thank Åsa Lundberg, Lars-Göran Spång, Jenny Käck, Ulf Westfal, Margareta & Arnold Thunström, Berndt Westman, Barbro Mårtens, the Öhlén family (Elisabet, Ove, Jonas, Sara & Malin), Kirsten Lindhard, Lennart Forsberg, Meredith Hardy, Lillian Rathje, Britta Wennstedt-Edvinger, Ronny Smeds, Gunnel Baudou, Lena Frykholm, Jan Lindström, Folke Hansén, Ann-Kristin Antman, Torbjörn Arnold, Peter Holmblad, cousin Jamie and, of course, Mom, Dad and Broth, who also gave me art, literature, science and history. Special thanks goes to Jonathan Harding, computer expert, who saved me extra work by rescuing a hard-drive that contained many original illustrations; to Carina Lahti, secretary and confidant, for keeping me abreast on the demands of bureaucracy and departmental affairs; to Gun Drugge, Gunilla Backlund and Marika Abrahamsson from maintenance, who keep the building running and who, with their wit and humour, rendered the long arctic winters much less so; and to Anna-Grethe Johansson, skilled librarian and energetic friend who guided me through the labyrinths of L-space, commenting and correcting various drafts, while incessantly prodding me to ever higher levels of proficiency. I am indebted to Thomas B. Larsson for taking the time to read through the final draft. I would also like to thank the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation and the Faculty of Arts at the University of Umeå for three years of funding via the Northern Crossroads Research Project. I am also indebted to the Kungl. Gustav Adolfs Akademien för svensk folkkultur for their much appreciated grant which saw me through the first three months of the fourth year.

Conical microblade core from Neder/Nedre Ransjön/Randsjön, Linsell parish, Härjedalen, located today at 401 meters above the present day sea level. Made of jasper it is 2.7 cm long and 1.8 cm in diameter. Illustration source Olofsson 1995, here redrawn and modified. Scale 1:1.
Chapter One

Putting Things Into Context

Issues, Aims, Methods and Setting

“The past is continually needed to explain the present, and the whole to explain the part.”

Introduction

This is an armchair thesis with its origins firmly founded in the soil. Experienced fieldworkers will soon perceive the connection behind this apparent contradiction and recognise that the thoughts expressed here are just as much a result of archaeological fieldwork as any of the other 200 or so dissertations that have been published in Sweden since the advent of the subject some 150 years ago.

The connection referred to above, is to be found and understood in those hundreds of accidental and spontaneous discussions that repeatedly occurred through encounters, either by chance or design, with the general public that regularly took place during the course of archaeological fieldwork in Norrland, and beyond. Most of these meetings naturally occurred out of doors with people who live close to the land, the majority of which are both inquisitive and generally well versed on topics of local history. Not without some pride, they will gladly impart their knowledge, pointing out the undeniable fact that much of what they have to relate will not and cannot be found in any of the general historical works that profess to present ‘Sweden’s History’. This is a topic that, almost without fail, is sooner or later deliberated with great intensity; where is Norrland’s history? Why is Norrland constantly marginalised and/or ignored in the National primers? Is the history of Norrland less important in comparison with that of the South? These are just a few of the questions that are often raised, and which invoke responses not so seldom tinted with bitterness. This is one of two notable issues that always seems to crop up during the course of these encounters. The second stands in contrast to the first; Norrlandians possess historical proficiency but their knowledge of prehistoric times in the North is often limited or non-existent. Let me exemplify. A visit to one of the many parish museums, all founded and run on a voluntary bases, typically involves viewing an object of some kind, invariably a wooden agricultural implement with a date carefully carved onto its surface. Usually from the 18th century, less often from the 17th, this relic is then proclaimed to be the oldest known artefact in existence from this specific parish. All the while, on display in the same room, one may discover, for example, a round-butted axe, which predates anything else in the museum by at least six thousand years. Bewilderment, uncertainty, astonishment, disbelief and/or delight are just a few of the nouns that could be used to describe the emotions that rapidly passed over their faces on receiving further particulars concerning any and all prehistoric relics from, or to be found in, the parish under discussion. ‘What is this prehistory, where is it, how can I find out more about it, why hasn’t this attracted more attention?’ are just a few of those many inquiries that this newly awakened awareness calls forth. These episodes are not unique, others have had similar experiences while working in the North; Sidenbladh in the 1860’s, Nätterlund in the 1920’s, Baudou during the late 1960’s and early 1970’s (Baudou 1986a; 1984:35; Nätterlund 1925:12; Sidenbladh 1869:193).

There is something paradoxical about this situation. The Swedish educational system has clearly taught them that the Nation is endowed with both a prehistory and a history. That Norrland’s share of this history is clearly absent from many accounts on the national level is recognised by most Norrlandians. What they often overlook is the fact that the prehistory of this area has also gone missing. The reason for this is simple, they have no idea that it has ever even existed, despite the fact that they might literally be holding it in their hands.

A Reluctant Anthropologist

For over thirty years the author has been what might be described as a ‘reluctant anthropologist’ in this northern part of Europe. Trying to master their language and dialects, learning to eat and enjoy their foods, enduring the dark and cold of the winters, lavishing in the endless light of the summers, observing and adopting their habits, detecting their
strengths and weaknesses, discovering what makes them laugh and cry, listening to their hopes and fears while acquiring their views and insights. This includes pondering over how and why it is that these people repeatedly express the opinion that they have been left out of the history of that country to which they supposedly belong. Furthermore, how is it possible that these Norrlandians, who are surrounded by a long and interesting prehistory that has left behind innumerable traces of itself all across the landscape, have for so long been oblivious to its existence? They themselves often provided insight into this situation;

Our school primers familiarised us with monumental passages graves and standing stones, the Vikings, of castles, canals and the deeds of great men and of kings. All this took place in the South. It added nothing to our lives, with the possible exception of making us feel inferior (Ulf Westfal, from a personal discussion with the author that took place in the autumn of 2002).

I would maintain that the sentiments so elegantly expressed by Westfal above are both shared and endorse by many living in the North.

To the extent that popular literature can be used as an instrument to gauge the mood and temper of a people, then a recent book by Mikael Niemi would more than corroborate Westfal’s observations. This semi auto-biographical novel recounts growing up in Pajala, a small community located in the far north of Sweden, during the second half of the 20th century. Here he gives both a melancholy and humoristic account of his early school years, a time in life when personal self-awareness and cultural identity are in their formative stages;

In time we began to understand that our community wasn’t really a part of Sweden. We had been accidentally included. We were a northern appendix... We were different, slightly inferior, slightly un-educated, slightly lacking in moral fibre. We didn’t have deer, hedgehogs or nightingales. We didn’t have any celebrities. We didn’t have roller coasters, traffic lights, castles or stately manors. We only had an unlimited supply of mosquitoes... We were nothing. Our parents were nothing. Our forebears had contributed nought and nothing to Swedish history (Niemi 2001:49).

Niemi’s account specifically describes the experiences of a culturally and linguistically distinct minority that calls Norrland home. But every Norrlandian reading the above is immediately able to emotionally identify themselves with this and similar passages found throughout this novel. While they do so laughingly, there is always a certain undertone of resentment, and pride.

Baudou (1984; 1986a; 2003a) has, on occasion, addressed this issue, approaching it from a different angle by drawing attention to the contextuality of the archaeological endeavour, e.g. to the significance of the country’s socio-political history during the last 600 years;

The State’s political and administrative centre is the Mälär Valley, where there is also a concentration of notable prehistoric remains that bare witness to bygone days of power. From that perspective, the history of southern Norrland appeared insignificant, while upper Norrland looked like a wilderness inhabited by [a bunch of] Sámi toting magic drums. To any extent that culture had been able to make its way into these areas, it was considered to have come from the south, especially from the Mälär Valley region (Baudou 1984:35).

There is a decided air of estrangement, even of alienation, in all of the statements above. And frustration. Annoyance at being repeatedly excluded and ignored. This would not seem to be a recent insight. The County of Norrbotten celebrated a jubilee in 1921 with an exhibition and a monograph, the latter consists of a collection of essays. Eighty years later one can still feel the sense of urgency and expectation expressed by the Editor, who wrote;

...the amount of literature that deals with Norrbotten is meagre, knowledge about this County, a region of great variability, is little known, not only as concerns the Swedish public in general but also by its own inhabitants. Let me state with some hope, that this book will greatly contribute towards the development of a deeper sense of love in the inhabitants for this, their home district and straighten their own belief concerning its potential development, and that it may also, among the general Swedish public, improve their knowledge of this, their great colony, and its significance for the fatherland (Malm 1921:5p).

There are a number of circumstances concerning this preface that make it exceedingly interesting. This is not solely due to the fact that it clearly demonstrates an obvious awareness that there exists an unbalanced relationship between (paraphrasing Moe 2002) the peripheral-North and the centre-South. What makes
this short preamble so compelling is the fact that its author, Gösta Malm, was not only a Southerner but a prominent figure in Norrland’s recent history. At the time the above was written he had just finished serving as cabinet minister at the Department of Commerce and was now both Chairman of the ‘Research Institute of Industrial Economics’ (Sw. Industriens Utredningsinstitut) and the County Governor of Norrbotten. He was also actively involved in the reorganisation of the regional heritage association (Sw. hembygdsförening) and the establishment of its new periodical. Previously he had, in his capacity as engineer, supervised the successful completion of the first hydro-electric power plant in the North, an achievement which led to his appointment as Managing Director of Skånska Cement, a leading construction company which would become heavily involved in the future exploitation of Norrlandian waterways (Lagergren 1928:7pp). His political and economic interests are obvious. But he also seems to possess a genuine concern for the well being of his constituents, not only their material welfare, but also their spiritual and intellectual existence (Lagergren 1928:3). Notice must also be drawn to the fact that this was written at a time in Swedish history when flag waving patriotism to King and Country was a common occurrence. But Malm does not try to invoke any loyalties there. Rather, he hopes to bolster the confidence of the Northern inhabitants themselves.

From this one might possibly conclude that the existence and operation of a regional chauvinism, divisions of inequality and estrangement as indicated by the examples above, are not just the relatively recent fantasies of a limited number of Northern malcontents. Indeed, we shall see further on that these and similar views have been held and aired ever since the establishment, in the middle of the 16th century, of an independent Swedish kingdom.

The Issues

This search for Norrland’s past began in earnest in the late 1970’s under the influence of the archaeological field staff at the Västerbotten Museum, which then consisted of Lennart Forsberg, Åsa Lundberg, Gunhild Rydström and Lars Göran Spång. Not only were they capable excavators but they were also engaged in a stimulating discussion concerning, among other things, the nature of archaeological knowledge. This was made manifest in the view they took of, and in the resulting work carried out on, the so called ‘embankments of fire-cracked stone’. The results from these excavations were not unveiling any specific features that previous investigations had not already uncovered, and yet they were drawing conclusions and interpreting them in ways that were new and completely different from any of their predecessors. They were the first to abandon, if not the original nomenclature, then at least the original interpretation, and assert that these features were the remains of semi-subterranean dwellings.

What is puzzling about all this, is the fact that it took nearly 70 years for archaeologists to realise that these structures were indeed the remains of prehistoric dwellings. One could convincingly argue that the descriptive term assigned to these distinctive features was somewhat cryptic and thus long befuddled and helped postpone the realisation and the correct identification of these remains for what they truly are. On the other hand, one would have thought that any of the many excavations that have been carried out on these ‘embankments’ since the 1920’s, sooner or later, should have provided enough impetus to jolt those involved into re-evaluating entrenched assumptions concerning the nature of these features. This, as we shall see in Chapter Three, did not happen. Therefore, one is inclined to assume that terminology alone is not responsible for this apparent lack of comprehension and that there are other, more profound issues effecting and influencing the way archaeologists view and interpret the prehistoric record.

At approximately the same time that these ‘embankments’ were being re-evaluated, two other colleagues, Lars Forsberg and Ulf Westfal, were starting down a road that would ultimately lead them, each in their own way, to first doubt and later challenge certain erstwhile views concerning the prehistory of northern Sweden. Their work would eventually lead to the discovery of a Late Mesolithic semi-subterranean dwelling outside the sleepy village of Vuollerim, situated in northern Sweden, not far from the Arctic Circle. Within the next few years hundreds of similar features would be found and recorded. One is forced to ask, why did it take so long for archaeologists to recognise so abundant a feature? One might conceivably argue that all houses similar to those found at Vuollerim are of a type that are exceedingly difficult to detect. Although it would seem that similar kinds of features, if not understood, were at least commented upon, documented and
excavated a number of times prior to the discovery at Vuollerim (Bergman 1995:131p; Forsberg 1985:253p; Loeffler 1998; 1999c). In light of the above, one must ask;

1) why did it take so long for archaeologists to discover, perceive and/or acknowledge those features, which are today so abundant and which we now know to be the remains of semi-subterranean dwellings?

The recognition of a Mesolithic period in Norrland shares certain similarities with that which occurred concerning the identification of the prehistoric dwellings. Despite clear indications that Norrland possessed a Mesolithic past it took about 80 years or so before the evidence was fully and finally affirmed, endorsed and accepted. Again, as in the case above, it is apparent that when confronted with a certain type and/or amount of material the archaeologists working in Norrland both drew, and failed to draw, a number of conclusions, any or all of which would have been just as reasonable in light of the material that was on hand at the time. How could this be? This leads one to suspect that the practising archaeologists were exposed to some strong, implicit and non-archaeological factors which exercised a decisive influence on their interpretations concerning the prehistory of this area. Seen in this perspective the question is simply;

2) why did it take so long for archaeologists to recognise the existence of a Mesolithic period in Norrland?

There are grounds for suspecting that the interpretation and presentation of the Norrlandian past has laboured under the sway of compelling forces and/or constraints situated above and beyond purely archaeological deliberations and that the impetus of these considerations has seriously influenced, interfered with and effected how archaeologists evaluated the material on hand. What is possibly even more alarming is the realisation that this often take place unawares but that it is also a continuous and ongoing occurrence.

Even the most ephemeral review of the literature of sociology, the history of ideas or that of philosophy, will reveal that this type of epistemological situation is not specific for Norrland nor archaeology, although the particulars surly are. The following is thus a case study, in which we will attempt to explore the nature and grounds of our archaeological knowledge with reference to its limits and validity through an inquiry into the development of those above mentioned issues within Stone Age studies that were carried out in Norrland during the last one hundred years or so. It is possible, indeed probable, that the conclusions drawn from this case study will be generally applicable elsewhere, illuminating the contextual dependency of archaeology irrespective of regional or national borders.

The Aims

The assumption taken here is that archaeological research in Norrland, more specifically the interpretations derived from this research, have been seriously effected, even determined, by non-archaeological factors and that the consequences of this influence on the intellectual environment of those involved was much greater than has often been realised. If this is so, then the problem we wish to solve is simply;

3) what is the nature of these determinants?

The answer to all three questions posed above, are to be found and understood, indeed can only be made comprehensible, with reference to and in light of Norrland’s recent history, specifically in relationship to the Swedish nation as a whole.

What then, is Norrland, and what is its history? Surprisingly this is rather more difficult to uncover than one would at first expect. There is to date no general historical overview and/or synthesis, neither short nor long, scholarly or otherwise, which addresses and exclusively presents Norrland’s history, either in Swedish or any other language. This rather unexpected discovery is made remarkable in light of the fact that Norrland has been recognised as a distinctive region for almost 600 years, that is to say, as far back as the historical documents can take us.

What then, is Norrland, and what is its history? Surprisingly this is rather more difficult to uncover than one would at first expect. There is to date no general historical overview and/or synthesis, neither short nor long, scholarly or otherwise, which addresses and exclusively presents Norrland’s history, either in Swedish or any other language. This rather unexpected discovery is made remarkable in light of the fact that Norrland has been recognised as a distinctive region for almost 600 years, that is to say, as far back as the historical documents can take us.

On the other hand one can find any number of specialised articles and books that deal with particular aspects of Norrland’s history. From those that explore such diverse subjects as the growth of the region’s forest industry to chronicles that present the history of its plumbers (Björklund 1992; Anesäter [1989]). Other works are geographically specific, from multi-regional panoramas that, for example, examine food traditions in the Provinces of Medelpad and Ångermanland, on down to local episodes concerning the everyday life in a small neighbourhood district.
whose very existence and survival was completely
dependent upon the fortunes of the local mechanical
wood-pulp mill (Kristiansson 1979; Tafvelin 1995).

One such monograph that possibly merits more
attention that many others for what it can tell us about
this situation, is entitled ‘Norrland. Nature,
Population, Commerce and Industry’ (Sw. Norrland.
Natur, befolkning och näringar). Drawing on the best
efforts of 22 authors together with an editorial board
of nine, the majority of whom were academically
accomplished, they attempted to present a
comprehensive description of the region in just under
600 pages. This document is rather unique, there is
probably no comparable or related publication of this
type for Sweden’s two southern regions. It is the result
of a collaboration between the ‘Geographical
Association’ (Sw. Geografiska Förbundet) and the
‘Research Institute of Industrial Economics’.
Published in 1942, the importance ascribed to this
work is best illustrated by the fact that two identical
editions were printed simultaneously, distinguished
only by their front covers (Lundqvist 1942a; 1942b).
According to the introduction, it was written in order to;

...illuminate... [the region ] ...in order to acquire a
background against which one can gain insight into
the problems and special circumstances that prevail
in Norrland (Lundqvist 1942c:i).

The motives for doing so would not seem to have
been founded on any altruistic desire to present the
inhabitants with a history of this region, but rather to
further an unblushing and pragmatic self-interest;

This spacious Norrland with its enormous
economic resources is of the greatest consequence
for the commerce and industry of the entire nation
and thus demands from all of us a deeper
understanding (Lundqvist 1942c:iii).

It is not a historical work. Rather it is an attempt to
bring together a divers amount of information,
including archaeological, in order to gain a wider
understanding on how to best take advantage of the
region’s economic opportunities.

Another publication, one that does come close to
presenting a comprehensive historical overview from
the prehistoric era up until the beginning of the 19th
century is the thirty to forty year old, four volume
anthology entitled ‘The History of Upper Norrland’
(Sw. Övre Norrlands Historia). This type of historical
overview is not unique for Norrland. Although
informative it is, nevertheless, regionally restricted
in that it specifically concerns itself with the upper
half of Norrland, that is to say Västerbotten and

The absence and need of a general monograph or
overview that presents the Norrlandian past in its
entirety, and the perceived need for such a
presentation, is not an original observation. The
historian Stellan Dahlgren drew attention to this
situation after a review of the available historical
literature some forty odd years ago (Dahlgren
1961:162 & 171). A more recent recognition of this
problem resulted in ‘The Norrlandian Encyclopaedia’
(Sw. Norrländsk uppslagsbok) which was published
in four volumes between 1993 and 1996. It was, at
least in part, undertaken to alleviate this situation to
some extent (personal comment by Lars-Erik Edlund,
accomplished linguist as well as assistant editor, later
chief editor, of this encyclopaedia). It is indeed a
wonderful accomplishment, one that is invaluable for
anyone working, living and/or even slightly interested
in the upper two-thirds of Sweden. Its sole blemish,
apart from the fact that it is only available in Swedish,
is as obvious as it is intrinsic to all similar works of
reference; that information on any one topic may be
found distributed throughout the work in any number
of different places. This results in a certain amount
of incoherence in the narrative structure of any
specific subject that one may wish to consult. This is
not an insurmountable obstacle, but one which, if
nothing else, emphasises the fact that this region
lacks, and is in need of, a substantial work devoted
to the historical issues and problems that are specific
to and for the North.

But is this justifiably so? Is it reasonable to assume
a priori that the whole of Norrland possesses any
collective history of its own? Norrland is a term that
is used to describe a relatively vast area that
encompasses a diversity of geographical,
climatological and biological environments, a variety
of languages and linguistic dialects together with a
multitude of ethnic, social and economic distinctions.
This would seem to indicate that the region known
as Norrland is anything but a uniform and
homogeneous entity and thus also boasts a host of
particular and distinctive histories. This would indeed
seem to be the case. Nevertheless, it would also
appear that this multifarious region does in fact share
a common history when perceived in relation to the
rest of the Swedish nation, or more specifically, in
light of its relationship to the powers that be, both past and present, which in this case and for the last 600 years, amounts to the same thing.

Some might maintain that that there is no comparable general historical work for either Svealand and Götaaland, those two regions, which together with Norrland, make up what is today known as Sweden. On the surface this would seem to be the case, but in reality this statement only serves to confuse the issue and disguise or obscure the discrepancies that actually do exist as they concern the lopsided presentation of the past as concerns the North and the South. The titles of some of the earliest historical works would seem to sustain this assumption. There is Olof von Dalin’s *Svea rikes historia ifrån de äldsta tider til wåra tider*, which caused quite a stir with its appearance between 1750-1762. This was soon followed by Sven Lagerbring’s four volume history, published between 1769-1783, entitled *Svea rikes historia, ifrån de äldsta tider til de närwarande*. The five volumes of Christian Friedrich Rühs’ *Svea Rikes historia* appeared in rapid succession between 1823-1825 (Lölw 1910). All of these authors use the appellation *Svea* or *Svea Rike* in the titles of their books, terms that are not unproblematic. In modern usage these terms signify the whole of Swedish realm and/or nation. But the concept of a nation-state is a relatively recent invention and the use of these terms prior to that event, which took place at the beginning of the 19th century, cannot be understood thus (Klinge 1983:14pp & 23). Instead they refer to or characterise a particular southern region that was occupied by a specific tribe of people, irrespective of whether or not there is any solid historical evidence for the past existence of either one. History, and power, has been firmly anchored, both geographically and ethnically, in the southern half of the country for so long that it has become supra-normative; the validity of the outlook is never questioned, the need to do so seems not to have been recognised. With this in mind one is compelled to first query, and then inquire into the nature of the relationship between Norrland and southern Sweden. An examination of the contents of three more recent and general historical works on Sweden’s past gives, not an answer, but at least an indication of the nature of this relationship; Norrland is hardly mentioned at all.

The most recent and informative is a volume edited by Hans Albin Larsson entitled ‘A Book on Swedish History’ (Sw. *Boken om Sveriges historia*) from 1999. It is divided into seven chronologically well defined chapters which, with a total of 325 pages, presents an overview that starts in the remote prehistoric past and takes the reader on up to contemporary times. Each chapter is written by one or more authors, each an expert within their respective chronological period. Only about 3.4% of the book, or 11.1 pages, specifically mentions Norrland. Of the 288 pages that deal with the historical periods, Norrland’s share amounts to ca. 6 pages or 2.1% of the total. The prehistoric eras are presented in the 37 pages of chapter one, written by Evert Baudou, an archaeologist who has spent the last 40 years working in the North. In light of his background, it is possibly therefore not surprising to note that the space allocated to Norrland is somewhat larger, approximately 5.1 pages or about 13.8% of that chapter (Larsson 1999a).

Equally readable is the shorter and more concise *Swedish History in Outline* from 1993 which was written by the historian Jörgen Weibull. He, at a brisk pace, traces Sweden’s history from earliest times up to the end of the 20th century in 8 chapters and 137 pages. Here, Norrland is treated even more summarily, with just four entries. Indeed, both Norway and Finland receive a great deal more attention while the Sámi population are not referred to at all. Norrland is mentioned for the first time on page 45, when we are told that Sweden took control over a number of provinces, both north and south, from the Kingdom of Denmark-Norway between 1644-1645. Later it is referred to again in connection with the consequences of the war of 1808-1809, presented on page 76, which resulted in the occupation of the whole of Finland and a part of northern Sweden by the Russians. The decisive battle of that war took place at Ratan, just north of Umeå. Oddly enough, it is not even mentioned. A picture caption on page 109 briefly informs one of the significance of the northern iron ore district and the importance of the railway line between Gällivare, Luleå and later Narvik, which “...advanced the exploitation of... [these iron deposits and] ...greatly expanded Swedish...exports.” (Weibull 1993:109). Twelve pages later we come across the last entry concerning Norrland. This is a reference to the murder of five workers by the Swedish military during a peaceful demonstration in 1931 at Ädalén in the Province of Ångermanland, brought on by the widespread political and social unrest of the times resulting from the Great Depression and the rise of
the labour unions. All in all the references to Norrland make up approximately half a page or about 0.4% of this book.

In four encyclopaedic volumes entitled ‘The Swedish History of Learning’ (Sw. Svensk Lärdomshistoria) Sten Lindroth presents an in depth investigation of the development of Swedish sciences, academic learning, intellectual achievements, cultural and scholarly personalities, institutions and organisations from the Medieval Ages up until the beginning of the 19th century (Lindroth 1997a; 1997b; 1997c; 1997d). It is a phenomenal accomplishment, originally published between 1975-1981 and reprinted a number of times since then. The North’s share of this 1892 page epic is practically non-existent. The only time Norrland is mentioned is when some prominent personality happens to have had their humble origins in this region or when some other personage of note undertook an expedition to, or enterprise in, the North. This does not make Lindroth’s masterly work any less enlightening or enjoyable, but it does underline the fact that Norrland’s contribution, at least to the intellectual elite and cultural capital of what is considered to be part and parcel of the Swedish nation, was and has continued to be microscopic.

These few examples do not pretend to constitute a penetrating, exhaustive or even thorough review of the general historical literature pertaining to the existing quantitative relationship between Norrland and the rest of the Nation. And while it is nearly always fallible to generalise from a limited sample, these sources, unfortunately and nevertheless, seem to be appropriate and reliable representatives of this unbalanced relationship, a condition which, as we shall see in Chapter Three, is comparable to that which exists within archaeological literature.

We are, in these later day examples, at least spared the ambiguity of the appellations employed in their titles, which would seem to indicate that they present Sweden’s history, an account that one would assume also included the North. The reality of this endeavour would however, seem to fall far short of the professed intentions. Of course, it is important that we remember that all of these books, like many similar works, set out to recount Swedish history from different perspectives. Each involves a description of the rise and growth of either its cultural, political, economic, social, and/or ideological foundations and institutions together with the reasons or rationale behind their appearance and the resulting consequences of their continued existence. This is something they often do quite well. Akin to all historical accounts, it is a transference of a certain and limited amount of information specifically chosen with reference to the subject under discussion. Thus choices are being made concerning what is to be recounted or imparted and what is not. In this case it would generally appear that any development of consequence occurred exclusively and primarily in the lower or southern one-third of Sweden, not so seldom along the reaches of the Mälar Valley, that is to say in and around Stockholm. The narrative panorama is set on and focused towards the South. Our attention is unwittingly drawn away from the North, creating an imperceptible polarisation between what is considered to be the centre and the peripheral, a viewpoint which unintentionally or otherwise infiltrates our attitudes and outlooks and in the end, becomes normative. This phenomenon is not only repetitive, it is also extremely abstruse, to such an extent that, in the end, one may not even be aware of its occurrence. It then takes a conscious effort on the part of the reader to realise that it has and/or is happening and to ask; throughout its long history, did Norrland contribute nothing?

The centrifugal force of this phenomenon is not necessarily or exclusively conditioned by quantity alone, that is to say how much space or elbow-room a region receives in any given text. It is also a question of quality, how and in what way a region is portrayed and presented. Here a contemporary example will suffice. In the second chapter of the Boken om Sveriges historia, which presents the Medieval Period, one reads with some trepidation that, “Large parts of what are today the inner regions of Finland and Norrland were for a long time either completely uninhabited or (in the northern areas) occupied by the Sámi.” (Harrison 1999:61). This statement is rather surprising, especially in light of the first chapter where the preceding prehistoric period was presented and which clearly contradicts this remark (Baudou 1999a). What is possibly even more alarming is the fact that this despairing quote is one out of a sum total of three that specifically makes reference to Norrland in this chapter. Although any Northern archaeologist will immediately recognise the fallibility of this statement, it has not here been included in order to reproach its author. Rather it can and should be seen as a further symptom or manifestation of that persistent myth to which everyone is susceptible and, to wit, is constantly being
reproduced and reinforced; that Norrland has no history of its own except that which is defined or determined in accordance to its relationship with the South.

This is neither a bold nor an original statement and it is implicitly born out through Sverker Sörlin’s dissertation from 1988 concerning the history of science and ideas, entitled ‘Land of the Future’ (Sw. Framtidslandet). This monograph, a landmark achievement, probably comes nearest to presenting a concise history of Norrland. Sörlin paints a fascinating and brilliant account of the development of those conceptions and convictions that were ideologically constructed in order to explain what Norrland was, is and should be, as seen through the eyes of a Southern elite, be they policy makers, scientists or artists, et cetera, both past and present. Surprisingly one recognises how the genesis and development of these concepts was highly artificial, one could even say, manufactured. In other words, much of what is considered to define Norrland is nothing less than a product of those shifting aspirations, fears, hopes, wants and needs of a changing Nation, where the economic and political power for the last 600 years has been firmly situated in the South. Norrland does have its own particularities, and these are sometimes, though not always, acknowledged. But it has no existence or identity of its own per se other than that which is mentally conceived or invented in the South by the powers that be, in accordance with the cultural, political, economic, social and ideological agenda(s) of the day.

In light of the above and in answer to the previously posed query concerning Norrland’s relationship to the Nation as a whole, one can only conclude that it is akin to that between a passive recipient and a dynamic participant. That it is an association between unequal and dissimilar entities, one strong the other weak, which has allowed the former to impose its will, needs, history and heritage on the latter. Indeed it would seem to be nothing less than one between a Mother Country and Her Colony. Non Scandinavians might find this statement somewhat surprising. They would presumably be even more surprised to learn that few, if any, in Sweden would consider this remark to be controversial. Probably mundane, possibly even trite but hardly disturbing. This attitude could conceivably be interpreted as an indication of just how successful this colonial endeavour has been. In fact one could even maintain that the colonisation, or Swedification, of Norrland ranks as one of the most successful ever undertaken by any nation to date.

This view of Norrland would seem to be shared by politicians, lay persons and historians alike, both past and present, North and South. Axel Oxenstierna (1583-1654) was not only a leading figure in his own country, but was also considered by his contemporaries to have been one of Europe’s most influential statesmen (Stadin 1999:145). He is often credited with having described Norrland as, “... a [West] India within our [national] boundaries, we only need to realise this and to use it.” Apparently there is no proof that Oxenstierna actually was the author of this quote although rightly or wrongly he is usually credited with having penned these lines (Bäärnhielm 1976:5). Whether or not this is so, is of little consequence. What matters here are the sentiments behind it, which seem to have been widespread at the time. Indeed, the historian Sven Lundkvist has pointed out that official documents from the fourteenth century onwards, which concern Norrland, all contain a common theme; what is the best way to utilise and exploit this area in order to enhance and advance the interests of the central authorities, that is to say, the South (Lundkvist 1994a:73). What is a little more surprising is that, 600 years later, this attitude seems hardly to have changed. Nils Ramqvist, one of the central figures behind an emerging and modern Norrlandian consciousness of the 1940’s, felt that this unknown, exploited and forgotten area must be acknowledged and that it was time to;

...create a heightened awareness concerning this part of the country and its right to exist in conditions equal to those comparable to the rest of the Sweden. Norrland should feel that it is a part of its native country and not a colony (Ramqvist as cited in Forsell 1992:15).

There are good grounds for suspecting that scientific inquiries are not and cannot be perceived as being detached or independent of their surrounding social environment. Thus, the aim of this study is to understand the character of archaeological knowledge by looking at both the ideas and the interpretations of past participants within the subject as they specifically pertain to Norrland. It is an inquiry into the reasons, incentives and/or motives, if any, behind “...why particular interpretations might have been chosen, or favoured...” over others (Ucko 1989a:x).
It is an assessment of those implicit assumptions upon which archaeological work has been based, while keeping in mind the social context of its use, in order to reveal those external and hidden influences or relationships which seem to have prevailed and/or predominated the archaeological community from without.

The Methods
All archaeological knowledge is produced within a given social, historical, ideological, economic, cultural and temporal context. In other words, paraphrasing Veit (1989:50), there can be no prehistoric research outside the confines of contemporary society. At first glance this might appear to be an exceedingly trite observation, in truth, it is both physically and mentally impossible for it to be otherwise. Its implications are, on the other hand, all the more consequential. Archaeologists have slowly come to the realisation that their subject, or more correctly, that the practitioners as well as the product they produce, are neither neutral nor apolitical. That our search for knowledge and the route we travel to reach that goal are based on value judgements external to the subject under study, convictions which may profoundly influence the choice of subject matter, the methods of analysis employed, together with the interpretations finally drawn from the material.

This situation is not unique for the subject of archaeology, nor for the humanities as such, nor for science as a whole. The genesis and development of this insight, the sociology of knowledge, the realisation that both scientists and scientific inquiry are affected by their socio-historical surroundings can be traced back to the beginning of the Enlightenment. This insight is not to be confused with the realisation that the knowledge any discipline might produce may (and probably will) be used by others in ways not originally intended or imagined by the producers, although this in itself is a very serious problem which was early recognised by archaeologists and which has lately received renewed attention (Ucko 1990:xiv). What we are here interested in is the realisation that the results and interpretations we and others draw from cultural research are affected by influences located far outside the academic subject itself (e.g. Hagen 1975; Kohl & Fawcett 1995; Miller, Rowlands & Tilley 1989; Ucko & Layton 1999). That the very explanation one selects or rejects may be based, not on any scientific rational, but on surrounding socio-historical circumstances of which we might well be completely unaware of;

...archaeologists themselves have been influenced in their interpretations by the received wisdom of their times, both in the sort of classificatory schemes which they consider appropriate to their subject, and in the way that their dating of materials is affected by their assumptions about the capabilities of the humans concerned (Ucko 1989a:xiii, English in the original).

There is no need to be pessimistic in the face of this revelation, quite the contrary. The very act of recognising the existence of this situation provides and presents us with an awareness, a conscious perception, which we may then utilise to create a number of analytical perspectives that can be employed, if not to master, then at least manage the consequences of this predicament. The past happened, thus to a certain extent, it is discoverable. A critical analysis of the development of archaeological research in Norrland will do much to illuminate the problems encountered when endeavouring to do so. This will be achieved by the loose employment of three perspectives.

The first of these was presented in an original work by the physician Ludwik Fleck and can be summed up using a pair of his key terms, ‘thought-styles’ and ‘thought-collectives’. The second approach has to do with the socio-ideological effects of what is here termed the colonial experience. The third springs from the second and concerns ideas of heritage and identity. It is hoped that the pluralistic research design implemented here, a combination of different interpretative perspectives, will help provide us with insights and reveal dependencies that otherwise might have remained hidden or only vaguely perceived if only one of the above approaches had been employed (Burström 1989:9 & 26).

Thought-Styles and Thought-Collectives
Lessons from the history of science show that the search for knowledge is often far from being the logical and rational procession that it is often given out to be. Even if one could ignore the social constraints, one still would be struck by the realisation that the production of knowledge is in the hands of people who are very human indeed. Emotional, irrational, bungling and eccentric, they grope their way along using enlightened guesses, informed insights and creative imaginations supplemented with
logic and analytical tools. And through mistakes, luck, experience and sheer persistence somehow do manage to contrive some understanding out of the complexities that surrounds them (Koestler 1979; Kuhn 1977).

The logical positivists of the famous Vienna Circle and their philosophical heirs, the Justificationists, were well aware of the complexities concerning the genesis and structure of knowledge and set themselves the seemingly impossible task of trying to formulate a standard that would separate science from metaphysics and create a rational methodological model with which one could use or apply in order to arrive at objective and value free knowledge. This endeavour resulted in the creation of the Covering Law model (which includes the deductive-nomological explanation of particular events, the deductive-nomological explanations of laws, the deductive-statistical explanation and the inductive statistical explanatory model). Basically this means that an event is explained and/or justified only if it can be subsumed under some general principle or law (Hempel 1966). This methodological positivism is deceptively simple and elegant. It is also afflicted with so many fundamental epistemological difficulties and objections which, in the final analysis, completely strip it of any of its intended methodological advantages, problems that were well-known even then and to which many have spent careers endeavouring to alleviate (Chalmers 1980; 1982; Hempel 1965; 1966).

In light of this, it is perhaps ironic that some within the New Archaeology, which emerged during the 1950’s and 60’s, adopted this epistemological stance at a time when philosophers were increasingly questioning and then forsaking both methodological positivism and justificationism, retreating, as it were, through the ranks of fallibilism, via the naive falsificationism of Karl Popper, onwards to the sophisticated falsificationism of Imre Lakatos and finally bumping up against the anarchistic epistemology of Thomas Kuhn and Paul Feyerabend (Feyerabend 1990a; 1990b; 1996; Lakatos 1970). This abbreviated account gives the impression that an orderly chronological procession of epistemological views occurred within philosophy. This is not so. What it does reveal is that philosophers were beginning to question the feasibility of being able to design and erect ideal models or guidelines concerning how science should be conducted and were increasingly turning their attention towards trying to understand and describe what scientists were actually doing. Thus, it is a double irony that many of the epistemological criticisms that post-processual archaeologists would later level against the New Archaeologists were already anticipated and formulated by philosophers even before many of the post-processualists were even born.

Even as Karl Popper was endeavouring to show that theories could never be confirmed, only falsified, while striving to save the edifice of methodological positivism, Ludwik Fleck was pioneering the constructivist-relativist trend in philosophy by exploring the inner nature or structure of the scientific endeavour and its relationship(s) with its surrounding social and ideological environment(s). Popper and his book, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* from 1935, would quickly attain world wide attention and acclaim while Fleck’s *Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact*, which was published in the same year as Popper’s, would languish for over 40 years before reaching a wider audience (Kuhn 1979; Trenn 1979:xvii).

Fleck’s account, like Kuhn’s, is not a method of analysis, but rather a recognition of the sociology of the scientific endeavour, together with a detailed description of the many idiosyncrasies surrounding the conceptualisation of what any scientific community considers to be knowledge. The key terms Fleck introduces are the ‘thought-style’ and the ‘thought-collective’, which contain many of the characteristics and properties of Kuhn’s paradigm concept. The thought-collective is simply “...a community of persons mutually exchanging ideas or maintaining intellectual interaction...” (Fleck 1979:39). Thus any individual will belong to any number of thought-collectives, be they scientific or otherwise. And while any thought-collective does consist of individuals it cannot be reduced or explained by referring to the sum total of its members (Fleck 1979:41). Thought-collectives are long term entities while individual members may come and go. They are the receptacles of information and function as containers and vehicles for the transmission of both the “…historical development of any field of thought, as well as for...[its]...given stock of knowledge and level of culture.” (Fleck 1979:39), that is to say, its distinctive thought-style. Although Fleck does not totally deny the impact of the individual, it is obvious that he considers individual contributions to be marginal in scope. Indeed, he asserts that the individual might not even be aware of the dominate thought-style, but that it will, nevertheless utterly and inescapably, structure his or her way of thinking.
Abandonment, followed by the formation of a new thought-style is the most creative phase in the history of research. It is during this stage, the break up of a thought-style, that inter-collective communication increases, indeed is made possible at all. The collapse of the dogmatic doctrine of an old thought-style opens up novel possibilities of interaction and transmission between thought-collectives which in turn result in new discoveries and the creation of new facts (Fleck 1979:109pp).

Anyone with even a passing knowledge of Kuhn’s seminal work, originally published in 1962, will recognise the similarities it shares with Fleck, although there are serious differences, of which only two will be mentioned here. The first concerns the creative significance and role of the individual in science and/or history, which in both Fleck’s and Marxist accounts is subordinate to the dominate epistemological/ideological communities. Whether this age old question can, or cannot, be resolved, is not a topic discussed here. I can only concur with, for example Baudou (1998a:85) when he states that the role of the individual is underestimated in the universalistic theories. In way of reply, Fleck might have pointed out that I am under the influence of a thought-style that extols the role of the individual to the exclusion of everything else.

The second important difference between Kuhn and Fleck concerns the relative independence of the paradigm and thought-style. Both provide and define the theoretical guidelines, methodological standards, worthwhile research goals, conceptual categories and acceptable solutions of problems for any scientific community. But this is where the similarities cease. Kuhn portrays the scientific community as if it was independent and unencumbered by any external ideological, cultural, social and economic influences. During periods of normal science the scientific community is even exempt from the distraction of competing paradigms. It is a closed and autonomous system. Only during periods of crisis resulting from internal and repetitively un-resolvable anomalies will the scientific community experience the creative forces generated by one or more emerging and conflicting paradigms. During this period of revolutionary science, the members of a scientific community will internally realign themselves, but only one will emerge and assert itself through a new and dominate paradigm resulting in a renewed period of normal science (Kuhn 1970). It is interesting to note that Kuhn’s portrayal of the pre-paradigm stage of a discipline is, in many ways, much more...
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descriptive of the situation to be found within archaeology as a whole, in comparison to that which is characteristic for a phase of normal science (Kuhn 1970:10pp). A paradigm sets the stage within a discipline, it defines its fundamental concepts, rules and standards. Research is then a matter of puzzle solving, tinkering as it were with all the smaller bits, and trying to make them fit into the larger picture as defined by the paradigm. Within archaeology we are still arguing over such fundamental concepts as ‘culture’, ‘territoriality’ and ‘diffusion’. There is a profusion of theories, hypotheses, explanations, assumptions, methods, techniques, procedures and definitions, but no over all guiding principle or superstructure, no dominate paradigm comparable to that proposed, for example, by Newton and Einstein in physics, by Darwin in biology or by Crick and Watson for genetics. This brings into question the suitability of applying the paradigm concept to describe the production of knowledge within the humanities and specifically within archaeology (Baudou 1998a; Hegardt 1997; Prescott 1994) which in turn would implicitly imply that there is a fundamental difference between the natural sciences and the humanities. In contrast, though styles are considered to be highly susceptible to external forces, both culturally as well as socially dependent and conditioned (Fleck 1979:98pp). Fleck’s thought-styles are in many ways closer to Kuhn’s pre-paradigm stage of science, where a number of chaotic, turbulent, unpredictable, dynamic, fuzzy, overlapping and rival thought-styles and thought-collectives are evolving, dissolving, recombining and competing for our attention.

Fleck, in many respects, presents a much more intricate and perplexing version of the development of science than Kuhn. One that, at least as far as the humanities are concerned, might cause more than just a ripple of recognition among practitioners within its various fields. Baudou has successfully applied Fleck’s account in his exposé over the life and times of the Swedish archaeologist Gustaf Hallström (Baudou 1997). One of the most revealing disclosures of this work is the recognition that academic Sweden throughout most of the 20th century was a very small duck-pond indeed. Archaeologists were not only few in number, but they knew each other personally, often socialising privately on a regular basis with their respective families (Baudou 1997:53pp; 2002b:188). Fleck’s account of science has much in common with post-modern ideas, that is to say, the historicism and irrationalist theories of today, which seriously

---

Fig. 1. The archaeological wheel ponderously rolls across the world it wishes to investigate, alternatively bringing into play many different methods in order to investigate the reality it encounters. Archaeology is a wonderfully diverse discipline, which will happily employ any and all means to explore the past, both of its own making and those from other, dissimilar fields. The above is an attempt to illustrate this situation. Located at the hub is the discipline of archaeology itself. The spokes radiating out from the centre exemplify some of those methods, techniques, ideas, theoretical concepts, et cetera, that it has borrowed from other subjects in order to explore the past, naturally including those of its own devise. The rim of the wheel symbolises a number of material and immaterial constraints that impose themselves between our most efficient efforts and the world we wish to probe. These restraints might, for example, either prevent or seriously impede archaeological research, while simultaneously influencing, implicitly or explicitly, the methods employed, material recovered and interpretations drawn during the course of any inquiry. These constraints are not constant, proportionally, their individual importance will wane and wax depending on both time and place. This drawing also illustrates the fact that no single archaeologist can hope to become significantly proficient in more than a modest number of methodologies, techniques or related disciplines, thus we are singularly limited in our individual ability to effectively employ more than a few of them at a time when endeavouring to examine the world. And yes, there is also a reason why a wagon wheel was intentionally chosen to symbolically represent the subject, rather than, for example, that from a Jaguar Mark II.
question some of the fundamentals of Enlightenment philosophy; reason, progress and universal truth (Larrain 1994:1pp). Thus archaeologists may find themselves compelled to achieve a reality in which reason, progress and truth are no longer self-evident, conceivably not even within their reach. The risk of pursuing those goals, universal and uniform explanations, might be greater than at first realised, forcing us to reduce and thus exclude much that makes the present and the past so interesting; its bountiful variations, valuable dissimilarities and incomprehensible idiosyncrasies. “A belief in an unconditional objectivity is an illusion,” says Baudou, the scientist “…is inescapably dependent on many factors that come from outside the profession…” (Baudou 1998b:115). But Baudou realises that these factors can be understood and to some extent controlled through a self-reflective discourse. Norwegian archaeologist Knut Helskog would seem to agree. In his comments concerning Baudou’s biography over Gustaf Hallström (Baudou 1997) Helskog notes the importance of this type of inquiry; that we “…need to be aware of the reasoning and the contexts of archaeological reasoning and the contexts in which the conclusions were formed… [so that] …we might have a better opportunity to understand how previous interpretations of… [the region and problems with which we are now working] …became what they became.” (Helskog 1998:101). In other words, our inquires will, if they are explicitly reflective, yield real knowledge about the real world, both past and present.

The Colonial Experience

From the above it would seem that each individual archaeologist, whether they wish to realise it or not, is embedded in the contemporary context of their own present, a situation that exposes them to internal and external influences that will, to a certain extent, effect and/or encumber their ability to interpret the archaeological record. In light of the above it would seem advisable to equip ourselves with a tolerable knowledge of the surrounding economic, political, social and ideological environment within which archaeology has produced its brand of knowledge. In the case under study here, it has already been suggested that Norrland has been viewed, and possibly utilised, as a colony by the southern half of the Swedish nation and that this relationship has influenced Swedish archaeological research when it came to the discovery and interpretation of Norrland’s prehistory. This would account for much of what has so far been observed concerning the apparent dearth of prehistory and history as it concerns the North. Consequently, in this specific case, it is necessary to have some understanding of what colonialism is and what the colonial experience entails.

The history and development of any one colony is partly the result of local particularities and circumstances that are specific for that place and time. But there are a number of prevalent tendencies, developments and consequences that do characterise the colonial experience as a whole. Not all of these elements occurred everywhere, neither did they appear simultaneously nor in any orderly sequence. But they have occurred, to a certain degree in one form or other, often enough to allow historians to make some general observations and draw some common and shared conclusions concerning this global phenomenon (Magdoff 1988:876).

Up until the advent of the industrial revolution during the second half of the 18th century, colonial activities were relatively confined. According to mercantilism, the prevailing economic principle of the times, a nation’s wealth was fundamentally a measure of the amount of bullion it had at its disposal. In an attempt to accomplished this goal, commerce was increasingly regulated and controlled by the centralised monarchies and leading noble families. The modus operandi was protectionism and the establishment of monopolies over the trade in goods and foreign produce. Early colonies were established in order to facilitate trade, obstruct foreign intruders, extract those commodities and goods required and monopolise local markets. This often entailed a restricted occupation of those areas that contained the desired commodities, natural products and/or raw materials, through the founding of a limited number of colonial settlements which would act as commercial centres, usually along the coast, together with the establishment or appropriation of existing trade routes, trading posts and/or strong points (Boutilier 1989:23; Magdoff 1988:875; Nowell 1988:873; Rider 1999:94pp).

The intrusion of these early mercantile empires was definitely an infringement on those societies that were confronted with this expansion. The profound disruption it caused among them should not be underestimated, yet in comparison with the following phase it was relatively secondary, or indirect. Thus indigenous communities, with their own particular cultural and social institutions, that were of no economic interest to the Europeans were not deliberately tampered with and, to a certain degree,
remained basically intact despite colonial encroachment. The next phase of colonial expansion, economic imperialism, would leave nothing untouched and nothing unchanged.

The industrial revolution and the development of a capitalist economy would propel the western European nations to a position of unparalleled world dominance, a one hundred year process which began in the 1760’s. By the 1840’s mercantilism was crumbling, being replaced by what has come to be known as classical economics, a doctrine usually attributed to Adam Smith (1723-1790) and his monograph from 1776 entitled *Inquiry Into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. From this time onwards it would be argued that productivity was the real economic measure of a nation’s prosperity. The catch word of the day was free trade, *laisser-faire et laisser-aller* (to let it alone and let it flow). In stark contrast to early practices, the central authorities were not to interfere with commerce at all. Indeed strong convictions were voiced that the abolishment of all regulations and legislative restrictions would lead to larger markets and permit a greater division of labour which in turn would promote an increase in production and thus in the wealth of the nations (Nowell 1988:874; Rider 1999:205pp).

Unbridled free trade was never fully achieved. By the 1860’s protectionism in the form of reinstated trade restrictions were again everywhere implemented (Rider 1999:211). On the other hand, economic enterprise did pass from under the direct control of the centralised monarchies into the hands of private citizens, the activities of which were now facilitated, accommodated and promoted by an increasing number of parliamentary governments, through the use of both legislation and military action.

The development of capitalism and industrialism resulted in a reorientation of the type of goods and the nature of the trade relationships now sought after by the western European nations. Control of markets and the administration of dependencies distinguish this second phase of colonialism. The purchase and appropriation of commodities and other natural products, such as spices, sugar and slaves, was now largely replaced by a call for raw materials and inexpensive food stuffs to sustain the growing demands of its processing industries and to feed Europe’s swelling labour force. The surplus production of manufactured goods in the industrialised nations also created the need for new and expanded markets, which hopefully would now be found throughout the world. A portion of the increasing profits from trade were thus invested in the colonies themselves, in order to establish and develop an effective administrative and economic infrastructure which would insure and increase the supply of raw materials and commodities as well as the maintenance and enlargement of markets (Boahen 1987:58; Boutilier 1989:23p; Magdoff 1988:875; Rider 1999:438p).

There were also a number of non-economic motives behind the extension and expansion of colonial control during this second phase. From many quarters within the industrial nations there existed a real and sincere, although misguided, sense of obligation towards the original inhabitants of the colonies. Founded on misbegotten ideas of evolution and progress, Europeans erroneously felt that it was either their profane or sacred duty to save and civilise these indigenous peoples, none of which were in need of saving. Indeed, most, if not all, of these cultures and societies had existed for ages, developing their distinctive lifestyles quite independently of any misconceived ideals concerning Western cultural and intellectual predominance. This obstinate arrogance towards other and different cultures, histories, races and religions would add a new dimension to this second phase of the colonial experience, which in all respects would be just as devastating as the economic effects.

The material and non-material consequences of colonialism are complicated, diverse and far reaching (Boahen 1987; Boutilier 1989; Magdoff 1988; Rider 1999). They are outlined as follows;

I) The ensuing scramble for colonies led to the partition and division of regions that cut across ethnographic, cultural, geographic and/or ecological realities. These new and often arbitrarily drawn boundaries effectively asundered existing social structures while disrupting and blocking age old lines of communication, ending regional and trans-regional trade and social relations.

II) The promotion of foreign emigration and the establishment of new settlements, first along the coast, then deeper into the interiors of the colonies, was augmented by,

III) the establishment, redistribution and/or expropriation of land and property rights by the central authorities, which in turn led to conflicts with the original inhabitants resulting in,
IV) the extinction and/or forceful removal of the indigenous populations or to their subjugation and pacification, ending in the total replacement of their original lifeways with those of the colonising power.

V) When colonies become subservient to economic forces outside of their control, ‘dependent economic development’ occurs. This takes place when a region’s natural resources or primary products are gathered into the hands of a relatively small number of foreigners who decide, often from afar, how and where these resources are to be used.

VI) Effective economic exploitation requires the “...creation of a labour supply for commercial agriculture and... [industry] ...by means of direct forced labour and indirect measures aimed at generating a body of wage [labourers]” (Magdoff 1988:875) which in turn entails,

VII) the substitution of money payments for goods, taxes and rents which ends the barter and exchange of local commodities together with the “...decline of the home industry... [and] ...the curtailment of production and exports by native producers.” (Magdoff 1988:875).

VIII) Colonies are characterised by either their total lack of, or their limited capacity to process and refine locally produced primary products within the region itself. Deficiencies as concerns the secondary processing of locally produced raw materials was augmented by,

IX) the destruction of the original and diversified subsistence economies and their replacement by a minimal number of cash crops or raw materials, resulting in,

X) mono economies, that is to say the exploitation and specialised procurement of a limited number and range of primary materials, thus making the colonies vulnerable to any negative fluctuations in the global economy, often as a result of a fall in the prices of raw materials and the simultaneous rise in the price of manufactured goods.

XI) Effective exploitation requires the building of a transport and communications network in order to facilitate the movement of raw materials, heavy machinery, etc. to and from the colonies and foreign economic centres. The establishment of this infrastructure was geographically restricted and regionally unbalanced, geared foremost to promote the exploitation of natural resources and not to assist nor meet the communication needs of the local population.

XII) The new colonial economy was complimented by a new political and administrative infrastructure. This involved the restructuring and/or replacement of indigenous political, legal and social leaders and systems with Western institutions in order to facilitate private and public economic transactions. The end result was,

XIII) total political dependency, the loss of sovereignty and the right to decide and/or associate with other regions to the colony’s own advantage.

XIV) Urbanisation increased as a consequence of the growth of both administrative and/or economic centres. This development was geographically asymmetric, escalating the gap between urban and rural areas as seen in the,

XV) uneven distribution of the social infrastructure in the form of e.g. hospitals, educational centres, universities and different types of cultural facilities, which in turn accelerated,

XVI) the de-population of the countryside by pulling more and more people into the urban centres.

XVII) Where educational systems were installed, acculturation and enculturation was accelerated by creating inhabitants moulded according to requirements dictated from political and economic centres. Indigenous and local cultures were denounced and proclaimed to be primitive, that is to say retarded, while the lifeways, views and standards of the political and economic centres were seen as normative.

XVIII) This centralised arrogance and the assumed inferiority of the colonised alienated many people from their own society, culture and past history. This estrangement led them to embrace that of the dominate culture while renouncing their own, thus contributing to the finial,

XIX) substitution of local cultural heritage, history and language with those of the dominate elite and region.
The increasing loss, dispossession and/or denial of all indigenous traditions, history, culture, language and life styles would, both during and after colonisation, promote a deep feeling of inferiority resulting in a corresponding loss of self-respect.

From all of the above, Boahen, in his *African Perspectives on Colonialism*, concludes that it is these final observations that, in the long run, have been the most serious and damaging (Boahen 1987:107p). Indigenous history, heritage and cultural traditions, on a global scale, were partly or completely eradicated. This is a process which did not end with colonialism. The intellectual and psychological repercussions of this development have been, and still are, profound, while their impact may turn out to be far more serious, long lasting, complicated and diverse than the economic consequences of colonialism.

The assumption taken here is that Norrland has been treated as a colony. If this assumption is correct then the nature of this unbalanced relationship should, to a large degree, be reflected in the general or particular histories of both Sweden and Norrland. If this is so then one would expect to find evidence for a good majority, if not all twenty, of the particulars outline above, implicitly or explicitly expressed in many of those historical works that are readily available for inspection by any contemporary and critical observer. The feasibility of this assumption will be explored in Chapter Two.

The Idea of Heritage

As indicated above, what is considered to be the heritage of any one nation plays a central role in defining the identity of both the country in question and its inhabitants.

The term ‘heritage’ is highly ambiguous and difficult to delimit. In *Webster’s Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary* (1967) it is defined as “something transmitted by or acquired from a predecessor”. Its synonyms are; inheritance, birthright, tradition and legacy. Inheritance usually “applies to that which passes from parent to child such as money, property, traits of character or feature” while birthright “means something received from a parent or predecessor”. Tradition is defined as “the handing down of information, beliefs, and customs by word of mouth or by example from one generation to another without written instructions” or as “an inherited pattern of thought or action, as a religious doctrine or practice or a social custom” and as a “cultural continuity in social attitudes and institutions”. Legacy is used in two ways, to indicate the transfer of property from parent to child or as “something received from an ancestor or predecessor or from the past”.

In all cases we are dealing with ‘something’ that is given or passed down from one generation to another. That ‘something’ can include anything from material objects such as property to intangible items such as an ideology, a culture or a history. It is heritage in this last sense that concerns us here; the transmission of historically immaterial values and beliefs that are presented as ‘a heritage’.

If heritage is the transmission of shared ideological, cultural and/or historical concepts then it follows that it is transmitted along aligned social relationships based either on class, politics, occupation, ethnic affiliation, citizenship, language, race, religion, family, age and/or gender. If the idea of heritage is based on one or more of these categories then the conventions or principles behind any selection of what is to be passed on as heritage are in some ways biased. Some things are passed on, others not. Some things are emphasised while others are ignored. This means that heritage is created, constructed, defined, asserted and defended by a specific group in a certain place during a particular time. If this is so, then heritage is normative and objectifying in that it helps to give a certain group an identity by including some and excluding others. This is not often apparent because the way in which it is presented obscures the realisation that what is past on as heritage is based on premises that led to choices concerning what and who are to be included or excluded. Thus it would seem that the presentation of what is considered to be heritage is both constructed and ideological in character (Brett 1996; Hewison 1987).

If this is so then it would seem that the development of a concept of heritage, whether ideological, cultural or historical, has a history and that it did not develop in a vacuum or spontaneously on its own but is the outcome of the vested interests of different groups during different historical periods. The argument that heritage is not neutral will probably not be considered especially controversial. Nor will it come as any surprise that concepts invested with heritage, e.g. religion, ethnicity, culture, language and/or history, have been engaged to define national identities and then employed as an excuse for not only depriving others of their security but of
their very lives. Indeed, it would seem that heritage and nationalism are two sides of the same coin, so entwined that it is difficult, possibly even impossible, to conceive of the one without the other. The ideas of heritage and nationalism spring from the Romanticism of the Enlightenment and are thus no older than that movement which rapidly spread, in part propelled by the success and vitality of the French Revolution and later in reaction to the armed victories of Napoleon, first across Europe during the 19th century, and then around the world in the course of the next century (Anthony 1995:88pp; Palmer & Colton 1971:405pp).

Today, notions of nationalism, national heritage and national character permeate every pore of our being, both public and private, to such an extent that it takes a conscious effort to realise just how artificial these constructs truly are. Despite any awareness this entails, it is still most difficult to even imagine an alternative existence, an identity grounded in values and perceptions that owe nothing to the modern conception of a nation-state as put forward by two of the main progenitors of this ideological movement, Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) and Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744-1803). At least the former, judging from his own dictum, seems to have been fully aware of the fact that the new order he was helping to create also demanded the fashioning of past tradition(s) in order to be able to achieve its socio-political unity in the present. Rousseau wrote:

The first rule that we must follow is that of national character. Every people has, or must have, a character, if it lacks one, we must begin by endowing it with one (Rousseau quoted in Smith 2000:8, English in the original).

This new line of reasoning came to stand in stark contrast to the initial spirit of the Enlightenment, which sought to discover the fundamental regularities of nature through the powers of systematic and objective science founded on rational reasoning, the results of which would be presented as natural or universal laws. This in turn was mutually bound up with a firm conviction in the natural rights of humankind, the advancement and progress of civilisation, universal brotherhood, together with the rejection of tradition, superstition, magic and of the irrational (Larrain 1994:7p; Palmer & Colton 1971:470pp).

Now, under the guiding light of Herder, a Romantic reaction against, and a rejection of, these guiding principles took place. The non-intellectual and the non-rational were wholeheartedly embraced, together with an individuality rooted in their respective emotional and subjective experiences and perspectives. In contrast to Rousseau, Herder seems to actually have believed in the existence of some fundamental national characteristic that was somehow passed on from one generation to the next. This essentialist conception, the belief in an unbroken continuity of ethnicity, culture, race and/or of a people, was expressed in his Ideas on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind published in 1784. Here, Herder maintains that a group of people are defined by a common language and that they possess their own authentic character, temperament, soul, spirit and peculiar genius together with their own way of acting and thinking, all of which is specific and different, though not superior, in relation to other people. A viable civilisation or culture could only be realised by drawing on the native heritage of a common people, the Volk, and on its national character, its Volksgeist, and not by copying the customs, habits or culture of a foreign people. This unique identity, when submerged or lost, must be rediscovered through philology, history and archaeology (Palmer & Colton 1971:442pp; Smith 1991:75; 2000:9; Trigger 1995:273p).

Thus we arrive at the understanding that “...nationalism [and heritage is] a form of culture...” (Smith 1991:91) a socio-political movement which is constantly being reproduced by our educators, poets, musicians, painters, sculptors, novelists, historians, archaeologists, playwrights, philologists, politicians, architects, anthropologists, folklorists and philosophers at an ever accelerated rate by the economic revolution of capitalism (Anderson 1983:129; Smith 1991:87pp; 2001:6p).

Anderson (1983:13) identifies nationalism as a “...cultural artefact of a particular kind.” and the nation as an imagined community where;

...the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion (Anderson 1983:15, English in the original).

Using symbols of language, territory, history and community, Eric Hobsbawm shows how we first invent, then mass-produce, traditions and practices based on the fictitious assumption of a historic continuity, that is sometimes projected far back into
the prehistoric past. These are overtly or tacitly overlaid with certain emotionally charged values, made normative through repetition, formalisation and ritualization which serve to maintain the obedience, loyalty, co-operation and social cohesion among the governed while establishing and sustaining the legitimacy of the ruling social and political authorities (Hobsbawm 1983a; 1983b; Kohl & Fawcett 1995; Lowenthal 1990:307pp; Nelson 1995; Trigger 1995:273pp).

Cultural historians and others working within the various heritage management sectors have also discovered that the concepts of nation and national heritage are constructs and that these tend to exert strong normative influences which effected and/or directed their perceptions concerning what was worth preserving and putting on display at museums, thus ultimately deciding what was considered to be, or not to be, heritage (Brett 1996; Hewison 1987:9; Lowenthal 1985; Lundström & Næss 1993; Lundström & Pilvesmaa 1997).

In a similar fashion, archaeologists, during the last decades of the 20th century, also experienced a growing awareness concerning the consequences of contextual influences upon themselves and their subject as it pertains to national heritage. This would seem to have made itself manifest in two distinct ways. The first concerns the realisation that “...there is an almost unavoidable or natural relationship between archaeology and nationalism.” (Kohl & Fawcett 1995:3; Trigger 1995) especially as it pertains to how the archaeological discourse has been conducted within the boarders of any single nation in relationship to the reconstruction of its own national past. This has resulted in what is labelled ‘the essentialist approach’. The second concerns the role of archaeology in substantiating and sustaining the asymmetrical relationship between the industrial nations and the Third World. This approach or strategy is know as the ‘primitivist definition of culture’ and is founded on a misunderstanding and/or misinterpretation of biological evolution and its subsequent confusion with terms such as ‘progress’ and ‘development’.

The doctrine of cultural essentialism can be traced back to Herder. It is based on a theory of cultural nationalism, in which a common heritage is seen as the unifying factor. One of the political consequences of this doctrine is a belief in the autonomy and indivisibility of the nation, a notion which, if needs be, justifies the suppression, or even the extermination, of local and regional differences (cultural and/or political) in the name of conformity (Smith 1991:75). Archaeological involvement in this cultural levelling are not difficult to come by in the literature. A few examples will suffice. In Spain, the manifestation of this doctrine resulted in the constraint and subordination of Catalanian, Galician and Basque identities (Diaz-Andreu 1995). Great emphasis was placed on cultural homogeneity in previously multi-cultural nations such as Bulgaria, Bosnia, Serbia and Croatia. In the case of Romania, this supposed cultural uniformity was successfully projected one million years back into the past (Kaiser 1995). Polish history was purged of Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Jews and Germans, while Greek culture and heritage was divorced from its Turkish, Slavic and Albanian elements (Lowenthal 1990). The antiquity and purity of both Chinese, Koran and Japanese civilisations were also constructed backwards into the prehistoric past (Tong 1995; Falkenhausen 1995). In post-revolutionary Russia the limited categories most often used to define a nation were temporarily abandoned in favour of a plurality of identities, only to be replaced with a vengeance by Stalin from the 1930’s onwards (Shnirelman 1995). This was paralleled in Germany by a ruthlessness grounded on a myth of ethnic and national unity that would have been bad enough had it stopped with the establishment of ‘Aryan Physics’ and ‘Germanic Mathematics’ (McCann 1990).

The primitivist doctrine can be traced back to the British philosoper Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) who coined the well-known phrase ‘the survival of the fittest’ and who, either by choice or ignorance, seems to have completely misunderstood the central thesis of Darwin’s evolutionary thought. Spencer supplied his own definition of evolution, which was synonymous with ‘continual improvement’, using it to promote the myth that the wealth of a selected few and the wretchedness of the multitude, that ever increasing gap which occurred under the canopy of the industrial revolution, was both natural and unavoidable. This doctrine, also know as ‘Social Darwinism’, was understandably welcomed by the opulent; it not only justified their own existence but gave them an excuse to ignore the suffering they inflicted on the greater masses of the underprivileged. Needless to say, Spencer did very well, both socially and financially, by peddling this nonsense to the members of that exuberant circle in which he himself moved. These ideas were soon applied to explain the apparent differences between ethnic groups and nations. The Enlightenment had fostered the view
that intellectual and emotional sensibilities were something that all humankind had a share in, and that progress was universal and unilinear. Now in the Victorian era, this was replaced by national, cultural and racial bigotry which sanctioned and legitimised colonialism by asserting that those races and/or nations that considered themselves to be the more advanced and developed had become so as a result of their superiority in the general struggle for survival on a global scale (Galbraith 1977:43pp; Gould 1977:35pp; Seymour-Smith 1998:356pp; Trigger 1989:110pp).

It is probably unnecessary to point out that archaeology and anthropology have partaken in this development and thus both share in the;

... undistinguished record of assuring the dominate of their right to rule, and convincing the dominated of their duty to obey... [and that these disciplines have in turn] ...been shaped by such roles, with the consequence that significant shifts have occurred in the perception of why certain kinds of archaeological investigation[s] should be more important than others (Miller, Rowlands & Tilley 1989:22, English in the original).

In the wake of colonial contact and expansion into areas inhabited by different peoples possessing civilisations of their own, archaeology and anthropology have both assisted in neatly explaining away, ignoring, forgetting or removing other cultures, erecting contrived prehistories and histories to take their place, in which indigenous populations were portrayed as unchanging primitives of little importance (Gathercole & Lowenthal 1990; Miller, Rowlands & Tilly 1989:22).

Ultimately, we are dealing with questions concerning power and authority; who has been sanctioned to present the past? and what particular parts of that past are being selected for presentation? (Friedman 1992; Gledhill 1988:2; Ucko 1988). The formulation of these questions focuses our attention on the fact that archaeology also possesses “...unavoidable political dimensions...” (Silberman 1995:249) that we both need and can come to grips with (Kohl & Fawcett 1995). This last point, that even our investigations into the prehistoric past have political ramifications, cannot be ignored, yet neither should it lead us to despair in the swamps of relativism. Let us not forget, that the past has occurred. It can be detected, discovered, re-discovered, documented, discussed, interpreted, re-interpreted and presented or not presented. But in light of the above it is obvious that the past cannot be taken for granted, because it;

...is always practised in the present... [and archaeologists] ...in the present fashion the past in the practice of their social identity (Friedman 1992:853, English in the original).

These two strategies, the essentialist and primitivist, have been incorporated within a process of subordination, were “...vocabularies [are used in order to] define the nature of difference... [thereby creating] ...social categories of the ineligible, the inferior and the outsider... [it is a form] ...of social closure, exclusion and differentiation common to all social systems.” (Miller, Rowlands & Tilly 1989:2).

What we are interested in here, paraphrasing Kohl and Fawett (1995:16), are the ways in which conceptions of national heritage have affected archaeological work and its interpretations. Indeed, the noticeable difficulty in locating a Norrlandian history and the apparent delay in identifying a Norrlandian past would seem to indicate that something similar has taken place within the confines of Sweden’s boarders and that this Northern example might be nothing less than just that. If our above assumptions concerning the unbalanced relationship between southern Sweden and Norrland are correct, then one would expect to find that the latter has contributed nothing or next to nothing towards the ideological superstructure of the nation, that is to say, to its heritage. As far as archaeology is concerned, even a casual glance at the archaeological literature shows that the various prehistoric and historic remains that are to be found in Norrland have not been utilised in the construction of a Swedish identity. This would seem to be a clear indication that some sort of discriminatory mechanism has been at work, one that has de-selected Norrlandian culture and/or history when presenting that of the Nation as a whole. The significance of these circumstances will be examine and presented in Chapter Two.

Both Historical and Reflective Archaeology

A few might argue that the subject presented here falls outside the realm of archaeology and that it would have found a much more natural and comfortable abode within that subsection of the Department of Historical Studies known as the History of Science and Ideas. While no one could reasonably deny the occurrence of a certain admixture of interests, it would nonetheless be erroneous to
conclude that these matters should be left entirely in the capable hands of the latter. The reasons for this are anchored in the subject of archaeology itself and thus will only be readily appreciated by those immersed in its learning through both erudition and field work. Historians from habit will be capable of familiarising themselves with the former but not necessarily in the latter. Even then, misconceptions will undoubtedly result due to confusion occurred over implicit and intricate concepts embedded within the subject under study, a danger faced by all when approaching another discipline from without. In a similar vein, the issues deemed important and the type of questions posed in any study will partly depend on the scholar’s professional background.

A simple example will suffice to underline these points. An informative biography on the life and career of Sigurd Curman, one of Sweden’s most accomplished directors at what was then called the ‘Central Board of National Antiquities’ (Sw. Riksantikvarieämbete) has recently been published by the historian Richard Pettersson. We are told that the archaeological work carried out by that institution in connection with the exploitation of the hydro-electric resources of the North, starting in the 1940’s, lead to the discovery of hundreds of dwelling sites. So far so good. Then, in reference to Sverker Janson, a central figure in the archaeology of the North during that time, Pettersson goes on to assert that these investigations gave rise to a new interpretation concerning the earliest settlement of this region; that “...the prehistoric population were now seen as ‘a people of the dwelling site’ (Sw. boplatsfolk), and that they were no longer considered to have been seasonally dependent nor nomadic.” (Pettersson 2001:193). This, of course, is completely erroneous, as any archaeologist acquainted with the literature would have immediately been able to point out. Sverker Janson, in three of his four articles published in that very same monograph under review states, quite unequivocally, exactly the opposite (Janson 1960a:29; 1960b:34; 1960c:39, and figure caption for the map located on the back inside leaf of that book). Let me hasten to add that this in no way diminishes Pettersson’s achievement. But it does sharply illustrate the two points made above. The first was this; when we cross disciplinary boundaries, mistakes will inadvertently slip in unnoticed. The second point, divergent concerns, is equally well demonstrated. Archaeologists have and will continue to exert enormous efforts on questions concerning prehistoric settlement patterns. Pettersson, in contrast and quite understandably, guided by another perspective, passes this subject by with hardly a murmur.

Thus, archaeologists and historians will inevitably bring and apply different perspectives to the subject, leading to divergent insights. If such a development is to be applauded, then one must also conclude that it would be detrimental to the subject if introspective studies were exclusively consigned to those scholars who are located outside the field of archaeology itself.

With this in mind, let us distinguish between the ‘history of ideas’ on the one hand and the ‘history of (archaeological) scholarship’ on the other. The former is here defined as an external analysis brought to bear on another subject by those university departments involved in that type of study. The latter is characterised as an inquiry motivated by internal and intrinsic imperatives that are carried out by an active participant from within the discipline itself.

As indicated above, archaeologists not only find delight in picking their way through the rubbish heaps of past cultures but also in going over those left behind by colleagues, past and present, in the form of correspondence, diaries, unpublished manuscripts, et cetera. In other words, monographs and articles penned by archaeologists working in Sweden that deal with the history of their own subject are not a recent development. An early example is found in ‘Sweden’s Prehistory’ (Sw. Sveriges forntid) published in 1874 by Oscar Montelius who devoted the first chapter of this work to a scholarly review of Swedish archaeology (Montelius 1874a). Gunnar Ekholm’s ‘Prehistory and Prehistoric Research in Scandinavia’ (Sw. Forntid och fornforskning i Skandinavien) from 1935 attempts, as the title implies, to combine a presentation of the archaeological material with a number of tentative and contending explanations and interpretations advanced by different archaeologists (Ekholm 1935). Another example, although penned by the hand of a historian, is a massive work in two volumes entitled ‘Thomsen and His Scholarly Contacts in Sweden 1816-1837’ (Sw. Thomsen och hans läarda förbindelser i Sverige 1816-1837). The first part appeared in 1937 and it was followed a year later by the second, the completion of which not only earned its author, Bengt Hildebrand, a doctorate in History but also an Assistant Professorship at the College of Stockholm. The gist of that thesis, presented at the University in Uppsala, traces the development of the Three Age System, an achievement which is created to the genius of Christian Jürgensen Thomsen. It was
a subject which its author could claim to possess a certain amount of personal knowledge, his uncle was Hans Olof Hildebrand while his grandfather was Bror Emil Hildebrand (Almqvist 1946:457; B. Hildebrand 1937; 1938). The archaeologist John-Elof Forssander also included an abbreviated account of archaeological research in his overview entitled ‘The Swedish People Throughout the Ages’ (Sw. Svenska folket genom tiderna) from 1938 (Forssander 1938).

Another sample of this kind of presentation is a collection of articles penned by both archaeologists and historians which appeared in 1946 under the title Ad Patriam Illustrandam, which may possibly be translated as ‘Towards the Embellishment of the Fatherland’ (Schück & Thordeman 1946). Here the authors present insights into the tortuous history of what is today known as the ‘National Heritage Board’ (Sw. Riksantikvarieämbete), that institution which probably more than any other has played such a vital role in the development of Swedish archaeology and heritage.

Our final example of this type of historical account is a thesis presented at Uppsala by a future Professor of that Department, Bo Gräslund. Published in 1974 and entitled ‘Relative Dating. On the Chronological Method in Scandinavian Archaeology’ (Sw. Relativ datering. Om kronologisk metod i nordisk arkeologi) it deals with the theoretical and practical implications of typology, that methodological landmark developed through the work of Oscar Montelius, Bror Emil Hildebrand and Hans Hildebrand (Gräslund 1974). Gräslund later returned to his dissertation topic in an English publication entitled The Birth of Prehistoric Chronology. Dating Methods and Dating Systems in Nineteenth Century Scandinavian Archaeology (Gräslund 1987). Scandinavian efforts within the field of ‘historical scholarship’ have not gone unnoticed internationally; the first conference on the history of archaeology was held in Aarhus, Denmark in 1978 and resulted in an anthology edited by Glyn Daniel (1981).

The history of scholarship, as it concerns Swedish archaeology, gained new momentum during the 1990’s. One also notices a clear shift in emphasis, away from the more or less straightforward historical account towards an increased interest in the reciprocal relationships between the ongoing production and reproduction of archaeological knowledge in conjunction with historical or contemporary structures and norms, be they economic, social or ideological. The mention of a limited number of relatively recent and notable Swedish dissertations and monographs ought to illustrate this point.

From the University of Uppsala there is Johan Hegardt’s ‘Relative Meaning: Individuality and Totality in Archaeological Cultural Theory’ (Sw. Relativ betydelse. Individualitet och totalitet i arkeologisk kulturteori) in which he endeavours to present a pluralistic dialogue by breaking the bonds of what he considers to be the limiting consequences of a science based on hierarchical authority (Hegardt 1997).

Pluralism is also an important theme in ‘The History of Archaeology as History and as Archaeology’ (Sw. Arkeologihistoria som historia och som arkeologi. Studier i arkeologins egenhistorier), a dissertation from the University of Göteborg. Here, Anders Gustafsson explores archaeological historiography, how it has been used to legitimise certain interests and/or interpretations within the subject (Gustafsson 2001).

Elisabeth Arwill-Nordbladh address the construction of gender as presented in archaeological interpretations in her dissertation from Göteborg, entitled ‘Constructions of Gender in Nordic Viking Age. Past and Present’ (Sw. Genukonstruktioner i nordisk vikingatid. Förr och Nu). She argues convincingly that there is a strong connection between archaeology and those unbalanced power relationships that exist betwixt the sexes in contemporary society, a relationship which is constantly being renewed and sustained by an uncritical and stereotyped portrayal of women from prehistoric times (Arwill-Nordbladh 1998).

In a similar manner, Elisabeth Rudebeck examines how human beings in general have been conceptualised and presented in different archaeological studies. She opens her University of Lund dissertation Tilling Nature - Harvesting Culture from the year 2000 by pointing out:

Contemporary archaeological writing often conceals the philosophical and ethical elements that are always present in discourses concerning human beings. This is partly due to the scientific rhetoric, the representation, which is devised to convince the reader that a particular way of representing is the self-evident way of writing about prehistory and prehistoric human beings (Rudebeck 2000:1, English in the original).

By probing the narrative structure of archaeology, using an approach based on a bricolage of theoretical points of departure, she wishes to show that images of the past are both formulated and reproduced by
particular social traditions in the present (Rudebeck 2000; *bricolage*, from the French *bricole* = trifle/small job. E.g. something made or put together using whatever materials happen to be available).

“The production of both archaeological data and the past cannot be expected to be neutral.” is also one of the conclusions reached by Stefan Larsson (2000:345) in his doctoral dissertation presented in Lund entitled ‘The Hidden Layers. Conditions and Conceptual Frameworks for Urban Archaeology in Lund Expressed in its Praxis for Production of Data 1890-1990’ (Sw. Stadens dolda kulturskikt. Lundaarkeologins förutsättningar och förståelsehorisonter uttryckt genom praxis för källmaterialsproduktion 1890-1990). As the title implies, he reviews the development of medieval archaeology in Lund, which he then uses to elucidate the relationship between archaeology and the powers that be, how archaeology through the production and reproduction of knowledge sought and succeeded in legitimising its own existence in the eyes of the legislative branch and thus became a participant in the exercise of secular power (Larsson 2000:345pp).

Using a hermeneutic and constructivist outlook in his ‘Prehistory in History’ (Sw. Forntid i historien), Ola Jensen states that “...conceptual differences in time and space should not be understood in terms of right or wrong.” Ideas, as well as the language used to express them, are socially and culturally conditioned (Jensen 2002:395). Thus our understanding should encompass the historical context in which these ideas were first formulated. In this dissertation from Göteborg he exemplifies this by examining how prehistory and prehistoric remains were viewed during shifting periods, from the Medieval Ages up until the beginning of the Enlightenment (Jensen 2002).

Evert Baudou is also aware of the fact that archaeology is not a subject that has exclusively relied on methods of its own device, that it is both dependent on and immersed in philosophical and political ideas from its surrounding social environment. Baudou’s point of departure is distinctive from the other examples cited above, in that he employs an analytical method know as ‘the problem-orientated scientific biography’, in which the life and career of Gustaf Hallström is used as a vehicle to critically scrutinise some seventy odd years of archaeological research in Sweden (Baudou 1997; 1998a).

From the above we see that there is an expanding consensus that archaeological practice has always, however implicitly, been contextual and that its participants should now explicitly recognise this, and to some extent also take responsibility for the product they produce and/or actively engage in the dissemination of this knowledge.

Let one final example suffice. Chronological speaking, it is one of the first in this category to appear in Sweden, but nonetheless worthy of note. Using material from the Norwegian Iron Age, Tove Hjørungdal in ‘The Hidden Sex’ (Nw. Det skjulte kjønn) from 1991 explores how gender was expressed in different ways and between different classes during prehistoric times. But the impetus of her work, theoretically based on a feminist perspective, reaches far beyond the bounds of archaeology. She draws our attention to the fact that scholarly praxis is socially conditioned, the results of which are used to uphold and reinforce the power structure of the present, e.g. the patriarchal social organisation of our own era. She goes on to state;

The objective is thus to change scholarship, and what we seek to change is a one-sided power structure which has attained the status of normality (Hjørungdal 1991:126, English in the original).

Hjørungdal’s theoretical point of departure, similar to the works already mentioned, endeavours to lift archaeology up out of itself and relocated it in the arena of contemporary social debate. It is an awareness that archaeological knowledge can and may contribute to the understanding of our own times (Hjørungdal 1991; 1995).

In light of the above, it might be tempting to subdivide what has here been called the ‘history of archaeological scholarship’ in order to differentiate between ‘archaeological history’ on the one hand, and ‘problematic or reflective archaeology’ on the other. The former represented, for example, by the work of Gunnar Ekholm, Bengt Hildebrand or Bo Gräslund, the latter by Elisabeth Arwill-Nordbladh, Elisabeth Rudebeck and Tove Hjørungdal, who aimed at revealing the hidden relationships that exist between archaeological interpretations and contemporary social praxis. Whether such a categorisation is useful or not is questionable. In either case, it is held here that all forms of historiography are beneficial to our understanding of the subject as long as we recognise that they are all equally biased and thus must be made subordinate to the critical scrutiny of our best efforts.

Three important conclusions may be draw from the above. First, there is a long tradition of...
archaeological historiography coming from within the subject itself. Secondly, archaeologists are not dependent on, nor necessarily in a position of disadvantage in comparison with, those fields that specialise in the history of science and ideas. It is felt here that similar endeavours within each field and/or any such co-operation that might result, will benefit both. Thirdly, the last ten years or so has seen a steady and growing body of Swedish archaeologists endeavouring to render studies into the past pertinent for the present. This is not due to some new found altruistic belief, nor have they been miraculously endowed with unprecedented powers of insight into the workings of contemporary society brought on by their prehistoric studies. Rather they have come to this out of the realisation that the knowledge archaeology produces has relevance for the society from which it sprang. This awareness, that scientific archaeology does contain explicit and implicit commitments to both empirical and metaphysical concerns external to, yet indivisible from, the subject itself, is viewed here as a positive development that has opened up new potentials in and for our understanding. Conversely, ignoring or failing to heed the lessons provided by general theoretical and/or historical studies only enhances the chance that previously embedded and potentially detrimental ideas within the subject will be systematically reinforced while new ones will be periodically added, inadvertently or otherwise (Whitely 1992:64p).

Political Prehistory

Many might be surprised to find that post-processual archaeologists were not the first to realise that interpretations of their subject matter were contextual, e.g. endowed with and influenced by norms and practices emitting from co-existent economic as well as socio-political and ideological power structures. This is clearly exemplified by Bandaranayake’s collection of essays, complimented by Bäärnhielm and Lind’s introduction (Bandaranayake 1978; Bäärnhielm & Lind 1978). But the political ramifications of archaeology had been duly noted at an even earlier stage, although unlike the present, it was seemingly not so much a topic of research, rather than an item to be avoided. Two examples will clearly illustrate this. Both, not unsurprisingly, concern questions over the identification of ethnic affiliation in the archaeological record.

The first is found in Clark’s now classic work The Mesolithic Settlement of Northern Europe from 1936. Here he brilliantly presents and summarises the archaeological results concerning this period, which also includes a brief review of the evidence provided by physical anthropology, a topic which has always engaged the attention of the inquisitive long before archaeology was even recognised as a discipline proper (Jensen 2002:371pp; Magnus [1555] 1982:178p & 937p). Clark’s comments are worth quoting in full;

A considerable amount of human skeletal material has at various times been ascribed to the Maglemose people by different writers, but very little of it is admissible as evidence. It is an unfortunate but undoubted fact that ancient human bones, and skulls in particular, have tended to exercise an effect on the judgement of scholars only too often of the most baleful nature; hypotheses and theories have been elaborated on evidence that no impartial investigator could for one moment admit as valuable, and anthropometric ingenuity and patience has exhausted itself on material without any certain relevance to the question in hand. It would be a task as melancholy as it would be tedious to consider these theories; I shall therefore content myself with detailing the chief material that has passed as evidence, and with attempting to isolate what is likely to be valid (Clark 1936:133, English in the original).

His judgement after reviewing the material, is short and to the point;

The only skeletal material that can be relied upon is thus singularly unhelpful. We cannot, pace Kossinna, speak with any certainty about the physical type of Maglemose man (Clark 1936:136, English in the original).

Even as Clark wrote the above, the blatantly racist research of Gustaf Kossinna (1858-1931) was about to reach even newer and much ill-fated academic heights with the emergence of a Nazi Germany. Kossinna was spared the horror his ideas help to promote, he passed away two years before Hitler came to power. From the above it is clear that at least Clark, and one would hope that he was not the exception, realised that much of the reasoning behind these interpretations concerning the significance ascribed to the brachycranial and dolichocranial skulls was both politically as well as ideologically motivated and could not withstand scientific scrutiny (Baudou 2002a; Lundmark 2002; Veit 1989).

The second example is retrieved from a controversy that waxed hot during the 1920’s between
an archaeologist from Finland and one from Sweden, both of whom may be viewed as representatives for one of many different disciplines that have participated and which continue to participate in this debate, one which basically concerns trying to establish the time for the earliest arrival of a Swedish population in Finland. Montelius addressed this issue in a speech held in Finland in 1897 entitled ‘When did the Swedes Reach Finland?’ (Sw. När kommo svenskarne till Finland?). Although he was not the first to ponder this issue, his lecture did awake an immediate response from Hjalmar Appelgren in the form of a critical summary which reached publication a year ahead of Montelius’ own paper (Appelgren 1897; Huldén 2002; Montelius 1898a). Bågenholm’s dissertation entitled ‘Archaeology and Language in the Northern Baltic Region’ (Sw. Arkeologi och Språk i norra Östersjöområdet) showed, if nothing else, that this subject was still capable of provoking both cool and heated responses (Bågenholm 1999a; 1999b; Werbart 2000). This question has not lost any of its fascination, as testified by a recently published collection of articles that reopened inquiries into this subject by purposely using the question posed over one hundred years ago by Montelius as the title of their recent analogy (Ivars & Huldén 2002).

Only a fleeting glimpse into this controversy will be presented. The example used here played itself out across the pages of the Swedish and Finnish periodicals 80 years ago. It primarily concerned the nature and identity of those people behind the material manifestation of that Neolithic assemblage known as the ‘Battle or Boat Axe Culture’. The two main disputants were Gunnar Ekholm from Uppsala, Sweden and Aarne Europaeus (who later changed his name to Aarne Äyräpää) from Finland. In the simplest of terms, we see that Europaeus was of the opinion that the Finnish variant of this culture was transmitted to the Finno-Ugric inhabitants from a Central Indo-European source through migration. In contrast, Ekholm forcefully asserted that it had reached Finland via Sweden, passing from one Swedish or Indo-Germanic population to another, the latter of which had already occupied Finland during the late Mesolithic and who were the forefathers of that Swedish speaking population living in Finland today. Both argued their case using comparative typological and stylistic studies of axes and ceramics found throughout northern Europe (Ekholm 1920; 1921; 1922a; Europaeus 1922; 1924).

We realise, as does Ekholm, that the significance ascribed to this question originated in needs and wants located far beyond the academic subject, he states;

...the hegemony over these ethnically related tribes must naturally pass to a people who, through their favourable geographical location and other contributing factors, possess an ability for superior cultural development. Archaeology has shown that this occurred among the Swedish population during the Stone Age...especially in the Province of Uppland...which continued into the Bronze Age...where it reached heights unsurpassed (Ekholm 1920:212).

Ekholm went on to state that the upward advance of these people did not continue uninterrupted, Uppland did periodically lose its prominent position, but the long term trend favoured this area and its people above all others inhabiting the shores of the Baltic (Ekholm 1920:213pp). He points out that;

History teaches us that the foundation of Sweden’s Baltic empire was laid down in 1561...[on the other hand] ...prehistorians would consider this to be the last stage of a development that had started thousands of years in the past. The [Swedish] Era of Greatness was the result of a successful foreign policy, what occurred around the shores of the Baltic during prehistoric times resulted from the cultural and mercantile supremacy of the Swedish tribes in comparison with their inferior neighbours (Ekholm 1920:215p).

Ekholm goes on to exclaim that Sweden’s eastward expansion was as natural as is the present day boarder between the cultivated West and the enigmatic East, ruled as it is by Communism and possessing other singular social practices (Ekholm 1920:216).

Aarne Europaeus attempts, matter-of-factly, to answer and refute Ekholm’s interpretations, although the opening remark of his rebuttal clearly shows that he is aware that much more than purely archaeological controversies are being aired. He writes;

...I am of the opinion that complicated questions cannot be decided with or by the use of any abbreviated polemics, especially when points of view other than those which are purely scientific in nature are so obviously being employed (Europaeus 1924:31).

Gunnar Ekholm is no less aware of the fact that the political present haunts the prehistoric past. He
explicitly asserts that the interpretations presented by Europaeus in his monograph from 1922 is a case in point;

One cannot suppress the suspicion that the vigorous defence of those theories that insist on upholding the view that Central Europe had a powerful impact on Finland during the period of the Boat Axe Culture is - unbeknown to its author - influenced by present day events and developments. If this is the case, then it only goes to show, that even archaeologists are human, susceptible to impressions from that time and environment in which they live. We should not seek to blame, but it is regrettable as it concerns the objectivity of the scientific endeavour (Ekholm 1922a:157).

The above clearly illustrates the correctness of the assertion made at the beginning of this section. That the early practitioners of archaeology were well aware that they were subjected and susceptible to external influences that would influence their scientific understanding. This contingency was something that was, as yet, not considered to be a legitimate object of study in itself, rather it was something to be recognised and then avoided, as well as deplored, at least when found in the works of others (see also Baudou 2002a; 2002b for further examples and references).

A Northern Brier Patch
The two examples above highlight yet another problematic aspect of the archaeological endeavour that has always dogged the heels of its practitioners; questions of ethnic identity and the feasibility of being able to assign the same to distinct collections of material remains from the past through arguments based on the study of the very same material. It hardly needs to be pointed out that this question has periodically occupied the best efforts of academics and laymen alike from earliest times up until and including the present. In 1451, at the monastery of Hersfeld, an early Medieval copy of Germania was rediscovered (Sklenár 1983:24; Tacitus [AD 98] 1985). Scholars have ever since been trying to identify the people Tacitus described, not only when and where they may have lived during the prehistoric past but also endeavouring to distinguish their supposed descendants now living in the historic present.

The intensity and conviction with which various interpretations have been defended concerning the ethnic identity of Europe’s prehistoric peoples does not diminished the further north one travels, as exemplified by the commits provided by Nils Aberg (1949) on the opening pages of his monograph entitled ‘A History of the Nordic Population During the Stone Age’ (Sw. Nordisk befolkningshistoria under stenåldern). In the northern half of Sweden, this controversy basically concerns proving who first inhabited this region. The selection that one is forced to choose from usually consists of two stereotypical candidates, a Sámi or proto Sámi population on the one hand, alternatively, a Nordic or Teutonic people on the other. Any and all choices are equally endowed and entangled with a whole range of contemporary political and economical controversies (Nordlander 1900:216; Zachrisson 1997a:19p; 1997c).

Sven Nilsson (fig. 2) in his now classic Skandinaviska Nordens Ur-invånare. Ett försök i komparativa Ethnografien och ett bidrag till menniskosläggets utvecklingshistoria was one of the first to express an opinion on this matter. From the scanty skeletal material that was then available for study, he concluded that the first people to inhabit Scandinavia after the last Ice Age were the direct forerunners of the present day Sámi population (Nilsson 1866:100pp & 128).

Gustaf von Düben (1822-1892), baron, physician and anthropologist, who after extensive travels in the North together with his wife Lotten, arrived at the completely opposite conclusion. In 1873 he published what is still considered to be one of the best accounts ever written concerning Sámi lifeways. Düben was convinced that the Sámi had migrated into northern Scandinavia during the middle of the last millennium BC as a direct result of the Scythian expansion out of the east (Manker 1952:40; Marklund 1993:193; Zachrisson 1997a:15pp).

These two diametrically opposing views have, more or less, held sway, with minor variations, up until the 1970’s (Baudou 1974). Questions concerning ethnic identity reached a new level of sophistication under the influence of Fredrik Barth’s astute introduction to the 1969 anthology entitled Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference, where he points out that;

...ethnic distinctions do not depend on an absence of social interaction and acceptance, but are quite to the contrary often the very foundations on which embracing social systems are built (Barth 1969:10, English in the original).
According to Barth, ethnic identity is conditional to interaction between one or more different groups. This also implies that it is malleable and that it evolves, on both the individual and group level.

With this in mind, archaeologists, instead of reasoning their way from an ethnographically unknown prehistoric past forward to the present, began their studies from the opposite direction. In a fashion similar to that used by linguists, prehistorians proceeded from the ethnographically conceived present and worked their way back into the past as far as they believed the material would take them. Many, in both Norway, Finland and Sweden, now considered it feasible to assume that the rise and spread of Säräsnäemi 2 Ceramics might be indicative of a separate Sámi ethnic identity, which if correct, would indicated that this group had distinguished itself from others by or during the first millennium BC (Baudou 1987; Mulk 1994:9p).

Concurrently, prehistorians in increasing numbers also began to realise that Norrland could well be much more complicated and diverse than previously believed, that both its prehistoric and early historic periods might encompass a dynamic wealth of assorted economic, cultural, ethnographic and/or social constellations (Baudou 1986b; 1987; 1996a:33pp; 1996b:50pp; 2002c; Fjellström 1987; Magnusson 1987; Ramqvist 1987; Wallerström 1995).

Conversely, there are others who would uphold the validity of a twofold economic, cultural, ethnographic and/or social dichotomy, which probably has its origins in the early Stone Age, one which has endured, seemingly unchanged throughout the millennia, up until present times (Sumkin 1990; Sundström 1997; Zachrisson 1987; 1997b).

The above is, of course, not a comprehensive presentation of research as it concerns ethnicity in prehistoric Norrland. It is only mentioned in order to acquaint the unfamiliar with the fact that this discussion is not unknown in these parts. Nor is this region exempt from contemporary political and economic conflicts and controversies that base their arguments on assumed ethnic evidence derived from archaeological contexts. No attempt has been made to conceal or even minimise these aspects as they pertain to scientific research, and yet they need only be of passing interest to us here. The intention and focus of this presentation is on the uneven development that has occurred between two regions, specifically, what is here defined as northern Sweden and southern Sweden (see below) in which the latter succeeded in taking political, administrative and economic possession over the former. In doing so it also seems to have managed to omit, forget, ignore, conceal and/or explain away any internal and independent historical developments that this Northern region might once have harboured in the past.

By focusing on the development and ramifications of this centre-periphery relationship, a situation that has now lasted for some 600 years, it is hoped that essentialist conceptions of the past (Kohl & Tsetskhladze 1995:150) with their stereotypical
cultural and ethnographic perspectives may be recognised and partially side-stepped, although over simplification, verging on travesty, is a predicament that is not easily avoided;

Whenever the archaeological data of material culture are presented...as the evidence for the activities of ‘races’, ‘peoples’, ‘tribes’, ‘linguistic groups’ or other socially derived ethnic amalgamations, there should be at least scepticism if not downright suspicion. In a large number of such cases, what we are witnessing is the none-too-subtle ascription of racial/cultural stereotypes to static material culture items (Ucko 1989a:xi, English in the original).

One of the earliest written accounts on the North would seem to vindicate our suspicion that much of the dualistic cultural and ethnographic stereotyping now encountered is of a late date. The Catholic churchman and author Olaus Magnus (1490-1557) would have us believe that 16th century Scandinavia, both North and South, was inhabited by a number of distinctive peoples (Magnus [1555] 1982:178p & 937p), a mixture that we today might possibly have described as multi-cultural (fig. 3). Whether this is a purely fictional account, or the factual outcome of developments as they occurred during Medieval times or the end result of processes with origins in the prehistoric past, is difficult to assess. If any credit whatsoever can be given to those few short yet tantalising passages that were originally published in 1555, then one can only conclude that this diversity, be it historical, cultural, ethnic and/or regional, has since been reduced to one single and all encompassing monolith, admittedly, one that has gladly appreciated picturesque regional variances, but one which has also safely excluded and/or ignored alternative regional histories, cultural varieties and ethnic minorities, both Sámi, Finnish and that of a sizeable population of guest workers who were later imported into Sweden in order to perform the most undesirable tasks within the budding Welfare-State (Galbraith 1979:127p).

As indicated earlier, we are not here interested in “…ethnicity, either in the form of groups of people claiming a special and separate identity from the majority population and its social subgroupings, or being recognised by ‘outsiders’ as constituting a distinctive cultural grouping.” (Ucko 1989b:xiii). What we are interested in is how the history and prehistory of a specific region was interpreted and presented, suspecting that it not only helped to promote acculturation and/or enculturation founded on historical and cultural hegemony, while also advancing and making legitimate asymmetric relationships that have their origins in metaphors such as; colonialism and incorporation, identity and conformity, core and periphery, dependence and dominance, development and underdevelopment, advanced and retarded; all of which not only rendered these associations normative and necessary, but even unavoidable and inevitable, is to say, inescapable.

This does entail a certain amount of generalising, based on the conviction that the local differences inherent in this Northern region are outweighed by a collective participation in the unfolding history of Norrland, past, present and future, that is shared by all, resident and non-resident alike. But generalisations and simplifications need not necessarily led to travesties. What we lose in historical detail, we gain in a heightened awareness, realising that there are many who are participating in the history of this region, and that it is no longer;

...merely a question of determining chronological primacy and deducing matters of continuity and discontinuity within a particular archaeological context... [because] ...archaeological and anthropological claims for indigenous distinctive ethnicity are being used by national governments and international agencies to separate out such groups...from other migrant non-indigenous (ethnic and cultural) groups with whom they in fact share many of the common features of the disadvantaged. Such claims demand that the chronology of distinctive ethnicity be seen to be of less importance than the current economic and social positions of such groups (Ucko 1989a:xix, English in the original).

Thus, the conviction held here is that the history of Norrland is a collective experience, presented here as a case study, that contains insights that transcend all boundaries, everywhere.

The Setting: Norrland

There is no simple nor unproblematic definition of Norrland despite the fact that the term is used daily in the vernacular and any Swedish citizen would or should have no trouble in tracing its borders on a map (fig. 4). Its eastern boundary is the Baltic. Along its western flank running north and south are the mountain ranges between Norway and Sweden while its northern border is the Torne river, which now separates it from Finland. None of these geographical
Fig. 3. When describing the peoples living in what we would today call Scandinavia, Olaus Magnus states that; "There are so many vast and strange regions, inhabited by Lapps, Muscovites, Svear, Goths, Värmer, Dalkarlar, Bergslagsbor and Normän, regions that in length and breadth are greater than Italy, Spain and Gaul put together...". He notes that at least five different languages were in use at this time, possibly more, and that there was a great variation in dress, tools, weapons, crafts, trades, tastes and in the choice of vocation between these different peoples, distinctions which he tried to capture in the illustration above (Jensen 2002:118; Magnus [1555] 1982:178p).

features are obstacles. On the contrary, the Baltic, until recently, longed functioned as an easy means of communication in all directions, both summer and winter. In comparison with many other European mountain ranges these western Scandinavian derivatives are relatively rolling and gentle, thus easily transversed in a number of places all year round. The Torne river is just one of several to be found in this Northern landscape that roughly flow in a south-easterly direction from the mountain areas, down through the foothills and coastal plains and into the Baltic. As far as we know these waterways have always provided excellent transportation possibilities as well as food and places of reference for those different societies that have inhabited this Northern region. Norrland’s southern border would at first glance appear to be nothing more than a line on a map. South of Norrland is middle or (significantly) central Sweden, known as ‘Svealand’. Below that lies southernmost Sweden or ‘Götaland’. It goes without saying that the well defined borders of present day Norrland are, in many respects, a relatively recent development brought on by internal and external politico-historical developments together with modern administrative needs.

As of 1996 Sweden was divided into 24 counties (Sw. län), the offspring of that young and independent Swedish kingdom, which in 1634 divided the country into these bureaucratic units, each with its own county administrative board which was and still is responsible to the central government for the management and control of their respective areas. The northern region known as Norrland consists of five counties. Although some are relatively recent, others have progenitors that reach back to the Middle Ages. The first county to be instituted in the North was that of Västernorrland, a vast area which included much of what is today considered to be Norrland together with large areas of both northern Norway and Finland (with the exception of Gästrikland, Jämtland and Härjedalen, the latter two were still part of the Kingdom of Denmark-Norway). This huge expanse of land would for the next 200 years be divided and subdivided a number of times. Each new division entailed either the foundation of additional counties while old ones disappeared or were lost to foreign powers or when boarders would be rearranged and adjusted as different parishes were transferred from one county to another and/or when the names of the counties were changed. By the beginning of the 19th century one starts to see a map with county boarders that are recognisably similar to those of today.

In a similar vein the provinces (Sw. land or landskap) are also regional administrative units, but in contrast to the counties, at least in most cases, they are founded on geographical, historical and/or cultural affinities or traits that would seem to be ancient indeed, with origins that are lost in prehistory (fig. 5). Many of these provinces were, at one time and to some degree, politically independent in relationship to the central authorities, possessing their own laws, administrative judges and courts. Hildebrand relates, as late as 1866, that farmers from different provinces would speak of each other as “...foreigners.” (H. Hildebrand 1866:67). Today, many if not most, will identify and present themselves in accordance with this ancient territorial system. One of the oldest known provinces in the North was called Greater Hälingsland, mentioned in AD 1070 by Adam of Bremen. The early boundaries of this province are obscure, stretching as far north as the Arctic Ocean, as far east as the White Sea and down to the northern area of present day Gästrikland. One hundred years later Ångermanland or Angaria is mentioned in a Latin text while the oldest know written source that mentions Medelpad is from 1257. In comparison, the Provinces of Västerbotten and Lappmarken (Land of the Lapps/Sámi or Lappland) are relatively recent.
The former name started to come into use during the middle of the 15th century, the latter some what earlier (Ahnlund 1937:26; 1942:236pp; Bruce 1955:233).

The Province of Jämtland is encountered on a rune stone dated to ca. AD 1000 (fig. 6). Framed within the serpentine body of a dragon we are told that “Östman Gudfasts son...allowed Jämtland to be Christianised”. The name of this province, together with that of its southern neighbour, Härjedalen, is again briefly mentioned in the Icelandic Sagas. Jämtland’s subsequent history, its early ecclesiastical contacts, first with Uppsala and then with Norway, its incorporation into the Danish-Norwegian kingdom and its later transfer, together with Härjedalen, to the Swedish Crown in 1645, has not diminished the recognition that Jämtland has long possessed its own and distinct cultural identity (Ahnlund 1942:241p; Jansson 1963:119; Lundkvist 1994b:270).

The area known as Norrbotten is the northernmost region of the Province of Västerbotten, but from the beginning of the 19th century it unofficially began to be described as a distinct province in its own right. It became an independent county, incorporating the northern halves of Lappland and Västerbotten, in 1810 (Ahnlund 1937:30; Johnsson 1995:244).

Norrland’s western, eastern and northern borders can at least be explained as resulting from a complicated and long drawn out rivalry between kingdoms and nation-states. Its southern boundary or border area would appear to be of a different kind. Norrland’s southern administrative and official border is clear and concise, it is the boundary between Svealand and Norrland, a demarcation that, as we have seen, has long been recognised. There is however another border between North and South, or more correctly a border area or zone, which is not the result of any orderly bureaucratic concern. This border area not only seems to possess historical and cultural significance but also a certain degree of geographical, biological, hydrological and climatological import, the mutual relevance of which is difficult to determine.

Scientific attention was drawn to this southern boundary zone through a long article published in the periodical *Ymer* by the cultural-geographer Sten...
De Geer, who noted that there occurred a rough boundary between North and South based on geographical, hydrological and climatological criteria (De Geer 1918). This regional division was immediately set upon and criticised by Helge Nelson in an article that appears in the very same volume of that periodical. Nelson is of the opinion that De Geer’s study is biased, that his division is heavily influenced by contemporary administrative statistical concerns and thus places too much emphasis on recent historical and administrative boundaries (Nelson 1918). Nelson would seem to have been grievously mistaken. This type of geographical investigation soon attracted or influenced similar kinds of studies in other fields. In ethnology, Sigurd Erixon (fig. 7) conducted an investigation into the distribution of different farm types and their layout. He found that the southernmost distribution of the typical northern Swedish farm complex approximately coincided with the geographic boundary described by De Geer (Bringéus 2000:35; Erixon 1919; 1931; Lange 1997).
are probably ‘Swedish Farm Types’ (Sw. Svenska gårdstyper) from 1919, ‘Swedish Cultural Boundary’s and Cultural Regions’ (Sw. Svenska kulturgränser och kulturprovinsen) from 1945 and ‘An Atlas Over the Life and Manners of the Swedish People’ (Sw. Atlas över svensk folkkultur. Materiell och social kultur) from 1957 (Erixon 1919; 1945; 1957).

One of the most celebrated of the cultural phenomena that Erixon discovered concerns the distribution of the chalet or shieling system (Sw. fäboddvall) which was found to be a specific Northern peculiarity. This discovery was quickly followed by the realisation that Norrland’s southern border constitutes the boundary for a number of other cultural specific traits. For example; in the North women were traditionally responsible for the spring planting, while in the South this was men’s work.

There are a number of other objects and techniques that typify the material culture of the North which are not found south of this border zone. These include the so called ‘tailed sickle handle’, the perforated threshing flail, the tree trunk arm chair, storage houses built on four short stilts as well as the use of the mortarise and tenon wall technique (Sw. skiftesverk). Equally, there are a number of southern Swedish cultural traits that do not extent northward beyond this zone, such as the utilisation of the ranged yoke, of oxen as draught animals, the four wheeled wagon and the so called central Swedish threshing frail, together with the occurrence of a number of northern and southern oral traditions concerning belief systems, popular myths, folk tales and place-names (Aronsson 2000:67; Berg 1983:10; Bringéus 2000; Campbell & Nyman 1976a; 1976b; Erixon 1931; 1948; Rathje 2001:154pp).

Culinary distinctions also coincide here. Campbell showed that, from Medieval times up until the 1880’s, bread baked from barley was common north of this boundary zone, while rye and oats dominate in the south (Campbell 1950 in Viklund 1998:141). Viklund has recently revealed that this tradition can be traced back to at least the Late Iron Age (Viklund 1998:141pp). While environmental factors are important, Viklund notes that dietary habits also embody cultural preferences and concepts of identity (Viklund 1998:151).

Geographers and ethnologists were not the first to notice the existence of this boarder zone. That distinction would seem to rest with the early practitioners emerging from within the budding biological sciences. As early as 1732, during his travels in the North, Carl von Linné noted that the oak did not naturally occur north of the city of Gävle. A more exact and exhaustive description of this geo-vegetational zone and the northernmost distribution of the oak had to wait until Göran Wahlenberg’s 1826 presentation.

In 1856 Elias Fries, upon observing that the frequency of the common alder (Alnus glutinosa) diminished north of this border area and was replaced by the grey alder (Alnus incana), went on to exclaim that in all of Scandinavia, it was only here that one could observe such a clear vegetational boundary between the North and the South, a border zone, he noted, where the cold of winter became more extreme, the summers less warm and where the average temperature of the topsoil noticeably drops (Fries 1948:52p).

Gunnar Andersson contributed to this growing body of evidence with his now classic study from
1902 entitled ‘The Hazel in Sweden, Past and Present’ (Sw. Hasseln i Sverige fordom och nu) that investigates the prehistoric and historic distribution of the hazel, which in recent times occurs along the northern marches of Svealand (Andersson 1902). In his distinguished work on animal geography from 1922 the zoologist and hunting enthusiast Sven Ekman recognised that the northern and southernmost distribution of certain animal species also broadly occurs along this border zone. For example, the southern boundary for both grayling (Thymallus thymallus), willow grouse (Lagopus lagopus) and the forest lemming (Myopus schisticolor) converge within this general area (Ekman 1922:170pp). The discovery of this biological boundary was augmented by Bertil Halden in 1926 who concluded that the northernmost occurrence of the ash tree was to be found within this zone, while Rolf Nordhagen showed that the northernmost distribution of the water-nut (Trapa natans) had occurred here during the Atlantic maximum (Fries 1948:57; Nordhagen 1933). This mounting evidence prompted Lennart von Post to echo Fries’ statement and exclaim that; The clearest and probably the most important natural geographic boundary to be found in Sweden, is the Norrlandian territorial boundary that faces southern Sweden (von Post 1933:8).

A year earlier, Erik Granlund pointed out in his dissertation that the northernmost extension of the so called raised bogs was also to be found within this area. The discussion that followed Granlund’s presentation inspired Rutger Sernander to mint the term Limes Norrlandicus, now widely used to describe the reoccurring phenomena of this border zone (Berg 1983:7; Fries 1948:56). In 1935 Einar du Rietz attempted to give this term a more precise definition by equating this border with the northernmost occurrence of the mixed oak forest. That same year Carl Dahl showed that this zone was also the northernmost limit for a number of different fruit trees (Fries 1948:57p). One may probably assume that Sigurd Fries dissertation from 1957 entitled ‘A Study of Nordic Tree Names’ (Sw. Studier över Nordiska Trädnamn) was inspired by the work being done in these and other fields, noting that this area operated as a border zone for a number of local dialectical differences concerning names given and used to describe trees (Fries 1957a; 1957b).

Further ethnological investigations into this cultural boundary reached new levels through Nilssson and Arvid Bringéus who conducted one of the most comprehensive studies ever carried out concerning the distribution of different cultural traits above and below this border area. More importantly, he set out to discover the reasons behind them. By combining the results from a number of investigations, Bringéus found that they all supported the division of Sweden into a northern and a southern region. He also concluded that this cultural duality, broadly speaking, reflected the degree to which vertical stratification was maintained within and between these two areas. The importance of sustaining social status and rank was discovered to decrease and become ever more flexible towards the north while southwards it became increasing rigid, hierarchical and codified (Bringéus 1978). While Bringéus’ sophisticated insights are probably the most accomplished in their understanding of this border zone, one is still left wondering why this phenomena occurs just here, within this geographic area.

Archaeology has also shown that the Limes Norrlandicus was, to some extent and during certain periods, a relevant border zone in the prehistoric past. During the Neolithic (4200-2000 BC) the people who lived north of this border zone can be distinguished by their extensive, although not exclusive, use of quartz, slate and the distribution of artefacts made from a characteristic green-stone (Baudou 1994:63) together with a marked scarcity of ceramics and the extensive utilisation of different types of pit hearths, the employment of which produced such an abundance of fire-cracked stone that it is today the most common type of refuse found by archaeologists on prehistoric sites in the North. This southern border zone endured into the following period, the Epi-neolithic (2000-800 BC). Norrland during the Neolithic period has been described as an independent area with its own traditions and wide flung contacts throughout Scandinavia (Baudou 1992:61pp). The following period is characterised by continued internal development augmented by strong Eastern and Southern influences. The former is most notable in the inland areas where the adoption of a new stone technology resulted in the remarkable bifacial arrowheads that are so abundant north of the Limes Norrlandicus (Baudou 1994:64pp). Southern influences are found along the coastal areas in the form of stone cairns of various shapes and sizes. Regional variations within Norrland, although present during the previous periods, become increasingly pronounced from 800 BC onwards. The peoples in the southern half of Norrland were slowly
Fig. 7. Sigurd Emanuel Erixon (1888-1968) pioneer ethnologist who gained wide spread recognition through his extensive research into regional variations concerning lifestyles, popular culture, village types together with their architecture and organisation, work which today is still extensively discussed and cited within the discipline (Sporrong 1994:31). Less well-known is the fact that Erixon started out as an archaeologist. He was a member of that highly successful group of students that was brought together by Knut Stjerna in Uppsala at the beginning of the last century. Erixon was entrusted with investigating the development of the prehistoric settlement of Blekinge in light of the distribution of the Stone Age artefacts and features found in that province. This resulted in a presentation of the material based on detailed distribution maps which was published in 1913 (Erixon 1913). This type of archaeological method, the plotting of a number of cultural traits across any given region, is based on the pioneering work of Oscar Montelius. Erixon successfully employed this method throughout his subsequent career, thus, ethnology acquired an important analytical tool from archaeology (Erixon 1938:137; photo source Erixon 1958).

being drawn ever closer into the cultural sphere of western and southern Scandinavia while the northern half strengthened its ties with the rest of northern Fenno-Scandia. The material evidence for this regionalisation in the northern areas consists of, among other things, eastern (or Russian) Ananino and Akozino bronzes together with use of asbestos ceramics, followed somewhat later by asbestos ware. From about the beginning of the Christian Era one begins to see the appearance of a certain type of characteristic hearth, either oval or rectangular in shape, together with the remains of tent-like house foundations, ritual deposits containing metal ornaments, reindeer hunting and later, herding, all or some of which are considered to be the early cultural manifestations of a linguistic and ethnically distinct people which are held to be the direct ancestors of the historically known Sámi population. Archaeological evidence along the northernmost coastal areas of Norrland is still sketchy but there are indications of sporadic agriculture from the first centuries AD onwards, together with the remains of graves in the form of small stone settings as well as coastal hunting sites or stations. This would seem to indicate the beginnings of a coastal semi-sedentary and/or sedentary community and/or communities composed of diverse peoples with contacts extending in many directions, but predominantly towards the south and the east, with a mixed economy consisting of cultivation, animal husbandry and the seasonal exploitation of both terrestrial and maritime resources. Place-name studies suggest that the coastal regions of Norrbotten and Västerbotten in and around AD 1000 consisted of a northern and a southern area, the former predominantly characterised by a Finnish speaking population and the latter by a Nordic speaking population. By the first millennium AD, western and southern Scandinavian influences had reached up to what is now the northern area of present day Ångermanland. The material and immaterial remains of these contacts consist of grave mounds with their characteristic burial rites and goods, three aisled long houses, cultivation with a heavy reliance on cattle breeding, a hierarchical social system, rune stones and place-names ending in -sta, -hem and -vin (Ahnlund 1937:32; Aronsson 1991; Baudou 1992; 1994; 1996a:38pp; Broadbent 1988; Edlund 1994c; 1996:115; Fjellström 1996:92pp; Liedgren 1992; Mulk 1988; 1994; Ramqvist 1983; Rathje 1996; 2001; Segerström 1996:75; Wallerström 1983; Wallin 1996; Viklund 1998:133; Zachrisson 1984).

While the above is far from being either a detailed or exhaustive presentation of the evidence and state of research within archaeology and other subjects for the five thousand year period in question, it does highlight the fact that by the end of the prehistoric era there was at least a three or possibly even a four fold cultural division of the region, each with its own distinctive material and immaterial attributes. In ethnic and/or linguistic terms, there would seem to be at least three principal groups of people in Norrland, probably supplemented by an unknown number of sub-groups, that roughly correspond to what could be labelled as the forerunners of those people who now reside in the area and who today choose to adhere to either a Sámi, Swedish and/or Finnish identity.

During the Iron Age the cultural ramifications of the Limes Norrlandicus boundary ceased to carry the same import as earlier, at least as far as we can see at
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Fig. 8. The *Limes Norrlandicus* border zone is depicted, together with the borders of the various provinces. As noted, this is not a distinct and precise boundary, and thus it lacks that certain sense of administrative neatness which seems to be so important in human affairs. Instead, we perceive a conglomerate of natural properties and cultural traits, past and present, that all happen to roughly coincide within this broad area which, more or less, runs from east to west across Sweden, partitioning this Nation into a northern and a southern domain, the former which has for the last 600 years borne the appellation Norrland (Engström 1994:280; 1995:463; 1996:426; Marklund 1992:262).

present, but neither did it entirely vanish altogether. This is apparent through the ethnographic and historical materials outlined above and which shows that the *Limes Norrlandicus* had once again become a fundamental cultural border zone sometime during the transition from late prehistoric to early historic times ca. AD 1000-1400.

While all of the above mentioned cultural traits are subject to temporal and historical restraints, there is at least one that isn’t. This is the use and distribution of hunting pits found throughout the area north of the *Limes Norrlandicus*, a feature that defies both chronological considerations and local historical differences. They were used to trap moose and/or reindeer and have been C14 dated from 6000 BC up to the 17th century (Spång 1997:51pp). They were, without a doubt, still utilised by local hunters decades after the central authorities had officially band their use in 1864, a measure implemented after an alarming decrease in the moose population that occurred at that time and throughout the region. The distribution of those pits that were used to trap reindeer can be explained in terms of the restricted environmental requirements of that species, those used to ensnare moose cannot. Moose have been, and still are, found throughout Sweden, and yet this hunting method is severely and exclusively restricted in its distribution to the northern regions of the country. The reasons for this, like those concerning all of the above mentioned cultural traits, remain, to a large extent, a mystery.

It would seem obvious that the differences between the distribution of northern and southern flora and fauna populations naturally occurs in conjunction with climatological and geographical boundaries and can thus be explained in relation to them. For example, it is here that we find the southern boundary for the 120 day duration of the winter snow cover, the southernmost limit of that region which experiences more than 190 days of frost per year and the approximate northern limit of the mean annual temperature of 16°C for the month of July (Berg 1983; Fries 1948:58p). On the other hand one is rather reluctant to attribute the distribution of cultural traits, prehistoric or historic, as resulting exclusively from natural causes, in other words, to have been environmentally determined. Although both climate, hydrology, geography and other natural conditions must surely have played their part, they would only have done so within a complex cultural milieu in combination with long term historical processes. But this is not an explanation, rather it is a recognition of the complexity of the problem. Thus we arrive, rather embarrassingly, at the brink of our knowledge and understanding of this seemingly enduring border zone. We realise its existence but the cause or causes behind it are still as elusive as ever.

While all borders are to some degree arbitrary, there are reasons behind their existence. The present western, northern and eastern borders of Norrland are recent national boundaries that would seem to have nothing to do with cultural contacts, collective identities and shared historical experiences that occurred prior to their final establishment and solidification during the last 200 years or so. Indeed these three national borders would seem to have effectively fulfilled their function by disrupting,
cutting off and compartmentalising Norrland from any earlier social affiliations, bonds or ties that existed within northern Fenno-Scandia throughout its recent 9000 year history (Bringéus 2000:43pp; Gidlund & Sörlin 1992:219).

That which is considered to be Norrland’s southern border is also a regional administrative construction, but it just so happens to roughly coincide, either through chance or design, within a boundary zone that periodically seems to have functioned or behaved as a cultural frontier, sometimes for thousands of years. That a number of natural and geographical frontiers also converge within this zone would only seem to underscore our suspicions and tempt one to conclude that this is something more than just another bureaucratic fabrication. Thus, the *Limes Norrlandicus* is and has behaved as a rough demarcation zone between North and South, and it would also seem to have its roots far back in prehistoric time for reasons that are as yet still not fully understood.

This preponderance concerning Norrland’s borders is not wholly the result of some trivial pursuit. While pondering the history of any region one is invariably confronted with the problem of delimiting the area under study. In light of the above it might not seem so surprising that this work observes those recent borders that are commonly used to define Norrland, which include, from south to north, the Counties of Gävleborg, Västernorrland, Jämtland, Västerbotten and Norrbotten, alternatively, the Provinces of Gästrikland, Hälsingland, Härjedalen, Jämtland, Medelpad, Ångermanland, Västerbotten, Lappland and Norrbotten. In practice this means that any discussion concerning Norrland automatically includes, for example, the County of Gävleborg, an area which during certain periods would seem to have much more in common with its southern neighbours. At the same time one is also forced to exclude the County of Kopparberg (the borders of which roughly coincide with the Province of Dalarna), an area that would seem to share much of what is considered to characterise Norrland. Having recognised this problem brings us to the final realisation that any and all generalisations concerning Norrland not only sanction the constraints imposed upon us by contemporary boundaries but that they also inadvertently hide and/or ignore all local and regional distinctions and differences that may exist or have existed. The full import of this is made clear when one remembers that we are dealing with a multitude of people, past and present, in an area that from north to south is approximately 1030 kilometres long and from east to west between 275-450 kilometres wide, a region that encompasses 6 distinct vegetational zones, from the northern Arctic Alpine to the Southern Boreal, together with 7 clear topological zones that stretch from the mountain ranges with their deep valleys in the west to the flat sub-Cambrian peneplains in the east, and which is today divided up into 11 different cultural landscapes, each having developed within the confines of their respective natural habitats (Bylund 1995:251p; Rune 1995a:266pp).

The complexity of this problem is underscored by the earliest written sources dating from 1435 where the plural *Norrlander* was employed when describing this Northern area, and which continued to be used up until the end of the 17th century (Ahnlund 1936:9; 1942:233). The use of this plural form seems to express an early understanding that this vast region was composed of different geographical landscapes, provinces, cultural traditions, histories and, possibly, even of different peoples. As noted above, Swedes today, when describing where they hail from, often use the old province designations instead of the more recent (400 year old) county classifications. It is also notable that people from the North are known as, and also call themselves, Norrländers (Sw. Norrlänningar) while no one uses the corresponding labels ‘Svealandians’ or ‘Götalandians’ to describe people from those regions. But it would be erroneous to suppose that all Norrländers automatically feel any deep sense of affiliation towards each other. Socio-cultural identities are, to a great extent, derived from and firmly anchored in the geographical confines of their respective river valleys, each conditioned by their specific historical, economic, political and social circumstances. Although sharing many traits in common, they lack an integrated or higher sense of unity, especially political solidarity, on both regional and national levels (Andersson-Skog & Bäcklund 1992:111p).

Norrland has often been portrayed as Europe’s last wilderness. Today this description is aired in many contemporary tourist brochures with the hope of enticing them to disburse while enjoying their visit to this region. In truth Norrland, with the possible exception of its mountain areas, is far from being that untouched natural landscape that it so often is made out to be. In truth it is, to a high degree, a cultural landscape, although of a type that is quite
isolated farmsteads scattered across the landscape. The former may take many forms, from the neatly ordered pastures and fields of England separated by tidy stone walls to the vineyard covered and sun baked slopes of France to the well tended olive groves of Greece. It may also manifest itself in the vestige of prehistoric and historic ruins, or in the form of stately homes and manors of the rich and powerful or as a cluster of picturesque rural cottages. It might present itself as lonely foot paths that criss-cross a desolate moor or take the shape of a four line highway running through a bustling urban area. Anyone who has travelled through Norrland has probably come away with a completely different impression; a largely unpopulated landscape that is teaming with wildlife, fish, edible berries and mushrooms, clean and untouched lakes and waterways nestled among endless and ancient forests that are only periodically punctuated by isolated farmsteads and villages, primarily situated along the river valleys. Reality is not as romantic. Humans have been living in, and altering, Norrland’s landscape since the end of the last Ice Age, which relented its grip over this region between 9000-8000 years ago. Using everything from fire to dynamite and from baskets to some of the largest earth moving equipment ever built, this landscape has been rearranged to suit the needs of its inhabitants.

This misconception is reinforced by visual impressions as exemplified by Figure 9. This schematic presentation depicts, from left to right, the development of agriculture in Norrland (above) and in southern Sweden (below). Continuous agriculture in the North reaches back to at least the first centuries of the first millennium AD with the establishment of small self-sufficient farmsteads. Incipient agriculture in southern Sweden began some 4000 years earlier which, by the end of the Neolithic, led to the appearance of small hamlets surrounded by fields and pastures. Agricultural continued to expand in both areas up until the middle of the last century. The various land reforms implemented during the 19th century resulted in the break up of the age old village formations, which were now replaced by single isolated farmsteads scattered across the landscape. In the North one sees a checker board pattern of forests, fields, meadows and pasture lands, reflecting the needs of a diverse economy. Development in the South led to the combination and creation of ever larger tracts of arable land. During the second half of the 20th century both areas experienced a decline in this sector, but with dissimilar consequences. In the North many farms vanished while the open landscape disappeared beneath the canopy of the expanding forests. Large scale industrial agriculture in the South not only led to the continued consolidation of arable land into the hands of ever fewer and larger estates but also to the creation of a monotonous landscape where all obstacles that impeded rationalisation, cultural or otherwise, were removed. The account outlined above is, of course, a generalisation. Much of what is ascribed to Norrland also occurred in the marginal areas of the South, while the subsequent development that took place along the many river valleys of the North has much in common with developments as they unfolded on the plains of southern Sweden.

Today, 97% of the forests are the product of human manipulation (Zackrisson & Östlund 1992:19). It is quite feasible that a majority of the region’s waterways and wetlands have at one time or another either been altered, cleared, dammed up, dredged and/or drained. The water level of many lakes has been lowered and/or raised, some more than once, in accordance with the changing needs of society. The wolf, eagle, certain species of owl and fish as well as the otter population have all been seriously effected by human encroachment but have managed to survive through the implementation of intensive conservation projects. The moose population is carefully culled each year through hunting, but not enough according to some forest owners, who see the seedlings in their re-planted clear-cuts eaten each spring by these hungry animals. The reindeer are now semi-tamed, the wild reindeer having disappeared by the 1880’s (Arvidson 1983:208; Spång 1997:70). Glaciofluvial ridges of sand and gravel up to several kilometres long have vanished, carted away to be used as building material. The air and water is still relatively clean, although acidification of lakes and waterways through airborne pollution, the majority of which is blown in from continental Europe, has not yet reached epidemic proportions, although some 8% of all lakes have been affected to such a degree that their flora and fauna are in jeopardy (Isacsson & Landgren 1998:2pp; Öhlén 1993:345p). Game, fish, berries and
mushrooms are for the most part still consumed in spite of periodic bulletins from the Ministry of Health and other environmental institutions warning about hazardous levels of mercury, PCBs or radioactive caesium, the latter from the 1986 Tjernobyl accident, which through a quirk of fate and prevailing winds fell abundantly on certain areas of Norrland (Isacsson & Landgren 1998:9pp). It is estimated that the radioactive contamination from this single incident will kill an additional 100-200 Norrlandians within the next 50 years (Fällman 1996:236p).

Let us not be unduly pessimistic. In comparison with much of Europe, Norrland would seem to fulfil the promise of being the untouched wilderness that it so often is given out to be. What the examples here show, as they would do for any area inhabited for any length of time, is that much of the flora and fauna as well as the physical landscape are the result of human intervention. Thus Norrland, to a much larger degree that is often recognised, is a cultural landscape in the sense that it has been transformed through human action, both intentionally and un-intentionally, even though these alterations are often not perceived either by visitors nor by the present day inhabitants.

One wonders if this persistent myth, Norrland as Europe’s last great wilderness, is partly the result of population density. In comparison with other areas of similar size, Sweden and especially Norrland, seem practically empty (fig. 10). Japan, which is smaller than Sweden, boasts a population of about 302 people per km² while the corresponding figure for Sweden is around 18 per km². Norrland and the United
Kingdom, including Northern Ireland, are almost the same size while their respective population densities are radically divergent. The former has a density of about 5 people per km² while the latter is inhabited by 230 persons per km². The County of Norrbotten is larger than Portugal or South Korea, but in comparison would appear practically deserted with only 2.7 people per km² while the latter two seem overtly crowded with 110 and 412 people per km² respectively. With these figures in mind it is easy to understand that anyone visiting this area from without would experience Norrland as a wild un-populated region. I suspect that this is equally true for people from southern Sweden and to a certain extent even for the Northern inhabitants themselves. The majority of the population today is concentrated in the urban centres along the coastal areas. If one were to take this factor in account, then many of the inland areas of northern Sweden would seem to be largely unoccupied. Thus this visual impression might lead one to erroneously conclude that Norrland is a natural and not a cultural landscape.

Another contributing factor might be Norrland’s apparent dearth of ancient monuments, something which is so often associated with cultural landscapes. Some might immediately call to mind the splendours of those Romanesque and Gothic cathedrals that embellish many of the towns and cities of Europe or the remains of once mighty castles and other fortifications that still dominate their landscapes. In both England, Denmark, Germany and southern Sweden their are areas where the horizon is punctuated by imposing barrows dating from the Bronze and Iron Ages. Dolmens and passage graves have held the people of Europe fascinated for centuries, as have such imposing monuments as Stonehenge, the forest of menhirs at Carnac in Brittany, the glories that once were Rome or the Acropolis in Athens, just to mention a few. Although Norrland does possess a number of impressive Iron Age barrows and Bronze Age cairns, their distribution is spatially restricted, while all are not readily accessible, situated as they sometimes are in out of the way places. Norrland’s apparent deficiency of monuments spelt large in conjunction with the relatively sparse population are reasons enough for drawing the misleading conclusion that Norrland is Europe’s last remaining wilderness.

But in truth Norrland is lousy with ancient monuments of a certain special variety and one would have to try very hard indeed to find an area within this region that is totally devoid of all traces of human

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>territory</th>
<th>area in km²</th>
<th>ca. population 1980’s</th>
<th>pop. per km²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>449 790</td>
<td>8 317 937</td>
<td>18.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>411 015</td>
<td>25 622 000</td>
<td>62.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>396 700</td>
<td>120 018 000</td>
<td>302.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>301 245</td>
<td>57 024 000</td>
<td>189.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrland</td>
<td>244 624</td>
<td>1 207 799</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K and N. Ireland</td>
<td>244 755</td>
<td>56 488 000</td>
<td>230.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Sweden</td>
<td>205 166</td>
<td>7 110 138</td>
<td>34.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>131 985</td>
<td>9 896 000</td>
<td>74.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrbotten County</td>
<td>99 911</td>
<td>267 054</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>98 445</td>
<td>40 578 000</td>
<td>412.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>91 630</td>
<td>10 164 000</td>
<td>110.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Västerbotten County</td>
<td>55 401</td>
<td>243 856</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jämtland County</td>
<td>49 443</td>
<td>134 934</td>
<td>30.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>43 075</td>
<td>5 111 000</td>
<td>118.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>41 160</td>
<td>14 420 000</td>
<td>350.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Västernorrland County</td>
<td>21 678</td>
<td>267 935</td>
<td>12.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>20 770</td>
<td>4 244 000</td>
<td>204.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gävleborg County</td>
<td>18 191</td>
<td>294 020</td>
<td>16.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>10 400</td>
<td>2 644 000</td>
<td>254.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 10. A comparison between the size and population of Sweden together with the different counties that make up the region known as Norrland (the counties of Gävleborg, Jämtland, Västernorrland, Västerbotten and Norrbotten) in relation to other geographical units. One realises just how sparsely populated Norrland is when compared to other regions of similar size (Norrlandsk Uppslagsbok del 1-4, 1993-1996; SCB 1995; The Times Concise Atlas of the World 1987; Webster’s Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary 1963).
activity. The use of the term ‘monuments’ is misleading. It is usually associated with something that is reasonably conspicuous. The most numerous monuments, or rather ancient remains, that are to be found in Norrland date from the Stone and Bronze Ages. These are usually and loosely classified as ‘dwelling sites’ (Sw. boplatser), an ill defined term which includes the remains from a wide spectrum of ideological, social and economic activities. In the North these remains would seem to share four qualities that set them apart from their southern and European counterparts.

The first is that they are often composed of a number of different elements that, if not unique, are at least distinctive in character from those found further south. The majority of artefacts, together with the waste resulting from their manufacture, consists of quartz and quartzite, while in southern regions flint is predominate. The tools from the former were not so seldom considered to be insignificant in number, manufactured from decidedly inferior materials and with less skill. Corresponding sites in the South seemed to abound with beautifully crafted and distinct forms that not only confirmed the superiority of their makers but also provided posterity with an excellent basis for a workable typology that is still in use today (Broadbent 1979:240; Ekelund 1950:83p; Janson 1945:49; Montelius 1874b; 1922:5p; Stenberger 1964:165). Ceramics are also plentiful on many southern sites, disclosing their whereabouts, providing the material for yet another typological chronology in and for these regions (Forssander 1938:360). While ceramics do occur in Norrland, they are still relatively infrequent, their function having largely been replaced by the abundant use of heated stones and cooking pits. Another example of elements that are specific, although not exclusive, in the northern regions is the wide use of slate for points and cutting implements.

The second quality that sets apart the prehistoric remains in Norrland from those found further south is the numerical predominance of these dwelling sites over other types found in the North. This ill-defined label is applied indiscriminately to localities that not only differ greatly in both size and content but also as concerns their occupational duration and chronological age. Since the 1980’s these dwelling sites have become increasingly associated with a new type of feature, the presence of structures that represent the remains of various types of semi-subterranean houses.

It has already been pointed out that Norrland lacks, not totally but to a large degree, eye catching monuments. A majority of the prehistoric remains in the North, the so called dwelling sites, with or without houses, may in fact be exceedingly inconspicuous, not so seldom hidden under a lush cover of forest vegetation. It often takes a conscious effort on the part of the observer to see and/or discover them. This involves both a high degree of awareness and sensitivity which, in most cases, can only be achieved through extensive training and practical experience. There are a number of mitigating factors that would seem to make similar sites in southern latitudes generally more visible than those found in the North. For example, the presence of eye catching ceramics or the relatively thick cultural layers that consist of an accumulation of a great amounts of cultural debris which makes them more visible and thus favours the likelihood of their discovery. Their detection is further assisted by the fact that they are, in many cases, located exclusively on arable land, fields that are ploughed annually and thus open to periodic inspection and discovery. But this also means that they are, to a large extent, damaged and in some cases approaching total destruction, a process which in some areas has been going on uninterrupted since Neolithic times. This brings us to the third and most important quality that many dwelling sites in Norrland, together with similar sites found in northern Fenno-Scandia, possess and which radically distinguishes them from those dwelling sites found further south; they are uncommonly well preserved. There are probably few places in Europe today where one can discover and observe so many prehistoric sites, together with houses, that have remained practically undisturbed and unaltered since they were abandoned in the forgotten past (Loeffler 1993). Norrland could be looked upon as treasure house of archaeological wealth, one that has largely gone unrecognised. When the full potential of this resource is finally and fully comprehended it will have much to contribute to the understanding of past lifeways. This is not to imply that these sites are immune to destruction. Quite the contrary, as noted in Chapter Three, their unpretentious character and subtle appearance has not prevented the devastation of these sites in ever increasing numbers during the last 50 years.

The fourth and last attribute that the remains from Norrland’s prehistoric (and historic) past have, or more precisely lack, in contrast to southern Swedish
monuments, would seem to be the fact that they have never been used to foster and promote any sense of Swedish national identity. Prehistoric remains in southern Sweden, including dwelling sites of various ages, or at least the imagined inhabitants that archaeologists have peopled them with, have repeatedly been utilised to invoke images of unity and continuity anchored in bygone days of glory (Sw. fornstora dagar). Those from northern Sweden have not. In comparison, the material from these Northern dwelling sites appeared strange, different and/or foreign enough to prevent them from being incorporated into the lore and myth of the nation-building project in any convincing and wholly satisfactory manner. One might immediately applaud such a development, but then one would also be totally missing the point. That they have never served as a source of propaganda for the advancement of a Swedish identity must not be confused with any apparent lack of manipulation. The fact that the physical remains of this region, indeed the whole history of Norrland itself, has largely gone unnoticed or has been (un)intentionally neglected and/or ignored is per se a form of ideological manipulation or deception. To overlook, exclude or deny the history of any region, for whatever reason, even unintentionally, is an act of historical repression and/or dispossession. This has lead to the widespread and erroneous assumption, past and present, that Norrland is, more or less, a cultural and historical vacuum into which one can insert or extract whatever one desires in accordance with the needs of the times.

Thus we arrive where we started, at the perplexing realisation that the history of this region has somehow gone missing. We also begin to realise that Norrland, like all regions, is more than just a juxtaposition of different geographical features, prehistorical and historical remains, climatological circumstances or arbitrary boundaries. As Sverker Sörlin (1988) has so thoroughly demonstrated, it is also a state of mind, an idea or a metaphor that has constantly been revised in context with external historical situations. It is the occurrence and, above all, the consequences of this very phenomenon that lies at the centre of this inquiry. In order to understand the origins and ramifications of this process as it pertains to the archaeology of this region, it becomes essential that one is at least equipped with a basic understanding of the recent history of Norrland in relationship to the Swedish nation as a whole. This will be presented in the following chapter.

**Source Criticisms**

As we have seen above, the inhabitants of Sweden divide their nation into three basic regions; Norrland, Svealand and Götaland. Svealand is usually also referred to as middle and/or central Sweden while Götaland is southern Sweden proper. Norrland is always ‘the North’. In this presentation a dual regional terminology has been adopted. On the one hand there is ‘the North’ which consists of what is traditionally known as Norrland. In contrast, the remainder of Sweden is simply referred to as ‘the South’. The reasons for doing so should already be apparent from the above and become even clearer during the course of the following.

Briefly, whatever differences that do exist between Svealand and Götaland, the inhabitants and institutions of both, in comparison with those from Norrland, have shown an ability to acquire, accumulate, exercise and exert economic, social, ideological or political influence and power to the advantage of their respective regions on a scale and to an extent that far exceeds, even transcends, Northern capabilities. Furthermore, when convenient, they have both employed and imposed their massed authority upon the North itself. It is the ensuing consequences of this regional imbalance of power that we are interested in here, especially as it pertains to the subject of archaeology. To accomplish this, the scale of the geographical units under discussion do not necessarily need to be any finer than those applied here, based as it is on those many dissimilarities that do exist between the North and the South, as already indicated above.

The stated aim of this study is to understand the ideas and the interpretations of past archaeologists from different times and places, as they specifically pertain to Norrland. To do this one must read what they wrote. A careful examination of everything that has ever been written about the prehistory of this northern region, to summarise every idea, interpretation and trend, while possible, has nevertheless not been attempted here, due to the realities of contemporary doctoral studies, that is to say, scanty resources. In any case, it is not clearly obvious that such a strategy would have been entirely beneficial to the understanding of this subject. Quite the contrary. Any quest for knowledge necessarily entails a sampling of that larger reality that surrounds us. It is assumed that by focusing on a well defined problem or question one will illuminate the complexities of the greater whole of which they are,
or were, a part. This is nothing more or less than a variation on the problem of induction, still unresolved, yet confronted by science at every moment. Through prudence, training, experience or sheer luck, one selects a sample that is considered to be representative and/or characteristic of the subject under study. In this case it concerns those opinions, conceptions and convictions held by the members of that greater whole or thought-collective which once existed in Sweden on the subject of archaeology during a specific period vis-à-vis those held concerning contemporary Norrland.

Thus, this study has confined itself to comprehending how and why Swedish archaeologists during a hundred year period between the 1870's and 1970's interpreted a certain selection of the archaeological record, recovered in Norrland and dating to an era usually referred to as the Stone Age, in the way that they did. In doing so we not only gain insight into the complexities of the past but also into the intricacies of the present.

The method employed here is necessarily literary. It involves delimiting some of the main trends in archaeological thought and tracing their development over time through the use of those sources that are readily available. In this case articles and monographs kept on hand at the University library in Umeå. No effort was made to access any unpublished papers that might possibly exist, stored in one of the main research archives in Sweden. One reason for not devilling into the papers of these treasure houses has to do with logistics, again, pertaining to limitations on both time and funding. Another is founded in methodological considerations. The intention of this investigation is to discover how and in what way the various participants, who were engaged in the study of Norrland’s prehistory, interpreted and presented the materials they had on hand. In other words, we wish to know what the different authors thought, or more pointedly, which and what interpretations they themselves felt or believed would either stand the test of time and/or be acceptable to their colleagues. Thus it would seem safe to assume that those articles and monographs that were committed to print and thus entered and became part of the official academic record, really do contain and convey those ideas, opinions and judgements that were indeed held, with a certain amount of conviction, by the various individual authors in question.

What they might have thought in private, about each other, about their own work or the work of others, however interesting and revealing, which may possibly be found preserved for prosperity in the form of personal papers such as letters, diaries or other miscellaneous notes jotted down on whatever was handy at the time, have not been sought out nor here taken into consideration. While the utilisation of any such material would undoubtedly have added another dimension to this study, it is not certain whether or not it would have greatly changed or even influenced either the content or the conclusions presented below. What we are interested in, is what they themselves were prepared to openly declare, and by doing so thus influenced not only their colleagues but also the general public. While discreet deliberations held behind closed doors do deserve historical attention, it is the debate that took place in the public forum which draws our attention and which will be examined here. It is also the relationship(s) between archaeological ideas and society as a whole which are of interest; if and how the political, social and economic ideas that permeated or dominated the public debate effected those emanating from the members of the various archaeological thought-collective(s). Thus, this review has concentrated on the public sphere of the ideological exchange, while the personal and private aspects, to the extent they are accessible, remain to be explored at another time.

Finally, certain specific aspects of this inquiry, especially concerning Finnish archaeology, will necessarily be scanty due to the fact that large amounts of the literature is either in Finnish or German, languages that are unfortunately more or less inaccessible to the author. As this problem primarily concerns Finland, any review thereof is often dependent on secondary sources, general reviews written in Swedish or English. Despite this disadvantage, it is not felt that this will seriously impede this review or fundamentally alter any of the interpretations and conclusions presented here.

Concluding Remarks and Summary
Developments within Northern archaeology during the last quarter of the 20th century brought to light a number of anomalies concerning previous interpretations of the Norrlandian past. These issues are exemplified in the form of two questions;

1) why did it take some 70 odd years for archaeologists to perceive that those many conspicuous features found in Norrland are the remains of semi-subterranean houses? and,
2) why did it take nearly 80 years for archaeologists to recognise and except the existence of a Mesolithic period in Norrland?

The assumption taken here is that archaeological research in Norrland, more specifically the interpretations derived from this research, have been seriously effected, even determined, by non-archaeological factors and that the consequences of this influence on the intellectual environment of those involved was much greater than has often been realised. If this is so, then the problem we wish to solve is simply;

3) what is the nature of these determinants?

The aim of this study is to investigate the production and character of archaeological knowledge through an examination of those interpretations presented by past participants as they specifically pertain to Norrland. This procedure should help to elucidate the implicit assumptions upon which their archaeological presentations were based, while indicating the nature of those external and ill-defined influences that are assumed to have prevailed and effected the archaeological community from without.

The methods employed to probe and illuminate the opening questions posed above consist of three complimentary perspectives.

1) Recognising the sociology of the scientific endeavour, Ludwik Fleck introduced the concepts ‘thought-style’ and a ‘thought-collective’. Fleck argues that the enculturation of any given scientific community will result in the formation and establishment of an accepted way of viewing and portraying reality, a specific thought-style, one constantly sanctioned, upheld and reproduced by the members of a particular thought-collective. Fleck’s concepts will be applied to a pair of archaeological examples in Chapter Three in order to discover the eventual occurrence of one or more thought-styles and/or collectives as concerns how the Norrlandian semi-subterranean houses and the Mesolithic period were perceived, interpreted and presented by Swedish archaeologists during the course of the 20th century.

2) Any inquiry into the possible effects of enculturation on the production of archaeological knowledge needs to be proceeded by a presentation of the contemporary socio-historical context within which the discipline and its practitioners worked and lived. This is provided in Chapter Two. Norrland’s association with southern Sweden during the last 600 years seems to have resulted in a relationship not dissimilar to that experienced by many erstwhile colonies. The structure of this association is explored using concepts derived from economics and African historians as concerns the nature of colonialism, expressed here in the formulation of 20 particulars that typify ‘the colonial experience’. This review should elucidate that relationship which has long existed between North and South, a background against which all ensuing archaeological interpretations have been formulated and presented.

3) In contrast to history, heritage are those events or traits that are repeatedly chosen to represent and justify the vested interests of some over others, most recently to create a National identity and maintain social cohesion within the Nation-State. Norrland’s share in the manufacture of contemporary Swedish heritage seems to have been negligible, further emphasising that unbalanced relationship that exists between North and South, making it appear not only normal, but natural. It is the consequences of this geo-political imbalance of power that we are interested in here, especially if and how it has effected to the subject of archaeology. This aspect will be explored in conjunction with the presentation of Norrland’s history in Chapter Two.

If archaeologists and their subject are ideologically and culturally conditioned by contemporary society to any degree, then one would expect, in accordance with the above, to find that archaeological interpretations and presentations reflect and reproduce the dominate and normative values and attitudes of contemporary society. This assumption will be explored using Norrland as a case study. Although a unique region, its recent history and the consequences thereof, are not. Thus, Norrland may well be illustrative of a more general and widespread phenomena that has occurred, and which is still taking place, within archaeology and throughout the world.

The setting is Norrland, a region which constitutes just over 54% Sweden’s landmass but just under 15% of its population. It is a diversified landscape, both natural and cultural, complimented by great variations in both climate and environment, which is today predominantly inhabited by Sámi, Finnish and Swedish speaking peoples. Regarded as a discrete region for the last 600 years, Norrland’s standing within the Swedish nation as a whole is distinguished
by its assumed inferiority, as repeatedly reflected in the general historical overviews that profess to present the history of Sweden. This has helped to promote and codify that decidedly unbalanced relationship, based on domination and dependence, that has long existed between the centre-South and peripheral-North.

T-shaped implement from Kästa 8:1, Stöde parish (Raå 164), Medelpad, found 60 meters above the present day sea level. Made of red slate, it is 15.2 cm long, 5.7 cm high and 1.5 cm thick. Illustration by the author. Scale 1:1.
Slotted-edged implement from Trolltjärnsbäcken, Åflo village, Offerdal parish, Jämtland, today situated at 330 meters above the present day sea level. Made from bone, it is 26.5 cm long, 3 cm wide and 0.9 cm thick. Discovered in 1881, it was recently C14 dated to 7950±80 BP (Larsson 2003). Illustration source Montelius 1917, here modified and depicted to scale 1:1.
Chapter Two

Norrland and the Nation
History and Heritage

“...an uncritical view of the national past generated an equally subservient acceptance of the present.”
Hans Schmitt as quoted in Deighton 1996:xxi.

Introduction

If archaeological research, and the conclusions derived from that activity, are influenced by the society that sustains it, as illustrated in Figure 1, then we need to know a little something about that society and its history.

Sweden is today commonly presented as consisting of a homogeneous country sharing a common past, an entity and account that leaves little or no room for divergent histories and thus, alternative insights. This is one consequence of actively ignoring and/or marginalising regional differences and singularities while simultaneously replacing them with one unproblematic and unifying heritage (Aronsson 2000; Gidlund & Sörlin 1992:195). The essentialism, and legitimacy, of this situation needs be explored and questioned if we are to discover or understand the possible repercussion(s) this may have had on the concepts of identity and heritage, on the practice of cultural management and on archaeological interpretations and explanations. In compliance with expectations expressed previously, it is here assumed that Norrland, in general, possesses its own particular history, divergent from the Nation as a whole and distinct from that which is normally presented in the textbooks. This assumption will be examined in accordance with those 20 particulars that define the colonial experience, as outlined in Chapter One. This should disclose and clarify those historical relationship(s) that have existed between Norrland and the Nation for the last 600 years or so.

This approach implies the existence of an asymmetrical relationship between the North and South. If the creation and propagation of identity and heritage, together with the formation and articulation of cultural management, is dependent on the dominant socio-political environment of any given time, then one would expect that Norrland’s share in, or contribution to, these forms of ideological expression would have been minimal, even non-existent, throughout the period under review. The limited extent to which Norrland appears in the history books would seem to support this assumption, a situation not entirely unnoticed by others;

...Norrland...is invariably [portrayed] as a region with no history, no prehistory, no past, having no living traditions and consequently, no soul (Nordström 1940:10).

Thus, the following account also includes an abbreviated outline of those evolving concepts and institutions, relating to and connected with, the production and re-production of Swedish identity and heritage as devised by the intellectual elite in accordance with concurrent socio-political needs and requirements.

Consequently, this chapter is not archaeology in the conventional or customary sense. Instead it is a presentation of that changing situational context within which both antiquarianism, and later archaeology, developed and produced its own brand of knowledge. A more detailed examination of the consequences that arose out of that historical relationship, especially as it pertains to the portrayal of Norrland’s prehistoric past, will be presented in Chapter Three.

The Emergence of a Royal Swedish Kingdom

Politics, by the beginning of the historic era, were based on hierarchical social relationships, patronage and clientage, augmented by kinship and marriage alliances. This was fuelled by a political economy in which authority was derived, not from wealth as such, but from personal prestige, influence and the ability to mobilise the people and resources of any one region. The influential few were not working for the betterment of any realm or kingdom, but for the elevation and advancement of their own family. Vows of fidelity and oaths of allegiance were pledged to individuals, not institutions. Sweden was not then a nation in any sense that we understand the term today.
It consisted of an ever changing federation of independent provinces over which one of the leading families would briefly rise to a position of prominence that allowed one of its members to proclaim himself king, a position that would be temporarily recognised by the other leading families until it was safe to do otherwise (Eriksson 1949:22; Harrison 1999:57pp; Lindkvist 2002:43pp).

An attempt to formalise this precarious political structure was made in 1389 with the establishment of the Kalmar Union between the leading Scandinavian families under one ruler. This only ushered in an era of ever increasing political intrigues which periodically erupted in open revolt. In an attempt to suppress the most recent, forces of the Union under the leadership of the Danish King Kristian II, with the blessings of the Archbishop at Uppsala and the Catholic Church, first massacred some 80 aristocrats in Stockholm and then attempted to disarm the peasants. It was probably this latter act which provided Gustav Vasa (1496-1560) with the armed support he needed in order to break with the Union in 1521 and then, two years later, proclaim himself regent over an independent Swedish kingdom (Eriksson 1949:28; Österlin 1997:86-87).

Norrland Enters History

From the 13th century onwards, the emerging power elite, located in southern Sweden, Denmark-Norway and Russia, all began to realise the growing importance of those regions which are today known as Norrland and Finland. The leading families in southern Sweden had been continuously and successfully extending their power eastwards across present day Finland, either by military conquest, the so called Crusades, by promoting colonisation of dependants and by strengthening their personal influence and social connections. In doing so they repeatedly came into conflict with the developing principalities of Russia and the Eastern Orthodox Church. Expansion and/or contacts, directed from south to north, all along the coast of Norrland were intensified by the flegding kingships of southern Sweden during this period. This northern expansion seems to have been both physical and judicial, in other words, both a question of colonisation and the issuing of privileges to allied families living in southern Sweden, granting them rights over various Norrlandian resources (Fjellström 1994:54; Harrison 1999:61p; Lindkvist 2002:43pp).

Scandinavian expansion eastwards through southern Finland and down the Karelian isthmus was checked by the growing strength of the Novgorod kingdom in 1240 at the Battle of the Neva river, which runs from Lake Ladoga and reaches the Gulf of Finland at St. Petersburg. These eastern areas, situated around the present day borders between Finland and Russia, would remain a bone of contention for centuries to come. The growing importance of both the northern and eastern regions in the minds of these regional kingdoms was not only made manifest through military ventures but also through negotiations, as in the case of the Nöteborg treaty from 1323, in which, if not boundaries, then at least spheres of influence were drawn up and arranged between these contestants (Harrison 1999:61; Lundholm 1987:146; Lindkvist 1996:133p; Lundmark 1999:21; Åkerman 1996:149). Blocked in the east from further expansion, the feudal lords of southern Sweden looked northwards, issuing privileges to potential homesteaders, granting them exemption from taxes if they would establish new farmsteads along the Skellefteå and Ule river valleys (Ahlund 1937:34p; Bergström 1981:13pp). This is the first recorded instance where the use of tax relief was employed to stimulate the economy of the North in order to create a body of dependent and/or loyal subjects, a practice that would be repeatedly used in one form or another up until the present. The motive then, as it would be in the future, was to stimulate a development that would serve the needs of the South. This measure was paralleled by the establishment of new administrative parish units all along the northernmost coastal areas during the first half of the 14th century, from south to north, at Lövängé, Skellefteå, Piteå, Luleå, Torneå, Ijo and Kemi (Lundholm 1987:143pp; Lundkvist 1990:74).

In northernmost Scandinavia trade relations up until the 13th century are believed to have moved primarily in a east-westerly direction, involving both English seafarers as well as various Norwegian, Sámi, Finnish, Swedish and Russian speaking peoples. This was now slowly replaced by trade that increasingly moved from North to South, between two main centres. Of these two, the northern was not so much a centre as it was a region, located in and around the Kemi, Torne, Lule and Pite river valleys in present day Sweden and Finland, with links as far away as northernmost Norway and the White Sea. The other was Stockholm and the Mälar Valley region, which was now emerging as one of southern Scandinavia’s major geo-political centres. Trade in the North was, by now, under the control of a people or persons known as the Birkarlar. Who these people or persons
were, whether or not they were a homogeneous population at all, and where they originally came from, is a matter of high dispute and historical speculation. They may have been of Finnish speaking stock with their origins in south-western Finland or the descendants of either Swedish, Norwegian and/or German speaking peoples. Whatever their origins, it would seem that the *Birkarlar* were granted trading privileges over the northern Baltic regions by one or more of the early southern Swedish kingships. With the passing of time these *Birkarlar*, acting as middlemen, established a monopoly over all trade between the North and South, the latter region supplied fish, both dried, salted and smoked, together with furs and skins, in exchange for flour, salt, iron goods and cloth (Baudou 1996a:35; Fjellström 1985:84p; 1994:54; Lundholm 1987:143p; Lindkvist 1996:134p; Lundmark 1999:18pp; Sundström 1993:80; Wallerström 1995:315pp).

The economic importance of Norrland attracted ever wider attention as trade with the area proved to be increasingly profitable. In 1327 the Archbishop at Uppsala, Olof Björnsson and the Catholic Church were granted fishing rights along the Lule river, which included the exceptionally rich Laxholm/Edefors salmon fishing grounds. To help insure this important asset the Church promoted the establishment of new settlements along the shores of this lucrative salmon rich river (Bäärnhielm 1976:8; Fjellström 1996:95; Lundmark 1971:14; Wallerström 1983:34pp). Fishing privileges along the equally important Pite river were acquired in 1441 by the famous Vadstena monastery located in the Province of Östergötland (Fjellström & Andreasson 1995:32). The driving factor behind these initiatives would seem to have sprung primarily out of the wish to secure their revenues rather than from any spiritual desire to redeem and deliver the locals from original sin. Just how economically important these and other fishing grounds could and would become can be gathered from later day transactions. For example, in 1837, on the eve of the industrial revolution, the city of Luleå’s total income amounted to some 1795 *riksdaler* of which 1375, or just over 76%, was exclusively generated by the Laxholm/Edefors fishing grounds (Fjellström & Andreasson 1995:32).

Along Norrland’s southern coasts a string of so called ‘bailiff strongholds’ (Sw. fogdeborg) were established during the end of the 14th and the beginning of the 15th centuries. Clearly, this too is an indication of the intensification and elaboration of economic and political institutions that were emerging from power centres located in the South (Wallander 1987). The increasing awareness concerning Norrland’s potential would, throughout the 15th century, prompt leading families in the South to try and gain ever increasing judicial control over this northern trade (Lundmark 1971:16) but full control over the economic resources of this area would have to wait until the establishment of a strong and stable central government.

**Identity and Kingdom**

During the Middle Ages the most important unit of affiliation, after kinship, was geographic. By the end of the 13th century many of the parish and provinces that we recognise today had come into existence. Local or regional identities were founded in relationship to a farm, the nearest village or town and later, on those emerging administrative units (Brink 1996:146; Harrison 1999:50pp). The peasants, nestled as they were within the confines of their own local and regional districts, resisted the increasing centralisation of political power and managed to retain a high degree of autonomy, even independence, against the various feudal kingships;

> The peasants would give their loyalty to a king...[and his lineage]...as long as they continued to make themselves useful. Otherwise it would seem that the peasants were devoid of all affection towards any realm, even less so towards any nation (Eriksson 1949:18).

It was common practice for the peasants from different regions to provide each other with ample warning concerning any hostile intentions and acts that their respective feudal lords might be planning to inflict on one or more of their neighbours (Eriksson 1949:26p; Harrison 1999:92p; Lindkvist 2002:49). Any universal sense of identity or loyalty to any larger community or regent would have to be provided for from above, both figuratively and literally.

This occurred through developments arising out of Gustav Vasa’s need to consolidate his regal authority and establish a strong centralised kingship, which was opposed by both Church and nobles. The power of the former was seriously circumvented in 1527, when it was forced to surrender large parts of its income and estates. Religious doctrine was reformed according to the Lutheran faith and the newly founded State Church was placed under the control of the Crown. The nobles, in an effort to
regain their position of authority, backed Gustav’s grandson in his claim to the throne. This eventuality not only threatened the fledgling Kingdom with a possible Counter Reformation but with future interventions, Sigismud being both a devout catholic and Poland’s king. As it happened, he was defeated and dethroned by his uncle Karl IX, who became King of Sweden in 1604 (Samuelsson 1999:129:pp; Weibull 1993:33:pp; Österlin 1997:78p).

The Swedish Reformation had its origins, not in any deep felt religious beliefs, but in urgent secular needs founded upon the realities of political economics. Neither Gustav Vasa nor his descendants were interested in the ideological aspects of religion (Österlin 1997:80). Threatened with a possible Counter Reformation, the Swedish State Church, now and for the first time in 1593, officially proclaimed its explicit and complete adherence to the Lutheran faith;

The repercussions of these developments would make themselves felt for over a hundred years into the future. The question of religion was now firmly impregnated with the political developments that threaten Sweden’s independence and would continue thus as long as the Polish branch of the Vasa dynasty had legitimate rights to the Swedish throne. For a long time this was considered as a real and pressing threat against the Realm. All Catholics were regarded as potential security risks and banished without exception from the country. In matters of confession, Sweden developed into a rigid and uniform state (Österlin 1997:79).

This situation provided the Swedish State Church with the opportunity of establishing itself as the single most normative and unifying force within the country, a position that would ultimately result in the emergence of a fiercely Lutheran and centralised kingdom, thus providing its subjects with their first collective, and manufactured, identity.

The Rise and Fall of the Swedish Empire

Sweden’s entry into the Thirty Years’ War (1618-1648) under the leadership of King Gustav II Adolf and his Chancellor Axel Oxenstierna (1583-1654) propelled the Kingdom to the forefront of European leadership. Gustav’s victorious campaigns would make him renown among his contemporaries as the defender of the one true faith against the legions of the Anti-Christ and among later historians as the founder of modern warfare (Boxall et.al. 2001:53; Österlin 1997:111). Starting now and for the next one hundred and fifty years, Sweden would find itself almost constantly at war with either Denmark, Poland and Russia, or with all three at once, during which time it established, maintained and later lost a vast Nordic empire that, at its height, turned the Baltic into a Swedish lake (fig. 11; K-G. Hildebrand 1992:99; Stadin 1999:135p).

Military prowess abroad was accompanied, indeed only made possible, by an internal domestic consolidation carried out during the 17th century which turned the Royal administration into one of the most effective ever devised. This was realised at three levels. First, through the establishment of an absolute monarchy with the sovereign right to govern and appoint the heir apparent. Second, through the consolidation and standardisation of all local and regional administrative, educational, religious and judicial agencies, measures that included the creation of the counties, the founding of 28 new towns and the establishment of a number of universities. The importance of the clergy as administrators, well organised within an established network, must not be underestimated. The clergy become the extended arm and watch dog of the central authority in its struggle to bind together the distant and dissimilar regions which were to be formed into a coherent kingdom under centralised control. The third measure that helped transform Sweden from a poor, backward and loosely defined kingdom into a superpower of the first rank was the policy of mercantilism, one that entailed supervision over every aspect of trade and industry, including production, distribution and consumption (Stadin 1999:147pp; Thorkildsen 1997:150). The paternal attitude of the governing authorities, their involvement and regulation in almost every aspect of existence, is a phenomenon that has come to characterise Swedish life from this time onwards.

The fact that such a small Kingdom was able to sustain and endure nearly one hundred and fifty years of almost continual warfare, affirms just how well organised and effective central control from above had become. But resources were not unlimited and with the death of the Warrior-King Karl XII in 1718, Sweden’s wars of conquest and dreams of empire came to an abrupt end. Now exhausted, it was reduced to an modest kingdom on the fringes of the European continent, periodically plagued by minor wars and territorial demands from more powerful neighbours that would further diminish the size of the Realm. It
was also a time of political re-ordering. The absolute autocracy of the kingship crumbled under increasing pressure from the nobility. From now on, the regents, with a few minor exceptions, would only rule by consent of the ‘Council of the Realm’ composed of representatives from all four Estates.

**Norrland and the Empire**

The whole political superstructure of the newly founded kingdom was confined to southern Sweden. This did not prevent the king and nobility from recognising the economic and political importance of Norrland. Interest in this area was motivated by ever increasing expectations of monetary gain, as exemplified and emphasised by Olaus Magnus. During his two year journey through northern Scandinavia he visited the port town of Torneå at the head of the Baltic in 1519. Magnus describes it as one of the largest marketplaces from “...here to the North Pole...” where White Russians, Lapps, Bjarmers, Bottningar, Finns, Svear, Tavasters, Hälsingar, Norwegians and Muscovites come, some on sleighs pulled by reindeer, others on skies and still others in their long narrow boats (Lundmark 1971:18p; Magnus [1555] 1982:938; Åkerman 1996:155).

Mercantilism, the economic philosophy of the times, advocated the accumulation of bullion, most efficiently accomplished through political centralisation and regulation of the entire economy, in other words, Royal monopoly over vital resources (Samuelsson 1999:105; Stadin 1999:154). Financial records from the 14th to the 16th centuries clearly indicate that trade in these northern areas was both important and lucrative, as exemplified by the volume of income it produced for the town of Gävle during a six year period between 1554-1560, where furs alone accounted for 23-39% of its total income (Ericsson 1980:67p; Hellström 1917:80). The wealth of the region is disclose, for example, in the tax rolls from Sweden and its territorial gains from the time of Gustav Vasa to the middle of the 16th century. In 1660, when Sweden stood at the height of its military might, the Baltic was virtually a Swedish lake, with territories extending into what is today Norway, Russia, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Germany and Denmark. The boarders of modern day Sweden are those that were formed at the end of the Napoleonic Wars, see fig. 5 and 53. By then Sweden had lost most of its territorial conquests of the pervious two centuries, now only retaining those areas in southern, western and northern Sweden that had been taken from the Kingdom of Denmark-Norway (Larsson 1999a; Weibull 1992). BP = Brandenburg-Prussia. DP = Duchy of Prussia.
the Luleå district which show that taxpayers, on average, possessed 166 grams of silver each, making this region the second richest area in the kingdom after Vadsbo in southern Sweden, where the average was 170 grams per taxpayer (Bylund 1996:192; Lundgren 1987:51; Åkerman 1996:159). This concentration of wealth was not spontaneous. Rather, it would seem to be the consequence of an ever expanding and flourishing inter-regional trade which occurred throughout the North from at least the final stages of the Viking period, judging from archaeological finds of Sámi silver hoards dated between AD 1000-1350 (Lundkvist 1990; Zachrisson 1984). These profitable circumstances provided a compelling reason for the central authorities in Stockholm to consolidate and strengthen their control over this northern region. But it was not only the wealth generated by this trade that attracted the eye of the powers located in southern Sweden. Records from the middle of the 16th century show that the leading producer of grain in Sweden at that time was the County of Gävleborg, with the County of Västernorrland holding the number three position. It should be noted that this dominance was before the Province of Skåne, known as the granary of the north, had been forcefully taken from the Danish kingdom (Hellström 1917:84p).

Measures needed to bind the North more closely to the power centres in the South became increasingly obvious in light of the geo-political developments taking place along the frontiers. In the west the Norwegian nobility was slowly replaced by Danish elements and by 1536 Norway was to all intents nothing more than a vassal state under the sway of an expansive and strong Danish realm. By the end of the 15th century Russia had reached a large measure of coherence which would grow to become a serious threat under Ivan the Terrible (1533-1584), a development that would constantly overshadow the economic supremacy over the North by redirecting all commerce to pass through Stockholm. Consequently the Capitol was enriched while effectively preventing Norrland from actively developing its own international contacts. Although the strict enforcement of this injunction would vary from time to time and from place to place it would...

A more effective and centralised administration was one means of fortifying central authority over the Realm. Another was through the promotion of colonisation and the establishment of farming communities which, after the collapse of the Northern fur market, would increase in importance throughout the 17th century. The fur trade in Norrland seems to have ended rather abruptly or within a relatively short period during the first half of the 17th century (fig. 12). The reasons for this are multiple; over exploitation compounded by increasing competition from furs imported from the New World, which by 1670 completely dominated the European and Russian markets (Lundgren 1987:50). In the Lule area, the number of registered tax payers within the Sámi population dubbed between 1550-1610, due to their involvement in this trade, which made them not only wealthy but also increasingly dependent on staple foods traded for furs. The decline of the fur trade left a population that far exceeded the carrying capacity of the ancient hunting, fishing and gathering economy. Lundmark (1982) convincingly argues that these circumstances ultimately and finally propelled the Sámi economy away from one based primarily on hunting, fishing and gathering, supplemented by trade, a few domesticated reindeer and organised around the territorial siitan, to one based on nomadic reindeer herding along the river valleys with one village unit in each (Lundmark 1982: 1999:33pp; Lundgren 1987:50pp). This transformation was further augmented by the reorganisation of taxes by the State, which saw its income decline in conjunction with the fur trade. Taxes where now to be paid in the form of foodstuffs, dried fish and reindeer meat, which would logistically become ever more important in maintaining the king’s army in the field as the Monarchy became increasingly involved in European wars (Lundgren 1987:51pp).

Various forms of agricultural expansion were actively encouraged by the Crown under Gustav Vasa with the duel aim of gaining and consolidating territorial control over larger areas and increasing the State’s income in the form of foodstuffs. Gustav envisioned a network of government farms located throughout the Realm, all under the control of the central authorities in Stockholm. This plan was never realised in full, but two such government farms were set up in Norrland, in Umeå and Luleå respectively.

These experiments, while they lasted, were apparently resented by the local population, especially by the rural elite, who saw them as an encroachment on, and a challenge to, their prestige and personal authority (Harnesk 1990; Åkerman 1996:161p).

The central authorities accomplished more by promoting the establishment of new farmsteads in the inland areas of the North through promises of temporary tax reductions. The farming expansion that had started in the Province of Savolax in south-eastern Finland, moved north-westwards across the country, grounding to a halt by about 1570. To a large extent this was due to the slash and burn farming methods employed by these people, a practice that necessitated large areas of land. From this time onwards and for the next one hundred years these land hungry peasants would migrate across the Baltic and establish new homesteads in Norrland, primarily in the hinterlands of Gästrikland, Halsingland, Medelpad, Ångermanland and southern Västerbotten. They settled an ecological niche that had until then not been utilised for farming purposes to any great extent, agriculturally peripheral lands that lay outside
those which had been occupied by permanent farming communities since at least the first millennium AD, that is to say the coastal areas and the river valleys where agricultural practices consisted of small to large permanent homesteads with cultivation and/or animal husbandry (Baudou 1978a; Bladh 1994:103; Bylund 1994; Engelmark 1978; Fjellström 1994; Huttunen & Tolonen 1972; Ramqvist 1983; Samuelsson 1999:102p; Sporrong 1997; Tolonen 1972). This central Norrlandian settlement phase was paralleled by an additional influx of Finnish speaking peoples in and around the Torneå river valley, who attached themselves to those related communities that had been in the area since at least the 11th century. Once again the Crown supported and encouraged this expansion, through temporary tax reductions and exemption from military service, in order to create a buffer against foreign intrusions and justify claims of Swedish sovereignty (Jonsson 1993:261pp; Sundström 1984).

The re-arrangement of Norrland’s demographic profile was furthered by the first ‘Decree Concerning the Settlement of Lappland’ (Sw. Placat angående lappmarkernas bebyggande) issued in 1673, by which the State hoped to entice farming peasants from the South to immigrate and establish new farmsteads in the North. The second decree, dating from 1695, was much the same as the first, a centralised effort to encourage both animal husbandry and agriculture in order to insure both taxable revenue and sustain the Crown’s territorial claims (Lundgren 1987:55; Lundkvist 1990:76p; Lundmark 1999:60pp; Stadin 1999:166).

By the beginning of the 17th century Sweden’s largest exports consisted of iron, copper and wood tar, in that order. The establishment and administration of iron foundries and/or mills by the central authorities, 334 by the end of the 17th century and over 600 by the middle of the 18th, made Sweden the world’s leading producer and exporter of iron, a mighty economic base from which the Monarchy could launch its bid to acquire a European empire (Harrison 1999:83; K-G. Hildebrand 1992:11pp; Hjulström 1950:299; Stadin 1999:156; Ågren 1974a:66).

The communities that grew up around the Northern iron mills were artificial constructs. They did not evolve out of pre-existing settlements, but were newly founded near aquatic resources that provided both reliable hydro-power and easy transportation possibilities. They were highly insular, patriarchal, largely self-sufficient, strictly stratified and tightly organised. The architecture and layout of these mills clearly symbolises this strict hierarchy; from the placement of the grandiose stone or wooden manor house with its styled garden, to the location of the office of the foreman and the church, to the site of the simple wooden houses for the master smiths and labourers. Some mills also provided a school, owned agricultural land and managed a substantial farm, the produce from which was processed and sold in the estate run shop and bakery or paid out in kind to the employees. Accordingly, generations would be born, raised, employed and then buried, within the confines of these self-contained socio-economic entities (Ahnlund 1978:177pp; Hasselberg 1998:286p; Hedlund 1932:105; K-G. Hildebrand 1992:97pp &139pp; Sundin 1994:153; Wetterberg 1983:107).

On a national scale, these early Northern mill communities were marginal, both in size and productive capacity, while their owners often lived in the South. At their height, a period that lasted for about a 150 years starting in the middle of the 18th century, the mills in the Provinces of Västerbotten and Medelpad only boasted 10 and 13 foundries and/ or forges respectively, each contributing about one percent to the Nation’s total iron production. On a local level they were important, both economically and socially, incorporating the local population into the national and international economy, pulling them away from one based purely on subsistence and payments in kind to one based on cash, thus rendering them increasingly dependent on external economic concerns and developments (Hasselberg 1998:290pp; K-G. Hildebrand 1992:86pp & 140; Hjulström
This is the first of many, centrally created and controlled micro-communities, patriarchal and highly authoritarian in nature, erected and made fully dependent on a fragile mono-economic foundation, that would be repeatedly established during various times in different parts of Norrland in order meet, when required, the passing needs of those political and economic interests that resided in the South. And when these microcosms had served the purpose for which they had been created, they could and would be abandoned, with dire consequences for the people made dependent on them.

**Identity, Antiquarianism and Empire**

Two historical traditions emerged during the Renaissance that vied for attention until the Enlightenment. One was founded on irrationalism spiced with generous amounts of fantasy and imagination, endowing the leaders of the emerging European kingdoms with pedigrees of great antiquity. While scholars were preparing to provide their respective monarchs with the ideological constructs they desired, others were rediscovering the historiography of Classical Antiquity and relearning lessons of critical assessment, both of which would transform this subject into an important analytical tool (Bronowski & Mazlish 1963:90pp; Eriksson 1995:25; Klindt-Jensen 1975:14pp; Palmer & Colton 1971:69; Sklenár 1983:6pp; Trigger 1989:45pp).

An early Swedish example of this latter outlook is found in a work entitled ‘A Swedish Chronicle’ (Sw. En swensk Cröneka) by Olaus Petri (1493-1552). Scholar, churchman and foremost advocate of the Reformation, Petri defended scholarly and intellectual freedom from political involvement, exhorting historians to remain unprejudiced while insisting on a source critical evaluation of references (Löw 1908:43). His presentation of the Goths illustrates his scholarly principles;

...those who have felt their hand did not praise them, instead they were considered to be a crowd of bandits and tyrants who took the land and cities of other men, which they had no right to do... (Petri quoted in Löw 1908:43).

Written in the 1540’s, at a time when Sweden and Denmark were bitter enemies, he declared that it was not possible to decide which of these two countries possessed the oldest and/or most illustrious origins. His uncompromising stance on this and other important questions forced him to flee the country under pain of death after running afoul of Gustaf Vasa. His ‘Chronicle’ would not be published until 1818 (Baudou 1995:168p; H. Hildebrand 1866:2p; Hägglund 1994:412; Klindt-Jensen 1975:14; Löw 1908:41pp).

Olof Rudbeck the Elder (1630-1702) and his monograph *Atlantica sive Manheim* is often cited as an example of Swedish Renaissance historiography of the other kind. Seen through modern eyes, it appears to be an enigma. Eriksson calls it “…impossible…” and describes it as being:

... over elaborated, a sick elephant-like construction, based on a highly strung national fantasy, and considered by many, not without reason, to be nothing more than a prank. In any case it is historically worthless other than as a telling monument over a political phase in our history, when our country was in a position of power, built on a brittle foundation of violence dearly bought through sacrifice and hardship (Eriksson 1980:75).

Disregarding what we consider to be an embarrassing foray into history, our confusion increases with the realisation that Rudbeck was a leading intellectual of his time, internationally well-known and highly respected. His medical studies at Uppsala resulted in the brilliant discovery and documentation of the lymphatic system. As professor of medicine at that same university, he also lectured knowledgeably on anatomy, engineering, mechanics, fortification techniques and botany. He designed and supervised the establishment of a botanical garden and the building of an anatomical theatre which is today considered to be a splendid example of Renaissance architecture. Thus it is unfortunate that Rudbeck is chiefly remembered for his historical fantasy, published in 1679. Combining material derived from philological sources, his excavations into the burial mounds at Old Uppsala, Plato’s *Republic*, the Icelandic Sagas, runic inscriptions as well as Teutonic, Greek, Latin and Egyptian myths and texts, he concluded that Atlantis and Sweden were one and the same, and thus the cradle of civilisation (Floderus & Gustawsson 1946:267; Henningsen 1997:99p; Klindt-Jensen 1975:30; Löw 1908:139pp; Stadin 1999:159; Sörlin 1988:27). From this it follows that the Swedish language and its people were the most original and pure of all, having never been;
...conquered by foreign rulers, nor conducted much trade with them, thus having never been compelled to receive or accept alien idols, language, laws, customs, habits or foods... (Rudbeck quoted in Löw 1908:142).

Gothic patriotism would have to wait a hundred years before it again reached such dizzy heights (Löw 1908:139).

In 1630 Johannes Bureus (1568-1652) became the first ‘Royal Antiquarian’ (Sw. Riksantikvarie) a government position accompanied by a 15 point Royal ‘memorandum and commission concerning antiquities’, that specified the duties of this appointment, which initially amounted to the collection of ancient documents and runic inscriptions. It wasn’t until 1666 with the ‘Royal Proclamation and Decree concerning Old Monuments and Antiquities’ (Sw. Kungliga Placat och Påbudh om Gamble Monkumenter och Antiquiteter) that other types of ancient remains and features besides rune stones were more actively sought out and documented. December of that same year saw the foundation of the Antiquities College (Sw. Antikvitetskollegiet) by King Karl XI (regent 1660-1697) and his Royal Chancellor Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie in order that “...the remarkable achievements of Our Swedish and Gothic nation should be commemorated, that they be uncovered and brought forth out of the darkness past, into the light of day and once again revealed.” (Gödel 1930:49). The proclamation from the previous month decreed that all ancient monuments were now and henceforth the property of the Crown. It also became the charter of this new institution, the duties of which were to collect, preserve and catalogue antiquities as well as inspect and document ancient monuments, specifically; old castles, houses, hillforts, pagan cemeteries, cairns, earthen mounds and ‘dynastic barrows’ (Almgren 1931; Floderus & Gustawsson 1946:289; Gödel 1930:17; Klindt-Jensen 1975:15pp; A. Schück 1946:8pp; H. Schück 1931; Selinge 1995).

In compliance with its charter the College initiated two ‘Inquests Concerning Antiquities’ (Sw. Rannsakningar efter antikviteter). The first, between 1667-1670, was carried out by the local clergy who were ordered to collect information concerning ancient monuments found within their respective parishes. Apparently this request was frowned upon by the priesthood, who took a dim view of any dealings associated with paganism (Floderus & Gustawsson 1946:246). The second inquest, 1672-1693, was more ambitious and successful, undertaken and directed as it was by public officials rather than relying on the somewhat reluctant assistance of the clergy. The quality of this inventory is irregular although, according to Baudou, spatially representative as concerns grave mounds and rune stones as they occur in the North (Baudou 1993:12; 1995; Klindt-Jensen 1975:27; A. Schück 1946:10p).

It was the resourceful Johan Hadorph (1630-1697), a skilled administrator and learned scholar, who accomplished the completion of those limited inventories mentioned above, while also publishing many of the ancient documents that had thus far been collected. He also found time to implement his own antiquarian survey, documenting over 1000 rune stones. From literary sources and a minor excavation, Hadorph also correctly deduced that the island of Björkö, located in the Mälar Valley just south of Stockholm, was the Viking site of Birka (Baudou 1995:171; Gödel 1930:73p; Klindt-Jensen 1975:28; Montelius 1874a:9; A. Schück 1946:10pp; H. Schück 1931; Thordeman 1946:87pp).

The growth of antiquarian research and institutions during the 17th century were depended on direct approval and financial backing from the Royal Crown. It was not by mere chance that interest in the ancient past was awoken on the very eve of Sweden’s entry into the Thirty Years’ War under Gustav II Adolf. Now embarking on a venture into the international field of European power-politics, Sweden’s rulers wanted a past as illustrious and majestic as their present political aims. Rudbeck’s Gothism, his creation of a Nordic identity, superior in both history, language, character and culture, suited the needs of contemporary power-politics (Baudou 1995:171; Klindt-Jensen 1975:17; Henningsen 1997:104pp; Moberg 1969:36).

Thus, from the very beginning, interest in antiquarian research was closely tied to the power elite and would consequently ebb or flow with the rise and fall of their fortunes on the field of battle. The end came suddenly. Faced once again with its customary enemies Sweden managed, despite its numerical inferiority, to inflict repeated defeats on both Denmark, Poland and Russia, under the brilliant military leadership of its Warrior-King Karl XII (regent 1697-1718). Pursuing the enemy eastwards, Sweden’s army was first decimated by the shear distances involved, the scorched earth tactics of its enemy and by one of the coldest winters on record, and then destroyed at the Battle of Poltava in 1709.
Returning to Sweden after five years in exile, Karl immediately laid plans for an invasion of Norway which was launched in 1717. In November of the following year he was shot dead, either by the enemy or his own troops (Weibull 1993:51pp).

So ended Sweden’s bid for European domination and so too the interest in antiquarian research. The political ambitions that had sustained it were swept away while the economy that had supported it now lay in shambles. However, the Antiquities College did survive, albeit in a much diminished capacity. In 1692 it was given a change in name, becoming ‘The Antiquities Archive’ (Sw. Antikvitetsarkivet) and then evicted from its beautiful rooms at the Gustavianum in Uppsala. This would be the beginning of a diaspora that would last throughout the 18th century. Its collections would be dispersed, partitioned out and stored wherever room could be found, in cellars, private houses, attics, unlocked cabinets and box-rooms. The staff, when there was any, worked in offices that often lacked proper lighting and heating, located in buildings that were fire hazards, often dirty or water damaged, infested with both vermin and mildew. At times they had no offices at all, meeting when and where they could. Many of its enterprising projects were never completed, the results from the antiquarian inquests languished in the archives, only to be published in full some 300 years later. The Royal Proclamation from 1666 was now largely ignored and burial mounds were once again the hunting grounds of treasure seekers or ploughed under, while stone cairns were used as convenient sources of building materials (Baudou 1993:13; Klindt-Jensen 1975:31pp; A. Schück 1946; H. Schück 1931; Thordeman 1946:89pp). A renewed and revitalised interest into Sweden’s past would have to await developments on the European continent and the arrival of Napoleon.

There had never existed any wider interest in or for antiquarian research among the general masses, Rudbeckian Gothism was a treat for the political elite. Having now lost their bid for glory in the political arena of the present, the monarchy and the ruling aristocracy could no longer afford a glorious past. As for the vast majority, any sense of identity was effected through the efficient use of religion. This was truly one of the single most important consequences arising out of the Lutheran Reformation and Royal control over the Church; it transformed the clergy into government employees, providing the central authorities with a nation-wide and God given organisation with which it could extend and strengthen its control over the population and the Realm (Baudou 1993:14; Samuelsson 1999:106).

In the conquered territories a process of ‘Swedification’ had been undertaken, in which adherence to Lutheranism was seen as essential, as made perfectly clear by the constitution and church legislature of 1686. One uniform religion and one divine liturgy were considered fundamental for the maintenance of a unified kingdom. All loyal subjects were by law obliged to embrace the Lutheran faith, failure to do so was punishable by fines, imprisonment or banishment (Ahrén 1995:483; Österlin 1997:122). By this time, these measures can no longer be understood in light of any danger of a Catholic succession in Sweden, a threat which had long since passed. What we are looking at is a purposeful and resolute policy of integration in which Church doctrine and the clergy played a key role. Sweden’s somewhat surprising and meteoric success on the field of battle and at the negotiating tables of Europe had left it in possession of a sizeable continental empire which included Swedish, Finnish, Sámi, Danish, Norwegian, Estonian, Lettish, German, Polish and Russian speaking peoples, while its bureaucrats, scholars and cultivated spoke Latin and later French. Most of these people had different historical backgrounds and/or hailed from regions where they were accustomed to governing themselves. The overhaul and standardisation of all local, regional and centralised governmental and administrative bodies was undertaken throughout the realm. The ideology of the Lutheran faith was used to bind the kingdom together, either through persuasion or coercion. As Stenius reminds us; “...the Reformation was a state-driven project, not a protest from below. This project was successful in that it prevented society from being split into subcultures...” (Stenius 1997:163).

A first step along this energetic policy was taken in the 1620’s with the revival and renovation of Uppsala University. This was soon followed by the establishment of new universities in the home provinces, at Åbo (Finland) in 1640, and in the conquered lands, at Dorpat (Tartu, Estonia) in 1632, at Greifswald (Germany) in 1636, at Lund (Denmark) in 1668. All of these institutions would educate and train loyal government officers in the form of clergymen, dedicated to the state, who would fill the elementary and secondary schools, the pulpits,
courtrooms and the administrative offices that were coming into being throughout the Realm (Stadin 1999:158pp).

The antiquarianism of the Monarchs was not intended for, nor directed towards the greater masses. Baudou (1995:165pp) has shown, at least for the North, that the vast majority of the population were completely indifferent towards the ‘inquests concerning antiquities’ that had been carried out at the end of the 17th century. The local farming population in Norrland were aware of the existence of various mounds and cairns, at least within the limits of their own rural community, but they felt no affiliation with these features, which were assumed to contain the remains of giants or other beings who had lived in the land long before their own time. A few harboured the notion that these features might well house the remains of their pagan ancestors, but one hundred years or more would pass before this line of thought became widely accepted.

Rudbeck’s imagined history was invented for and confined to the political sphere that had fostered its existence. It was the Church which provided the focal point for a larger collective identity founded on the idea of a common religion, an ideal that was invoked in order to transcend the differences inherent in a population who diverged from each other both ethnically, linguistically, geographically and historically. The powers that be, in pursuit of its own geo-political and economic interests, employed this useful instrument until it was made redundant by the unfolding historical circumstances of the 19th century.

From Royal Kingdom to Nation-State

Sweden’s forced retirement from European power-politics and the loss of its Baltic territories during the first quarter of the 18th century did not isolated it from the rest of the continent. By the beginning of the 19th century a combination of economic, political and ideological factors coincided, ultimately transforming the Royal Kingdom into a Nation-State.

Laissez-faire capitalism replaced mercantilism as the leading economic doctrine, thus expanding Sweden’s commercial, cultural and scientific contacts, ultimately exposing the population to a host of foreign scholars, tradesmen, bankers, investors, skilled craftsmen, artists, musicians, new ideals and divergent religious practices. The latter was perceived as a real threat towards the unity of the Kingdom, which reacted by enacting a number of new laws that legalised the persecution and punishment of religious dissidents in order to protect the orthodoxy of the Swedish State Church against outside and subversive influences. Religious tolerance came about when unity, hitherto synonymous with the absolutism of the State Church, was replaced by a new identity, one created out of values founded on cultural essentialism and nationalism. Even then, it was not until 1870 that people of the Jewish faith and other Christian sects were granted political rights, while absolute freedom of religion was not fully established until 1951 (Ahrén 1995:483; Beijbom 1977:34; Häger 1999:202; Lundström & Pilvesmaa 1997:16pp; Österlin 1997:167).

Political developments in Europe hastened the spread of nationalistic ideals. Napoleon, at the height of his career, envisioned a Europe united under the canopy of his Continental System, a union not dissimilar to that which exists today. Swedish resistance towards France and its temporary allies, the Russians, led to war in the winter of 1808, resulting in the annexation of Finland by Russia, which also temporarily occupied large parts of northern Sweden. In the face of this crushing defeat, Gustav IV Adolf was dethroned in a coup d’état and a constitutional monarchy was established.

Thus, both religion and the Monarchy lost their dominate position as the normative mediators in constructing and shaping the idea of a uniform nation-state. These erstwhile forces of cohesion were now superseded by novel categories fashioned within the framework of the Romantic and Nationalistic movements by such thinkers as Rousseau and von Herder. The essentialism and nationalism of the latter is based on the belief that the boundaries of a nation-state should coincide with the cultural boundaries of a specific people, visualised as being ethnically uniform while sharing a common language, history and cultural heritage. In Sweden, a new collective identity, modelled on these absolutes, resulted in a national stereotype that was successfully formulated and propagated among the upper classes via two popular movements, the ‘New Gothic Revival’ and ‘Scandinavianism’.

The Gothic Union (Sw. Götiska Förbundet), with Erik Gustaf Geijer and his friend Esaias Tegnér as two of its most influential members (fig. 13) was established in 1811. Within a remarkably short time it became the most predominate and conservative thought-collective in Sweden, extending its influence throughout the county’s intellectual and political elite,
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Structuring all key concepts as they concern nation, history and heritage (Molin 2003). Pagan in its values, it sought inspiration in what was considered to be ancient Swedish history, moralising from legends, stories and myths, while praising the assumed virtues of their heathen forefathers. The goal of this Union was to “...re-awaken the ancient Gothic ideals of freedom, manhood and clear senses.” Geijer was explicitly aware of the powerful political influence that historical scholarship exercised, as made evident from his own work, where he uses history as a moral foundation on which to erect a new national heritage. Geijer and Tegnér both attained lasting prestige and influence, not from scholarly endeavours, but through their romantic poetry, which abounds with references to the prehistoric past. The intellectual labours of these ‘New Goths’ derives its origins directly from Rudbeck and antiquarian research of the 17th century. Having fallen into disrepute during the 18th century, it was now resurrected and viewed as a vital national resource that must and would be used to build the new Nation-State. The Gothic Union was dissolved in 1844, yet its influence lingers on today. Its official journal Iduna, originally edited by Geijer, continued to be published until 1924, enjoying a widespread circulation, directed towards “...those who love the ancient Nordic past...” with articles on both literary and archaeological topics, including descriptions of prehistoric features, the results of field work and advice on how to carry out excavations, thus making this periodical Sweden’s first antiquarian, if not archaeological, journal (Andreæ 1968a:44; Baudou 1993:16; Floderus & Gustawsson 1946:270pp; Klinge 1983:152; Löw 1910:51 & 58; Molin 2003; Pettersson 1995:123pp; A. Schück 1946:19; Vinge 1992:370p; Åberg 1993:377).

Scandinavianism, both political and cultural, was an ideological spin-off from the Gothic revival, a further manifestation of those basic ingredients that had by now been incorporated within the ideological arsenal of the ruling classes; nationalism, romanticism and patriotism (Nilsson 1997:216). The political aspects of Scandinavianism were short lived. It was largely a student movement, advocating the establishment of a pan-national union under one king. This is a remarkable development, 30 years previously the Nordic kingdoms were embittered enemies and had been for the last 300 years, a testimony to the persuasiveness of the romantic ideology. Political Scandinavianism evaporated in wake of the war over Schleswig-Holstein in 1865, when Denmark found itself alone after being attacked by Prussia and Austria despite Swedish promises to the contrary (Edgren & Edgren 1999:234; Nilsson 1997:216pp; Pettersson 1995:125pp; Weibull 1993:101; Åberg 1993:411pp; Østergård 1997:39p).

Literary Scandinavianism championed the ideals of a pan-national identity, founded on the myth of shared and common customs, language, history and ethnic affiliations. One of its leading exponents was Viktor Rydberg (1828-1895) yet another of Sweden’s foremost poets and cultural figures. His poetry,
flavoured with misconceived notions of social evolution derived from Spencer, is filled with the wonders of nature and expressions of passionate pride in belonging to a superior, Nordic race (Andrée 1968b:53; Broberg & Tydén 1996:79).

Two tangible results arising out of the Gothic revival and the pan-Scandinavia movement was the outdoor museum *Skansen*, which opened in 1891, and the Nordic Museum (Sw. Nordiska Museum) which, after much delay, was finally completed in 1907 (Andrén 1967). Both owe their existence to Artur Hazelius, educator, ethnologist and visionary, who was deeply immersed in Gothic ideals and heavily involved in the Scandinavian movement. The Nordic Museum, “...the cultural palace of the people...”, with its Scandinavian ethnographic collection, is centrally located and symbolically situated across from the Royal palace in Stockholm. *Skansen* was created to reflect and mirror the soul and spirit of the Swedish people though its collection of buildings that were taken from the length and breath of the country and then reassembled on the highs just above the Nordic Museum. In face of the ever increasing social and economic harshness to be found in the city slums, together with the frightful spectre of class conflict created by the industrial revolution, these institutions emphasised the picturesque, the wholesomeness and the assumed charms of the rural present and its harmonious past. The agricultural romanticism of the affluent and their nation-building project was not shared by the object of their veneration, the rural population, who fled both from the countryside and from Sweden. This exodus began in earnest during the 1860’s and reached a peek between 1881-1890 when 7% of Sweden’s population immigrated. During the ensuing ten year period another 4.2% of the populace departed, followed by the same amount between 1901-1910. The fact that large sectors of that new national icon were abandoning their rural existence did not put an end to national-romantic fancies, which succeeded in creating a new national identity while promoting pan Nordic unity. These two national monuments, *Skansen* and the Nordic Museum, would inspire hundreds of local derivatives established throughout the country during the following years (Bohman 1997:53pp; Edgren & Edgren 1999:248; Norman & Runblom 1980a; 1980b; Pettersson 1995:127pp).

**Norrland, Sweden’s ‘Amerika’**

The expansion of the Swedish Empire initiated a number of academic inquires from the late 17th century onwards, aimed at a more methodical exploration and systematic description of Norrland’s resources in order that they might be more effectively utilised for the betterment of the Kingdom and later, by the Nation-State (Henningsen 1997:108; Melkersson 2000:35pp; Sörlin 1988:34pp). The reception bestowed upon the earliest of these scientific studies by the powers that be was similar to that accorded to those contemporary historical studies mentioned above, their judgement was to a large degree ideologically and politically motivated.

The overtly optimistic picture of Norrland that was both desired and expected was not forthcoming in Johannes Schefferus’ (1621-1679) *Lapponia* from 1673. This scholarly humanist, in the best sense of the Renaissance, presented a source critical review of Norrland, one which is today considered to be a sober and important work, especially those parts that present the life and customs of the Sámi people. Within five years of its publication it had became a European best seller, translated from Latin into German, French, Dutch and English, the latter in 1674 entitled *The History of Lappland wherein are shewed the Original Manners, Habits, Marriages, Conjurations etc. of that People*. Schefferus’ lack of accommodation towards the powers that be might explain why almost 300 years would pass before this work was finally translated into Swedish (Fjellström 1980:86; Wretö 1996:95).

On the opposite end of the scale we find Olof Rudbeck the Younger (1660-1740) and his *Nora Samoland sive Laponia illustrata* from 1701, which is an account of his tour to Luleå and Torneå in 1695. Undertaken on the request of King Karl XI, he readily endorsed excessive Southern expectations with tales of a contented people, living in a healthy northern climate, surrounded by natural beauty and a wealth of resources, which include mountains of silver, copper, iron, berries, fish, birds and animals (Fjellström 1980:85pp; Henningsen 1997:108pp; Sörlin 1988:27p).

The exaggerated optimism and dreams that encompass many descriptions of Norrland from this time were not easily dispelled. Even one of the most respected thinkers of the period would not be able to free himself from contemporary expectations. The five month journey through Norrland undertaken by Carl von Linné (1707-1778) in 1732 left a lasting
impression, both on himself and later generations. His agricultural optimism far surpasses that of his contemporaries, even the future cultivation of the high mountain slopes was not beyond the scope of his imagination (Broberg 1995:61p; Sörlin 1988:35). The economic importance of Norrland, misrepresented or no, was not lost on Sweden’s more powerful enemies. The death throes of its European empire left Sweden so enfeebled that it was unable to protect its northern provinces which were now left open to attack by the Russians, who plundered and pillaged the Norrlandian coast four times between 1714-1721. In light of this the Swedish kingdom anxiously tried to stimulate demographic growth once again in order to consolidate its economic and geographical control over the North. In 1749 a third Lappland Decree was issued in an attempt to increase the number of farms, which in both Västerbotten and Norrbotten had fallen from 3200 to 2800 between 1695-1720. New homesteaders would be granted a 25 year tax exemption if they followed agricultural pursuits while forsaking both hunting, fishing and gathering, activities that the central authorities tried to discourage (Bergström 1981:22; Ekman [1910] 1983; Lundkvist 1990:76; 1994a:79pp; 1996:135; Sörlin 1988:45p).

The Napoleonic Wars would renew and accelerate southern Sweden’s expansion into Norrland. The turning point occurred in 1809 when Finland was annexed by the Russian Empire. The psychological trauma that this event incurred in the minds of the ruling elite is hard to imagine or even adequately express. In one fell swoop Sweden was deprived of about 40% of its territory and 25% of its population (K-G. Hildebrand 1992:12). The economic hopes of Sweden, with an earnest sense of urgency, were now fully directed towards Norrland. What had been lost in the east must needs be replaced by renewed efforts and developments in the North. Norrland, with its game and fish, forests and minerals, came to be viewed as the treasure house of the nation, Sweden’s ‘Amerika’. The national pathos sweeping the Nation in the form of the Gothic revival quickly embraced and spread this seductive and desirable fiction. Norrland, which up until then had never been culturally integrated into the Nation as a whole nor been allowed to develop any independent ties, economic or otherwise, was now expected to fulfil the optimistic anticipations placed upon it by the South (Nordström 1940; Sörlin 1988:49pp).

Reality would not be as rosy nor as kind. During the course of the 19th century Norrland was opened to investors, adventurers, fortune hunters and speculators from without. It became a Klondike, a ‘land of the future’, Sweden’s economic dynamo. But the wildcat development that was about to commence would also leave behind a trail of poor, unemployed and landless people, both economically and culturally dispossessed. But this development still lay far in the future (Nilsson 1992:139; Nordström 1940; Sörlin 1988).

This seemingly new view of Norrland is probably best described by one of the men who helped formulate and propagate this fantasy, Esaias Tegnér. In his poem Svea from 1811, he not only sets the stage, but uncannily seems to predict, in rosy terms,
the fate of Norrland by almost one hundred years;

Cry, Svea, for what you’ve lost; but protect what you own.
From the Healthy rich shores to the Northern mountains high, where the Lapp moves in freedom with his herd, forest clad mountains, fields of harvest adorn.
O! love our land, we have it to protect.
Allow, Svea, your mountains to redouble their yield of treasure, let the harvest blossom in the forests of the night.
Direct the river’s surge as one would a tame subordinat, and within Sweden’s boundaries conquer Finland anew (Tegnér 1966:40p).

This outpouring of patriotic zeal and romantic ardour continues for ten pretentious pages, expounding on Odeon’s ancestors, the Nation’s glorious past, its eternal summers, heroic deeds, virtuous warriors and the country’s impending and splendid future (Tegnér 1966:36pp). In this context it is interesting to note how Tegnér defines Norrland’s role, it will supply the minerals, timber and water-power for Odeon’s ancestors, providing ‘Svea’, the feminine personification of (south-central) Sweden, with a second era of greatness (Tegnér 1966:40p). Thus did Sweden’s intellectual elite redefined themselves and their country in the terms and ideals invented by the national-romantic movement and paid for by economic liberalism. Symbolically, Norrland was also seen as providing a spiritual dimension towards this great new undertaking. On a more pragmatic note, Sweden, denied colonies by the other industrial powers, once again set its sights on Norrland’s natural resources in order to effect “…an internal and peaceful imperialism.” as sardonically expressed by Sörlin (1988:100).

The first extensive exploitation of Norrlandian resources in the name of these new ideological constructs occurred within the forest industry, initiated by the doctrine of laissez-faire capitalism, which holds that industry will expand only if the movement of natural resources, capital and labour is unencumbered, which during the middle of the 19th century led to a repeal of many national and international guild and export restrictions (Nilsson 1992:138p; Samuelsson 1970:40).

Until now the Northern forest had primarily been viewed as a source of fuel for the iron industry, while its few sawmills, the earliest which date from the 16th century, had provided the Crown with limited amounts of building material. Both the iron mills and the sawmills were marginal landowners. Most of their needs were met by purchasing timber from farmers or by leasing the right to clear-cut private or Crown lands. They did not own, nor were they interested in owning, forest land. As the forest industry flourished it soon became apparent that the only obstacle to its continued success was access to those forest lands owned by the small farmer. From about 1870, the forest barons, assisted by liberal amounts of liquor and the illiteracy of the farmer, began to acquire land on an unprecedented scale (fig. 15). By 1906, when the Government passed legislation that specifically banned land transactions between forest companies and farmers in the four northernmost counties, over 40% of all the forests in Norrland were in the hands of the forest industry (Arpi 1959:68pp; 1960:154p; Björklund 1992:153pp; Boethius 1937:189; Holmström 1988:15p; Lundberg 1984:71; Rolén 1993a:166pp; Ternstedt 1944:11pp; Åsander 1976:5).

The economic ascendancy of the forest industry was paralleled by an increase in their political power, which in some areas enabled them to rule over a municipality much to their own advantage, creating a plutocratic political system that remained in place until the reform of 1909 (Edgren & Edgren 1999:230p; Hanæus 1974:147pp; Lundberg 1984:126pp).

Industrialisation was also accompanied by abrupt social and demographic transformations. The inland locations of the early sawmills had been dictated by

| Skorped parish | 50% | 57% |
| Trehörningsjö parish | 50% | 94% |
| Bjöna parish | 15% | 72% |
| Anundsjö parish | 29% | 43% |

Fig. 15. Percent of farms acquired by the forest industry in the 15 year period from 1885-1900 in four parishes in northern Ångermanland (Illustration source Lundberg 1984:47). Competition for access to the new wealth inherent in the forests prompted a wholesale land rush, bringing this new industry onto a collision course with the reindeer herders, the farmers and the iron mill owners. The former could be safely ignored, while the farmers could be fooled or coerced into parting with their land. Through the use of their new found wealth, the forest barons were able to secure controlling shares in the iron companies and then shut down any mills that threatened their own interests (Dackman 1963; Ågren 1974b:78pp).
the availability of water-power. Now with the increasing use of steam, sawmills relocated near the coastal ports. The area in and around the city of Sundsvall in the County of Västernorrland, together with its northern neighbours Härnösand and Ådalen, experienced a rapid growth and soon hosted the highest concentration of sawmills in the world. This was augmented, during the 1890’s, by an eruption within the pulp industry, brought on by the technological introduction of the sulphite process that largely replaced both the mechanical and sulfate methods (Lundberg 1984:12; Holmström 1988:17; Samuelsson 1970).

Demands for cheap labour and the resulting social and demographic upheavals this caused were extensive. While the total population of Sweden grew by 18% during the last 35 years of the 19th century, it jumped by 75% in Norrland. This expansion was geographically unbalanced, occurring as it did primarily in the coastal towns in accordance with the relocation of the forest industry and the ever increasing export of Norrland’s unprocessed resources (Nilsson 1992:140; Sörlin 1988:54pp). The social repercussions of this development would make itself felt in the next century.

The forest industry also created its own insular socio-economic communities, similar to those founded by the iron industry, the remains of which are still highly visible in the cultural landscape of today. Two of the most distinct and renown of these communal undertakings were planned, designed and founded by Frans and Seth Kempe (fig. 17). The former established his community on Norrbyskär in southern Västerbotten, the latter further north at Robertsfors, in 1891 and 1897 respectively. Each mill supported a community of between 1000-1700 people, who were provided with everything that its founders thought they needed. The inhabitants at Robertsfors enjoyed free medical services, free housing, subsidised electricity and firewood, while widowers and retired employees were cared for. Services included a company dairy, flour mill and farm that provided employees and their families with inexpensive food products. They had access to a garden plot, a general store, a bank, a post office, a school, a telegraph and telephone exchange, a pharmacy, a medical dispensary, an indoor swimming pool, a laundry, a sauna, a town meeting hall with a theatre, a library and a church. Similar benefits, yet with fewer services and facilities, were available at Norrbyskär. In return, the inhabitants of both communities were required to regard their respective company and its director as omnipotent. Many workers, despite the almost complete loss of personal freedom and integrity, found this life both congenial and acceptable in light of the high degree of economic and social security that these private and patriarchal societies provided (Franzén 1977b; Holmström 1988:45pp; Norstedt 1994:71).

The economic onslaught initiated an ecological equivalent, the accumulative effects of which are today everywhere visible. The rivers had been used for logging since the 17th century, but these were
comparatively small scale operations, the transportation of relatively modest amounts of timber to the iron mills, work that periodically engaged a proportionately minor number of local inhabitants (Lundgren 1984:85). The ever growing need to transport greater amounts of timber to supply the coastal sawmills, and later the pulp mills, led to ever increasing logging activities which in turn resulted in the initiation of a 90 year development, starting in the 1850’s, which involved the extension, clearance and maintenance of a vast network of waterways that surpassed the entire Swedish rail network (fig. 34). With almost 80% Sweden’s floatways located in Norrland, this development entailed a major encroachment on the natural and cultural environment of the water systems. Lake surfaces were raised or lowered or completely drained, dams, embankments and log chutes built, roads cut, waterways cleared through dynamiting or dredging, canals dug, the water courses of streams and the inflow and outflow of lakes diverted, wharfs for steamships constructed, loading and un-loading ramps established, stone caissons, boom guiding boxes and bank revetments built and innumerable booms laid out. These activities, as the logging itself, damaged or destroyed water meadows, ferry boat berths and crossings, bridges and fords, fishing tackle, fishing installations, fishing grounds, reindeer pastures and trails (Hvarfner 1964; Laestander 1993:294pp; Lundgren 1984:24; Nordberg 1977).

Intensified agricultural practices also contributed to the transformation of the landscape, draining both lakes and peat bogs in order to create arable land or pasture. Thirteen square kilometres of farm land were created in 1860 when the water level of Lake Tåsjö, Ångermanland was lowered (Nerman 1903:62). Other lakes, through miscalculation, were not only drained, but disappeared altogether (Fahlgren 1954; Lassila 1996; Lundqvist 1927). The drainage of lakes between 1820-1840 almost doubled the amount of arable land in Jämtland (Egervärn 1993:156). Records show that no fewer than 2936 State assisted drainage projects were carried out in Norrland between 1841-1914 resulting in an additional 3319 square kilometres of arable land. The number and extent of private drainage ventures carried out during that time is not known (Hellström 1917:223; Håkansson 1997; Sporrong 1997:27).

The accelerating ecological encroachment of the natural landscape did not restrain the metaphysics of the nation-building project. Norrland’s natural resources, if exploited rationally, would provide the Nation with clear industrial and economic advantages in its struggle for survival on the world markets. Its natural environment was also harnessed to this cause. The Norrlandian mountains were ascribed aesthetic-spiritual qualities that would endow the population with those moral values so important for the development of healthy and wholesome citizens. The vehicle of this ideological exploitation, the ‘Swedish Tourist Association’ (Sw. Svenska Turistföreningen - STF) was founded in 1885. An instrument of the national-romantic movement, it gained enormous momentum, by 1910 it boasted 50.000 members.
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(Sörlin 1988:126pp) and became pivotal in promoting the myth of Norrland as an eternal and pristine wilderness despite evidence to the contrary.

From Antiquarianism to Archaeology

Interest in, and the study of, antiquities and history did not completely come to a halt during the 18th century, although its political import and support was now clearly diminished. The subject would survive the century, albeit in the shadow of the natural sciences. As far as the future of archaeology is concerned, the most important development that took place during the 18th century was the establishment of the ‘Academy of Literature’ (Sw. Vitterhetsakademien) in 1753 by Queen Lovisa Ulrika (regent 1751-1771). The significance of this new institution for the future of the subject lies in the fact that it provided the foundation for a new academy established in 1786 by King Gustav III (regent 1771-1792). Now known as the ‘Royal Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities’ (Sw. Kungl. Vitterhets, Historie och Antikvitets Akademien) it took over the responsibilities of both ‘Ulrika’s Academy’ and the ‘Antiquities Archives’ which were both dissolved. The Royal Antiquarian, apart from the duties of that office, now also assumed those arising out of this new Academy, as its Secretary, an arrangement that would have far reaching consequences for the future (Häger 1999:210; A. Schück 1946:5pp; H. Schück 1931; Thordeman 1946:95pp).

After the relative stagnation of antiquarian research during the 18th century, progress during the following was rapid and by the end of the 19th century archaeology, having evolved out of antiquarianism, emerged as a new scientific discipline. This transformation occurred within the nation-building project initiated by the New Goths, who in their endeavours to create a common national heritage, institutionalised archaeology while appropriating the past according to their own needs.

The Gothic Union was fuelled by romantic and nationalistic influences, fired by a new sense of patriotism arising out of the ashes of that recent coup d’état and disastrous military defeat of 1809. Its original founders, Jakob Adlerbeth, Johan Gustaf Liljegren, Magnus Bruzelius, Leonhard Fredrik Rääf, Johan Henrik Schröder and Johan Wallman, all men of high social standing, were soon joined by Tegnér and Geijer. Both Liljegren and Bruzelius were infatuated with the ancient past, an interest they acquired during their studies under the direction of Nils Henrik Sjöborg (1767-1838) at the University of Lund, where both Bror Hildebrand and Sven Nilsson were also in the process of embarking on their archaeological careers. Founder of Lund’s famous Historic Museum, Sjöborg pioneered the documentation and preservation of prehistoric grave monuments, publishing a number of important works, including ‘An Attempt to Create a Nomenclature for Nordic Prehistoric Monuments’ (Sw. försök till en nomenklatur för nordiska fornleimingar). His work

Fig. 18. Newly constructed accommodations for the working class families ca. 1896 on Norrbyskär, that previously uninhabited island, where personal freedom was sacrificed for the sake of communal welfare. The strict social hierarchy of these communities was made visibly manifest in their layout and architecture. The manor house, the foremen’s residence, the standardised quarters for the working families and the barracks for single workers, were all placed and dimensioned according to their respective social positions. This standardised community is a symbol for, and harbinger of, an emerging national collectivism with a corresponding increase in the centralisation and regimentation of daily life, a phenomena that occurred in conjunction with the creation of a new national heritage and identity, one invented and propagated by the intellectual elite of southern Sweden (Ahnlund 1978; Norstedt 1994; Norstedt & Ahnlund 1995:248pp; Vikström 1994a:200pp; photo source Ahnlund 1978).
had Royal approval via Lars von Engeström, one of the leading and most influential government officials of the period. Count, experienced diplomat, Royal Chancellor, Minister for Foreign Affairs from 1809, Knighted that same year, University Chancellor at Lund, member of the Academy of Letters since 1793 and the Academy of Sciences since 1810, a man who had the ear of the King, these are but a few of Engeström’s social assets, which clearly show that he was in a position to further the aims of those he befriended. By the time the Gothic Union was dissolved, many of its original members had, with the assistance of Engeström, been elected into the ranks of the Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities, turning that learned institution into an instrument moulded according to the nationalistic and patriotic values of the New Goths. Their social influence was further strengthened when Liljegren, in 1826, became Royal Antiquarian and Secretary of the Academy, who in turn appointed still other members of the Union to positions of authority. (Carlgren 1926:562pp; Floderus & Gustawsson 1946:250p; Gödel 1930:222p; B. Hildebrand 1954:53p; Klindt-Jensen 1975:61pp; Molin 2003; Montelius 1874a:16p; Pettersson 1995:129; A. Schück 1946:20; H. Schück 1931; Willers 1944:412p).

Excavations and surveys were initiated but the most important measures were legislative. Drawn up by Alderbeth, a new law was enacted in 1828 to increase the protection of ancient monuments, here defined as the "...ruins, walls and remains of ancient manors, castles, monasteries, churches, chapels and other notable buildings, menhirs, rune stones, stone circles, sacred places and wells, ancient cemeteries consisting of ‘dynastic barrows’, cairns and/or artefacts..." (Floderus & Gustawsson 1946:296). These basic categories, singled out to represent Sweden’s new heritage would, with few modifications, remain unaltered until recently.

This act of inclusion, essentially excludes Norrland’s participation in this nation-building project. The symbolic potential of prehistoric grave mounds, a characteristically abundant feature in southern Sweden, was widely exploited in this connection. Once considered to have been the abode of giants or erected by heathen savages, they were now re-evaluated and re-defined, transformed into ancestral monuments, both proof and symbol of national continuity. And greatness. The extremely popular poetry of both Tegnér and Geijer helped disseminate these ideals, first to the middle and upper classes, and later to the masses via the compulsory school system soon to be implemented. Three of Geijer’s most well-known works, ‘Manhem’, ‘The Viking’ and ‘The Yeoman’ are excellent examples of how the prehistoric past was incorporated into the nation-building project in order to advance and consolidate this new dogma;

On victorious soil Swedes walk, Where mountains and forests speak of yesteryears achievements. He calls to you in song, composed on a storm From the ashes of a warrior, lying deep within the mound (from the poem Manhem by Geijer 1999:7).

These illusory ideals would gain further legitimacy through the romantic idolisation and future archaeological excavations at various Bronze and Iron Age sites that soon came to be revered as national shrines, for example, the early urban environments of the Birka and Sigtuna settlements, the ‘royal’ mounds at Häga, Old Uppsala and Husby as well as the ‘chieftain’ and/or ‘noble’ boat graves at Vendel and Valsgärde, all located in the Province of Uppland (Ambrosiani 1980:231pp; Baudou 1997:164pp; 1999b:121; Rentzhog 1967:101pp).

Thus, either by chance or design, the New Goths and their descendants found themselves occupying influential positions in the Royal Academy and the Office of the Royal Antiquarian, consequently realising the socio-political potential inherent in the organisation created by Gustaf III when he combined a scholastic institution with a government office. Entrusting both to one and the same person enabled scholars and academics, as government officials, to personally influence, affect and direct legislators and legislation, thus extending their influence deep into the political sphere while straightening their authority and control over all aspects of archaeological research in precisely those institutions where Swedish archaeology would be invented, standardised and ultimately centralised (Floderus & Gustawsson 1946:250pp; Molin 2003; Montelius 1874a:18p; Nerman 1946:180pp; Pettersson 1995:129; A. Schück 1946:19pp; Thordeman 1946:101pp; Utterström 1942:14).

Liljegren was succeeded by Bror Emil Hildebrand (1806-1884) who, at the age of 31, became Royal Antiquarian in 1837. This position was passed on to his son, Hans Hildebrand (1842-1907) in 1879, who
held it until the end of his life. Within these 60 years, together with their good friend Oscar Montelius, they remade the Office of the Royal Antiquarian and the Academy of Letters into a world class scientific institution. Their accomplishments include the transformation of the Academy’s curiosity cabinet of some 260 objects into one of the best reference collections in Europe, which by 1874 encompassed over 16,000 artefacts, the majority of which Bror Emil had personally described and catalogued. He also founded and supervised the embryonic ‘State Historical Museum’ (Sw. Statens Historiska Museum) which in 1866 was provided with adequate accommodations within the walls of the ‘National Museum’ (Sw. Nationalmuseet) thus ending the Antiquities Archive’s 174 year long diaspora. An archaeological library and the Antiquarian Topological Archives (Sw. Antikvariskt, topografiska arkivet - ATA) were founded, both which are today invaluable. Leading archaeological periodicals were also established, in 1864 ‘The Swedish Antiquarian Journal’ (Sw. Antiqvarisk tidskrift för Sverige),
followed in 1872 by ‘The Monthly Journal of the Royal Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities’ (Sw. Kongl. Vitterhets historie och Antiquitets Akademiens Månadsblad). The latter was replaced by ‘Friends of the Ancient Past’ (Sw. Fornvännen) in 1906. The sporadic antiquarian surveys of the 1840’s, sponsored by the Academy and undertaken by such New Goths as Dybeck and Ekdahl (see below), were expanded. Regional antiquarian societies were empowered to document “...the ancient monuments of their forefathers...” surveys which came to include the Provinces of Skåne, Småland, Gotland, Halland, Bohuslän, Västergötland, Östergötland, Södermanland, Västmanland, Dalsland, Uppland, Närke, Dalarna, Hälsingland, Medelpad and Ångermanland (Ambrosiani 1987:291pp; Floderus & Gustawsson 1946:250pp; B. Hildebrand 1946a:452pp; Hildebrand & Westin 1949:584pp; Klindt-Jensen 1975:110pp; Montelius 1874a:25p; Nerman 1946:182pp; Rydbeck 1926:572pp; A. Schück 1946:31; H. Schück 1931; Thordeman 1946:113pp).

The Hildebrand’s, together with Montelius, also brilliantly developed and expanded the socio-political capital they inherited from Liljegren and the New Goths. The growth and success of Swedish archaeology during the later half of the 19th century owes as much to the individual skills of its gifted practitioners as it does to the surrounding social milieu within which they moved; the upper and middle classes, now increasing affluent in the wake of the industrial revolution. An attempt has been made to illustrate this situation by diagramming the family relationships of some of the leading scholars of the age (fig. 19). The six year period between 1903 and 1910 saw the publication of the ten volume overview entitled ‘Sweden’s History Up Until the 20th Century’ (Sw. Sveriges Historia intill Tjugonde Seklet) in just over 4100 pages, an accomplishment that engaged such notables as Oscar Montelius (1903), the bothers Hans Hildebrand (1905) and Emil Hildebrand (1903; 1904), father and son Martin and Lauritz Weibull (1906), Gustaf Fåhræus (1906), Ludvig Stavenow (1903; 1905), Sam Clason and E. Hildebrand (1910) and Aron Rydfors (1909).

Figure 19 inadequately illustrates the extent of that decisive social network within which the subject of archaeology was realised. Personal ties of friendship, for example between Tegnér, the Hildebrands and the Montelius family, are not revealed (Baudou 1997:66; B. Hildebrand 1946a:452p). Nor is the full extent of their activities, which is often impressive. For example, Hans Hildebrand, apart from his duties as Royal Antiquarian, Secretary of the Academy of Letters and Director of the fledgling State Historical Museum, was also a co-founder and Chairman of the ‘Fredrika Bremer Association’, Chairman of the ‘Swedish Tourist Association’ as well as an active member at the Academy of Sciences, the Swedish Academy and the Nobel Committee (Arbman & Hildebrand 1946:453p). Figure 19 also fails to reveal their genuine personal commitment as exemplified by activities directed towards the general public. Both Hans Hildebrand and Oscar Montelius guided visitors through the archaeological exhibition at the State Historical Museum. They also actively engaged in the promotion and popularisation of archaeology by writing numerous articles for public consumption which were published in many of the county’s leading magazines and newspapers. Moreover, they saw to it that the Historical Museum opened its doors free of charge almost as often as not. Montelius popularised the subject by giving one hour weekly seminars at the Museum for the general public, which were widely appreciated. Considered an excellent speaker, Montelius kept up this routine for an incredible 35 years, from 1886 until his death in 1921 (Nerman 1946:194pp).

Their commitment, public and private, furthered the cause of these early archaeologists. Looking back on what he and his co-workers had accomplished, Montelius’ declared on the opening page of his archaeological overview that;

We have every right to be delighted when we consider just how far the growing interest in the study of the ancient past has progressed (Montelius 1874a:1).

The social utility of this commitment, the unifying properties of both archaeology and the museums, their ability to awaken, instruct and guide the population along the collective path towards a new national identity, was not an abstract ideal but a concrete goal. Archaeology “...is Swedish, it is patriotic.” declared Sven Nilsson in 1847 while giving a lecture in Stockholm (Nilsson quoted in Moberg 1969:37). Patriotic nationalism, for Nilsson and his contemporaries, was the norm. Even the most internationally minded of all, Oscar Montelius, felt no qualms concerning this point. He even endows his predecessors, as far back as the 16th century, with the same ideological motives that he proudly possessed;

66
Their endeavour was generated by the same love for the fatherland and the same scientific zeal as ours, although their efforts were not always crowned with the same success (Montelius 1874a:1).

Summing up the development of archaeology, Montelius concluded with satisfaction that;

We have large and well ordered collections of prehistoric Swedish artefacts together with a complete picture of the Nation’s prehistoric features; we have well equipped libraries, which allow us to get to know the archaeology of other countries; we have good translations of our own early laws, the **Edda**, and Snorre’s ‘royal sagas’, as well as many other works of ancient Nordic literature; in other words, we are in possession of a rich collection of sources of all kinds. Should not all this exhort us to make renewed efforts in the service of science, never forgetting, that this science is Swedish in its origins, and its goal must be patriotic! A people who love and honour their forefathers memory, have every right to look forward to a great and happy future (Montelius 1874a:26).

This is not just a question of exercising influence or authority, but power, of being able to access and mobilise cultural, social, political and economic resources. With this in mind, it is hardly surprising that archaeology acquired the influence and resources it needed or that it was heavily embedded in the nation-building project, sharing and promoting that patriotic-nationalistic conviction which helped to vindicate and maintain the position and interests of the ruling classes (see Baudou 1999b).

**Laissez-faire Heritage in the Nation-State**

The influence generated by the Gothic revival inspired the emergence of hundreds of Regional Antiquarian Societies (Sw. Formminnesföreningen). The first of these was founded by Nils Gabriel Djurklou who baptised his creation ‘The Society for the Collection and Arrangement of Närke’s Vernacular Language and Ancient Relicts’ (Sw. föreningen till samlande och ordnande av Nerikes folkspråk och forminnen) a name that clearly reveals a wide range of interests and fields of study that the members of this and similar organisations were about to initiate, which might include the documentation of local and regional dialects, music, costumes, customs, myths, building traditions, geography, flora and fauna as well as the occurrence of prehistoric and historic remains. These learned Societies were private initiatives, created by enthusiasts intent on exploring their own regional past, documenting and collecting, establishing a museum and/or a periodical. Their efforts were yet another display of the new patriotic nationalism of that emerging upper and middle class, economically solvent and politically vigorous, intent on defining and asserting their own distinctive individuality and identity, one that would single them out from the preceding social and political order of the Four Estates, which was in the process of being swept away by new economic realities resulting in novel hierarchical and political relationships (Baudou 1997:55; Brännman 1962:8pp; Curman 1936; 1963:6p; Feuk 1931:6p; Grundberg 1999:57; Sjöström & Flodén [1982]:10pp; Welinder 1994:204pp).

These organisations obviously filled a growing need. The first was formed in 1856, by 1864 there were eight, five years later there were twelve and by 1925 over 300 (Baudou 1993:19pp; Pettersson 1995:131). Their mounting number resulted in the establishment of the Swedish National Antiquarian Society (Sw. Svenska formminnesföreningen) at a meeting held at Växjö, Småland in 1870. Similar to its predecessors, this umbrella organisation was a direct continuation of the Gothic and Scandinavian movements, created in order to preserve and promote the cultural greatness of the country in order to straighten the new national identity, an aim clearly stated in the opening speech delivered by its first chairman, Gunnar Olof Hyltén-Cavallius;

This organisation has taken upon itself a goal, which will awaken a response in every Swedish heart. A child of our own era’s most fertile ideas, she strives to return us to ourselves, by elevating our national awareness to new heights of clearness. She wishes to give our modern teachings a pure national foundation and a genuine national expression. How can this be accomplished any differently or better, than by re-awakening to life and bestowing honours on the remains of our fathers extraordinary, and in many cases, richly developed culture? She gathers together these purely Swedish antiquities, preserved in the form of Nordic folk traditions, language, myths or ancient remains, and searches after a material for scientific research, or to be used in the unrestricted development of literature and art. This is the national principle, applied in a new area, sprouting new forms, with science as its stem, and with art.
as its flower and with heart-roots that reach down into the depths of our ancient Nordic cultural life. May this organisation, here gathered today for the first time, clearly decide, with strength, to work for its great patriotic goal! May she gain strength to inspire our Swedish people and teach them to honour themselves in their own memories! (Hyltén-Cavallius 1870 as quoted in Baudou 1993:11).

Hyltén-Cavallius, echoing sentiments expressed earlier by Rudbeck and in the poetry of Geijer, went on to warn his listeners against the degenerate effects of alien influences, especially the French, Latin and Greek languages, which he compared to “...a poisonous magic potion...” that almost caused the Swedish nation to lose itself and its own language (Hyltén-Cavallius 1870 as quoted in Baudou 1993:12; Baudou 1993; 1997:56; Geijer 1999:6p; Pettersson 1995:127).

The members of these private societies soon accumulated a considerable amount of social influence. They were also becoming increasingly dissatisfied with what they conceived to be the shortcomings of the central antiquarian authorities. In part, the emergence and success of these learned societies was a reaction against the centralising tendencies of the formal and institutionalised heritage management of officialdom. Liberalism was sweeping across the Nation. The political authority of the four Estates had been formally broken by the political reform of 1865 and replaced with a limited amount of electoral representation. The monopoly of the gilds was finally done away with in 1864, resulting in the right of the individual to pursue a trade of choice, while the State was relinquishing its monopoly over strategic resources in the North. In this light, these organisations are an extension of prevailing ideals, a laissez-faire heritage movement, one further manifestation of an rising upper and middle class consciousness, confident in their own newly discovered abilities, they set about creating both regional and national stereotypes of their own choosing.

Initially, these regional societies were favourably received by representatives of the central authorities. Bror Emil Hildebrand, in his capacity as Royal Antiquarian, pointed out that the aims of both were similar; to protect ancient monuments and promote an awareness concerning the prehistory of the country in order to reach a higher goal, to awaken, foster and sustain a deeper sense of devotion towards the Nation. Their eagerness to ‘...collect, preserve and arrange the ancient artefacts and cultural relics...’ was often undertaken with the intention of establishing a provincial museum, an objective that soon brought those voluntary efforts into conflict with emerging officialdom located in the capital. What started off as a question over who should have acquisition rights over prehistoric artefacts, essentially evolved into a
70 year long dispute concerning the centralisation or de-centralisation of authority; who should be endowed with the responsibility for the management of the Nation’s heritage. The issue aroused passions, pitting officialdom and the centralising forces as represented by Bror Emil and Hans Hildebrand, against the regionalists, which included notables such as Sven Nilsson, Djurklou, Hyltén-Cavallius and Dybeck. The personal depth of this dispute is reflected in the writings of Dybeck, who went so far as to slander his former patrons, the Hildebrands, who he characterised as “…cultural barons…” while accusing them of misusing their official capacity to paralyse independent activities (Baudou 1993:19; Berg 1945; Berthelson 1956; Bringéus 1973:552pp; Carlsson 2000:89; Curman 1926; Grundberg 1999:55pp; Nerman 1944; Pettersson; 2001:119; Sellberg 1993; Waldén 1945:304pp).

Djurklou’s view of the situation is summed up in a letter to a friend from 1873;

The bullying manner, that is beginning to develop within academic scholarship, gives rise to much bitterness in the remoter areas of the country, where there are also people who are not without character and who are no less capable of expressing an opinion, even though they may live at a distance from the centre of education and culture (Djurklou 1873 as quoted in Sellberg 1993:302).

The carefully worded comments from a later day governmental committee that was appointed to review this situation reveal just how serious and complicated this matter was considered to be;

No one denies, that historic… [and] …archaeological research is of interest to the State, worthy of support, and indeed endowed to a great degree by the general public and in equal proportion controlled by the State, yet no one holds the opinion that the archaeological research undertaken by the State should be considered superior to comparable work undertaken by individuals, neither would anyone argue that the State should be granted a monopoly over all or any part of this undertaking. However, circumstance differ as concerns heritage management. Opinions clash as concerns how far the hegemony State should extent into this domain, on the other hand, all should at least agree that heritage management, to a large degree, should be given over to the State (Johnsson 1923:139, italics in the original).

This in turn;

…demands a centralised organisation, where all threads converge, which through its position can observe the whole enterprise and also take responsibility for that which needs to be done and then do it… [thus] …all other heritage associations must to a certain degree be made subordinate to this central organisation if it is to be able to fulfil these duties (Johnsson 1923:147).

As we shall see, this conflict was resolved during the first half of the 20th century through the nationalisation of heritage management by the central authorities.

Identity in the Nation-State
Separately or together, institutionalised archaeology and the laissez-faire heritage movement fabricated a new national identity out of the ideological concepts derived from the Gothic Union and their intellectual descendants, substantiated by empirical material retrieved from the ancient past. The central metaphors of this construction are five in number. The first consisted of an ideally conceived culture represented by a virtuous and un-corruptible yeomanry living in small healthy and picturesque agricultural communities. The second and third was founded on the imaginary existence of a homogeneous, unchanging and vigorous racial stock speaking a common language, the purity of both in need of protection from harmful foreign influences. The fourth was the belief in a glorious history, a golden age, conceived as a shared experience, a unifying thread, with origins stretching as far back into the distant past as possible. The fifth metaphor was the unwavering belief in the beneficial attributes of nature untamed. Lastly, and as a precautionary measure, these new ideals were tempered with repeated and firm exhortations concerning the virtues of collectivism, duty, obedience and loyalty towards the powers that be (Anderson 1983; Beckman 1999; Bohman 1997; 1999; Hobsbawm 1983a; 1983b; Klinge 1983:128; Molin 2003:70pp & 85pp; Smith 1991; 2000; 2001; Sørensen 1997:121; Sørensen & Stråth 1997; Sörlin 1988:82pp).

The fulfilment of this new national identity entailed that it overcome and replace the older conceptual categories and normative absolutes founded on the needs of the Swedish empire which, at its height, encompassed a multi-cultural and multilingual population that had little in common with each other apart from being required to pay lip service to one regent and one religion. Loss of empire did not
automatically entail a homogenisation of the population. Not only were there regional differences, but also a number of ethnic and cultural minorities, Jews, Roma, Finns and Sámi, later periodically augmented by imported ‘guest workers’ when required. These sub-cultures could be ignored, while regional differences were successfully incorporated into the nation-building project by re-classifying them as genuine survivals of that larger, original and common cultural, linguistic and/or ethnic past. Concepts of racial purity and superiority would be added piecemeal throughout the 19th and 20th centuries as they became available through the misunderstanding or misrepresentation of evolutionary theory developed within other scientific disciplines (Anderson 1983:81; Backman 1999:32pp; Broberg 1988; Broberg & Tydén 1996:110; Grundberg 1999:36; Klein 2000:6pp; Kliinge 1983; Korhonen 1996:59pp; Lundström & Pilvesmaa 1997:20; Lööw 1991:24; Nyberg et.al. 1987:9; Stenius 1997:168; Sørensen & Stråth 1997; Östergård 1997:54).

The success of any nation-building project not only rests on the ability of its cultural elite to create sufficiently holistic categories needed to transcend regional differences. They must also be made normative. This was in part achieved through the establishment of various types of learned institutions, associations, learned societies and museums where these new cultural symbols, practices and rules could be constituted, formalised and then embedded within the framework of these various upper and middle class organisations. As such, these concepts were also constantly being reinforced along that network of relationships that came into being in the wake of these organisations. But if the nation-building project was to succeed, then these unifying values and norms must necessarily also be passed on to, instilled and reproduced, among and within the greater masses. Former subjects had to be transformed into citizens, peasants into Swedes. Tingsten, echoing Rousseau’s dictum, reminds us that;

The Swedish state did not come into existence because Swedes lived there, they were created because they belonged to the Swedish state (Tingsten 1969:134).

This was accomplished through the creation of the compulsory public school system, characterised by Tingsten, in his penetrating account, as one of the finest and most successful propaganda machines ever conceived (Tingsten 1969:276pp). Centrally controlled and standardised by the powers that be, this “...educational system...became the central mechanism in the process of cultural socialisation, the place where ‘national’ knowledge and values were instilled...” (Östergård 1997:52). Up until then, the subjects of the Realm had been disciplined and enculturated through the absolutism of the Lutheran state church. Now the citizens of this new Nation-State were to be given a;

...historical and poetical education, in line with the people’s character and identity. National history, the mother tongue, ancient Nordic myths, and knowledge of the country became the main subjects... (Thorkildsen 1997:143).

In Sweden this process was implemented with the use of a remarkable textbook, ‘The Elementary School Reader’ (Sw. Läsebok för folkskolan). Also known as ‘The Governmental Primer’, it was first published in 1868 and would be repeatedly reprinted, edited, expanded and, with the 1938 edition, subdivided into separate volumes, some of which would be re-published and sporadically employed until the 1960’s. No other secular book, without exception, has been so instrumental in shaping and ensuring social cohesion and identity in so many generations than this one work (Furuland 1979; 1987:111; Melander 1996:19; 1998:6pp; Petersson 2000:647). It is an extraordinary anthology, a mixture of both fact and fiction, richly spiced with nationalistic and romantic poetry, proverbs, moralisers and fables, all designed to instil the population with the authorised version of the new national identity and character. The values of the Gothic Union and the nation-building project are all abundantly represented; the unbridled belief in a bright future built on the foundation of a glorious and common past, the exaggerated idolisation of both nature and rural lifeways, the satisfaction and pride derived from belonging to a unique race in possession of its own language, the importance of being humble, of respecting and obeying authority and showing the proper devotion to God, King and Country (Furuland 1987; Tingsten 1969).

Artur Hazelius was actively involved in the production of the first edition, while the table of contents from five editions printed over a 70 year period repeatedly reveals contributions, often more than one, by such prominent Goths as Erik Gustaf Geijer, Esaias Tegnér, Richard Dybeck, Nils Gabriel...
Djurklou, Gunnar Olof Hyltén-Cavallius and Viktor Rydberg. Representing the sciences we find Elias Fries, Sven Nilsson, Oscar Montelius, Gunnar Andersson, Martin Weibull and Sigurd Erixon, just to mention a few (Läsebok för Folkskolan [1868] 1979; 1875; 1878; 1893; 1901; [1901] 1969; 1915; 1925 & 1938).

An example of just how persuasive and all pervading the ideas created by that thought-collective actually became, and remained, is provided by a song entitled ‘Native Soil’ (Sw. Fosterjorden) written by Richard Dybeck. Encapsulated in these few short verses are all of the above mentioned mystic elements that make up the core of what is usually conceived as Sweden’s heritage;

You ancient, you healthy, you mountain high North,
You serene, you joyful, beautiful!
I bid you welcome, you fairest of lands upon the Earth,
Your sun, your sky, your pastures green.

You shelter memories from magnificent days of yore,
When honoured your name soared above the Earth.
I know, that you are and will be what you were.
Oh! I want to live, I want to die in the North.

Written in 1843, it became a reoccurring feature in all editions of the ‘Elementary Reader’. The author later substituted ‘you healthy’ in exchange for ‘you free’, a version that has become imbedded in the consciousness of the Nation to such a degree that it has, since the end of 19th century, been regard as Sweden’s national anthem, despite the fact that it has never officially been adopted as such (Marklund 1991:168).

The values and norms presented in the ‘Governmental Primer’ are founded on southern Swedish perspectives and experiences. This is exemplified in the way the Sámi people and Norrland are depicted. The former are often superficially and condescendingly portrayed (Marken 1993a:150; 1993b:108). Much the same can be said about Norrland as a whole. The region’s natural splendours are highly praised, although we are reminded that they are transitory and “...soon replaced by the cold and dark, the long winter, the long night, when nature as it were, lies dead under a white shroud.” (Läsebok för Folkskolan [1868] 1979:85). Norrland is also described as a supplier of raw materials, a finial frontier where;

... silence reigns. Away over there, in those forlorn forests, that define space, one sees lofty pillars of smoke here and there that reach up into the sky. This is civilisation, which ever draws nearer to the Pole, using fire to clear the forests for the plough. These are the pioneers, marching through the wilderness, forcing aside the Lapps who instinctively give way (Läsebok för Folkskolan [1868] 1979:85p).

Gustavsson has noted similarities between the way in which both Norrland and Africa are presented, the future development and success of each are depicted as being dependent on external interests and initiatives (Gustavsson 2003:2). The passage quoted above was penned by no less a personage than Fredrika Bremer, otherwise renown for her sensitivity as concerns the socio-economic and political plight of women, a capacity that did not enable her to surmount the normative influences of southern Swedish perspectives as they concern Norrland.

Needless to say, Norrland’s share of the Nation’s prehistory is non-existent as presented by Montelius in four editions printed between 1878 and 1901. All four are practically identical as to content, he introduces the young reader to the Three Age system with its dolmens, passage graves, Bronze Age barrows and Viking Age mounds (Montelius 1878a; 1878b; 1893a; 1893b; 1899a; 1899b; [1901a] 1968a; [1901b] 1968b) a situation that immediately brings to mind Westfal’s comment quoted at the beginning of Chapter One. Later editions from the 20th century do mention prehistoric Norrland, but to such a limited degree and in such a manner that it only underscores the peripheral status of the region, both past and present (Läsebok för Folkskolan 1915; 1925; 1938).

From Nation-State to Welfare-State

Ever since the end of the Napoleonic Wars, Sweden has followed a policy of neutrality, one that has allowing it to pursue its own interests, albeit not without regard to external powers and relationships. This new Nation-State, largely agricultural and poor at the beginning of the 19th century, became the world’s first welfare-state, urban and affluent, by the mid 20th century. This was accomplished through industrialisation, the exploitation of Norrlandian resources, the exportation of its most improvised citizens through migration and a succession of internal political developments that, from 1932 onwards, kept the Social Democratic Party in power
for the better part of the 20th century (Beijbom 1977:22pp; Galbraith 1979:123pp; Åberg 1993).

Attainment of the welfare-state, what has since come to be called ‘the people’s home’ (Sw. folkhemmet) was seriously impeded by the Great Depression and then by the Second World War. Official non-involvement was declared on the out break of that conflict, although economically Sweden profited by exporting strategic commodities that helped to sustain the Nazi war machine and oppress a continent. At the end of the war Sweden found itself in a unique economic position. Its infrastructure and industry were completely intact, an advantage that gave Sweden an unparalleled head-start in post-war Europe, one that would last for the next two and a half decades and provide the financial foundation for the continued extension and enlargement of ‘the people’s home’ through parliamentary reforms that included a general pension system, affordable medical care, unemployment benefits, social services for the elderly, paid vacations, the building of better housing and the reformation of the school system. These accomplishments, financed through ever increasing taxes and later with ever larger international loans, helped to insure that the electorate repeatedly favoured the Social Democrats at the ballot box (Boëthius 1992:60pp; Eivergård 1993:229; Elting 1981:45pp; Henningssen 1997:117; Trägårdh 1997:273; Weibull 1993:129pp; Åberg 1993:513).

The Industrialisation of the North

Prior to the industrialisation of Norrland, the peoples living there had developed a number of successful economies based on a complicated combination of complementary subsistence strategies carried out at different times during the course of the annual work year. Describing these as either reindeer or agricultural societies is an over simplification of the complexity and flexibility of this Northern achievement, which was able to accommodate both innovations and change, internal and external, until overtaken by the full onslaught of the industrial revolution.

Due to poor soils and a short growing season, agriculture in Norrland has always been heavily dependent on animal husbandry, cattle, sheep and/or goats, and thus on the subsequent production of fodder. In southernmost Sweden the production of grain increases in importance, only about 10% of the arable land is pasture, while this figure increases to 80% in Norrland (Arpi 1971:167). Animal husbandry at these latitudes is a precarious subsistence strategy, and because of this farmers in the North have always supplemented live stock breeding with other domestic and subsidiary activities as they became available, such as the logging of their own forest plots, the making and selling of charcoal, potash, wood tar, saltpetre and/or potassium nitrate together with gathering, fishing and hunting pursuits (Blehr 1968a:10pp; Boëthius 1937:192; Borgegård 1996:85; Bylund 1996:204p; Bäcklund 1996:228pp; Eckerman 1925; Ekman [1910] 1983:456pp; Henriksson 1978; Hvarfner 1964; Sixtensson 1994:93pp; Åkerman 1996:153pp; Österlund 1995:401p). The economic significance of these individual strategies is difficult to define in detail, their importance has varied according to both time and place (fig. 21 and 30).

Economies incorporating the domestication of the reindeer developed two main subsistence strategies, one migratory the other stationary. The mountain-herders moved annually between pastures located in the mountains and the forests, covering great

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>hunting and or fishing</th>
<th>farming</th>
<th>seasonal work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norrbotten</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Västerbotten</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Västernorrland</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 21. An assessment of the relative importance of various subsistence strategies in the rural economy between 1920-1940 from three Northern counties (Avidson 1983). Proportions fluctuated over time and between regions. Tax records from 1559 along the Lule river valley reveal the existence of a diverse rural economy in which butter, cheese and wool made up 46% of the taxable income, grain 34%, fish 14% and furs 6% of the total. During the following century animal husbandry steadily increased in importance (Lundmark 1990:150p & 156). There is no doubt that hunting and fishing were locally important, as exemplified by Ekman ([1910] 1983:461) who relates that domestic servants and farm hands in certain areas would only hire on if they were solemnly promised that salmon would not be served more than two or three times each day. Up until recently, the rural subsistence economy in Norrland consisted of a number of complementary strategies, primarily animal husbandry of some kind, together with hunting, fishing, gathering, agriculture, domestic subsidiary pursuits derived from their own forest plots and/or external auxiliary employment. A periodic decline in one or more of these components could be offset by intensification within one or more of the others. Long term disturbances in, or the loss of, two or more of these elements would set up repercussions within the whole socio-economic fabric of the Northern communities, seriously threatening their survival.
distances with large herds, their seasonal movements co-ordinated to take advantage of ecological diversity as it became available. The forest-herders remained in their forest base camps for most of the year, moving short distances as dictated by the grazing requirements of their much smaller herds, the produce from which was supplemented by trade, hunting, fishing, gathering and/or the production of various milk products (Fjällström 1985:40; Lundmark 1999; Ruong 1982).

Thus, the pre-industrial economy of the North was a hybrid, combining cultural and economic elements from both the Sámi, Nordic and Finnish populations. Initially this rendered Northern agriculturists and reindeer herders economically independent, a situation that has distinguished Norrlandians from their Southern affiliates since at least the 16th century. It was also a state of affairs that conflicted with, and which were contradictory to, the conceptual framework and economic policies of the central authorities in their efforts to regulate and control the North (Hellström 1917:85; Lundgren 1984:156; Lindkvist 1996:134pp; Ruong 1982; Åkerman 1996:156pp). Industrialisation would accelerate the accomplishment of these goals through the ecological, economical and social disruption it caused, a process which started with the forest industry.

The ecological ramifications of forestry were considerable and by themselves constituted a serious encroachment on the livelihood of the various Norrlandian communities. Vast tracts of land were devastated by clear-cuts, some were enormous, with over a million trees taken at a time. Logging practices were purely exploitative, the sawmills only sought timber of the largest dimensions while the rest was left where it fell. Along the Ångermanälven river system alone, anywhere from 600 thousand to 6.6 million logs were floated annually between 1873 and 1902. Forestry was described by contemporaries in terms of “...despoilment and devastation...”. Replanting and restoration of the forests was not practised, rejuvenation programs would not be adequately formulated until the 1950’s (Lundgren 1987:77pp; Lundmark 1971:38pp; Nerman 1903:36p; Segebaden 1996b:128; 1996c:129).

For the farmer, this entailed the loss of a steady and long term source of income from their own forest plots once they had been logged out. For the reindeer herders it meant the devastation of pasture grounds and the disruption of migration routes. Hunting possibilities were also effected by these radical and man made ecological transformations. This was accompanied by adverse effects on fishing that arose out of the manipulation of the waterways primarily to suit the needs of logging, subsequently augmented through the exploitation of the hydro-electric power sources. The combined effects of both would eradicate inland fishing as a viable subsistence strategy by the second half of the 20th century (Bylund 1996:204; Hvarfner 1964; Laestander 1993:294; Lundmark 1999: 124pp; Nordberg 1977:704; Ruong 1982; Svensson 1968; Åström 1954:83).

The central authorities continued to encourage agricultural colonisation of the interior through the distribution of land and tax reductions throughout the 19th century, a practice which resulted in the further encroachment on the reindeer pastures, setting the agriculturists and reindeer herders on a collision course. The Government responded to this problem with the “Reindeer Herding Law” of 1886, by which the State expropriated all of the grazing lands, now only allowing the Sámi the rights of usufruct. This curtailment of their lifeways was further compounded by the fact that these usage rights would be revoked and irrevocably lost if they should have to abandoned reindeer herding, even temporarily, through choice or economic duress. This negative spiral would continue well into the middle of the 20th century as inroads onto pasture lands increased with the explosive growth of both the forest and the hydro-electric power industries (Edgren & Edgren 1999:237; Lundgren 1987:92; Lundmark 1999:94pp; Nordlander 1900:216; Svensson 1968; Thomasson 1993:189p).

Continued competition for land and access to resources also increased internal tensions between Sámi communities. The expanding economy of the Mountain Sámi resulted in greater demands on, and claims to, grazing in the forest areas, which would be granted, either by the State or through agreements with the forest-herders themselves, a development which, in the long run, under-cut the economy of the latter (Lundgren 1987:64pp; Lundmark 1999:68). Access to grazing pastures in the forest would diminished in step with the continued expansion of the forest industry and farming economy, later augmented by the iron and the hydro-electric power industries. The cumulative effect of these infringements would change the ecology of the forests and slowly reduce areas suitable for reindeer
grazing. The other economic mainstay of these forest-communities, fishing, would also be seriously effected. Farmers not only competed for available fishing grounds but also began draining lakes in order to increase agricultural lands, a practice which seriously effecting fishing possibilities. Industrialisation would later accelerate this process by clearing, dredging and/or altering water courses and through the building of dams, first for logging purposes and later for the production of hydro-electric power. Caught between the expanding and dynamic economies of the mountain-herders on the one hand and that of the farmers and the industrialists on the other, the forest-herder’s distinctive way of life edged towards extinction as increasing numbers were forced to adopt other pursuits (Lundgren 1987:65pp; Lundmark 1999:70p; Nordberg 1977:684).

At the beginning of the 19th century the State had moved to rid itself of its controlling interest in forest lands. By mid century it only owned about 4000 square kilometres. This was motivated in part by its inability to adequately manage these vast tracks of land and by the new economic doctrine of the time, laissez-faire capitalism. The gradual termination of the English import duty on forest products resulted in a rapid industrialisation of the North, largely through private and external interests. Now that the forests had become a valuable commodity per se, the State slowly began to re-acquire forest land, by the 1950’s it had, through legislation and purchase, transformed itself into one of the dominating powers within this industry with over 58 thousand square kilometres or about one forth of the country’s forest land under its control. It also began to restrict the establishment and expansion of both farmers and reindeer herders into these now valuable forest areas. From 1865 onwards Crown Forests (Sw. Kronomarker) were re-classify as Crown Parks (Sw. Kronoparker) where agricultural pursuits were banned. The continuing development of the forest industry soon led to a revision of this ban. Now, as in the private sector, the State realised the need of establishing and ensuring the availability of a local labour reserve within its own domains in order to exploit this resource in an economically rational manner (Arpi 1959:29pp; 1960:159; 1971:97; Bergström 1981:32pp; Nilsson 1992;138p).

Consequently, the State, in 1891, began to promote one further round of settlement in the North with the
promise of a certain number of tax free years. These new farmsteads, known as ‘Crown Cottages’ (Sw. Kronotorp), consisted of small plots that were leased to families throughout Norrland and the County of Kopperberg. Houses and other farm buildings were built according to a standardised type, the blueprints of which were provided by the government (Lange 1997:177p). These had been drawn up by some of the Nation’s leading architects, motivated by patriotism, they wanted to provide the new industrial workers of the rural areas with;

... simple, wholesome, cheap and well ordered dwellings of Swedish character. Not shabby imitations of houses belonging to foreign gentry, but Swedish homes, similar to those our fathers built. Because underlying them are Swedish thoughts and it is Swedish thoughts we should think (Molin 1909 quoted in Stavenow-Hidemark 1967:71pp).

Thus the well tended red cottages with their white painted corners and windowsills so familiar to us today, now taken for granted as representing some fundamental and ancient Swedish building tradition, is nothing more than a highly successful metaphor that was invented less than a hundred years ago. The contextual and ideological ramifications presented on the front cover of the ‘Governmental Primer’ from 1907 onwards are immediately made apparent (fig. 23). These Crown Cottages were smaller than traditional farmsteads, provided as they were with only a few small arable fields, one or two cows and a minimal amount of other types of livestock. This was not enough, in itself, to sustain a family, and indeed, it was never intended that these farmsteads would or should be economically viable on their own. Quite the contrary, they were designed to be totally dependent on seasonal work provided by the State owned forests (Bergström 1981:26pp; Stavenow-Hidemark 1967:65pp; Vikström & Bergström 1994:364p).

Initially, seasonal employment in the forest industry had been effectively combined with agricultural pursuits (fig. 30). In 1860 the number of men employed as seasonal loggers was insignificant. Ten years later 20% of all men between the ages of 15 and 50 would be seasonally employed as loggers, by 1885 it would be 35% and by the turn of the century 50%. Soon, many found themselves dependent on cash payments, as seen from employment figures for Norrbotten and Västerbotten between 1912-13 which show that 90-100% of all the farmers in those provinces were engaged in this seasonal activity. Others completely abandoned their former lifeways, becoming landless tenants, a rural proletariat or full time wage earners wholly dependent on the new economy. The alternative to seasonal and/or full time employment in forestry was the extensive rationalisation and industrialisation of their former subsistence strategies, integrating

![Image](image.png)

Fig. 23. It is no coincidence that the 10th edition of the ‘Governmental Primer’ from 1907 was given the front cover it sported from that time onwards. Here we see the very ideal of what the State and the national romantic movement of the period were in the midsts of promoting. This black and white illustration is often understood as representing a red cabin with white corners. One hundred years previously the spruce represented nature at its most menacing. Now it is a symbol of security and well-being, its branches embrace the house, its heart shaped roots the soil. At its foot grow blue liverwort, as symbolic of the Nation as is the flag, a flower that becomes considerably less common the further north one travels. The slogan above bids us “Listen to the murmur of the spruce, its roots are the foundation of your home.” It can also be found above the entrance to Skansen, care of Artur Hazelius (Furuland 1987:122p). This seemingly trivial illustration is actually highly idiomatic, it represents the ideal of a single people endowed with in a common heritage that spans the past, the present and the future (Baudou 1993; illustration source Baudou 1993:27).
themselves into the capitalistic economy by becoming either large scale agriculturists or reindeer ranchers. A few began to practice a greater amount of specialisation in vocations that up until then were traditional domestic subsidiary activities. One such example was the rendering of wood tar by the farmers in Västerbotten and Norrbotten, which in those counties grew in economic import. By the end of the 19th century, and into the beginning of the next, Västerbotten was the leading producer of this commodity in Sweden, some of its farmers were spending four months of the year distilling wood tar, an activity that soon accounted for 35-50% of their yearly income (Borgegård 1996:89; Bylund 1972:105; 1996:204pp; Bäcklund 1996:234pp; Ingold 1980:253pp; Streyffert 1942:458pp).

The emergence of the predatory capitalistic economy, in the form of the forest industry, rendered Norrlandians increasingly dependent on external employment and cash payments, resulting in the creation of a mobile labour reserve that could be tapped when needed by the forest industry, both private and State owned. Many, if and when this source of income failed, would not be able to revert to any of the old subsistence strategies, the prerequisites for that type of economy; fishing, hunting, gathering, the working of their own private forest plots and/or small scale reindeer herding, were all rapidly diminishing or had already disappeared, while the forest industry could and would survive, there would always be other sources of labour (Bäcklund 1996:233pp; Daun 1968:40; Lundberg 1984:73; Nerman 1903:35; Sörlin 1988:60).

The demographic strain and socio-economic stresses generated by the meteoric and unrestrained industrialisation of Norrland increased political anxieties in connection with the future of this region. In 1894 these concerns erupted into an entangled political debate known to prosperity as 'The Norrlandian Question' (Sw. Norrlandsfrågan) that lasted for almost two decades, giving rise to opinions that cut across party lines and social classes, resulting in the 1901 appointment of a parliamentary commission that presented its 6 volume report four years later. What started out as a debate in regards to what should constitute Norrland’s principal economic base, agriculture/pastoralism or industry, evolved into a criticism of the darker sides of the industrial revolution which was radically transforming rural lifeways. The industrialisation of Sweden and especially Norrland, in contrast to most other countries, was not predominately an urban phenomenon. It did not necessarily lead to the agglomeration and growth of large industrial centres but to the establishment of many small urban hubs located in rural surroundings (Samuelsson 1970:32). By the turn of the century over 60% of Sweden’s industrial workers were employed in rural areas as compared with 20% in the United States and 30% in Germany (Söderberg & Lundgren 1982:7). The corresponding rapid change in rural life styles and the perceived destruction of idealistic values occupied the minds of many, from artists and writers to economists and politicians. This concern was a result of that romantic and patriotic nation-building project which fostered the belief that a return to nature and a simpler way of life would cure many of the ills facing modern society while simultaneously nurturing a tough, honest, simple Teutonic yeoman farmer, that bulwark of a stable society, who would guarantee the preservation of a vital and vigorous population, now and in the future (Edgren & Edgren 1999:235). The report concluded that the State, by permitting unbridled laissez-faire economics, had set industry and rural interests on a collision course. The natural resources of the region, its forests, peat bogs, minerals and water-power were much to important to be entrusted to any single individual or interest group. The forest barons who had enriched themselves on Norrlandian timber did not often even live or work in the areas that they exploited. The wealth being generated was accumulating in the towns along the coast, in the cities of southern Sweden or abroad, and if this was allowed to continue it would jeopardise the future of the Nation as a whole. In order to protect itself, the State, with the general well being of society in mind, would be justified in exercising its prerogative of restricting the rights of individual ownership. In the name of justice the State must take control of the natural resources for the common good of all (Sörlin 1988:242pp; Ternstedt 1944). This is exactly what the central authorities proceeded to do as the State policy changed from liberalism to protectionism. Foreign ownership of Sweden’s natural resources was sharply curbed, the forest companies were effectively deterred from acquiring forest lands, restrictions were placed on farmers concerning what kinds of land they could own and to whom they could sell it to, the reindeer herders were de-possessed and their movements confined, while the State proceeded to become one of the largest forest owners in the country (Arpi 1959:73pp;
In many respects this new policy was not especially innovative. The central authorities, in one form or another, had always intervened in developments taking place in Norrland. During the 20th century these concerns not only included the lucrative forest industry, but now also the iron, mineral and hydro-electric resources of the region, while it continued to dictate the terms and conditions for both agriculture and reindeer herding. The end result would finalise that which had its start in the Middle Ages; a colonised and submissive Norrland subordinate to the economic and political will and whims of the central authorities in Stockholm.

The economic importance of Norrland was further emphasised by the loss of Norway in 1905. The Norwegians, after having been part of the Danish kingdom since 1660, had in 1815, on the point of a bayonet, been forced into a union with Sweden, as compensation for its loss of Finland during the course of the Napoleonic wars. Now after a lengthy period of political and social unrest, during which both countries at one time or another threatened military action, the Union was finally and peacefully brought to an end (Ericson 2000; Pettersson 2001:50p; Weibull 1993:104). Norrlandian resources would also have to make good this loss, resulting in a new round of optimism concerning Norrland’s economic potential, one that embraced both politicians, the cultural elite and the sciences. The latter, banishing a vast new arsenal of analytical methods, were once again mobilised in an effort to survey, probe, describe, analyse and evaluate Norrland in order to insure that its natural resources were procured and utilised in the most rational manner for the betterment of the Nation. Many of these scientific endeavours were initiated, not by the universities, but by the State and the private industrial sector. Scientific work in the North attracted Sweden’s best and brightest, while research carried out in the Norrland came to be regarded as a merit, a status symbol and a career booster (Sörlin 1988:152pp).

The ‘State Colonisation Board’ (Sw. Statens kolonisationsnämnd), in order to insure an adequate labour supply for their renewed exploitation of Norrlandian resources, began promoting a further round of homesteading from 1918 onwards. The smaller of these ‘Colonial Cottages’ (Sw. Kolonat) would produce a few of the more basic economic necessities, the remainder would be acquired through seasonal employment. The larger Colonial Cottages were meant to function in conjunction with their smaller counter parts. They were self-sufficient farms in the traditional sense of the term but they were also expected to compliment the smaller units by supplying them with work horses and foodstuffs, the former would be rented and the latter purchased by the seasonally employed forest workers (Bergström 1981:52pp).
Obviously, this precarious reciprocal relationship that the State authorities were trying to institutionalise was economically vulnerable to say the least. Any decline in the forest industry would immediately be transmitted in one form or another to these settlements. This system was made even more vulnerable by the fact that these farmsteads were situated, and thus made dependent on, some of the most marginal agricultural land imaginable (Bergström 1981:51pp; Wik 1995:170). These were the peat bogs which make up about 14% of Norrland’s total area (Rune 1995b:168). A State survey carried out between 1916-1920 showed that there were 1145 square kilometres of arable land available for cultivation in the Crown Parks, of which 96.8% consisted of peat bogs (Bergström 1981:90). The drainage of wetlands, to increase and improve their productivity, had been taking place at least since the middle of the 18th century. From the beginning of the 20th the State would increasingly finance large scale ditching operations (Zackrisson 1976:50). The dream of turning Norrland’s extensive wetlands into productive farmland is part and parcel of the agricultural optimism that harks back to late 17th century. Voices were raised against the ghost of this re-awakened and centrally sanctioned optimism, but by now short sighted political considerations had taken command, politicians of all flavours were desperately trying to win the vote in the rural areas through a show of pragmatic activity directed towards the agricultural population (Bergström 1981:51). The amount of arable land in Norrland reached its greatest extent during the 1950’s, of which about 25% consisted of cultivated peat bogs. In the inland areas of Norrbotten county, peat bogs would constitute around 50% of all arable land. Peat bogs, fens and mires have always been an important component in Northern agriculture, employed as a soil conditioner, providing animal bedding, fodder and pasture for livestock (Bergström 1981:127; Zackrisson 1976). But peat bogs are poor in key nutrients such as phosphor, potassium, magnesium, copper and nitrogen and are also more susceptible to frost than other types of arable land, factors which severely limit their productive capacity. Thus, they would not and could not fulfil the hopes and aspirations of Southern visionaries (Wik 1995:170).

During the first half of the 20th century the central authorities made what would appear to be one last effort to establish new homesteads in the North. Known as ‘Small Working Class Farms’ but generally referred to as ‘Per Albin Cottages’ (Sw. arbetarsmåbruk, Per Albin torp) after the Social Democratic prime minister of the time, this further attempt was initiated in order to counteract the depopulation of Norrland caused by widespread unemployment among the growing rural proletariat and landless farmers of the depression years (Bergström 1981:94). About 7000 of these small farmsteads were established during the 1930’s, and like the Crown Cottages, many were built according to standardised blueprints provided by the State on small plots of arable land that would yield some of the basic necessities (Westerström 1974:108). They too, were never intended to be self-sufficient. It was envisioned that the wife and children would stay at home and take care of the farm while the husband would seek seasonal or full time employment in the forest, construction and/or mining industries (Bäcklund 1993:31; 1996:233).

The introduction of the puddle process in the early 19th century, which allowed the use of fossil fuels for the production of high quality wrought iron, ended the advantage that the forests had given Sweden and brought an end to its mining industry in the south (Morger 1994:118; Samuelsson 1970:14p). Even as this industry declined in the Bergslagen district, events unfolding in the northernmost regions of Norrland would propel Gällivare-Malmberget and Kiruna to the forefront of this branch. These rich iron ore deposits, with lodes containing up to 70% iron, as compared with European deposits averaging 28-38%, had been known since the middle of the 17th century but remained un-utilised until now. Two innovations were needed in order to transform this Northern resource into one of the largest iron mines in the world; the Thomas-Gilchrist process that could convert this phosphorus rich ore into high grade steel and the building of a railway in order to transport the ore to the centres of production. The former became available in 1879, the latter in 1888 when Malmberget was connected with the port of Luleå. This rail line would later be extended up to Kiruna and, in 1902, reach the ice free harbour at Narvik in Norway. In response, the Northern mining industry would mushroom. On the eve of the First World War iron production would amount to 8.5% of Sweden’s exports, with Norrlandian mines providing at least two thirds of the ore, supplying both England, Germany and France (Andersson-Skog 1994:295; Arpi 1971:61pp; Heaton 1964:500p; Nilsson 1992:143; Samuelsson 1970:53pp; Wik 1941:122).
The Swedish State involved itself heavily in these new developments right from the very start. The railway, originally initiated by an English company, was nationalised in 1892. By 1907 the State owned 50% of the Northern iron mines via its share in the Luossavaara-Kiirunavaara AB mining company, thankfully shortened to LKAB. In 1957 the State became the majority owner of this company, which was nationalised soon afterwards (Björklund 1992:160; Roeck-Hansen 1994:138p).

A more unlikely setting for the economic and social development that was about to take place would be difficult to find. Here, on the fringe of Europe, two towns grew up, Gällivare-Malmberget and Kiruna, around and literally on top of the iron ore mines. Disrupting the previous inhabitants, the seasonal Sámi reindeer herders, they sprang into being practically over night, two urban outposts located at the foot of the mountains just below the tree line along the border between the Alpine and northern Boreal environmental zones where the average temperature seven months of the year is 0°C or less (Forsström 1973:104; Nilsson 1992:141p).

Initially Malmberget (Ore Mountain) was one of the fastest growing communities in Sweden. During the second half of the 1890's its population increased with a rate of 600-900 people annually, transforming this pristine mountain wilderness into an urban industrial environment with 7000 inhabitants within just 15 years. It was a chaotic expansion, a vast shanty town consisting of ramshackle, tumble-down huts made of old packing crates and earthen hovels dug into the side of the mountain. Almost 20 years would pass before regulated and centralised management was established and began providing municipal services. The result would be a town that is reminiscent of other urban-industrial environments that were soon to be established in the rural areas of the Northern inland; a heavily segregated community with characteristic housing based on class distinctions in accordance with the socially dictated hierarchical divisions of the period (Forsström 1973:143pp).

About 75 kilometres to the north, a similar urban centre was in the process of becoming. Kiruna, which in 1890 consisted of one log cabin and a few turf huts, would within 20 years, develop into a thriving mining town with a population of 7000 living in a well planned and organised urban environment that consisted of 1877 one room apartments, 1073 multi-room apartments and 372 houses, 40% of which were built by the mining company according to standardised models. Thus, not only was LKAB the largest employer in the Kiruna and Malmberget area, it was also a major landlord (Carlsson 1972:97pp) making the State, if not omnipotent, at least omnipresent.

While the land of the midnight sun and the midwinter darkness was being transformed into one of the worlds foremost iron ore producers, its southern neighbour, the County of Västerbotten, would briefly rise to a dominate position as one of Europe’s richest sources of minerals and precious metals. These ore fields straddle the border between Västerbotten and Norrbotten and run for 250 km, from the coast, north-west, towards the mountain foothills. Deposits of sulphur, iron pyrites and copper had been sporadically exploited since the 17th century, but did not become economically viable until the 1924 discovery of the Holmtjärn and Boliden deposits, both of which contained gold as well as varying amounts of copper, silver, arsenic, selenium, nickel, zinc, quicksilver, cobalt, lead and sulphur. The latter, until it closed in 1967, was Europe’s largest gold mine (Arpi 1971:89; Nilsson 1992:142; Pettersson 1994:166pp). The development of this mining industry was also meteoric, by 1930 there was a dressing plant at Boliden, a smelting plant and port faculties at Rönnskär and a railway line to transport ore from the mines together with number of artificial communities that provided the necessary labour.

The mining town of Boliden was planned and built from the ground up within the space of a few years, the logistics of this enterprise are mind boggling. The Boliden Company took an active part in providing or promoting the establishment of housing, electricity, water, streets, sanitation, schools, sporting faculties, a library, shops, a chapel, a meeting and dance hall, together with all the other services a modern society requires (Lundkvist 1980:128pp). The layout and architecture of the town clearly reflected and reinforced those strict social differences of the period. Overlooking it all from a two story house on a hill is the residence of the Company manager (Vikström 1994b:10p). This pattern would be repeated as new urban centres spring up out of nowhere in conjunction with the opening up of new ore deposits; at Kristineberg in 1938, Adak in 1942 and Rutjebäcken in 1951.

The Boliden mining company is a private concern, but the State had a finger in the pie from the very beginning. Through the offices of the ‘State Geological Survey’ (SGU) it assumed ownership over
7 of the 24 exploitable ore deposits in the area (Lundkvist 1980:80). State finances would be further bolstered by the vast increase in the production of gold and silver, the former, almost without exception, was deposited in the vaults of the Swedish National Bank while the silver was sent to the Royal Swedish Mint (Björklund 1992:159pp).

Of all those industrial events and/or encroachments that have taken place in Norrland, there is one that stands out above all others in the minds of its inhabitants, exemplifying both symbolically and emotionally, the region’s subordinate status within the centralised Nation-State to which it belongs. In truth this is not one single episode, but a series of events that took place within an incredibly short period of time and which literally changed the face of Norrland, effecting the lives and livelihoods of thousands. This was the exploitation of the region’s waterways for the production of hydro-electric power.

The development of Norrland’s hydro-electric power resources began with the large scale dam and power station at Porjus on the Lule river. Completed in 1915, it was built to power the trains running between the recently opened iron ore fields and the ports. But the full potential of Norrland’s hydro-electric power resources was not realised until the problems surrounding the long distance transfer of electrical energy were finally resolved. This occurred during the later half of the 1930’s (Bäcklund 1996:239; Spade 1994:288) allowing the power hungry industries of southern Sweden to effectively and ruthlessly tap the abundant energy sources of the North. By 1980 there were 1003 hydro-electric power stations in Sweden, of which 806 delivered 10 mega-watts or less, providing 5% of the hydro-electricity produced. Of the remaining 197 stations, 139 were located along the waterways of Norrland, together they produced just over 82% of Sweden’s hydro-electric power, three fourths of which was exported and consumed in southern Sweden (Angelin et.al. 1981:119; Arpi 1971:56).

It is not the fact that Norrland has for so long provided southern Sweden with its main source of power that has left such a lasting impression on the inhabitants of the North. The significance of these events is to be understood in the way they completely transformed the landscape, both natural and cultural. The natural environment was moulded and remade while the social structure of neighbouring communities was effected and in some instances even invented. Never has the landscape of Norrland been so radically altered since the end of the last Ice Age. In truth the efforts of man cannot compare with that great event, but the changes brought about by the wholesale regulation of the water systems is so extensive that it would take another Ice Age to erase all traces of its presence.

The dams, some of the largest in the world, are mammoth affairs consisting of earth, rock and/or concrete, the highest reaching 125 meters while the longest stretch for 3.8 kilometres. They have been thrown across river valleys one after another like enormous barricades, severing these age old lines of communication. In the Lule river valley there are fourteen that are 15 meters or higher, along the Ångerman river valley there are eighteen (Angelin et.al. 1981:120pp). Other rivers were diverted, leaving in their wake dead and dry beds, their waters redirected through underground headrace and tailrace tunnels tens of kilometres long or through the excavation of new channels up to 6 kilometres long, some of which were enclosed on either side by huge earthen embankments, cutting swaths over the landscape like some ancient and over sized fortification.

Lakes and sections of river valleys were transformed into gigantic water reservoirs to be tapped by the power stations on demand, either weekly or annually. The level of these new lakes was raised from between 1.7 to 30 meters above the original water surface, putting extensive areas of land beneath the waves of these reservoirs (Angelin et.al. 1981:19p).

To transfer the electrical energy from the hydro-power producing areas in the North to consumers in the South has required the construction of a vast transmission network. In less than ten years, from 1936-1945, over 5000 kilometres of 200 kilovolt transmission lines were built. A 400 kilovolt network was later added, which by 1980 was 9000 km long (Angelin et.al. 1981:53p; Arpi 1971:54pp). There is probably no other single object which so emphatically symbolises the exploitation of Norrland’s natural resources than the unending rows of transmission towers marching southwards. These bizarre skeletal giants with outstretched arms that straddle hills and mountains, hurdle rivers and lakes, cut through forests, farmlands and urban areas, dominate the landscape as well as the skyscape.

Countless sand, gravel and rock quarries were carved out of the landscape in order to provide the materials needed to accomplish this vast and
impressive feat of engineering, while innumerable roads were cut in order to transport the fantastic quantities of materials, equipment and workers into the sites. The scars of both can be seen everywhere. In face of this total human rearrangement of the landscape, it is astonishing that people still think of Norrland as a pristine wilderness. If nothing else, the above clearly demonstrates how persistent this myth has become.

While these engineering projects have clearly left their highly visible and lasting mark on the landscape there have also been a host of other and often less conspicuous but serious environmental impacts with consequences that reach far beyond that of the individual building sites themselves. Erosion has been continuous. Not only has it caused extensive damage to shorelines and property but it has also accelerated the discharge of increasing amounts of iron, magnesium, cadmium, nitrogen and phosphorus into the rivers, negatively affecting the quality of the drinking water and the health of both fish and plant life. The yearly deposits of ooze on the bottom of the riverbeds is no longer washed away by the intense spring floods, causing problems for spawning fish while creating favourable conditions for the growth of algae, further deteriorating the quality of the water. The constant variation of the water level in the reservoirs also creates an ecological desert or barrier between the aquatic and terrestrial ecotones. This significant transition zone is thus deprived of important plant and insect life, a contingency that not only facilitates further erosion but is also detrimental to the flora and fauna on either side of the beaches, reducing both the numbers and variation of species in both. Fish that are adapted to running water, such as salmon, trout and grayling are depleted and/or replaced by perch and pike. The growth rate and health of many fish populations of all species has been effected, making them more susceptible to parasites, further deteriorating their health (Angelin et. al. 1981:59pp; Nilsson 1983; Peterson 1983; Rolén 1993c:207).

These are just some of the ecological problems that have turned up in the wake of the hydro-electric power industry, few of which could probably have been foreseen with any accuracy. But these examples do illustrate the complexity of the natural network that was tampered with. This is no less true when one considers the social dimensions of this story. The rapid development of the power industry is not only about amazing feats of engineering, of which there are truly numerous and impressive examples. Nor is it only about intricate environmental repercussions, the consequences of which will take years to understand and even longer, if possible, to set right. It is also a human story. It is about societies (plural) that were literally forced to give up their way of life in order that we might enjoy the blessings of electricity. This precious commodity, which revolutionised and made possible modern Sweden, with all the wonderful benefits this implies, came at a high price, one paid for by others; the small farmers, the fishers and reindeer herders and their families (Arell 1983; Rolén 1991; Sundberg 1983). Their numbers are presumably not great, either numerically or relatively, they are minorities within minorities. But it was their pastures, forests, fields and fishing grounds, buildings and houses, roads and trails, memories and place-names, the labour of generations, that were engulfed by the flood in order that we might enjoy the luxury of cheap disposable aluminium packaging (Loeffler 1999a). Our gain is their loss.

![Fig. 25. The number of construction sites for hydro-power stations with a capacity of 10 mega-watts or more and/or of dams higher than 15 meters that were either built or re-built and/or enlarged between 1900-1989 in both southern and northern Sweden. It is interesting to note that the 75 sites in southern Sweden are more or less evenly spread out over the whole period while in Norrland one sees that 138 or 76% of the 181 construction sites were built and completed in the thirty year span between 1950-1979. Note that we are here talking about construction sites, which means that some individual dams and/or power stations have been counted twice or more because individual sites were re-build a number of times (Angelin et. al. 1981:120-141).](image-url)
How deeply this loss was felt, indeed is still being experienced by the people involved, can probably never be fully measured. It must be remembered that this wholesale transformation of the Northern river systems occurred well within the space of a single lifetime. Seventy-six percent of the 181 largest sites built in Norrland were constructed within 30 years (fig. 25).

This was no gradual modification of the landscape, economy and life styles of those people and places that were effected. It was a radical and traumatic mutation which swept over the North like a whirlwind effecting everything in its path. Anyone born during the first quarter of the 20th century would, by the end of that era, literally not recognise their surroundings.

Lake Rebnisjaure is regulated, its surface has risen thirteen meters.
We set our nets. We rowed and fished.
The char were small and hungry.
Sven sat long and stared deeply at the water.
Down there, he said, was my home for 27 years.

Beppe Wolgers' poem provides one of those rare windows into the thoughts of the individual and shows just how intimately and emotionally the events taking place affected people, not only for awhile, but for the rest of their lives (Wolgers 1983:30).

In many ways it was a brutalization of the landscape and the cultural values that had evolved in the North. This is clearly illustrated by the architectural design of the power stations over time. The earliest were designed, inspired by Art-Nouveau and New Classicism, testifying to an awareness that these stations did constitute an infringement on the natural and cultural landscape. Sensibilities were dulled during the later stages of this enterprise when the majority of the dams and power stations in Norrland were built. Economic rationalism and the Functionalism of Le Corbusier supplemented aesthetic values and left the river valleys dotted with ugly bunker-like edifices consisting of naked grey concrete that greatly impoverish their surroundings.

This vulgarisation of the landscape did not go entirely unnoticed, efforts were subsequently made to mitigate this situation, but in truth the damage had already been done and there was little that these stop-gap measures could do to alleviate the magnitude of the eyesores that had been created (Brunnström 1994; Pettersson 2001:190pp).

Monetary compensation for physical and material losses were, and still are, being paid. But how does one redress the psychological and emotional costs? Is it even possible to gauge non-material values such as historical, cultural and aesthetic knowledge, experiences and memories in monetary terms? This is humanism’s dilemma (Loeffler 1993). How can one motivate the destruction or protection of non-materialistic values according to assessments based on commercial, materialistic and monetary terms and considerations?

Despite all prior investigations, inquests and analyses it was difficult if not impossible for the lay person to fully grasp and comprehend the extent of the operations that were about to be implemented. That the dam at Messaure would involve the movement of more than 10.5 million cubic meters of fill using some of the largest earth moving equipment ever built, that Harsprånget alone would initially provide Sweden with 20% of its energy needs or that huge lakes would be created, for example Lake Lossen in Jämtland, the surface of which was raised 22 meters, enlarging the lake by more than half, from 9.5 km² to 25 km², engulfing 20 homesteads including the village of Valmåsen (Angelin et.al. 1981:25pp; Hvarfner 1961a:1; Rolén 1991; 1993c:208).

All of the above are consequences that are not easily conveyed on paper. None of the figures, maps, drawings and building plans that were presented before (or after) can ever adequately convey the magnitude of the events that were about to overtake the landscape and its dependent societies (fig. 26). Seeing is believing, and once you’ve seen, it is hard to believe. Initially there were no guidelines, no previous examples on a scale that would have visually conveyed to people the extent of what was about to transpire. In truth no one, least of all those directly effected, could have thoroughly understood and appreciated the size and extent of the sacrifice that the landscape and people of Norrland were being called on to make. With the possible exception of one person, Harald Hvarfner. He was involved in, and later responsible for, many of the cultural and prehistoric surveys and excavations that took place in conjunction with the exploitation of the river systems and thus became a key figure in the early discovery and documentation of Norrland’s prehistory during a short period. We will return to him in following chapters.

Hydro-electric power plants are money machines. They are expensive to built, but inexpensive to maintain, while producing a commodity that has
The economic value of this undertaking led to a wholesale scramble when the time came to exploit this lucrative resource. The State found itself well placed in this respect, as one of the dominate landowners in the North, it possessed the legal rights over many attractive and exploitable river sites. Locations that the State could not take advantage of itself, could be sold to others. In 1909 the State established the 'Royal Power Board' (Sw. Kungliga Vattenfallsverket), forerunner of the ‘Swedish State Power Board’ (Sw. Vattenfall), which would coordinate the activities of all major producers. By the 1980’s the total production of hydro-electricity was more or less equally divided between the State, which provided 31 891 GWh annually, and the private, municipal and other non-governmental bodies which were turning out 30 891 GWh a year (Angelin et.al. 1981:10pp; Lundgren 1987:82pp). Needless to say, the majority of all energy produced in Norrland is controlled by non-regional owners and distributors (see fig. 27 and fig. 33 below).

State dominance in the power producing industry is due to the fact that it took total control and responsibly for the development of the most profitable of Sweden’s water systems, the Lule river. Not only did it assume full ownership over the installations there, it also engineered and constructed

Fig. 26. Lake Fagervikssjön, Medelpad is part of the Gimå water system that empties into the Baltic via the larger Ljungan river. The waters of this lake were raised 5.5 meters, from 196.4 m.a.s.l. to 201.9 m.a.s.l. (thick black line) with the completion of a dam and power station located further downstream in the early 1940’s. What is surprising is not so much the fact that productive forest (shaded) and a number of homes (squares) were laid waste, but the amount of arable land (white) that was destroyed, approximately 30 to 50% or thereabouts. If one also takes into account that the rich fishing grounds of this system were also ruined, add this to what we know about former Norrlandian sustenance strategies, then we are forced to ask; how did anyone expect this enfeebled community to survive after losing two major sources of subsistence? Cogwheel symbols at the northern inflow of the lake indicate a sawmill (left) and a flour mill (right). Based on the ordinance survey map (Sw. Generalstabskartan) Indal 74, here re-drawn and modified.
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them. And in many respects, it was here, along the reaches of the Lule river, that the State re-invented and perfected a social phenomenon which had come into existence long before the beginning of the industrial revolution; those enclosed and hierarchical communities, created out of nothing and completely dependent on the purpose for which they were created. The latest of these came to be known as ‘Waterfall Communities’ inhabited by ‘Waterfall Men, Women and Children’ (Sw. Vattenfallssamhällen & Vattenfallare). Similar to their predecessors, these artificial communities were a highly hierarchical, consisting of skilled construction workers and engineers, sometimes with their families, living in temporary or semi-temporary housing at or near the construction sites in sparsely populated areas and moving from one to the other as circumstances dictated (Bursell 1984).

These migratory construction communities were streamlined and transformed into efficient self-contained mobile urban social units that, within a matter of weeks, could be loaded onto trucks, moved and then re-assembled at the next construction site. They were societies within a society, small models of an emerging welfare-state, miniature examples of the benefits of controlled social engineering. The most famous of these is probably Messaura. Established in the 1950’s out of nothing in the middle of nowhere it provided its 3000 inhabitants with segregated housing, not only according to class and occupational distinctions, but also according to their civil status, bachelor or married. There was a mess hall for white collar workers and a canteen for blue collar workers, a school, a library, grocery stores, a news-stand, a small public hall used for meetings, dances and cinema shows, an infirmary, a sauna, a laundry, a football field, an ice hockey rink, a tennis court and a gas station (Bursell 1984:139pp). The whole family might find itself employed by the power company, the men in construction, maintenance or administration while the women worked in the mess hall.
halls, the laundry, as cleaners or at the school. At its height Messaure was one of the largest inland urban centres in the region, rivalling Jokkmokk, the provincial capital.

Norland, From Promise to Problem

Even as the political consensus was gearing itself up to transform Sweden from a poor, rural and undeveloped country into a modern industrialised welfare-state, Norrlandians increasingly found themselves labouring under a number of disadvantages that would create various social and economic difficulties which have ever since come to characterise this region in the minds of many, endowing Norrland with an unfavourable reputation that is today as persistent as it is undeserved. This is exceedingly odd in light of the fact that Norrlandians, through their farms, iron ore, minerals, hydro-electric power and the many different products from their forests, lakes and rivers, as well as their labour, have all been of great, even decisive, economic import to the Nation, most recently for its development into a welfare-state (Björklund 1994:61; Lundberg 1992:169; Nilsson 1992).

The various pre-industrial communities that had evolved in the North were based on a mixture of different and complementary subsistence strategies in combination with local ecological conditions tempered by diverse cultural preferences. Any prolonged interference or disturbance within either the economic, social, cultural and/or environmental spheres would produce repercussions throughout the whole of this interconnected structure. The advent of the forest industry initiated a cycle of infringements within these communities that continued until the completion of the hydro-electric power projects. All of these intrusions entailed the loss of domestic subsidiary activities, leaving the population increasingly dependent on external auxiliary employment and thus on a cash economy (Bäcklund 1996:241; Edgren & Edgren 1999:236p; Lundgren 1984:11). As viable economic strategies decreased, it escalated the economic vulnerability of the different communities, now made ever more dependent on fewer and fewer sources of income, seriously effecting the ability of these various social constructs to maintain and reproduce themselves, with consequences that are still in evidence today in the haunting spectra of abandoned farms and deserted villages.

The iron and ship building industries were the first to fold in the North, although their passing was economically marginal. Of much more significant consequence was the fate of the sawmills, their greatest expansion occurred at the beginning of the 20th century when three fourths of the Nation’s
timber came from Norrland, making it the world’s largest exporter of lumber. On the eve of the First World War Norrland’s share in the Nation’s export was down to 60%, by the beginning of the Depression to 34% and by World War Two it had fallen to 20% of the national total. The collapse of this economic bubble is know to prosperity as ‘The Demise of the Sawmills’. Exact figures are hard to come by. Sundsvall, located at the centre of this industry, boasted about 60 sawmills in 1900, fifty years later there were 10 which soon fell to three (fig. 28). This crises was brought on by a number of factors. Predatory logging practices and the almost total lack of any kind of rejuvenation program led to an increasing scarcity of prime timber. Growing competition from foreign sources and the disruption of exports caused by the First World War and the Russian revolution. This was followed by an economic slump within the forest industry that lasted throughout the 1920’s, which was intensified by the economic depression of the 1930’s. The initial ascent of the pulp industry, which was not dependent on first class timber, expanded during the 1920’s but could not compensate for the loss of employment opportunities that occurred in the lumber industry (Arpi 1971:114; Andersson-Skö & Bäcklund 1994:87p; Björklund 1994:154pp; Björklund & Nyström 1996:208; Nilsson 1992:144).

The pulp industry also felt the effects of the depression, by the middle of the 20th century the number of mills in the Sundsvall area had fallen from a grand total of twelve down to one (Layton 1994:126).

A decrease in forest resources sharply reduced job opportunities for the seasonally employed lumberjacks. Mechanisation would speed up this process with the introduction of chain saws and tractors from the 1950’s onwards. The construction of hydro-electric power stations and dams imposed an increasing number of physical obstacles to logging while stimulating road building, both of which would indirectly accelerate the increasing use of trucks to transport timber, further minimising the need of seasonal workers. By the 1970’s logging was a rare
The last log drive in Norrland took place in 1982 along the River Ångermanälven (Laestander 1993:296).

The decline of the forest industry was followed by one in construction due to the completion of the hydro-electric power projects during the last quarter of the 20th century. This in turn was accompanied by the depletion of various mineral deposits, leading to the subsequent closure of the mines.

The various artificial communities and homesteads that had been created to serve Norrland’s industrialisation could not survive on their own, as was never indented. Like all instruments or tools, after fulfilling their function, they were discarded. The personal and collective trauma felt by those people who were dependent on these ‘artificial societies’ can only be imagined. Forest-communities such as Norrbyskär was shut down in 1952, Robertsfors in 1968. There is no longer a permanent population on the former, while that of the latter is much diminished. The high watermark of the Colonial cottages, which altogether amounted to about 500 farms, reached its peak in the 1920’s and then declined. The Per Albin Cottages lasted a generation, by the 1960’s most of them had been abandoned. In 1930 there were about 2200 Crown Cottages, by the 1990’s they too had completely disappeared (Bergström 1981:84; Nilsson 1992:146p; Vikström & Bergström 1994:364p). The mining towns Rutjebäcken and Adak were abandoned in 1977 and 1978 respectively. At present Kristineberg is struggling for existence (Pettersson 1994:172pp).

Others have survived, the dressing plant at Boliden and the smelting plant at Rönnskär continue to support local population concentrations by importing and processing ores from around the world (Nilsson 1992:142pp). On completion of the hydro-electric project, those many migratory communities that had been created to build them now disappeared as though they had never existed. Today there is hardly any trace left of their presence. This would be the final fate of most Waterfall communities. The exceptions were left stranded like so much flotsam that reveals the high watermark of the latest, if not the last, wave of Southern expansionism in the North.

Termination of agricultural subsidiaries during the 1960’s hastened the doom of the farming community, which had been in decline throughout the second half of the 20th century (fig. 31; Lundgren 1984:3pp). Loss of income brought on by the demise of those many traditional domestic activities hastened this development (fig. 30). Industrialisation and/or external seasonal employment made rural communities increasingly dependent on a mono economy. The demise of the latter helped insured the demise of the former (SCB 1920; 1927; 1932; 1937; 1944; 1951; 1956; 1961; 1966a; 1970; 1980; 1990; 2000).

Fig. 31. The number of farms larger than 0.25 hectares situated in the coastal and inland areas of the Counties of Västernorrland and Västerbotten between 1920-1981. The depopulation of the country side was dramatic. Some Provinces would lose, on average, one farm every single day throughout the 10 year period of the 1960’s, a decade which is otherwise considered to have been economically expansive (Eivergård 1993:230). Ever since the second half of the 19th century small farmers had become increasingly dependent on external seasonal employment, primarily provided by the forest industry (Lundgren 1984:3; Nilsson 1992:146p; Söderberg & Lundgren 1982:37) so it is not remarkable that the decline of the latter helped insured the demise of the former (SCB 1920; 1927; 1932; 1937; 1944; 1951; 1956; 1961; 1966a; 1970; 1980; 1990; 2000).
responsibility for running the farm. With the men ever further afield and for longer periods of time, women were forced to shoulder ever greater workloads, becoming solely responsible for the continued existence of these farms (Andersson-Flygare 1997:192pp; Bergström 1981:156; Edgren & Edgren 1999:236p; Lundgren 1984:157; Nilsson 1992:146p; Rathje 2001:148pp). Financial records for the years 1925 to 1935 show that the farms located on the Crown Parks generated 58.6-70.3% of a family’s income while 29.7-41.4% came from seasonal employment (Bergström 1981:149). These figures indicate two things. That these homesteads were now dependent on external seasonal income and that the whole system itself would soon cease to function if it was deprived of the labour provided by these women. For women, especially those living on the various cottage farms, seasonal employment meant that they found themselves increasing isolated, far removed from both friends, relations and neighbours as well as from the growing commercial and service centres. One can only imagine what this institutionalised and State sponsored loneliness must have been like. Their men at least had the comradeship of the logging camp or its equivalent, seasonally residing in provisional turf huts located deep in the forests (Lundgren 1984:143pp). This disheartening aspect of rural life ultimately lead increasing numbers of young women to seek employment in the expanding metropolitan areas along the coast. This exodus was augmented by the mechanisation and industrialisation of agriculture, a development which especially reduced employment opportunities for women in this sector. Further incitement came from the fact that women, for half the amount of work, could earn four to five times more in the expanding urban centres. The resulting mass departure of women from the countryside soon made itself demographically conspicuous. For single individuals between the ages of 20-35 years, men soon out numbered women by two to one. This un-proportional ratio in the rural areas left a growing number of farms and villages inhabited by bachelors, communities of loneliness, which today stand empty and abandoned (Andersson Flygare 1997:198pp; Arpi 1971:36; Daun 1968:55; Isacson 1997; Larsson 1968:135; Lundgren 1984:143pp; Olofsson 1983:96p).

One of Norrland’s greatest assets has always been its own population, composed of a well education and skilled work force. During the third quarter of the 20th century, large portions of this human

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Southern Sweden</th>
<th></th>
<th>Norrland</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>population (million)</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientists</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3278</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21 786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>17 556</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93 846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11 835</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>244 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20 063</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade A bookstores</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23 759</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29 756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National museums</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>790 000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional museums</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>35 706</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58 095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/village museums</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>8 646</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7 011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General scientific libraries</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1 580 000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 220 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialised libraries</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>56 937</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>406 667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional public libraries</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>67 234</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58 095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/school libraries</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17 904</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16 944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1 580 000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 32. A comparison between northern and southern Sweden’s cultural and educational workers and institutions for the years 1955-1958 in relation to their respective populations, both total and per capita (Albinsson 1964; Boalt 1964). Apart from a few notable exceptions, Norrland often found itself far behind the rest of the Nation in this area. The general scientific library, the nucleus of the future University library in Umeå, was founded in 1958 (Söderlind 1963:123). What these figures don’t show is that Norrlandians, through the taxes they paid, also contributed to the maintenance of the National museums and other cultural institutions, all located in southern Sweden and thus relatively inaccessible for anyone living in the North. Furthermore, the net wage in Norrland was then about 20% lower than the national average, the ratio between doctors/patients was twice as high, while Norrland had the greatest number of substitute teachers and by far the highest rate of un-employed (Albinsson 1964:124pp; Söderberg & Lundgren 1982:52; Söderlind 1963:171).
resource was lost due to lack of job opportunities, forcing them southwards where their talents were highly welcomed (Bäcklund 1996:244; Dahl 1983:33; Larsson 1968; Söderlind 1963:160). Those who were not forced to leave the region altogether, congregated in the largest urban centres situated along the coast. Once initiated, this process soon became self-sustaining. Both private consumption and taxable revenue sharply decreased as people left the rural areas, irrevocably leading to localised economic and social decline. The first to fold were the small shops and businesses. These were accompanied, or soon followed, by the demise of various social services, which relocated to the larger urban centres. Increasing centralisation accelerates depopulation, which in turn leads to a further round in the decline of local businesses and services. A sure sign of a community on the brink of extinction is when the local school closes its doors.

The re-location of the population was accompanied by an increasing consolidation of the region’s natural resources into the hands of a minimal number of non-regional owners, State and private.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>owners</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The State Power Board</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydkraft</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm Municipality</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Municipalities</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graningeverken</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gullspångs Kraft</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo &amp; Domsjö</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 33. The consolidation of Norrland’s resources into the hand of a few actors is exemplified by the hydro-electric power industry as of 1995. It is interesting to note that this valuable resource is to a very large extent controlled by non-regional proprietors. For example, the Municipality of Stockholm owns a greater share than the three Northern municipalities of Skellefteå, Umeå and Jämtland combined. Additional large non-regional owners are Sydkraft and Gullspångs Kraft. The forest industry is also heavily involved, Mo & Domsjö is part or sole owner of 30 hydro-electric power stations in the North. It is joined by some of Europe’s largest forest industries, Graningeverken, Stora AB and SCA, all of which own considerable amounts of Norrland’s power resources (Angelin et al. 1981:10; Arpi 1959; 1971:82; Burton 1991a:338pp; 1991b:335; Lamontagne 1991:317pp; Landström 1996:285; Westlin 1996:285).

Before the advent of nuclear power in the 1970’s, Norrland was producing about 82% of Sweden’s hydro-electric power, three fourths of which was exported and put to work in southern Sweden (Angelin et al. 1981:119; Arpi 1971:56; Söderlind 1963:65). This lucrative resource is today controlled by an exclusive group of non-regional owners, of...
which the State is by far the largest (fig. 33). This stands in sharp contrast with circumstances as they existed at the beginning of the century, when the energy industry was divided up among a number of local and regional entrepreneurs (Rolén 2000; Westlin 1996:285).

By the middle of the 20th century the iron mines of Norrbotten were producing just over 75% of the Nation’s entire output of iron ore, of which 85-96% was exported out of the country instead of being regionally refined (Jonsson 1987:316; Söderlind 1963:57). Up until then, the majority of all iron and steel had been produced by mills situated in the County of Gävleborg and southern Sweden (Andersson 1926:254). Efforts to amend this situation were undertaken in 1906 with the establishment of an iron mill at the port of Luleå in Norrbotten. Increasingly profitable, this plant was viewed as a serious threat by Southern competitors. After running into financial difficulties in the early 1920’s, it was acquired by these Southern interests, who soon shut it down and then had it dismantled (Nilsson 1992:143p). In 1940 the State established, at Luleå, its own iron and steel mill, the so called Norrbotten Iron Works (Sw. Norrbottens Järnverk - NJA). By the middle of the 20th century pig and cast iron from this mill amounted to 10-27% and 15-44% of the Nation’s total respectively, while its share of the Nation’s steel production rose from 1.4% to 15% of the total. By the 1970’s the mill at Luleå was one of the largest in the country, but the majority of the iron ore from the mines of Norrbotten was still being exported out of the region (Arpi 1971; Eriksson 1995:70; Jonsson 1987:301; Nilsson 1992:149). Northern iron and mining industries are today almost totally dominated by the Swedish State via its controlling interests in both SSAB (Svensk Stål AB) and LKAB respectively (Burton 1991b:335pp; Nyström 1996:202p; Petersson 1994:289).

The forest industry is dominated by four companies, SCA (Svenska Cellulosa AB), Mo & Domsjö, Stora AB (previously Stora Kopparbergs Bergslags AB) and the State via Assi-Domän (previously ASSI), who together now own half of all the forests, and most of the pulp and paper mills, in Norrland (Burton 1991a:340; Hugosson & Hössjer 1990:81; Lamontagne 1991:317pp; Gaunitz 1995a:160; 1995b:295p). Throughout the 20th century the Nation’s total production of pulp has been produced by factories situated along the coast of Norrland, while the vast majority the Nation’s paper and cardboard has been produced in southern Sweden (Andersson 1926:234pp; Hjulström 1950:334). Figures for the third quarter of the 20th century show that Norrlandian’s were producing 60% of the Nation’s wood pulp but only 12% of its paper
(Söderlind 1963:43). By the end of the century Norrland was producing 40% of the Nation’s paper while a third of its wood pulp was still being exported out of the area and refined elsewhere (Gaunitz 1995c:376p). Recent figures show that 70% of all lumber produced in Northern sawmills is exported out of the region (Björklund & Nyström 1996:208). In contrast to the South, the North has never substantially managed to refine this indigenous resource through the establishment of its own carpentry and/or furniture industry (Andersson 1926:245; Hjulström 1950:313; Lundgren 1984:3p).

Despite the demise and down-sizing of Northern industries and the reduction of its population through emigration, Norrland was, and still is, a major contributor to the Swedish economy, while its population is still one of the most productive in the entire Nation (fig. 36; Gidlund & Sörlin 1992:204p; Lassinantti 1972:201; Nilsson 1992). However, Norrland has remained socio-politically and culturally dependent on the South while simultaneously possessing an abundance of vital raw materials, a renewable energy source and a well educated population. There are at least three inter-related factors why this is so. The first concerns its economic dependency on the export of a few basic resources, making it highly sensitive to any external economic fluctuations. Secondary processing and manufacturing capabilities in Norrland have numerically increased during the second half of the 20th century, yet are marginal in comparison with the amount of un-refined resources that are still being exported out of the region. The second factor is compounded by the first. It concerns the concentration of these natural assets into the hands of a few select companies, the largest and most important of which are located outside the region. Any decisions concerning Norrlandian resources that may radically effect the survival of the people and communities dependent on them are thus effectively removed or divorced from any regional and/or local considerations, wants or needs. This lack of socioeconomic accountability is paralleled by a third factor, the rise of a remarkable degree of political centralisation. Ever since the Middle Ages the State has repeatedly succeeded in establishing, asserting and renewing its power over the North through the implementation of a mono political privilege system, by which the powers that be have gained and exercised their exclusive right to grant access privileges to Northern resources, distributing them among competing interest groups in exchange for taxable revenue and/or political support. The latest manifestation of this strategy is clearly exemplified by the fact that some of Stockholm’s most recent and prominent taxpayers include such notables as LKAB, Boliden and the hydro-electric power companies (Balgård 1970:81; Bylund 1996:215; Lundgren 1987:104pp; Lundkvist 1980:202pp; Nilsson 1992:148pp; Rolén 1993a:175; 2000:134; Söderberg et.al. 2002:25; Söderlind 1963:64 & 71).

Archaeology and the Nation-State

The idea of progress, evolution and the universal advancement of humankind passing through ever higher stages of complexity, can be traced back to the philosophy of the Enlightenment. These ideas became part and parcel of the industrial revolution, of liberal capitalism, of the growing and prosperous upper and middle classes and of archaeology. But even as the Enlightenment’s historical idea of progress became imbedded in the political, economic and social institutions of Europe, other ideals were lost. Concepts concerning the natural rights and the universal advancement of all peoples, everywhere, did not survive. They were replaced by doctrines
coming out of the national-romantic movement, where the nation-state is viewed as the natural entity, exercising exclusive claims over political, social, territorial and economic rights. The national-romantic philosophers reserved the concept of historical progress for an exclusive few, a people united within one nation. This coincided with the manufacture of a number of original national identities moulded around the idea of a common history, language, ethnic origin and racial stock. It was within this intellectual and social environment that the discipline of archaeology evolved and its members moved. Willingly or not, the values of the nation-building project, augmented by contemporary issues and concerns, found their way into archaeology through existing social channels (Baudou 1997:66; Hampson 1982:218pp; Palmer & Colton 1971:646; Sklenár 1983:59).

Questions concerning the identity of Scandinavia’s original inhabitants clearly illustrates this situation. Scanty skeletal evidence led Sven Nilsson to propose that the ancestors of the present day Sámi population were the first to settle the Nordic countries, an assumption he would later retract. Montelius, while acknowledging the presence of both long dolichocranial and a short brachycranial individuals in the southern Swedish Stone Age material, was hesitant. The former were understood as representing the forefathers of today’s Nordic population, while any affiliation between the latter and the present day Sámi population remained questionable (Montelius 1874b:98pp).

‘The Arctic Stone Age Culture’ was coined by the Norwegian archaeologist Oluf Rugh to describe the northern Stone Age with its characteristic slate artefacts, so different from the flint based technology of southern Scandinavia. Rugh concluded that these objects of slate and flint respectively represented two prehistoric populations, a northern Sámi and southern Nordic (Christiansson 1963:10; Montelius 1874b). The methodological implications of Rugh’s essentialist argument, equating material culture with a distinct people or race, had a profound impact on archaeological thinking, most often exemplified by the work of the German archaeologist Gustaf Kossinna who later delineated ‘cultural provinces’ throughout northern Europe according to the distribution of various archaeological materials (Baudou 1997:128 & 160; 1999b:121p; 2000a:13; 2002a:57p; Moberg 1948:292). Montelius initially accepted Rugh’s assumption, while rejecting the notion that the distribution of slate artefacts found in southern Sweden represented a Sámi presence, at least in those areas.

Returning to this subject in 1884, Montelius outlines the shifting sequence of various features and artefacts, from the Stone Age to the Iron Age, concluding that cultural development in southern Scandinavia had continued interrupted since the Younger Stone Age, when it was settled by a dolichocranial Germanic people composed of Danes, Goths, Swedes and Norwegians. He recognises the existence of a brachycranial race in southern Sweden, a people that might have been there before the arrival of the Nordic population, but denies that these short skulled individuals represent the remains of any Sámi or Finnish people who might once have occupied the area in the past (Montelius 1884:28pp).

In a monograph from 1903 entitled ‘Prehistory’ Montelius again discusses the relationship between the dolichocranial and brachycranial peoples. The former are now quite definitely the forefathers of today’s Nordic population that arrived in southern Scandinavia during the Younger Stone Age while the latter might or might not be the remains of an older population and/or the ancestors of the Sámi (Montelius 1903:50pp).

In 1917 Montelius reinstates the same basic opinion he expressed in 1884, with one addition, that southern Scandinavia and the adjoining north-western corner of Germany was the original homeland of the Germanic people, who settled these areas sometime during the Younger Stone Age. They soon expanded northwards until they occupied the southern two thirds of Norway, all of Sweden up to and including Jämtland, Ångermanland and the southern and coastal areas of the Province of Västerbotten, the coastal regions of northern Germany and Poland, the Baltic countries, and the coastal areas of Finland. The possible existence of an earlier population in southern Scandinavia prior to the arrival of this Nordic race is left un-addressed (Montelius 1917a; 1917b:8). What is noticeably different, is his marked tone of superiority when presenting his opinions. We are now told that “...the beautiful and tasteful shape...” of their stone tools clearly indicates that the “...Germanic artefacts were indisputably superior [in comparison with] those from other parts of Europe.” (Montelius 1917a:402).

In his presentation of Scandinavia’s prehistory, significantly entitled ‘Our Prehistory’ (Sw. Vår forntid) from 1919, Montelius finally resolves the
dilemma as to who first occupied southern Scandinavia; it was the long skulled dolichocranial forefathers of the present day Nordic population. It is rather surprising that he even cites toponymical evidence as proof that these Germanic people had inhabited southern Scandinavia since the end of the last Ice Age (Montelius 1919:14).

Consequently, it is our people who first establish settlements here in Sweden. It is our people that year after year, century after century, millennium after millennium worked and strove to make this country what it is today. We have not, as have the pioneers in so many other countries, with weapons in hand, taken this country from another people (Montelius 1921:71, the italics are in the original).

In a final article, published posthumously the same year he passed away, we learn that Scandinavia’s first settlers were the dolichocranial Nordic race, the purest descendants of the Cro-Magnon or Aryan people (Montelius 1921:408pp). Northernmost Sweden and Finland had initially been inhabited by a population of Sámi and Finnish peoples respectively, who arrived out of the east. Exactly when this had occurred was still unknown. He also assures his readers that the short skulled brachycranial population in southern Scandinavia had arrived there from south-eastern Europe thousands of years after the arrival of the Aryans. Who these later people might have been is never made clear, but they did not replace, or even seriously intermix with, the original Aryans. No matter who they might have been, they were definitely not the forefathers of either the Sámi or Finnish people (Montelius 1919:77; 1921:403pp). Once again he emphasises that;... it is with every right we say: Our forefathers have lived in Sweden for 15.000 years. When they came here, that which is now known as Sweden was uninhabited. We inhabited a country, which we did not take from any other people. We, the Swedish people, have ourselves ‘made’ our country, founded homesteads and cleared roads. These are unusually good title deeds (Montelius 1921:408).}

Having once arrived in southern Scandinavia from somewhere out of central Europe, this Aryan race developed into the first and most original of the Germanic peoples; the Danes, Swedes, Goths and the Norwegians. This occurred during the Stone Age and coincided with a slow outward expansion that had engulfed the whole of Europe by the second half of the Iron Age (Montelius 1921:407p).
The colonisation of the past was continued by other scholars, such as Gunnar Ekholm, who unequivocally pursued this line of reasoning by embarking upon that polemical exchange with his Finnish colleges which was outlined in Chapter One. He continued to populate large areas of northern Europe with a Swedish presence that, at least metaphorically, ended in the creation of a European empire larger than the one Sweden had acquired through its military might during the course of the 17th century. According to Ekholm, the original homeland of the Germanic people, as presented by Montelius, was much too narrow. Instead he forcefully maintained that by the end of the last Ice Age, these people, his ancestors, inhabited all of Scandinavia and much of northern Europe, from the shores of the Arctic ocean in the north to the Harz Mountains in central Germany while their eastward extension included all of the coastal areas along the southern, eastern and northern shores of the Baltic together with a rather large chunk of Finland (Ekholm 1923a; 1925; Olsén 1978:13p).

The ethnocentric and historic essentialism, so prevalent within the walls of the Royal Academy and the Archaeology Department at Uppsala, reached its peak during the first half of the 20th century, as exemplified by the work of Sune Lindqvist, professor of archaeology at Uppsala 1928-1952 and Birger Nerman, director of the State Historical Museum 1938-1954. Treating the Icelandic Ynglingatal Saga and the Anglo-Saxon Beowulf Poem as historical documents, they endeavoured and succeeded in convincing themselves and their contemporaries that it was possible, not only to equate certain types of archaeological features and artefacts with particular races and ethnic groups, but also to specific individuals. The ‘dynastic mounds’ at Old Uppsala and the prominent ‘royal grave’ known as Otta’s Mound at Husaby, were now identified as the last resting place for a number of kingly individuals mentioned in the legends. These speculations would, with time, prove themselves to be exactly that. Until then they were widely accept as facts, but also loyally fulfilled their duties as guardians of the Nation (Lindqvist 1937 as cited in Baudou 1997:236).

The inherent essentialism conveyed here is the logical outcome of that nation-building project that was initiated over one hundred years earlier by the New Goths, resulting in the fabrication of a new national heritage, into which both Lindqvist and his contemporaries were schooled through the use of ‘The Governmental Primer’.

The prevailing values and attitudes of the nation-building project are plainly visible in the provisional exhibition entitled Ten Thousand Years in Sweden (Sw. Tiotusen år i Sverige) which opened in April of 1943 at the State Historical Museum, just recently installed in the buildings it still occupies at present. This provisional exhibit, and its accompanying publications, was one of the largest archaeological undertakings of the period (Baudou 2002a:66p). In the introduction to the exhibition catalogue, Sigurd Curman (1879-1966) Royal Antiquarian since 1923, refers to the cultural mission of the museum in terms that are almost identical with those he used twenty years previously;
Without a doubt the opinion must be held that it is of the greatest significance that all the social classes be enlightened concerning the main developments of our country’s and people’s history, on the importance of the work and hardships of bygone generations and on the remarkable continuity of our society over many thousands of years of existence. This knowledge might well constitute the strongest foundation for a healthy patriotism and a reliable spirit of citizenship. To provide this knowledge in a captivating and convincing way to a wider audience, this is our museum’s great social mission (Curman 1943a:VII-VIII, compare with Curman 1928 as quoted in Pettersson 2001:135).

Now, surrounded by a world at war, the unifying ideals of the national, romantic and historical approach were explicitly employed, through archaeology, in order to present a unified front against all threats, external and internal.

The remaining 42 pages of the exhibition catalogue were written by Birger Nerman and are as revealing as Curman’s introduction. Not only is the doctrine of essentialism taken for granted, we are also informed that the Swedish state is the oldest in Europe with origins in the 8th century (Nerman 1943:30 & 34). The exaggerated national chauvinism expressed in these pages does not encompass the North, which is hardly mentioned, receiving just over half a page. Norrland’s peripheral standing is further emphasised by the way in which the South and North are contrasted and inadvertently played off against each other. We are told that during the course of the Neolithic, artefacts made out of flint and green-stone reach a level of sophistication unsurpassed in the Old World. On the same page we read that slate and quartz were utilised in Norrland (Nerman 1943:13). Only Greece can compete with Scandinavia in the richness and brilliance of its Bronze Age, a development that Norrland played no part in (Nerman 1943:16pp & 20). And, as already noted above, economic progress and social elaboration during the Iron Age resulted in the early establishment of the Swedish realm, all of which exclusively occurred in the South (Nerman 1943:33pp). There is a message here, possibly not intentional and only discretely perceptible, and it says: Sweden does indeed possess a glorious past and a wonderful heritage, to which Norrland has contributed nothing.

While academic archaeology was domesticating the past by filling it with a population of choice, others proceeded to nationalise heritage management.

Heritage Institutionalised

The New Gothic Revival manufactured a unifying identity for the new Nation-State. During the course of the 19th century a controversy arose over who was best situated to administer and thus ultimately define, determine and mediate this newly contrived heritage, the central authorities or the many regional antiquarian societies and/or heritage associations (Curman 1926; 1936; 1943b; Johnsson 1923). The question over whether this activity should be centralised or de-centralised was resolved during Sigurd Curman’s term as Royal Antiquarian (1923-1946). Basically, this was achieved by creating an independent and efficient governmental department, the Central Board of National Antiquities, making it the leading curator and broker of the country’s cultural heritage through the implementation of three organisational and judicial reforms; the establishment of a national network of regional antiquarians, the transformation of the Office of the Royal Antiquarian into an official governmental department in the modern sense of the word, and by the enactment of a new and comprehensive antiquarian legislation.

The first measure was realised in 1927 through the creation of a trust fund, the proceeds from which were used to engage a full-time director for each of the provincial museums that had been established through the efforts of the various regional antiquarian and/or heritage movements. These regional and hitherto semi-independent cultural-historians were thus transformed into ‘Provincial Antiquarians’ (Sw. landsantikvarier), responsible for the administration and maintenance of all ancient relicts and remains within their respective provinces, yet dependent on, and answerable to, the central antiquarian authorities in Stockholm (Arcadius 1991; Brännman 1962:52pp; Curman 1963:15p; Grundberg 1999:64; Pettersson 2001:238p). In effect, the Royal Antiquarian managed to consolidate and vindicate authority over the previously autonomous regional capabilities by converting them into compliant civil servants.

The second step towards complete centralised control over the Nation’s cultural heritage took place in 1938 when the Central Board of National Antiquities was formally constituted. Up until then, the Office of the Royal Antiquarian had figured as a clearing house, somewhat haphazardly, for errands concerning the management of ancient remains. Now it became an official government department headed by a Director-General with its own staff and well
defined duties that now included responsibility for legal questions together with the administration and supervision of all surveys and excavations (Baudou 1991; 1992:34; 1997:200; 2000b:200; Curman 1943b; Pettersson 2001:9pp).

The third event that secured the Central Board of National Antiquities’ monopoly over the Nation’s antiquarian administration occurred in 1942 when the law protecting ancient remains was reformed and strengthened, definitely establishing the government’s prerogative over all matters concerning cultural heritage (Curman 1943b). The consolidation of this institution, which had commenced some one hundred years previously with the installation of Bror Emil Hildebrand as Royal Antiquarian in 1837, was now complete, thus transforming the State into the foremost arbitrator and custodian of the Nation’s heritage (Baudou 2000b; Beckman 1999:26pp; Bohman 1997:83pp; 1999:96pp; Curman 1943b; Grundberg 1999:79; Janson 1974:202pp).

The pivotal position of this organisation was further emphasised in 1938, with the realisation of that 300 year old dream, the implementation of an extensive, nation-wide, centrally managed and controlled, antiquarian survey. This came about when it was decided that ancient remains should be included on the new Economic Map, a comprehensive cartographic publication that would cover all of southern Sweden, but not the whole of Norrland (fig. 38). Thus, to all intents and purposes, the Central Board of National Antiquities was also empowered with defining that which constitutes a prehistoric remain together with the creation of a standardised register based on a uniform classification scheme founded in a fixed nomenclature. The result would be a highly regimented and standardised cultural heritage as defined and presented by a chosen few (Curman 1936; Gren 2000; Hallström & Gustawsson 1930; Magnusson-Staaf 2000; Selinge 1989:16pp).

Any project of this type involves choices based on values that will ultimately influence the results in ways that are not immediately apparent. Consequently, even though archaeological ambitions ran high and the total number of features earmarked for documentation was great, the vast majority of sites that were registered by the Central Board of National Antiquities during that so called ‘first or prehistoric survey’, completed in 1977, consisted of graves; either mounds, cairns, barrows or stone settings, as well as stone cists, dolmens and passage graves together with various types of standing stones, rock carvings, hillforts, rune stones, church ruins, fortifications, castles, certain types of roads and bridges as well as early traces of iron working (Gren 2000; Hellervik 2000:107; Hyenstrand 1967; 1978; Janson 1962a:66; Selinge 1969b; 1974a; 1989:17; Winberg 1978).

These categories are both familiar and strikingly similar to those set forth in 1666, 1760 and again in 1828, and to those which caught the imagination of the New Goths and other national-romantics. This is hardly surprising, archaeological preoccupation with graves has a long tradition in Sweden, starting in the 17th century with interest in ‘royal’ mounds, an engrossment that was re-kindled during the 19th century through the excessive excavations at Birka (1870’s), Old Uppsala (1846, 1847 & 1874) and Häga (1902), augmented by the discovery of the ship burials at the Vendel (1881), Tuna (1893) and Välsgärde (1928), all of which are situated in Uppland. This interest was furthered by Lindqvist’s and Nerman’s investigations into various ‘dynastic’ mounds during the first half of the 20th century, linked by their common desire to trace the origins of the Swedish nation as far back into the past as possible (Ambrosiani 1964:225; 1980; 1985:109).

It is hardly an exaggeration to characterise traditional archaeology in Sweden as research into graves. This is illustrated, not least, by the actual distribution of available resources. Millions are annually invested in the excavation of graves, the surveying of graves and the planning for their future preservation. Research, legislation and projects have all intuitively worked in co-operation starting from the hypothesis that graves are a good mirror of prehistoric society. The graves constitute the best means of communication between prehistoric men and archaeologists, they form the most important basis of our knowledge. This is a natural consequence of the structure of the archaeological material in Sweden (Hyenstrand 1979a:37p).

Many or most of the features earmarked for documentation by the Central Board of National Antiquities do not, or only marginally, occur in Norrland. Two additional features, one particular to, the other distinctive of, Norrland, were initially not recorded at all. These are hunting pits and dwelling sites of ‘Stone Age character’. The first was simply not considered ancient enough to be included. The latter was excluded as a result of a directive from the Central Board of National Antiquities (Sw. Rikets Allmänna Kartverk)
which specified that only those remains which were clearly visible above ground, and thus could be precisely delimited, were to be included on the new map, a requirement that is difficult if not impossible to accomplish when dealing with sites of this type. Thus sites of ‘Stone Age character’ together with a number of other prehistoric and historic features were not routinely registered at this time, even though there was no formal nor methodical obstacle that prevented their documentation. The objection raised by the Map Office only concerned those features that were to be included on the printed map, it did not infringe on the working procedures adopted by the Central Board of National Antiquities or place limits on what they should, or should not, record. Probably the greatest hindrance towards the inclusion of these, and other types of remains, was the enormity of the task and the employment of an inadequate surveying methodology that cannot effectively detect sites that lack distinguishing features above ground (Loeffler 1999b; Selinge 1989:18p).

Hyenstrand, probably more than anyone else, understood the potential of this antiquarian archive, an insight that lead to a succession of interesting publications concerning the pragmatic and theoretical implications of this project (e.g. Hyenstrand 1975; 1979a; 1979b; 1984). No one was unaware that the ‘National Register of Ancient Monuments’ contained a number of shortcomings, nor did this contingency go entirely unchecked by those involved in this undertaking. Policy changes in order expand and extend the usefulness of the Register through the documentation of a wider spectrum of remains began long before the finalization of this ‘first’ survey (Bertilsson & Winberg 1978:99p; Hallberg 1974; Hellervik 2000:107; Hyenstrand 1979b:9p; 1984:9, 34 & 211p; Selinge 1969b; 1989:19; 1978; Winberg 1978).

This is not to imply that this undertaking was or is useless. A number of noteworthy doctoral dissertations would be produced using material generated by this project (Selinge 1989:32 note 57). The first of these all specifically base their assumptions on the presence or absence of burials in order to explore emergent settlement patterns from the Iron Age on up until early historic times in Södermanland (Ambrosiani 1964) in Uppland and neighbouring areas (Hyenstrand 1974) and in Medelpad (Selinge 1979).

Notwithstanding all of the above, and with the benefit of hindsight, it is evident that Norrland was evaluated, not on its own merits, but according to circumstances as they appear through Southern perspectives. This is moderately evident in Hyenstrand’s dissertation where southern Norrland during the Iron Age is viewed as Uppland’s hinterland (Hyenstrand 1974) but even more so in Selinge’s presentation, where he is quite unequivocal;

...Norrland is by tradition poor in ancient monuments, there are large tracts of wilderness between the settled river valleys... [and] ...even if we take into consideration topographical and cultural source critical differences - the number of graves in Norrland shows that it must have been an appendage of the Märlar Valley region during the Bronze and Iron Ages (Selinge 1978:78p).
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Selinge views the distribution of the Iron Age graves on the fertile areas along the coast and river valleys of Medelpad as evidence of sedentary agricultural communities founded by southern immigrants who were involved in reciprocal relationships, economic and ideological, with similar communities in the Mälar Valley to the south and with Norway in the west. These pioneers also found themselves confronted with a Stone Age population living along their hinterlands, which they profitably exploited, apparently to the satisfaction and prosperity of both. He believes that this symbiotic relationship, between one single Stone Age culture and one single Iron Age culture, endured, at least in some areas, up until the Middle Ages (Selinge 1979:194pp). This scenario is reminiscent of the recent historical accounts as they concern the spread of the iron, forest and power industries during historic times, which established themselves along the coast and the river valleys, each respectively exploiting an underdeveloped hinterland. Prehistoric or historic, developments in Norrland are ultimately portrayed as being completely dependent on conditions as they exist elsewhere.

The significance of this, contrary to circumstances as they exist in southern Sweden, lies in the fact that a preponderance of Norrland’s prehistoric past consists of those very remains that were not, or only fragmentarily, included in the first round of this so called ‘comprehensive and nation-wide prehistoric survey’. Conversely, southern Sweden’s past was abundantly represented in the prehistoric remains and features that were slotted for documentation. Whether acknowledged or not, subjective choices were being made according to value judgements founded in normative categories embedded in Southern conceptions, far removed from Norrlandian experiences.

Methods, time and money all set limits as concerns how much is recorded during the course of any antiquarian survey. But finite resources do not adequately explain why certain types of remains are systematically slotted for documentation, restoration, preservation and/or presentation, while others are not. The antiquarian survey that commenced in 1938 was proceeded by a good 280 years of cultural bias and tradition that had directed a considerable amount of ideological and symbolic capital towards specific types of sites located in the South, some of which, during the first half of the 20th century, were elevated to the status of national monuments and/or memorials, to be managed, promoted and made accessible to the citizens of the new Nation-State by the central antiquarian authorities. This is reflected in the writings of Karl-Alfred Gustawsson (b.1897) who, after Curman, was directly responsible for the antiquarian survey and heritage management from 1938-1963. His scholarly production is revealing, with a preponderance for questions concerning the well-being and welfare of those now familiar

Fig. 39. The so called ‘first or prehistoric survey’ lasted almost 40 years and resulted in the registration of about 11 000 remains annually, the majority were graves of some sort, located in the southern half of the country. Production of the new Economic map was limited, thinly populated areas were not included in this ‘nation-wide’ cartographical undertaking. Thus not all of Sweden was archaeologically surveyed (shaded area), large parts of Lappland and a good sized chuck of Jämtland were excluded (illustration source Winberg 1978, here re-drawn and modified). The upper half of northern Lappland was partly surveyed from the air using a helicopter (Hyenstrand 1967:100p), a method that was possibly not appropriate under the circumstances, much of that region lies hidden beneath the forest canopy. In light of this one can only conclude that Hyenstrand later understates this case when he says; “Large areas of the mountain regions and the northern inland were...only partially surveyed. Large amounts of [different] prehistoric remains, not least those of Sámi origin, are unevenly or insufficiently recorded.” (Hyenstrand 1979b:10).

Selinge views the distribution of the Iron Age graves on the fertile areas along the coast and river valleys of Medelpad as evidence of sedentary agricultural communities founded by southern immigrants who were involved in reciprocal relationships, economic and ideological, with similar communities in the Mälar Valley to the south and with Norway in the west. These pioneers also found themselves confronted with a Stone Age population...
categories: graves, hillforts, strongholds, rune stones, as well as for various types of secular and ecclesiastical buildings or ruins, together with their local environments (Baudou 1997:227p; Floderus & Gustawsson 1946:303pp; Gustafsson 1933; 1949a; 1950; 1952; 1956; 1959; 1960; 1964; 1965; 1970; Nyman 1946:171).

The dominance of Southern conceptions as they pertain to heritage management and maintenance becomes even more conspicuous if we look at the number and type of sites owned by the Royal Academy and placed under the direct care and supervision of the Central Board of National Antiquities (fig. 40; Gustawsson 1959). The majority of these sites consist of prehistoric grave mounds, seconded by fortifications, Medieval strongholds, historical manor houses together with other ecclesiastical and secular sites or buildings. Once again we see that Norrland’s share of the national heritage as defined by that governmental office and paid for with public funds falls far below any national average, however calculated. Not only is southern Sweden numerically favoured, but also symbolically. The type of sites and features selected for special treatment, both secular and ecclesiastical, are elitist, they are representative of those very same groups that have, during different periods, benefited the most from that enduring and asymmetrical relationship between North and South.

The supposed uniformity of the Nation’s heritage as defined during the last 200 years will continue to perpetuate itself until a deliberate and conscientious effort concerning the legitimacy of this ideological edifice is seriously questioned, challenged and then replaced by a viable option that provides room for divergent values, views and norms.

Identity as Dogmatic Heritage

Swedish national identity and heritage was codified in the 19th century. The normative influences arising out of the collectivist nature of this national thought-style as they concern the meditation and reproduction of identity and heritage have proven themselves to be both persuasive, deep-rooted and long-lived. In light of this, one must pause to ask, notwithstanding all our academic sophistication, if we today are any less immune to the numbing effects that this dogmatic cultural regimentation seems to entail? Apparently not, as the following example clearly shows.

Nineteen ninety-three was declared to be ‘The Year of Swedish History’, initiated with the intention of underlining the importance of history and/or cultural
heritage, these two terms being often employed more or less uncritically, as if they were synonymous. This national campaign involved both the State Historical and the Nordic Museums, most of the county and provincial museums, together with schools, workshops, the mass media and various heritage associations, each of which was to present a different aspect or theme taken from Sweden's history (Rentzhog 1993a:7). The universities are not mentioned in this connection.

This project probably could not have occurred at a less opportune time. During the last quarter of the 20th century Sweden was slowly overtaken by the reviving economies of those war-torn countries that had initially given Sweden its economic headstart. Its GNP began to decline and by 1990, according to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Sweden fell from its previous top position to 8th place among the industrialised nations. This economic slide had already begun twenty years earlier through the repeated devaluation of its currency, first in 1973 and then again in 1976, 1977, 1981 and 1982, in order to try and stimulate its economic growth. This negative spiral was augmented by increasing expenditures incurred by the government through interest rates on international loans which were taken to cover its budget deficit, brought on by excessive spending in order to cover the rising costs of its welfare programs. The bubble finally burst, in conjunction with the international economic depression of the 1990’s, accompanied by inflation, bankruptcies, massive unemployment and huge cut backs in government spending, most notably in the social services and welfare sectors (Larsson 1999b:318p; Lundgren 1992:115). These economic woes were accompanied by wave of xenophobia and the emergence of racist and neo-nazi groups that grew ever bolder and more outspoken, openly roaming the streets and proclaiming the doctrine of white supremacy and the virtues of racial and ethnic purity. Periodically this erupted into outright violence with cross burning, fire bombings and murders. The apprehension created by these developments was compounded by the foundation of a new political party, ‘The New Democracy’ (Sw. Ny Demokrati) which was blatantly racist and frankly hostile to refugees, immigrants and other foreigners. By systematically exploiting the socio-economic anxieties of the majority, the representatives of this party created an atmosphere of suspicion and fear directed towards the Nation’s minorities, pitting the purely fictitious interests of the former against that of the latter. Employing arguments that were oversimplified, grossly chauvinistic and exceedingly ethnocentric, this party managed to get itself elected to the Swedish parliament in 1991 with 6.7% of the popular vote (Gardberg 1993:105-106 &118; Tistelgren 1993:5; Ungerson 1992:40pp).

It was against this backdrop that ‘The Year of Swedish History’ opened with the expressed aim of;
racial and or ethnic purity and affiliation have been discreetly omitted (see also Baudou 1993; Bohman 1997:134pp; Rentzho 1999).

The uncritical regurgitation of these concepts are possibly as tragic as they are predictable. The development and extension of the Swedish national history and heritage has not favoured a view of society as a conglomerate of shifting communities, possessing characteristics distinct and particular unto themselves, which might have little in common with accounts as experienced and presented by southern Swedish intellectuals. This is, of course, to be expected. The nation-building project is founded on the doctrine that the nation-state is a one and indivisible. Archaeology seemly proves this assertion by providing the community with symbolic continuity and collective memory that irrefutably connects the past with the present. The success of this dissimulation should not be underestimated, it has become normative to such a degree that alternatives are difficult to come by. Dogmatic heritage for everyone.

Concluding Remarks and Summary

The assumption that archaeological research and accounts of the past are advertently or inadvertently susceptible to implicit and/or explicit interests and influences external to the subject itself, requires and deserves serious consideration from its practitioners. Any attempt to do so necessitates an initial and critical assessment of those essentials deemed pertinent for the creation and maintenance of this assumed relationship as illustrated in Figure 1. The case study under review here concerns Norrland, a region habitually described as a colony and frequently ignored in those general overviews that profess to present Sweden’s heritage and history, one conceivable consequence arising out of a prolonged and unbalanced relationship between these two regions. The legitimacy of this assumption was researched using literary sources that were readily available and generally well-known, both past and present. Intercourse between the North and the South, as it has developed during the last 600 years, was explored under the direction of two complementary perspectives, one economic, the other ideological. The latter was examined using concepts concerning identity and heritage, with results that dispute the essentialist stance, despite all appearances as they are presented today. The economic relationship was investigated in light of the colonial experience as it has occurred elsewhere in the world. Norrland’s subordinate and customary status as an exclusive source and supplier of various types of raw materials was confirmed. The extent and complexity of these economic and ideological relationships are briefly outlined below in accordance with the use of those 20 particulars that typify the colonial experience as presented in Chapter One. They are;

I) Centralised Rearrangement of Borders. An extensive and diverse network of contacts, social and economic, existed in the Circumpolar regions prior to the establishment of the Swedish kingdom in the early 16th century. Spheres of influence, and later administrative units and boundaries, both parish, county and national, were contrived and maintained in accordance with southern Swedish interests. These centralised measures effectively curtailed and later severed earlier connections between the various Northern regions, a process that was completed by the beginning of the 19th century, transforming that ancient cultural cross-roads into a southern Swedish appendix.

II) Centralised Establishment of Towns and Settlements. The powers that be in southern Sweden, initially Feudal and later Royal, promoted the foundation of strongholds along major trade routes, trade towns along the coast and central marketplaces along the interior in order to facilitate the centralised management of commerce for the benefit of Southern interests. The establishment of individual farmsteads was repeatedly encouraged by Royal authorities throughout the 17th and 18th centuries in order to legitimise and consolidate political and economic dominance over the North. With the advent of capitalism and the Nation-State, emphases shifted towards maximising economic exploitation of Northern resources by securing an adequate labour supply. This was achieved though the continued promotion of farmsteads, together with the creation of various types of patriarchal and self-contained industrial communities.

III) Loss of Ingenuous Property Rights. Shortly after the independent Kingdom of Sweden was founded, the Regency laid exclusive claim to Norrland, periodically invoking this Royal provocative to issue decrees regulating ownership and access to land and resources, both natural and human, establishing a precedent readily employed by ensuing parliamentary governments, all of which continued to enrich themselves by granting both public and private
industries accession rights over Norrlandian timber, iron, minerals and hydro-electric power resources, this in turn restricted and/or prevented local access to both land and water, which effectively curtailed Northern inhabitants from pursuing their previous livelihoods, forcing them to become increasingly dependent on economic forces beyond their control.

IV) Pacification and/or Extinction of Inhabitants and/or their Lifeways. The ethnic and cultural diversity that seems to have characterised the North up until the time of Olaus Magnus, has since diminished and/or been made obscure, through the use of ideology and/or economic policy. The Reformation, fuelled by dire political and economic needs, resulted in a centralised theology implemented by a powerful State Church, one that pacified the population, providing them with their first mass produced identity. The centralised promotion of successive migrations and settlements, large and small, assisted the diffusion of religious dogma, eradicating and repressing local customs and practices. Economically motivated colonisation led to disruptions or outright clashes between divergent subsistence strategies, which until then, and to a certain extent, had co-existed. In some cases the resulting changes were dramatic, as exemplified by the alternating fortunes of the various societies based on reindeer management of some kind.

V) Dependent Economic Development. External control over Norrlandian resources was initiated during the Middle Ages by the powers that be in southern Sweden, issuing privileges and rights over Northern resources to individuals or institutions who resided elsewhere. Strict supervision of all aspects of the economy was continued by the Kingdom in accordance with mercantilism, which endorsed centralised Royal monopoly over resources. The laissez-faire economics of the 19th century opened the door to powerful private speculators from without, who soon came to dominate the forest industry, in part by dispossessing the independent farmers of their forest plots while seriously disrupting the socio-economic fabric of the pastoral reindeer herders, large and small. From the early 20th century onwards, centralised State management of Norrlandian timber, iron, minerals and hydro-electric power resources has increased, while the over all number of private owners has decreased, concentrating authority, and profits, into the hands of a select few living in the South, far removed, both socially and economically, from the consequences of their own decision making, which otherwise effects the lives of thousands and the very survival of these Northern communities.

VI) Creation of a Labour Supply. Providing an adequate labour supply in order to effectively exploit Norrlandian resources by both State and privately owned companies has, since the advent of the industrial revolution, starting in the mid 19th century, been a prime concern of both. This was basically accomplished in one of two ways, through the promotion of individual homesteads or by the establishment of insular communities, all of which either became, or were deliberately created to be, dependent on either seasonal or full time employment within one key industry, and thus automatically rendered vulnerable to external events and interests beyond their control.

VII) Establishment of a Cash Economy. Home industries, permitting payment in kind, local barter and regional exchange, had helped to make Northern households economically self-sufficient. This insular economy declined and later disappeared in the wake of industrialisation, which created a body of seasonal and full time labourers, made dependent on wage payments and a cash economy. When employment opportunities later declined, household economies collapsed, unable to revert to the former self-sustaining subsistence strategies.

VIII) Lack of Secondary Industries and Processing. The powers that be in the South have regarded Norrland as a source of raw materials for so long that it has since become equivalent to a natural law, one largely unquestioned and undisputed. Starting in the Middle Ages, food products, skins and furs were regularly shipped South, enriching both secular and ecclesiastical interests. Norrlandian forests and hydro-power were later utilised by the Royal Kingdom to produce iron, wood tar, potash and potassium nitrate. None of these products were produced in any great quantities in the North, yet they were locally and/or regionally important, while only marginally contributing to the wealth and power of the South. Timber, iron ore, precious metals, valuable minerals, hydro-electric power and human capital, the latter characterise by a dedicated and educated labour force, have all been exploited with great intensity and success by the South since the advent of the industrial revolution, ensuring that Norrland has provided more than its fair share to the
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economy of both the Nation- and Welfare-States. Common throughout the North is the noticeable lack of secondary processing and industries, Norrlandian resources are almost without exception shipped out of the region and refined elsewhere, depriving the North of jobs, business opportunities and revenue.

IX) Demise of a Diversified Subsistence Economy. By the late Middle Ages, various Norrlandian communities had developed a variety of diversified subsistence economies that included a combination of elements such as fishing, gathering, hunting, animal husbandry and/or agriculture, supplemented by cottage industries, local barter, regional trade and auxiliary seasonal employment. These activities were successfully co-ordinated and scheduled according to a yearly seasonal cycle. Novel opportunities introduced before, during and after the industrial revolution were initially synchronised to mesh with the working year, complimenting previous activities. The advancement of industrialisation entailed economic consolidation of ownership into ever fewer hands, a situation which curtailed or completely obstructed access to various Norrlandian resources and thus effectively ended the implementation of previous subsistence strategies. The ecological ramifications of industrialisation were equally devastating, reducing or eradicating resources central to the continued maintenance of the various ingenuous substance economies. These developments reduced economic diversity, forcing individual households to become increasingly dependent on ever fewer and external sources of income.

X) Establishment of a Mono Economy. The different communities that had evolved in Norrland prior to the establishment of the Swedish kingdom were economically diverse, and remained so until overtaken by the industrial revolution. Industry and capitalism, both private and public, required ever increasing amounts of cheap labour in order to exploit Norrlandian resources. This resulted in the intentional creation of individual homesteads as well as entire communities, all of which were established with the expressed intent of providing that labour. These Northern settlements were often made dependent on the procurement of one major natural resource, timber, iron ore, minerals, hydro-electric power. When these resources were depleted or when demand for them diminished, these mono economies collapsed, with dire socio-economic consequences for the entire region.

XI) Asymmetric Transportation System. The type, placement and extent of the Norrlandian transportation systems was dictated by the needs of the secondary processing industries located elsewhere. Floatways, roads, railways and power lines are all geographically restricted, geared primarily to facilitate the removal of natural resources out of the North as quickly and effectively as possible.

XII) Asymmetric Political and Administrative Infrastructure. The economic importance of Norrlandian resources has been realised by the powers that be in southern Sweden, both Royal and Ecclesiastical, since the Middle Ages. This was highlighted by the loss of Finland in 1809, and again in 1905 with the loss of Norway. Norrland’s economic potential was clearly demonstrated, to both public and private investors alike, by the unfolding events of the industrial revolution. This prompted the State to exercises ever greater political and administrative authority over Norrlandian resources by regulating access to them, while simultaneously turning itself into one of the principle owners of Norrlandian timber, iron, mineral and hydro-electric power resources. Consequently, the decision making power over the utilisation and administration of these Northern resources, and the profits they generate, have been concentrated in the hands of a limited number of actors external to the region itself, located in the political and administrative centre of southern Sweden.

XIII) Loss of Sovereignty. The concentration of ownership, administrative authority, economic capacity, social affluence and political predominance over Norrlandian resources, and thus over the fate of those individuals and communities made dependent on them, rests in the hands of an exclusive minority located in the South, far removed from Norrlandian realities, concerns and problems. This is a process that started in the Middle Ages and culminated in the 20th century with the partial or complete centralisation of Norrlandian timber, iron, mineral and hydro-electric resources by government officials and the State. The appropriation of these resources by Southern interests “for the betterment of the Nation as a whole” has been accompanied by a parental attitude that views the peripheral-North as naturally regressive and thus quite dependent on the progressive centre-South.
XIV) Asymmetric Urbanisation. Urbanisation in the North was always geographically asymmetric, partly the result of the centralised creation of specific administrative markets, towns and units by Royal decree in order to gain control over local populations. Artificial communities were later added, created in response to the labour needs of the various industries, State owned and private, which were either grafted on to existing urban centres or built up from scratch near lines of communication and/or sites of exploitable resources. The curtailment of alternative subsistence strategies, agricultural pursuits and animal husbandry, was augmented by the demise of seasonal and full time employment opportunities brought on by mechanisation, rationalisation and fluctuations in world markets, resulting in economic and social duress which, from the 1920’s onwards, drained the rural areas of its human resources, who were forced to relocate, either to the expanding urban centres along the coast, or to leave Norrland altogether.

XV) Asymmetric Social Infrastructure. The continued decline of the rural population throughout the remaining three quarters of the 20th century was accompanied by diminishing municipal revenues, which ultimately lead to the asymmetrical concentration of the social infrastructure. Hospitals and other medical institutions, educational and cultural centres, social facilities and services, together with small businesses and commercial opportunities, were either relocated to ever fewer urban centres, often situated along the coast, or were discontinued. By the 1960’s Norrland had noticeably fewer scientists, authors, actors, bookstores, museums, libraries and universities per capita than southern Sweden, while overall wages were 20% lower than the national average, the ratio between doctor and patients was twice as high, while it also had the greatest number of substitute teachers and the highest number of un-employed.

XVI) Asymmetric Population Distribution. The abandonment of agricultural and pastoral lifeways increased throughout the 20th century. This was augmented, during the second half of the century, by the collapse and abandonment of those isolated homesteads and artificial communities made dependent on a mono economic system located in the rural areas, further weakening the already economic and socially depleted countryside. By the end of the 1960’s a preponderance of the population had relocated to a few major urban centres situated along the coast, leaving behind a much depleted countryside.

XVII) Acculturation and Enculturation. Economic colonisation was accompanied by political and social assimilation. This was accomplished in part by fraternisation leading to familiarisation and thus to the exchange and sharing of cultural traits within and between regions. Assimilation was also centrally orchestrated by the powers that be in southern Sweden. The Royal Kingdom accomplished this through the creation of an artificial identity and sense of community based on the forceful adherence to a single Religion and Monarch. The Nation-State, supplemented and then replaced, religious and royal conformity with an identity equally artificial, founded on the essentialism of Herder, the romantic movement and the nation-building project as defined by the New Gothic Revival. This new identity espoused the natural existence of a uniform cultural heritage consisting of a common language, a long and glorious history, both shared and held in common by a healthy, rural, homogeneous and very ancient racial stock. This centrally manufactured heritage was instilled into the general population through the implementation of a national, compulsory and centralised educational system, characterised as one of the most effective, and successful, propaganda machines ever devised.

XVIII) Cultural and Historical Arrogance. Religious conformity for the masses was paralleled by a political identity manufactured, during the course of the 17th century, by an intellectual elite for exclusive consumption by the aristocracy. This aristocratic or Gothic identity consisted of historical fantasies that espoused the antiquity and superiority of the ruling class in order to enhance their prestige and justify their right to rule, and conquer, engaged as they were in a military venture to establish and maintain a European empire. These histories entailed the use or manipulation of prehistoric monuments, which were transformed into symbolic and ideological icons of the Swedish kingdom and its rulers. The most conspicuous of these being the many grave mounds and rune stones which are so numerous in southern Sweden, while being rare in the North. The manufacture of this political propaganda occurred in conjunction with the appearance of the earliest
antiquarian scholars, legislation, collections and institutions, all of which were later neglected and/or ignored when the Swedish empire came to an abrupt end at the beginning of the 18th century. A revitalisation of antiquarian scholarship, legislation, collections and institutions occurred 100 years later in conjunction with the rise of nationalism and the foundation of the modern Nation-State. In need of a new identity, the intellectual elite utilised material provided by antiquarianism, and later by archaeology, to construct an ancient and prestigious historic and prehistoric past, a revival of Gothic ideals, applied to a new national heritage worthy of the emerging upper and middle classes together with the ascension of their new capitalistic economy and the developing parliamentary political system that empowered them. Grave mounds were once again accorded great symbolic value by the creators of this new cultural identity. The cultural arrogance inherent in these identities is intentional; a heritage is designed to both encompass and exclude. The categories, elements and symbols chosen when manufacturing these identities are based on southern Swedish experiences, values, conventions and history. Norrland appears empty by default, as equally devoid of cultural and historical content as it was dynamically impaired, seeming to be naturally dependent on a progressive South.

XIX) Historical Substitution. Identity and heritage are cultural artefacts made to appear both natural and eternal, yet constructed and manipulated in accordance with changing historical needs and circumstances. The most recent of these dogmatic creations has proven itself to be as successful and persistent as its predecessor. This was made clearly evident in the last decade of the 20th century by that nation-wide manifestation entitled ‘The Year of Swedish History’ which was presented with the explicit aim of re-establishing a sense of national place and security. It did so by evoking a heritage consisting of those very same elements and symbols invented 200 years ago by the New Goths during their nation-building project, which consisted of attributes manufactured by that intellectual elite, with their roots in the upper and middle classes of southern Sweden in accordance with their own history, values and agendas, while excluding that of others.

XX) Historical Dispossession. During the course of the 19th century, scientific archaeology and modern heritage management, together with their scholarly, educational and administrative institutions, all located in southern Sweden, emerged within, and thus were encompassed by, that ideological mind set established and fixed by the nation-building project some 100 years previously. Within the first half of the 20th century these institutions had became the sole arbitrator’s and custodian’s of that national heritage. In accordance with its dictates of this ideology, archaeology had, by the 1920’s, cleared the Swedish past of all foreign racial and cultural elements, populating it with ancestors of choice. The Central Board of National Antiquities, in accordance with its origin and name, initiated a centralised antiquarian survey, ascribing the greatest national importance to those categories of prehistoric remains that are so abundant and representative of the past as found in southern Sweden. Graves, symbolically charged since the 17th century, once again defined how the past was portrayed. The obvious dearth of similar types of monuments in the North only confirmed the obvious.

The historical review above has revealed the South’s economic and ideological hegemony over the North, a state of affairs that began some six centuries or so ago, one which has since then been expanded and strengthened. This situation has resulted in the adoption of a highly parental attitude towards what is assumed to be the peripheral-North, which is practically always portrayed as being utterly dependent on change and/or progress arriving from what is often perceived as the centre-South, be it economic, social, technological or political. This contingency has become so axiomatic through repeated use that Norrland’s subordinate position appears preordained, the logical outcome of some eternal and natural process. Recursively, the South’s predominance seems both reasonable, sensible and enduring. The legitimacy of this relationship has been regularly reinforced throughout the centuries by expressions of identity and cultural heritage, ideologies that have exclusively embodied and ennobled southern Swedish experiences, perspectives and agendas, further embellished with material acquired from both historic and prehistoric sources. Norrland’s material and immaterial contribution towards the formation and maintenance of these ideological superstructures has been minimal to non existent, one further confirmation of its submissive status.
If archaeological research is contextually conditioned then, as far as Norrland is concerned, it was and has been conducted within the cultural-historical background presented above. The intellectual ramifications of this situation, how antiquarians and archaeologists have perceived, explained and interpreted the Norrlandian past, are explored in the following chapter.

Round-butted axe from Klöstre 17, Torps parish (Raä 345), Medelpad, today situated at about 80 meters above the present day sea level. Made out of a grey-brown-tan coloured stone, it is 12.3 cm long, 5.8 cm wide and 4.6 cm thick. Illustration by the author. Scale 1:1.
Introduction

It has previously been maintained that the archaeological endeavour is not exclusively the providence of the scholastic domain. That interpretations are also influenced, possibly even governed, by external factors, be they political, social, economic, historical and/or ideological as illustrated in Figure 1. Thus, in order to fully comprehend archaeological research as it has been practiced in any single area, it would be beneficial to at least have a tolerable working knowledge of that region’s history. Consequently, a concise history of Norrland was presented in Chapter Two, where it was concluded that this Northern expanse has, for the last 600 years, experienced a colonial situation similar to that encountered elsewhere in the world. The development of those concepts or elements that are generally considered to define Swedish identity and heritage were also briefly reviewed. Norrland’s contribution was minimal and passive, the country’s heritage as understood today is largely a Southern construct. It is here held that these circumstances helped to foster a number of decidedly asymmetric relationships between North and South, not only socio-economic but also cultural and ideological, resulting in regionally disproportionate presentations and assessments, both qualitatively and quantitatively, of their respective histories. This is exactly what one would expect in accordance with the colonial experience as defined in Chapter One. Consequently, one would also expect to find that Swedish archaeological research as it pertains to the discovery and interpretation of Norrland’s prehistory has also been significantly influenced by these external circumstances. This assumption will be examined with the use of Ludwik Fleck’s theoretical concepts, thought-style and thought-collective, as presented in Chapter One. These concepts will be employed to explore two of those archaeological issues presented earlier. The first concerns the long belated recognition that Norrland contained an abundance of features that represent the remains of prehistoric houses. The second queries the tardy discovery of the region’s Mesolithic past. But before embarking on those two studies, a short examination will be made into a number of general textbooks that profess to present the prehistory of Sweden. This inquiry is similar to that which was conducted in Chapter One as concerns the historic overviews, undertaken in order to gain insight into the interpretative relationship(s) that exist between North and South.

Writing Prehistory: Quantity

Hans Hildebrand’s dissertation from 1866, which is an overview of the Nation’s prehistory entitled ‘The Swedish People During Pagan Times’ (Sw. Svenska folket under hednatiden), was later reworked and re-published in 1872. Hildebrand made liberal use of both archaeological and ethnographical material, together with literary sources such as the Icelandic Sagas. He interprets material culture as being ethnically significant, thus the distribution of certain types of Iron Age artefacts and features across the landscape are taken to represent the spread of the Goths prior to the 6th century AD, followed soon thereafter by the Swedes (H. Hildebrand 1866:77pp). These are, of course, the forefathers of the present day Nordic population (H. Hildebrand 1866:47). He notes that the “...nationality...” of the inhabitants prior to the Iron Age cannot be determined, but with the arrival of the Germanic tribes, these unknown people “… either remained where they were and accepted their enslavement by the victorious newcomers, or searched for a place of refuge in the remote forest areas.” (H. Hildebrand 1866:45). The exact location of this forest sanctuary is not specified, but one is left with the distinct impression that it is in fact Norrland, which before the Iron Age;

...should not be considered as a continuation of that found in southern Sweden, it is more akin to that of Finland and the other eastern countries generally (H. Hildebrand 1866:43).
That one line just about sums up the full extent of Norrland’s share in Hildebrand’s monograph, in which he notes that; “The rest of Sweden [e.g. Norrland] during pagan times was hardly inhabited.” (H. Hildebrand 1866:41). Consequently, prior to the emigration of the Teutonic tribes into this area, it had very little history of any kind, an opinion similar to that voiced by Harrison almost 140 years later (see Chapter One).

This scenario is more or less repeated in an article spanning over 100 pages entitled ‘The Early Iron Age in Norrland’ (Sw. Den äldre jemälern i Norrland) that was printed just three years later (H. Hildebrand 1869a). Here Hildebrand makes good use of the recent archaeological surveys that had been carried out in Norrland by both Ekdahl and Sidenbladh, together with an ample amount of other material, which he presents in a very thorough going manner. He concludes that the earliest Iron Age settlement in the North were migrating Goths who initially settled along the coastal areas and river valleys and who later crossed the mountains and colonised central Norway (H. Hildebrand 1869a; 1869b; Sidenbladh 1869). The general theme that Hildebrand outlines is reminiscent of that presented by Selinge over 100 years later (see Chapter Two).

Norrland’s share in the prehistory of the country does not improve in the overview written by Oscar Montelius entitled ‘Prehistory’ which was published in 1903 as part one of a nine volume set covering the history of Sweden from the earliest times up until the end of the 19th century (see Chapter Two). As one can see from Fig. 42, he hardly mentions Norrland in his deliberations. Of the 287 pages of text and figures only 3.6 pages or some 1.25% are devoted to the northern two thirds of Sweden (Montelius 1903).

Another overview in five volumes appeared in 1914. The first part is entitled ‘The Swedish People’s History, Part One, Prehistory and Medieval Times’ (Sw. Svenska Folkets Historia. Band I. Forntiden och Medeltiden), which was written by Henrik Schück (1855-1947). Again we see that Norrland’s share is minimal, receiving only a half a page out of a total of 262, or just 0.2% of the total.

Norrland fares no better twenty-one years later with the 1935 publication of Gunnar Ekholm’s otherwise worthy monograph entitled ‘Prehistory and Prehistoric Research in Scandinavia’ (Sw. Forntid och fornforskning i Skandinavien), a presentation that is much more comprehensive than any of its predecessors. This 359 page volume includes the prehistory of both Denmark and Norway together with a description of the development of the discipline as a whole. Thus, the exact proportions devoted exclusively to Denmark, Norway, southern and/or northern Sweden are difficult to delimit. The general introduction is 13 pages long, while Denmark and Norway together share about 152 pages. Hence ca. 194 pages, including text and illustrations, are more or less devoted exclusively to Sweden. Of these only about 5 pages, or 2.5%, deal with Norrland. Compare that with the 6 pages devoted to Hågahögen, a Late Bronze Age grave mound just north of Uppsala. Thus, both Denmark, Norway and one single site from southern Sweden each received more attention than the whole of Norrland.

Holger Arbman’s account of Sweden’s prehistory from 1947 is part of another large undertaking in which the history of the whole country was presented in five volumes. In this 139 page outline about 8.1 pages, or 5.8%, are devoted to Norrland.

Stenberger’s encyclopaedic overview entitled ‘Prehistoric Sweden’ (Sw. Det forntida Sverige) was the most massive and important general review of its kind when it first appeared in 1964. The third and final edition has been used here. As far as it concerns those chapters that specifically deal with Norrland, there is only one difference between the first edition and the following two from 1971 and 1979 respectively. This is found under the subtitle ‘The Northern Swedish Stone Age’, and has nothing to do with Norrland per se, but with Finland. In the first edition the date of the Finnish Kiukais Culture is given as 1800-1000 bc, while in the later editions it has been adjusted to 1600-1300 bc (Stenberger 1964:166; 1971:166; 1979:166). Norrland’s share of this 820 page monograph amounts to about 77 pages or 9.4% of the total.

Stenberger’s leading reference work was superseded by Göran Burenhult’s trilogy entitled ‘Archaeology in Sweden’ (Sw. Arkeologi i Sverige) published between 1982 and 1984. The first volume, ‘Hunters and Herders’ begins with a 34 page general theoretical and methodological introduction followed by 137 pages of text and illustrations that takes the reader to the end of the Stone Age. Part two, ‘Farmers and Bronze Workers’, presents the Bronze Age in 204 pages. The final volume, 208 pages of text and illustrations, introduces the reader to the Iron Age under the title ‘Community Builders and Tradesmen’ (Burenhult 1982; 1983; 1984). Out of these 540 pages, Norrland may claim about 15.7 pages or 2.9% of the total.
Lack of empirical data might explain away this obvious discrepancy as it concerns the relative amount of attention given to the Country’s northern and southern regions respectively. If this were in fact true, then one would expect that Norrland’s share would increase over time with the appearance of each new textbook, just as research in Norrland has increased with each passing decade. This has not happened. Instead we see that Norrland’s share at first fluctuates, then steadily increases, reaching an all time high at 9.4% with Stenberger, then declines to 2.9% of the total, the same amount it held some 50 years previously. This is rather odd, considering that two of Sweden’s largest archaeological undertakings were launched in the mid 20th century, both conducted by the Central Board of National Antiquities and both which would greatly increase the amount of archaeological information coming out of Norrland. The longest and possibly even the largest of these two antiquarian projects was that nation-wide survey mentioned earlier, the first round was carried out between 1938 and 1977, resulting in the registration of some 12 000 individual features in Norrland (Hyenstrand 1978). The other is the ‘Norrlandian Salvage Investigations’ (Sw. Norrlandsundersökningar), which were initiated by the commencement of that large-scale exploitation of the North’s hydro-electric power resources, which in lieu of the new antiquarian law from 1942, required that massive transformations of the landscape be proceed by archaeological investigations. During the next forty years well over 2000 prehistoric sites would be found and documented, of these about 200 would be excavated, at least in part (Baudou 1970:5; 2003b:17; Baudou & Björnstad 1972:7; Björnstad 1966; Janson 1960a; Sundlin 1990:22pp).

Arbman’s account appeared before the results from these two endeavours became widely available and thus did not figure into his presentation to any extent. But they were available to Stenberger and it is obvious that he successfully incorporated these new sources of information into his overview. Between Stenberger’s and Burenhult’s publications there occurred an additional increase in the amount of research being carried out in the North with the appearance of two university research projects, Nordarkeologi and ‘Early Norrland’ (Sw. Nordlands tidiga bebyggelse - NTB). The former was initiated by the University of Uppsala in 1962 under the direction of Hans Christiansson and carried out in co-operation with the Skellefteå, Västerbotten and Norrbotten museums. Work was conducted over a huge area which included parts of the Counties of Norrbotten, Västernorrland and Jämtland. Intensive surveys were undertaken between 1969-1979 in and around the Parish of Arvidsjaur under the direction of Herbert Wigenstam, resulting in the discovery and documented over 2300 sites from all periods (Christiansson 1972a:145; 1975:13; 1980:153p; Christiansson & Wigenstam 1980; Sundqvist 1975a:310). The most extensive investigations were carried out between 1962-1974, resulting in the excavation of 3706 square meters distributed amongst 11 sites located in the coastal areas of northern Västerbotten. Of this, 2137 square meters or 58% of the total was invested in the Bjurselet site, Byske parish, making this single site the major recipient of the project’s attention (Sundqvist 1975b:15). This

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number of pages</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>Stone Age</th>
<th>Bronze Age</th>
<th>Iron Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montelius 1903</td>
<td>283.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Schück 1914</td>
<td>261.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekholm 1935</td>
<td>189.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbman 1947</td>
<td>130.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenberger 1964</td>
<td>743.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>130.4</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burenhult 1982-1984</td>
<td>524.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 42. Norrland’s share of Sweden’s prehistory according to the number of pages (text & illustrations) it received during the 20th century as revealed by six overviews published during an eighty year period. Norrland’s share expressed in percent starts to increase with Ekholm at 2.5% of the total, passing through 5.8% with Arbman, reaching an all time high at 9.4% with Stenberger, from which it falls, hitting 2.9% with Burenhult. Criticism may and can be directed towards how pages, or rather their contents, are judged according to this North-South criteria. It is probable that no two attempts would produce the exact same figures. However, there is a real difference between the relative amount of attention each region receives, a situation that is easily grasped by anyone who cares to sit down and familiarise themselves with the literature. Exact quantities are not as important as explaining why these differences exist (Arbman 1947; Burenhult 1982; 1983; 1984; Ekholm 1935; Montelius 1903; H. Schück 1914; Stenberger 1964).
hardly surprising in light of the scientific goal of this project, which was set on establishing a chronological baseline for Norrland using the characteristically southern Scandinavian Bjurselet site as a starting point (Christiansson 1975:9).

The ‘Early Norrland’ research project, begun in 1968, set its sights on the elucidation of Norrland’s initial settlement and subsequent development, from prehistoric to historic times. With the intention of primarily utilising the material produced by the ‘Norrlandian Salvage Investigations’, complemented when necessary by further field work, this project set out to accomplish its goal through a strenuous analysis and classification of the archaeological material, the establishment of stricter chronological controls and the use of extensive ecological and environmental studies. Medelpad and Ångermanland were the two provinces that received the greatest, although not exclusive, attention of this project which, under the leadership of Evert Baudou, then at the University of Stockholm, and Margareta Björnstad from the Central Board of National Antiquities, produced a flurry of articles and at least 11 major monographs (Baudou 1968a; 1973a; 1977; Baudou & Björnstad 1972; Baudou et.al. 1978; Björnstad 1966; 1968; 1973; Ekman & Iregren 1984; Engelmark et.al. 1976; Henriksson 1978; Huttunen et.al. 1972; Lannerbro 1976; Meschke 1977; Miller et.al. 1972; Zachrisson & Iregren 1974; Zachrisson 1976).

A further research project was initiated by the Västerbotten County Museum in 1975. It too produced a number of noteworthy publications, more of which will be presented below.

Despite the amount of new research being produced by these five projects, Norrland’s share of the Nation’s prehistory did not increase with the appearance of Burenhult’s otherwise extensive presentation. Instead it fell, rather drastically. This development would seem to suggest that research, e.g. scholarly output and/or the absence or presence of a certain amount of empirical data, may not be the deciding factor as concerns the amount of attention given to any one region. This in turn would seem to suggest that choices are being made, a contingency that always entails both inclusion as well as exclusion.

Writing Prehistory: Norrland

Research in Norrland, especially in comparison with the Southern part of the country, appears to be meagre. But all comparisons conceal as much as they reveal. In this case, it obscures the realisation that quite a bit of useful archaeological research was carried out in Norrland during the 19th century and the first half of the 20th, that is to say, prior to those five extensive projects mentioned above. This work was often of good quality, well-known, readily available and regularly utilised.

Antiquarian documentation in the North began with the first and second ‘Inquests Concerning Antiquities’ that were undertaken during the latter half of the 17th century in conjunction with the rise and expansion of the Swedish kingdom and its
Chapter Three

The New Gothic Revival and the spread of nationalism during the beginning of the 19th century re-awoke interest in the past and hence to the rejuvenation of the Royal Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities which, in 1828, led to the revitalisation of antiquarian legislation. Thus strengthened, the Academy began to sponsor comprehensive antiquarian surveys throughout the country, including Nils Johan Ekdahl’s (fig. 43) four year odyssey in the North which took him to the Provinces of Västerbotten (including Norrbotten), Ångermanland, Medelpad, Jämtland, Härjedalen, Hälsingland and Gästrikland, where he collected and/or copied thousands of Medieval manuscripts and documented ancient remains, again primarily grave mounds and cairns. This material was also well-known and useful, although not published until much later (Enqvist 1943; Hallström 1928a; 1929a; T. Hellman 1946; H. Hildebrand 1969a; Molin 2003:202pp; Selinge 1969a).

Antiquarian inquiries in the North were resumed during the second half of the 19th century re-awoke interest in the past and hence to the rejuvenation of the Royal Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities which, in 1828, led to the revitalisation of antiquarian legislation. Thus strengthened, the Academy began to sponsor comprehensive antiquarian surveys throughout the country, including Nils Johan Ekdahl’s (fig. 43) four year odyssey in the North which took him to the Provinces of Västerbotten (including Norrbotten), Ångermanland, Medelpad, Jämtland, Härjedalen, Hälsingland and Gästrikland, where he collected and/or copied thousands of Medieval manuscripts and documented ancient remains, again primarily grave mounds and cairns. This material was also well-known and useful, although not published until much later (Enqvist 1943; Hallström 1928a; 1929a; T. Hellman 1946; H. Hildebrand 1969a; Molin 2003:202pp; Selinge 1969a).

Antiquarian inquiries in the North were resumed during the second half of the 19th century and would, from that point onwards, steadily increase in volume and intensity. The foundation for this development were the many regional antiquarian societies that came into being at this time, together with the incipient beginnings of a State sponsored and scientific archaeology under the guiding influence of Bror Emil Hildebrand, Hans Hildebrand and Oscar Montelius (see Chapter Two). The first antiquarian society in the North was established in the Province of Hälsingland in 1860, followed by Gästrikland in 1862; Carman 1963; photo source Brännman 1962:7).
1862. The ‘Society for the County Museum of Västernorrland’ was formed in 1880. An antiquarian society for the County of Västerbotten was established in 1882 which, four years later, split into two separate organisations, known respectively as Västerbotten’s Northern and Västerbotten’s Southern Antiquarian Society. In 1886 the ‘Society for the County Museum of Norrbotten’ was established, followed a year later by the ‘Antiquarian Society of Jämtland’. The Antiquarian Society of Funäsdalen, which later became the Antiquarian Society of Western Härjedalen, came into existence in 1894, while the Province of Medelpad’s Antiquarian Society was launched in 1906 (Curman 1963:5; Feuk 1931; Lundholm 1993:311; Rathje & Lundholm 1994:76pp). These societies were a product of the national-romantic movements, appearing at a time when the county’s economic and social institutions were undergoing great changes brought about by laissez-faire liberalism and the emergence of a new upper and middle class in need of asserting their own historical legitimacy in the present by confirming their continuity with the past (Brännman 1962; Feuk 1931; Pettersson 1995; Sjöström & Flodén [1982]).

This should not blind us to the fact that there was a genuine curiosity and interest in things both past and present within all of these organisations. Their aims, as expressed in their charters, are often similar in content and reflect this interest; to put together a detailed inventory over regional prehistoric and historic remains, to gather artefacts and documents and to collect and record all manner of ethnographic data, with the intention of making this material accessible to the general public, often through the creation of a provincial museum (Brännman 1962:10; Curman 1926; 1963:8p; Feuk 1931; Olsson 1887-1895:1pp; Post 1947).

The Royal Academy, now in the capable hands of Bror Emil Hildebrand, was able to harness this enthusiasm by promoting a restricted number of antiquarian surveys in order to record “…the prehistoric relicts of the Fatherland.” in accordance with the ideals of the nation-building project of that era and the scientific aims of an emerging archaeological discipline. Limited financial support was offered to antiquarian societies, where they existed, or to individuals, all of whom carried out this commission in a variety of ways and with varying amounts of success (Curman 1936:239p; 1963:12; Floderus & Gustawsson 1946:252; Lindälv 1980:19).

On behalf of the Academy, Carl Fredrik Wiberg (fig. 44), with the assistance of N.L. Söderholm, undertook a two year survey of Gästrikland’s prehistoric remains, a task that took them to each and every parish in the province during the summers of 1864 and 1865. Rune stones took centre stage, but an inventory of prehistoric graves, hillforts and elderly ecclesiastical collections was also compiled. The Academy received a full report, parts of which appeared as monographs or in various periodicals, including that published by the ‘Antiquarian Society of Gästrikland’ (Brännman 1962:12p; Gustawsson 1931; H. Hildebrand 1869c:336; Wiberg 1865; 1871; 1889; 1890).

With no antiquarian society as yet in either Ångermanland or Medelpad, the Academy turned to Karl Sidenbladh (fig. 45) who travelled extensively throughout Ångermanland between 1865 and 1867 and then to Medelpad in 1868. He compiled an extensive catalogue consisting of descriptions and drawings over various ancient remains, primarily grave mounds, cairns and stone settings situated along the coastal areas and up along the river valleys of this region. He also managed to find the time to

Fig. 45. Karl Sidenbladh (1840-1911) statistician and linguist who, upon the request of the Hildebrands (father and son) and the Royal Academy, carried out an extensive antiquarian survey between 1865 and 1867 in Ångermanland where he travelled an astonishing 4500 kilometres before turning his attention to Medelpad in 1868. Born in the Parish of Arnäs in northern Ångermanland, Sidenbladh obviously felt at home in the area, a circumstance that might have contributed to the success of this project, which is still considered to be one of the finest of its time. Upon completion Sidenbladh returned to Uppsala where, for a short while, he held a post as an associate professor in Nordic Languages before moving on to a position with the ‘Central Bureau of Statistics’ in 1869 (Enqvist 1943:19; Floderus & Gustawsson 1946:253; Selinge 1969a; Sidenbladh 1869; photo source Hildebrand & Ugglé 1900:128).
excavate a number of mounds, interview the local inhabitants on antiquarian issues and collect stray artefacts. His report has ever since been praised for its accuracy and attention to detail by the many who have had the pleasure of utilising its contents (Enqvist 1943:19; Floderus & Gustawsson 1946:253; H. Hildebrand 1869b; Selinge 1969a; Sidenbladh 1869:192pp).

A survey of Hälsingland was also supported by the Academy, initiated in the 1860’s and carried forward by various persons under the supervision of Lars Landgren (1810-1888) who, in contrast to Mickelsson, was a well-known figure in the community. Dean, clergyman, teacher, school principle, historian, author, Bishop of Härnösand, member of Parliament, founder of schools and libraries, co-founder of Hälsingland’s Antiquarian Society in 1860 and the ‘Museum Society for the County of Västernorrland’ in 1880 (Sw. Västernorrlands läns museisällskap), he quickly recognised Mickelsson’s talent as a field worker and soon entrusted him with the responsibility of completing and compiling the results from this antiquarian survey, the success of which was readily acknowledged by all (Floderus & Gustawsson 1946:253p; H. Hildebrand 1869b; 1869c:336p; Jonsson [1997]; Post 1947:92; 1948; Reinhammar 1994:402; Stenberger 1931:78; illustration source Floderus & Gustawsson 1946:254, here redrawn and modified).

Fig. 46. Map of Hållsta village, Hälsingtuna parish in Hälsingland showing the location of a number of Iron Age grave mounds. It was drawn by Erik Mickelsson (1826-1906) who, starting in the mid 1860’s and for the next 17 years, carried out an exemplary antiquarian survey, readily exemplified by the quality of his maps and field notes which, even by today’s standards, are excellent. He seems to have lived an anonymous existence, at present little more is known about him besides the fact that he was a father, a teacher and a widower. The sponsored documentation of the province’s prehistoric remains by the Royal Academy began in 1864, and was carried out under the supervision of Lars Landgren (1810-1888) who, in contrast to Mickelsson, was a well-known figure in the community. Dean, clergyman, teacher, school principle, historian, author, Bishop of Härnösand, member of Parliament, founder of schools and libraries, co-founder of Hälsingland’s Antiquarian Society in 1860 and the ‘Museum Society for the County of Västernorrland’ in 1880 (Sw. Västernorrlands läns museisällskap), he quickly recognised Mickelsson’s talent as a field worker and soon entrusted him with the responsibility of completing and compiling the results from this antiquarian survey, the success of which was readily acknowledged by all (Floderus & Gustawsson 1946:253p; H. Hildebrand 1869b; 1869c:336p; Jonsson [1997]; Post 1947:92; 1948; Reinhammar 1994:402; Stenberger 1931:78; illustration source Floderus & Gustawsson 1946:254, here redrawn and modified).

Much work was accomplished in Jämtland and Härjedalen without assistance or involvement from the central authorities in Stockholm. This was largely due to the efforts of Peter Olsson (fig. 47) who, funded by the Antiquarian Society he helped establish, began to record in words, drawings and photographs the prehistoric and historic remains of that province and, on occasion, those found in Härjedalen, Ångermanland and Medelpad. He was joined by Knut Kjellmark in 1899, who excavated a number of Iron Ages graves on behalf of this Antiquarian Society. Both were diligent and prolific writers, reporting their finds to the central authorities and publishing numerous articles in various periodicals, both national and regional (Ekhoff 1910:271pp; Sefastsson 1986a; Seth 1948:261).

Many others sporadically contributed to the discovery and documentation of Norrland’s prehistory during this initial period. For example; Erik Modin (1862-1953), who is otherwise primarily remembered for his brilliant ethnographic work from Härjedalen, also gave a much appreciated account of ancient remains found in his home Parish of Täsjö, Ångermanland, which included notes on Stone Age remains and the now famous Iron Age burials located
at Långön (Edlund 1995b:157p; Modin 1916:44pp; 1938:49; Sefastsson 1986b:45). On commission from Artur Hazelius and the Nordic Museum to collect ethnographic materials, Per Gustaf Vistrand (1852-1912) travelled extensively throughout Sweden, during which time he produced a useful catalogue over Stone Age finds from Norrland (Nilsson 1955:414; Vistrand 1892). These and the many other individual efforts, considered signally, are all modest at best, but together amount to a substantial addition within this field.

Much of what these individuals were trying to accomplish was inspired by the success and popularity of both Skansen and the Nordic Museum under the guiding hand of Hazelius who, through those two institutions, awoke an awareness of, and search for, provincial identities past and present. This in turn, early in the last century, resulted in a heritage movement (Sw. hembygdsrörelsen) which came to encompass handicraft, tourist and educational organisations, environmental and temperance groups, various youth movements and the establishment of the so called ‘heritage associations’ (Sw. hembygdsföreningar). Nationalistic and patriotic, the heightened social involvement that this movement entailed was also a reaction against the accelerating pace and degenerate effects of industrialism, its adherents looked for inspiration and guidance in the mundane deeds and rustic exploits of their pastoral forefathers and thus set about promoting an interest in, and preservation of, rural lifeways. In comparison with the antiquarian societies, it was a re-orientation. The latter reflected and flourished on the past and bygone days of glory. In contrast, the agricultural

romanticism of the heritage movement enthusiastically directing their attention to the here and now, and towards the future. Yet it too would stimulate research into the prehistoric past, together with the documentation of local and regional dialects, music, myths, place-names, history, customs, building traditions and lifeways, transforming this knowledge into a foundation upon which the ethnographic present, and its tomorrow, could be securely anchored (Baudou 1999b:120; Björkroth 2000; Brännman 1962:25pp; Curman 1963:15; Danielsson 1967; Frändén 1986:123; Gustafsson 1982:10; T. Hellman 1946:43; Rathje & Lundholm 1994; Rumar 1986:66p).

The influence exercised by the heritage movement is evident in ‘The Norrlandian Student’s Educational Association’ (Sw. Norrländska studenternas folkbildningsförening) which was founded in 1905 by pupils from the North who were then enrolled at the University of Uppsala, which included such notables as Theodor Hellman (fig. 48), A.G. Högbom and Eric Festin, each of which would contribute much to the erudition of Norrland, past and present. The overall objective of this cultural association was typical for the period;

... to labour, both big and small, for public enlightenment generally and more specifically for a greater and more exact knowledge about [our] regional birthplace (Sw. hembygd), its environment, language and memories... (Festin 1910:3).

The reasons, or rather the need to do so were practically self-evident;
The future of a people is highly dependent on their ability to avail themselves of those talents and strengths which are to them peculiar. A comprehensive self-esteem is of the greatest importance for the Nation - knowledge about the natural environment and people during both the past and the present. In our efforts to reach extensive understanding about the age in which we live, we must not neglect to gather in what we can about ancient traditions and lifeways, since our time is deeply rooted in the past...to collect old songs, stories, melodies... [as well as] ...the material culture...is patriotic to the highest degree (Festin 1910:4).

This association launched a number of educational programs, one of the most memorable took place at Härmösand in June of 1907, attracting over 2700 participants with lectures on any number of subjects, delivered by some of the country’s leading experts, together with concerts, games, sporting events, exhibitions and excursions. Oscar Almgren’s participation resulted in a short presentation of Västernorrland’s prehistoric remains which was later published (Almgren 1908; Eriksson 1908; Festin 1910; Hansson 1986). Realising that national resources were limited, this association took upon itself to fund an archaeological survey of Ångermanland, one which was carried out by Eskil Olsson between 1908-1911. During the last year of this project he also excavated a number burial cairns, work that was financed by the Royal Academy (Festin 1910; Olsson 1914).

Interest in Norrlandian prehistory from university scholars was not lacking during this time. In 1905 Knut Stjerna (1874-1909) took up a teaching position at Uppsala and set in motion a program of research into the Stone Age on a national scale. By all accounts Stjerna was a brilliant and inspirational teacher who, during his short career, managed to bring together a talented group of prehistorians. The research aims of this project was to distinguish and then classify cultural units or groups of people as they evolved and progressed across the country during the Stone Age. It was thought that this would be revealed through the creation of detailed distribution maps that depicted the spread and shifting patterns of typologically well defined artefacts and assemblages from different periods as they changed over time and across the landscape. The whole country was to be investigated, thus each student was allotted a region to document (fig. 79). Norrland was divided up between Eskil Olsson, who was given responsibility for the documentation of Dalarna, Gästrikland and Hälsingland; Erik Festin took on the Provinces of Härjedalen, Jämtland and Medelpad; Theodor Hellman was assigned the Province of Ångermanland and Gustav Hallström the Provinces of Västerbotten and Lappland (Almgren 1914a:3p; Baudou 1997:124pp; Hyenstrand 1975:11; Nerman 1965a:222). Of these, both Hellman and Festin were swept onto other paths by the heritage movement. Hallström was also diverted by other interests. Only Eskil Olsson (1886-1915) progressed in this work which, due to a sudden illness leading to his death,
was never completed in full. However, the extensive material that he had compiled from the three provinces assigned to him were published posthumously and are not without value (Almgren 1917:154; Olsson 1917a; 1917b).

While some worked through an organisation of some kind, others struck off on their own, heading out into the field in order to teach themselves to recognise, find and document the past. Gustaf Hallström (1880-1962) and O. B. Santesson both belong to this latter group. A recent and penetrating biography that presents the extraordinary background against which Hallström acted out his life's work precludes any lengthier presentation here (Baudou 1997). Hallström did not pursue his assignment in the Stjerna research project, instead he set his own course, travelling extensively throughout the North and exploring its past, writing and publishing more than anyone else of his generation. Starting in 1920 and for the next three decades, about 40 articles and monographs on Norrlandian archaeology would leave his hand. In comparison with his colleagues and considering the scope of his other interests and commitments, this was an achievement.

In contrast, Olof Bernt Santesson (1874-1950) was neither a trained archaeologist nor a proficient writer. But he did travel, from 1905 onwards, transforming the vastness of Ångermanland and its immediate surroundings into his own backyard through extensive surveys and occasional excavations, often financed by the Antiquarian Office. His archaeological interests began at the age of 13 when he discovered the Stone Age dwelling site at Backsjö in Eds parish, Ångermanland, the first of its kind to be acknowledged as such in Norrland. By profession, Santesson was a teacher who specialised in biology and geography. These subjects, together with his interest in geology, palaeontology and archaeology, left him well equipped to read the landscape and locate prehistoric dwelling sites. Another one of his many contributions to Norrlandian archaeology was his doggedness in tracking down, collecting and registering stray finds, especially from the Stone Age, carefully determining their height above the present day sea level in the hopes of establishing a typological chronology based on shoreline displacement (Baudou 1969:32; Floderus 1949; Lindqvist 1952; Sundlin 1990:18p). Santesson published little, but his person and work were well-known at the time, in part through his corpulent reports which were compiled and sent to the central authorities in Stockholm.

Others worked in the background of antiquarian research. One such person, who left a long trail of publications behind him, was Arvid Enqvist (1886-1975). He too was one of Stjerna’s students, completing his doctorate in 1922 on the Stone Age material from northern Bohuslän. His career is hard to follow, but he did spend a few years in Jämtland where he worked with Festin. He seems to have been a great compiler, cataloguing the prehistoric collections from Gotland, as well as, those gathered together and kept in the Norrlandian cities of Söderhamn, Örnsköldsvik and Sundsvall. He also edited and published a number of older records and

Fig. 49. Sigurd Dahlbäck (1866-1932). He belongs to that exclusive few who conducted antiquarian and archaeological documentation in the Province of Norrbotten during the first half of the 20th century. As an attorney living in Stockholm, Dahlbäck made a reputation for himself by representing the poor and underprivileged in social and political disputes arising out of the emerging labour movement during the turn of the century. In 1914 he published a novel, much acclaimed, which encouraged him to leave his career as an attorney and proceed towards one in literature. This quickly proved to be a serious blunder and his economic situation soon became precarious. A scholarship from the Nordic Museum, to conduct a general ethnographic study in Norrbotten during the summer of 1916, resulted in his moving to that Province in 1917 where he spent the rest of his life and succeeded in establishing himself as a representative for both the Nordic Museum and the Office of the Royal Antiquarian. These and various other central authorities repeatedly considered him to be tiresome and difficult, largely a result of his own economic insecurities that were never wholly resolved. But no one denies that his ethnographic and antiquarian material, which consists of descriptions, catalogues, drawings, artefacts and photographs, is of great value. Sigurd Erixon benefited from the former, while his archaeological correspondence, consisting of over 500 letters and reports, provided invaluable material for both Gustaf Hallström, Carl-Axel Moberg and others (Borelius 1936:173pp; Christiansson 1971:34p; Hallström 1921:25; Hederyd 1985:27pp; Moberg 1955; photo source Rehnberg 1958).
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Fig. 50. Knut Tinnberg (1878-1948). In the pantheon of extraordinary personalities that have contributed to Norrlandian archaeology, Tinnberg stands out as one of the more interesting and unusual. He was 50 years old when he discovered his true calling in life, which occurred the day he found a stone axe on the island of Bokö in Lake Mjörn, situated along the Swedish West Coast. His archaeological appetite and skills were sharpened through his participation in the now famous excavations at the Mesolithic sites of Sandarna and Gottskär under the leadership of Nils Niklasson and Harald Thomasson, while his own independent surveys in that region resulted in the discovery of other important sites dating to that period. Tinnberg’s archaeological interests brought him to Norrland in the early 1930’s, to which he returned annually to the very end of his life, conducting archaeological surveys despite considerable and sustained economic strain on his personal financial situation. With each passing year he would report the discovery of new sites and finds from areas that had either been neglected and/or considered by others to be void of prehistoric remains. Aside from his obvious successes, which at the time were both celebrated and many, he was never fully accepted within established archaeological circles. Whether due to his amateur status, business man turned archaeologist, the stigma of which the central authorities seemed more than willing to emphasise, or if it was brought on by his independent and obstinate nature, or if it resulted from the controversies that arose out of his often advanced and undisciplined archaeological interpretations, or if it was just another case of collegial envy, or the combined accumulation of all of the above, are interesting questions. However, his talents were recognised and much sought after, especially with the commencement of the salvage investigations conducted by the Central Board of National Antiquities along the Norrlandian rivers from the early 1940’s onwards. Sverker Janson, who worked with him during the last years of Tinnberg’s life, attests to the fact that he had “...an extraordinary ability and talent for discovering dwelling sites in the landscape.” (Janson 1949:167). There is no doubt that Tinnberg was an exceptional field archaeologist but, unfortunately, he was not a scholar. However, he did write for the newspapers. Just how many articles he penned is uncertain, those available are filled with many valuable insights (Bagge 1937a; Baudou 1978b; Fredsjö 1939; Sundlin 1990; photo source Janson 1949).

chronicles that are of greater or lesser antiquarian and archaeological interest, together with a guidebook over Medelpad that includes a number of notable prehistoric sites (Backman 1992:152; Enqvist 1945; 1960; Nerman 1965a:225p; Sjöström & Flodén [1982]:41pp).

Sigurd Dahlbäck (fig. 49) and Einar Wallqvist (1896-1985) belong to that group of solitary amateurs who came to archaeology along different paths, achieving much, each in his own way. The latter came to Arjeplog, situated beneath the shadows of the Caledonian Mountain Range, as a young man in the capacity of provincial doctor. The unadorned reality of both the Sámi people and the agricultural pioneers simply captivated him. Realising that this ancient Northern existence was changing and would soon be lost, prompted him to collect, anything and everything, including the documentation of Stone Age sites and artefacts. In 1965, his vast collection was brought together under one roof with the opening of the so called ‘Silver Museum’ in Arjeplog (Bergman 1995:31; Hvarfner 1972). Although decades would pass before this material was properly published, it did serve as an inspiration to others and it also indicated that Norrland was far from being the empty wasteland that many made it out to be.

The Antiquarian Society of Gästrikland, after a period of inactivity, changed its name to ‘Gästrikland’s Cultural-Historical Association’ (Sw. Gästriklands kulturhistoriska förening) and took wing upon a new current of projects. It commenced by supporting the excavation of a number of Stone Age sites and Iron Age features between 1917-1921 under the direction of the talented and industrious Hanna Rydh (1891-1964). These were the first systematic and scientific investigations ever undertaken in this area, resulting in a hail of articles published in the Association’s periodical (Brännman 1962:32; Nerman 1965b). In 1926, under the chairmanship of Karl Hedlund (1887-1962) this Association began a documentation of prehistoric iron production sites in Gästrikland. By the following year this program had developed into a general antiquarian survey of all prehistoric remains, including Stone Ages sites, complimented by excavations, that continued up until 1934. This ‘total’ survey was one of the first of its kind ever undertaken, making Gästrikland one of the most extensively documented provinces in all of
This project, like the many others that were being carried out in Sweden, was financed by private donations, in this case from the regional forest and iron industries, funding which was used to engage the co-operation of the ‘Office of the Royal Antiquarian’. The quality of this work, even by today’s standards, was exceptionally good. It also produced many articles, large and small, and two comprehensive monographs on the Iron Age material. Many of the working routines that were tried and established here would later serve as models for those future surveys that would so thoroughly engage the Central Board of National Antiquities on a national scale from 1938 onwards (Ambrosiani 1932:83; Arbman 1931; Bellander 1933; 1939; 1945; Brännman 1962:41; Claesson 1931; Curman 1936:243p; 1963; Gustawsson 1931; Janson 1962a; Källström 1931; 1933; Malmborg 1931a; 1931b).

Nothing succeeds like success, the activities in Gästrikland soon attracted the interest and efforts of others. A joint venture financed by the University of Uppsala and Gästrikland’s Cultural-Historical Association brought Sune Lindqvist and his students to the province in 1931 where they excavated a series of Stone Age sites accompanied by a round of lectures. Both O.B. Santesson and Knut Tinnberg (fig. 50) were also drawn to the area, where they each carried out a survey of Stone Ages sites. An illustrated description and inventory of the County’s churches was also completed followed by a documentation of its manor houses (Brännman 1962:39pp; Claesson 1931:85; Curman 1963).

The Antiquarian Society of Jämtland also came under the influence of the heritage movement, in 1923 it joined forces with the ‘Handicraft Association of Jämtland’, the ‘County Environmental Association’ and the forerunner of the regional museum to form the ‘Provincial Heritage Association’ with Eric Festin (1878-1945) as its director. Formerly a tireless member of all of the above, Festin activity promoted archaeological investigations in Jämtland, often publishing accounts of these activities in the Society’s periodical. He now helped to create the ‘Museum of Jämtland’, making it a dynamic focal point for cultural management, public out-reach, environmental protection and archaeological investigations, while finding time to pen articles that presented the results coming out of this work (Hemmendorff 2000; Näström 1928; Rentzhog 1986a; 1986b; Rumar 1986).

While some antiquarian societies occupied themselves with the past, others concentrated their interests elsewhere. In Medelpad this took the form of creating an outdoor museum in Sundsvall, in many ways comparable to that established by Hazelius in Stockholm (Feuk 1931:8; Sjöström & Flodén 1982). Archaeological activities were limited to the management of an Iron Age burial ground at Fläsin, just south of Sundsvall, which came into their possession through a donation of land in 1916. That
same year they excavated an Iron Age mound at Kvisle, which otherwise would have been destroyed by the new railway line. They also built up a fine collection of Stone Age tools, but apart from this they did not engage in any archaeological activities until 1943, when they tired to initiate an antiquarian survey of the province that was to be funded by private donations. This did not come to pass. Instead, their efforts were re-directed towards saving the monumental Iron Age burial ground at Högom. The site was purchased in 1946 and renovated, a measure made possible by the efforts of this Society and funds made available by G. Versteegh, director of the Graninge Iron Foundry. The excavations of 1949-1951 uncovered the rich remains of a royal burial dating to the Migration Period. The site was investigated three more times between 1954-1960, all under the supervision of the Central Board of National Antiquities but financed through the generosity of Gustaf Velander from Sundsvall. Further donations from the municipal government, the Antiquarian Society and the regional forest industry insured that this astonishing find would remain accessible to the local population and not be shipped off to Stockholm (Bøhn 1956:160; Janson 1990:9pp; Ramqvist 1990:16p; Sjöström & Flodén [1982]:31pp).

The Antiquarian Society of Västerbotten was rather a late comer to archaeology. Four years after its establishment it split into two divisions, one each for the northern and southern halves of the County. Of these, it would be the former which initially contributed most towards the elucidation of this region’s past. Once again, much of what was accomplished issued out of the enthusiasm of one person, in this case Ernst Westerlund (1900-1976). He began his career as a newspaper reporter, working his way up through the ranks to become the editor of one of Västerbotten’s leading dailies. His interest in the past and involvement with this antiquarian society resulted in an increasing production of articles and, in 1950, to his appointment as the first full time director of that museum which this society had established in Skellefteå (Gustafsson 1982:12pp; Ågren 1996:292). His scholarly output kept pace with the archaeological and antiquarian projects he helped initiate, including the Nordarkeologi project with Hans Christiansson and the University of Uppsala, mentioned earlier.

The above is only an abbreviated account of archaeological research in Norrland, indicating that the area has not been totally neglected. It also attests to the fact that research in the North was often in the hands of either private individuals or local and regional organisations, at least prior to the commencement of those large scale investigations which took place during the second half of the 20th century.

Writing Prehistory: Making Choices

No argument is here being made for the inclusion of Norrland in the history or prehistory of the Nation according to percentages based on any conceived scale or standard. What is being proposed is that this scholarly activity involves choices. Most are aware of this contingency, although the grounds upon which selections are made might not be as readily apparent, nor the consequences thoroughly appreciated. Common sense tells us that lack of empirical data is a sufficient justification for exclusion. But, for how long is this excuse valid? May we appeal to it on behalf of Burenhult’s three volume overview from the 1980’s? What about the other general reviews outlined above? Janson and Hvarfner’s 130 page monograph (256 pages counting photographs) on the prehistory of Norrland was available to Stenberger four years before his national overview was printed, yet he only managed to put together 77 pages on Norrland (Janson & Hvarfner 1960, Stenberger 1964). Hallström published a 124 page presentation on the prehistory of one single Norrlandian parish in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southern Sweden &amp; Dalarna</th>
<th>Månadsbladet 1872-1905</th>
<th>93%</th>
<th>7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fornvännen 1910-1934</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fornvännen 1940-1964</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fornvännen 1970-1994</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 52. The percentage of articles according to geographical regions in two of Sweden’s leading periodicals. Fornvännen is, as was its predecessor Månadsbladet, published by the Royal Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities. Both have played a central role as mediators of archaeological information in Sweden. A recent study into the relative amount of attention each geographical region has received over time shows the same pattern as revealed in fig. 51 above. Here, Norrland together with Dalarna, shows a lower, although equally steady share in the amount of attention it received according to four samples covering a 122 year period between 1872-1994. Unfortunately the authors have left us with no explanation as to why the North’s share suddenly more than doubles during the fourth quarter of the 20th century (Sandin et.al. 1998:61).
1942, five years before the appearance of Arbman’s monograph, where Norrland is represented by 8 pages (Arbman 1947; Hallström 1942a). The five pages given over to Norrland in Ekholm’s overview from 1935 is easily surpassed, for example, by Hanna Rydh’s 21 page article on Gästrikland’s Stone Age or by Hallström’s 24 page review of Norrland’s prehistory (Ekholm 1935; Hallström 1926; Rydh 1922). Hans Hildebrand’s report-like essay on the material remains from the Norrlandian Iron Age, with its 110 pages, dwarfs the amount of space allotted to Norrland in the general overviews presented by both Montelius and Schück, and for that matter, by everyone else (H. Hildebrand 1869a; Montelius 1903; H. Schück 1914).

The point being made here is that, empirical evidence, large or small, does not in itself determine how something will be interpreted and presented. Interpretation is dependent on theory, hopefully one relevant to the subject at hand and not entirely the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stenberger 1962</th>
<th>no. of pages</th>
<th>pages south</th>
<th>% south</th>
<th>pages north</th>
<th>% north</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>introduction</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Age</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>127.7</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hagen 1967</th>
<th>no. of pages</th>
<th>pages south</th>
<th>% south</th>
<th>pages north</th>
<th>% north</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>introduction</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Age</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kivikoski 1967</th>
<th>no. of pages</th>
<th>pages south</th>
<th>% south</th>
<th>pages north</th>
<th>% north</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>introduction</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Age</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age Society</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 53. Map showing the regional divisions of Norway, Sweden and Finland. The different regions of the first two are well defined while those of Finland are not. Norway is divided into four regions, a South-Western, a South-Eastern, a Middle and a Northern. Sweden, as we have already seen, is divided into three regions, from south to north; Götaland (including the islands of Öland and Gotland), Svealand and Norrland. When speaking of Northern Finland, authors often refer to the Provinces of Lapland and Österbotten or parts thereof. The Provinces of Karelen and Savolax are somewhat imprecisely considered to make up an Eastern region. Western Finland is loosely used to describe an area consisting of the Provinces of Satakunda, Travstland, Egentliga Finland and Nyland. This Western region is sometimes subdivided into a Western and Southern region, the former consisting of Satakunda and Travstland while the later is made up Egentliga Finland and Nyland (Bull et.al. 1965; Hagen 1967; Kivikoski 1967; Luho 1967a; Myhrvold 1965).

Fig. 54. Comparison between the amount of space (text and figures) given to each region (north and south) in three general overviews on Swedish (Stenberger 1962a), Norwegian (Hagen 1967) and Finnish (Kivikoski 1967) prehistory published by Thames and Hudson in their Ancient Peoples and Places series. The introductions, as well as the last chapter in Kivikoski’s book, have not been included due to the fact that they are so general in scope that they cannot be assign to any specific region (number of pages in parenthesis). The same problem was encountered concerning Kivikoski’s chapters on the Stone and Bronze Ages, where distinctions between Finland’s northern and southern regions are not emphasised, in stark contrast to the praxes in both Sweden and Norway. Thus for Finland, the number of pages dealing with those two periods was divided equally between its northern and southern regions. It is noticeable how little attention northern Sweden has received in comparison to the corresponding regions in both Finland and Norway.
choices are being made, based on values usually considered exterior to the academic or scholarly sphere \textit{per se}, should by now appear probable, if not obvious. Before exploring what the latter might consist of, one further example that illustrates the former will be provided. Both Norway and Finland have northern regions of their own. A comparison between the three will be made as concerns the amount of archaeological attention each one has received in relationship to their southern partners.

The northern regions of Sweden and Norway are well defined and accepted, those of Finland are not as clear cut (fig. 53). Thus any comparison between these regions must be judged with this in mind.

Just less than half the size of Norrland, northern Norway is 35\% of that country’s landmass with 12\% of its population. Northern Finland is somewhat smaller than Norrland, its relative portion of Finland amounts to 56\% while its population is not quite 24\% of the Nation’s total.

A quick comparison between the amount of space given to the northern and southern regions of both Sweden, Norway and Finland is possible due to the nearly contemporaneous appearance of three general prehistoric overviews, one for each country, published in the Ancient Peoples and Places series by Thames and Hudson (fig. 54). The now familiar discrepancy as concerns the relationship between northern and southern Sweden as noted above is once again repeated. In contrast, both northern Norway and northern Finland each received a much larger share in the prehistory of their countries, 28\% and 27\% respectively, more than 3 times as much as Norrland.

Whether or not this is due to a significant difference in the amount of field work that was being conducted within each respective region is difficult to say. Available figures for the period 1963-1966 would seem to indicate the opposite (fig. 55). The northern regions of Norway and Finland both had a larger relative share of the total amount of fieldwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pop. total</th>
<th>pop. %</th>
<th>area km$^2$</th>
<th>area %</th>
<th>no. of excav.</th>
<th>% excav.</th>
<th>excav. per capita</th>
<th>excav. per km$^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W Norway</td>
<td>920 300</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>58 300</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>57 519</td>
<td>3 644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Norway</td>
<td>2 005 700</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>111 200</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>200 570</td>
<td>11 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Norway</td>
<td>336 000</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>41 100</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>67 200</td>
<td>8 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Norway</td>
<td>3 262 000</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>210 600</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>105 225</td>
<td>6 794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Norway</td>
<td>447 600</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>113 000</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>49 733</td>
<td>12 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway total</td>
<td>3 709 600</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>323 600</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>92 740</td>
<td>8 090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svealand</td>
<td>2 892 400</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>80 900</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>28 676</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Götaland-Öland</td>
<td>3 632 500</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>84 000</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>24 710</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotland</td>
<td>53 700</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3 100</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1 851</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Sweden</td>
<td>6 578 600</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>168 000</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>23 495</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrland</td>
<td>1 194 100</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>243 200</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>26 535</td>
<td>5 404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden total</td>
<td>7 772 700</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>411 200</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>23 916</td>
<td>1 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Finland-Åland</td>
<td>2 099 000</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>53 500</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>56 729</td>
<td>1 446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Finland</td>
<td>1 298 000</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>94 300</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>92 714</td>
<td>6 736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Finland</td>
<td>3 397 000</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>147 800</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>66 607</td>
<td>2 898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Finland</td>
<td>1 059 000</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>188 400</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>58 833</td>
<td>10 467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland total</td>
<td>4 456 000</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>336 200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>64 579</td>
<td>4 872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 55. The number of archaeological investigations undertaken in a four year period between 1963 and 1966 in the various regions of Sweden, Norway and Finland. Relative percentages show that both northern Norway and northern Finland had a greater share in the proportion of archaeological work being carried out within their respective country’s than Norrland did. In total numbers, Norrland’s share far exceeds that of its northern neighbours, as does its relative share when compared against population density and the size of each region. These figures indicate that Norrland was not entirely neglected, especially in comparison with its nearest northern counterparts. Figures for both population and regional size have been rounded off to the nearest hundred. Population figures for Norway and Finland are for the year 1965, those for Sweden are from 1966 (Bull et al. 1965; Damell & Hagberg 1967; Luho 1967a; Myhrvold 1965; SCB 1966b; Straume 1967).
undertaken within their respective countries than Norrland did. However, numerically speaking, there were 2.5 to 5 times as many excavations taking place in Norrland than elsewhere in these northern regions. Further comparisons between the number of excavations per capita and in relationship to the size of each region shows that Norrland’s share exceeds that of its northern neighbours.

Stenberger’s book appeared prior to the completion of this fieldwork. A review of the references cited by both Kivikoski and Hagen reveals that the results coming out of this fieldwork had not as yet made its way into their monographs. While this tells us nothing about the volume of the empirical data upon which these three presentations are based, it does imply two other things. The first is that quite a few excavations were being carried out in Norrland, at least in comparison with its northern neighbours. The second is that regional representation is not necessarily dependent on the number of excavations carried out, nor on the volume of empirical output per se, at least as it pertains to Norrland.

In contrast to Norrland and for whatever reasons, northern Norway and Finland both received a greater share of, or contributed a greater amount to, the prehistory of their respective nations. Choices are obviously being made. This becomes even more conspicuous when an attempt is made to compare how the different authors treat or present these different regions. As noted above, Kivikoski, when discussing the Stone and Bronze Ages does not differentiate between regions. When distinctions are made, which occurs when the Iron Age is presented, it is often between the western and/or coastal areas in comparison with the eastern and/or inland regions (Kivikoski 1967).

Hagen’s presentation of Norway is much more varied. He acknowledges and embraces “...the great variations in the setting and the parallel existence of different cultural groups.” within Norwegian prehistory (Hagen 1967:20). The North is described as being a rich country, its Stone Age inhabitants are seen as leading a relatively sedentary existence, maintaining their own ways of life, yet actively participating in cross-cultural contacts, evolving through both internal developments and external influences (Hagen 1967:67pp).

Stenberger’s account of Norrland is of a completely different kind. The North was populated by “...a primitive hunting and fishing culture...” (Stenberger 1962a:21);...with no established settlement...no clusters of farms or hamlets, no agriculture and not even herds of domestic animals...only an existence completely dependent on hunting and fishing... [a] ...way of life...somewhat reminiscent of that of the Maglemose people in the south, but here conditions were harder and seasonal migrations after the quarry were long and toilsome (Stenberger 1962a:64, English in the original).

The North is inadvertently (?) contrasted with the South, where agriculture has created a landscape which;

...more than any other is regarded as the genuine Sweden: meadow and enclosed pasture with luxuriant grass and a wealth of flowers in the spring (Stenberger 1962a:44, English in the original).

This exceedingly benign environment soon hosted the most glorious Bronze Age north of the Aegean, establishing “...the foundation of that society in eastern central Sweden which was to become the Kingdom of Sweden.” (Stenberger 1962a:83 & 93). Norrland is presented as “...one huge wilderness occasionally penetrated by hunters from the coast...”, that provided the natural resources which fuelled the economy of the Mälar region (Stenberger 1962a:158 & 159). The establishment of Iron Age settlements along the coast of Norrland was an extension of this development, but not of its affluence. The Southern settlements were inhabited by “...prominent families...and skilled organisers...distinguished by cultural and commercial progressiveness.” (Stenberger 1962a:158, English in the original) while those in the North, notwithstanding the conspicuous wealth of the huge grave mound at Högom in Medelpad, are characterised as being locally isolated and commanding only limited resources (Stenberger 1962a:157);

The clearest evidence of the consolidation and growing influence of Uppland and the Mälar area is provided by the three great mounds at Gamla (Old) Uppsala...These mounds may be regarded as the true national monument of Sweden (Stenberger 1962a:152p, English in the original).

To what degree the occurrence of fieldwork alone might or might not have effected choices as concerns the quantitative relationship between regions as revealed by the amount of attention they have been given in various general overviews, remains
unresolved. However, the above does indicate, as did the abbreviated review of Norrlandian research together with the bibliographic data, that neither the amount of empirical data nor the volume of scholarly output are sufficiently decisive as concerns how one chooses to represent and present any specific region. In other words, the availability, or not, of empirical data does not preclude interpretation. Nor is interpretation exclusively dependent on scholarly output, instead it would seem that its content is conditioned by selections based on preferences dictated by values determined by non-archaeological influences. The limited comparison between the three Scandinavian scholars above indicates that this is indeed so. There is a diametric relationship between the way the northern regions of Finland, but especially Norway, are treated and depicted in comparison to Norrland. Reflecting on the colonial status of the latter, this is exactly what one would expect. Recursively, both Norway and Finland have an extended experience of subservience and intervention, historical circumstances that in their case might have facilitated national inclusion rather than regional exclusion.

Writing Prehistory: Thought-Styles and Collectives

Quantity is no substitute for quality. That is to say, how many pages any given region receives is not as interesting as how it is presented, described and portrayed. Interestingly enough, the various general archaeological overviews cited above echo their historical counterparts, that is to say, Norrland is assigned a peripheral role according to a repetitive set of norms which are constantly being revamped and then re-circulated.

Hildebrand’s early presentations of Norrlandian prehistory depict a landscape sparsely inhabited by an unsettled population. Change, when it occurred, was imposed from without (H. Hildebrand 1866:45 & 47; 1869a).

Returning to the 1903 publication by Montelius we find that the forefathers of the present day Germanic and Sámi populations were believed to have, more or less, occupied their respective regions since the beginning of the Younger Stone Age (Montelius 1903:50pp). Racial esteem and patriotic pride are clearly evident in his presentation of the southern Scandinavian flint artefacts which show that “...the Stone Age Swedes...” in comparison with their European contemporaries were “...not only the equals of other Stone Age peoples, but even surpassed them.” (Montelius 1903:32pp). These views are repeated when he presents the Bronze Age; “...in taste and skill, the casting of bronze not only reached the highest levels, but surpassed that of nearly all of the other Bronze Age peoples in Europe.” (Montelius 1903:99). New levels of accomplishment are, of course, attained during the Iron Age Period. Norrlandian stone artefacts are never presented with such glowing terms, although their perceptible beauty does not prevent one from doing so. This is the situation a reader is implicitly and continually confronted with; positive judgements concerning the South are tacitly contrasted with what little is said about the North. At other times Montelius is more explicit. For instance, we are told that the presence of southern Scandinavian flint artefacts in the North shows that the “...Swedish people...” were expanding outwards and inhabiting new territories (Montelius 1903:53). At a later stage when the Swedish population was creating wonders with metals, those living in the North remained firmly in the Stone Age until recent times (Montelius 1903:57). The implications of these statements are as obvious as they are discreet. The Southern population is dynamic and enterprising, exploring and colonising new areas, they are skilful and creative and they are evolving higher levels of social complexity. In contrast, the Northerners are standing still, or retreating, ever deeper into the wilderness.

Schück’s 1914 presentation of Swedish prehistory is quite different from that of his predecessor. This is understandable in light of the fact that Schück’s field was the History of Literature, in which he held a Professorship and a Chair at the Royal Academy. This background is evident in his method and style, archaeological evidence and reasoning are not utilised to any great extent, prehistoric features and artefacts are mainly employed to illustrate conclusions derived from linguistics, ethnology, physical and cultural anthropology, folk tales, legends and historical sources. Here we learn that Sweden was originally inhabited by a brachycranial race that was to a large extent replaced by a dolichocranial people that moved into the country from the South during the end of the Late and the beginning of the Younger Stone Age. The former are the ancestors to the present day Sámi and Finns while the latter were Scandinavians. These new-comers, that is to say, Indo-Europeans, pushed the original inhabitants northwards while introducing
their own language and culture into the southern regions, together with stock breeding and agriculture, a hypothesis that is remarkably reminiscent of one recently presented by Colin Renfrew (Renfrew 1987; H. Schück 1914:15pp). The superiority of these new arrivals is never in doubt, they reached a new pinnacle of excellence during the Viking Period in the personage of the Swedish warrior who, in lieu of his sexual prowess, phenomenal business abilities and his superior military capabilities, established a unified Swedish state that soon evolved into a superpower, pacifying the Slavs and transforming the Baltic into a Swedish lake (H. Schück 1914:184p, 209p, 222p & 245p). Norrland’s part in all this is inconsequential.

By the time Gunnar Ekholm published his monograph, the contrast between the Stone Age economy and tools of northern and southern Sweden were no longer interpreted as reflecting racial variances. Instead, both regions had initially been inhabited by a long-skulled race. Differences in the material culture between these two regions are explained as having resulted from environmental influences and the local availability of raw materials (Ekholm 1935:46pp). No additional interpretation of the Norrlandian material is forthcoming. Any further mention of the North confines itself to a mundane presentation and description of sites and/or artefacts.

Holger Arbman’s overview from 1947 recognises the otherness of the North, which probably supported a population by the end of Older Stone Age ca. 3000 bc that originated somewhere out of northern Asia (Arbman 1947:21). The many Stone Age sites found along the coastal areas of Ångermanland, which exhibit an abundance of quartz and slate artefacts, are interpreted as evidence for an intense development within that area during the Neolithic period. This, he states, was partly an indigenous Northern event that occurred in conjunction with similar developments taking place in circumpolar areas throughout the northern hemisphere (Arbman 1947:40pp). Norrland was later pulled into the southern Swedish sphere during the Stone Cist Period (1800-1500 bc) as made manifest through changes that occurred in the stone technology of the region, from one based on quartz/slate to one predominately consisting of quartzite (Arbman 1947:42). He attributes this development to the arrival of the Indo-Europeans in the guise of the Battle Axe Culture who founded seasonal or permanent settlements along the Northern coast and established a monopoly over the fur trade (Arbman 1947:43pp). During the ensuing Bronze Age these Battle Axe people evolved into an upper class elite along the reaches of the Mälar Valley (read Uppland) that resulted in “...one of the most remarkable periods of our history...” (Arbman 1947:44 & 74) while the people in the North retained their “...pure Stone Age existence.” (Arbman 1947:70). The few bronze artefacts that have been found in the North are synonymous to the presence of southern Swedish thick-buttock flint axes of the preceding period, they were all exchanged for furs;

It can hardly have been anything else than the fur trade that caused these bronze artefacts to find their way so far north into these undeveloped districts. Their presence reveals a glimpse of the immense enterprise that was taking place, a fur trade with its centre in the Mälar area, the furs coming down along eastern and western routes from the north, to be exchanged for bronze artefacts from Central Europe and then transported south; one can get an inkling of the [many] trade stations along the coasts of both Norrland and those of our nearest neighbours [Norway and Finland] where the skins were collected. This must have entailed an organisation of immense proportions, the threads of which were gathered into the hands of the great wholesale dealers in the Mälar region (Arbman 1947:74).

In other words, the exploitation of this northern resource more or less financed the single most remarkable period in the history of the country, the Bronze Age. The tangible result of Norrland’s (including Dalarna’s) participation in this trade, which lasted for something less than a thousand years, was 43 artefacts of bronze, the majority of which Arbman considers to be “...rather mediocre...” (Arbman 1947:75; Hallström 1941:188p).

Many of the interpretations and descriptions of Norrland that Stenberger presented in his account from 1962 are repeated with more detail in his encyclopaedic overview from 1964. Here, the hunters and fishers of the North are portrayed as living from hand to mouth, forever on the prowl, indentering neither to stay nor settle, using tools that had long since been abandoned by their southern contemporaries, lingering on in the Stone Age millennia beyond everyone else (Stenberger 1964:46p, 57, 156, 161 & 307). The Mälar Valley region is once again portrayed as a delight for the developing farming societies, while “...the cold and dark of winter has always paralysed the North.” (Stenberger 1964: 60 & 61). Conditions for life in Norrland are presented as severe and laborious for the first inhabitants, their possible
origins are discussed but left undetermined (Stenberger 1964:147 & 160). Development only occurs in Norrland when its resources are harnessed, initially by the southern Scandinavian Battle Axe and/or Pitted Ware Cultures, who coveted northern furs, but also skins, meat and fish. In return the Norrlandians received flint, “...a material much superior to their own indigenous quartz and slate...” (Stenberger 1964:165). This trade continued into the Bronze and Iron Ages. It was during this latter time that the first sedentary settlements were established in Norrland, although they were few and far-between. But it was primarily trade, not settlement, that attracted the attention of the “...ancient motherland...” located in the dynamic Mälar Valley region, an interest that would provide Norrland with a new era of prosperity (Stenberger 1964:310, 558, 572p, 786).

Burenhult’s presentation of Norrland, what little there is, follows in the footsteps of his predecessors. Changes, when they do occur in this otherwise static region, are always initiated from without (Burenhult 1983:40pp). He reasserts that the Stone Age of the North continued into the Iron Age and probably beyond (Burenhult 1983:39). We are also told that, in order “...to survive...” in this region, long distance seasonal movements were a necessity (Burenhult 1983:40). And finally;

Norrland can be considered to have been the hinterland of an emerging Swedish kingdom... [during the Iron Age]... (Burenhult 1984:137).

Two interesting observations are revealed through the review of these general works. The first is that none of the authors, with the exception of Ekholm, refrained from passing judgement on, offering a view about or presenting an interpretation of, the Norrlandian material. And they did so without the slightest regard to the amount of empirical data at their disposal. The second is the emergence of a fixed set of reoccurring presumptions which are repetitively invoked when the prehistory of Norrland is presented. This repertoire consists of five postulates;

1) Norrland was inhabited relatively late.

2) Its population density was low, settlements sparse and of temporary duration.

3) Development in the North was retarded or completely lacking.

4) When changes do occur or progress is made, it is always initiated from without, most often from southern Sweden. And finally,

5) Norrland’s only contribution to the prehistory of the Nation amounts to provisioning its more progressive neighbour with various raw materials, ad infinitum.

The authors referred to above are not necessarily responsible for the introduction of these postulates, nor did they take recourse in each and every one of them. However, and as we shall see, these five explanations have continuously been perpetuated, and to such a degree, that they have evolved into the normative presumptions of an established thought-style which has long since dominated the way the North has come to be perceived. It would be credulous to assume that any similarity between any or all of these archaeological interpretations or value judgements and the way Norrland’s history has been repeatedly presented and understood is due to an accidental coincidence. Indeed, as we have already seen, the archaeological community and its institutions originated and developed both with and within the affluence of the established and influential levels of Swedish society. Firmly nestled within the confines of this social context, its members were (and still are) no less immune to prevailing social values than any other group of individuals. Value judgements, once normative, are exceedingly unpretentious, they slip quietly into our consciousness and, in this case, make the prehistoric past intelligible in the familiar terms of the historic present.

Semi-subterranean Houses: Introduction

With this recursive relationship in mind we will now address those initial questions posed at the beginning of this inquiry, beginning with an introductory presentation into the discovery, recognition and interpretation of those features which are today understood to be the remains of prehistoric subterranean and semi-subterranean dwellings, predominately those that date to the Stone Age.

Knowledge concerning the existence and use of this type of dwelling as a form of habitation in the North is as old as the region’s written history. An early references to this form of architecture is found in the writings of the ecclesiastical historian Adam of Bremen (11th century AD). His work includes a
portrayal of northern Fenno-Scandia, where the people lived in ‘earthen dens’ (Prüser 1964:118; Tanner 1928:3). Accounts from various explorers, missionaries, travellers and historians throughout the 16th and 17th centuries contain references on conditions in the far north, where the inhabitants lived in ‘caverns’ or ‘hollows’ made out of earth, turf and/or stone, dwellings that were either subterranean or semi-subterranean (Tanner 1928:3 & 10). Olaus Magnus in his mammoth work from 1555 describes these northermost houses as;

...caves made with the bones of sea animals, especially their rib bones. These cave dwellings appear to be cleverly built along the lines of a boat turned up-side-down, the roof of which is covered with sea plants... (Magnus [1555] 1982:175).

The archaeological discovery of various semi-subterranean dwellings found throughout Scandinavia during the first three quarters of the 20th century led to a number of surprisingly divergent interpretations concerning the nature, function and purpose of these prehistoric features. The following is not intended to be a complete or comprehensive presentation of those many remarkable remains that have been unearthed in Scandinavia during the last century. Nor does it pretend to encompass a thorough and detailed review of the different interpretations that have been put forward with regard to them. Instead, the aim of this overview is to draw attention towards the many similarities shared by these various remains, resemblances which emphasise the dissimilarities in how (but not why) the Norrlandian material was understood, treated and explained in comparison with that from southern Sweden, northern Norway and Finland.

Semi-subterranean Houses:
Southern Sweden

Semi-subterranean dwellings are nothing new to Swedish archaeology. A century ago Montelius briefly mentions the existence of this architectural type in his general presentation over Sweden’s prehistory. He states that;

During the Stone Age, the floor of the Nordic huts... [similar to those from the Bronze Age] ...were not so seldom submerged somewhat below the level of the surrounding ground surface (Montelius 1903:80).

Fig. 56. A woodcut from 1555 illustrating the “...savagery of the forest people...” who are depicted dressed in their furs and attacking a visiting ship with stones. Magnus tells how the northernmost inhabitants of Scandinavia lived in subterranean ‘caverns’, the reasons for doing so were multiple. One was the weather, they constructed these dwelling in order to protect themselves from the violent winds, terrible storms and the enormous amounts of snow so common to this area. Another reason was because these underground houses were practically undetectable, thus perfect hiding places from which the inhabitants could conceal themselves from marauding pirates on those occasions when they could not kill or drive them off. Beneath the bird on the left, in the upper right hand corner, one sees what would appear to be the entrance-way to one of these subterranean dwellings (illustration source Magnus [1555] 1982:175).

Montelius does not supply the necessary references one needs in order to track down the sites he is referring to, but in all probability he is alluding to a pair of discoveries that were made the same year his monograph was published.

One of these might have been the semi-subterranean dwelling found at Multorp, Tanums parish on the Swedish West Coast that was excavated and later published by Oscar Almgren. This was a small oval floor area, 2x2.4 meters (E-W) situated 30-35 centimetres below the present day ground surface. Stones, about 20 cm in diameter, were set along its edge, with the exception of a 40 cm wide section along its western side, a feature considered to have been the entrance. It was here, just inside the entrance, that a round hearth was discovered, measuring between 110-120 centimetres in diameter and 15 centimetres deep, filled with fire-cracked stones and charcoal (Almgren 1904:9; Almgren & Gustawsson 1934:16p; Frödin 1912:424pp).

The other dwelling that Montelius might have been referring to is located on the Hemmor site, Närs parish on the island of Gotland. None of the authors who
mention this feature seems to have taken the time to describe it, they simply state that it was similar to the Multorp dwelling (Almgren 1904:9; Almgren & Gustawsson 1934:16).

Montelius made a stab at discussing Stone Age settlement patterns based on the shifting presence of Neolithic burial monuments (dolmens, passage graves and cist/galley graves) which he viewed as representing an ordered society with permanent settlements (Montelius 1903:10).

In 1906 Almgren excavated a Bronze Age dwelling at Boda, Breds parish in Uppland, which produced an abundance of wattle and daub fragments. The floor area was rectangular in shape with rounded corners, about 9.5 meters long (E-W) and 7 meters wide, and set slightly lower than the surrounding ground surface. A round pit hearth was located along the central axes of the floor, slightly east of centre. It was 120 centimetres in diameter, 40 cm deep and filled with charcoal and fire-cracked stones (Almgren 1912; Almgren & Gustawsson 1934:18). By the middle of the 1960’s at least five additional sites with a total of 6 dwellings, both round and rectangular, had been found and excavated in the Mälar Valley area. All of them were, as regards to both construction and date, similar to the Boda dwelling (Hyenstrand 1976). As we shall see, the excavations in the Åloppe area of Uppland came to play a pivotal role in deliberations concerning shoreline displacement and chronology. These sites yielded up other important results. During the 1911 and 1913 excavations at Norrskog, some 200 postholes were discovered and documented. While the absolute majority of these were irregular in arrangement, there were at least two, possibly three, instances where a number of postholes were placed in such a way that they formed circular or arc shaped patterns around a single hearth. The sandy soil surrounding some of these hearths was

Fig. 57. Plan and profile of the Bronze Age house at Boda, Breds parish, Uppland, which was excavated by Almgren in 1906. Six years would pass before these drawings were published, but note the detail of the documentation, which leaves one with the impression that Almgren was indeed making a conscious effort to collect and record evidence that would support and vindicate his interpretation concerning the nature of this structure (illustration source Almgren 1912, here redrawn and somewhat simplified).
discovered to be much more firm or solid than elsewhere, soon regarded as trampled earthen floors, about 3 to 4 meters in diameter. The centrally placed hearths were stone-lined and oval in shape, about 120x80 centimetres large. The presence or absence of both ceramics, fish scales, bones and charcoal found scattered on the different floor areas give rise to the interpretation that these huts or tent-like constructions were functionally distinct (Almgren 1933:39p; Almgren & Gustawsson 1934:17; Lindqvist 1916).

Lindqvist also presents a scanty description of another feature that appears to have been a semi-subterranean hut or tent-like construction of some kind. This was discovered at the Rusthållsskog site, situated on the southern shore of Lake Åloppe, and partly excavated in 1913. The dwelling was plainly visible on the surface prior to excavation in the form of a round, shallow depression, 15-20 cm deep and 2.6-3 meters in diameter. One posthole, ceramics, charcoal and traces of wattle and daub were found within the confines of this presumed dwelling (Lindqvist 1916).

In 1912 Knut Kjellmark filed an unpublished report on a semi-subterranean house that had been discovered by peat diggers at Hylteberga in the Province of Skåne. From the description given by the workers, it was round, about 3 meters in diameter and 0.75 cm deep, with a 2.5 meter long and 0.5 meter wide entrance-way located in its southern side. Bones, a flint flake and a slotted bone point were recovered from this feature (Larsson 1975:14pp).

Two seemingly rectangular floor plans were discovered and excavated in the early 1920's, one at Persbo and the other at Ytterby, both situated in the Parish of Skuttunge, Uppland. Both dwellings covered an area of about 16 square meters and each contained greater or lesser amounts of ceramic sherds, quartz débitage and burnt bones. At Persbo large quantities of wattle and daub were also recovered and the presence of two postholes were noted. At Ytterby the walls were, at least in part, constructed using the dry-walled technique. In the former a hearth, consisting of a layer of fire-cracked stones 1.5 meters in diameter, was found just inside the door-opening. The hearth at the Ytterby site, placed just outside the door-opening, consisted of a layer of charcoal and soot ca. 0.5 meters in diameter. The ceramics and shoreline displacement chronology date both sites to the middle of the Neolithic (Ekholm 1926; 1929; 1935:83). The divergent appearance of these features compared to previous discoveries prompted Ekholm to issue a word of caution well worth contemplating;

...their outer appearance...should constitute a warning against the dogmatic opinion that all dwellings from the Stone Age must be round. Dwellings from the Stone Age, from all prehistoric times, have most assuredly taken on different shapes according to the material used to build them and according to external circumstances under which they were constructed (Ekholm 1929:11p).

Another simple structure was excavated on the small island of Lerholmen, in Frändefors parish, Dalsland in 1929. This consisted of a 2x2 meter large floor area found nestled in among a number of large boulders. Two hearths were discovered, one inside and one outside the floor area. A posthole was found in the south-western corner of the dwelling while a bench-like feature was situated along the back of the northern wall (Larsen 1934).

Axel Bagge gives a brief description of a floor area that he excavated in 1935 at the famous Fagervik site, Kroeks parish in Östergötland. It consisted of a sandy and completely stone-free area 7x4 meters (E-W). This living space had been created through the clearance of an ample amount of stone material that had been placed along the outer edges of the dwelling, forming a wall or low embankment which encompassed the floor area with the exception of an opening situated in the middle of the southern wall. A hearth consisting of soot and stones was located in the north-eastern corner of the dwelling, its dimensions are not mentioned (Bagge 1937c:3pp). Bagge goes on to relate how “...a number of hut floors were exposed...” during the following year. Unfortunately, he does not go into any details, only mentioning that “Under or next to some of these...[floors]...were deep, oblong hollows...which were either rubbish or storage pits.” (Bagge 1937c:6p).

During the 1930’s Sten Florin excavated and reported on the discovery of two different house types situated in the Parish of Stora Malms in the Province of Södermanland dating to ca. 3000 bc according to typology and shoreline displacement studies (Florin 1938:48; 1944). The first was found at Östra Vrå in 1935 and consisted of an “...extensive 5000 year old Stone Age village with the remains of some well preserved house foundations...” (Florin 1938:18). One of these was completely excavated, two partially so. Material found in many of the test pits indicates
the presence of numerous other dwellings in the area (Florin 1938:31p; 1958). A second farming village from the Stone Age was found the following year at the so called Katrineholm-Mogetorp site (Florin 1938:27pp; 1958) albeit with houses of an entirely different kind.

Fig. 58. These carefully and elaborate drawings depict a Stone Age house from Vrå (right) and from Katrineholm-Mogetorp (left), both from the Province of Södermanland. The latter was excavated in 1936 and consisted of a wall-like construction 1 meter wide and up to 50 cm high made with stones, 5-25 cm diameter, surrounding a floor area that was 4.5x6 meters (NW-SE). A second floor area of approximately the same size was uncovered immediately to the NW of the first, but it was only partly enclosed by a stone-lined wall. The floors in both rooms were semi-subterranean and made up of fine, hard-packed clay and sand situated 75 cm below the level of the present day ground surface. A number of postholes were noted in both floor areas but no signs of any hearth were found in either of them. Instead, two round pit hearths, 125 centimetres in diameter and filled with fire-cracked stones, were uncovered, each situated 3 and 4 meters from their respective floor areas. Rubbish recovered from the floor areas included ceramics, stone tools, burnt bones and large amounts of fire baked wattle and daub (Florin 1938:32pp; 1958). The rectangular dwelling from Vrå was 4x5 meters with a semi-subterranean floor, hard-packed, consisting of a mixture of fine sand with a small amount of gravel, the outer edges of which were lined with stones, 30-40 cm in size. There was no sign of any hearth in the floor area, but two hearth pits were discovered close by. Only a minimal amount of rubbish was found on the floor area, with the exception of large amounts of wattle and daub. By now Swedish archaeologists knew of a number of different kinds of prehistoric dwellings, the effort expended in order to document them is considerable, the results both informative and useful (illustration source Florin 1938, here redrawn and somewhat simplified).
1952 (Fredsjö 1953:44). One would have thought that more would have been said concerning this remarkable find, instead we are presented with a detailed discussion of the artefacts, while the dwelling is never properly described. Judging from the drawings it was more or less round, about 4 meters in diameter or ca. 12.5 square meters in area. About 65 stones, between 10-75 cm large, were found along two thirds of its circumference (Fredsjö 1953:46). Munthe, using shoreline displacement, dated the site, which lies at 50 m.a.s.l., to 8750 bc (Fredsjö 1953:68). On the very next page of his book Fredsjö put forth a somewhat more cautious estimate of 7900 bc (Fredsjö 1953:69). But even this date was offered with some hesitancy and he concludes his chronological deliberations by proposing that the date of the Hensbacka Culture is between 7300-6600 bc (Fredsjö 1953:135). Fredsjö’s main concern was typology, trying to convince his colleagues that flake axes were not exclusive to the following Ertebølle Culture. This was an uphill battle in itself and probably explains why other aspects of the site received less attention.

Today the Hensbacka Culture is considered to have flourished during the Pre-Boreal period, that is to say ca. 9500-8500 BC and the Tosskärr site is interpreted as a seasonal hunting station. It is interesting to note that the present date of the Hensbacka Culture has been derived through an application of the exact same method employed by Munte over 60 years ago, that is to say, through use of shoreline displacement (Burenhult 1999:188).

Semi-subterranean Houses: Norway

The discovery and recognition of semi-subterranean houses in Norway would seem to have its origins in Russia, along the north-easternmost corner of the Kola Peninsula, through the work of an eminent Finnish geologist and geographer. While conducting extensive field work on the Quaternary geology of this remote area, Väinö Tanner (1881-1948) noted the remains of two different house types that inspired him to write what can only be described as one of the most interesting articles of its time (Ekberg 1985; Tanner 1928; 1930). The first of these semi-subterranean houses was discovered in the vicinity of Petsamo (or Pechenga) a town situated on an inlet of the Barents Sea, originally referred to as a house of the Soim-type, because the first to be found overlooked a bay of that same name (Soim’vähke). Primarily built of sod, with walls up to 1.5 meters thick, they consist of a number of nearly square rooms placed on either side of a long central corridor that also served as a covered entrance-way. Tanner, judging from the state of these remains and their position in relationship to the ancient shorelines, dated them to the 16th and 17th centuries AD (Tanner 1928:6pp).

Tanner’s Sámi informants acquainted him with the fact that they not only knew about these and similar remains but that they also considered them to have been built and used by their ancestors, calling them jennam ‘vuolas’ kuatt which roughly translates as ‘subterranean tents’ (Sw. under jorden belägna kåtor). They went on to explain that their forefathers employed this form of architecture in order that they might remain undetected by outsiders who used to frequent the region in order to capture and enslave them (Tanner 1928:3pp). It is somewhat astonishing to note that this explanation is precisely the same as provided by Olaus Magnus some 373 years earlier (Magnus [1555] 1982:175pp).

The so called Gröttug house type was discovered soon after, near the Gröttug stream on the Fiskarhalvön peninsula. Here, overlooking the sea, situated parallel to three beach escarpments of varying heights, are the remains of eight semi-subterranean houses placed end to end in groups of two’s and three’s. Tanner, realising that these were not hunting or trapping pits, proceeded to map and describe them (fig. 59). The former is an excellent source of information, while the latter is not, but by combining the information provided by both one can formulate an opinion concerning their size and shape. Their similarity with the houses known as the Gressbakken type in Norway is as striking as it is obvious (see below).

Tanner’s Sámi informants took him to another site, located at Malö’muette, on the eastern side of the Madde’muette spit, also situated on the Fiskarhalvön peninsula, where he was shown another three houses of the Gröttug type, placed in a row along an ancient beach ridge some 15 meters above today’s sea level. A man by the name of Mattis Noste told Tanner that he had, some twenty years previously, delved into one of these houses in order to “...find out if the Sámi tradition, that it was our forefathers who lived in these structures, was true or not.” (Tanner 1928:15). We do not know if Noste managed to answer this question to his own satisfaction, but he did uncover two objects during the course of his investigation, which he later handed over to the proper antiquarian authorities and which were duly catalogued by Rygh. One of these was a boot-shaped knife of slate, the other a bone fishhook, implements that we now know are typical
Fig. 59. Tanner’s map of the jennam’ vuolas’ kuatt located on the coast of the Barents Sea, just north of the Göttung stream (also Grottug’jokk or Rotojoki), Fiskarhalvön (or Poluostrov-Rybachy) peninsula, situated on the north-eastern corner of the Kola peninsula in Russia. This is probably the first map ever made and published showing the layout of a Fenno-Scandian Stone Age village. It is an excellent example of useful archaeological documentation conducted in a simple and straightforward manner, albeit by someone who isn’t an archaeologist. The information it contains is invaluable, having once seen it, one can immediately put that knowledge to use, both to locate and then recognise similar features in the landscape (illustration source Tanner 1928:14, here redrawn and somewhat simplified). On the surface these houses appear as oval depressions, about 5-10 meters long, 3.5-4 meters wide and 0.5-0.7 meters deep, surrounded by an embankment ca. 1-2 meters wide. Four trench-like hollows were observed to occur in each and every embankment, running from its inner to its outer edges. Those located in the middle of the long sides are less conspicuous, being both short, squat, 0.7 meters wide, and shallow, 0.2-0.4 meters deep. Those situated in the middle of the side ends are much more pronounced, being both longer, wider, 1 meter, and deeper, 0.2-0.6 meters (Tanner 1928:13pp).
excavations were also carried out at the Nyelv site. All in all, Nummedal and Gjessing excavated 19 house remains (Nummedal 1937; 1938a; 1938b; Simonsen 1961; 1976).

These discoveries soon became one of the most well-known, if not famous, archaeological sites in Scandinavia. Here, in a relatively restricted area, one finds all the quintessential elements so characteristic of semi-subterranean houses. As of 1967 there were at least 250 semi-subterranean houses of prehistoric date in the Varanger Fjord area, a figure that is probably much too modest if one considers the amount of research that has been carried out since then. The first three and most well-known localities to be discovered and excavated are all situated along the southern shores of the fjord. They are the Gropbakkeengen, the Gressbakken and the Nyelv sites, with 85, 14 and 35 semi-subterranean houses respectively. (Hagen 1967; Johansen 1985; Renouf 1989; Schanche 1994). These houses are usually assigned to one of two main categories, the Karlebotn type or the larger Gressbakken type, although not all houses fit smoothly into this classification scheme (fig. 60 & 61).

A second and much more extensive round of excavations was carried out by Povl Simonsen between 1951-1958, by which time a further 94 houses were investigated. It is interesting to note that one of Simonsen’s co-workers, at least for a while, was Hans Christiansson (Simonsen 1961:9; 1976). The results from these excavations were also quickly made available through publication, the most notable of these being the Varanger Funnene series published by the Troms Museum in five volumes (Olsen 1967; Simonsen 1961; 1963; 1968; Torgersen 1959).

Nummedal mainly concerned himself with the typological and chronological aspects of the Gropbakkeengen site. From the lithic artefacts, the...
chapter three

He concluded that this site represented a thriving settlement, more or less permanent, from about 2000 BC that probably boasted a population that exceeds the amount of people living in the area today (Nummedal 1937:77).

Gutorm Gjessing and Povl Simonsen focused attention on questions concerning settlement pattering and prehistoric subsistence strategies within the Varanger Fjord area. Both based their interpretations on the archaeological material, with inferences drawn from ethnographic studies, both local and circumpolar. Simonsen viewed the material remains as representing a territorially bound, semi-nomadic hunting and fishing population. Maritime, coastal, inland, river and lacustrine environments were all exploited according to a fixed yearly cycle.

Group movement within each separate territory was determined by the seasonal occurrence, location and amount of various subsistence resources, which in turn influenced population density and thus settlement size. Social groups repeatedly occupied between 3 to 4 seasonal camps on an annual basis. The greatest population aggregations correspond to the large agglomerations of house foundations found along the coast, which Simonsen interpreted as winter villages. He did not assume that each and every house on any single site had all been occupied at one and the same time. The earliest villages of the Late Stone Age, as represented by the houses of the Karlebotten type, were considered to have consisted on average of about 20-25 households. Exceptionally large

Fig. 61. House no. 2 at the Gressbakken site, in the Varanger Fjord, Norway, excavated in 1956 and published in 1961. Here is yet another example of a no frills archaeological documentation that is both informative and useful. The similarities between this type of house and the Göttug type as described by Tanner is readily apparent (illustration source Simonsen 1961:287, fig 122, here redrawn to scale and simplified). On the surface the Gressbakken house type is an oval to rectangular hollow encompassed by an embankment. Two stone-lined hearths are often found centrally placed in the floor, an area which is usually located 0.25-0.5 meters below the original ground surface and measures between 3.5-7 meters wide, 7-12 meters long. The surrounding embankment reaches considerable proportions, anywhere from 4-7 meters wide and 1-1.5 meters high. They usually consist of alternate layers of gravel, sand, peat and rubbish, the latter may include mussel shells, animal bones, stone debris, discarded tools of stone, bone, antler and wood as well as ceramic sherds of various types. The embankment is usually crossed sectioned by one or more trench-like hollows, often ca. 0.75 meters wide, that run from the floor area to the outer edge of the embankment. These features have been interpreted as entrance passages or alternatively, if they were covered, as entrance tunnels (Lundberg 1986:83; Renouf 1989; Simonsen 1961; 1970:181pp).
villages, like the Grophakeengan site, might have harboured 40 households. The Karlebotten house type was seen as the abode of the nuclear family, composed of 5-6 individuals. This would have meant that the average winter village (read tribe) was the largest social unit, numbering between 100-150 people. During the rest of the year people lived in smaller groups consisting of 20-30 individuals. During the latter part of the Late Stone Age the Gressbakken house came into use. Simonsen concluded that this occurred in conjunction with a parallel reduction in the size of the winter villages, now seen as averaging between 10-15 households per site, a change that reflected a corresponding alteration in social organisation. The shift from the smaller Karlebotten house type with its single hearth to the larger Gressbakken type with two hearths was interpreted as representing a transformation of the primary social unit, from one based on the nuclear family to one founded on the shared dwelling of the extended family (Simonsen 1965).

Since then, novel theoretical approaches, renewed field work, in both this and other northern fjords, together with the availability of a greater number of radiocarbon dates resulting in finer chronological control, have prompted the reappraisal, modification or complete abandonment of a number of Simonsen’s original and innovative conclusions (Helskog 1974b; 1980; 1984; Renouf 1989; Schanche 1994; Thrash-Helskog 1983). This need not concern us here. Of greater interest is the quantity and quality of northern Norwegian research during the first three quarters of the 20th century as compared with that being produced by contemporary studies in Norrland. But first, a short presentation of the Finnish material.

Semi-subterranean Houses: Finland

Semi-subterranean houses received an early mention in the Finnish literature and were apparently considered to be a common feature on many Stone Age sites. Unfortunately details concerning these structures and their distribution are at times distressingly vague. These ‘house foundations’ are either round or rectangular in shape, 3-4 meters in diameter. A pit hearth, consisting mostly of ash and infrequently of fire-cracked stones, is often found located in the floor area. It was assumed that the walls and roof were built of bark, branches, turf and/or peat. Structures erected directly on the existing ground surface were considered to be summer dwellings while the semi-subterranean structures were viewed as winter houses (Ailio 1911:20). Ailio was possibly referring to the work carried out that same year by Topelius, who excavated a number of ‘Stone Age dwelling hollows’ located along a forest ridge not far from Lake Oitback, Kyrsklått parish in Nyland (Topelius 1912).

Whatever the case might be, this type of feature was promptly overshadowed by the discovery of what soon became one of Finland’s most well-known prehistoric dwellings, uncovered at Lake Pitkäjärvi in Raisilä parish on the Karelian isthmus. This hut-like construction was excavated by Sakari Pälsi in 1915, the results were published soon thereafter (Pesonen 2002:9; Pälsi 1918). The thousands of sherds found in association with this feature dated it to the Late Comb Ceramic Culture. Other artefacts recovered included about 100 whetstone fragments, hundreds of waste flakes, fragments of clay figurines and bone artefacts as well as three amber beads (Europaeus 1917:47).

During his investigation of the Mesolithic Suomusjärvi Culture, Ville Luho discovered postholes on at least 10 different sites which were taken to indicate the former presence of one or more dwellings similar to those noted above. Conclusive evidence that this was indeed so was uncovered at the Lauhala site, Honkajoki parish, in the Province of Satakunta in 1952. Here a number of postholes were recorded, 12 of which traced and oval form, ca. 7.5x5.5 meters (NW-SE), with a porch-like construction along the middle of its south-western wall, ca. 3x2 meters large. A hearth, 1x0.75 meters (N-S) was found in the floor area just left of centre together with at least 3 other postholes (Luho 1967b; Willebrand 1969:8pp).

By the time Kivikoski published her two general overviews on the prehistory of Finland, this type of dwelling had become a well-known and recognised feature on many Suomusjärvi and Comb Ceramic sites (Kivikoski 1964:46; 1967:36; Salo 1976:51). They are usually round or oval in shape, either 2-3 or 5-6 meters in diameter, the smaller interpreted as a one family dwelling while the larger were viewed as having been used by an extended family consisting of about 15 people. Dwellings with small hearth pits, considered just large enough to heat the interior, were perceived as sleeping quarters. Cooking and all other activities took place outdoors around the larger hearths, as indicated by the presence of the majority of all cultural debris, including fire-cracked stones, pottery sherds, burnt bones, débitage and stone tools. Semi-subterranean dwellings of this type, albeit with larger hearths, were regarded as representing winter

A related type of dwelling was also being uncovered during the first three decades of the 20th century in and around Lake Vuopaja, Enare parish in the Province of Lappland. These round, tent-like constructions were 4-5 meters in diameter and semi-subterranean, with the floor anywhere between 20-60 cm below the level of the ground surface. A few showed traces of having been surrounded by a low embankment. One centrally placed hearth was found in each dwelling, some were lined with stone, others not. At least one had a double hearth built of stone similar to those found in the houses of Gressbakken type. Quartz tools and débitage, slate objects and ceramics of various types and age make dating problematical, but suggests that this type of dwelling had been in use since the end of the Stone Age.

Similar structures were excavated in the Lappland province during the 1960’s, the results would seem to indicate that dwellings of this type span the entire Iron Age and continued to be used until recent times (Carpelan 1976).

Dwellings of a completely different kind came to light in 1946. What was at first considered to be a collection of burials, stone settings under low mounds, proved to be a small village comprised of eight (later twelve) houses side by side, together with at least five rubbish dumps or mounds. Due to the abundant amount of ceramics found, this village, at Otterböte on the island of Kökär in the Åland archipelago, was dated to the late Bronze Age. On the surface these huts or houses appear as shallow depressions, either round or square, with stones carefully placed along their edges. One foundation was excavated in 1946, revealing an oval floor 5.5x4.5 meters (NE-SW), surrounded by an embankment of stones 0.7-1 meters wide and 30-40 centimetres high. The floor area was situated 15-25 centimetres below the level of the ground surface. A pit consisting of sooty material, 25 centimetres in diameter and 40 centimetres deep, was found along the inner side of the north-eastern wall. The floor area was practically empty of finds, containing only a few ceramic sherds. The rubbish mound that lay immediately to the south of this house contained fire-cracked stones, soot, ceramic sherds and unburned seal bones (Dreijer 1947).

The type of semi-subterranean dwelling first mentioned by Ailio seems almost to have been forgotten in the wake of the discoveries of Pälsi and others. Aarne Europaeus, in the early 1920’s, and
Ville Luho in the late 1940’s each excavated a Stone Age feature that would seem to have been a semi-subterranean dwelling akin to those presented by Ailio (Pesonen 2002:10). But it was not until 1950, when Luho and Meinander discovered a semi-subterranean dwelling at Madeneva, Pihtipudas parish, situated in northern Tavastland province, that this type of house received widespread attention and recognition. By 1966 at least six additional sites with ‘Madeneva type dwellings’ had been found and/or partly excavated. The results from this work were presented in 1967 at the Nordic Archaeological Conference held in Helsinki (Edgren 1976). These houses occur alone or in groups of up to at least 5, although one gets the impression from Meinander’s review that they do occur together in greater numbers, a point on which he is vague (Meinander 1976:26pp).

On the surface the Madeneva houses are visible as shallow depressions, 20-60 centimetres deep, usually round, 6-8 meters in diameter, although oval shaped foundations do occur, one of which was reported to have been 5x7 meters large. In some cases the shallow depression is partly or completely surrounded by a low embankment. Excavations show that the floor area may lie up to 1 meter below the original ground surface. In only one case has a centrally placed, stone-lined hearth been found in the house itself. On the other hand, ceramics and stone tools were prevalent on the floor area. The presence, or not, of postholes, is disputed. All of the hut foundations are located on sites where different types of hearths have been found, together with ceramics and stone tools. The majority of the ceramic sherds belong to the Typical Comb Ceramic Phase, although other types have also been recovered, indicating that this type of house was common throughout the whole of the Comb Ceramic interval of the Neolithic period. Only one of these sites was found situated along an ancient sea coast, the rest are located near inland lakes (Edgren & Törnblom 1993:58; Meinander 1976:27). With this in mind Meinander offers a brief interpretation:

“One can pose the hypothesis that the sites located along the ancient sea coast were mainly summer camps and that the inland lake sites [with houses] were winter villages with more or less permanent dwellings (Meinander 1976:27).”

A growing awareness concerning this type of feature produced dramatic results. From the 1970’s onwards ever increasing numbers of semi-subterranean dwellings were being discovered in all parts of the country. By the end of the century almost 3500, spread over 600 different sites, had been recorded in Finland (Pesonen 2002:14; Ranta 2002).

Semi-subterranean Houses: Norrland

In 1921 O.B. Santesson documented what might possibly be the first prehistoric semi-subterranean dwelling to have been found in Norrland. This occurred at a location known as the ‘Northern Tenant Farm’ (Sw. Bäckarna Norra Torpet), near the village of Backe on Lake Fjällsjö, Fjällsjö parish, Ångermanland. Later, in July of 1926, Santesson mapped and test excavated this feature which he describes as a “...presumed pit dwelling...” (Santesson 1927). His field notes were never published, his endeavours have come down to us through his handwritten rapport which is on file at the Antiquarian-Topographical Archives in Stockholm. His description of this presumed dwelling is as follows:

“The pit is quite shallow, circle round, 4 meters in diameter with an entrance facing towards the lake, surrounded by a very low embankment (Santesson 1927).”

It is apparent that this type of feature is readily visible to anyone who knows what to look for. The archaeological discovery in 1965 of the many houses at Sätös, Kuusjärvi parish in the Karelen province was proceeded by the opening of a sand quarry by the local villagers, who thus inadvertently damaged and exposed a part of this site. Meinander relates that;

“...some of the local village boys had observed that ceramics and stone tools were most readily found in the distinctly visible, round or oval depressions that were encountered laying side by side along the ancient beach terrace. One youth had a collection of at least 100 kilos of sherds consisting of some of the very best Comb Ceramic pottery (Meinander 1976:27).”

He goes on to tell us that;

“This same youth...did us the favour of seeking out new sites by following the ancient beach terrace, where he test probed in the basin shaped hollows that he came across. Stone Age ceramics were found in every one of them... (Meinander 1976:28).”
Fig. 63. Harald Hvarfner (1926-1975) both archaeologist and ethnologist, the latter of these two perspectives provided him with a keener awareness concerning the abrupt and irreversible changes that were being wrought on the Norrlandian inhabitants and their lifeways by the rapid exploitation of the region’s hydro-electrical resources. This is clearly apparent through the cultural and historical field work, conducted either by him or carried out under his supervision during his stint at the Central Board of National Antiquities between 1950-1962, from which he moved on to become director of the Norrbotten County Museum in 1962 and director of the Nordic Museum in 1971. Obviously, others were also conscious of the transformations overtaking Norrländ in the wake of this latest industrial onslaught, but they often come across as detached observers, viewing unfolding events as professional administrators, intent on effectively supervising the antiquarian documentation required by the strict letter of the law. Not so Hvarfner. There is an underlying intensity in the ethnographical investigations he was involved in, possibly derived from the realisation that the cultural manifestations confronting him along the Norrlandian waterways would soon vanish forever, their demise hastened through the engineering feats of a modern society that was effectively dispossessing these communities of their livelihoods. Hvarfner also manages to convey, intentionally or not, a deep sense of empathy mixed with respect as concerns the customs, traditions, experiences and history of these people. Much of his own work, published or unpublished, together with that completed by others who he undoubtedly inspired, is often richly illustrated with many black and white photographs. These include not only archaeological remains, but pictures of contemporary houses, cottages, cabins, barns, sheds and stacks, fences, fields, meadows, pastures and vegetable gardens, fishing places and hunting grounds, roads, paths, trails, bridges, fords and much more that was soon to parish beneath the waters of the reservoirs created by the dams of the hydro-electric power stations. Tools, equipment and tackle were documented in this way, as well as the interiors of houses, including furniture and other common objects and items that were once part of everyday life. Men and women, old and young, at work, play and in rest were also photographed. Some of these were made by Hvarfner, but many were taken by Lars Bergström Jr. (b. 1930) a talented young photographer who often collaborated with Hvarfner and who would go on to earn international recognition for himself. Surprisingly, this incalculable treasure, exempting Hvarfner and a few others, has hardly received the attention it truly deserves. Neither has Hvarfner, who was a prodigious writer, his untimely death deprived Norrländ of one of its most energetic explorers (Granlund 1975; Hvarfner 1957a;[1958a];[1958b];[1958c];[1958d];[1958e]; 1958f; 1960a; 1961a; 1964; Hvarfner & Kvarning 1959; Janson 1960a:14; Westerlund 1959; 1961; photo source Granlund 1975).

The scarppers of quartzite, flakes of quartz, quartzite, slate, porphyry and flint, burnt bone fragments, charcoal, ceramic sherds and fire-cracked stones. He concludes by stating that the excavation revealed “No proper cultural deposit or layer.” (Santesson 1927). Over 30 years would pass before any mention of this site appeared in print. This occurred in 1955 when Harald Hvarfner briefly presented the archaeological material from the Parishes of Bodum and Fjällsjö in a short article where he states that the “...material from Bäckarna was supposedly found in association with a circle round embankment-like mound, which has since been destroyed though agricultural activities.” (Hvarfner 1955:21). It is interesting to note Hvarfner’s employment of contradictory terms when he comes to describe this feature, a circumstance that often occurs when discussing Norrlandian structures of this type.

We will probably never know exactly what it was that Santesson found and documented at the Bäckarna Farm, surprisingly, the site never awoke any interest among archaeologists. Not so the site discovered at Bellsså, (Raä 101) Täsjö parish in the Province of Ångermanland. Here, in 1923, Santesson recorded a structure that has attracted attention ever since. The Bellsås site is beautifully situated on the south-eastern peninsula of a small island with a view over Lake Hotingsjön. It is monumental in its proportions, but reports vary concerning its exact dimensions. In any case, it would seem to be more or less round, measuring somewhere between 23-30 meters across with a flat inner hollow area located about 0.5 meters below the original ground surface that is 6-10 meters in diameter. Seven different hearths have been discovered within this area, both pit and stone-lined. The surrounding embankment is 5-10 meters wide and 1-2 meters high. In the south-eastern side of the embankment there is a shallow trench-like hollow that runs from its inner to its outer edge (Baudou 1977:93pp; Hvarfner 1955:23; 1957b:99; Lundberg 1997:24pp).
Santesson undertook a limited test excavation at Bellsås in 1923, which was later supplemented by a three and four day investigation undertaken in July of 1925 and 1926 respectively. He describes this structure as "...a pit surrounded by a high circular embankment." (Santesson 1926). His excavations revealed that the flat bottomed hollow consisted of a thick cultural deposit with an abundance of archaeological material; stone tools, bone, charcoal, asbestos tempered ceramics, masses of fire-cracked stone and two hearths. Despite these results, he does not go on to make any further interpretation of this site other than to conclude that this feature is not a pit-trap, or a charcoal pit, nor a recent fortification, but that it must be "...a structure from the Stone Age." (Santesson 1926; 1927).

By the 1970’s about 30 structures of this type had been discovered (Löthman 1986b:39). As of 1997 there where 83, distributed across 29 different sites, all exclusively located in the inland of Norrland. Nineteen of these have been excavated, in whole or partly. They are found within a rather restricted area ca. 350x200 km that falls within the borders of the Counties of Jämtland, Ångermanland and Västerbotten (Lundberg 1986:85; 1997:19). They are always situated near water and on well drained soils, either alone or in a groups of 2-10, although clusters of 2-5 are the norm. As seen from the surface, these structures are composed of two main features, a flat hollow surrounded, in part or completely, by an embankment. The shape of these structures varies, being round, oval, rectangular, horseshoe shaped or irregular. Their size also greatly differs, the round range between 6-30 meters in diameter while the oval-rectangular structures are 5-30 meters long and 4.5-20 meters wide. The flat hollow, or interior area, is situated 0.1-1.5 meters below the original level of the ground surface. Their shape and size also varies, round ones are between 2.5-10 meters in diameter, the oval-rectangular in shape are 3.5-10 meters long and 3-5 meters wide. The embankment always consists of varying combinations of soil and cultural rubbish, primarily fire-cracked stones with burnt bone fragments, soot, charcoal, flakes and débitage from tool production as well as various worn and broken stone tools of quartz, quartzite, slate and other various lithic types. Both the height and width of the embankments differ within one and the same site and between sites, ranging from 0.1-2 meters in height and anywhere up to 10 meters wide. The embankment is usually cross cut by a trench-like hollow, running from its inner to outer edge. One or more hearths are always located in the flat hollow area. Pit hearths, stone-lined hearths and other types of pit-like features are also found in the embankment itself or in its immediate vicinity. Uncalibrated C14 dates indicate that these structures were in use roughly between 4000-2000 bc (Lundberg 1985; 1997; Löthman 1986a; 1986b; Spång 1986a; 1986b).

As already noted, the Central Board of National Antiquities had become the leading antiquarian authority throughout the land, due in part to the legislation of 1942. Its rise to dominance in the North was facilitated by the accelerated exploitation of Norrland’s hydro-electric power resources which increasingly occurred from this time onwards (fig. 25). This huge enterprise now required, by law, antiquarian involvement on a scale hitherto unprecedented in the annals of Swedish archaeology. For the next 40 years the Central Board of National
Antiquities would conduct an incalculable number of surveys, followed by hundreds of excavations, along the majority of the Norrlandian waterways. This documentary work reached its greatest extent during the 1950’s and 1960’s and included not only archaeological, but ethnographical and toponological investigations as well. These ‘Norrlandian Salvage Investigations’ came to occupy the considerable talents of both Sverker Janson (b. 1908) and Harald Hvarfner. The former became involved in this undertaking right from the very start, soon advancing to a position of responsibility, spending his entire career at the Central Board of National Antiquities. He was joined by Hvarfner in 1950, who, and for the next 12 years, also found himself directing and overseeing many of these investigations (fig. 63). Either together or separately, Janson and Hvarfner, utilising select portions of that vast material they were helping to amass, produced a flood of influential articles and monographs on different aspects of Norrlandian prehistory and history (Biörnstad 1966:65pp; Hvarfner 1957a; 1958f; Sundlin 1990:14pp).

One of the chief features to come under their scrutiny were those ‘mound-like embankments of fire-cracked stone’. During the 1947 and 1948 field seasons, Carl Gustaf Blomberg and Björn Allard investigated one such feature situated on Lake Kvårbergsvatnet, Gäddede, (Raä 101) Frostvikens parish, Jämtland. Originally discovered by Knut Tinnberg, it was the first of its kind to be fully and completely excavated. Blomberg and Allard alternatively described it as “…a mound…”, “…an embankment shaped formation…” and finally as “…an oval shaped embankment...” measuring 10x7 meters and 0.2-0.3 meters high, with an opening facing the lake. This horseshoe shaped embankment surrounded a flat oval depression or hollow some 6x4 meters large and 0.2 meters deep (B. Allard [1948]; Blomberg [1948]; Lundberg 1997:20pp). Blomberg states that this structure, in both form, composition and function, is similar to those found in southern Sweden, commonly referred to as ‘mounds of fire-cracked stone’ (Sw. skärvstenshögar). This interpretation was suggested to him by K.A. Gustawsson, to whom Blomberg explicitly refers (Blomberg [1948]). Initially, these Southern ‘mounds of fire-cracked stone’ had often and mistakenly been regarded as grave mounds and/or cairns. Numerous excavations, from the beginning of the 20th century onwards, revealed that these Southern features consisted of various types of rubbish, mainly fire-cracked stone mixed with soil, soot and charcoal together with ceramic sherds, burnt and unburned bone as well as objects made of both stone, bronze and iron, suggesting that they were primarily in use during the Bronze and Iron Ages. They are often found in close proximity to grave mounds, cairns and/or rock carvings, a relationship that led Bellander to conclude that these features were not merely complicated piles of rubbish, but in fact funeral pyres and/or sacrificial shrines, the result of elaborate interment and/or mortuary practices (Bellander 1938;
U. Bertilsson 1986; Gustawsson 1949b; Schönbäck 1959). It was Gustawsson who reverted to the interpretation that these southern Swedish mounds were indeed, nothing more than piles of rubbish, as were the Norrlandian structures (Gustawsson 1949b).

Hvarfner carried out a limited excavation at Bellsås (Raä 101) in 1952. He interprets this and all similar structures in Norrland according to Gustawsson’s suggestion, referring to them as “…mounds of cooking stones…” as well as “…embankments of cooking stones…”, noting that their size indicates that they were in use for a considerable period of time (Baudou 1977:93pp; Hvarfner 1955:23; 1957b:99). In one of the unpublished reports from Bellsås, Hvarfner does mention that the inner area had been dug down below the level of the original ground surface and that the embankment was, initially, formed with soil produced by that excavation, which was then covered with cultural material that had later been thrown onto the embankment from the inner area during cleaning operations. He also describes finding a stone-lined hearth containing fire-cracked stones in this inner area (Hvarfner [1953]:57).

A second structure of this type was discovered at Bellsås (Raä 102) by Hvarfner and excavated in 1959 with the assistance of Birgitta Hallgren. In the unpublished report it is described as a 10x4 meter oval hollow surrounded by an irregular shaped embankment 5-15 meters wide and up to 0.6 meters high. It is repeatedly referred to as an “embankment of cooking... [or] ...fire-cracked stones…” (Hallgren 1959a).

The interpretation of these structures was no longer an issue by the time Harald Hvarfner, Elisabeth Allard and Christian Meschke et al. excavated similar features at Tjikkiträsk, (Raä 17 & 18) Stensele parish, Lappland in 1961. The three structures located there were comparable to those of “…the Hoting type…” and were referred to as “…mounds…” and “…embankments of fire-cracked stone…” (E. Allard [1961a]; [1961b]; [1961c]).

Allard returned to Norrland for a month in 1963 and again in 1964 to conduct investigations into the “…mound of cooking stones…” that Santesson had registered and test excavated almost forty years earlier at Lemnäset on Lake Lesjön, (Raä 26) Bodum parish, Angermanland. Here she was confronted with yet another oval hollow 10x7 meters large (N-S) and 0.4-0.8 meters deep that contained a number of hearth and hearth-like features. The surrounding embankment was irregular in shape, 2-8 meters wide and 0.2-0.5 meters high, with a trench-like opening located in the middle of its eastern side (E. Allard [1964a]; [1964b]; Lundberg 1997:32pp).

In reviewing the unpublished reports from all of these excavations, one can’t help but notice the discrepancy that continually crops up between the descriptive labels applied to these structures in comparison with some of the detailed and beautifully executed drawings, both plan and profile, that were produced with each ensuing excavation. The centrally placed hollow and its accompanying hearths are always dutifully noted and meticulously illustrated, and then ignored. Instead, attention is focused towards the ‘mound’ or ‘embankment’, disregarding the fact that they are obviously not mounds and that the embankment is only one feature of many, albeit a prominent one, that together with the other features make up a larger structure. One reason for this oversight resides in how these structures were understood to have been formed. This in turn harks back to the re-interpretation of those southern Swedish features by Gustawsson, who observed that ‘fire-cracked stones’ were no such thing. Instead, heated stones had been used to bring liquids to a boil, a task that had generated the masses of cracked stone visible on many prehistoric sites today. He was not the first to propose that the cracked stones had been thus employed but, and for whatever reason, his article gained widespread attention. The net result of this was that any larger aggregation of cracked stones was summarily labelled as a rubbish heap. This interpretation was adopted by Hvarfner. The Norrlandian embankments were viewed as having been formed as a consequence of food processing and production. Heated stones had been used to boil water, having once done so and then cracked, they had then been discarded in and about the working area, resulting in the embankments visible today (Gustawsson 1949b; Hvarfner 1955:23; Nummedal 1924). Hvarfner’s description and interpretation of these Norrlandian structures was the first ever to appear in print and became the standard or normative interpretation (fig. 64).

Sverker Janson echoes Hvarfner’s interpretation concerning these structures in an article that appeared in a lavishly illustrated anthology, issued by the Central Board of National Antiquities in 1960. This commemorative work was published in order to present the results coming out of their work in connection with the exploitation of Norrland’s hydroelectric power resources (Janson & Hvarfner 1960). Janson persistently describes these Norrlandian
structures as ‘mounds’ in a number of different publications, which seems odd, especially when he recognises that they are ‘...circular embankments...’ and that Bellsås is ‘...actually an embankment-like formation with a hollow space in its centre.’ (Janson 1960c:32pp 1962b:50). He then goes on to acknowledge that we do not know if Bellsås was a settlement site of a more permanent kind or if it was only used seasonally. He continues by suggesting that Bellsås could have been a winter camp. Immediately after formulating this idea he rejects it, and reinstates the prevailing opinion that this site was ‘...used seasonally, to hunt big game and stock up on stores, staying a certain time, year after year, generation after generation.’ (Janson 1960c:34) and that the ‘...river valleys make ideal hunting grounds for a rambling, nomadic people.’ (Janson 1960d:38). He goes on to characterise Norrland as an empty waste, where;

...we have found an astonishing... [number of]...localities evenly distributed...along the shores of rivers and lakes. We have discovered a populated wilderness. A survey of these localities immediately shows that it is not conceivable that we are here dealing with a settled population (Janson 1965:342pp, English in the original).

He points out that both the lithic and osteological material, together with the evidence of the rock carvings and paintings, all support this interpretation. These hunters required;

... vast spaces for their wide-ranging mode of life...we thus find a folk group outside the settlement, whose conditions are diametrically opposed to those of the settled population. For the roamers of the hunting ground it is space and mobility that are of vital importance. It must be regarded as natural that a hunting and fishing culture of this kind need not for its survival follow the changes and the cultural course characterizing the evolution of the settlement. Considered under the aspect of the means of subsistence, there is nothing to contradict the assumption that in its [remote] regions this stone-age culture did not change its character during the whole of the prehistoric era, and perhaps even persists after this. We here find ourselves in a region outside the settled countryside, where the natural resources can be exploited without the advances which set their stamp on the settled population, and where it is possible to obtain the bare necessities of life in a primitive and relatively unchanged way (Janson 1965:345p, English in the original).

Partly in lieu of their prominent positions, more probably in light of their vast experience and diligence in the field, vindicated by their scholarly output, Janson and Hvarfner formed the nucleus of what soon became an enduring thought-collective within the Central Board of National Antiquities. This collective shared the same convictions that characterise that thought-style noted above, as represented by those five basic hypotheses or postulates that seem to have regularly occurred and re-occurred within the literature throughout the 20th century.

The first of these postulates is the belief that Norrland had been inhabited relatively late, an assumption that will be explored in more detail below (Hallgren 1959b; Hvarfner 1957a; 1957b:102p;

The third is the view that the society (singular) located in the North, as represented by the remains of its slate, quartz and quartzite technology, was culturally retarded. Stone Age Norrland had basically remained unchanged for thousands of years, having persisted up until AD 1000 and, at least in some areas, into late historical times (E. Allard 1964c:55; Ambrosiani 1965:5pp; Biörnstad 1962a:79; 1962b:134; 1965:80; 1967; 1969; Hvarfner 1955:28; 1957b:101pp; 1957c:85 & 94; 1957e; 1958g:28; 1961a:23; 1961b; 1962:158pp; 1963:28; Janson 1956:68; 1960b:26pp; 1962c:68; 1962d:4; 1964:40; 1965:346; 1969a:64; 1969b:182; Selinge 1967:14; Stenberger 1962:64p; 1964:46, 57 & 156; 1969; Westin 1952:21). This assumption was, in part, readily deduced from the artefacts themselves;

Certain Norrlandian Stone Age artefacts must have had been modelled on southern Swedish Iron Age prototypes. (Hvarfner 1955:28).

While Hvarfner based his conclusions on typology, Janson found further support in the sheer volume of research that had been carried out during the intervening years;

...we know of a number artefacts found on these sites, which indicate that this Stone Age culture survived long after the Stone Age culture of southern Scandinavia had entered the metal ages. The material is at present so large that we can with great confidence express an opinion concerning this relationship... [everywhere we find Iron Age objects]...mixed with material from the Stone Age, this cannot be explained by assuming that these later day objects, by chance or due to the [reuse of these] favourably placed sites, have become accidentally mixed in with the older material (Janson 1962c:68p).

The belated development of prehistoric Norrland was periodically alleviated through contacts with southern Sweden. This is the fourth general postulate of this thought-style and collective; that any and all changes and/or progress which occurred in Norrland resulted from outside influences of one kind or another and that they usually came from the South (Biörnstad 1962a:79; 1962b:114; 1962c:113; 1967a; 1967b; 1969; Hallgren 1959b; Hvarfner 1960b:63p; 1962:145; 1963; Janson 1956:68p; 1962c:68; 1964; 1965:345p; Stenberger 1962:69pp; 1964; 1969; Selinge 1967:20; Westin 1952).

The fifth basic assertion upheld by this thought-collective is that Norrland has always been a source of raw materials for the South. This is viewed as having been especially beneficial for the North, its economic exploitation by Southern entrepreneurs resulted in the transference of advanced cultural elements into this otherwise backward region (Ambrosiani 1965:8; Becker 1952; Biörnstad 1962a:97; 1962b:114pp; 1965; 1967a; 1969; Hvarfner 1957c:28; 1962:150 & 171; 1963; Janson 1960d; 1962c:72; 1965:346p; 1970:83pp; Stenberger 1962:71p; 1964:148 & 157; 1969; Westlin 1952). In the minds of this thought-collective it is;

...natural to assume that the riches from the forests and rivers had, during prehistoric times, attracted attention (Biörnstad 1962a:97),

and that;

The whole of southern Norrland, including Medelpad, functioned as a source of raw materials for the centres of commerce. From Norrland the products were gathered, and used in trade, both within Scandinavia and beyond (Biörnstad 1967a:39).

Indeed, the entire Iron Age culture of Norrland is more or less conceived as having arisen and endured in response to this commercial enterprise;

It is natural to assume that it was the entrepreneurs who [first] founded trading stations and settlements in order to effectively cement contacts with the hunting population...those highly evolved Iron Age settlements that we later find in the settled countryside developed out of those trading stations which had previously been established in the homeland of the hunters (Janson 1962c:72).

In light of the above, it is hardly surprising that the ‘embankments’ were viewed as rubbish heaps rather than semi-subterranean houses. The prehistoric
society envisioned and evoked by this thought-collective had absolutely no use of the latter. With this in mind it is no longer remarkable that the comparable material coming out of both Norway, Finland and southern Sweden availed them not at all. Houses simply did not fit in with the overarching theoretical superstructure of this thought-style.

In 1967 Christiansson excavated what was interpreted to be a floor area, situated at Kungaudden, Sorsele parish, located in the mountainous areas of western Västerbotten. It consisted of a central hearth, 1.2x2 meters large, surrounded by 22 postholes, which were assumed to demarcate the outer edge of the floor. The presence and distribution of the ca. 22 thousand flakes and/or débitage of quartzite found in conjunction with this feature more or less coincided with the supposed circumference of this round tent-like construction, which measured ca. 3.6-4 meters in diameter (Christiansson 1969c). The publication of this discovery did not perceivably alter prevailing assumptions.

Neither did the 12th Nordic Archaeological Conference, held in Helsinki, Finland in 1967, the main theme of which were 'prehistoric dwellings'. Many of the archaeologists mentioned above were present (see attendance roster in Edgren 1976). But not even the input coming out of this assembly, where a number of different types of subterranean dwellings from various periods were presented and discussed, was strong enough to inspirer or stimulate a re-evaluation of these Norrlandian features by the members of this southern Swedish thought-collective. Something more than just another increase in the amount of empirical data was needed in order to effect a change in the prevailing interpretation.

Actually, there were a few who did suggest that these Norrlandian structures represented the remains of semi-subterranean dwellings. Santesson, in his unpublished field notes, implied that the structure he had discovered in 1921 was a dwelling of this type, but he seems to have quickly abandoned this idea and never returned to it (Santesson 1927). One who did regard these structures as semi-subterranean dwellings, built and occupied by “...ancient hunters...” was Olof Petter Pettersson (1859-1944), a much appreciated teacher and recorder of local Lapplandian folklore (Pettersson 1944:334; Ågren 1995:385). He was probably the first ever to do so in print, arguing his case based on their morphology, topographical location as concerns local resource availability and communications, as well as drawing ethnographic comparisons with various historically known Sámi dwellings (Pettersson 1944:332pp). Tinnberg also surmised that these structures could have functioned as winter dwellings in an unpublished report from 1945 (Tinnberg 1945 in Löthman 1986b:42). An account of the typological and chronological aspects of the lithic material recovered from the Tjikkiträsk excavations was carried out and published in 1967 by Christian Meschke. Concerning the use and function of these structures, he summarily notes that the excavation had not revealed any proof that a tent or house-like construction had ever been erected on this feature (Meschke 1967:4). He ends this important monograph by pointing out that this site, rich in wildlife and fish “...has always been an excellent camp for wandering and rambling hunters.” (Meschke 1967:46).

Bellsås (Raä 101) was revisited and partly excavated in 1969, this time under the direction of Evert Baudou in connection with the Early Norrland Research Project. This was primarily undertaken in order to establish chronological control over the stratigraphy inherent in the embankment, which could then be compared with the material remains embedded in the vertical stratigraphy of other sites and with the horizontal stratigraphy of sites located at different heights in relationship to ancient shorelines during prehistoric times (see below). Baudou points out that the osteological material from the embankment at Bellsås indicates that the site was used during the winter and goes on to suggest that these embankments could have been utilised as windbreakers or functioned as a foundation for some hut-like construction (Baudou 1976:18; 1977:98p).

But these ‘dissidents’ were voices in the wilderness. Santesson censured himself while both Pettersson and Tinnberg were ignored. Meschke was aware of the conjecture but rejected it, while Baudou’s main line of research effectively directed his attention elsewhere. Moreover, there is a great difference between suggesting a hypothesis and setting out to establish its legitimacy. Having once done so, there still remains the difficulty of its being accepted as such by the scientific community. In this case there was little possibility of that happening. What was needed was a new thought-collective and style. In 1975, two events were set in motion that would help bring this about.

One was the commencement of a project carried out and administered by the Västerbotten County
Museum (the ‘grandchild’ of the region’s antiquarian society and various local heritage associations) in cooperation with a number of municipalities in the County of Västerbotten. The initiative behind this development originated in the concern expressed by a few citizens who drew attention to the ever increasing amounts of prehistoric material that was unexpectedly turning up along the shores of those inland lakes located in and around the little community of Vilhelmina. Sites in this area had been excavated, following salvage-surveys, by the Central Board of National Antiquities prior to the exploitation of this water system in connection with the development of the region’s hydro-electric power resources for the benefit of the industrial South. Despite these antiquarian measures, an alarming number of previously undiscovered sites were obviously being exposed and destroyed through erosion. Lars Göran Spång, an experienced field archaeologist and eyewitness to this unchecked destruction, exclaimed; “In some places the amount of material that had been washed out... [through wave action] ...almost made one dizzy.” (Spång 1988:9). This situation led to the commencement of a project entitled ‘Archaeological Investigations of Regulated Lakes and Watercourses in Västerbotten County’ (Sw. Arkeologiska undersökningar vid reglerade sjöar och vattendrag i Västerbottens län), undertaken in order to identify the extent of this predicament (Rydström 1984; Spång 1978; 1988).

A few figures from the Vilhelmina area provide insight into the unmitigated antiquarian and archaeological disaster that was, and still is, occurring throughout many parts of Norrland. In 1954 the Central Board of National Antiquities had registered 36 sites of Stone Age character along the waterways located north-west of that community, 11 on the shores of Lake Malgomaj (an additional 2 had previously been registered by Tinnberg), 3 on Lake Insjön, 20 on Lake Varris and 2 on Lake Maksjön. Six of these were excavated, at least in part (Linder [1956]; [1958]; Spång 1978:114). Surveys undertaken by the Västerbotten museum in accordance with their project in 1975 and 1976, for example, led to the discovery of an additional 133 sites of various types along the shores of Lake Maksjön (Halén 1994:202; Lundberg 1997:85).

It would be erroneous to assume that the ‘Regulated Lakes Project’ was merely some massive rescue and clean-up operation. Quite the contrary. Efforts were specifically directed towards formulating a plan of research, which in summary, consisted of elucidating the shifting complexities of the prehistoric settlement pattern of this region as disclosed by the combination of various artefacts, features and structures as they occurred together on different sites over time. This in turn entailed the explicit re-definition of both the nature and socio-economic context of the ‘embankments’ while necessary excavations were undertaken in order to evaluate the feasibility of these new assumptions (Rydström 1984; Spång 1978). Råå 554, Grätanån in the Parish of Vilhelmina was the first embankment to be investigated in accordance with the aims of this project. By the end of the second field season Lars Göran Spång, director of the excavations, wrote with some confidence that;

The bottom of the central hollow is level, the pronounced entrance passage [the shallow hollow leading out through the embankment] and the relative lack of fire-cracked stones in the central area, all this indicates that the ‘embankment’ functioned as a house foundation. The [piles of] fire-cracked stone [on the surrounding embankment] served as a windbreak (Spång 1976 unpublished report, as quoted in Lundberg 1997:45).

The results from these and other excavations carried out during the second half of the 1970’s were not unveiling any specific features that previous investigations had not already uncovered, yet the conclusions and interpretations drawn from them were completely different. From this point on ‘embankments’ were interpreted as semi-subterranean houses. One cannot fail to notice the corresponding change that occurred in the way the material was treated and presented in the published literature. Now, and for the first time, profile drawings were published and thoroughly discussed. The stereotypical sketches are now replaced with detailed plan-drawings. These are accompanied by the first distribution maps ever published, showing the spread of artefacts, lithic waste, burnt bone and fire-cracked stone across the sites, while the significance of these patterns is debated. Also and for the first time in print, a map showing the distribution of these structures across the landscape was produced (Lundberg 1985; 1986; Rydström 1984; 1986; Spång 1978; 1985; 1986a; 1986b).

So, after more than fifty years, ‘embankments’ had become semi-subterranean dwellings. Why did this
As concerns the assumed lack of research, then yes, in comparison with southern Sweden, Norrland does lag behind. On the other hand, it is quite apparent that any presumed deficiency in the amount of research available has never, ever, prevented archaeologists (or anyone else) from formulating explanations, proposing answers or suggesting solutions, which includes interpreting these ‘embankments’ as rubbish heaps. If followed to its logical conclusion, all appeals to a dearth of empirical data and/or research, would result in a situation where no one would ever be able to draw any conclusions until after all the relevant data had been collected and analysed. This research strategy, otherwise known as ‘naive’ or ‘narrow inductivism’, is encumbered with several inherent problems. The foremost of these is the realisation that it is impossible to observe and record all of the facts because we do not know what they are. It is not the problem per se which guides data collection, but the answer(s) to the problem in the form of a hypothesis which shepherds the search for relevant data. Unless one has a hypothesis which guides data collection, the amount of facts to be recorded would be infinite.
Analysis and classification of the recorded facts runs into similar problems if not guided by a hypothesis; there are potentially endless ways in which to analyse and classify data. If relevant analysis and classification is to be carried out, then one must have some preconception of the relationships that may or may not exist in the material that has been collected. Hypotheses act as such an indicator (Hempel 1966:11pp). The classification of these Norrlandian structures as rubbish heaps was clearly guided by such a hypothesis. This can be seen in the way these structures were depicted in the literature; always portrayed in a highly stylised and/or simplified fashion. Profiles were never published. This was not done out of necessity. The unpublished reports cited above contain beautifully executed and highly detailed drawings, in both plan and profile, together with many useful distribution maps, that are all potentially informative, but they were never unitised. They did not need to be. These ‘embankments’, when interpreted as rubbish heaps, did not merit or necessitate the use of these drawings, nor did it require any extended or expanded analysis. As seen above, this stands out sharply against the way similar material coming out of southern Sweden, Norway and Finland was treated and presented. The re-evaluation of these Norrlandian structures not only required renewed excavations, it also called for a thorough re-examination of all previous material. Now and for the first time these unpublished reports would be thoroughly scrutinised and their contents utilised, and published, in order to provide support for conclusions dictated by a completely new hypothesis. This hypothesis, that ‘embankments’ represented the remains of semi-subterranean houses, was nurtured in the literature produced from 1978 onwards by a new thought-collective consisting of, among others, Lars Göran Spång, Gunhild Rydström and Åsa Lundberg (see references above).

But promoting and invoking the feasibility of a new hypothesis is not acceptance. This comes with adherents, recruited in a sympathetic institutional environment of some kind. The necessary conditions for this were created in 1975 through the occurrence of the second of those two events hinted at above. The first was the commencement of that project which led to the re-examination and re-evaluation of the Norrländer material. The second was the establishment of the Department of Archaeology in the North, at the University of Umeå, with Evert Baudou as its first professor. Within the walls of this department a core of Norrlandian archaeologists would be educated and trained, a new thought-collective, surrounded by a stimulating environment where an alternative thought-style could be fostered and promoted, one founded on the budding assumption that Norrland might well possess a prehistory of its own, independent and unconstrained by southern Swedish expectations and experiences, past or present.

The advent of this Northern thought-collective and style did not by any means bring an end to its predecessor. Indeed, and as we shall see, the five main postulates outlined above did not exclusively belong to any one specific thought-collective located in one particular institution as such. Instead, it would seem that this southern Swedish thought-style is part and parcel of a larger national thought-collective, an overarching theoretical view of what Norrland was, is and/or should be. In the next section we will see that this thought-style was not invented by that group which was gathered around Janson and Hvarfner at the Central Board of National Antiquities in connection with the ‘Norrlandian Salvage Investigations’. However, as the principal arbitrator of the country’s past, the Central Board of National Antiquities practically reigned supreme in Norrland, solely and wholly responsible as it was for the majority of all surveys and excavations undertaken there. Thus by default, it also came to possess a cadre of highly trained and motivated personnel capable of assuming control and training others. Many of the original members of this thought-collective went on to have long careers in positions of authority within the walls of this and other institutions, consequently, the five main postulates of this Southern thought-style were perpetuated and passed on to a new generation.

Lars Löthman, for example, is a later day heir of this thought-collective and its style (Löthman 1980:140; 1986b:42pp). Writing about the ‘embankments’ in an article that was published twice within a six year period, without amendments, Löthman upholds the main postulates of this southern Swedish thought-style by making a few suitable adjustments, despite fresh work coming out of the North concerning the function of these structures. Admitting that it is at least;

...theoretically possible that the larger oval structures could have held some kind of edifice, the round ones a tent-like construction of some kind. (Löthman 1980:136; 1986b:41).
Having thus made accommodations for this eventually within the theoretical framework of this Southern thought-style he continues to put a new twist on that otherwise familiar interpretation, these sites are;

... the remains of a network of hunting stations where furs, dried meat and fish, birds, antler and bone products as well as lithic materials where collected before being transported downstream. If this is the case, then one must ask if the ‘exploitation’ of this huge inland was directed by the needs of the coastal settlements alone or by those with their origins in Scandinavia at large. It is tempting to suggest that even European needs and wants, principally of furs, might have influenced developments at least during the Neolithic and/or Bronze Age (Löthman 1980:140; 1986b:42pp, quotation marks in the original).

Thus, with a few slight modifications the original assumptions of the southern thought-style are saved, the ‘embankments’ might well represent the remains of some sort of dwelling, but Norrland is still the vast wilderness warehouse, possessing an abundance of raw materials to be shipped elsewhere.

One of the latest adherents of this Southern thought-style is Hans Bolin who, in a 1999 dissertation from Stockholm, returns to that very same interpretation launched some 50 years previously by Gustawsson, Hvarfner and Janson, in which these features are once again described as “...mounds...” and viewed as rubbish heaps, albeit now with assumed ritual and symbolic overtones (Bolin 1999:120pp). The most disturbing aspect of Bolin’s revisionism is not the fact that it entails a certain amount of violence to the empirical record, instead it is the realisation that a readily available and wonderful resource, the Department of Archaeology at the University of Umeå, which for over 25 years has specialised in Norrlandian archaeology, was ignored, its expertise neither utilised nor consulted.

These southern Swedish viewpoints are worlds apart from the Northern alternative, which views these structures as the remains of permanent semi-subterranean winter houses, the abode of nucleated or extended families. Sites with one or more houses are interpreted as winter villages inhabited by a corresponding number of related families. Two or more villages, e.g. local bands, are seen as forming a number of regional bands, which together are perceived as representing a people who might have shared a common economy, similar social and cultural values and possibly the same language, providing thus a stable cultural foundation that lasted ca. 2000 years (Lundberg 1985; 1997). In a larger sense this alternative account implies that Norrland was not a vacant, inert and/or subservient backwater, but quite the contrary and that its ancient and recent histories might indeed have been very different from that envisioned by the South. This northern thought-style has gradually gained adherents, and although it has by no means succeeded in replacing its predecessor and/or competitor, it at least now is in possession of a formal institution from which it might compete, and possibly survive.

Chronological Horizons: Introduction
This section will explore why it took the better part of a century for archaeologists to identify Norrland’s Mesolithic past. Unfolding events will be simplified by focusing this inquiry on chronological studies as exemplified by the employment of typology and shoreline displacement, both widely applied throughout Scandinavia during the 20th century in order to identify, substantiate and date the existence of a Mesolithic presence on that continent.

A review of a few general archaeological textbooks in the first section of this chapter revealed the existence of a thought-style characterised by five postulates that have repeatedly been invoked when describing the prehistory of Norrland.

The second section of this chapter consists of a review and critical examination of that interpretation, which has long dominated our understanding concerning those features commonly known as ‘mounds of fire-cracked stones’. The underlying rationale behind that interpretation was exposed, revealing the existence a thought-collective characterised by the repetitive use of those five postulates noted earlier, which together form an interpretative framework, a thought-style, through which the Norrlandian past has been viewed, explained, understood and compartmentalised.

With the advantage of those insights provided above, we will, in the following section, seek to elucidate the extent of this thought-style; was it limited in both time and space, applied only sporadically and by a select few to explain certain features of Norrland’s prehistoric past, alternatively, was it a common interpretative framework widely shared and propagated by a number of different institutions and/or the members thereof, an integral
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Theoretical Component of a Larger Archaeological Community.

Chronological Horizons: A Beginning

Norrland has always had a Mesolithic past, or rather, it was colonised soon after the retreat of the latest ice sheet. Despite clear and persistent indications that this was indeed so, it took archaeologists about 70 years to concede this point. In contrast, the discovery and disclosure of this period in the rest of Scandinavia occurred relatively early and expanded rapidly. Why this discrepancy?

An increasing realisation concerning the diversity inherent in the Stone Age material and culture resulted in its division into an Older and Younger (or Newer) period, a suggestion initially put forward by the Danish archaeologist Jens Jacob Asmussen Worsaae (1821-1885) in 1859. This was motivated by the stratigraphically well defined assemblages that were being revealed in connection with the investigations carried out on the shell or kitchen middens, including the now classic Ertebølle site in Denmark. Core axes, point-butted axes (Sw. spetsnackig yxor) round-butted axes (Sw. trindyxor) flake axes and transverse arrowheads characterised the earlier period while polished flint axes and megaliths were typical of the latter. John Lubbock (1834-1913) endorsed this duel division by introducing the terms ‘Mesolithic’ and ‘Neolithic’ in his now famous monograph ‘Pre-historic Times’ from 1865, although he then believed that the Ertebølle phase should be assigned to the younger period (Daniel 1967; Ekholm 1935:35pp; Gräslund 1974:115pp).

The need of a third major division was anticipated by the Irish archaeologist Hodder Westropp in 1866 and by the Swedish quaternary geologist Otto Torell in 1874, both of whom wished to insert a ‘Mesolithic Period’ between the Older and Younger Stone Ages (Daniel 1967:260; Gräslund 1974:118; 1987:38). This term did not immediately take hold, although the need to demarcate a third Stone Age phase was at least implicitly recognised by many, as can be seen from the many different terms, derived primarily from geology and climatology, which were used to describe this interval of time. The term ‘Mesolithic’, first suggested in the late 1860’s, did not come into widespread use until the 1930’s. Further partitions were suggested by Montelius in 1892, and again in 1896, where he proposed a subsequent sub-division of the Older Stone Age into two periods and the Younger Stone Age into four, the latter based on changes in both artefact use and burial customs. While there was early and widespread agreement as concerns the contents and chronology of the last three periods of the Younger Stone Age, that of the first differs, depending on the author. The schema on the right is primarily based on Stjerna 1911 and Lindqvist 1912. On the left is an alternative scheme for Norway presented by W.C. Brøgger in 1905, one not widely adopted but, with the benefit of hindsight, much more in line with modern thinking. The scant space allowed in this schema for the changing hydrology of the Baltic, the stages of the retreating ice sheet together with the climatic and floral phases, belies their tremendous importance as chronological horizons in the archaeological discourse during the first half of the 20th century (W.C. Brøgger 1905; Daniel 1967; Gräslund 1974:119pp; 1987:40pp; Lindqvist 1912:52; 1918; Montelius 1892:135; 1898b:6; 1917b; 1918:54; 1919; Nerman 1946:184; Sahlström 1915; Stjerna 1911; Trigger 1989:75pp; Weibull 1923; Åberg 1912).
from the varied assortment of terminology used to
describe this time period, some of which was
borrowed from other subjects, including that used to
differentiate stages of the retreating glacial ice sheet
that had once covered the continent, as well as those
contrived to explicate the changing hydrology of the
Baltic or the shifting climatological phases that also
occurred during those times. Others delimited this
period through the use of place-names derived from
various archaeological type sites that were thought
to be typical for and of this period (fig. 68). By the
1930's the designation ‘Mesolithic’ had begun to
receive widespread, although not universal,
acceptance through repeated use by, among others,
Graham Clark, although another 15 years or so
would pass before it became fully established within
archaeological circles (see references in e.g. Althin
1954; Fredsjö 1953).

Despite the lack of any single and unifying
descriptive designation, the archaeologists working
in Scandinavia managed to achieve much of
importance as concerns the constitution of the
different types of sites encountered, their chronology
and characteristic typologies. In Denmark, Worsaae
argued for the antiquity of the kitchen middens, which
was verified by the ‘Second Kitchen Midden
Commission’ that began work in 1893, the results of
which were published 7 years later. Both Georg
Sarauw and Gerard De Geer took part in this work,
the former overseeing many of the investigations,
which included the excavation of 8 different sites,
including the Ertebølle type site located in northern
Jutland. Key artefacts consist of core axes, flake axes,
transverse arrowheads, blade tools, round-butted
axes, Limhavn axes, conical microblade cores and
earthenware (Alin 1953:29; Almgren 1902; Andersen
1972a; Clark 1936; Ekholm 1935:14pp; Enqvist
Sahlström 1915:26).

Commencing in June of 1900, Sarauw went on to
excavate a bog site near Mullerup on Zealnd,
Denmark, which soon became synonymous with one
of the earliest human manifestations in Scandinavia,
the Maglemose Culture. Two other key sites
belonging to the same period and culture, at
Sværdborg and Holmegaard, both located in southern
Zealand, were investigated in 1917 and 1922
respectively, furnishing further proof of the antiquity
of human settlement in this region. The stratigraphy
inherent in these and similar sites, together with their
prompt publication, did much to elucidate typological
affiliations. The most distinguishing artefacts
associated with this culture are microblades, handle
cores, keeled scrapers, microliths, core axes,
perforated antler adzes, the slotted-edged implements
as well as many other objects of bone and antler, often
decorated with the geometric patterns that are so
generally characteristic of the Mesolithic as a whole
(Andersen 1972b; Broholm 1924; Clark 1936:174;
Ekholm 1935:20pp; Friis-Johansen 1919; Larsen
1931:15; Larsson 1978:15; Påsse 1988e; Sarauw
1919)

At Nørre Lyngby in northermost Jutland, antler
pick axes had been coming to light since end of the
19th century. The first of those characteristic tanged
flake points was found in 1912, one at the Lyngby
site itself and another from Tosskärr, Tjörn (Stenkyrka
parish) in Bohuslän, Sweden. Ten years later, due to
an ever increasing number of finds, the concept of a
late Palaeolithic Lyngby Culture was launched
(Andersen 1972c:218pp; Clark 1936; Ekholm

The existence of a Norwegian counterpart to the
Danish Ertebølle Culture was established through
parallel publications by the geologist Waldemar
Christofer Brøgger (1851-1940) and the archaeologist
Anton Wilhelm Brøgger (1884-1951), father and son,
in 1905. Over 50 sites belonging to this Nøstvet
Culture, with its distinctive core axe, were known
and presented (A.W. Brøgger 1905; W.C. Brøgger
1905). On the Swedish side of the border this culture
and axe are named after the Lihult site, from a now
abandoned farmstead situated on the eastern shore
of Lången, a narrow lake in northernmost Bohuslän.
First documented in 1906 by Frödin and Hallström,
axes of the Nøstvet-Lihult type had been collected
from this definitive site since the 1870's (Alin
1955:179pp; Bertilsson & Winberg 1978:100;
Enqvist 1922:25pp).

The discovery of the first ‘Flint Places’ (Nw.
flintpladsene), situated along the coast of Norway,
from Oslo to the Trondheim area, were made by
Anders Nummedal in 1909. These sites, later
attributed to the Fosna Culture, are characterised by
core and flake axes, keeled scrapers, handle cores,
microliths and oblique, single edged, tanged points,
attributes that rightly prompted Nummedal to assume
that this culture was contemporary with the
Maglemose of Denmark (Niklasson 1934:132;
Nummedal 1923). During the 1940's traces of the
Fosna Culture would be found in a completely
different environment and topographical milieu, sites
situated in the tundra, well inland on the exposed
plateaus of the high mountains, a novel setting that
chapter three

revealed the complexities of this and similar cultural manifestations from the Mesolithic (Bøe 1942; Grønlie & Petersen 1948; Petersen 1944). These three blades were the first hint of a hitherto unknown Stone Age civilisation, which would also prove to be one of Norway's oldest. By 1912 over one hundred sites had been discovered and registered (Rygh 1912:3). The enormous amount of waste flakes on these sites initially led Karl Rygh to suspect that they represented workshops and not dwelling sites as such, hence the designation 'Flint Places' (Nw. Flintpladser) but now known as the Fosna Culture. Rygh noted their elevation and typological similarities with the Danish Kekkenmødding Culture, primarily flake and core axes, and placed these sites at a late stage of the Older Stone Age ca. 5-4000 bc (Rygh 1912:5pp). Nummedal initially thought they might date to the Palaeolithic but later placed the Fosna Culture to the beginning of the Ancylus period ca. 7000 bc (Nummedal 1926:47). Today it is C14 dated to 7600-6500 BC, e.g. to the Pre-Boreal and early Boreal Periods. Nummedal's seemingly phenomenal success probably owes something to his geographical and geological background, allowing him to reconstruct the prehistoric landscape and find these sites. Neither did he exclusively rely on ocular inspection alone, but also used a shovel, carrying it with him on surveying excursions, employing it to pry away the turf and sod that covered the surface of presumed sites and for digging small test pits when the occasion arose (Helskog 1974a:263; 1974b:98; Hennum 1975:22pp; Nummedal 1923; 1926). Up until the 1920's it was widely held that northern Norway had probably been settled ca. 3-2000 bc by an off shoot from a southern Scandinavian culture (Binns 1979:5; Gustavsen 1975:49). Nummedal set off to test this assumption in the summer of 1925, by travelling to Alta with the expressed opinion of trying to locate sites along those ancient shorelines which could be dated to the Older Stone Age. Within a matter of hours after stepping off the ferry boat he had accomplished his objective. On a terrace situated 54-57 m.a.s.l. on the side of Mount Komsa, he found the first of the many sites now known under that name (Nummedal 1926:43). His third major discovery, the prehistoric villages of the Varanger Fjord, was still to come (photo source Petersen 1944).

Fig. 69. Anders Nummedal (1867-1944) did not come to the subject as a trained archaeologist but as a geologist. Born a farmer's son, he received a teaching degree at the age of 33 and began his employment at the Kristiansund Public School of Higher Education where he taught math, general sciences, geology, geography and art. On a Sunday outing in October of 1909 he found three flint blades on the shores of Vollvattnet near Kristiansund (Nummedal 1923:89; Petersen 1944:56). These three blades were the first hint of a hitherto unknown Stone Age civilisation, which would also prove to be one of Norway's oldest. By 1912 over one hundred sites had been discovered and registered (Rygh 1912:3). The enormous amount of waste flakes on these sites initially led Karl Rygh to suspect that they represented workshops and not dwelling sites as such, hence the designation 'Flint Places' (Nw. Flintpladser) but now known as the Fosna Culture. Rygh noted their elevation and typological similarities with the Danish Kekkenmødding Culture, primarily flake and core axes, and placed these sites at a late stage of the Older Stone Age ca. 5-4000 bc (Rygh 1912:5pp). Nummedal initially thought they might date to the Palaeolithic but later placed the Fosna Culture to the beginning of the Ancylus period ca. 7000 bc (Nummedal 1926:47). Today it is C14 dated to 7600-6500 BC, e.g. to the Pre-Boreal and early Boreal Periods. Nummedal's seemingly phenomenal success probably owes something to his geographical and geological background, allowing him to reconstruct the prehistoric landscape and find these sites. Neither did he exclusively rely on ocular inspection alone, but also used a shovel, carrying it with him on surveying excursions, employing it to pry away the turf and sod that covered the surface of presumed sites and for digging small test pits when the occasion arose (Helskog 1974a:263; 1974b:98; Hennum 1975:22pp; Nummedal 1923; 1926). Up until the 1920's it was widely held that northern Norway had probably been settled ca. 3-2000 bc by an off shoot from a southern Scandinavian culture (Binns 1979:5; Gustavsen 1975:49). Nummedal set off to test this assumption in the summer of 1925, by travelling to Alta with the expressed opinion of trying to locate sites along those ancient shorelines which could be dated to the Older Stone Age. Within a matter of hours after stepping off the ferry boat he had accomplished his objective. On a terrace situated 54-57 m.a.s.l. on the side of Mount Komsa, he found the first of the many sites now known under that name (Nummedal 1926:43). His third major discovery, the prehistoric villages of the Varanger Fjord, was still to come (photo source Petersen 1944).

In 1925 Nummedal went on to find what was then thought by some be the oldest sites in Scandinavia, located along the coastal areas of northernmost Norway. Sites belonging to this so called Komsa Culture consist of an ambiguous blade and flake industry made from wide range of different lithic materials that includes flake axes and a distinctive tanged and backed point, all of which prompted Nummedal to infer that this culture belonged to a Late Palaeolithic phase of the Older Stone Age. This interpretation did not gain widespread acceptance, although the Mesolithic origins of this assemblage were never seriously in doubt (Bøe 1937b; Nummedal 1926).

In 1909 the Finnish archaeologist Julius Ailio excavated three sites which he ascribed as belonging to a so called ‘Pre-ceramic Culture’. First referred to as the Suomusjärvi Culture by Aarne Europaeus in a seminar held in 1916, these and similar sites were recognised as dating to the last phase of the Older Stone Age. Key artefacts include the curved-backed gouge (Finn. käyräselkäinen kourutalta), the so called ‘primitive axes and chisels’ (Finn. alkeellinen kirves & taltta), analogous to the Nøstvet-Lihult axes of western Scandinavia and the broad leaf-shaped ‘spear point’ of slate (Finn. leveälektisiä livskekeihäänkärkiä), which could just as well be a knife blade. The characteristic north-Bothnian axes/Rovaniemi pickaxe or mattock were also known to occur on these sites (Europaeus 1922; Luho 1967b in Willebrand 1969:7). That Finland had indeed been settled at an early stage gained further support from a number bog finds, including the much celebrated Antrea assemblage which was excavated by Pälsi in 1914 and dated to the Pre-Boreal/Boreal transition of the Ancylus Lake Period (Kivikoski 1967:27; Lindberg 1920; Pälsi 1920).

Sweden’s first Ertebølle site was discovered in the port town of Limhamn, which lies just west of Malmö. This site was found embedded in the so called Järavallen, a stratified post-glacial beach embankment that runs along the western coast of Skåne. Some sixty years earlier, Sven Nilsson had studied the stratigraphy of this feature in an attempt to gain a chronological foothold on the archaeological material contained therein (Nilsson 1866:92 & 192), a possibility that now attracted the attention of Knut...
Kjellmark (1866-1944). With degrees in both biology and geology, he was appropriately equipped to investigate this complex geological feature, from which, starting in 1891, increasing amounts of artefacts were being recovered, including the characteristic Limhamn axe. The full extent and relevance of this site was made clear through Kjellmark’s excavations carried out from 1901 to 1904 and by his doctoral dissertation from 1903 (Bagge 1944; Kjellmark 1903:4pp; Stjernquist 1977). It provided the key for understanding a whole suite of related sites found throughout southern Sweden, both coastal, such as the Sandskog locality near the town of Ystad, and inland sites, such as those found along the shores of Lake Ringsjö and its two connecting bogs, Ageröd and Rönneholm (Kjellmark 1903:113pp; Larsson 1978:16; Lönnberg 1929).

The first kitchen midden in Bohuslän was discovered, excavated and published by Otto Frödin in the first decade of the 20th century (Frödin 1906). Progress then proceeded at a rapid pace, by the early 1920’s over 1200 Stone Age sites of various ages were known in Bohuslän and neighbouring areas, including over 350 Mesolithic sites, of either Ertebølle and/or Lihult type, distributed exclusively and almost equally between the islands of Orust and Tjörn (Enqvist 1922; Larsen 1931:49). Localities comparable in age to those of the Maglemose would not be fully accepted as such until after the excavation of the now classic Sandarna and Gottskär type sites located in the Provinces of Bohuslän and Halland respectively, the former just south-west of Göteborg while the latter lies ca. 36 km due south from there. Both had been discovered over a decade earlier, each yielding stray artefacts that typologically placed them in the Maglemose phase of the Old Stone Age, a date later confirmed by investigations which commenced in 1930 (Alin 1934:5pp; Andersson et.al. 1973; Enqvist 1922:6pp; 1935; Lindälv 1980:26pp).

From the above it is obvious that the apparent deficiency of an unambiguous or unifying terminology was not a determining factor with regard to the discovery and recognition of the material culture that typifies this period. Thus the following is not an exercise in nomenclature, but an attempt to place the material in a historical or geographical context, a task that is facilitated by the detailed study of typology and contextual data. The chronological framework that has been developed will be used to illustrate the manner in which these two factors interact and influence each other, with particular reference to the archaeological sites of the Maglemose phase.

**Chronological Horizons: Southern Sweden**

In 1874 Montelius published a tabulation over all known artefacts of stone according to assumed regional origins and racial affiliations (fig. 70). The theoretical consequences conveyed by this unpretentious table were taken at face value. The ancestors of today’s Nordic population were viewed as having entered the continent from the south-west as indicated by the enormous amount of ‘Scandinavian’ artefacts found in the Province of Skåne. From here, they had moved northwards along the Swedish coasts, absorbing and/or pushing the original inhabitants in front of them, the latter represented by their ‘Arctic’ tool types, often made of slate. Later, these newcomers had spread inland following the river systems, albeit slowly, as indicated by the ever decreasing number of artefacts found further away from their initial point of entry. It was assumed that the eastern areas of southern Sweden were the last to be occupied, with Uppland receiving its first ‘Scandinavian’ inhabitants relatively late, sometime during the ‘Dolmen Period’ ca. 3000-2500 bc (Ekholm 1913b:370; Montelius 1874b; 1903:53pp; Salin 1905:161pp).

The inherent implications of Montelius’ presentation was challenged by the publication of three dissertations produced during the second decade of the 20th century. The first of these appeared in 1912 and is entitled ‘From Närkes Stone and Bronze Age’ (Sw. Från Nerikes sten- och bronsålder). Its author, Sune Lindqvist, documented the occurrence of some hundreds of artefacts typologically belonging to different prehistoric periods. The earliest of these were considered to be the 9 Limhamn axes, the 7 Nøstvet-Lihult axes and the 139 round-butted types found in the southern and western areas of Närke at elevations in and around the 60 meter level. He points out that the typological determination and dating of these artefacts is problematical, cautiously suggesting that this province had been colonised during the ‘Round-butted Axe Period’ ca. 4000-3000 bc by a people coming from both the south and the west (Lindqvist 1912:4pp & 51). Lindqvist ends by pointing out that;
...these oldest prehistoric artefacts are, without a doubt made under the influence of a culture, which can be traced to Västergötland, Bohuslän and Skåne. From this we should not conclude that these represent the first phase of the province’s settlement. On the contrary, it is plausible to assume, thorough experience gained from other regions in Scandinavia, that a population settled the area during an older phase of the Nordic Stone Age, one that essentially used wood, bone and antler from which to make their tools. It is quite natural that traces of this imagined culture, which manufactured artefacts of perishable materials, would be few after thousands of years had passed, which would explain why no such artefact has been found in Närke... (Lindqvist 1912:51).

The possibility that this Province had been colonised at a very early stage by this hypothetical ‘Bone Age Culture’, is a theme he would return to a few years later (Lindqvist 1912:51).

To the south-west, in the neighbouring Province of Västergötland, Karl Esaias Sahlström, geologist and archaeologist, published a similar investigation in 1915 under the title ‘On Västergötland’s Stone Age Settlement’ (Sw. Om Västergötlands stenåldersbebyggelse). The occurrence of slotted bone points fitted with microblades, flake axes, core axes, point-butted axes and over 600 Nøstvet-Lihult axes seemed to prove that this Province had supported a population during the Older Stone Age, one that had entered the region from the neighbouring Provinces of Bohuslän and Dalsland at an early time (Sahlström 1915:21pp).

This conclusion sustained Lindqvist’s earlier assumption, which gained further support from Gunnar Ekholm’s ‘Studies on the Settlement History of Uppland. Part One, The Stone Age’ (Sw. Studier i Upplands bebyggelseshistoria. Del 1, stenåldern) which was published in 1915. Having plotted the distribution of some 2765 known artefacts, Ekholm noted that the 26 cores axes, including both Limhamn and Nøstvet-Lihult types, the 4 point-butted axes and the 19 round-butted axes of type-A, were all located in a relatively restricted area of western Uppland at elevations in and around the 60 metre level, which corresponds to the Litorina-Tapes maximum, considered to have occurred ca. 4500-4000 bc. This convinced Ekholm that Uppland had received its first inhabitants at the end of the Old Stone Age or during an early phase of the following period, that is to say, no later than ca. 4000 bc (Ekholm 1913b:370; 1915).

In his effort to populate Uppland at the earliest possible moment, Ekholm belittles previous assumptions;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scandinavian types</th>
<th>Arctic types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lapland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Västerbotten</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ångermanland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jämtland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medelpad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Häringsland</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gästrikland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrland (unspecified)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrland total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svealand</td>
<td>2068</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Götaland (minus Skåne)</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skåne</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Sweden total</td>
<td>38468</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden total</td>
<td>38590</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 70. Table showing the number of Stone Age artefacts, classified by Montelius, which were presumed to reflect racial affiliations. The Scandinavian types consist of those flint and stone artefacts considered to have been manufactured by the Germanic forefathers of today’s Nordic population. The Arctic types, primarily made of slate, were originally understood has having been made by a people related either to the present day Sámi and/or Finnish population. These figures seemed to indicate that the Scandinavian colonisation of the continent had occurred in and from the south before moving gradually northwards. There is a deeply implicit and provocative symbolism inherent in this presentation, where the subordinate position of both Svealand and Norrland is discreetly implied. The shear amount of artefacts recovered in the far south, in comparison with central and northern Sweden, conveys a sense of heightened dynamic in the former region while the latter two appear truly peripheral. The source criticism that immediately should and could have been directed towards these figures appeared many decades later. It was Ekholm who pointed out just how misleading this data was, that it only reflected the amount of acreage under cultivation and not any prehistoric reality (Ekholm 1923c; 1941:143). This critical insight successively challenged the legitimacy of that dependent relationship though to have existed between Götaland and Svealand during prehistoric times, yet left in place Norrland’s submissive role in relationship to Svealand, a scenario which Ekholm, to a large degree, helped create. The existence here, of duel standards for the evaluation of equivalent evidence, is not exceptional (illustration source Montelius 1874b:100, here redrawn and simplified).
...it is improbable, nay indisputable, that very little time elapsed before the Mälar provinces were settled, it is geographically absurd to think that thousands of years passed before the people, who had been living along the shores of Lake Vänern [e.g. Västergötland & Närke] since the Older Stone Age, crossed over the narrow strip of land that separated the Vänern water basin from that of the Mälar valley, which with its deep coves naturally attracted settlement (Ekholm 1913b:374pp).

The results and interpretations derived from the work of both Lindqvist, Sahlström and Ekholm shattered the conceptual constraints imposed by the tabulation presented by Montelius. Uppland had received its first inhabitants, not from colonists moving slowly northwards up along the eastern seaboard, but rapidly from western Sweden, by a people moving cross-country via Västmanland and Närke as indicated by the presence of a couple of dozen Nøstvet-Lihult axes, tools which are common along the Swedish West Coast, as opposed to the meagre number of Limhamn axes that are otherwise so typical of sites located in southernmost Sweden. This scenario was seemly confirmed by Nils Lithberg’s dissertation entitled ‘Gotland’s Stone Age’ from 1914, which presents the island’s Mesolithic settlements, their existence deduced through the presence of 1 Lihult axe, 28 Limhamn axes and 81 round-butted axes found in and around the shores of the Litorina-Tapes maximum (Lithberg 1914:29 & 35). As already noted in Chapters One and Two, within the following decade, Uppland would be transformed and firmly established as Scandinavia’s single most innovative centre and as the most important mediator of all cultural change and progress, both prehistoric and historic (Ekholm 1913b; 1915; 1921; 1922a; 1923c).

Arguments in favour of the early settlement of Uppland, to a large extent based on comparative typology, were not universally accepted. Professor Otto Rydbeck, in Lund, raised serious doubts by suggesting that most of the key artefacts, of both stone and bone, that were considered to be chronologically ancient, had in fact been used and manufactured throughout the Stone Age (Rydbeck 1928; 1930a; 1930b).

...the so-called dwelling-place, kitchen-midden or Ertebölle culture, survived in the Scandinavian Peninsula, broadly speaking, from the Old Stone Age right up to the close of the New Stone Age, that is to say longer than in Denmark where the megalith culture so soon won the ascendancy (Rydbeck 1930b:59, English in the original).

Lindqvist was strongly opposed to Rydbeck’s ideas, realising as he did that the implications of this scenario were devastating for all those who would uphold Uppland’s unique status as one of Scandinavia’s prime cultural centres. If the key chronological indicators proved to be archaic survivals, then Uppland would become a region of little significance, dependent on influences coming from without and populated relatively late. To his dismay, Lindqvist acknowledges that this would entail that Uppland had initially been colonised by;...the keepers of a retarded culture: one as primitive as that which existed during the kitchen midden phase in southern Sweden... [which would imply]...that the most important advances that occurred during the Stone Age - agriculture and animal husbandry - gained ground when these fishing peoples were driven out or subjugated by the arrival of the Megalithic people [coming from the south] (Lindqvist 1929: 67).

Much ink would be expended in proving Rydbeck mistaken, but the factual correctness of his opponents is not as interesting as is their willingness to ascribe to Norrland what they could not except for Uppland.

Chronological Horizons: Norrland

The belief that Uppland was the cultural hub of the country from early prehistoric times had a profound influence on the way in which Norrland soon came to be viewed. Originally and at an early stage in the development of the archaeological discipline, the prehistory of Norrland was considered to have been fundamentally different from the rest of the Nation. This conclusion was based on the presence of various types of slate tools, artefacts which were considered to typify the North and East rather than the South, where flint artefacts are the rule. As already noted; at this time in the history of the discipline, it was usual to equate a particular assemblage in any given area with the presence of a specific racial group (Christiansson 1963:10; H. Hildebrand 1866:43; 1872:74; Montelius 1874b; Nilsson 1866). While the assumed affiliation between artefacts and race did not go wholly unquestioned even then (H. Hildebrand 1872:79), it nevertheless became a central tenet within archaeological thinking;
The idea that there must be some kind of link between the Stone Age and a Lapplandian tribe seemed completely natural. The Stone Age showed us the existence of a lowly cultural level in our country and there still existed within its boundaries a people on a fairly lowly cultural level, the Lapplandian culture (H. Hildebrand 1872:78).

These slate objects, which captured the attention, if not the admiration, of these early archaeologists, were characterised by Rygh as representing the existence of an ‘Arctic Stone Age’. The presence of slate objects in southern Scandinavia, together with the results provided by physical anthropology, had initially suggested that the original inhabitants of Scandinavia consisted of a population of Sámi and/or Finnish peoples who, during the course of the Younger Stone Age, had been replaced by the arrival of Indo-Europeans (see Chapter Two). Retreating northwards, these aborigines were soon followed by “...the Swedish people [who] began to colonise Norrland as early as the Stone Age...” (H. Hildebrand 1872:74). The material support for this latter assertion was the occurrence of thick-butted flint axes found at the Bjurselet site in Västerbotten (Almgren 1908:4pp; H. Hildebrand 1872:74; Montelius 1919:73). This scenario implicitly implies that at least some slate objects should be as old as, or older than, those made and used by the later, flint using population.

As we have already seen, by 1921 the information provided by physical anthropology had been totally re-evaluated, resulting in the formulation of a revised archaeological account in which the whole of Scandinavia had initially been colonised by Aryans (Lindqvist 1918:79pp; Moberg 1948:290pp; Montelius 1921). Fundamental to this conceptual transition was the influential interpretation put forth by A. W. Brøgger in his dissertation entitled ‘The Arctic Stone Age in Norway’ (Nw. Den Arktiske Stenalder i Norge) which was published in 1909. Combining evidence from history, ethnology, linguistics, physical anthropology and archaeology, he concluded that slate tools did not signify the existence of either a Sámi or Finnish presence. Instead they had been made by a population of tall dolichocranial hunting and fishing people with their origins along the south-eastern shores of the Baltic. By the end of the Stone Age these original inhabitants of both Sweden and Norway, north and south, had either been absorbed and/or thrust aside through the expansion of their superior agricultural relatives who had entered the continent from the south-west. It is interesting to note that the work of both Peter Olsson and O. B. Santesson were cited in these deliberations, a clear indication that Norrlandian archaeology, even in its infancy, was highly consequential (A.W. Brøgger 1909:25pp; 36pp, 162p, 166p, 170p, 183p).

Oscar Almgren, of whom more will be said below, developed this line of reasoning in two articles, equating the carriers of the ‘Arctic Stone Age’ with those of the so called Dwelling Site Culture (later the Pitted Ware Culture) of eastern Sweden (Almgren 1907; 1914b). Almgren hypothetically equates this culture with a Finnish branch of a Finno-Ugric tribe, which vacated Uppland during the middle of the third millennium bc, moving into Norrland and Finland, due to the arrival of the agricultural forefathers of today’s Nordic population in the form of the Boat Axe Culture. This initial cultural contact gave rise to the manufacture of slate tools, copies of the more advanced flint artefacts made and used by their Swedish neighbours. Upon entering Norrland, and with the subsequent discovery of the abundant source of red slate located near the Överveda site in Nordingrå parish on the coast of Ångermanland, this slate industry radically expanded, establishing long distance trading relationships with both southern Sweden, Finland and northernmost Norway (Almgren 1914b:23; 59pp; 65-69).

Lindqvist and Ekholm also began to question the assumed racial affiliations of the slate industry. Lindqvist pointed out that at least some of the slate artefacts from Närke were made out of local derivatives, instead of Norrlandian red slate, and that they were contemporaneous with objects typical of the battle axe equipped and agriculturally advanced megalith builders who had arrived in the area ca. 3000-2200 bc (Lindqvist 1912:19pp). He concluded that these slate tools were locally manufactured, “...poor surrogates...” made in response to a regional lack of flint. Ekholm concurs. Noting how certain slate arrowheads resembled those made of flint, he inferred that the former were local copies of the latter made by the people of the ‘Dwelling Site Culture’ who lacked flint (Ekholm 1915:33pp). Consequently, differences in the material culture and/or use of lithics were now understood, when required, as having resulted from chronological, geological and/or cultural-geographical particularities, rather than signifying racial distinctions (Ekholm 1913a:141p; 1915:91 & 96p; Lindqvist 1912:49pp).

This revision concerning the correlation between material culture and racial differentiation allowed
archaeologists to appropriate Norrlandian prehistory into the nation-building project. In an introductory course on archaeology held at Härnösand in 1915, participants were assured by Sune Lindqvist that the Stone Age population of Sweden were the forefathers of today’s modern Germanic race “...which, because of their superior talents, now rule the world.” (Lindqvist 1915:5). The Nordic people took possession of Norrland during the Younger Stone Age, as seen by the close association between various artefacts found both North and South. Only in the very far north was there evidence of a foreign element, an eastern-Finnish racial group, as represented by the distinctive ‘north-Bothnian implement’ that is “…coarsely napped…”, in contrast to the flint artefacts manufactured in southern Sweden, which were artfully made by stone smiths who were only surpassed in skill by Egyptian craftsmen (Lindqvist 1915:5pp).

Fig. 71. This illustration is based on Almgren’s account (1907; 1914b) as it concerns the development of slate knives (right) and daggers (left) in accordance with his comparative typological studies. The earliest forms of the boot-shaped or curved knives were considered to be those that sported an animal head on the handle, one that subsequently ‘degenerated’ into a semantic representation consisting of notches, knobs or buds, which later disappeared altogether. The daggers were believed to have followed a similar line of development. Both of these series was anchored in time by a single bone comb that was recovered from the Gullrum site on Gotland, excavated 1891-1893 (Hansson 1897). The Gullrum site, through the use of comparative typology, was assigned to the Dwelling Site Culture as represented by Åloppe in Uppland, a site dated to the second half of the third millennium through the use of shoreline displacement. At the time, there were no compelling archaeological reasons that precluded the reversal of this assumed chronological relationship. Comparative typology, based as it is on a highly personal and subjective opinion concerning the apparent similarities between artefacts, could have just as well been employed to suggest that the southern Swedish material had been modelled after Norrlandian archetypes. But to so would have seriously called into question, if not upended, prevailing and entrenched conceptions, both prehistoric and historic, concerning the relationship between the peripheral-North and centre-South. Today we know that numbers 1 and 4 are indeed contemporaneous and date to the Middle Neolithic. Numbers 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 were all in use at least a thousand years before the advent of the figure headed implements. Key: 1) Kultsjön, Lappland. 2) Ångermanland. 3) Vibygerä parish, Ångermanland. 4) Norra Sannäs, Delsbo parish, Hälsingland. 5) Mäja, Ullånger parish, Ångermanland. 6) Gästrikland. 7 and 8) Överveda, Nordingrå parish, Ångermanland. (Almgren 1906a; 1906b; 1907; 1911; 1914b:44pp; Loeffler 1999a; Montelius 1917b).
Scandinavia, all ensuing research became a matter of typologically deducing which of the southern Swedish flint artefacts from the Passage Grave Period had stood model for the various slate tools produced in the North (Christiansson 1963:12).

These typological deliberations should not be confused with the method employed by Montelius some 30 odd years previously, where chronological and periodic divisions had been founded on the study of sealed artefact-combinations, in other words, on the employment of a contextual typology. The form of typology now applied to trace and date the development of the slate industry was based on the belief that one only needed to arrange artefacts according to their assumed similarities in order to disclose their developmental dependencies. This method is founded on the unsubstantiated belief that material culture is subject to an ordering principle equivalent to biological evolution (B. Almgren 1995; Gräslund 1974:83pp; Malmer 1995; Montelius 1900). Criticism of this type of ‘impressionist or comparative’ typology is as old as the procedure itself (B. Almgren 1995:24pp; Gräslund 1974:197pp) and its limitations, then as now, are well understood;

...[only] a small part of typology is objective and the rest is often emotional after-rationalizations made with the help of subjectivity in order to reach the desired results in its details (Åberg 1929 quoted in B. Almgren 1995:37, English in the original).

Oscar Almgren subjected the slate artefacts to an investigation in accordance with the methodology of comparative typology in his articles from 1907 and 1914 (fig. 71). So too did Axel Bagge (fig. 73) who, echoing both Lindqvist and Ekholm, begins by asserting that the distinct assemblages and raw materials found both North and South do not represent racial differences. Instead, they are divergent cultural manifestations of one and the same homogeneous people. He goes on to assume that the original home of the slate tool tradition was not Norrland, but Svealand, where slate copies of flint tools were being manufactured by the middle the Passage Grave Period. This technique was then exported northwards where it reached its greatest extent along the coastal areas of Ångermanland during the Stone Cist Period due to the availability of that large slate deposit found near the Överveda site (Bagge 1923:34pp). He closes his article by stating that;

...this is yet another example of the strong influences that the southern Scandinavian culture has had on the North, which lacks flint - a further and parallel example are the thin and thick-butted axes found in this area that are made of [other types of] stone [rather than flint] (Bagge 1923:37).

From the above one realises that the parental or colonial attitude towards Norrland that has prevailed throughout historic times is clearly present in the archaeological discourse from an early period. This attitude grew and gained ground in step with the
promotion and presentation of Uppland as Scandinavia’s predominant cultural centre, both past and present. This supercilious perspective coincided with the elimination of all alien racial elements, foreign or domestic, from the prehistory of Sweden which, as we have already seen, was accomplished by the 1920’s. Norrland, as exemplified by the typological analyses of the slate artefacts, had been colonised from Uppland at a relatively late date. Moreover, any and all ensuing changes in the material culture of the North would now be explained with reference to events as they occurred in the South, thus ultimately depriving Norrland of any independent or innovative prehistoric development of its own. Even Gustaf Hallström, probably the most knowledgeable of his generation as concerns Norrlandian archaeology, and most assuredly the individualist that he has been made out to be, could not escape the background influences prevalent in his own contemporaneity;

...the sea binds Norrland to Svealand, which has been the cradle and womb of the Norrlandian throughout the ages. Norrland was the natural hinterland of the politically strong Svealand and its predecessors far back into the dim past, just as Stockholm is (and ever since the Middle Ages has been) Norrland’s capital, there being no other (Hallström 1926:45p).

Chronological Horizons: Scandinavia

In 1936 Clark produced an admirable synthesis on the Mesolithic of northern Europe. Here we find a cultural and chronological schema that is fully recognisable in modern terms, one that would be further refined until overtaken by the changes that radiocarbon dating would later bring about (fig. 74).

In southern Sweden this involved renewed studies into the chronological and typological apprehensions that had been raised by Rydbeck and others concerning the duration of Mesolithic industries and
the cultural affinity of key artefacts, such as the core and flake axes, questions largely put to rest by Oskar Lidén in his brilliant two volume study on the Stone Age of north-westernmost Skåne. Commencing with an intelligently planned survey strategy, followed up by selective excavations on certain sites, he conclusively showed, with the aid of contextual typology, that the artefacts of the Ertebølle and Pitted Ware Cultures were not contemporary (O. Lidén 1938; 1940). Lidén’s next work, from 1942, included a thorough presentation of the Scandinavian bone and antler implements, noting the existing contextual relationship between slotted-edged implements, handle cores, round-butted axes, the core and/or the flake axes, thereby substantiating the cultural and chronological affiliations of these various bone and antler objects. In doing so he clearly refutes Rydbeck’s arguments concerning the longevity of the Mesolithic industry (O. Lidén 1942). Soon after, Carl-Axel Althin excavated 29 sites, some of them stratified, situated around Lake Ringsjö and its neighbouring bogs. Although reluctant to use the Maglemose designation, these investigations uncovered the main cultural development of the Mesolithic from Pre-Boreal times up to and including the Neolithic Sub-Boreal period, thus ratifying Lidén’s conclusion and definitely confirming the Mesolithic cultural affiliation of the many and various stray artefacts that had, clearly and for decades, indicated such a presence in Skåne (Althin 1953; 1954; Larsson 1978:19; Stenberger 1964:38).

On the Swedish west coast the results from the important Gottskär excavation remained unpublished until 1973. However, the investigations into the equally important Sandarna site were expeditiously and admirably presented, resulting in a culture of that name, characterised by the single edged and barbed stone point made out of a backed blade, its core axes, conical microblade cores, the bifacially knapped Sandarna axe and the bizarre cross-shaped and perforated pickaxe or mace-head. This site was dated to the first half of the Ancylus Lake period ca. 7000 bc (Alin 1934; Arne 1934:157; Clark 1936; Niklasson 1934; 1973; Thomasson 1934:215).

The Hensbacka Culture, named after the type-site situated in Foss parish about 15 km NW of Uddevalla, Bohuslän, gradually came to be recognised during this time. The type-site was well-known, despite the fact that no excavations had ever been undertaken there, artefacts having been systematically collected from the annually ploughed fields ever since the beginning of the century. By the 1920’s the number of related find sites in this region had grown to such an extent that they were recognised as belonging to an interrelated industry based on a blade technology that included tanged points together with core and flake axes, all of which showed a clear affiliation with the Fosna and Komsa Cultures of Norway. (Alin 1955:230pp; Fredsjö 1953:70pp & 138pp; Larsen 1931:61pp; Niklasson 1965; Stenberger 1962a:32). The first dwelling site associated with this culture to be excavated was the Tosskärr site. Excavations were begun in 1950, resulting in Åke Fredsjö’s dissertation from 1953. Entitled ‘Studies in Western Sweden’s Older Stone Age’ (Sw. Studier i västsveriges äldre stenalder), it confirmed the Pre-Boreal date of the Hensbacka Culture and thus the antiquity of the flake axes, which until then had remained questionable (Fredsjö 1953; Moberg 1957).

In Denmark, the discovery of the Klosterlund bog site on Jutland pushed back the age of the Maglemose Culture to the Yoldia Sea/Ancylus Lake transition. This occurred in conjunction with a typological and chronological division of the Mesolithic, a process which also included the rise and demise of the so called Gudenå Culture, between the late 1930’s and the late 1950’s (which proved itself to be an admixture of various elements from a variety of different Mesolithic industries) together with the recognition of a new cultural group, originally christened ‘The Early Coastal Culture’, chronology sandwiched between the Maglemose and Ertebølle Cultures, later re-named after the Kongemose bog site located in west Zealand (Andersen 1972d; 1972e; Becker 1952; 1953; Glob 1942; 1967; Klindt-Jensen 1962; Larsson 1978:18).

The chronological limits and relationships of the Fosna, Komsa and Nøstvet sites were central themes within Norwegian Mesolithic research. Typological comparisons played an important part in efforts to date the Komsa sites, resulting in a variety of conclusions. A few speculated that these finds represented some form of population that inhabited the area before and/or during the last Ice Age, an undeniably exciting idea but one that was never substantiated to any degree. Nummedal and Bøe, in their typologically orientated work entitled Le Finmarkien, Les Origines de la Civilization dans l’Extreme-nord de l’Europe thought that the lithic material of the Komsa sites clearly showed Palaeolithic traits, which suggested an early arrival of this culture into the area ca. 16-15000 bc, one which had lasted until 6000-5000 bc (Bøe &
Gjessing and Freundt suggested that the Fosna and Komsa cultures might have survived up until the Neolithic, possibly beyond (Freundt 1948; Gjessing 1945:521). By the early 1960’s the general consensus had them both commencing ca. 8000 bc, give or take a thousand years, and lasting up until about 3000 bc. The Nøstvet Culture was considered to have begun ca. 5000-4000 bc and to have lasted to around 2000 bc, thus coexisting with the Fosna in southern Norway (Binns 1979:5p; Hagen 1967:43; Hagen & Joys 1962:19pp; Odner 1966:134pp).

Chronological boundaries were also sought after in Finland, initially with the use of typology, now increasingly with the use of the relative and absolute chronology provided by shoreline displacement studies (Nordman 1968). Initially it was thought that the Suomusjärvi Culture might have persisted up until the beginning of the Passage Grave Period (Europaeus 1922:178). By the late 1930’s it was placed roughly in between the Ancylus and Litorina transgressions ca. 6000-4000 bc, followed somewhat belatedly by the Comb-Ceramic Culture that lasted from ca. 4500/3000-2000 bc (Luho 1952a; 1952b; Äyräpää 1934:14; 1950a:13; 1952 Äyräpää & Sauramo 1949). The discovery by Ville Luho of a number of sites containing what appeared to be an archaic quartz technology located in the Parish of Askola, in Nyland, southern Finland, gave rise to the so called Askola Culture. On the bases of shoreline displacement studies and typological comparisons, it was assumed to pre-date the Suomusjärvi Culture (Edgren & Törnblom 1993:27pp; Kivikoski 1964:24pp; Luho 1956). Today it is generally held that these are two manifestations of one and the same tradition. In either case, the discovery of the Askola sites helped confirm that Finland had indeed hosted an early settlement from the beginning of the Pre-Boreal ca. 8000 bc (Luho 1956:152p).

Early evidence of south-western Scandinavia’s first inhabitants came to light in northern Germany through the discovery and subsequent excavation of...
two key sites by Alfred Rust, engineer and self-taught archaeologist. The first to be investigated was the Meindorf bog site between 1933-1934, which revealed the blade and flake based technology of the Hamburg Culture and two of its most characteristic artefacts, the Zinken and the Kerbespitzen (a shouldered and tanged point similar to the Lyngby type). The site of this reindeer hunting culture was dated to the Alleröd climate phase. The second site, located at the Stellmoor bog, was excavated between 1934-1936. Its bottom most layers contained elements of the Hamburg complex, while its upper layers enclosed artefacts similar to those found at the Ahrensburg site, which gave its name to this new culture, one dated ca. 8500-8100 bc, thus placing it in the climate phase of the Younger Dryas. The Ahrensburg Culture is predominantly characterised by its distinctive tanged and leaf shaped point (Bøe 1937a; Clark 1936:54pp & 74pp; Fredsjö 1953:138; Niklasson 1934: 132pp; Åberg 1936).

The technology of these two Late Palaeolithic cultures shows a certain affiliation with that of the so called Lyngby Culture, which amounted to nothing more than a general designation employed to describe a dispersed collection of stray finds consisting of tanged flake points and antler picks. The discovery of the Bromme site in western Zealand in 1945 and the Segebro site near Malmö in 1960 gave Scandinavia its first settlements dating to the Alleröd Period. The Lyngby designation, originally thought to be an later and separate development, is no longer in use, it is now seen as manifestation of the Bromme cultural complex (Klindt-Jensen 1962:16; Stenberger 1962a:30; 1979:23).

One of the most important developments for the understanding of the Mesolithic was derived from Neolithic studies and the spread of agriculture. Initially it was thought that farming communities had, after established themselves in Denmark and southwesternmost Sweden by the beginning of the Dolmen period, fanned out slowly across the southern Scandinavian peninsula, reaching eastern Sweden during the following periods, in some cases not until the Late Neolithic. The discovery of a number of early Stone Age farming communities in Södermanland by Sten and Maj-Britt Florin during the second half of the 1930’s, including the villages at Östra Vrå and Katrineholm-Mogetorp, both of which clearly dated to an early stage of the Dolmen Period, obviously indicated that this substance strategy had spread much more quickly than previously envisioned (Arbman 1947:24pp; Ekholm 1938:38; Florin 1938; 1944; 1958:143pp; Lindqvist 1935:95pp; 1944:20pp). This growing realisation spurred the establishment of a new chronological horizon between the Older/ Mesolithic and Younger/Neolithic Stone Ages, now placed at 3000 bc, a division drawn with greater regard to economic factors rather than artefact typologies.

Chronological Horizons: Northern Ambiguities

With developments occurring as rapidly as they did within Mesolithic studies, it is not surprising that Hjalmar Larsen, when presenting the earliest prehistory of Bohuslän, found it “...quite natural...that the oldest settlements are being pushed further and further back in time.” (Larsen 1931:36). In contrast to the work being done in the rest of Scandinavia, the existence of a Norrlandian Mesolithic remained highly ambiguous, despite the availability of empirical evidence to the contrary.

Initially, slate technology had been equated with the original population of Scandinavia and Norrland’s first inhabitants. The introduction and acceptance of Almgren’s and Bagge’s truncated chronology for this industry and region ruptured the original settlement sequence, opening up a void consisting of many thousands of years between the end of the last Ice Age and the late introduction of the slate industry, now thought to have occurred during the middle of the Passage Grave Period. The resulting discontinuity created by this rationale was implicitly recognised (Hallström 1921:21; 1926:52) and sparked the creation of a number of ad hoc hypotheses specifically formulated in order to explain away inconsistencies that clearly indicated that Norrland might well have been populated at a relatively early stage. These ‘inconsistencies’ consisted of roughly 70 round-butted axes (see Hermansson & Welinder 1997) together with another 50 or so miscellaneous artefacts, some of which were particularly indicative of a human presence in the North during an early phase of the Older Stone Age.

The type of round-butted axes that were being recovered in the North were, when found in southern Sweden, considered to have come into use during the Ertebølle Phase. The conviction that Norrland had received its first substantial settlement during the Passage Grave period as indicated by the introduction of southern Swedish flint and slate artefacts via
Uppland is seriously challenged by this circumstance. In consequence, all round-butted axes when found in Norrland were considered to date from a later period, probably 3000-2500 BC. Their presence in the North only signalled an intermittent appearance of a limited number of people in the area and/or a population that had retained this archaic tool form long after it had fallen into disuse elsewhere (Bergfors 1928:53; Bygdén 1921; Ekholm 1934:1300; Hallström 1924b:696; 1924c:858; 1925; 1926:52; 1928b:28p; 1929c:12; Lindqvist 1915:5p; Olsson 1924; Rydh 1928; 1929a; 1929b; 1934a).

The cognitive transformation that this new theoretical point of departure forced upon its various adherents was not insignificant. This is exemplified by Hallström, who initially thought that the prehistory of Norrland showed signs of independent innovations as well as contacts far beyond its own boarders, while the northernmost area of this region seemed to display an admixture of Stone Age elements from both Sweden and Finland (Hallström 1924c:857p). He was even inclined to accept the possibility that:

...humans had entered Norrboten at a very early time, presumably not much later than they had done in other parts of the country... [and that the] ...artefacts [found there] conceivably indicated the existence of a numerous population... (Hallström 1921:25).

This early optimism is later reversed, expansion into the North had only been accomplished at a price, exhausting the vitality of its pioneers, rendering northernmost Fenno-Scandia;

...a dumping-ground for an enfeebled culture. Weakened through the long journey, a vulgarised patch work culture, which to a large degree, on arriving, had outlived itself (Hallström 1929:11p).

A similar shift in cognition was required to adequately explain the northern presence of a number of artefacts that, when found elsewhere, clearly dated to the Older Stone Age. These objects have never been numerous, but on the other hand, they were no less in number than those found in Uppland, and yet they would be interpreted in a profoundly different manner. Some of the first Mesolithic objects recovered in the North were discovered at the turn of the century in the Province of Jämtland. These consist of two slotted bone artefacts, one from a small bog near the village of Åflo in Offerdal parish and the other, now lost, from the Parish of Refsund. The decorated Offerdal point, as it is usually termed, is probably a double-edged knife blade that has broken off just above the handle. Its cutting edge, made fast by resin still present in the slots, consisted of microblades up to 3 centimetres long (Ekhoff 1907:29p; Larsson 2003; Olsson 1909:182; Stjerna 1911:20pp).

Other finds consist of an atypical axe made of elk horn, from Backen, Råtans parish, Jämtland, which was recovered from a bog at the turn of the century (Olsson 1902-1905:68; Stjerna 1911:30). This find was followed, in succession, by the discovery of three perforated adzes made of elk antler, one from Görvik, Hammerdal parish (Ryh 1934b:40) one from Singsän, Ragunda parish (Janson 1962e:21) and a third from Billsta, Hackås parish (Hansson & Perming 1983:34p) all three of which exhibit close similarities to their Mesolithic equivalents found in southern Scandinavia.

The presence of a few Nøstvet-Lihult axes were known from the early 1920's. Four examples come from Ovansjö parish in Gästrikland, one from Uhrfors and three from Sunnanå (Hallström 1928b:29; Rydh 1922:115p) while another two had been found in Hälsingland, one from Lake Långrösten in the Parish of Alfå and the other from the Parish of Ovanåker (Enqvist 1935a:303; 1948; Hallström 1937:137). Lihult-like axes were reported to have been recovered from at least four different locations in Jämtland, although this was later disputed (Janson 1962e:22p).

Ovansjö parish also sported a broad-leaf shaped point typical of the Suomusjärvi culture together with a number of round-butted axes (Olsson 1917a; Rydh 1922:124), all of which would clearly seem to signal the presence of humans in southern Gästrikland, at a relatively early stage in time, a people with far-flung contacts.

From Hälsingland there is also a single Limhamn axe from Kyrkbyn, Alfå parish (Hallström 1937:138) and a handle core, found in 1935 on the northern shore of Lake Öjungan, Ovanåker parish (Hallström 1937:220). Another was discovered in 1957, on a Stone Age site overlooking Lake Lofsjöen in the parish of Linsell, Jämtland (Janson 1962b:54; O’Konor [1959]).

Cross-shaped and perforated mace-heads (Sw. spetshacka/stenhacka) also occur in Norrland. The initial ambiguity surrounding the cultural and chronological affiliation of this implement (Enqvist
1922:29) had largely cleared, in both Norway, southern Sweden and Finland, as ever increasing numbers had been recovered in various Mesolithic contexts (Alin 1934:42pp; Clark 1936:105p; Hallström 1937:147; Niklasson 1934; Äyräpää 1950a:27p). Their presence in Norrland has been know since the end of the 19th century. One of these was found the Parish of Ragunda in Jämtland while another is from the Parish of Vemdal, Härjedalen (Montelius 1917:26 & Olsson 1899:214p) while a third, of unknown providence from Jämtland, was noted by Janson in 1962. Hallström knew of at least one from Lappland and another two from Hälsingland, one from Järvsö parish and one from the village of Södra Edsbyn, Ovanåker parish (Hallström 1937:147) an area already distinguished by the existence of a number of different Mesolithic artefact types.

Three large single-edged barbed harpoons of bone were also known and discussed. They are of a type that is usually considered to belong to the Ancylus Lake Period, at least when found in southern Sweden. One of these is the decorated point from Vibosjön, Tuna parish in Hälsingland (see page 253; Lindqvist 1918:75; Stjerna 1911:24). The other is represented by a fragment recovered in 1885 from the bottom of Lake Lill-Skirsjön, Täsjö parish, Ångermanland (Lindqvist 1918:74; Modin 1916:45; 1938:49). The third was pulled out of Lake Klövsjö, Jämtland in 1961 (Hansson & Perming 1983:34p). There is also a large barbed, double-edged bone harpoon from Örnsköldsvik which was found at ca. 3 meters above the present day sea level (see page 206; Ekhoff 1907:292; Stjerna 1911:25).

Handle cores and/or keeled scrapers were not an uncommon artefact in the North, largely due to the untiring efforts of Knut Tinnberg, who in the course of his annual surveys, undertaken from the mid 1930’s to the late 1940’s, amassed 18 of them, together with 2 conical microblade cores and 13 microblades. These hail from 15 different sites, the northernmost is located on Lake Torneträsk, Lappland, the southernmost comes from Lake Neder/Nedre Ransjön/Randsjön, Linsell parish in Härjedalen (Gräslund 1970; Hallström 1937:220; Olofsson 1995:166pp). The diagnostic significance of these artefact types would largely be ignored.

The existence of similar or comparable artefacts of both bone and stone when found in other areas of Scandinavia were often understood as indicating a human presence from a very early period. When acted upon, this assumption usually proved to be correct, as the history of Mesolithic studies clearly shows. Most of the artefacts noted above, and the implications they represent concerning the earliest settlement in Norrland, were not infrequently omitted or only briefly presented (e.g. Ekholm 1935; 1938). Those not altogether ignored were considered by some to date to the Younger Stone Age, the remnants of antiquated or ‘degenerate’ forms that were still being manufactured long after they had been abandoned by other people living in the South (e.g. Stjerna 1911:26 & 32; Ekholm 1941:149). Alternatively, when found in the North these artefacts were regarded as indicating that the North had been visited and exploited, but not yet settled, from the South, both sporadically and fleetingly, until sometime after the beginning of the Younger Stone Age (e.g. Forssander 1938:31; Hallström 1942b:194; 1944:133pp).

One object, more than any other, exemplifies the characteristic ambiguity surrounding the South’s view of Norrlandian prehistory. This is the double-edged implement from Åflo, Offerdal parish, which has been subjected to all of the various interpretations mentioned above (see page 44). In an early study, Knut Stjerna, despite noting the similarities between this and the other bone artefacts from Norrland with those found in the Kunda, Maglemose and Ertebølle Cultures, concluded that the former probably dated to the Dolmen Period of the Younger Stone Age (Stjerna 1911:26 & 32).

Lindqvist undertook an comparative typological analysis of all bone and antler objects in Sweden in order to further substantiate his thesis concerning the early settlement of Uppland by the Aryan forefathers of today’s Nordic population. In doing so he was compelled to admit that the Offerdal implement also dated to the Ancylus Lake Period, its presence in the North indicating that the Aryan tribe in Svealand was periodically undertaking expeditions into the North (Lindqvist 1918:79pp).

Hallström’s uncertainty is illustrative of just how fickle comparative typology can be;

We have a pair of bone artefacts from Jämtland that indicate a human presence, one that occurred not much later in time than it did in the southernmost areas of the country. But...are these Norrlandian objects really that old. For my own part I don’t see why not, but I would be grateful for proof, preferably of some other kind than archaeological (Hallström 1926:52).
Somewhat later Hallström acknowledges that the bone and horn objects from Jämtland, as well as the Nøstvet-Lihult axes, indicate that Norrland was at least periodically visited during the Older Stone Age (Hallström 1928b:29; 1942b:193). The presence of the round-buttox axes in Norrland also invoked a southern Swedish presence;

Only now, at the transition to and with the beginning of the Younger Stone Age [3000 bc] ...dare we speak of a coherent and permanent “settlement” in southern Norrland. Its connection with developments in Middle Sweden [Svealand] is completely apparent, it moved slowly up the coast from the south (Hallström 1942b:194, quotation marks in the original).

As ever, Uppland was considered to be the heartland from which this colonisation sprang;

It would appear that colonisation from the Atlantic coast, from west to east towards the Baltic coast, was scarcely enticing. The opposite would seem more natural. The most natural would be to assume that colonisation occurred from the south along both coasts...a scenario that has repeated itself throughout history. The Norrlandian side [as opposed to the Atlantic coast] has always been poorer and sparsely populated - at least until the industrial revolution. One exception to this rule is the Younger Stone Age which in Norrland is amazing in its intensity (Hallström 1944:130).

But colonisation was considered to have proceeded slowly. Only towards the end of the Younger Stone Age did this process near completion, as indicated by the many sites which were just then being found in Norrland, situated along the shores of the inland lakes and waterways;

The whole of Norrland was now occupied by humans. But we still cannot conceive of any permanent settlement in the forest and mountain areas, they were presumably only utilised during the annual hunting trips, probably from sites closer to the coast (Hallström 1942b:198).

Ekholm did not discount that the Offerdal implement represented a very early proof of ”...our forefathers migration into Norrland...”, but he too was also quick to point out that this was a minor occurrence, settlement of a more established nature occurred first later, and from Uppland (Ekholm 1941:146p).

Having once occurred, development soon stagnated, only to be periodically jump-started through trade with the South, but not wholly alleviated;

Norrland’s development, as presented here, has followed a divergent route and above all, a different tempo, than the rest of Sweden...its peripheral position in the past and present has retarded its progress. It has long remained an underdeveloped region which first now, with the awakening of its vital energies in our own time, will conceivably transform it into an important dynamic centre (Ekholm 1941:163).

The above is nothing less than a prime example of the ‘colonial experience’ as perceived by the South looking Northwards and made manifest by those five postulates noted above, all of which were first conceived and developed during the first decades of the 20th century. As already noted;

1) The first of these postulates holds that settlements of any significance in the North occurred relatively late in comparison to the rest of Scandinavia, sometime between 3000-2000 bc under the direct influence of southern Sweden via Uppland while all prior indications of any earlier presence were either questionable or had been sporadic at best and of short duration. This scenario was launched by Almgren in his typological studies into the development of the slate industry and was soon generally accepted (Almgren 1907; 1914b; 1920:15; Arbman 1947:21; Bagge 1923; Bellander 1945:9p; 1946:34p; Ekholm 1915; 1934:1300; Hallström 1917:203p; 1924c:858pp; 1925; 1928b:29; 1929b:51pp; 1929c:12; 1937:148pp; 1949:23; Lindqvist 1915:15p; Olsson 1910-1913:37p; Rydh 1948; Santesson 1941).

2) The second postulate, that the Northern population was both sparse and nomadic, seems to have gained ground slowly from the 1920’s onwards, although it is implicitly implied in the ramifications of the proceeding postulate (Almgren 1904:78; Almgren 1920:15; Almgren & Gustawsson 1934:173; Hallström 1926:47 & 52p; 1929c; 1937:150p; 1942a; Santesson 1924a:477).

3) The third postulate depicts the Norrlandian Stone Age as retarded, e.g. abnormally delayed as regards to internal dynamics and developmental potentially as typically displayed by the manufacture and
maintenance of archaic tool forms and technology long after they had become redundant elsewhere, in some areas right up into recent historic times. First suggested by Montelius in 1874, it too reached normative status during the first half of 20th century (Arbman 1947:40, 50, 70 & 76; Bellander 1946:36; Ekholm 1941:149; Hallström 1917:190; 1924b:696; 1926:55; 1929b:16; 1944:133p; 1949:38; Montelius 1874b:102 & 108; 1903:57; 1910-1913:38; Rydh 1948:47; Santesson 1941; Stjerna 1911:26).

4) The fourth follows from the third, when progress of any significance occurs in the hinterland-North, it has its origins in the centre-South. Hildebrand was probably the first to suggested this possibility, an interpretation that, when it came to explaining the Norrlandian past, became a popular and established archaeological doctrine that lasted throughout the 20th century (Almgren 1907; 1914b; 1920:15; Arbman 1947:42pp; Bagge 1923; Bellander 1946; Ekholm 1915; 1923a; 1934:1300; 1941:146; Hallström 1917:204; 1921:27; 1925; 1926; 1928b; 1929c:12; 1934:56p; 1937:141p; 1942a; 1942b:193; 1944:130pp; H. Hildebrand 1866:45; 1869a; 1869b; Lindqvist 1912; 1915; Montelius 1903; Santesson 1941; H. Schück 1914:15).

5) Hallström would seem to have been the first to formulate the fifth and last of these postulates, which explains the presence of southern Scandinavian artefacts in Norrland as resulting from trade of some kind. This too would develop into one of the most popular explanations employed to characterise the peripheral-North, which thereafter is always understood as having served as a source of raw materials for the centre-South (Almgren 1920:15; Arbman 1947:43pp & 74; Ekholm 1941:146pp; Gjessing 1942:508; Hallström 1917:203p; 1925; 1928b:35p; 1929c:12; 1934:68; 1937:151pp; 1942a; 1949:21; Lindqvist 1935:19; Santesson 1941).

Thus we see that these five postulates, the hallmark of a southern Swedish thought-collective and style, were invented, spread and grew, influencing and later dominating how the Norrlandian past has been viewed and portrayed throughout the first three quarters of the 20th century. No one scholar would always hold or express all five of these postulates in each and every publication. Nor were they rigidly codified, details would be periodically tinkered with and minor modifications or adjustments suggested or made. For example, both Bagge, Hallström and Moberg would all later acknowledge the possibility of a foreign cultural and/or racial presence of eastern origin in the northernmost regions of Norrland (Bagge 1937b:106; Hallström 1942b; 1949:24; Moberg 1955). But these deliberations did not, singularly or together, effect any basic alteration in the overall theoretical foundation as concerns how the North was perceived and presented. The full implications that could have been drawn from the archaeological material, which clearly allowed for alternative interpretations, were never sufficiently contemplated. Norrland’s prehistory remained shoe-horned into the last two or three millennium of the Younger Stone Age, its cultural development retarded and dependent upon unfolding events as they occurred in and from the South.

Chronological Horizons and Alternative Thought-Styles

Scandinavian archaeology during the first half of the 20th century expanded its chronological and typological horizons, both geographic and conceptual. These developments seemed to call into question the hegemony of the South, as exemplified by Gutorm Gjessing (1906-1979) who was working along the coast of the Arctic Ocean in northern Norway for the Tromsø Museum. Gjessing approached the archaeological material from an ethnographic perspective, exploring questions concerning independent development vis-à-vis cultural borrowing on a pan-continental scale. He clearly recognised the existence of a;

...south Scandinavian theory [which] is principally based on the natural conception that cultural progress and influences in Europe have largely moved from south to north (Gjessing 1942:486, English in the original),

and that this theoretical stance was conditioned by contemporary economic and geographic circumstances that obscured the ingenuity and success of Northern cultural innovations;

On the whole one has over-much regarded the north of Norway as the extreme outpost of Scandinavian civilization towards the north, whereas it may well be that the region may more rightly regarded as part of the great arctic circumpolar economical zone (Gjessing 1942:487, italics and English in the original).
Gjessing ascribed a number of cultural innovations to this ‘Circumpolar Stone Age’ including the origins of the slate industry, suggesting that it might have been an indigenous northern Norwegian development or one that had reached Fenno-Scandia from the east (Gjessing 1942:490pp; 1944:24p).

Finnish archaeologists had already reached a similar conclusion concerning the slate industry of the Suomusjärvi Culture, which was obviously thousands of years older than anything else in Scandinavia. Generally speaking, allowances have always been made for the possible occurrence of independent developments in prehistoric Finland, especially in relationship to its western neighbour, without denying the existence and importance of foreign contacts. A second independent innovation concerning the use of slate, during the first phase of the Comb Ceramic Culture, was now also contemplated and found probable. If correct, then it must have occurred prior to the flowering of the Norrlandian slate industry under the assumed influence of southern Sweden, the characteristic artefacts of which occur on sites belonging to the later phase of Comb Ceramic Culture (Europaeus 1920; Luho 1952a; 1952b; Riska 1945; Äyräpää 1950b; see also Shetelig & Falk 1937:78).

The assumed Upplandian origins of the slate industry received a further blow from excavations taking place in northern Norway during the 1950’s. It was discovered that many of the slate artefacts supposed to be chronologically distinct, at least according to Almgren’s and Bagge’s comparative typologies, were in fact contemporary (Christiansson 1961:122; Simonsen 1956). This fact did not alter the accepted chronological horizons of when this industry was presumed to have arisen, but it did bring into question the assumed supremacy of the South.

Others began to question the racial hegemony of the past. Santesson, one of the few who never abandoned the thought that the carriers of the ‘Slate Culture’ represented some other racial group, now returned to this possibility. Initially he thought that the slate industry represented the presence of a “…primordial Finnish…” tribe. Now these people were considered to have been of Sámi extraction, having come out of the north, they had settled along the coastal areas of the yet un-inhabited Norrland ca. 2500 bc. In conjunction with the arrival of the southern Swedish Boat/Battle Axe Culture ca. 2000 bc, the slate using Sámi population either moved, or were forced, inland, surrendering the coastal areas to the newcomers (Santesson 1924a:447; 1941).

Bo Hellman, influenced by Santesson, Erixon and Gjessing, also drew attention to the cultural differences inherent in the archaeological record from different parts of the country, pointing out that they are as varied as is the contemporary ethnological material of today. He goes on to assert the autonomy of a Northern ‘cultural community’ in contrast to that which existed in the South (B. Hellman 1946). This scenario gained ground and a few years later both Hellman and Westin were equating the Sámi with the ‘Slate Culture’, which was considered to have entered the region from the north, sometime after 3000 bc, colonising the coastal regions. These people later withdrew into the interior, abandoning the coast to the Boat/Battle Axe Culture which arrived ca. 2000 bc with its characteristic boat-shaped stone axes and its thick-butted flint axes (B. Hellman 1949; Westin 1952). Others remained non-committed, admitting the possibility of this interpretation while pointing out how difficult it was to substantiate such a claim (Hvarfner 1957b:111; Westerlund 1958).

Continued contextual typological studies in the South confirmed the Mesolithic origins and antiquity of the various stone, bone and antler implements found there. In light of this, the possibility of an early human presence of some kind in the North appeared increasingly possible, even probable, and as we have seen, it was often alluded to. Arvid Enqvist was by far the most outspoken adherent of this notion, proposing, at first cautiously and later with certitude, that the stray finds of both the Nøstvet-Lihult and round-butted axes represented a more substantial settlement phase which must have begun ca. 4000 bc, possibly even as early as 4500 bc (Enqvist 1935a:302; 1935b:463; 1944:22pp; 1948).

Enqvist’s assumption was originally based on typological premises, later corroborated by other independent data. In 1938 a sealed depot consisting of five axe blanks was discovered at Västra Edsbyn, Ovanåker parish, Hälsingland. Their nearest equivalent was recognised in the ‘primitive axes’ typically belonging to the Suomusjärvi Culture. The find was pollen analytically dated, the conclusion being that these axes must have been deposited before 4200 bc (Enqvist 1944:24; Janson & Sandegren 1942). Enqvist is alone in citing this as evidence of an early settlement. Everyone else adhered to the approved and time honoured scenarios of the southern Swedish thought-style. Bellander for example, while recognising that both the core axes and the round-
butted axes found in Gästrikland were elsewhere considered to date back to 5000 BC, did not allow these typological implications to assert themselves. Instead, he says;

It is far from positive, that this early population was permanently settled in the province. They could have had their real places of residence further south, in Uppland and Västmanland, from which they came, only to periodically visit the rich fishing grounds in the North (Bellander 1946:34p).

So too, Hanna Rydh, in her short prehistoric presentation of Jämtland and Härjedalen. Through the use of comparative typology, she places the Offerdal implement in the 6th millennium BC, yet interprets its existence as an accidental occurrence, lost by “...some bold hunters who forced their way into this region, but who had no permanent home here.” (Rydh 1948:45). The round-butted axes are perceived as archaic survivals while the perforated elk antler adzes are seen as belonging to the region’s earliest dwelling sites, which are considered to be from about 2500 BC (Rydh 1948:45pp).

On the other hand, it would seem that one of Norrland’s leading archaeological experts, Gustaf Hallström, was slowly groping his way towards a revised view concerning certain aspects of the archaeological record. After retirement in 1946 he was commissioned to write a survey over the prehistory of Jämtland and Härjedalen, a task that prompted him to undertake a comprehensive review of the prehistoric material from the whole of Norrland. This circumstance provoked him into reassessing many of the chronological implications provided by the empirical material at hand. He never completed this monograph, the drafts of which are to be found at the University Library in Umeå. His health was failing and in 1950 he gave up this task with a heavy heart, choosing instead to spend the last 10 years of his life completing that monumental publication on the Norrlandian petroglyphs. That Hallström was on the verge of a major reappraisal of his earlier views is born out in this, his final publication, where he discusses the age of the Gärde petroglyphs, located in the Offerdal parish. Hallström suggests that they might possibly date to the Ancylus Lake period as indicated by the Offerdal implement, found nearby, the presence of which, in turn, opened the door to an early colonisation of Jämtland from Norway (Baudou 1997:269pp; pers. comm. 2003; Hallström 1960:51pp & 372p; Janson 1962e:18pp).

Ironically, after spending almost half a century defending the hegemony of southern Sweden over that of the North and arguing for its dependency on the South, Hallström was rethinking his position. But the logic of his former arguments were not forgotten and were soon to be adopted, propagated and defended by a new generation of archaeologists.

This assignment, the presentation of Jämtland’s prehistory, was later completed by this new generation, working out of Stockholm for the Central Board of National Antiquities. Since 1942 this institution had become increasingly involved in the salvage investigations taking place throughout Norrland in connection with the exploitation of the region’s hydro-electric power resources. This entailed the employment and training of a whole new core of professional archaeologists who, during the course of the 1950’s, came to replace the principle scholars of the previous generation that had studied the Norrlandian past - Bagge, Ekholm, Hallström, Lindqvist, Santesson - all retired during the mid 20th century. Not only were fresh job opportunities opening up but also new intellectual horizons. With each passing field season the ongoing salvage investigations were revealing a hitherto unknown material with unimagined panoramas into the Norrlandian past (e.g. Hvarfner 1957b:80; Janson 1956:65). Sverker Janson recognised the existence of these new circumstances in the first article he ever penned on Norrlandian prehistory, in a preliminary presentation of the 1944 excavations at Närnoforsen he notes that;

...during the last few years, throughout Norrland, from Lake Torneträsk in the north, along the Lapplandian water systems and in the other Norrlandian provinces, a great multitude of hunting and fishing sites have been discovered, which presents us with a different and richer image of Norrland’s Stone Age settlement (Janson 1945:52).

Janson goes on to briefly sum up the position of the two contrary and rival thought-styles that now vied for support; on the one hand the established position which held that the “…connections with southern Sweden have generally been considered to be the determining factor for the development of the Stone Age culture in Norrland…”; contra, the novel view as presented by Gjessing who envisioned a Northern culture that had “…evolved within its own region and thus was highly adapted to living conditions as they exist here.” (Janson 1945:49p).
Chronological Horizons and The Dogma of Heritage

In light of events as they unfolded during the 1940’s, the creation of a novel thought-style, as it pertains to Norrland, carried by members of a new thought-collective, appeared to be immediate. All the necessary prerequisites seem to have been in place; the accusation of new archaeological material, the re-arrangement of traditional concepts and the formulation of alternative points of view, all of which occurred during a period of turnover and renewal within the professional community. Ensuing developments proved to be otherwise. Instead, we are confronted with a return to, and a restoration of, the traditional system of thought that had come to dominate Norrlandian archaeology during the first half of the 20th the century;

...a review of the new material recovered from Norrlandian sites located inland, shows that these finds cannot be very much older than about 2000 bc. This material contains imported objects from the South and East, both of which provide secure chronological horizons. In this material there are objects that clearly date to the Bronze and Iron Ages of southern Scandinavia. Hence, the hunters and fishers up here remained in a Stone Age state for a very long interval. It is quite evident that this Stone Age culture survived thus until Medieval times (Janson 1956:68).

This opinion was expressed in a short article which appeared in a small monograph that briefly discussed and presented the prehistoric rock art of Sweden. Nevertheless, it was a harbinger of things to come. Four years later Janson vents the same views in a larger anthology, an elegantly extravagant publication that is a summation of the salvage investigations carried out by the Central Board of National Antiquities during the last 20 years. This work, entitled Från Norrlandsälvar och Fjällsjöar, was published in 1960, an English translation appeared in 1966, its full title being Ancient Hunters and Settlements in the Mountains of Sweden. Archaeological and ethnological investigations carried out in connection with power-station projects and lake regulation schemes (Janson & Hvarfner 1960; 1966). Here, and once again, we are informed that these investigations have “…provided us with a whole new material of great archaeological interest.” (Janson 1960b:18). This material was recovered from sites located;...everywhere within the interior, along the lake shores and the river banks. Often in surprisingly large numbers. It is quite evident that the high density of these sites does not signify that there was here any permanent settlement along these waterways. These areas would otherwise have been overpopulated. Instead, and of this we are certain, we have come across the tracks of a Stone Age people who are migratory and made seasonal trips to different places within the vast areas that constituted their hunting grounds (Janson 1960b:19).

He then goes on to inform us “…with certainty, that none of the artefacts encountered on the sites in Norrland are older than from the Neolithic era, that is to say, from between 3000 to 1500 bc.” (Janson 1960b:21) and that it is quite probable that many of these stone objects were manufactured and used during the Middle ages, possibly right up until recent times (Janson 1960b:26pp; Hvarfner 1957b:103). As far as racial affinities are concerned, Janson states that the answer to that question is largely a mater of “…guesswork.” (Janson 1960b:28).

The monograph Hallström hoped to complete on the prehistory of Jämtland and Härjedalen, was realised in 1962 by a trio consisting of Janson, Biörnstad and Hvarfner. The latter two present the region’s Iron Age while Janson covers its earliest and longest prehistoric period. In doing so he systematically reviews and then rejects the chronological implications displayed by all of those artefacts that, elsewhere and for quite some time, are known to date from the Mesolithic. For example, in presenting the round-butted axes we are told that they have no chronological value in themselves unless found with other datable artefacts (Janson 1962b:25p). After reviewing the Offerdal implement, the harpoons, the perforated adzes made of elk antler, the Nøstvet-Lihult axes and the round-butted axes, he concludes that “…there are no artefacts from this region that can definitely be dated to the Older Stone Age.” (Janson 1962e:23).

This is all very singular, especially in light of the fact that Sverker Janson was by then one of the most experienced and knowledgeable archaeologist’s ever to have worked in Norrland. During the last twenty years he had been deeply involved in all aspects of the extensive field work being carried out in connection with the salvage operations necessitated by the exploitation of the Norrlandian waterways.
Under his supervision, thousands of sites were discovered, hundreds excavated, while the reports, which even by today’s standards are both informative and useful, were actually being written and thus made available for study. This alone is an extraordinary accomplishment, attesting to his considerable talents and familiarity with the material. His re-discovery of the Lyngby point from Torskär, which had lain forgotten for almost 30 years in the vaults of the Historical Museum in Stockholm, would appear to indicate that he was typologically well versed (Janson 1940). He also knew and worked with Tinnberg and thus was most probably aware of the Mesolithic material issuing from those surveys. Janson even illustrated one of his articles with a photograph of the handle core found on the Lofssjön site in the Parish of Linsell, Härjedalen (fig. 75 & Janson 1962b:54). The first radiocarbon dates were also starting to make their appearance (see below), supplying further evidence for a Norrlandian Mesolithic. But the continued accumulation of empirical evidence did not effect or alter the dominate and prevailing interpretations, which, from about the middle of the 1950’s and for the next 10 years or so, became positively dogmatic.

As we have seen above, the hunting and fishing population of Norrland was considered to have been scanty, comprised of a wandering nomadic people who, judging from the presence of imported artefacts, were in touch with “...higher developed cultures...” in southern Sweden (Janson 1962c:68). This southern material, which is chronologically relevant;

...is now so large that one can, with great certainty, express an interpretation. The presence of asbestos tempered pottery, moulds, metals, iron axes, strike-a-lights of stone and iron, knives and arrow points of iron etc., found on sites mixed together with material that is Stone Age in its character, all this cannot be explained by maintaining that these later day artefacts have by chance, or because the site has been re-used over many thousands of years, come to rest next to these older objects. The mixing is all to great (Janson 1962c:68pp).

There is only one explanation, that the Norrlandian Stone Age culture (singular) survived as an archaic relic long after its southern Scandinavian counterparts had passed on to better things. This postulate, consummated during the first half of the 20th century was, from the 1950’s onwards, reinstated as the normative view and repeated to such an extent that it became a matter of course. The same problem, a clear lack of stratigraphy and the mixture of chronology distinct cultural remains, was one familiar to archaeologists working with Mesolithic material in Skåne. Their response to this difficulty is as different as it is enlightening;

A site by a lake that does not fill up through stagnation or by a river that does not change its course can be a favourable spot for hunting camps for a very long time and it is therefore natural for finds from different periods to be concentrated in the same place. If the deposition of earth is so slight that no stratigraphy results, it is easy to assume that the flint artefacts derive from one single settlement phase; and if the finds from one
occupation are scanty and those from another abundant, we may easily be led to theories of “infusion from another culture-group” or “archaic survivals” (Althin 1954:132, quotation marks in the original).

The possible presence of another, racially distinct, group of people in Norrland during the prehistoric past, was re-introduced and re-considered from the mid 20th century onwards (B. Hellman 1949; Hvarfner 1957b:111; 1961b:23; Santesson 1941; Westerlund 1958; Westin 1952);

From whence this aboriginal Norrlandian population might have come is still unknown, but there are indications that they might possibly have arrived out of the great eastern forests. This migration was hardly a single occurrence...in all probability, it consisted of small groups of people, families and wandering hunters, who entered this region, not intending to colonise or to settle permanently. Movement in the opposite direction must have also taken place, people returning to regions they had left, areas not owned by anyone, open to all (Stenberger 1964:307p).

Irrespective of when, where and who these people were or might have come from, it was obvious that they had retained a retarded Mesolithic way of life that did not develop. The impaired state of the Norrlandian Stone Age was only interrupted by influences and/or population movements coming from the South, bringing progress, both social and economic. It was from that direction a higher social order came, along with permanent settlements, advanced technologies, a more rational economy and the sense to exploit the resources of Norrland for their own gain.

As already seen above, this postulate, the assumption that progress in the North rested in developments as they occurred in the South, had already become normative during the first half of the 20th century. Its explanatory capacity was now re-employed from the 1950’s onwards, to interpret the new archaeological materials coming to light through the Norrlandian salvage excavations conducted by the Central Board of National Antiquities

Norrland’s advancement commenced, at least precariously, with the arrival of the Dwelling Site Culture and/or the Boat-Battle Axe Culture, both of which had moved up along the coast from Uppland. The latter had possibly also brought agriculture and/or stock breeding, as well as their thick-butted flint axes, “...these new and better implements.” (Janson 1945:49) made from “...a material superior to that of the indigenous quartz and slate in both cutting edge and strength.” (Stenberger 1964:165). These people were either followed by others from the South, or retained close ties with their original homeland throughout the remainder of the Neolithic and the following Bronze Age period, as seen by the abundant presence of shaft-hole axes and the distribution of their many burial cairns which they built along the coastal areas of Norrland (Stenberger 1964:307). The final and greatest advancement occurred during the Late Iron Age and onwards;

The colonial enterprise northwards, which from central Sweden began during the Older Roman Iron Age, continued with increasing intensity towards the end of pagan times. Areas previously uninhabited were now permanently settled, older communities expanded (Stenberger 1964:786).

The retarded Stone Age way of life was considered to have lingered on in the North, as indicated by the continued manufacture of slate artefacts which were obviously modelled on Iron Age implements of southern Scandinavian origin (Hvarfner 1955:28; Janson 1960b:27; 1962c:69). Meanwhile, the progressive forces from the South rolled onwards, breaking “...through the vast isolation that had secluded Norrland, incorporating it into the cultural sphere of southern Scandinavia.” (Biörnstad 1962b:136).

But even in its success, this advancement northwards fell short of southern Swedish expectations, as exemplified by the subsequent excavation of that rich Iron Age chamber burial discovered beneath the monumental mound at Högom, Medelpad. Here;

...the unburnt remains of a splendidly attired man buried with all his weapons, gold ornaments and much domestic equipment including glass and bronze [were recovered]. In spite of all its richness, the material shows evidence of long use, local isolation and limited resources. The man was a farmer chieftain from the northernmost borders of the Svea kingdom... (Stenberger 1962a:157, English in the original).

Despite the civilising effects bestowed upon it from the centre-South, Norrland remains a backwater, a pale imitation of its dynamic neighbour, invariably in need guidance and support, both then and now.
Chronological Horizons: C14

By the early 1940’s archaeologists had managed to populate Scandinavia with a wide variety of Mesolithic cultures while Norrland continued to remain empty, and for thousands of years (fig. 76). This contrast, between Norrland and its neighbours, is as startling as it was persistent. This map, like nothing else, testifies to the success of the southern Swedish thought-style outlined above, which soon came to dominate the way Norrland was perceived despite clear archaeological evidence to the contrary. The success of this explanatory model is in whole or in part explicable in light of the support it sustained from both historical and contemporary perceptions as they concern the asymmetrical relationship that has existed between the peripheral-North and centre-South, a dependency that has been taken for granted since the Middle Ages.

This southern Swedish thought-style received a further challenge during the late 1950’s, not from archaeology, but from physics, in the form of the first radiocarbon dates to be analysed from various sites in Norrland. These were reported on by Mårten Stenberger, his comments are as enlightening as the dates were surprising.

He begins by presenting 7 dates from five hearths and a pit feature from a site situated on Lake Storuman, Stensele parish (St 407-413), together with one from a hearth located down stream at Lake Stenselet (St 418). These features dated between AD 175 to AD 1640 ± 70-120 years (Stenberger 1962b:361). Stenberger points out that the association between these hearths and the presence of a number of stone artefacts might be a coincidence, but nevertheless chooses to interpret their presence and these dates as;

...proof for the existence of a Stone Age culture in Norrland’s inland up until the end of the prehistoric age (Stenberger 1962b:362).

He then goes on to present the dates coming out of the Döudden locality on Lake Hornavan in Arjeplog parish, one of Norrland’s few stratified sites (see Bergman 1995). The three handle cores/keeled scrapers recovered from this site (Olofsson 1995:168) indicated its antiquity. This was vindicated by two C14 samples from two hearths in the bottom most layer which gave dates of 4200 and 4210 bc respectively (fig. 77), putting this site well into the Mesolithic and opening up the possibility that Norrland had been settled one or even two thousand years earlier than most cared to admit or were even prepared to accept;

It was considered likely that ancient deadwood had been burned in these hearths, which would explain the age of these dates, so additional tests were run...but with the same results. These tests have plainly shown that we must take into account that people moved into the inner regions of Norrland far earlier than anyone had previously assumed, during a time that is comparable to the Early Neolithic [3000-2500 bc] in southern Scandinavia, if not even earlier. There is no archaeological support for such an early appearance of humans in Norrland, but there are no obstacles that would have prevented such an occurrence (Stenberger 1962b:362).

Careful reading is required to catch the somersault in Stenberger’s logic, disregarding the full import of these radiocarbon dates while striving to keep faith with established doctrine. Two dates from Lake Hotingsjön in the Parish of Tåsjö in Ångermanland, proved to be just as troublesome. One hearth, found in association with artefacts that typologically belonged to the Middle Neolithic 2500-2000 bc (Östlund 1957:495) was C14 dated to 3510 years bc while another feature was dated to 5640 bc, an unbelievable result;

...which is exceptionally old. Perhaps here a mistake has been made, although it is hypothetically possible that the use of very ancient deadwood is the reason behind this early date (Stenberger 1962b:363).

Other Norrlandian sites containing artefacts typical of the Older Stone Age would also produce Mesolithic radiocarbon dates. In the high mountain regions of the far north, not far from the Norwegian border, site no. 1371 was excavated between 1963 and 1964 by the Central Board of National Antiquities in connection with the exploitation of the Stora Lule river system. A variety of artefacts from different periods was recovered from this site, including three keeled scrapers and a radiocarbon date of 4380 bc (Bergengren 1964:56 & 59). Site S104 was also excavated in 1964, by the Central Board and for the same reasons. This semi-subterranean dwelling is located on a mixed period site along the River Rörströmsälven in Bodum parish, Ångermanland. It yielded one keeled scraper, 5 microblade cores, 46
microblades and 5 radiocarbon dates that placed the initial settlement of this site well within the confines of the Mesolithic (E. Allard [1964a]; [1964b]:photograph 67).

Volume 9 of the periodical *Radiocarbon* was something of a banner year for Norrlandian archaeology, here we find no fewer than 13 Mesolithic radiocarbon dates from 6 different sites (Engstrand 1967).

These early test results, so contrary to expectations, fell well outside the chronological limits imposed on Norrland by the dictates of the established archaeological thought-collective. According to Fleck, when new empirical evidence confronts and poses a challenge to the premises of any normative thought-style, it will initially be ignored and/or explained away (see Fleck 1979:27 and Chapter One). Both Janson and Hvarfner seem to have opted for this strategy. As far as I can tell, they never once mentioned or discussed the Mesolithic dates coming out of these salvage investigations undertaken by the Central Board of National Antiquities, work that directly involved them and for which they were largely responsible, as both excavators and supervisors. The last time Hvarfner and Janson maintain the relatively late settlement of the North was in 1963 and 1969 respectively (Hvarfner 1963; Janson 1969a:64). The last to do so, at all, would appear to be Klas-Göran Selinge in two overviews. The first appears in an obscure publication that presents the prehistory of Haverö parish in westernmost Medelpad. Despite the abundant presence of some twenty round-butted axes found within this area, Selinge, on typological grounds, states that there is no proof of any;

...human settlement or presence in Haverö earlier than the Neolithic, in other words, the period 3000-1500 bc. But when during this time period humans first appeared, and from whence, is at the present impossible to say (Selinge 1970:21).

The second overview recounts the prehistoric environment of the neighbouring provinces of Jämtland and Härjedalen, which he considers to have been colonised during the 4th or 5th millennium bc (Selinge 1976:30).
Meanwhile, an alternative thought-style was developing, inspired, at least in part, by Gjessing’s revised attitude towards the North. The members of this new thought-collective would find temporary residence in those three research projects mentioned above; Christiansson’s *Nordarkeologi*, Baudou’s ‘Early Norrland’ and the Västerbotten Museum’s ‘Investigation of Regulated Lakes’, all three of which provided the theoretical and empirical nourishment needed to sustain the belief in the existence of a specific Norrlandian past;

During the 20th century’s first and second decades, archaeologists were more and more inclined to view the Norrlandian Stone Age as an extension of forceful cultural impulses from the South, ignoring the eastern cultural regions and the distinctive character of the northern Scandinavian Stone Age material in comparison with that from southern Scandinavia. The distribution of stone artefacts was interpreted in accordance with modern, national borders, that have disconnected neighbouring regions from each other. This huge northern Scandinavian territory, was looked upon as one single, somewhat obscure but uniform, region (Christiansson 1961:122).

Christiansson was well aware, possibly more than anyone else at the time, that Norrlandian prehistory was dominated by a Southern bias;

It seems to me urgent that we free northern Scandinavia from that fabricated relationship which depicts the former as being dependent on southern Scandinavia. Its connection with the circumpolar regions should not be exaggerated, but northern Scandinavia must be viewed as a special cultural region in much the same way as it was perceived before the first decades of the 20th century (Christiansson 1963:20).

Despite his singular awareness, Christiansson too, was influenced by his academic and social surroundings;

It is obvious that, as far as Norrland is concerned, the Mälar Valley has played an important role as its cultural intermediary since the Early Neolithic. Interest in Norrland, which to a great degree had its own cultural foundation, is of course explained by the fact that it is a hinterland, producing natural resources (Christiansson 1963:38).

As argued in Chapter Two, Norrland is not naturally a hinterland nor a colony. However, it was turned into one due to unfolding historical circumstances. The difference in wording might appear to be inconsequential, but the shift in perspective that it produces is not.

Initially cautious with regard to when the first colonisation might have occurred, Christiansson became bolder and began to speculate that humans could have taken position of the North as “…soon as it became inhabitable.” even if he could not then specify exactly when this might have occurred (Christiansson 1961; 1962:6; 1966b). Christiansson is not as bold or rash as it may first appear. Archaeologists had known for decades that a good deal of Norrland was available for human occupation since the bi-partition of the Scandinavian ice-sheet, which occurred ca. 6800 bc, an event that was otherwise considered to signal the end of the last Ice Age and the beginning of the post-glacial period (Clark 1936:2pp; De Geer 1925; Granlund 1943). The remains of a moose, found embedded in clay from the Ancylus Lake period in the port of Skellefteå had been known since 1946 (Ekblom 1946). It attested to the obvious presence of animals in the region since at least 5000 bc and was now, and for the first time, conceived as a hypothetical indication that the area could also have housed a human presence as well (Christiansson 1966a:15; 1973c:63). Still largely dependent on typology, Christiansson began to emphasise the presence of artefacts that clearly derive their origins from the Finnish Comb Ceramic Culture and thus pushed back the earliest human presence in Norrland to at least 3000 bc (Christiansson 1965a:15; 1969b:16; 1970:38; 1972a:149). During the late 1960’s *Nordarkeologi* began excavations at what would later prove to be two key sites, Lundfors in Skellefteå parish and Garaselet in Jörn parish, both located in the northern reaches of the Västerbotten province.

Lundfors is a series of 7 sites situated along an ancient shoreline ca. 77-80 meters above today’s sea level, an elevation suggesting that one or more of these sites might possibly date to the Mesolithic, an assumption that proved to be correct. Excavations commenced in 1968 and continued until September of 1975, revealing a quartz based technology supplemented by slate, a circumstance that initially prompted this site to be equated with the Suomusjärvi Culture and dated to ca. 4000 bc (Broadbent 1975; 1979:10pp; Christiansson 1970:37p; 1972a:149; 1972b:26pp; 1973a:169p; 1973b:20; 1973c; Christiansson & Broadbent 1975:51).
chapter three

In an early summation of the *Nordarkeologi* research project, Christiansson now declared that it was obvious that;

...Norrland’s prehistory is not a story of poor hunters living in the outback, without contacts with surrounding regions, living for thousands of years with the same types of tools and without proper dwellings (Christiansson 1970:36).

With the benefit of hindsight one might look upon Christiansson’s statement as prophetic. Since then, radiocarbon dates have placed Lundfors in the Late Mesolithic and Early Neolithic period, while the analysis of its quartz technology led to a re-evaluation of its assumed cultural dependency or affiliation with the eastern Suomusjärvi Culture. Instead, and under the normative bias of this new thought-collective, we are presented with a picture of a self-sufficient prehistoric society primarily supported by a maritime seal hunting economy, stable enough to maintain a permanent and healthy population, one actively engaged in technological development, promoting their own external contacts, dynamically involved in trade, observing established communal territories, while evolving independent socio-political structures based on residence and kinship descent (Broadbent 1978:190pp; 1979:195pp; 1981:171pp; Christiansson & Broadbent 1975:51p)

Excavations at the stratified Garaselet site, from 1969 to 1975, became important for a different reason; this site pushed back the limits of the Norrlandian past farther than any other site had previously managed to do. Initially interpreted as yet another example of an intrusion from southern Sweden during the Middle Neolithic, it was dramatically re-evaluated when the bottom most layers, some 25-125 cm below the present day ground level, were uncovered in 1971. Here a total of 11 handle cores (originally classified as keeled scrapers) and a possible flake axe, were recovered. This site was soon considered, based initially on comparative typology alone, to be one of the oldest in Norrland (Gustafsson 1977; Knutsson 1993; Sundqvist 1970; 1974; 1975a). Considering the importance of this site for the interpretation of the Norrlandian past, it is rather astounding to realise that 30 years after the completion of this excavation, no proper report has been written.

Members of the *Nordarkeologi* project were also discovering other sites that were yielding what was considered to be ancient typological artefacts that bespoke of an early human presence in the region, one that had probably arrived from the Atlantic coast. This is the Rastklippan site on Lake Tärnasjön in Tärna parish, Lappland and the Lake Neder/Nedre Ransjön/Randsjön site in Linsell parish, Härjedalen. The former is located near the Norwegian border in a mountain valley that has, at least in recent times, functioned as a natural passageway through the mountains, connecting the Norwegian coast with the Norrlandian inland. This would also seem to have been the case during the prehistoric past, judging by the discovery of a number of oblique-edged and retouched points of quartz found on this site, points that are typical of the Fosna Culture situated along the Norwegian coast (see page 196; Westerlund 1970). The Ransjön/Randsjön site was discovered by Knut Tinnberg, from which he recovered, among other things, a conical/cylindrical microblade core of porphyry (see page x). Excavations were initiated in 1970, under the direction of Bo Gräslund for *Nordarkeologi*, resulting in the unearthing of a further number of handle cores, keeled scrapers, conical cores and microblades (Gräslund 1970; Olofsson 1995:166pp). Gräslund’s thoughts concerning these artefacts are worth quoting in full:

Microblades and microblade cores have earlier been found on a number of sites in north-western Svealand [Dalarna] and southern Norrland’s inland. One can debate whether or not they should be classified as belonging to the Older Stone Age, as they are in southern Scandinavia, or if their presence here signals some sort of retarded development.

However, the handle core and keeled scraper are, without hesitation, Mesolithic in form. If they had been made of flint and had been found on a site situated along the West Coast or in Skåne, then there would have been no hesitation as to their dating to the Older Stone Age, as far as the handle cores are concerned, not later than to the first half of the Atlantic phase, that is to say, the 5th or 6th millennium bc. Of course this date cannot, without further ado, be applied to the Ransjö material, but the handle core and the keeled scraper are, together, a clear archaeological indication that settlement in southern Norrland occurred sometime before the start of the Younger Stone Age in southern Scandinavia, the beginning of which is usually placed at 3000 bc (Gräslund 1970:144p).

Gräslund had expressed similar views three years earlier in a penetrative and critical review of Meschke’s *Tjikkiträsk* publication, and he would later
follow through with an enlightening dissertation on
the socio-scientific development of typology as a
chronological method (see Chapter One and Gräslund
1967; 1974; Meschke 1967).

The importance of such sites as Garaselet,
Rastklippan, Neder/Nedre Ransjön/Randsjön and
others, lies not in the recognition of these artefacts
for what they are, but in the decision to interpret them
according to the same scientific standards as
employed elsewhere. This cognitive reversal from
previous practice required a certain amount of
scholarly courage, which was aided by the
accumulation of radiocarbon dates that also pointed
in the same direction. But radiocarbon dates could
also be explained away when necessary, even thought
it was becoming increasing difficult to do so. By the
mid 1970’s more and more archaeologists were
willing to re-evaluate the archaeological material,
both old and new, according to an alternative
theoretical framework. This, as pointed out above,
occurred within a new theoretical environment, one
with its roots founded within work carried out in
northern Fenno-Scandia since the 1920’s. From the
1960’s onwards, indirect encouragement came from
Anglo-American archaeology, as exemplified by
Richard Lee and Irven DeVore’s analogy from 1968,
titled *Man the Hunter* and Marshall D. Sahlins’
book *Stone Age Economics* from 1972 (the former
re-printed 9 times between 1968 and 1984). Their
anthropological perspective, similar to Gjessing’s
ethnographical view, helped propel archaeological
interest away from the exclusive study of artefacts,
inspiring them to begin populating the Stone Age with
people who were (surprisingly) innovative, intelligent
and resourceful.

Christiansson would never completely escape from
the dominating influences of that southern Swedish
thought-style outlined above, which in part had its
origins in that very same department from which he
accomplished so much;

The further we penetrate into Norrland’s prehistoric
past, the more complex it shows itself to be. Wave
after wave of migrations or innovations have
followed each other, with longer or shorter intervals
in-between. These influences have come from the
south, from the west, maybe from the north, but
the most vital source is to be sought in the east
from over the [Baltic] sea (Christiansson

No one can dispute the past existence and importance
of these various contacts, yet Christiansson

In other words; the goal of this project was to create
a chronological baseline for the Norrlandian past
through the use of a contextual and comparative
typology founded on the presence of southern
Swedish artefacts. This is essentially the same
strategy employed by everyone working in Norrland,
one that would now be expanded to include
typologically useful artefacts from both Norway and
Finland, supplemented by radiocarbon dates and
shoreline displacement studies (Christiansson 1961;
1963; 1965; 1966a; 1969a; 1969b; 1970; 1972a;
1972b; 1973a; 1973b; 1973c; 1980). And while much
valuable work was accomplished, it still left a
majority of the Norrlandian prehistoric material out
of the picture.

A completely different strategy was pursued by
the members of the ‘Early Norrland’ research project
which, in conjunction with other goals, specifically
launched a study in order to make sense out of the
vast amount of material that had been, and still was
being, generated by the Central Board of National
Antiquities in connection with their salvage
operations in Norrland (Baudou 1966; 1969:36pp;
Age material differs considerably from that found
in the familiar-South. Confronted with this different
and little known techno-complex, one that had
utilised a number of unfamiliar materials (such as
quartz and quartzite, supplemented with various
amounts of slate, flint, porphyry, green stone, et

cetera) was perplexing, even daunting. Some
expressed doubts concerning the possibilities of ever
formulating meaningful typological and/or
chronological markers using this material
(Christiansson 1973a; 1973c:56).

This is exactly what the Early Norrland research
project succeeded in doing, despite the difficulties
It is its own indigenous typological and chronological sources, Baudou managed to provide Norrland with the information inherent in a number of independent inquiries ever carried out in Norrland. By combining achievement, one of the most elegant archaeological involved. It was, and still is, an impressive achievement, one of the most elegant archaeological inquiries ever carried out in Norrland. By combining the information inherent in a number of independent sources, Baudou managed to provide Norrland with its own indigenous typological and chronological baseline, one so elementary that it is now largely taken for granted, and few today could probably give an accurate account of the particulars behind its conception (fig 78).

By combining the limited information provided by a number of individual sites, Baudou managed to present a larger and more coherent picture of Norrland’s prehistory than hitherto thought possible;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>site</th>
<th>lab no.</th>
<th>sample no.</th>
<th>BP± sigma</th>
<th>uncalibrated</th>
<th>published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotingsjön, River Fjällsjöälven</td>
<td>St 188</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5470±100</td>
<td>3510 bc</td>
<td>1957 &amp; 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Täsjö parish, Ångermanland</td>
<td>St 198</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>7600±110</td>
<td>5640 bc</td>
<td>1957 &amp; 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inv. no. 927, Raå 508, Döudden</td>
<td>St 453</td>
<td>Döudden 1</td>
<td>6160±100</td>
<td>4200 bc</td>
<td>1960 &amp; 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St 456</td>
<td>Döudden 11</td>
<td>6170±100</td>
<td>4210 bc</td>
<td>1960 &amp; 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St 453A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6260±225</td>
<td>4310 bc</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St 453C</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6125±140</td>
<td>4175 bc</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St 453F</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6140±140</td>
<td>4190 bc</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St 548</td>
<td>Döudden 4</td>
<td>5200±150</td>
<td>3240 bc</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St 550</td>
<td>Döudden 7</td>
<td>5070±125</td>
<td>3110 bc</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St 551</td>
<td>Döudden 8</td>
<td>5050±120</td>
<td>3090 bc</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nSt 453</td>
<td>Döudden 1</td>
<td>6105±100</td>
<td>4155 bc</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nSt 456</td>
<td>Döudden 11</td>
<td>6115±100</td>
<td>4165 bc</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St 552</td>
<td>Döudden 14</td>
<td>5100±85</td>
<td>3150 bc</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inv. no. 1371, Lake Kärtejaure</td>
<td>St 1571</td>
<td>1371:AB12</td>
<td>6330±80</td>
<td>3480 bc</td>
<td>(1964)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stora Sjöfallet, Stora Lule river</td>
<td>Gällivare parish, Lappland</td>
<td>St 1648</td>
<td>S104:3</td>
<td>5765±110</td>
<td>3815 bc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemnäset, Lake Lesjön</td>
<td>St 1650</td>
<td>S104:5</td>
<td>5285±130</td>
<td>3335 bc</td>
<td>(1964a) &amp; 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Röströmsälven</td>
<td>St 1651</td>
<td>S104:6</td>
<td>6345±180</td>
<td>3495 bc</td>
<td>(1964a) &amp; 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodum parish, Ångermanland</td>
<td>St 1655</td>
<td>S104:10</td>
<td>5440±115</td>
<td>3490 bc</td>
<td>(1964a) &amp; 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krankmärtenhögen</td>
<td>Lake Storsjön, Ljusnan river</td>
<td>St 1834</td>
<td>V:2A</td>
<td>6325±90</td>
<td>4375 bc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storsjö parish, Härjedalen</td>
<td>Inv. no. 1371</td>
<td>Lake Kärtejaure, Stora Lule river</td>
<td>St 1571</td>
<td>1371:AB</td>
<td>6330±80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gällivare parish, Lappland</td>
<td>Inv. no. 786, Smalnäset</td>
<td>Lake Lossen, Ljusnan river</td>
<td>St 1724</td>
<td>Lossen 16</td>
<td>6650±90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tännäs parish, Härjedalen</td>
<td>Tjärnbäcken</td>
<td>Lake Lossen, Ljusnan river</td>
<td>St 1728</td>
<td>Tjärnbäcken</td>
<td>5440±85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tännäs parish, Härjedalen</td>
<td>Inv. no. 1036, Raå 17</td>
<td>Lake Tjikiträsk, Ume river</td>
<td>St 1750</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>7005±100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Storsjön, River Fjällsjöälven</td>
<td>St 1751</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>7380±100</td>
<td>5430 bc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Täsjö parish, Ångermanland</td>
<td>St 1752</td>
<td>T3a</td>
<td>7085±90</td>
<td>5135 bc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stensel parish, Västerbotten</td>
<td>St 1753</td>
<td>T7a</td>
<td>6395±90</td>
<td>4445 bc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St 1755</td>
<td>T9</td>
<td>5300±80</td>
<td>3350 bc</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inv. no. S 56, Raå 101, Bellsä</td>
<td>Inv. no. S 56, Raå 101, Bellsä</td>
<td>Inv. no. S 56, Raå 101, Bellsä</td>
<td>Inv. no. S 56, Raå 101, Bellsä</td>
<td>Inv. no. S 56, Raå 101, Bellsä</td>
<td>Inv. no. S 56, Raå 101, Bellsä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotingsjön, River Fjällsjöälven</td>
<td>St 3234</td>
<td>lager 2</td>
<td>5100±100</td>
<td>3150 bc</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St 3233</td>
<td>lager 4</td>
<td>5190±140</td>
<td>3240 bc</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St 3235</td>
<td>lager 5</td>
<td>5425±140</td>
<td>3475 bc</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St 3236</td>
<td>lager 6</td>
<td>5745±110</td>
<td>3795 bc</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raå 79, Garaselet</td>
<td>St 5190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>8160±110</td>
<td>6210 bc</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garaselet Bay, River Byskeälven</td>
<td>St 5191</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>7885±300</td>
<td>5935 bc</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jörn parish, Västerbotten</td>
<td>St 5193</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>8040±100</td>
<td>6090 bc</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 77. Some of the first radiocarbon dates to be analysed from Norrland proved themselves to be thousands of years older than most would have thought possible, which explains the checking and rechecking of the Döudden samples. By the second half of the 1960’s the accumulation of Mesolithic dates was becoming harder to ignore and/or explain away. The proverbial second shoe did not drop until the publication of the Garaselet dates, which placed a human presence in coastal Västerbotten only some 6-800 years or after the retreat of glacial ice sheet from that area. Note: parentheses around the year of publication donate excavation rapports that are not formally published (E. Allard [1964a]; Bergengren 1964; Engstrand 1967; Engstrand & Östlund 1962; Hvarfner et.al. 1960; Meschke 1967; Stenberger 1962b; Sundquist 1978; Östlund 1957; Östlund & Engstrand 1960).
Instead of an incalculable and incoherent mass of chipped stone, sites are beginning to emerge that exhibited individual traits. That it was at all possible to discover differences between sites to such a degree, more so than anyone had previously thought feasible, is one of the greatest accomplishments made so far. The study of these diversified sites may lead to conclusions with regard to chronology and cultural affinities (Baudou 1969:37).

In 1978 the Västerbotten Museum published an anthology entitled ‘Studies in Norrlandian Prehistory’ (Sw. Studier i Norrländsk Forntid) which contained three key articles. The first is Baudou’s, its significance is outlined in Figure 78. The other, written by Lennart Sundquist, presents the material from the Garaselet site and, for the first time, the radiocarbon dates from this locality (Sundquist 1978). The third article was penned by Lars-Göran Spång and its importance lies, not in the presentation of a handle core together with a few microblades, but in the fact that he recognises that they were recovered from a mixed period site and then proceeds to implement a methodology in order to deal with this.

---

**Fig. 78.** The relative and absolute dating methods provided by different sites were here combined to form a coherent and applicable typological and chronological schema for Norrland. The former included the vertical stratigraphy inherent in the Rå-inget site, Ädalsliden parish, Ångermanland and the horizontal stratigraphy of the so called Anundsjö parish sites (Yttersel, Mellansel and Nörböle), Ångermanland, which consist of seven individual localities that were once situated along different shorelines but are now found at various elevations above the present day sea level, thus datable according to shoreline displacement studies, dates that were substantiated through radiocarbon analyses. The chronological horizon of the Överveda site, Nordingrå parish, Ångermanland, also located along an ancient shoreline, was incorporated into this study. The vertical stratigraphy of the Hälla site no. 869-870, Åsele parish, Västerbotten, together with that inherent in the embankment at Bellsås, Tåsjö parish, Ångermanland, provided further corroboration. The stratigraphy of both Hälla and Bellsås was later quantified through radiocarbon analyses (Allard & Modig [1977]; Baudou 1969; 1970; 1972; 1976; 1977; Linder [1961]). The full extent of this work, which stretched over a number of years and publications, was summarised in full by Baudou and published in 1978. Briefly, an extensive transformation of the techno-complex takes place between 2500-2000 BC. Prior to that time there is a widespread use of slate and quartz, the latter shaped through the use of a rather coarse knapping technique resulting in thick flakes. This is largely replaced by a technology based on quartzite, producing thin flakes, bifacial arrowheads and the use of ceramics (illustration source Baudou 1978b:17, here redrawn and slightly modified).
chapter three

contingency (Spång 1978). If we need to establish a moment in time for the emergence of a viable alternative to the southern Swedish thought-style, then the publication date of this anthology is a likely candidate.

But it would be a mistake to assume that the dominate southern Swedish thought-style dissolved or disappeared in the wake of this Northern alternative and the novel way it viewed and presented the archaeological material. The second line of defence taken by any thought-style and its collective, when seriously challenged by novel empirical data and/or explanations, is to retreat and regroup. That is to say, an attempt is launched to couch and explain the new and disturbing evidence in terms that does not contradict the prevailing thought-style while the importance of all those particulars that do support the dominate school of thought are promoted and elevated. Failing this and as a last resort, adjustments within a thought-style may also be undertaken (see Fleck 1979:27 and Chapter One).

The first postulate, that Norrland was inhabited relatively late, lingered on throughout the 1970's, before finally being dropped from the repertoire of the southern Swedish thought-collective. Stenberger was one of the first to include the evidence of the radiocarbon dates, cautiously placing the first human presence in Norrland at about 4000 bc, having them arrive from the south and/or from the north-east. It is however interesting to note that the Offerdal implement, which typologically would indicate an even earlier settlement phase, is summarily dismissed as belonging to some younger and unspecified tradition located somewhere in north-eastern Russia (Selinge 1970:21; 1976:30; Stenberger 1962a:69; 1964:46 & 160pp; 1971:46 &160pp; 1979:46 &160pp).

The second postulate, the view of the North as a sparsely populated wilderness would persist a while longer (Janson 1970; Selinge 1976:38; 1979; 1982; Stenberger 1971; 1979; Burenhult 1983:40). Life in the Norrlandian Stone Age had been a struggle, an unending trek through the forest by a people who;...would occasionally stay for quite a while in one place...but usually the sites were used for shorter periods on reoccurring occasions for varying lengths of time (Stenberger 1964:147; 1971:147; 1979:147).

Two subsequent editions of the Swedish version of Stenberger’s general prehistoric overview would insure that this conception of Norrland would persist and be passed on to a new generation of readers. In summing up nearly 30 years of intensive archaeological field work in the North, Janson justifiably notes with some pride that in;

...these "empty" expanses we have found an amazing even distribution of dwelling sites and artefacts spread out along the rivers and lakes. We have discovered the populated wilderness (Janson 1970:80, quotation marks in the original).

And yet, in the very next line he reminds us that;

A review of these sites immediately reveals that it is not thinkable that we are here dealing with a settled population (Janson 1970:80).

The third postulate, Norrland’s retarded development, has sporadically continued to crop up in the literature, either explicitly or implicitly (Anderson 1981; Burenhult 1983:39; Janson 1970:80pp; Knutsson 1993; Lannerbro 1976:70pp; Selinge 1970; 1973; 1974b:29p; 1976:68; 1977:400; 1979; 1982; 1984:48; Stenberger 1971; 1979). A recent explicit and implicit example of this view is provided by Ragnar Lannerbro and Kjel Knutsson respectively. Lannerbro, not a professional archaeologist in the strict sense of the word, deserves high praise for his contribution to archaeology. His forty field seasons have resulted in the discovery and documentation of ca. 300 Stone Age sites and the collection of some 6000 artefacts, which include keeled scrapers, handle cores, conical microblade cores, tanged points with oblique edges, microblades and core axes (Lannerbro 1976; 1991; 1997). Found anywhere else, these artefacts are decidedly Mesolithic, a circumstance that underscores the persuasiveness of this dominate thought-style, which initially led Lannerbro to a completely different conclusion, one that is worth quoting in extenso;

Implement types such as keeled core scrapers, handled cores, conical platform cores, chipping stones and pick-axe-like tools, give a picture of a Mesolithic trapping culture in which a fairly small number of people lived by hunting and fishing along various water systems in Upper Dalarna. the implements mentioned above...may be assumed to date from a period corresponding to the Ertebølle and Early Neolithic of southern Sweden. It is impossible at present to say whether a retarded culture appears in Upper Dalarna, with Mesolithic
implement types, since no stratigraphic excavations have been undertaken which yield such a composition of finds.

People who live in isolation in a stationary ecological environment become bound by tradition and conservative in the sense of continuing in time-honoured ways. Such a state of affairs may suggest a retarded culture form.

Continuing in the way sanctioned by usage seems to have been a characteristic feature of the population of Upper Dalarna in historical times and the possibility that this was also the case in their prehistory cannot be wholly excluded (Lannerbro 1976:74, English in the original).

Lannerbro’s work concerns the Province of Dalarna, which is not officially part of Norrland and thus formally falls outside the bounds of this study. Nevertheless, this example has been included because it so well illustrates the logic of the thought-style uncovered by this inquiry, while underscoring the many similarities that these two regions share.

Knutsson, in an interesting article from 1993, endeavours to elucidate from whence the initial settlement of Norrland might have originated. In doing so he questions the early introduction of the handle core technology into the North as indicated by the uncritical acceptance of the archaeological evidence provided by the Garaselet site. His final comment on this subject is revealing;

If this tradition [the use of handle cores] originated in a southern-Scandinavian context c. 6000 B.P., its appearance in Norrland in the period 5000-4000 B.P. would not be illogical (Knutsson 1993:48, English in the original).

Obviously an error has been committed during translation, BC dates have been rendered as BP dates, but this is not what makes this statement so perplexing. Rather it is the fact that all too many find it perfectly logical that it took one or even two thousand years for this innovation to reach Garaselet, presumably from southernmost Sweden, a distance of some 1125 kilometres. At present, it is thought that it took just over one thousand years for humans to colonised the Americas, from the Bering Strait in the north, to Patagonia in the extreme south, a distance of some 16,000 kilometres on foot. This would entail an annual movement of 16 kilometres, a distance that takes about 5-6 hours to cover on foot and ca. 3-4 hours on skies or by canoe (Broadbent 1979:191p; Diamond 1999:45). This comparison reveals how truly persuasive the southern Swedish thought-style has become.

The fourth postulate, the preconceived notion of the South as the eternal and pre-eminent catalyst of change when and where it occurs in the peripheral-North, has also survived (Ambrosiani et.al. 1984:62p; Anderson 1981; Burenhult 1983:42pp; Hyenstrand 1974a; Janson 1970:80pp; LÖthman 1980:140; 1986b:42pp; Selinge 1974b:34; 1976:69pp; 1979; 1982; Stenberger 1971; 1979). Ambrosiani’s interpretation of those peculiar grave forms found along the inland water ways is typical of this thought-style, in that it combines a number of these postulates;

There is much that indicates that the graves...belong to a hunting population. These were small groups of people, who must have been in close contact with the surrounding agricultural areas, from which they received impulses, for example, with regard to the arrangement of grave rituals. An exchange of goods must have also existed, the artefacts recovered from the graves often show a high class of workmanship (Ambrosiani et.al. 1984:63).

The fifth and last postulate, that which portrays Norrland as a reoccurring source of raw materials, procured for and consumed by the more advanced cultures in or from the South, is one of the most normative of all and will probably continue to re-occur for as long as the asymmetrical relationship between Norrland and southern Sweden is allowed to go unchallenged (Ambrosiani et.al. 1984:62p; Anderson 1981; Hyenstrand 1974a; Janson 1970:83pp; LÖthman 1980:140; 1986b:42pp; Malmer 1975:44; Selinge 1973; 1974b; 1976:69pp; 1977:400pp; 1979; 1982; Stenberger 1971; 1979).

Shoreline Displacement: Introduction

Throughout Scandinavia during the first half of the 20th century, the typological method, although independently applied, was more often utilised in conjunction with both environmental and shoreline displacement studies, which together provided relative or absolute chronological horizons, not least within Mesolithic studies. This incurred a close working relationship between archaeologists and various specialists with geology and biology, making inter-disciplinary studies the norm rather than the exception (Bagge 1937a:358; Larsen 1931; Nordlund 2001). Empirical material gathered by the naturalists from within Norrland itself made a substantial contribution to the edification of these various
subjects, not least as concerns both the speed of the de-glaciation and rate of the ensuing shoreline displacement. Despite this, archaeologists, exploring the Norrlandian past, did not use this tool to any satisfactory degree until the mid 1960’s. In light of the above, this is exactly what one would expect.

The Scottish geologist Thomas F. Jamieson is usually credited with having first proposed, in 1865, that there is a connection between de-glaciation and isostatic rebound. Empirical support for this hypothesis was provided by the Swedish geologist Gerard De Geer (1858-1943) in two publications, from 1888 and 1890 respectively. By plotting the maximum elevation of the post-glacial water levels as indicated by ancient beach formations he correctly surmised that shoreline displacement was caused by isostatic uplift. He also concluded that the crustal depression, and thus the rate of the rebound, had varied considerably as disclosed by these very same beach formations, which occur at different elevations throughout Scandinavia. However, he mistakenly located the centre of the glacial maximum, corresponding to the greatest isostatic rebound, to Norrland’s northern half. Arvid Högbom (1857-1940), a geologist and native of Västerbotten, later identified the centre of the glacial maximum as having occurred over Mount Skuleberget, situated on coast of Ångermanland. By combining geological observations and methods with information derived from the elevation of various prehistoric and historic remains, written documents, tree ring analysis, place-names and the testimony gathered from elderly farmers and fishermen, Högbom was able to provide an estimate concerning the rate of the shoreline displacement and show that this region had never been effected by later transgressions (Frängsmyr 1994:403p; Högbom 1887; 1904; 1906:198pp; 1934; Nordlund 2001:135pp).

Work that would result in a method for calculating the absolute date and rate for both the de-glaciation and the resulting isostatic recovery was already in progress. This is the geo-chronological method, a consequence arising out of a hypothesis presented by De Geer in 1884 in order to explain the origin of those beautifully banded sediments, consisting of fine multicoloured layers of clay, the existence of which had been discussed for over 30 years. He showed that these were annual layers or varves, deposited in melt-water basins by the retreating glacier. By counting the number of varves, analogous to tree rings, De Geer established a time table for the withdrawal of the latest glacier from Scandinavia which he presented in 1910 (Caldenius & Sandegren 1925; De Geer 1925; Högbom 1920; R. Lidén 1938; Lundqvist 1958:39; Munthe 1940).

Continued work by Högbom and Ragnar Lidén confirmed and refined De Geer’s geo-chronological calculations. The latter, working in Ångermanland, clarified and/or confirmed three important points. The first is that Ångermanland was exempt from transgressions and thus from confusing chronological controversies that those events otherwise produce. The second was a more accurate determination of the highest post-glacial shoreline, allowing for more precise calculations concerning the annual rate of the isostatic uplift, which had initially been very rapid, starting at about 15 meters per century, but soon falling off to 10, then down to 5, from which it gradually slowed to its present rate of 0.9 meters per century. The third concerns the speed and date of the glacial retreat. Lidén’s geo-chronological calculations were initially imprecise, resulting in a chronology that was much to short. These figures were adjusted by Lidén in 1913 and by De Geer in 1924, resulting in a chronological sequence for the de-glaciation of Scandinavia that would not be seriously adjusted until the introduction and application of radiocarbon analysis (Alin 1953:25; De Geer 1925; Högbom 1905; 1920:142; 1934; R. Lidén 1912:277p; 1913; 1938).

Isostatic rebound is a theoretical model that successfully provided an explanation for another set of related observations and events; the appearance and disappearance of the so called ice lakes, the tip and tilting of existing lakes, the development of the different stages of the Baltic and of the climate, accompanied by shifting floral and faunal populations. Vilhelm Henrik Munthe (1860-1958), credited with the discovery of the Ancylus Lake stage, became one of the foremost experts on the history of the Baltic. Within the first quarter of the 20th century both the duration and extent of Baltic Ice Lake, Yoldia Sea, the Ancylus Lake and the Litorina Sea, were tolerably well-known (Högbom 1906:205pp; 1920:152; Lundqvist 1958:19).

Economic interest in the peat bogs, from the 1880’s onwards, led to the realisation that these layered formations were natural archives containing information on post-glacial climate fluctuations. The assumption that specific climatic conditions promoted distinct floral and fauna communities engaged the talents of both Rutger Sernander (1866-
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and the botanist/geographer Gunnar Andersson (1865-1928), see Chapter One (Caldenius & Sandegren 1925; Fægri & Iversen 1966; Lundqvist 1958). These early macroscopic studies provided a rough outline of climatic differentiation, but the detection and description of those post-glacial climactic periods that are now so familiar, demanded more refined methods. This occurred under the microscope in connection with the analysis of pollen, a discovery that would not only enhance understanding of climatological and environmental change, but also provide a new, if not perfect, means of dating events, both natural and cultural. The botanist Gustaf Lagerheim (1860-1929), recording the different frequencies of tree pollen and insect remains from various geological layers, was one of the first to draw attention to the chronological significance of this bio-stratigraphical material. But it was Lennart von Post (1884-1951), together with Sernander and Andersson, who transformed pollen studies into that powerful analytical instrument recognisable today and which was later presented in von Post’s ‘Norrländska torvmossesstudier del I’ from 1906. The quaternary geologist Ragnar Sandegren (1887-1966) would take this method one step further by combining pollen analysis with the geo-chronological method, the results of which were presented in a key paper entitled ‘The Ragunda Area’s Post-Glacial Development According to Evidence of Micro Fossil Plant Remains’ (Sw. Ragundatraktens postglaciala utvecklingshistoria enlight den subfossila florans vitnesbörd) from 1915. By correlating the relative chronology of the former with the absolute chronology of the later he enhanced the precision and reliability of both (Caldenius & Sandegren 1925; Fægri & Iversen 1966; Högbom 1920:153p; Larsen 1931:46; Lundqvist 1958; Nordlund 2001).

By 1920 the chronological framework, both natural and cultural, of the post-glacial period was tolerably well-known. Based partly on circular reasoning, these developmental sequences would be adjusted and refined throughout the remainder of the 20th century. A major re-orientation occurred during the 1920’s when it was discovered that shoreline displacement, regressive and transgressive, was not exclusively the result of isostatic action alone, but also involved eustatic movements. The Finnish geologist Wilhelm Ramsay (1865-1928) was pivotal in determining the ramifications of this realisation, using the elevations of various prehistoric remains to do so. That shoreline displacement was a much more complicated process than anyone had first anticipated did not undo previous research. As far as archaeology was concerned, Ramsay thought that the relative chronological relationship between prehistoric remains, as established by shoreline displacement, was basically sound, although he predicted that that the initial settlement of Scandinavia would have to be pushed further back in time (Bagge 1937a:358; Granlund 1928; Ekholm 1923b; Nordlund 2001:264pp; Ramsay 1926:13 & 21pp).

Shoreline displacement studies, supplemented by diatom and pollen analysis as well as archaeological and historical sources, would continue to be used recursively in chronological support of one another until replaced by radiocarbon analysis during the second half of the 20th century. Bror Asklund clearly understates this relationship when he writes;

Research and results during the last few decades concerning the post-glacial shoreline displacement of the Baltic have increasingly united archaeologists and geologists in a common effort to disentangle the problems concerning the earliest phases of this phenomena (Asklund 1927:112).

In doing so they discovered, reconstructed and dated the changing post-glacial landscape and environment. They also created a predictive model, which if properly employed, could and would be used to locate various types of prehistoric remains.

Shoreline Displacement: Stjerna and Uppsala

De Geer, in 1896, was one of the first to suggest the predictive implications of this model by proposing that prehistoric sites would be found along the ancient shorelines (Högbom 1920:156p; Nordlund 2001:226). A practical application of this hypothesis resulted in a doctoral thesis in geology entitled ‘Changes in Elevation after the First Immigration into Sweden’ (Sw. Sveriges nivåförändringar efter människans invandring). Written by Artur Hollender, it was published in the Geological Society’s periodical for the year 1901. Employing what Hollender called an ‘archaeological-geographic’ method, he plotted the distribution of three different types of typologically dated axes that commonly occur in both Sweden and Finland, noting their relationship to each other and their elevation in accordance with the changing shorelines. After publication, Hollender broke off his career as a
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Bernhard Salin (1861-1931) seems to have independently anticipated the importance of shoreline displacement, as indicated by number of unpublished lectures which he gave starting in 1900. These deliberations led Salin, in the autumn of 1901, to the discovery of the first of the pivotal Åloppe sites. In the following year, and again in 1905, he published an overview on the prehistory of Uppland, drawing attention to the relationship between different axe types and their elevation, demonstrating the connection between shoreline displacement and the initial prehistoric settlement, indicating how it had expanded and spread throughout this region (Almgren 1933:33pp; Baudou pers. comm. 2004; Hyenstrand 1975:11; Nerman 1965a:224; Salin 1905:164pp).

In 1906 Oscar Almgren, in a paper entitled ‘Stone Age Sites in Uppland’ (Sw. Uppländska stenåldersboplatser), presented the seven Åloppe localities, the first Stone Age sites ever found in this part of the country. Situated along the shores of the Litorina Sea at the 36-37 meter level, these discoveries were a direct outcome of Salin’s and Hollender’s reasoning; that stray Stone Age artefacts indicate the existence of dwelling sites, often located along ancient shorelines. Excavations started in 1902, undertaken in close and pragmatic collaboration between archaeologists and geologists, including Bernhard Salin, Otto Frödin, Oscar Almgren, Eskil Olsson, Rutger Sernander and Gunnar Andersson. Their joint efforts resulted in a crowning confirmation as concerns the practical application and advantages of reconstructing the prehistoric landscape in accordance with these geo-archaeological guidelines (Almgren 1906a; 1906b; 1933:33pp).

This type of investigation would reach a higher level of intensity under the direction of Knut Stjerna (1874-1909), who was recruited by Uppsala University from Lund in 1905 to assist Oscar Almgren. Stjerna initiated a massive research program aimed at describing the colonisation and subsequent development of Sweden’s earliest settlement by combining the typological method with shoreline displacement studies (fig. 79).

Both Arvid Högbom, Rutger Sernander and Lennart von Post regularly participated in these deliberations, while Henrik Munthe, Gunnar Andersson and Gerhard De Geer contributed periodically (Högbom 1920:158; Nerman 1965a:225;...
Nordlund 2001:251). One can only assume that the atmosphere surrounding this work must have been highly stimulating, composed as it was of so many promising students and internationally established experts coming from a number of different fields, all engaged in what was literally pioneering and groundbreaking research.

Basically, all of these studies reconstructed the prehistoric landscape of their respective regions using maps, often in colour, showing the succeeding stages of the shoreline in conjunction with the distribution of different artefacts types, thus strengthening the chronological classification of the latter while providing a reasonable chronological estimate for the former.

By the 1920’s shoreline displacement studies had become a standard methodological procedure; additional discoveries were fitted into the established schema according to their typological assemblage, their affinity to local or regional type sites and their height above the present day sea level (Curman 1936:246p; De Geer 1926; Ekholm 1923b; 1929; Granlund 1928; Lindqvist 1928:76p). Johan Nihlén’s thesis from 1927, simply entitled ‘The Stone Age Dwelling Sites of Gotland’ (Sw. Gotlands Stenåldersboplatser) is a good example of the excellent results obtained with the proper application of these methods (Nerman 1945:22; Nihlén 1927).

Ivar Schnell and Olof Arrhenius added a new dimension to shoreline displacement studies with the application of phosphate analyses in order to more accurately determine the level of the shoreline in relationship to the occupation of a site, thus further refining chronological deductions (Arrhenius 1935; Schnell 1932). Pollen and diatom analyses would also enhance these studies, as seen from the work presented by Maj-Britt Florin (botanist, limnologist and Sweden’s foremost diatomologist) and her husband, Sten Florin (geologist and archaeologist), as seen from the discovery of those early farming communities located in eastern Sweden mentioned above (Florin 1938; 1944; 1947). Sten Florin’s 1948 dissertation entitled ‘Shoreline Displacement and Settlement Development in Eastern Central Sweden During the Late Quaternary Period’ (Sw. Kustförskjutningen och bebyggelseutvecklingen i Östra mellansverige under senkvartär tid) is yet another excellent example of how these diverse methods could be combined to elaborate the past. Recent work by Agneta Åkerlund in south-eastern Sweden has added a completely new and exciting chapter to our understanding concerning the relationship between shoreline displacement and the earliest settlement of that region (Florin 1948; Åkerlund et.al. 1995; Åkerlund 1996).

Shoreline Displacement:
The Swedish West Coast

Sven Nilsson contemplated the age of the Limhamn site and the earliest settlement of southern Sweden with reference to shoreline displacement, a method that later engaged the attention of Kjellmark and resulted in the discovery of similar sites (Högbom 1920:157; Kjellmark 1903; 1904; Nilsson 1866:92 & 192).

The importance of shoreline displacement for understanding the prehistory of Bohuslän soon became apparent to those involved in the so called ‘Göteborg Survey’. This systematic search and documentation of prehistoric remains of all kinds,
including Stone Age sites, was launched in 1879, and would inadvertently become a training ground for generations of archaeologists, engaging the efforts of Oscar Almgren, Otto Frödin and Gustaf Hallström, the latter of whom worked in this area from 1903 until 1911. Together, Frödin and Hallström made an important discovery in 1905, the kitchen midden at Ånnerröd in Skee parish, Sweden’s first and a clear indication concerning the antiquity of human settlement in this region. The resulting article penned by Frödin, entitled ‘A Swedish Kitchen Midden. A Contribution to the History of the Post-Glacial Shoreline Displacement’ (Sw. En svensk kjökkenmödding. Ett bidrag till de postglacial nivåförändringarnas historia), discusses the relationship between prehistoric sites, their elevation and shoreline displacement, a paper which on publication immediately became a classic in this field (Alin 1953; Bagge 1937a:359pp; 1937c:1; Lundqvist 1938; Nacke-Krogh 1988a:288pp; 1988b:291; Niklasson 1944:5; Nordbladh 1986:20; Påsse 1988a:77pp; 1988b:98; 1988c:107; 1988d:116p; 1988f:176; Thomasson 1934; 1936).

In 1912 the Museum in Göteborg hired its first archaeological curator, Georg Sarauw, who took up his new duties still flush with his accomplishments in Denmark. One of his first tasks was to bring the ‘Göteborg Survey’ to a successful conclusion, which occurred in 1929, largely thought the efforts of Johan Alin (1879-1944). Geologist, archaeologist and discoverer of the Gottskär site, his reputation as a keen observer is attested by all who worked with him. Well aware of the relationship between archaeological features, shoreline displacement and the dating potentials of both, he meticulously documented their setting in the landscape (Alin 1953; Bagge 1937a:357; Lindälv 1980:26; Nacke-Krogh 1988b:291; Niklasson 1937:18).

The resulting complexities of isostatic and eustatic fluctuations was not yet fully recognised when Arvid Enqvist published his thesis in 1922 (see above). The relative vertical chronology provided by shoreline displacement was, however, well understood. The presence of core and flake axes at the highest elevations indicated that an early settlement had taken place ca. 5000-4000 bc, but evidence quickly accumulated that clearly pointed to an even earlier human presence in the area, during the Göti- and/or Finiglacial period, that is to say, equal to or earlier than the date of the Danish Maglemose Culture. Nils Niklasson, who succeeded Sarauw on his death in 1928, initiated a comprehensive program in order to unravel the chronological complexities of shoreline displacement and the earliest human settlement of this region, resulting in an even wider collaboration with the natural scientists, which came to include Lennart von Post, now professor of geology at the College of Stockholm, the zoologist Harald Thomasson as well as Bror Asklund and Ragnar Sandegren. Archaeologists involved in this work include such notables such as Knut Timberg, Sverker Janson, Axel Bagge and Philibert Humbla, all of
whom would later go on to work in Norrland (Alin 1934; 1936; 1953:17pp; Bagge 1937a:358pp; 1937c:1; Enqvist 1922; Fredsjö 1939; Janson 1936; 1940; Larsen 1929; 1931; Lundqvist 1938; Nacke-Krogh 1986a:288p; 1988b:291; Niklasson 1934; 1944:4p; Nordbladh 1986:20; Thomasson 1934; 1936).

By the time the Sandarna excavation reached publication (Alin et.al. 1934) an effective, if not yet perfect, tool had been forged that could be used to both date and locate prehistoric remains situated along the Western Coast of Sweden (fig. 81).

Shoreline Displacement: Norway and Finland

Shoreline displacement studies have been of great import for the archaeology of Norway ever since the duel appearance of the Brøgger monographs in 1905 (see above and fig. 82). This is readily exemplified by the astounding work conducted by Nummedal, who first discovered the Fosna and then the Komsa Cultures, and then went on to find the first of those many Stone Age villages located along the Varanger Fjord (see above).

The significance of both typology and shoreline displacement studies is even more conspicuous within Finnish archaeology, and from a very early stage in its development;

Populations living in the coastal areas have, due to shoreline displacement, always been obliged to move to lower elevations, following the retreating shoreline. This is confirmed by the distribution of artefacts and their altitude above the present day sea level (Ailio 1911:17).

This line of research has, ever since, been vigorously pursued in Finland, and to such a degree that Carpelan, in a reflective mood, described Finnish archaeology as consisting of “…things and chronology...” (Carpelan 1973:190). While this is, to a certain extent, true, so are their successes. Lack of vertical stratigraphy on Finnish Stone Ages sites, similar to Norrlandian conditions, undoubtedly contributed to the widespread employment of shoreline displacement studies, which soon resulted in the presentation of a relative chronological sequence for the Stone Age by Åyräpää in the 1920’s, one that he would return to and refine throughout his career. Ari Siiriäinen (b.1939), with a background in geology and archaeology, continued to clarify and improve on these studies over the decades, not least with his dissertation from 1974 entitled Studies Relating to Shore Displacement and Stone Age Chronology in Finland. While the absolute chronological framework of the earliest studies has since been revised, especially with reference to radiocarbon dating methods, the relative chronological relationships between the various Stone Age cultures and periods that were first proposed have proven to be surprisingly accurate (Huurre 1999; Meinander 1961:9; Moberg 1957:219; Nordman 1968:52; Nuñez 1978:25; Siiriäinen 1978).

Shoreline Displacement: Norrland

Images of ships among the Nämforsen rock carvings prompted Nils Ekdahl to speculate that the site must have been in use some 2 or 3 thousand years ago when it was still possible to reach it by sailing up along the Ångermanland river from the sea (Ekdahl 1833 in Fransson 2004:115). Karl Sidenbladh also tried to gain a chronological handle on the Nämforsen site, noting that “…the secular elevation of the land...” had increasingly rendered that river less accessible by ship from the coast. This, he surmised, occurred some 4-5000 years ago, implying that the petroglyphs were, indeed, ancient (Sidenbladh 1869:206p). Sidenbladh’s calculations are based on faulty presumptions, his attempt to date the petroglyphs, as was Ekdahl’s, amounts to nothing more than a lucky guess, and yet their reasoning is basically sound; the changing landscape can be used to date prehistoric features. The opposite is equally true, as seen from Hollender’s quick appreciation of Högbom’s work in Norrland, where the existence of prehistoric remains located at different elevations had been used to date and gauge the rate of shoreline displacement in Västerbotten (Hollender 1901:234; Högbom 1887:22). Hollender noted the complete dearth of Stone Age dwelling sites north of the Limes Norrlandicus in his monograph from 1901, a situation he found “…rather remarkable...” (Hollender 1901:260). The Bjursele site was known, some 40 thick-butted flint axes had already come to light by then. Estimating the elevation of this site, Hollender realised that these axes could not have been left behind by the first inhabitants of this region. Instead he suggests that the earliest settlements are “…to be found along the 125 meter level...” (Hollender 1901:262).

Rough and ready chronological calculations for Norrland were available from the beginning of the
century through Högbom’s work, who estimated that the annual yearly rate of the isostatic rebound for Gästrikland, Ångermanland and Västerbotten had been ca. 0.9, 1.5 and 1.1 cm respectively. More accurate figures for Gästrikland were presented by Asklund in 1935, for Ångermanland by Lidén in 1913 and again in 1938, for Västerbotten by Granlund in 1943. Reliable data on shoreline displacement for the whole of the Norrlandian coast during the last 200 years was available from Witting in 1922, and from Bergsten in 1930, figures that can also be used to predict the elevation of prehistoric shorelines, albeit with reservations (Bergsten 1930; 1939; Eriksson & Henkel 1994:101; Granlund 1943; Högbom 1906:199; R. Lidén 1912; 1913; 1938; Witting 1922).

As shown above, in their efforts understand the phenomenon of the changing landscape, geologists provided archaeologists with a research methodology that was soon implemented throughout Scandinavia. Its practical application in Norrland will be exemplified by the work of three early pioneers, Eskil Olsson, Knut Tinnberg and O.B. Santesson, with results that markedly differ from those obtained elsewhere.

Shoreline Displacement and Eskil Olsson

Eskil Olsson, under the tutelage of both Stjerna and Almgren, was well versed in shoreline displacement studies and not without recourse to expertise on the subject. In an attempt to date the important Överveda site, he begins by estimating its elevation, placing it at the 70 meter level (it lies between 69-76 m.a.s.l.). He then assumes that it was occupied when the waterline was 65 meters above the present day sea level and then concludes that the site dates to the end of the Passage Grave Period ca. 2000 bc (Olsson 1914:53p). We now know that the site was occupied ca. 3500-2500 BC, during which time the shoreline fell from the 70 meter level down to the 50 meter level (Baudou 1977). Olsson could have reached and presented a completely different conclusion had he only applied the data he himself possessed and presented concerning the rate of the isostatic rebound, which he gives as having been 1.2 meters per century, a figure that accordingly dates the 65 meter level to 3503 bc (Olsson 1914:71).

Olsson’s monograph on the Stone Age of Västmanland, Dalarna and Gästrikland is similar to those produced by the others members of that
southern Swedish thought-collective, as concerns both content and conclusions (see above). The northeastern corner of Västmanland, bordering on Ekholm’s core area in Uppland, is identified as the springboard from which Gästrikland, and later Norrland, was colonised. The presence of round-butted axes north of the Limes Nordlandicus are stubbornly interpreted as representing the presence of an initial settlement that began ca. 2500 bc despite the well-known fact that they were consistently being found on or above the shoreline of the Litorina maximum at about the 80 meter level, otherwise estimated to have occurred ca. 4500-4000 bc (see page 106; Olsson 1917:116p & 128).

Shoreline Displacement and Knut Tinnberg

It is a pity that Norrland’s full share in the Stjerna-Almgren seminars never materialised. However, archaeological investigations in the region continued, organised by the various regional antiquarian societies and by the provincial heritage associations, or through the diligent efforts of private individuals, any and all of which had access to the latest shoreline displacement data. Interest in archaeological evidence from the geological point of view also continued, as exemplified through the articles of yet another geologist, Bror Asklund (1896-1969). He systematically tabulated the changing frequencies of different axe types according to their elevation in a number of different provinces, thereby illuminating the composite nature of both the isostatic rebound and the eustatic movements, providing more reliable chronological horizons for both (Asklund 1927; 1929; 1930; 1935). Working in Gästrikland, he noted that core axes are usually situated above the Litorina maximum, which in this province is located along the 80-90 meter levels, while round-butted axes, with few exceptions, are found at slightly lower elevations (Asklund 1927:122; 1935). From this he concluded that the earliest human presence in Gästrikland must have taken place ca. 5000 bc (Asklund 1935:89pp). But he too interprets this according to the prescribed thought-style fostered by his archaeological colleagues; these early artefacts represent temporary excursions from the South, sporadic fishing forays of limited duration, all the while assuming that permanent settlement first occurred during the Passage Grave Period (Asklund 1935:94). Asklund, however, realises that archaeologists must be ready to rethink their positions when;

... new finds force them to push back the earliest colonisation of the Fatherland ever closer to the edge of that now vanished glacier. No one should be surprised if someone, sometime, in the landscape and at a higher elevation, suddenly finds an artefact from a dwelling site that dates to the period of the Ancylus Lake. This has not happened so far (Asklund 1935:89).

This had, in fact, already happened, as well he knew. The four Nøstvet-Lihult axes from Ovansjö parish in Gästrikland were all found along the 90 meter level, an elevation that corresponds either to a late stage of Ancylus Lake period or to the beginning of the Litorina phase (see above and Hallström 1928b:29; Rydh 1922:115p). The archaeological implications of all this are blatantly obvious, their practical application equally so; Gästrikland probably supported a human presence from a very early time, their settlements will be found at these elevations or higher. This of course is equally true for the whole of Norrland.

It is evident that Knut Tinnberg profited from Asklund’s data on shoreline displacement (Tinnberg 1937a). It is equally obvious that he hardly needed to be reminded of its value. Tinnberg had cut his archaeological teeth in 1928 along the West Coast of Sweden in company with some of Sweden’s leading geologists and archaeologists, all of whom were involved and well versed in the theory and pragmatics of shoreline displacement. Starting in 1931 he began to search for Stone Age sites in Norrland, work which at times benefited from financial backing, at other times not. His surveys in Gästrikland and Hälsingland resulted in the discovery of a number of Stone Age dwelling sites that were expediently presented in his reports to the central antiquarian authorities and through a number of popular articles he penned and published in various local newspapers, Tinnberg’s forum of choice, where he expressed himself freely, ventilating his assessment on various aspects of Norrland’s prehistory. Many of his articles are insightful, and one soon realises that Tinnberg was, in certain respects, decades ahead of everyone else working in Norrland at that time. The reconstruction of the ancient landscape using shoreline displacement and the systematic recording of the elevation of various remains and artefacts was, for him, a matter of course. He considered stray finds to be indicative of yet undiscovered sites and he realised that the presence of fire-cracked stones probability signified the existence of a prehistoric site and/or feature of
some kind. He also knew that the so called ‘ocular method’, which is still the standard surveying technique employed by the Central Board of National Antiquities, was insufficient in itself and that the use of a shovel for test pitting, phosphate analysis and aerial photography should also be systematically utilised. He was the first to recognise that those features found in the geological phenomenon know as ‘cobblestone fields’ were made by humans and that they might be of considerable age. He understood that sites of Stone Age character are not necessarily located right on the shoreline and that a search behind the beach is necessary. He suggested that waste flakes should be collected and analysed, studies that he was sure would yield insights into the techniques employed by the Stone Age people. He also knew that surveyed areas must be revisited, that once is never, ever, enough. All of the above has either come to pass and/or been proven to be quite correct (Baudou 1967; 1977:26pp; 1978b; Halén 1994; Holm 1991:52pp; Janson 1949:167; Linder & Rissén 1966; Loeffler 1992; 1999b; Spång 1988; Tinnberg 1937a; 1937b; 1939; 1940a; 1943). Tinnberg was convinced that the southern provinces of Norrland were inhabited by humans “...following on the heals of the retreating ice...” that is to say, by about 7500 bc (Tinnberg 1935). He soon discovered both artefacts and/or sites along the 80 to 150 meter levels, elevations that would suggest an age of 5500-7000 bc, putting them on the shores of the Ancylus Lake (Tinnberg 1935; 1937a; 1937b; 1938; 1940b).

It would be fallacious to assert that Tinnberg was only interested in finding the most ancient sites possible, although the prospect of doing so did hold a certain fascination for him, as did the environment of the Northern tundra, which he began to visit annually from 1932 onwards. In 1934 and 1936 he surveyed the shores of Lake Torneträsk, a long and narrow expanse of water that has always presented a convenient passage through the mountains, linking the Atlantic coast with Norrland’s vast interior. In light of Nummedal’s discoveries in northernmost Norway, one need not speculate that Tinnberg cherished the desire to achieve something similar (Hvarfner 1961b:22; Janson 1960b:20p). It was, and possibly still is, entirely feasible that one or more of the 7 sites he discovered along the shores of that lake might date from ca. 6000 bc. One site (T97) yielded...
a handle core and a conical/cylindrical microblade core, while the assemblage from all appeared to be both coarse and archaic (see page 249). But their age was primarily based on geological evidence vis-à-vis the post-glacial development of the lake itself. The sites are located at elevations suggesting that they were occupied when the surface of the lake was much higher than today’s, an assumption deemed conceivable by such eminent authorities as Erik Granlund, Arvid Högbom and De Geer (Bagge 1937b:96pp; Olofsson 1995). Tinnberg thought that these sites represented the early presence of reindeer hunters, coming in from the east, who were the ancestors of the present day Sámi population ([Tinnberg] 1934a). Bagge, despite his enthusiasm, proceeded cautiously;

Are these the remains of a most ancient reindeer hunting culture that penetrated westwards into this region during the Older Stone Age, one which has no direct connection with the colonisation of Norrland that apparently took place from the south during the Late Stone Age, or is this nothing more than a peculiar variation of, and from, that latter and younger cultural manifestation, this is a question which cannot yet be answered with any satisfaction (Bagge 1937b:106).

The authenticity of the Lake Torneträsk sites, let alone their antiquity, has remained controversial. Bagge was prepared to accept, at least tentatively, the possibility of both, although he admitted that he had been compelled to discount about half of the material Tinnberg collected from these sites. Tinnberg worked on the principle that it is better to bring home to much rather than too little, a survey strategy that Bagge was well aware of (Bagge 1937a:366: 1937b). Bagge’s reservations do not come as a surprise. The material Tinnberg was finding throughout Norrland, or at least his interpretation of it, flew in the face of accepted doctrine as prescribed by the southern Swedish thought-style outlined above. With the benefit of hindsight we see that the outcome of this encounter was never in doubt.

Hallström, who periodically found himself working in the same region, and thus with the same material, as Tinnberg, held rather different views on how it should be interpreted. He too was aware of the particulars and significance of shoreline displacement, duly noting that the earliest settlements, as well as those from following periods, were located, and thus are to be found, along the shores of the retreating prehistoric coast. Hallström admits that the core axes found in Gästrikland and Hälsingland could possibly indicate the presence of humans by 5000 bc but prefers 4000 bc as a much more plausible date. The round-butted axes he dates to between 4000-2500 bc, thus ignoring the fact that they are situated at elevations that clearly place them to an earlier period of time (Hallström 1934:56p; 1937:138pp). As already noted, Hallström held that none of these artefacts represented a permanent settlement, instead they mark the spot of temporary camps, traces of a Stone Age people from the Mälar Valley in search of new fishing grounds, moving steadily northwards along the coast (Hallström 1937:148). They, like their Bronze Age descendants, never settled, content or compelled to journey ever onwards in pursuit of game and fish (Hallström 1937:150p). The majority of the Stone and Bronze Age artefacts are considered to be of southern origin, indicating that this region belonged to the southern “...Swedish...” cultural orbit. The apparent dearth of artefacts and features that seems to have occurred towards the end of the Bronze Age was interpreted as resulting from a de-population of Norrland caused by climatic deterioration. This hiatus was considered to have provided the descendants of the Sámi population with an opportunity to colonise Norrland from the north-east. Moving south, these people later encountered the Nordic inhabitants who, from AD 100 onwards, were once again moving north, repopulating their former haunts (Hallström 1929b; 1937:139pp). Now and for the first time, permanent settlements were thought to have been established, but only along the coast. This was made possible through the adoption of both farming and animal husbandry. But the mainstay of this Northern economy, the necessary condition for the maintenance of a viable community in these remote northern areas, was considered to have been anchored in the expanding fur trade with the South (Hallström 1937:151pp).

The above scenario contains all five elements of the southern Swedish thought-style outlined above, while markedly clashing with that envisioned by Tinnberg on a number of points. Hallström counters Tinnberg’s thought-style by calling into question the authenticity of those 8 sites discovered in Hälsingland by Tinnberg during his 1935 field season. After first paying lip service to his contributions, Hallström informs us that Tinnberg has clearly “...overestimated both the quantity and quality of both the sites and
the artefacts...” (Hallström 1937:226). Hallström then eliminates half of these sites from the discussion while characterising three out of the remaining four as “...scanty...” or “...doubtful...” (Hallström 1937:220pp). The artefacts Tinnberg recovered from these sites are described as being “...worthless...” (Hallström 1937:227) while the rest cannot be of any great age (Hallström 1937:226). Hallström, in his critique of Tinnberg, ignores the handle core of flint recovered from one of these sites, an artefact otherwise recognised since the 1880’s as belong to the ‘Køkkenmødding Period’ (Hallström 1937:220; H. Hildebrand 1886:141). Disregarding the implications provided by shoreline displacement, Hallström goes on to throw doubt upon the significance Tinnberg accorded to the presence of fire-cracked stones and/or artefacts as indicators of prehistoric dwelling sites;

Real dwelling sites, that is to say, find sites where it can be demonstrated that people have had their dwellings and lived for a longer period, have not been clearly proven to exist within this area (Hallström 1937:141, see also page 224).

A singular statement in light of the work coming out of Uppsala and from along the West Coast, especially from someone who never discovered one single Norrlandian Stone Age dwelling site throughout his entire career (Baudou 2003b:14).

From this time onwards Tinnberg concentrated his efforts along the waterways of the interior, especially in or near the mountain areas, never abandoning the possibility of finally discovering Norrland’s most ancient past. This assumption would later prove itself to be entirely correct, as demonstrated by recent work carried out by Ingela Bergman and the personnel at the Silver Museum in Arjeplog (Bergman 2004; Olofsson 2003). However, the uncertainties surrounding his coastal sites and those from Lake Torneträsk, cast a long shadow over Tinnberg’s later work, as concerns both his interpretation and reliability. Today, localities discovered by him are designated ‘Tinnberg Sites’ (Sw. Tinnberg boplats), a term synonymous with a ‘site of uncertain standing’. Paradoxically, his credibility was never re-established, even though his talents were recognised and actively sought out by the Central Board of National Antiquities in connection with their investigations occasioned by the development of Norrland’s hydro-electric power resources. Starting in 1942 and for the next 6 years, he was seasonally employed by the centralised antiquarian authorities, during which time he would make a few of his most spectacular discoveries, albeit now under the supervision and watchful eyes of Sverker Janson (Janson 1949). Tinnberg continued to write articles for various local newspapers, periodically expressing audacious views on the antiquity of the Norrlandian Stone Age, but he never again attracted the attention or support of any established academic authority.

It was Janson who, at length, determined the fate of the Torneträsk sites, by declaring the artefacts fictitious. Janson based this conclusion, in part, on a completely irrelevant analogy, comparing the material from Torneträsk with that gathered in from the Råö and Varberg sites located on the Swedish West Coast, the latter of these two sites was discovered by Tinnberg in 1931. Originally thought to be of considerable age, the assemblage from both were later declared to be ecofacts (Janson 1960b:19pp; Niklasson 1932:20). Janson’s judgement on this matter was accepted and has remained unchallenged, despite clear indications to the contrary (Olofsson 1995).

The exchange, outlined above, can be viewed as a classic confrontation between the academic establishment on the one hand and the useful but over enthusiastic amateur on the other. But the essential import of this dispute is not whether any one individual happened to be right or wrong concerning a certain number of supposed artefacts and/or sites. It is really a question of control. It harks back to that recently resolved controversy between the central antiquarian authorities and the regional antiquarian societies and local heritage associations; who is to be entrusted with authority over the past.

**Shoreline Displacement and O.B Santesson**

Tinnberg’s marginalisation stands out in stark contrast to the way academia treated O.B. Santesson, another early enthusiast, who for decades also conducted numerous archaeological investigations in the North, primarily within the Province of Ångermanland. His contributions were acknowledged with his 1941 appointment as a corresponding member to the Royal Academy and again in 1948 with an honorary doctorate from Uppsala (Baudou 2003b:13p; Sundlin 1990:18p). Tinnberg’s and Santesson’s individual accomplishments in the field are not dissimilar, while their literary production differs only slightly. The former published two articles, not counting the
numerous items he wrote for the newspapers, while Santesson managed three, and one short monograph. Tinnberg’s writings contain deep insights derived from his extensive fieldwork mixed with bold interpretations. Santesson’s work is largely descriptive, sometimes informative, but often unpretentious (Santesson 1924a; 1924b; 1935; 1941; Tinnberg 1934b; 1939).

The importance of shoreline displacement was not lost on Santesson, who spent a great amount of effort in tracking down and documenting the elevation of stray Stone Age artefacts recovered along the coastal areas of Ångermanland in order to determine their absolute and/or relative chronology and thus produce a typological sequence for the Norrlandian slate techno-complex. In this, Santesson failed, not once, but twice. The first time occurred in a short overview published in *Eberts Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte* from 1924 (fig. 84). The material Santesson presents was found at elevations ranging between 80 and 25 meters above the present day sea level, with a clear concentration along the 60 meter level. He notes that the various southern Swedish artefacts are found distributed along specific elevations in accordance with anticipated typological and chronological expectations. On the other hand, he found that the different kinds of slate objects did not form discreet clusters at various levels, and thus could not be dated using shoreline displacement studies (Santesson 1924b).

Santesson presented no raw-data of any kind, so we cannot examine the foundation upon which he based his conclusions. Converting Santesson’s written account into a diagram reveals relationships that suggest a number of alternative interpretations vis-à-vis the dominate thought-style. One finds that slate artefacts are situated at elevations which indicate that their manufacture began before the appearance of that southern Swedish presence from which they are otherwise considered to have derived, represented here by the polygonal battle axes. The almond-shaped points of the Finnish Comb Ceramic Culture and the north-Bothnian implements from northern Fennoscandia are found at elevations that equal or exceed many of those artefacts with their origins in southern Sweden, the early presence of the former also implicitly challenges the cultural dominance of the latter. Finally, if one considers the appearance of a limited number of polygonal, shaft-hole, rhomb-shaped, boat-shaped and/or thick-butted flint axes to be indicative of settlement, then why not accord the same significance to those round-butted axes found at elevations which indicate an even earlier settlement phase?

Seventeen years would pass before Santesson again published a study on the relationship between shoreline displacement and prehistoric remains. During this intervening time, the natural sciences would make a number of significant contributions while simultaneously perfecting their techniques, with implications of great importance for those working in the North.

One of the most important contributions was summarily revealed by De Geer in 1924, followed by a more extensive publication the following year, where he presented a refined geo-chronological timetable for the de-glaciation of Scandinavia (De...
The bi-partition of the Finiglacial ice sheet, ca. 6800 bc, occurred during an early stage of the Ancylus Lake period (illustration source De Geer 1925, here redrawn and simplified). Five hundred years later the last remains of the glacier had retreated into the mountains. A Mesolithic presence in Scandinavia was well established by the time De Geer published this map in 1925; the Suomusjärvi, Kunda, Maglemose, Ertebølle, Nøstvet and Fosna Cultures were all known, the Komsa was discovered that very same year, see fig. 76. This implicitly implies that Norrland could have been colonised from any number of various directions simultaneously and developed any number of different and distinct cultures a good 2000 years before Uppland even began to emerge from the waters of the Ancylus Lake and/or Litorina Sea. Today, this phase of the glacial retreat is considered to have occurred about 7400-7300 BC, by 6800-6700 BC the last remains of the ice sheet had practically disappeared (De Geer 1925; Lundqvist 1994:130p; Lassila 1994a; 1994b).

The second point is just as interesting. Isberg concludes that the reindeer arrived, in the region known today as Sweden, from the south as well as from the north (Flensburg 1948:22; Isberg 1930:384).

The early presence of both moose and seal in Norrland was also attested through pollen analysis and, in the case of the latter, with the assistance of shoreline displacement studies. The remains of a moose were found in the port of Skellefteå, in a layer of clay that Sandegren pollen-dated to the final phase of the Ancylus Lake period ca. 5000 bc (Ekblom 1946). The remains of a seal were discovered in a layer of clay located at 97 meters above the present day sea level which, in combination with pollen analysis, placed it somewhere between 5000-4000 bc (Blomqvist 1943; 1944).

Of equal importance to archaeology was the continued production and refinement of shoreline displacement curves. Lidén turned out a revised curve for Angermanland in 1938, one which would serve until replaced by improved variants corrected with the use of radiocarbon dates (fig. 86; R. Lidén 1938).

By now, shoreline displacement studies in the rest of Scandinavia, were a regular occurrence. Useful curves for e.g. Gästrikland and Västerbotten were
published in both general geological overviews and in more specialised publications (Magnusson & Granlund 1936:198; Granlund 1943). None of these shoreline displacement curves are terribly accurate with regard to modern standards, based as they are, on scanty empirical data, estimations and interpolation (Granlund 1943:111) thus often giving dates that are too young for almost all elevations. This matters little, the important factor, the relative chronological relationship between sites, features and/or artefacts, is not affected by this liability, neither is its potential as a tool for modelling the landscape.

Many of the advances mentioned above were available to Santesson prior to his last publication, their conspicuous absence is puzzling. Instead he lamented the scarcity of both sites, stratigraphy and/or ceramics located along ancient shorelines that could be used to establish a relative chronology for this region (Santesson 1941:13pp). In absence of those traditional chronological markers he had, for decades, invested a great amount of effort into tracking down stray artefacts that had been found along the coast of Ångermanland in order to measure their elevation, realising that the best available chronological tool was post-glacial shoreline displacement;

... at present, the elevation of practically all stray Stone Age artefacts in Ångermanland has been determined. So far, all attempts to establish a relative chronology [of slate artefacts] based on typological grounds, have not taken into account either their elevation, topological location or the circumstances of their discovery, and have thus led to unreasonable conclusions, [this situation] is now starting to clear up, and I now think that I can now date most of the Stone Age material from Norrland, although much work remains, before everything can be made public (Santesson 1941:13).

Unfortunately, this never occurred, although the brief outline he did present, and the conclusions based thereon, are informative (fig. 87). Santesson first shows how three different types of implements, the T-shaped artefacts, the curved and double-edged knives and the animal-headed daggers, are all tied to specific elevations. This observation is confirmed by the composition of the assemblage found on two sites located at different elevations, the Överveda site situated between the 71-64 meter level while the elevation of the Kläpp site is estimated to be 60 meters above the present day sea level. The former contains an abundance of the T-shaped artefacts and the curved and double-edged knives, but none of the animal-headed daggers. This relationship is exactly the reverse at the younger Kläpp site (Santesson 1941).

Santesson equated the slate industry, which he calls the Överveda Culture, with the present day Sámi population. This assumption is based partly on past authority, quoting Hildebrand and Montelius from 1866 and 1874 respectively (Santesson 1941:28) and partly on analogy, noting the apparent similarities between the T-shaped implements of slate and a recent Sámi ceremonial object of bone. From whence these prehistoric people originated is not discussed, but he places them along the coastal areas of northern Ångermanland by the beginning of the Passage Grave Period. They were, towards the end of this period, 

![Fig. 86. Three shoreline displacement curves for the Province of Ångermanland; Lidén’s from 1938, Catos’ from 1985 and Lundqvist’s from 1987. The dates obtained from the older curve are too young, the further back in time, the greater the margin of error, as seen in comparison with one produced almost 40 years later by Lundqvist, who enjoyed the benefit of calibrated radiocarbon dates. The inaccuracy of Lidén’s diagram makes no difference as far as its usefulness is concerned. It may still be utilised successfully to delineate the chronological relationships between sites, features and/or artefacts. It can also be gainfully employed as a model with which to reconstruct the prehistoric landscape in order to pinpoint likely locations for various features from different ages (illustration sources R. Lidén 1938:403 & Lundqvist 1987:93, here redrawn and modified).](image)
forced inland, which until then had remained uninhabited, by the arrival of the southern Swedish Boat Axe people. These newcomers soon establish a trading network in furs with the people they had just displaced, as made apparent by the large amounts of primitive scrapers found on the dwelling sites of this now retarded inland culture (Santesson 1941:18pp).

This seems all very particular, even according to the standards of his own time. One would have thought that the next logical step would have been to pull out Lidén’s shoreline displacement curve, draw attention to the fact that the slate industry, as represented by those artefacts found at the highest elevations, seems to have commenced with the demise of the round-butted axe phase, possibly indicating a continuity of settlement that had begun at a very early stage. Then, using comparative typology, proceed to date any and all inland sites where equivalent objects had been recovered. This is not an unreasonable expectation, as shown above, this was by now standard procedure throughout the rest of Scandinavia and would remain so until eclipsed by radiocarbon analyses.

Shoreline Displacement: Sufficient and Necessary Conditions

In 1968 Baudou finalised a one hundred year old debate concerning the age of those many thousands of cairn and cairn-like features situated at different elevations along the coast of Norrland. Morphological traits and typological deliberations, in combination with shoreline displacement studies, provided the necessary chronological horizons (Baudou 1968b).

Members of the Nordarkeologi Research Project had, by the early 1970’s, constructed a chronological framework for the sites they were investigating, one based to a large degree on shoreline displacement studies (Christiansson 1966b; 1973c; Christiansson & Broadbent 1975).

Using Santesson’s material (supplemented with additions provided by Evert Baudou via the Early Norrland Research Project) and Lidén’s shoreline displacement curve, Karin Tennander created a comparative typological chronology that embraces all the principal artefacts as they occur in Norrland, both ingenious and imported. This typological instrument was later confirmed and expanded through Baudou’s independent study, outlined above. The obscure existence led by Tennander’s un-published bachelor’s thesis, presented in 1972 and entitled ‘Stray Finds from the Younger Stone and Bronze Ages found along the Coastal Areas of Northern Ångermanland’ (Sw. Lösfynd från yngre stenåldern och bronsåldern i norra Ångermanlands kustland), is contrasted by its utility, which has not diminished since it first appeared some thirty odd years ago.

One of the most recent success arising out of the systematic employment of shoreline displacement studies resulted in the discovery of a number of prehistoric sites along the ancient beaches located in Norrbotten, which include the important Mesolithic site at Alträsket and the Early Comb Ceramic site at Lillberget (Halén 1994:184).

The sufficient conditions required for the completion of these and other relatively recent studies is not significantly different from those that existed
previously. Then as now, the coastal regions of Norrland provide an ideal setting for the application of shoreline displacement studies. The mechanics of this phenomena have been tolerably well-known since the beginning of the 20th century, and with every passing decade refined. Material gathered from Norrland played an important role in the clarification of those many changes that occurred in the natural environment since the retreat of the latest glacier, thus engaging many of the key figures working within this research area, including Gerard De Geer, Bror Asklund, Arvid Högbom, Ragnar Lidén, Lennart von Post, Erik Fromm and Ragnar Sandegren.

Neither has there been any lack of knowledgeable archaeologists working in or with a material from Norrland, all of whom were well aquatinted with the archaeological utility of this geological phenomena. Knut Kjellmark, of Limhamn fame, was one of the first (Hemmendorff 2004; Kjellmark 1910). Other early practitioners include Oscar Almgren, Eskil Olsson, Erik Festin, Theodor Hellman, Gustav Hallström and Arvid Enqvist, all of whom were members of the Stjerna-Almgren seminars, some of which had also gained valuable field experience along the Swedish West Coast. These were later followed by such notables as Axel Bagge, Philbert Humbla, Knut Tinnberg and Sverker Janson, all with prior knowledge of shoreline displacement acquired from work along the West Coast. From all of the above, only Olsson produced a proper shoreline displacement study, albeit with conclusions in complete accord with the prevailing southern Swedish thought-style. O.B. Santesson was one of the few working in Norrland who had no prior experience with shoreline displacement studies elsewhere, and yet he too was aware of its archaeological possibilities. Nevertheless, he twice failed, at least in print, to harness the full potential of his own field work.

As already shown, this inertia cannot be explained away with reference to any dire lack of archaeological investigations in, and/or empirical data from, Norrland. In light of the above, one wonders; why didn’t anyone just take a shovel and start to dig test pits along the 100, 125 or the 150 meter level, or even higher? Hollender, over a century ago, suggested that this is where one should start looking for the earliest sites. Elsewhere, throughout Scandinavia, reconnaissance along ancient shorelines was repeatedly implemented, at times with great success. Why not in Norrland? Ignorance concerning the mechanics of shoreline displacement cannot be invoked to explain this situation. An appeal to any presumed deficiency in the empirical data base and/or in the number of archaeological investigations, is not convincing. Nor was there any scarcity of knowledgeable participants and/or specialists with which to consult. One can only conclude that all of the sufficient conditions appropriate for the detection and discovery of the Norrlandian past were both known and understood. However, there is one element in all of this that was missing; the necessary theoretical conditions, that would both prompt, direct and encourage such an undertaking.

Concluding Remarks and Summary

This chapter began with a survey over the amount of space Norrland has received in the archaeological literature. It was followed by a historical survey as concerns the discovery and recognition of semi-subterranean houses and the Mesolithic period in Norrland, together with a comparison of developments in these two fields as they occurred elsewhere in Scandinavia.

The review of the general archaeological overviews, although limited, revealed four things;

1) That the quantitative relationship assumed to exist between the amount of data produced in any given region and the amount of space or attention it may or may not receive in the literature at any given time is questionable.

2) That no necessary quantitative relationship exists between interpretation and/or explanatory proposals vis-à-vis the sheer amount of data available at any given time. Archaeologists have not refrained from interpretation, explanation and/or assessment concerning various aspects of the Norrlandian past in lieu of any perceived scarcity within the empirical data base.

3) That no necessary quantitative relationship exists between the type or quality of the interpretation presented and the poverty or profusion of the empirical data base per se. The attitudes and values encompassed and repeatedly voiced in any and all interpretations concerning the Norrlandian past have not been dictated by any profound deficiency in the empirical material and/or in basic research.

4) The existence of a repetitive number of explanations commonly employed when presenting the prehistory of Norrland were also uncovered,
indicating the inconspicuous presence of reoccurring and underlying attitudes and/or values, which implicitly or explicitly have directed and defined what was selected and how it was presented, affirming once again the interdependence of interpretation on surrounding theoretical and/or ideological circumstances as they exist in society at large.

Using concepts devised by Ludwik Fleck, the two questions posed in Chapter One were investigated; Why did it take the better part of the 20th century for archaeologists to recognise both the presence of Norrlandian semi-subterranean dwellings and the reality of its Mesolithic past? This study revealed that the repetitive explanations noted earlier belonged to a coherent system of cognition, a specific thought-style, that consists of five basic and inter-related generalisations or postulates that have been repeatedly invoked, in one form or another, when interpreting, explaining and/or presenting Norrland’s prehistoric past. These are;

1) The North was settled relatively late in comparison to the rest of Scandinavia.

2) The population living in the North was sparse and basically nomadic.

3) Development in the North was absent or retarded, on both the technological, social and economical levels.

4) When significant progress of any kind did occur, it was initiated from without, usually from Uppland.

5) Norrland has always functioned and served as a source of raw materials for the South.

The genesis of this thought-style occurred during the second half of the 19th century, during which time the first of these postulates sporadically began to appear in the archaeological literature. During the first two decades of the 20th century, all five of these postulates had been formulated and were increasingly being invoked when presenting the prehistory of Norrland. By the end of the 1920’s these five postulates were widely accepted by a majority of Swedish archaeologists, becoming codified, thus repeatedly structuring the way the Norrlandian past was perceived and presented. By this time the nexus of this southern Swedish thought-style was located in the Department of Archaeology at Uppsala. During the 1950’s this thought-style also became established within the walls of the Central Board of National Antiquities, which by then had turned itself into the most important arbitrator of the Nation’s heritage, further ensuring the expansion and renewal of this southern Swedish thought-style. The various members of this thought-collective, that came and went during the last century, did not necessarily embrace and/or express all five of these assumptions simultaneously in each and every one of their respective publications. Yet the continual occurrence and re-occurrence of these postulates in the literature leaves no doubt as to the vitality, longevity and the persuasive nature of those attitudes and values inherent within this southern Swedish thought-style. This was made manifest by the double standards applied to the evaluation of similar archaeological material, depending on where it had been recovered, in the North or in the South, circumstances which revealed that;

1) Archaeologists were quite prepared to believe in the unique cultural constitution and geographic position of Uppland and/or southern Sweden, yet incapable of perceiving that these very same qualities also existed in the North.

2) Archaeologists forcefully, and rightfully, argued for the genoses of novel and/or important cultural innovations evolving in the South before being passed northwards, but they could not envision that this relationship also worked in reverse.

3) Most archaeologists saw no good reason why various regions, e.g. Uppland, should not have been colonised and permanently inhabited as soon as it was physically possible to do so, yet they were ready to persuade themselves and believe that Norrland had remained empty for thousands of years.

4) The members of this southern Swedish thought-style were also quite prepared to follow the evidence and implications provided by the presence of artefacts that typologically indicated that the South indeed possessed a very ancient past, but were quite unwilling to pursue the same line of reasoning and draw, let alone accept, the same kind of conclusions when confronted with identical artefacts found in the North.

5) The methodology of shoreline displacement, pollen analysis and radiocarbon dating were well
understood and applied with great success, leading to the discovery and recognition of the earliest inhabitants throughout much of Scandinavia. Yet when similar results were implicated or obtained in Norrland using the very same methods, they were either explained away or ignored.

6) The recognition and significance of those features known as semi-subterranean houses were also well-known throughout Scandinavia, yet remained obscure when discovered in Norrland.

7) Many were generally able to apply a source critical approach towards assumptions and interpretations as concerns the South, but could not recognise the implications of their own bias as it pertains to Norrland.

8) All were well aware of the archaeological discoveries being made in both Norway and Finland, regions that in many respects have much in common with Norrland, but they did not contemplate that these similarities might be indicative of other, very subtle and ancient connections, affiliations or bonds that once existed between these various northern regions.

In light of the above, one realises how archaeological knowledge, as it concerns Norrland during the first three quarters of the 20th century, was repeatedly conceived and structured in accordance with this southern Swedish thought-style and its expectations, none of which included the possibility of a long Norrlandian past or the necessity for substantial dwellings. Simply put, the theoretical prerequisites needed to recognise an alternative Norrland past did not exist.

The prerogative of this southern-Swedish thought-style was challenged by the genesis of an alternative thought-style during the mid 20th century. The development and existence of this new thought-style was, for quite a while, precarious, its thought-collective did not successfully congregate until after 1975, that is to say, in conjunction with the establishment of the Department of Archaeology at the University of Umeå. The values and attitudes that characterise this Northern thought-style are found in its practice of placing greater emphases on the internal and innovative capabilities of past Northern societies rather than repeatedly taking recourse in normative explanations based on the assumed and infinite cultural predominance of southern Sweden. This theoretical stance makes allowance for an early human presence in the region while anticipating their need of substantial dwellings. These developments have not lead to the demise of the southern Swedish thought-style, which has successfully adapted and modified itself to changing circumstances and has continued to exert its influence and its interpretation on the Norrlandian past.

Choices are still being made.

Oblique-edged and retouched points of quartz from Rastklippan, Lake Tärnasjön, Sorvare parish, Lappland, today situated at about 606 meters above the present day sea level. Illustration source Broadbent 1982:33, here redrawn and modified. Scale 1:1.
Introduction

Three questions were posed in the opening chapter of this exposé. The first pointed out the tardy recognition of those features found in Norrland which are now conceived to be the remains of substantial semi-subterranean dwellings. The second drew attention towards the belated realisation that Norrland did indeed possess a Mesolithic past. It was assumed that the explanation for both of these circumstances was to be found in the sociology of the scientific endeavour itself. Hence the third question queried the nature of that presumed association, suggesting that the unbalanced relationship that has long been considered to exist between the peripheral-North and the centre-South has effected the scholarly environment, with adverse consequences as concerns how Norrland has been archaeologically perceived and portrayed. Consequently, any satisfactory reply to the questions posed above would first require a presentation of the historical framework against which the subject of archaeology was first conceived and later developed, together with an overview of Norrland’s history in light of both the nation and Europe as a whole. This was presented in the second chapter, through the application of two complimentary angles of approach. The one, defined and summarised according to those 20 particulars which together make up what has here been labelled the ‘colonial experience’ clearly demonstrated that Norrland has, to all intents and purposes, functioned as a lucrative colony for the powers that be, located in the South, for the last 600 years or so. The other point of departure concerned concepts of identity and heritage, together with a presentation of the ideals they encapsulated and the people instrumental in their formation and propagation. It was demonstrated that both antiquarianism and archaeology contributed substantially to the ideology, history and heritage of the Kingdom and later to that of the Nation-State, amassing concepts, experiences, symbols and materials collected from the lower third of the country, which were then employed to maintain and vindicate the exclusive expectations, conceptions and perceptions as understood and conceived by and for the South. Norrland’s contribution to this national construct was minimal to non-existent, thus its seemingly peripheral position in relationship to the dominate South was rendered even more conspicuous, its submissive station normative, its colonial status made to seem inevitable. The first two questions posed were addressed in Chapter Three, using concepts devised by Ludwik Fleck. This analysis revealed the existence of a southern Swedish thought-collective that possessed a thought-style consisting of five postulates that were repeatedly invoked when interpreting and presenting the Norrlandian past. In the following, the deliberations and findings presented in Chapters Two and Three will be drawn together, their implications discussed, ending with speculations conjectured and contemplated.

Interpretation and Socio-Historical Conventions

This study opened by initially assuming that archaeologists working with material from the North were subjected to powerful influences issuing from sources external to the academic subject itself and that the effects of these non-archaeological factors was often greater than presumed, resulting in a biased intellectual environment as concerns how the North was understood and presented. It was further assumed that geo-political relationships as they have existed in Sweden since historic times were largely responsible for this situation, which would explain the obvious discrepancies between the way the North and South were treated and portrayed in both historical and archaeological overviews. As expected, these assumptions have proven themselves to be well founded; there is indeed an intimate, possibly involuntary, yet strong relationship between how the past has been perceived and presented vis-à-vis historic and contemporary geo-political and socio-
econimic realities that are founded on a regional imbalance of power that has normalised an asymmetric relationship between the North and the South to such a degree that it appears unavoidable. Not fully anticipated, was the detection of a coherent interpretative framework particular to the subject of archaeology itself, a southern Swedish thought-style that showed itself to be as repetitive as it is enduring, and distinct, as clearly defined by its five postulates. The discovery and composition of this thought-style is in complete accord with the lessons of the colonial experience and the reflective awareness concerning the social context of scholarly interpretation.

The first of these five postulates holds that the prehistoric settlement of the North was initially sporadic and transitory at best, permanent settlement having occurred relatively late. This archaeological scenario has its historic equivalent in the late expansion and uncertainties surrounding the spread of agricultural communities ever northwards. The ideological importance ascribed to this phenomenon should not be underestimated. For hundreds of years the Royal Kingdom promoted agricultural colonisation in order to establish its political legitimacy over the North and strengthen its own economy. The New Goths and the nation-building project of the early 19th century endowed great amounts of symbolic capital into promoting the myth of the yeoman-farmer as the living embodiment of what the country had been and what it should be. The harbinger of both civilisation and progress, agriculture would be repeatedly promoted by the State, idolised in the ‘Governmental Primer’, its material and immaterial culture cherished by the antiquarian societies, its values and virtues fostered by the heritage associations. The abusive and degenerate side-effects of both industrialisation and urbanisation readily confirmed these convictions. Archaeology was conceived and matured in this ideological environment, so it is possibly not surprising that archaeologists invested so much effort into documenting grave mounds and other related features, ancient remains that had by then already been turned into prime national symbols by the cultural elite and its nation building project, tailored to represent a vigorous folk and ‘bygone days of glory’. Norrland’s share of these symbolically charged remains being minimal, prompted many to mistakenly assume that the whole of its prehistoric past was as equally marginal. Discrepancies in both the quantity and quality allotted to Norrland in the historical and archaeological overviews also contributed to, and helped sustain, the fallacy that Norrland possessed little or no history of any depth or consequence.

The second postulate holds that when the North was finally inhabited, it was only sparsely so, and only then by a rambling or nomadic population that precariously irked out a living from day to day. When Norrland is briefly mentioned in the contemporary historical narratives, it is usually simply portrayed, stereotyped as a vast and more or less uninhabited, or even uninhabitable, hinterland. The life-style of the contemporary reindeer herding population confirmed their nomadic existence. That envisioned for the prehistoric hunting and fishing population was assumed to be no less mobile and that much more precarious. This interpretation was only maintained by ignoring historical material to the contrary, such as the plentiful fishing rivers of the North that had enriched both the Church and Kingdom. The mixed subsistence economy of the northern inhabitants was also disregarded, an occupation that not only provisioned its practitioners with the bare necessities of life, but one that had produced and sustained a vast network of pan-continental trade and commerce, which in turn had provided the central authorities with much appreciated and sought after revenue. Norrland depicted as the “...populated wilderness...” was not difficult to maintain, any statistical comparison would immediately validate that assumption. Norrland’s dearth of ancient monuments writ large provided further confirmation, ignoring the fact that the criteria upon which this judgement was founded is based solely on southern Swedish experiences and values. That the Norrlandian present might be a pale copy of the centre-South’s is no justification for presuming that the Norrlandian past was equally so. However, this was nevertheless assumed to be the case, while the regional chauvinism and the manufactured nature of the national heritage that underlies this stance has often gone, if not unnoticed, then at least un-challenged. However, there are singular, although unheeded, exceptions. In 1910 Festin declared that;

...the provinces of Norrland [during pagan times] were inhabited by a relatively large population that had lively contacts with southern Sweden as well as with countries both east and west, this Norrlandian Culture was by no means lacking in its own distinctive character (Festin 1910:5p).

Written at a time when the amount of archaeological material from the North was easily encompassed by
any one individual, it is evident that the interpretations of both Festin and his colleagues, who held other opinions, are based on contradictory values rather than divergent data.

A belief in the retarded nature of the Norrlandian Stone Age is the third postulate of this southern Swedish thought-style. Here, clearly embedded within this thought-collective, are the essentialist and primitivist doctrines of the romantic and nation-building project. The “...evolutionary superiority...” of the South is never in doubt, although it is an ideological stance that, since 1859, can only be maintained by blatantly ignoring and/or distorting one of the central principles of evolutionary theory. This was readily accomplished, in Sweden and throughout the Western world, through the selective presentation of the historic and prehistoric material (Gathercole & Lowenthal 1990:7p; Gould 1977; 1988; Kohl & Fawcett 1995:5; Lowenthal 1990:302; McGuire 1992:213pp; Scarre 1990; Trigger 1995:272), resulting in what has come to be called “...colonialist archaeology...”, which;

...served to denigrate native societies and peoples by trying to demonstrate that they had been static in prehistoric times and lacked the initiative to develop on their own (Trigger 1984:363 as cited in McGuire 1992:227, English in the original).

Sweden’s nation-building project constructed and moulded its new identity and heritage around Southern experiences and concepts, both material and non-material, that had little or nothing to do with Norrland. This Göta and Svea-centric outlook has dominated archaeological and historical production for hundreds of years, one made increasing credible by constantly contrasting the North against the South, using the latter as the standard by which all else is gauged. The allocation of national resources in the form of museums, universities, libraries, academies and institutes of cultural management have all, until recently, been located in the South. This unequal distribution of cultural and educational assets once again emphasis and reinforces the disparity between what has come to be considered the peripheral-North and the centre-South, a relationship considered to be so self-evident that the rationale behind the South’s hegemony is no longer questioned or even recognised.

The fourth postulate follows from the third; when important changes in the North do occur, they are always initiated from without, often from Uppland. Here, archaeological and historical narratives coincide to such a degree that they almost become indistinguishable. Growth and development is considered to have repeatedly arrived out of the South in a succession of waves. One of the first to alight along the shores of the North was the Swedish Battle Axe and/or Pitted Ware Culture, which was later superseded by the cairn and mound builders of the Bronze and Iron Ages, and by Medieval agriculturists, who were in turn followed by centralised administration and religion, and then by a succession of iron, saw and paper mills, each accompanied by their respective communities. Other communities would be created at need, together with the necessary transport facilities, to expedite the exploitation of the North’s iron, mineral and hydro-electric power resources by the ever progressive South. Every succeeding wave of development from without unfolded long a common trajectory; each initially consisting of a dynamic expansion that reached a peek of opulence and stability, followed by a sharp decline, broken only by the arrival of the next wave. The static-North cannot, on its own, master the constraints imposed upon it by its own inherent nature, environment and/or geography. Norrland, past and present, came to be viewed as a particular type of problem, constantly lagging behind developments elsewhere, its inertia only broken by the impetus of the South. It has long since been accepted that the North is wholly dependent on the benevolent authority of the centre-South, the apparent necessity of this arrangement vindicated and reinforced the prevailing parental attitude and patriarchal character of this manufactured relationship.

The fifth and last postulate, that the North has always served as a source of raw materials for the South, is the logical extension of the proceeding four. Constantly invoked by archaeologists and historians alike, Norrland is repeatedly depicted as either supplying dried meat, fish, furs, skins, antler, timber, lumber, iron ore, wood pulp or water power, useful commodities extracted and shipped southwards by clever entrepreneurs, where they are processed and/or refined before being profitably re-circulated, to the advantage, and increasing wealth, of those centres of commerce located in the South, a train of events often ambiguously described as being beneficial to the well-being of the nation as a whole. This interpretative explanation has become as axiomatic as it is dogmatic, emphasising once again the now customary hegemony of the expansive-South over the naturally submissive-North.
Together, these five postulates make up the core of that southern Swedish thought-style which has dominated the archaeological perception of the North throughout the course of the 20th century. Consequently, and in reply to those two opening questions that initiated this inquiry; substantial dwellings inhabited by the descendants of an unknown yet vigorous and innovative population who had settled the North as soon as it was physically possible to do so, was not a viable interpretation according to the canons of this southern Swedish thought-style. Any and all evidence to the contrary that could not be incorporated into the body of the dominate interpretative framework, was either explained away or ignored, effectively preventing its members from perceiving or ascribing any alternative significance to these prehistoric features and remains.

In light of Chapters Two and Three, one realises that this interpretative system is not exclusively the result of archaeological deliberations alone, but has clearly been influenced and shaped by those unfolding socio-historical events that, among other things, helped turn Norrland into a colony, a process initiated during the Middle Ages when the emerging power centres of the South began to extend their sphere of influence into the lucrative North. Full colonial control was first achieved by the Royal Kingdom, and later maintained by both the Nation and the Welfare-state. Norrland’s colonial and/or submissive status has long since come to be perceived as unavoidable, in part due to the permanence of this relationship, which has lasted for centuries, and partly in lieu of the authoritative nature of the historical narrative that periodically reinforces, reproduces and makes legitimate this conception of the North through a selective presentation of the Nation’s history. The construction of that national stereotype as defined by the dogmatics of heritage has further entrenched and maintained the perception of the North as a peripheral and stagnant hinterland. Antiquarianism, cultural management and archaeology, guided by the southern Swedish thought-style, advanced and expanded this perspective by projecting it far back into the distant past, thus conferring upon it even greater credibility. Norrland’s inferior position was soon conceived as not only unavoidable, but natural and predetermined, no longer the result of specific historical circumstances, it came to be implicitly viewed as the irreversible outcome of relentless natural forces beyond the reckoning of time and removed from all human control.

This then, in answer to the third question posed at the beginning of this inquiry, is the nature of those external and non-archaeological factors and determinants that have directed, and in some cases still guide, archaeological interpretations as they pertain to Norrland. It is a set of five interpretative explanations, all formulated under the influence of specific historic contingencies, shaped and propagated by socio-historical conventions and institutions, embedded in a social and intellectual framework of cognitive relationships that recursively strengthens and empowers this theoretical framework with scholarly authority in an ever ascending spiral of conformity. The hegemony and limitations of this socio-historical edifice has here been exposed and recognised through an analysis of the literature. It can only be challenged by comparison, that is to say, through the creation and application of an alternative thought-style.

Interpretation and the Clash of Thought-Styles

Throughout Scandinavia, during the first half of the 20th century, archaeological material was repeatedly discovered and interpreted as indicating that the continent had harboured a relatively ancient, stable and permanent population during the Mesolithic. However, when equivalent material was uncovered in Norrland, it was perceived differently. As we have seen, this discrepancy cannot adequately be explained away with any appeal based on the premise that this was due to a scarcity of comparable data, to a deficiency of key concepts or to any lack of basic research. The historical overview presented in Chapter Three has shown how the archaeological material from Norrland was organised, interpreted and presented according to concepts and categories determined by the logic of a specific thought-style, one that was forged according to a theoretical framework largely external to the subject of archaeology itself. The inability of new or novel data to change the theoretical framework of this community or thought-collective, suggests that the former is dependent on the latter for its empirical content, that is to say, data gains or loses meaning in relationship to the theoretical framework into which it is incorporated. Consequently, theoretically charged data that presents an alternative to, and/or contradicts the interpretative explanations of the dominant thought-style will go unnoticed or, on those occasions
when a divergent thought-style is recognised, its significance will be ignored, trivialised or discredited. All this is in complete accord with Fleck’s outline of the scientific endeavour. How we interpret and/or present the past is not dependent on the amount of evidence available. Instead, it is a function of our theoretical assumptions which provide the explanatory framework that suggests answers and thus directs our attention to certain aspects and/or amounts of the available material which is thus made empirically meaningful by the way it is structured according to the premises of the guiding theory. Changing the theoretical perspective not only alters the explanatory framework, it also re-structures the data base according to its own internal logic. In this situation, empirical data that was once considered relevant might be made redundant, while that which was previously ignored, is now rendered both meaningful and understandable. In light of this one must needs concede that all knowledge is constructed. However, it would be erroneous to further conclude that this automatically prevents us from making discoveries in and about the real world, past or present. It only implies that our abilities to do so are restricted, as illustrated in Figure 1. Theoretical frameworks are intellectual instruments, devised and utilised to probe reality, they sharpen our perspective and direct our attention, and they do so explicitly. Similar to both individuals and scientific disciplines, theoretical frameworks are limited in scope, while none can encompass the totally of existence, they are, each in their own way, capable of investigating and reporting on a portion of it. This further implies that no single theory or explanation may adequately capture the complete complexity of any specific situation under study. This is not an argument for the existence of an infinite number of possible explanations nor a justification for unbridled relativism as espoused in post-modern thinking, a conviction that harbours its own set of questionable consequences and dubious agendas (Hartsock 1987; Lee 1992:35pp; Mascia-Lees et.al. 1989; Massey 1994:214pp). Rather it is the recognition that reality is complicated and that understanding might be facilitated by the simultaneous application of a fixed number of theoretical perspectives that might at best yield a like number of explanations, or at least a more diversified account.

As argued above, the epistemological limitations of the southern Swedish thought-style was not due to any apparent lack of archaeological material. Rather, it is a function of its own theoretical framework, one highly influenced and almost entirely based on conceptions derived from external socio-historical circumstances as they have unfolded and developed during the last six centuries or so, resulting in what has here been characterised as the peripheral-North and centre-South. Consequently, most accounts of Norrland’s prehistoric past have largely echoed or mimicked that asymmetrical relationship. This is neither unusual nor unique in the annals of historical narratives;

As social beings and scholars, we inherit beliefs and social relations from the past, and these factors structure how we act. This inheritance does not enslave us, but it urges us along already set paths of thought and deed. It is easy to follow these paths without thinking about why they exist or what the unintended consequences of such a course may be, but to just accept them as given. A historical analysis dissolves the given nature of these paths and asks how were they laid out, why should archaeologists follow them, to what ends do they lead, and whose interests do they serve? (McGuire 1992:218, English in the original).

These implicit non-archaeological assumptions impact and influence interpretative choices according to their own internal ideological agendas as assuredly as those derived from explicitly formulated archaeological criteria. The sophisticated and duel nature of this unobtrusive situation is clearly perceptible in the work of Harald Hvarfner. Probably no one else, either before or since, so understood the changes and challenges facing Norrland and its people in the wake of that industrial onslaught that swept up the river valleys during the third quarter of the 20th century (e.g. see fig. 63). This is immediately made evident through his ethnographic studies, where he depicted the vanishing lifeways of those effected with a sensitivity and respect that is only surpassed by the proficiency of his learning. His insight into the problems facing the North is readily exemplified when discussing national economic policies and their effects on the rural-North contra the urban-South, where he notes that;

Equality has been the goal, but the point of departure has been Central [e.g. Southern] Swedish valuations (Hvarfner 1973:79, English in the original).

One sees here that Hvarfner-the-ethnologist is quite aware of the bias produced by the predominance of
the centre-South and is not taken in. Yet, as we have
seen, Hvarfner-the-archaeologist never unmasked nor
escaped from the debilitating influences of that
southern Swedish thought-style which truncated both
the chronology and the cultural diversity of the
Norrlandian past, reducing it to a poor reflection of
Southern aspirations, devoid of originality, an empty
vessel to be filled periodically from without. Hvarfner’s
duality confirms Fleck’s assertion that an
individual may belong to a number of different
thought-collectives. Bror Asklund’s interpretation of
the Norrlandian past is a further verification of this
contingency; the full potential, possibilities and
implications of the time-scale provided by his
geological thought-collective was never fully realised
within the confines of his archaeological thought-
collective. These two examples would seem to
suggest that contrary evidence provided by a thought-
derived from one scientific subject will not
necessarily bring about the abandonment of, or cause
any radical alterations to, the thought-style belonging
to another branch of learning. At best, this
confrontation might induce modifications to the
theoretical framework of one or both, in order to
integrate or ostracise the material provided by the
other. Any serious challenge to the dominate thought-
stylisty of any one subject must needs come from within
the discipline itself, preferably presenting a
theoretical framework tailored according to the
subject’s own internal issues and concerns. Hvarfner’s and Asklund’s situational context also
seems to bear out Fleck’s assessment of the
subordinate significance of any single individual vis-
à-vis the encompassing influence of the dominate
dominant thought-collective. Irrespective of the possible nature
of that relationship, it does draw our attention to the
importance of comprehending individual
contributions in light of the contextual situation
within which they were carried out. With this
perspective in mind, one realises that the history of
archaeological research in the North harbours neither
heroes nor villains, but only a number of
archaeologists, professional or otherwise, who,
besides being remarkably talented, diligent and/or
exceedingly motivated, also accomplished a great
deal, irrespective of the prevailing thought-style that
influenced their thinking. Here, Sverker Janson’s
contribution is exceedingly conspicuous. Chiefly
responsible for one of the largest archaeological
projects ever undertaken in Scandinavia, as concerns
both its magnitude and duration, the modern observer
stands transfixed before the quantity and quality of
the work carried out by Janson and his many gifted
associates, especially in relation to the resources at
their disposal. The utility of the reports produced in
connection with this work, by themselves,
demonstrate the scope of their achievement. That we
are today able to employ and apply the material they
gathered in, together with the accounts they compiled,
to our own advantage, testifies to the fact that they
did indeed achieve much. That the theoretical
framework that guided their thinking did not allow
them to envision any alternative to that interpretative
construction should not distract us from
acknowledging their dedication, skill and successes.
It would be extremely presumptuous, if not outright
foolish, to berate our predecessors from afar as
concerns how they interpreted the material. Endowed
with the presence of hindsight, we should strive instead to use that advantage and realise the
full import of this and similar studies, and ask
ourselves; where and what are the limitations posed
on us today by our own contemporary thought-styles, both old and new?

The dependency of data on theory implies that the
significant methodological relationship is not located
there, that is to say between data and theory, but rather
between two or more competing theories or thought-
stylisty and the resulting interpretative and explanatory
peculiarities and inconsistencies that are explicitly
revealed through their confrontation. Fleck holds that
the most creative phase of research occurs with the
abandonment of an old thought-style and the
formation of a new, a circumstance that creates an
environment that permits the recognition of novel
fields of cognition (see Chapter One and Fleck
1979:109pp). Might not a similar situation be
achieved by creating a deliberate confrontation
between two or more competing thought-styles,
brought on by a socio-historical comparison of their
respective literary production? This was not
attempted here, although the possibility of doing so
has been indicated. A deliberate clash of contradictory
thought-styles could reveal the limitations and
advantages of each. Such an encounter might well
assist comprehension and increase awareness about the
choices that are being made, allowing us to
challenge our social and scholarly conventions, assess
the formulation of alternative interpretations, seek
new and/or complimentary explanations while
providing encouragement to explore new avenues of
scientific research.

None of the interpretations derived from
archaeological studies are value free. At best they
will be endowed with concepts derived from a theoretical framework made sufficiently explicit to allow us the privilege of making and recognising discoveries about the past. When based on inferred assumptions or hidden agendas, the theoretical framework will produce a past that is largely constructed, its interpretations biased in accordance with its implicit premises. The existence and nature of that southern Swedish thought-style outlined above was made apparent through a literary analysis of available publications, demonstrating that methods borrowed from the sociology of science and applied to archaeology, by archaeologists in order to study questions of archaeological interest, do indeed provide useful analytical insights that help render theoretical frameworks both visible and explicit. Thus structured, they may then be contemplated, discussed, appraised, rearranged, abandoned.

**Norrland Today, Archaeology Tomorrow**

This inquiry has exposed the existence of a southern Swedish thought-style that has dominated the way the North has been archaeologically presented for the better part of a century, an interpretative framework that has not been abandoned, only modified. The presence of an alternative to this southern thought-style was alluded to, although it has not here been specifically analysed, hence its composition and properties are only vaguely recognised in outline. Is this ‘northern alternative’ nothing more than a general and un-specific reaction against the hegemony of its predecessor, or is it a coherent and repetitively consistent thought-style characterised by its own well defined postulates? In either case, one must also pause to ask if this ‘northern thought-style’ is any less socio-politically embedded, endowed and/or motivated than its predecessor. If not, should this contingency be universally deplored and prevented, or selectively accepted and abetted?

The last decades or so have witnessed a voluminous production of literature that recognises how archaeology and its practitioners have served to legitimise positions of power in the present. Ashish Chadha’s revealing article entitled *The Anatomy of Dispossession* is a penetrating example of this awareness;

...in order to develop and modernise the country...huge dams, power plants, steel plants... [were built, resulting in] ...the displacement and dislocation... [of] ...the population... [who] ...were never party to the planning of the projects that would render them homeless and dispossess them of a landscape that they had held for generations. The concept of landscape is... [defined] ...as a combination of land, water and forest, with which the population is culturally, physically and spiritually associated. It is the destruction of these associations that brings about a people’s dispossession from their landscape. The symbiotic relationship that prevails between the population and landscape is consciously severed by the policies of the contemporary state. In order to fulfil its national objectives, the State destroys the landscape without consideration for... [those] ...who are dependent upon it for survival. I argue that the Government’s insensitivity emanates from a colonial ideology still strongly rooted in the consciousness of the country... [and that this] ...attitude is reinforced by the intelligentsia, among them anthropologists and archaeologists who have yet to divorce themselves from the colonial heritage in their scholarly research (Chadha 1999:146 & 147, English in the original).

The intentionally scissored appearance of this quote disguises the fact that it is not Norrland’s recent past that is being presented, but India’s. The human displacement that took place in the wake of the hydro-electrical power project under discussion by Chadha far exceeds anything that ever occurred in Norrland, yet the similarities they do share clearly indicate that ‘internal-colonialism’ as a phenomenon, together with its socio-political and scholarly repercussions, is not specific to Norrland alone. One or more like occurrences have, or are taking place, in over 50 countries throughout the world, some of which involve the same Swedish companies that despoiled the Norrlandian river systems (McCully 1998). Case studies such as this, transcend national particularities, revealing the existence of a coherent set of underlying agendas that structure the choices made, the interests that are being advanced and the subservient role of archaeology and cultural management.

There is nothing mysterious or natural about authority. It is formed, irradiated, disseminated; it is instrumental, it is persuasive; it has status, it establishes canons of taste and value; it is virtually indistinguishable from certain ideas it dignifies as true, and from traditions, perceptions, and judgements it forms, transmits, reproduces (Said 1979:19p, English in the original).

Is this any less true on the eve of the 21st century than it has been for the last two? Can we, in accordance with Hewison’s appeal, break away from
the embrace of national heritage, fully comprehending the socio-political origins and contemporary concerns of that project, and seek out an archaeology and a history that both permits and provokes a critical revision of the conceptual framework of long held assumptions, perceiving their consequences, and providing alternative insights? Beyond the goals set in this essay, though in light of what it has revealed concerning Norrland’s history, what kind of insights would such an attempt produce? Despite recent and positive economic developments and efforts to the contrary, the myth of Norrland as a naturally peripheral and retarded economic region still lives on (Andersson-Skog & Bäcklund 1992; Gidlund & Sörlin 1992; Lundberg 1992).

Northern Sweden today has an highly efficient export intensive economy. Living conditions and recreational possibilities are good. These facts are not widely known nor appreciated in the country as a whole. Norrland has and still is treated as a colony by the rest of Sweden. Its raw materials, its export income, its hydro-electric power and free access to its natural environment are taken for granted by many to be the property of Sweden as a whole. The north’s disadvantages, its susceptibility to foreign competition, problems relating to economic rationalisation together with its unbalanced regional labour market are, on the other hand, considered to be part and parcel of the region itself and thus its own concern (Lundberg 1992:169).

Its riches belong to the State, but not its difficulties. Norrland as the ‘eternal colony’, beset with unsolvable problems, is periodically reaffirmed and reinforced for public consumption, most recently by that national project presented earlier and known as the ‘The Year of Swedish History’, which reached its culmination in 1993 (see Chapter Two). An overview of the country’s history was published in conjunction with that nation-wide campaign and circulated as a Sunday supplement by one of Sweden’s leading newspapers (Dagens Nyheter 14-03-1993). This particular supplement consisted of a number of different articles that covered different aspects of the country’s past, from the end of the first millennium AD up until the present. Only one of these essays dealt directly with northern Sweden, entitled ‘Wasted Labours’ (Sw. Förspillda mödor), it is depressing reading. Norrland is that “…unchanging world, that barren world, branded and plagued by a harsh climate.” which will never be productive, all efforts to make it so have failed. The people who came North to build and work on the railways, in the iron ore mines, on the farms and to build the hydro-electric power plants have all, in the end, packed their belongings and left. “Silence descends. Things are once again as they always have been.” (Lundegård 1993). This is not to say that all of the other articles that dealt with southern and central Sweden were universally positive, but neither were they portrayed in such a negative manner. Norrland’s despondency and its assumed dependency on the South was, once again, unreflectively regurgitated, confirming what is expected, thus returning us to the security of a familiar and established historical existence. For the majority, this account of Norrland has become a conditioned reflex, for many it is a law of nature. It is possibly here, as concerns the axiomatically assumed inferiority of Norrland, past, present and future, that archaeology might possibly make a contribution to the contrary (fig. 88).

Since the congregation of that alternative thought-collective which occurred in and around the Department of Archaeology at the University of Umeå, archaeological research from the North has begun to produce an account of Norrland’s past that would seem to contradict all five of the postulates that characterises the southern Swedish thought-style (see Chapters One and Three). If any credibility can be ascribed to these alternative interpretations, then we are here confronted with a Norrland that for a good seven or eight millennia was anything but a subsidiary appendix to the South. That it was instead, for a greater part of its existence, something else, something different, something unexpected, something that we have barely begun to discern, let alone comprehend. The implications of this realisation reverberate far beyond the disciplinary bounds of academic archaeology. If the prehistoric past was something unlike, something other, something more than a simple extension of the historical present into the past, then Norrland’s here and now was not predetermined, nor was it necessarily inevitable. Rather, it is the end result of political decisions motivated by economic concerns, backed by social interests that were justified and reinforced by ideological, cultural and historical dogmas. Challenging the latter exposes the former, disclosing the fact that choices were being made that favour certain individuals and/or groups. If the unbalanced relationship between the peripheral-North and centre-South is the result of human action,
then that means we can change that relationship by making other choices. If the past was not like the present, then the future needn’t be. A shift in the theoretical point of departure favours new insights and discoveries about the world. A comparable shift in historical awareness provides novel avenues of contemplation, enabling the formation of alternative futures. This (paraphrasing Hewison 1987:146) can only be accomplished by replacing the complacency of inordinate heritage with a critical awareness gained from the laborious application of historical analyses.

Contrary to popular belief, the inability of the North to assert its own interests is not due to climatic effects or economic defects, but is today largely a political issue (Bylund 1996:184pp; Forsell 1992:39pp; Gidlund & Sörlin 1992:9pp; Lundberg 1992:181pp). By now there can be little doubt that the dearth of any kind of historical perspective has helped to obscure and mystify this realisation (Aronsson 2000). Archaeologists have begun to fully realise that;

The politics of the past is no trivial academic game; it is an integral part of every people’s earnest search for a heritage essential to autonomy and identity. In this search, archaeologists form part of a cadre of historians, social scientists and other scholars increasingly press to defend or resist claims to this or that interpretation of the past (Lowenthal 1990:302, English in the original).

Then, is the northern thought-style politically endowed or encumbered? We will not know for certain, if or how, until it has been subjected to a proper socio-historical analysis. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that it possesses latent socio-political potential, as does any scholarly endeavour that exposes a one-sided power structure that has attained the status of normality (paraphrasing Hjørungdal 1991:126).
In light of the above, one must necessarily direct the same question towards this work and consequently conclude that the results derived from this academic inquiry also harbours socio-political implications for the present. Doubtless, this should not astonish, especially if archaeology is a subject that produces knowledge about, and provides perspectives on, the real world. How this might effect those involved is uncertain. Will it prompt malignant indignation over past injustices, both genuine and fictitious, or, realising that the present is not the past, will it focus attention towards making informed judgements concerning the future? Furthermore what responsibilities do archaeologist have, collectively or individually, for the product they produce? However and whatever the case maybe, this investigation, as clearly stated in the beginning of Chapter One, was initiated as a result of, or more correctly, as a reaction to, the apparent belief that Norrland did not possess a history of any depth or consequence. This in turn led to the discovery that the presentation of the Norrlandian prehistoric and historic past, its significance and otherness, has largely been excluded and ignored, while those aspects that do reach the public are repeatedly underestimated or devalued in accordance with the axioms of a dogmatic heritage constructed around a cultural stereotype based on values derived from sources and agendas of little benefit to the North. The thrust of this realisation does pose a challenge to the monolithic centralism of traditional and sanctioned prehistoric and historic narratives by specifically calling into question Norrland’s relationship with its southern neighbour, here depicted as neither natural nor unavoidable, but as having been brought about by a combination of particular geo-political and socio-economic circumstances that involved human actors making choices, either informed, or not.
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Handle core from site T97, Lake Torneträsk, Jukkasjärvi parish, Lappland. Found by Knut Tinnberg, the site is situated 83 meters above the lake, the surface of which is 342 meters above the present day sea level. Made of yellow-brown quartzite, it is 6 cm long, 2.9 cm wide and 3.6 cm high. Illustration source Olofsson 1995, here redrawn and modified. Scale 1:1.
North-Bothnian axe found near the Degerforsen rapids on the River Ångermanälven, ca. 230 meters above the present day sea level, Junsele parish, Ångermanland. Made from a green slate-like material, it is 20.5 cm long, 6.9 cm wide and 4.7 cm thick. Illustration by the author. Scale 1:1.
Guidance for the Reader

Many of the quotes, together with the titles of various books, articles and periodicals mentioned in the main body of the text, were translated into English by the author. Generally accepted and standardised translations of specialised terms, e.g. of a particular type of artefact, or the title of a specific institution, organisation or historical occurrence, have been used when available. A glossary of translations has been provided below, one which includes those abbreviations used in this volume.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Swedish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC - calibrated date</td>
<td>BC - calibrated date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bc - uncalibrated date</td>
<td>bc - uncalibrated date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP - Before Present (1950)</td>
<td>BP - Before Present (1950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finn. - Finnish</td>
<td>Finn. - Finnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nw. - Norwegian</td>
<td>Nw. - Norwegian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pers. comm. - personal comment / communication</td>
<td>pers. comm. - personal comment / communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sw. - Swedish</td>
<td>Sw. - Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antikvarisk Topografiska Arkivet (ATA)</td>
<td>The Antiquarian-Topographical Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antikvitetsarkivet</td>
<td>The Antiquities Archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antikvitetskollegiet</td>
<td>The Antiquities College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antropologiska Sällskapet</td>
<td>The Anthropological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arbetarsmåbruk (Per Albin torp)</td>
<td>small working class farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bananformade dubbeleggade knivar</td>
<td>curved &amp; double-edged knives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boplats dwelling, settlement or habitation site</td>
<td>boplats dwelling, settlement or habitation site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bothnisk, nordbottnisk eller rovaniemis hacka / yxa</td>
<td>Bothnian, north-Bothnian or Rovaniemi mattock, pickaxe or axe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>djurhuvuddolk</td>
<td>animal-headed dagger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.nr. - Dianummer</td>
<td>official registration number of e.g. a document in an archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flinteggade redskap</td>
<td>slotted-edged implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fogdeborg</td>
<td>bailiff stronghold / fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fornminnesförening</td>
<td>regional antiquarian society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fångstgrop</td>
<td>pitfall trap or hunting pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fäbodvall shieling or chalet</td>
<td>fäbodvall shieling or chalet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Föreningen för norrländsk hembygdsforskning</td>
<td>Association for Norrlandian Heritage Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalstabskartan ordinance survey map</td>
<td>Generalstabskartan ordinance survey map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geografiska förbundet</td>
<td>Geographical Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grophus semi-subterranean dwelling / house foundation</td>
<td>grophus semi-subterranean dwelling / house foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Götiska förbundet</td>
<td>The Gothic Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hembygd birth place / place of origin</td>
<td>hembygd birth place / place of origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hembygdsförening heritage association</td>
<td>hembygdsförening heritage association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hembygdsråd</td>
<td>local heritage museum / parish museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hembygdsrörelsen heritage movement</td>
<td>hembygdsrörelsen heritage movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hyddobotten hut (house) foundation</td>
<td>hyddobotten hut (house) foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industriens Utredningsinstitut</td>
<td>The Research Institute of Industrial Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kokstenshög mound of cooking stones</td>
<td>kokstenshög mound of cooking stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolonat Colonial Cottages</td>
<td>Kolonat Colonial Cottages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kronomarker Crown Forest</td>
<td>Kronomarker Crown Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kronoparker Crown Parks</td>
<td>Kronoparker Crown Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kronotorp Crown Cottages</td>
<td>Kronotorp Crown Cottages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krumkiv boot-shaped knives or curved knives (of slate)</td>
<td>krumkiv boot-shaped knives or curved knives (of slate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krumryggig håleggad mejsel curved-backed chisel / gouge</td>
<td>krumryggig håleggad mejsel curved-backed chisel / gouge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish: käyräselkäinen kourutalla</td>
<td>Finnish: käyräselkäinen kourutalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kungl. Placat och Påbudh om Gamble Monumenter och antiquiteter</td>
<td>The Royal Proclamation and Decree Concerning Old Monuments and Antiquities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kungl. Vattenfallsverket</td>
<td>Royal Power Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land / landskap province</td>
<td>land / landskap province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landsantikvarie provincial antiquarian</td>
<td>landsantikvarie provincial antiquarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lägerplats camp site</td>
<td>lägerplats camp site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>län county</td>
<td>län county</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mandelformad pilspets</th>
<th>almond-shaped point or arrowhead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationalmuseet</td>
<td>The National Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nordbottnisk, bottnisk eller rovaniemihacka / yxa</td>
<td>north-Bothnian, Bothnian or Rovaniemi mattock, pickaxe or axe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordfennoskandisk fornmlid (NF)</td>
<td>Northern Fennom-Scandia (Prehistoric) Phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordiska Museet</td>
<td>The Nordic Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrbottens Järnverk (NJA)</td>
<td>The Norrbotten Iron Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrländs tidiga bebyggelse (NTB)</td>
<td>The Early Norrland Research Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordlandsundersökningar</td>
<td>Norrlandian Salvage Investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrmaniska studenternas folkbildningsförening</td>
<td>The Norrmiland Student’s Educational Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrlänings</td>
<td>Norrlandians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placat angående lappmarkernas bebyggande</td>
<td>Decree Concerning the Settlement of Lappland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primitiv yxa / mejsel</td>
<td>primitive axe, chisel or gouge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish: akeellinen kirves / talta</td>
<td>inquest concerning antiquities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rannsakningar efter antikviteter</td>
<td>National Map Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riksantikvarie</td>
<td>The Royal Antiquarian (between 1630-ca. 1938)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riksantikvarie</td>
<td>Director-General of the Raä (from ca. 1938)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riksantikvarieämbetet (Raä / RAÄ)</td>
<td>The Royal Antiquarian Office or The Office of the Royal Antiquarian (between 1630-ca. 1938)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riksantikvarieämbetet (Raä / RAÄ)</td>
<td>The Central Board of National Antiquities (between ca. 1938-1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riksantikvarieämbetet (Raä / RAÄ)</td>
<td>The National Heritage Board (after ca. 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riksarkivet</td>
<td>The National Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rombisk yxa</td>
<td>rhomb-shaped axe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rovaniem, bottnisk eller nordbottnisk hacka / yxa</td>
<td>Rovaniemi, Bothnian or north-Bothnian mattock, pickaxe or axe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simpel / enkel skafthålsyxa</td>
<td>(simple) shaft-hole axe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandinavisk- etnografiska samlingen</td>
<td>Scandinavian-Ethnographic Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skiftesverk</td>
<td>mortise and tenon wall technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skärvsten</td>
<td>fire-cracked stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skärvstenshög</td>
<td>mound of fire-cracked stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skärvstensvall</td>
<td>embankment of fire-cracked stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snedeggad spets</td>
<td>oblique-edged point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socken (sn)</td>
<td>parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spetshacka / stenhacka</td>
<td>cross-shaped and perforated mace-head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spetsnackig yxa</td>
<td>point-butted axe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalotomter</td>
<td>Stalo-foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statens Historiska Museum (SHM)</td>
<td>The State Historical Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statens kolonisationsnämnd</td>
<td>The State Colonisation Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistiska Centralbyrån (SCB)</td>
<td>The Central Office of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stenålderslokal</td>
<td>Stone Age site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stenålderslokal av Hoting-typ = skärvstensvall</td>
<td>Stone Age site of the Hoting type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strids- eller båtyxa</td>
<td>boat-shaped (battle) axe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svenska Formminnesföreningen</td>
<td>The National Antiquarian Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svenska Sällskapet för Antropologi och Geografi</td>
<td>The Swedish Anthropological and Geographical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svenska Akademien</td>
<td>The Swedish Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svenska Turistförening (STF)</td>
<td>The Swedish Tourist Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sveriges Geologiska Undersökning (SGU)</td>
<td>The Geological Survey of Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>särskilda antikvitetsintendenter</td>
<td>extraordinary antiquarian curators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tjocknackig yxa</td>
<td>thick-butted axe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>torp</td>
<td>tenant farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trädvax</td>
<td>round-butted axe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vattenfall</td>
<td>Swedish State Power Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vattenfallssamhällen</td>
<td>Waterfall Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitterhetskademien</td>
<td>The Academy of Letters (between 1753-1786)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitterhetskademien (KVHAA)</td>
<td>The Royal Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities (from 1786)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ålg</td>
<td>elk / moose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Harpoon from Lake Vibosjön, Hältingtuna parish, Hälsingland (SHM inv. 14.375), located about 3 kilometres NE of Hudiksvall and ca. 20 meters above the present day sea level. Recovered while digging a drainage ditch, it was found 6 feet below the level of the ground surface. Possibly made of moose antler, it is 26.8 cm long and 2.8 cm wide. Illustration source Ekhoff 1911:240, here modified and rendered to scale 1:1.