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Abstract

This dissertation discusses the material heritage of the German presence in Finnish Lapland during the Second World War (WWII), as seen through archaeological and multidisciplinary studies initiated by the author in 2006. Over a decade of fieldwork, the research has evolved from a purely archaeological inquiry of the WWII materialities into an interdisciplinary survey of long-term perceptions of and engagements with the ruins and finds from the WWII. Since 2014 this has taken place within the project “Lapland’s Dark Heritage: Understanding the Cultural Legacy of Northern Finland’s WWII German Materialities within Interdisciplinary Perspective”, funded by the Academy of Finland. The Nazi German presence as brothers-in-arms in northern Finland has been a debated, difficult and downplayed issue on multiple levels throughout the post-war decades. Until the past two decades there have been few historical studies on the subject, and even fewer archaeological enquiries. This study presents the first wider, problem-oriented and theoretically informed investigation about the archaeologies, materialities and heritage of the German WWII presence. However, even this work barely scratches the surface of this multifaceted subject and sets out future research directions.

The experience of WWII in Lapland was something completely different from the war experience elsewhere in Finland. The German troops held the frontal responsibility in Finnish Lapland in 1941–1944, and at the height of their military build-up there were more German troops and their multinational prisoners in the area than local inhabitants. After Finland made a cease-fire with the Soviet Union in 1944, a Finno-German Lapland War (1944–1945) broke out between the former brothers-in-arms under an increasing Soviet pressure. This ruptured the earlier friendly relations and ended with the Germans burning down most of Lapland during their retreat to Norway. It is this brief showdown of WWII in the north that has been mostly remembered and highlighted on the national level. Due to the persistent nation-level downplay of the German presence, also the northern Finnish and Sámi war experiences have become side-lined. Accordingly, the German material remains have been treated dismissively as mere “war junk” littering Lapland’s nature. However, for the local people these remains were well-known throughout the post-war decades, as active material agents of communal and familial memories, and as part of Lapland’s cultural landscapes.

This dissertation has two main focuses. Firstly, I study the Germans’ and their prisoners’ experiences in Lapland during the war through the material remains and archaeological inquiries, and secondly, the various ways in which the different stakeholders have signified and engaged with the traces of war in the post-war decades. The material traces illustrate and highlight in many
ways the experiential aspects of the German soldiers’ and their prisoners’ existence in an unfamiliar northern environment. The feeling of alienness and displacement appears to have taken many curious material and behavioural forms, as documented by the archaeological studies of the site layouts, their spatial configurations, and the material culture. The sheer number of German WWII sites in Lapland is astonishing, and only a fraction of these have so far been mapped. This is best illustrated by the increase in the number of known German-run Prisoner-of-War (PoW) and labour camps in northern Finland in little over a decade, rising from a handful of sites known in the early 2000s to the over 180 camps mapped out in this dissertation.

The post-war relations to, perceptions of, and engagements with the German material remains underline the social value of these as part of the local long-term heritage and lived-in cultural landscape. The locals’ resilient sense of place, folklore, traditional stories, belief systems and ancestral spirits all secure people into their “own lands” through the personified, corporeal landscape biographies, and the German material traces have become incorporated and embedded into this cultural continuum. Many enthusiastic locals see themselves as custodians of their “own past”, including the WWII legacy, wish to control access and engagement with the sites in their local landscape, and often feel that the (southern) authorities neglect their heritage. Thus, the traces of German presence have become one symbol of the continuing north-south confrontations, and the marginalization of the north. These issues tie in with Lapland’s long colonial history, and the Finnish State’s slowness in answering, and often even recognizing, the complex and fluctuating colonial issues, intertwined for instance with the questions of land ownership and landuse rights.

The vast differences in approaching, and engaging with, the German WWII material remains, and an inability to engage in a meaningful dialogue from the opposing perspectives, appear to derive from fundamentally different mental templates with which the people perceive the subject and its importance. The people propagating the “clearing” of “war junk” appear to approach the subject, and the landscape, with a “western” gaze, by drawing a division between “nature” and “culture” and labelling the locals’ historical cultural landscape as a natural wilderness. Conversely, in the northern environmental awareness it is not meaningful to separate between “nature” and “culture”. Instead, the landscape and its various layers form an overarching web of relations, which tie together the past, present and future into a cognitively controlled and embodied unity. It appears that the different stakeholders should come to recognize and accept the differing standpoints from which they engage into the discussions, before a fruitful dialogue can be instigated. This is one major challenge for the future discussions about the heritage value of Lapland’s WWII material legacy, and about the connected ownership and custodianship questions. These should be somehow elucidated, preferably in a common agreement with all the involved stakeholders, to allow the German and other WWII remains official recognition, heritage status and protection.
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AOK20</td>
<td>20th Mountain Army, Gebirgs-Armee-Oberkommando 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>et cetera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e.</td>
<td>id est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g.</td>
<td>exempli gratia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDF</td>
<td>Finnish Defence Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Global Positioning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSMH</td>
<td><em>Lapin sotahistoriallinen seura</em>, Lapland Society for Military History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBA</td>
<td><em>Museovirasto</em>, Finnish National Board of Antiquities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBF</td>
<td><em>Metsähallitus</em>, Finnish National Board of Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>National Museum of Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td><em>Organisation Todt</em>, a Third Reich work organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLS</td>
<td><em>Pidä Lappi Siistinä</em>, Keep Lapland Tidy, a Rovaniemi-based environmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoW</td>
<td>Prisoner-of-War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.l.</td>
<td>sine loco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, i.e. the Soviet Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWI</td>
<td>First World War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWII</td>
<td>Second World War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YLE</td>
<td><em>Yleisradio</em>, the Finnish state-owned broadcasting company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One day the old, silent Sámi man started talking. It was a calm summer evening, and I and my friends had been sitting on a sandy beach by a lake in northern Lapland, watching as the kids played in the cool water, with the rolling rocky fjells rising in the distance, and chatting casually about their reindeer and my archaeological studies (Fig. 1). The old man was indifferently fixing the roofing of a turf covered storage hut next to us. Later, after the kids had run along, I was whittling wooden chips to light a fire when the old man stooped next to me and picked up one of the whittled logs. I had not realized he had been listening to our earlier conversation, but when he started talking I understood he had actually paid close attention.

The old man began slowly and softly, with a confident tone:

“Well, you can always study things, war and other, but it is a little like this log. World is like a whole log, but what the scientists see, is like one chip of wood.”

He snapped one wooden chip off the log and dropped it into my hand, and continued, gesturing with the log to the vast, immersing fjell landscape around us:

“But it belongs to the log, to the whole. And that is how things have always been. They belong where they are, and they belong together.”

Then, without adding another word, he placed the log to the ground, turned his back to me and carried on with his work.

It is these kinds of surprising and unexpected, often even contradictory, encounters and perspectives that got me attracted in the first place to carry out an in-depth study of the German WWII material remains, and to explore their multiple meanings and significances to various people and communities, as discussed in this dissertation. To this day, I am not certain if the old man was simply stating his own perspective or criticizing what he saw as a shallow, thin view of the world that the scientists have. Still, he managed to summarize in few sentences and with a very concrete metaphor some immensely important and big issues associated with, for instance, the relational worldviews, interspatiality, agency of things, and landscape perceptions, which anthropological, archaeological and geographical theorists have spilled a lot of ink to confer in great length and with complex words (e.g. Curry 1996; Hamilakis 2017; Herva 2009, 2010, 2014; Hodder 2014; Ingold 2000, 2011; Merleau-Ponty 1962; Moshenska 2008, 2010; Relph 1976; Seamon 1979, 1984, 2000, 2012, 2013, 2014; Seamon & Sowers 2008; Tuan 1974, 1977). These and other mobility, materiality and landscape related issues lie at the heart of this dissertation.

---

1 All translations to English by the author.
The landscape setting where this unexpected discussion took place, was also appropriate for this study and accentuates how readily the memory of WWII still nowadays encircles the people in Lapland. The headquarters of several German-run Prisoner-of-War (PoW) and forced labour camps stood next to the beach where we were sitting, the surrounding scenery was once an important German logistical logging landscape, and Albert Speer, Hitler’s chief architect and Minister of Armaments and War Production, spent a night there at a lean-to during his visit to Lapland in winter 1943 (see chapter 4). Furthermore, the remains of German structures by the beach represent a hands-on example of how the WWII material remains are still around as ever-present parts of the northern people’s everyday lifeworlds.

WWII material remains were also around as part of my own childhood lifeworld in the 1980s, and had thus initially a deceiving sense of familiarity to me when I started encountering them on the archaeological surveys. The overgrown WWII trenches and airplane shelters were favoured playgrounds for the boys playing war or cowboys and indians, parents’ warned children from venturing too deep into the collapsing dugouts with harrowing ghost stories of hanged German soldiers, and there were plenty of WWII veterans around, always with hair-raising stories about fighting the “Russkies”. Besides my great-grandfather and his vivid tales of serving in the cavalry and horse-drawn artillery, another person that made a special impression on me at a young age was a former Finnish Waffen-SS veteran\(^2\) who had later become a preacher and used to travel up and down the river preaching the gospel – but still in his older days relished at demonstrating the SS “punishment jump pushups” after the sauna on the front porch.

The kind of misleading familiarity with the material traces is doubtless a key reason why WWII, and many other recent past, sites have gotten into the

---

\(^2\) About 1400 Finnish volunteers served in the Waffen-SS on the Eastern Front in 1941–1943 (e.g. Jokipii 2002).
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focus of archaeologists in Finland only in the first years of the 21st century, besides the duration of time passed since the war. For the previous generations, WWII was conceivably too close, as an integral part of their own and their parent’s life experiences. Also, the experience of WWII in Lapland was something completely different from the war experience elsewhere in Finland (e.g. Jokisipilä 2005, 2007a; Tuominen 2003). Especially the presence of Nazi German troops in northern Finland as allies against the Soviet Union has been a debated, difficult, contested and downplayed issue for decades (e.g. Tuominen 2015). Germans held the frontal responsibility of an almost 1000 km long frontline in Finnish Lapland in 1941–1944, and at the height of their military build-up there were more German troops and their multinational prisoners in the area than local inhabitants. However, after Finland signed a cease-fire treaty with the Soviet Union in 1944, a Finno-German Lapland War (1944–1945) broke out between the former brothers-in-arms, under an increasing Soviet pressure. This ruptured the earlier friendly relations on the state-level, but not necessarily on the local or personal levels, and ended with the Germans burning down most of Lapland during their retreat to Norway (e.g. Ahto 1980).

The history of WWII German relations was very little discussed especially during the Cold War (e.g. Kivimäki 2012; Otto 2008; Tuominen 2015; Westerlund 2008a:17). Still in my own schooldays in the 1980s-1990s, Finland was typically presented as an involuntary “floating log” in the torrential stream of WWII, ending accidentally side-by-side with Nazi Germany (see Löfström 2011, 2015; Soikkanen 2007). In recent years, the picture has become more nuanced (see Jokisipilä 2007b; Vehviläinen 2002), but the German presence is still a controversial issue, which provokes strong feelings in the public (e.g. Alariesto et al. 2015; Hakonen 2014; Koskinen-Koivisto & Thomas 2017; Thomas & Koskinen-Koivisto 2016; Vesa 2015). This has also affected how people continue to perceive, engage and interact with the German material remains, which are the focus of this dissertation.

This dissertation is based on five papers dealing with the material remains of the German military presence in Finnish Lapland, published by me and my colleagues in international forums. Papers I–V approach the subject from different perspectives and with various methods, ranging from the traditional archaeological surveys and excavations to netnographic (online ethnographic) analyses and ethnographic interviews, and to public online crowdsourcing. The scope and methods of each paper are briefly summarized in the table 1 (see chapter 1.2 for more in-depth discussion on them).

Lapland has a special status both nationally and internationally as a land of natural and supernatural wonders, such as the midnight sun and the Aurora Borealis (e.g. Herva 2014; Länsman 2004). Finnish Lapland is also part of Sápmi, the homeland of Europe’s only acknowledged indigenous people, the reindeer herding Sámi (Fig. 2, 3); therefore, the North Sámi names of places are given the first time I mention them. Importantly for Lapland’s reputation as a mythical, “enchanted” land, the Sámi have been perceived by outsiders as
powerful witches since the Middle Ages. On top of this, Lapland was the setting for Finland’s own fabled gold rush in the late 1800s and early 1900s, and is often presented, especially for the foreign tourists, as the “home of Santa Claus”, a magical winter wonderland (e.g. Massa & Snellman 2003; Ridanpää 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Seitsonen, Oula, Vesa-Pekka Herva, Kerri Nordqvist, Anu Herva, &amp; Sanna Seitsonen 2017. &quot;A Military Camp in the Middle of Nowhere: Mobilities, Dislocation and the Archaeology of a Second World War German Military Base in Finnish Lapland.&quot;</td>
<td>Journal of Conflict Archaeology 12(1) (online first).</td>
<td>Archaeological survey and excavation Results of the first problem-oriented archaeological excavation of a German military base in Finnish Lapland, first archaeologically documented German WWII assemblage in Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Thomas, Suzie, Oula Seitsonen, and Vesa-Pekka Herva 2016. &quot;Nazi memorabilia, dark heritage and treasure hunting as “alternative” tourism: understanding the fascination with the material remains of World War II in Northern Finland.&quot;</td>
<td>Journal of Field Archaeology 41(3): 331–343.</td>
<td>Online ethnography (netnography), preliminary interviews, media analysis, material culture and heritage studies Initial mapping of the range of public attitudes towards and engagements with the German material remains in Lapland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Herva, Vesa-Pekka, Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto, Oula Seitsonen and Suzie Thomas 2016. &quot;&quot;I have better stuff at home&quot;: treasure hunting and private collecting of World War II artefacts in Finnish Lapland.&quot;</td>
<td>World Archaeology 48(2): 267–281.</td>
<td>Ethnographic and anthropological enquiries, material culture and heritage studies Mapping the range of engagements with and attitudes towards the German WWII remains in Lapland, analysis of the war memorabilia collectors and their incentives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Original papers I–V: the used methods and scope of the papers.
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Figure 2. A rare colour photograph from 1940s of a Sámi man and children with their reindeer and a sled, somewhere in Finnish Lapland; Original caption: “sámi [sic] man and reindeer and children in a reindeer sled” (NM HK6869:7.10/ Lapland/ 1940s).

Consequently, this distant northern fringe of Europe has been presented, and abused, since the early-modern times, in the essence of colonialist Othering and marginalizing (see Herva 2014; Ridanpää 2007, 2016). However, the Nordic countries have been, and to an extent still are, notoriously sluggish in acknowledging their own colonialist pasts (Länsman 2004; Naum & Nordin 2013). For instance, Finland has been slow in answering its “Sámi-controversy” (Lehtola 2015a), recognizing its own colonialist past in Lapland, and still has not ratified the ILO 169 Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention. Also, cases of appropriation of Sámi cultural elements by others are unfortunately common, constantly recurring, and poorly understood by the Finnish public. The most visible public example of this is the continuing misuse of the traditional Sámi clothing, gákti (Fig. 2), loaded with meanings (see Heikkinen 2016a–b; Paltto 2015; Sajjets 2010; Suohpanterror 2017; Toivanen 2017, for ongoing debates in media).

The downplaying of Lapland’s WWII history and the German presence (see Herva 2014; Kivimäki 2012; Paasi 1997; Tuominen 2015), and consequently the local northern Finnish and Sámi WWII heritage represented by its material traces, echoes and intertwines in many ways with the continuing – intentional or unintentional – side-lining of the north. It is also one of the main reasons why studying these material remains from a heritage perspective is highly relevant, although not always easy. Northern people typically express strong and personal sentiments about the memory of the German presence
and its material legacy, and these issues appear to interlace intimately and subconsciously with myriad other contemporary, and past, issues (see papers I–V; chapter 5-6).

I.I Why an archaeological study of WWII?

“After all it is good that someone collects waste from the nature. Hardly any treasures to be found there.”

Website comment about our public excavations in 2016 (Ilta-Sanomat 2016)

In the early 2000s many of my archaeologist colleagues were slightly surprised and amused when I started, alongside my primary work with the prehistoric surveys, documenting archaeologically the sites of 20th century conflicts, related to the First World War (WWI, 1914-1918), Finnish Civil War (1918) and WWII (1939–1945) (see Nordqvist & Seitsonen 2007, 2009; Seitsonen 2011, 2013; Seitsonen & Kunnas 2009). They typically deemed these themes as insignificant and not that interesting for archaeological studies, beyond illustrating and recapitulating the pre-existing historical narratives, which were outwardly well-known based on the documentary records. However, this sense of familiarity is largely based on a general misconception, especially when it comes to sites such as the German ruins in Lapland’s vast wilderness areas of which hardly any historical records exist. Most of the archival material was intentionally destroyed at the end of WWII and parts of it might have ended up in the closed Soviet archives (e.g. Alftan 2005; Silvennoinen 2008; Westerlund 2008a; also papers I–II). Most importantly, archaeological, material culture and spatial approaches open previously unexplored and potentially unexpected perspectives, which can differ considerably from the views provided by the written documents or oral testimonies. These include, for instance, the glimpses into the PoW materialities and mentalities allowed by the material finds, and the human-environmental relations mirrored by the site layouts and settings (see chapter 4).

Admittedly, to begin with my own motivation in the archaeological documentation of the recent past sites that I came across was getting a respite from the monotonous mapping of dozens of Stone Age lithic find locations that we often encountered (e.g. Nordqvist & Seitsonen 2009; Seitsonen et al. 2016). However, while documenting the sites of recent conflicts at various places, first in the Karelian Isthmus, Russia (2003–2009) and little later in Lapland (from 2006), I got interested in the possibilities offered by a more in-depth archaeological study of these places and material remains. Inspired by these musings, in 2004 I managed to convince my colleagues in launching a pioneering project “Landscapes of Finnish Conflicts: Conflict Archaeological
Studies in Finland and Karelian Isthmus” (LOFC), with a wide-ranging interest in approaching the sites of past conflicts archaeologically, regardless of their type or age (e.g. Seitsonen 2004; Seitsonen & Kunnas 2009).

At the same time, there were also (to begin with subconscious) family ties at play, besides the scientific goals, that drew me especially into studying the archaeology of the Karelian Isthmus, the birth place of Finnish Stone Age research (e.g. Nordqvist et al. 2009; Uino 2003). My family’s ancestral Seitsola Village (occupied by my ancestors at least from the 16th century to 1944) lies dormant in the area ceded to the Soviet Union (USSR) after WWII. Since one of the iconic battles of Finnish Civil War in 1918 was fought by our village, at the Ahvola battlefield where also my forefathers fought, it became the scene of our first problem-oriented conflict archaeological survey in 2007 (Seitsonen et al. 2007; Seitsonen & Kunnas 2009). The family connection to the Ahvola battlefield attracted also my relatives to take part in the survey (Fig. 4). Our recent interviews with various stakeholders in Lapland have shown that also in the northern context the familial and personal links, and a general sense of heritage and landscape ownership and custodianship, appear as important incentives for studying and safeguarding the local history and cultural heritage of war for the local public (papers III-V). In relation to Lapland’s WWII heritage, I consider myself an “informed outsider”: even though the wartime ruins and exploring them have been familiar to me since my early childhood, I have spent all my adult life in the south. Still I have been visiting the north regularly through the years for work, recreation and meeting friends.

In many cases the general public was much more open and understanding towards an archaeological approach to the 20th century conflicts than my professional colleagues. The people living in, or originating from, our study areas were extremely interested in our research, especially since they often perceived it as illustrating their “own war history” long ignored by the state-level authorities and historians, especially in northern half of the country. Audiences often commented in the public lectures about our studies, that compared with the “book history”, touching the tangible, artefactual evidence made them more concretely aware of the past and forced them to meet it “face-to-face” (see paper IV). It was this positive public response that kept me going with the archaeological studies of WWII, and encouraged me to assess more closely the varying public perceptions of, and engagements with, the WWII sites. Of course, there are also opposing public opinions, for instance, some people discouraging the recollection of the German presence in Lapland (see Seitsonen & Herva 2017a), or neglecting its importance, as shown by the quote related to our public excavations in Inari (Sámi: Anár) in 2016: “After all it is good that someone collects waste from the nature. Hardly any treasures to be found there” (Ilta-Sanomat 2016). This kaleidoscopic multivocality is but one of the stimulating things related to the archaeological study of WWII materialities that keeps it so interesting.
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Archaeologies of the recent or contemporary past have these days become an internationally established subfield of archaeology (e.g. Buchli and Lucas 2001; Graves-Brown 2000; Holtorf and Piccini 2009; McAtackney & Penrose 2016; Mullins 2014; Olsen & Pétursdóttir 2014; Pétursdóttir 2016; Pétursdóttir & Olsen 2014a–b). Alongside this development, such themes as modern conflict, battlefields, institutional incarceration and other “darker” heritage themes have been drawn into the focus of archaeological inquiries (e.g. Carr 2014; Casella 2007; Dobinson et al. 1997; Gilead et al. 2009; González-Ruibal 2008; McAtackney 2014; Moshenska 2013; Myers & Moshenska 2011; Saunders 2000, 2012; Schofield 2009; Schofield et al. 2002, 2006). We have decided to call the heritage related to difficult, painful and contested themes connected to war, death and suffering in Lapland as “dark heritage”, following the concept of dark tourism coined in the tourism studies since the 1990s (see McAtackney 2013; Stone 2006). Also other labels, such as “difficult”, “contested “, “dissonant“ and “negative”, have been used to describe these kinds of legacies, but “dark heritage” has been gaining popularity in the recent years (see Carr & Corbishley 2015; McAtackney 2014; chapter 6). This concept is still developing, and dark heritage appears to be most useful as an umbrella term covering a wide range of concepts related to these themes (see Koskinen-Koivisto 2016). These include not only death and atrocities, but also other failures of (super)modernity (e.g. Gonzáles-Ruibal 2006, 2008; Harrison et al. 2016), manifested for instance by the material legacies of

Figure 4. Ilari Seitsonen and Lauri Seitsonen inspecting a machine-gun position in the former Seitsola Village during the archaeological survey of the Finnish Civil War-era Ahvola battlefield in western Russia (Oula Seitsonen 2007).
Heritage in its widest sense can be understood as “a human condition” and “a social process” (Harvey 2001:320) of preserving, and also re-forming, inherited aspects of the past that are seen as important, for instance, for the communal memory and identity in the present and curating them for the imagined future generations (e.g. Lillbroända-Annala 2014). Perceptions of heritage are nowadays recognized as fluctuating and culturally determined, instead of being translucent or universal (e.g. Harrison 2013a), and they evolve, and have always evolved, hand-in-hand with other major societal changes (e.g. Harvey 2001; see chapter 5; paper III). It is important to note, that as heritage perceptions develop through time in both the academic and public spheres, so does the extent of “darkness” of heritage defined as dark (see chapter 6). In recent years the heritage theorists have increasingly called for more democratized and multivocal readings of heritage (e.g. Enqvist 2014), instead of any single “canonised” officially defined perspective, in line with the “postcolonial politics of representation and difference” (Harrison 2013a:580). This includes realizing that there might be potentially multiple, even contradictory understandings of heritage in any community (e.g. Waterton & Smith 2010; see papers III-IV).

Heritage theorists have reminded that “communities” in themselves are complex entities, which can be constructed along various, fluid lines, and should not be approached as uniform units (Koskinen-Koivisto & Thomas 2017; Watson & Waterton 2010). They can include myriad perspectives on, for instance, what is heritage and what is its social value (see Jones 2017), some of which can differ starkly from the professional views (Koskinen-Koivisto & Thomas 2017; also paper V; chapter 6). This links closely with the complex processes of heritage creation: what eventually becomes seen as heritage and by whom, and how it is valued socially as well as economically (e.g. Fredheim & Khalaf 2016; Harrison 2013a; Harvey 2001; Jones 2017). Heritage interpretation is approached in this thesis through a relational reading, which attempts to escape the “western” Cartesian dualistic oppositions of, for instance, nature and culture (e.g. Harrison 2013a, 2015; Mlekuž 2014a–b; Seamon 2013), and instead draws on the traditional northern Finnish and Sámi way of seeing the world as an all-encompassing, fluid, and cognitively controlled unity (e.g. Herva 2014; Länsman 2004:99; Ruotsala 2002:331, 360; paper III).

Maintaining and promoting heritage is based on various forms of remembering, while, on the other hand, the memory studies suggest that the process of forgetting is “integral to remembering” (Harrison 2013a:580). This is especially important to acknowledge when dealing with complex, politically-loaded and painful matters, such as the WWII legacy, which in Lapland involves the Nazis, who are often mythicized in public through a popular culture lense (see Kingssepp 2006; Rau 2014). While heritage can at its best maintain and promote, for example, communal memories and ecologically
sustained and resilient ideals, it also runs a serious risk of “aestheticizing” the past by selectively forgetting some unpleasant and negative experiences, especially in a WWII context (Lento & Olsson 2013:24–25). This encourages acknowledging the multivocality and diversity of connected individual and communal memories and the multiplicity of cognitive relations tied to the material legacy.

Contemporary and conflict archaeologies have a vast potential to provide fresh insights especially into little discussed or ignored subaltern histories. Based on the material culture, they can highlight neglected, unspoken and silenced perspectives, which are often absent from the written and oral sources (e.g. Buchli and Lucas 2001:171; Harrison and Schofield 2009:191). In Lapland, these include the views and experiences of normal German soldiers, Germans’ PoWs and forced and slave labourers, Finnish civilians, and Sámi whose lands in Fennoscandia have been subjected to long and enduring colonization (papers I–V; also Lehtola 2012, 2015a-b, forthcoming; Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). Recent past, or (super)modernity, is characteristically impregnated by various kinds of paradoxes, juxtapositions, contradictions, ambiguities and, in general, heterogenous and messy worlds and temporalities (e.g. Augé 1995; González-Ruibal 2008, 2016; Seitsonen et al. 2017), which become especially highlighted in a complex conflict setting such as Lapland in WWII (see chapter 2).

The role of contemporary archaeology has been aptly termed as a “mediation of the past as a creative engagement with the present and future” (Harrison 2011a:160), accepting, as described by the archaeological theorist Alfredo González-Ruibal (2006:112), “that all presents are entangled with a diversity of pasts in a percolating time”. In Lapland this is shown by the myriad links that tie the WWII heritage in the local landscapes closely to various present-day issues, for instance, to the little discussed colonial past (and present) and the connected postcolonial questions (see Källén 2015; Spangen et al. 2015). These include, for instance, the land ownership disputes, and the complexities of competing landuse necessities of the traditional reindeer herding, the state-directed exploitation of Lapland’s natural resources, and the tourism (e.g. Lehtola 2015a–b; chapter 6). These are often linked to the – real or perceived – north-south confrontations and southern dominance, and shade also how the WWII material and immaterial heritage is memorialized and has become embedded into the longer cultural continuum of various local communities in Lapland (see paper II; chapters 5–6). This is manifested, for instance, by the strong feelings of heritage ownership exhibited by many people in Lapland towards the WWII German matériel (see papers III–V; chapter 5.8). Matériel refers here generally to all kinds of military material encountered in the landscape, from weapons, personal belongings and paraphernalia, to empty tins and broken pieces of porcelain and glass (e.g. Schofield et al. 2002).

In the early 2000s, the archaeologies of the recent and contemporary past and conflicts in Finland were very much in the marginal and in their infancy.
Only a handful of sites of recent conflicts had been examined by Finnish archaeologists, yet already these studies suggested on the cultural heritage potential of these localities (e.g. Adel 2009; Kauppi 1994, 2002; Koskela & Pietiläinen 2004; Lagerstedt 2008; Lagerstedt and Saari 2000; Lahelma & Sipilä 2006; Sipilä & Lahelma 2004; Taavitsainen 2012; Takala 1998). The need to conserve at least some of the 20th century conflict heritage was also becoming recognized by the heritage authorities (see paper I; Niukkanen 2009). Typically, the places suggested for protection represented WWII sites closely related to the established and commemorated “national narrative” (see Kivimäki 2012), such as the celebrated Winter War battlefields at the Raate Road (Niukkanen 2009) or the defences of the renowned Salpa Line along the eastern border (Kauppi 1994, 2002; Lagerstedt 2012). In contrast, the German WWII sites in Lapland carry a much more complicated and contested burden of history, not least since they stand out as physical testimonials of Finland fighting alongside the Nazis, and of atrocities and even war crimes that took place also on the Finnish soil (Silvennoinen 2008; Westerlund 2008a). This is still a controversial and politically-loaded issue from many perspectives (papers I–V; chapter 5; also Alariesto et al. 2015; Tuominen 2015).

Over the past decade, the studies of 20th century conflicts have become gradually more approved into the mainstream of archaeology also in Finland, and there has been an upsurge in public and professional interest (e.g. Fast 2017; Lagerstedt 2012, 2015; Taivainen 2013; Ylimaunu et al. 2013). As an example, the National Board of Forestry (NBF) now habitually documents the 20th century cultural heritage in the areas they control, and recently finished a massive survey project of state forests in 2010–2015. This resulted in discovering and documenting hundreds of WWII sites, most of them previously known only to the locals (Taivainen 2013, 2015). Besides the NBF studies, the most extensive location-specific field mapping of the German remains up to date has been carried out by local historian Kalevi Mikkonen in Rovaniemi (Sámi: Roavvenjárga) since 2012 (Mikkonen 2016). There has been a recent increase of interest in the archaeologies of WWII also in the neighbouring countries which cover parts of Sápmi, in Norway and Sweden (e.g. Axelsson & Persson 2016; Grabowski et al. 2014; Figenschau 2016; Hesjedal 2016a–b; Jasinski 2013; Jasinski et al. 2012; Kosnes & Siira 2015; Olsen & Witmore 2014; Persson 2011, 2014a-b). These studies provide comparative material for our ongoing research in Finnish Lapland, even if the Norwegian and Swedish perspectives of WWII are markedly different, and contrasting with, the Finnish one. Norway was occupied by the Germans (e.g. Stenius et al. 2011), and Sweden was outwardly neutral (e.g. Persson 2014a-b) although with close economic and other ties with Germany, whereas Finland was a Nazi co-belligerent against the Soviet Union.

I and my colleagues launched the study of German WWII sites in Lapland as part of the abovementioned project “Landscapes of Finnish Conflicts”. Before our surveys and excavations of the WWII sites, hardly any theoretically-informed or problem-oriented archaeological studies of the German presence
in Lapland had been carried out (but see Koskela & Pietiläinen 2004). For that matter, also historical studies had been relatively few and limited (but see Ahto 1980; Junila 2000; Kaila 1950; Lähteenmäki 1999; Otto 2008; Tuominen 2005; Vehviläinen 2002; Virolainen 1999; Wendisch 2006; Westerlund 2008a–b; chapter 2). In 2006, during a survey in the Muotkatunturit (Sámi: Muotkkeduottar) wilderness area in Inari (Nordqvist & Seitsonen 2009), we encountered a German WWII site, the Peltojoki (Sámi: Bealdojohka) military base and PoW camp, which then became the scene for our first excavations in 2009. Studies at the Peltojoki site (papers I-II) gave us a spark to delve deeper and deeper into the abyss presented by the material remains of the German presence in northern Finland, and from that humble, almost accidental seed grew out our ongoing, international and multidisciplinary research project “Lapland’s Dark Heritage: Understanding the Cultural Legacy of Northern Finland’s WWII German Materialities within Interdisciplinary Perspective” (henceforth LDH), funded by the Academy of Finland in 2014–2018.3

I.2 Digging into WWII in Lapland 2006–2016

“Collectors of war junk have combed every single place with the minesweepers and dug up all the more significant finds. In summer 2008 the Keep Lapland Tidy association systematically collected war junk away. Sure there still may be a few army spoon-forks to be found.”

Author Seppo Saraspää (in Kauppinen 2009)

This dissertation builds on the archaeological, anthropological and ethnological field research carried out by me and my colleagues in different parts of Lapland from 2006 to 2016, mostly in the Inari, Sodankylä (Sámi: Soađegill) and Salla regions (Fig. 3), and the analyses of that material. The order of the original papers I–V, on which this dissertation is based on, illustrates well how our research into the WWII-era German tangible and intangible heritage has proceeded over the past decade.

Personally, I have approached my work on the German WWII material remains as a kind of weaving, which is mirrored also by the structure of this dissertation. Beginning from the Peltojoki site in 2006, I started off with the lone, relatively thin threads of school history (e.g. Löfström 2011, 2014a-b, 2015) and personal experience. I firstly tangled these to the established thread of military history (e.g. Ahto 1980), and then added to that plait little by little the diversified, multi-coloured threads of existing social and microhistories (e.g. Lähteenmäki 1999; Otto 2008; Virolainen 1999; Wendisch 2006;

3 Academy of Finland, decision no. 275497.
Westerlund 2008a-b). Then, I finally started to weave my and my colleagues’ original threads of materiality, spatiality and memoriality into the others, hoping to create a sort of multi-shaded (dark) fabric of the material traces of German presence in northern Finland.

Our explorations have evolved, rather organically, from a more or less purely archaeological inquiry (papers I–II) into a wide-ranging novel and multidisciplinary enterprise (papers III–V), and the array of applied research methods mirrors this development. The lack of documentary evidence and the dearth of historical research related to the Germans in Lapland called strongly for an archaeological intervention when we first encountered the ruins of a German military base. Especially the German activities in the vast wilderness regions are poorly known from the archival sources. Since 2006 we have archaeologically surveyed and documented dozens of WWII sites, carried out more detailed mapping of a sample of these (see papers I–II; chapter 4), and excavated at several sites, also through public and community archaeological endeavours (Banks et al. 2017). Both the sparse documentary material and the archaeological studies are supplemented by the wartime photographs, for instance, in the Finnish Defence Forces’ archives (SA-kuva n.d.; see chapter 2). The rare German wartime propaganda pictures (e.g. Mabre 1943–1944) illustrate fascinatingly the German views of northern Finland (Kleemola 2014, 2016; Seitsonen et al. forthcoming), which are also mirrored by the archaeologically documented artefacts and structural remains (chapter 4; paper I–II). Available photographic material is used extensively throughout this thesis.

The various perspectives of place, time and memory appeared to best clarify by actually “being there”, by visiting the wartime sites and by discussing about them and their meaning and importance with the different stakeholders. The signifying and interpretations of the WWII materialities were approached with targeted formal and informal interviews, as well as netnographic analysis (Kozinets 2010:4) of for example discussion forum contents (paper III). I also briefly touch upon the visitor survey that LDH organized in a temporary exhibition “Wir Waren Freunde – We were friends. Encounters of Germans and Finns in Lapland 1940–1944” at the Provincial Museum of Lapland (Alariesto et al. 2015; chapter 5). Many of the discussed themes also expand the perspectives beyond the papers I–V, and will be explored in more detail in my and my colleagues’ upcoming joint publications.

The first two papers (papers I–II) assess the Germans’ and their prisoners’ materialities, mobilities, environmental experiences, and dislocation based on the archaeological analyses of the material culture and spatiality. These contribute, for instance, to the ongoing discussions on the materialities of (forced) mobility and displacement in the context of modern conflicts (e.g. Convery et al. 2014; Harrison 2011b; Jones 2005; Kuusisto-Arponen 2016; Symonds 2011; Wollentz 2017). They have also wider significance to the anthropological considerations of everyday environmental experience, movement, dwelling and building, and environmental embodiments and
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configurations (e.g. Augé 1995; Cresswell 2006; Ingold 2000, 2011; Relph 1976; Seamon 2000; Tuan 1977; Urry 2007). As a concrete example, the varying views on the past transnational heritage can throw light also on such unexpected issues as the ongoing global refugee crises, as discussed in a recent essay on the material traces of the multinational refugee flow from Russia to Lapland in 2015–2016 (Seitsonen et al. 2017; also Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017; Koskinen-Koivisto & Seitsonen forthcoming).

The three follow-up papers (papers III–V) took up from the notion how important the WWII remains are still today for numerous people, both locally and also more widely, and venture deeper into the persistent and continuing signifying of, and engagement with, the German matériel in Lapland. These material traces reach through the post-war decades as concrete, pressing and active agents of wartime, and even earlier, memories (Herva 2014; Seitsonen & Herva 2011; Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). Especially the so-called “alternative engagements”, such as militaria collecting and metal detecting, have profiled in our interviews with different stakeholders, who are often inspired by various local, familial and personal motivations, and by the experiential aspects of “treasure hunting” in the wilderness and the joy of discovery (papers III–IV).

To begin with, I present in chapter 2 a general historical background for the German WWII presence in Finnish Lapland, and raise some significant and thought-provoking themes which have been brought up during our recent studies. These include, for instance, the fact that the Finnish-Jewish soldiers were fighting alongside the Nazis as their everyday comrades-in-arms against the Russians on the northern front. Different connotations related to these themes have affected, and continue to affect, in various ways the people’s interactions with and attitudes towards the material remains. Chapter 3 illustrates the range and current state of the German ruins and matériel encountered in Lapland and discusses briefly its legal status.

In chapters 4–5 I present the results published in the original papers I–V and place them in a wider framework. I discuss in chapter 4 our pilot studies on the German and prisoner materialities and spatialities at the Peltojoki military base. Since I have been familiar with these kinds of material remains ever since my childhood, this deceiving familiarity might to some degree bias my opinions on the subject. Also, my perceptions and interpretations are influenced by a general interest in, and a love for, these and basically all the other material traces left behind by the past human activity, no matter how outwardly unremarkable or recent they are, from the earliest prehistory to yesterdays garbage (see Rathje 1979; Seitsonen et al. 2017). I am especially fascinated by how these traces illustrate the human relationships to, and behaviour with and through, their material culture, people’s embeddedness in their lived-in embodied environments, and what we can learn through the material remains about wider and more diverse issues than the specific tasks at hand. I am particularly interested in, and want to urge, the detailed documentation of the various traces of human activity, such as the WWII sites
discussed in this dissertation, before they are lost. I do not advocate any fundamental preservation, conservation or reconstruction of all the material remains, but their careful documentation and a “caressing” approach towards them (see DeSilvey 2017; Kobialka 2014; Moshenska 2015), considering the diverse stakeholders’ opinions of them and their importance. Using mobile technologies, one could, for instance, present on-site the carefully documented traces of past human activity, even after they have been eradicated and merged into the nature, with the help of augmented and virtual realities and three-dimensional modelling (see Haugstedt & Krogstie 2012). In the end of this dissertation (chapter 6) I present some ideas about how this could be achieved in the future.

We made the preliminary mapping of the Peltojoki site in 2007, funded by the NBF. However, we got funding for test excavations only in 2009, and meanwhile, in 2008, a Rovaniemi-based environmental organization Pidä Lappi Siistinä ry (“Keep Lapland Tidy”; henceforth PLS) unexpectedly and unknown to us or to any heritage authorities interfered and cleaned out all the surface finds from the Peltojoki site. This was part of their wider environmental project to keep Lapland’s wilderness areas neat, “pristine”, and appealing (see chapter 5). These “war junk collecting” activities of PLS in 2005–2010 were well-intentioned, but unfortunately ill-informed from a heritage perspective, and caused a sudden fuss and resistance, especially on a local level (papers III–IV; also Heinäaho & Rautiainen 2011; Herva 2014; Seitsonen & Herva 2017a). Activities of PLS were seen by the locals, for example in the Sodankylä and Inari regions, as a “southern” intrusion into their “own lands” (see Länsman 2004:82), and as a casual destroying of their local cultural heritage (Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017; papers III–IV). This elucidates also the concept of “southerness” from the northern Lapland perspective, since Rovaniemi is situated on the Arctic Circle, above 66 degrees north. For the people in Lapland the “south” is typically not something geographically demarcated, but instead it is defined mentally and symbolically as opposite to their “own lands” in the north (Ruotsala 2002:18). Also, from a local perspective, these “cleaning” activities were based on a major misconception, on the branding of the locals’ lived-in, embodied, ancestral cultural – and holy – landscapes, loaded with myriad meanings, as an empty, untamed “natural” wilderness by “southerners” approaching it with a biased “western” gaze (e.g. Ingold 2000; chapter 5-6) (Fig. 5).

Initially our excavations in 2009 were simply aimed at finding out what, if anything, was left behind at the Peltojoki site after the “cleaning” actions of PLS. To our delight, and contrary to author Seppo Saraspää’s cynical prediction quoted above, we located substantial subsurface deposits that were unaffected by the clearing activities, and we could concentrate on studying what the archaeologically documented finds and features might tell us about the Germans’ and their prisoners’ lives and experiences in this northern periphery. I am personally especially interested in the multitude of ways in which the WWII matériel mirrors, for instance, the military mobilities,
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The Peltojoki excavations opened also new, wider questions beyond the importance of understanding the past events and the local WWII histories, most importantly of the various associations that the German material legacy has in the present. Many conflict sites around the world have been noted to carry this kind of active legacy (e.g. González-Ruibal 2008; McAttackney 2008; Moshenska 2015). The strong local, and also national, reaction against the cleaning of “war junk” by PLS got us interested to explore the indications of the continuing local importance of these rusting remains in the backwoods. During our excavations at Peltojoki, and surveys and test excavations of several other sites in 2010-2012, it materialised how significant and ever-present the WWII remains are as an embedded part of the everyday lifeworlds for the people who live around them nowadays – and whose families in many cases lived there already during the war.

Papers III-V illustrate how the various local and other communities and stakeholders, including for example indigenous Sámi and other reindeer herding people (Fig. 2, 3b), have perceived, related to and engaged with the material remains both during and after WWII. Paper III presents our initial attempt at exploring these differing perspectives on the German legacy through a netnographic analysis (e.g. Kožinetz 2010:4) of online contents in 2013. In 2015 we launched the fieldwork of the LDH project, and paper IV takes the initial netnographic assessment further, using the data from our
interviews and discussions with different interested parties in 2015–2016. These interviews emphasize, on the one hand, the multivocality of caleidoscopic reminiscences of the locals who experienced the wartime. On the other hand, they highlight the enduring importance of the German *matériel* in the present (papers III–IV), for instance, the dynamic role the material traces play as active agents of local communal memories in remembering the war, destruction and beyond (see Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017).

We have so far carried out the most in-depth interviews about the local perspectives on the German heritage and its importance at the southernmost Sámi village in Finland, Vuotso (Sámi: Vuohčču), in northern Sodankylä, also known as the “Gateway to Sápmi” (Sami poarta) (Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). These discussions exemplify illustratively how the local viewpoints present a range of marginalized and indigenous, truly subaltern voices that differ from, and challenge, the generalized nationwide perspectives on WWII heritage and also more generally on WWII (e.g. Nyyssönen 2013; Ó Gráda 2001; Yurchuk 2012). Different people’s multivocal, yet intertwined, recollections typically revolve around the most important parts of their lived-in lifeworlds and transmit their bodily everyday environmental experiences, sense of place, spatial cognition and configuration, and embodied immersion into the world (e.g. Koskinen-Koivisto 2011; Seamon and Sowers 2008; Sääskilahti 2013; Tuan 1977). As an example, the reindeer herders’ memories typically center on herding-related topics, such as the loss of their families’ reindeer in the Lapland War. In many cases these separate remembrances have evolved together into transgenerational communal memories (Seitsonen forthcoming; Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017).

Paper V assesses the public perceptions more widely from another perspective, discussing a public conflict heritage crowdsourcing endeavour by the Finnish state-owned broadcasting company Yleisradio (YLE) in 2014. This successful crowdsourcing inspired me to launch an analogous participatory mapping endeavour in our ongoing project on 27 April 2015, the 70th anniversary of the end of Lapland War (LDH 2017). By the time of the writing, public has marked over 300 sites on the online map (Fig. 6). These will be analyzed in detail elsewhere, although I occasionally refer to the user entries in the following chapters.4

Lastly, in chapter 6 I discuss briefly the concept of “dark” heritage in the context of German presence in Lapland, as a baseline for future research, and present some possible ideas of putting this “dark” heritage into positive usages, for instance, in cultural tourism. Tourism is a vital livelihood in most parts of Lapland (Fig. 3c) (e.g. Länsmann 2004; Saarinen 2001). Somewhat paradoxically, Lapland has been a popular destination for German tourists for decades, and in fact some of the German soldiers who served there during the WWII visited recurrently in the post-war decades (M2; M17; M18).

4 All the entries are publicly available and browsable at:
https://www.grafetee.com/laplands_dark_heritage
Conceivably, the German WWII *matériel* could be applied beneficially in the cultural tourism sector. There have already been initial constructive discussions of applying the WWII heritage in the Inari municipality in tourism promotion (Suoninen 2016). These were instigated by the public excavations and community archaeological studies we carried out at a German military hospital site in Inari in summer 2016 (Banks et al. 2017; Hekkuraninen 2017), and I have been preliminarily asked to participate as a scientific advisor in this prospective heritage tourism process.

Present in the following the historical background for the existence of the German material legacy in northern Finland, and highlight some idiosyncratic features of the era, such as the close encounters between the Germans, their prisoners, and Lapland’s civilians. These have been brought up, for instance, in our interviews with different stakeholders, and illustrate well some of the absurdties and peculiarities related to the war on the Arctic front. This historical outlining is based on the published military and social histories, on ethnographic interviews of locals in different parts of Lapland – most recently carried out by us in our ongoing LDH project – and, implicitly, on the photographic evidence from different sources.

Germany and Finland have had long-lasting close cultural, economic and other relations, especially since the early 20th century (Hentilä & Hentilä 2016). For example, an Imperial German expeditionary force took part in the 1918 Finnish Civil War on the victorious White side after the country’s declaration of independence in 1917, and a German Prince was originally selected to become the King of the newly-independent state of Finland (see below). The presence of German WWII material remains in Finland has its roots in the commemorated Finno-Russian Winter War (from 30 November 1939 to 13 March 1940). The Winter War resulted in heavy territorial, economic and other losses for Finland, yet it is widely remembered and mythified as the “Miracle of Winter War” and the “105 days of glory” unifying the country’s population in a common war effort (e.g. Mäkki 2008; Paasi 1997; Tepora 2015). It also established the popular image of the Finnish underdog fighting against the massive military power of USSR, with agile and adaptable, yet severely under-equipped, ski troops ambushing motorized enemy convoys in the snow-covered wilderness (Fig. 7).

Finns are generally very fascinated by their WWII history, as manifested by constant rewriting of, typically gallant, WWII stories and histories in public media. Especially the Winter War and the military actions on the southern Karelian front form an integral part of the acknowledged “national narrative”, which has a substantial emphasis on the “real” battle fought against the Soviet Union (e.g. Kinnunen & Jokisipilä 2012; Kivimäki 2012; Paasi 1997). Even the war histories dealing specifically with Lapland have focused most often on the wider scale military and political actions and place emphasis on the Finno-German Lapland War of 1944–1945, the brief showdown of WWII in northern Finland (e.g. Ahto 1980; Hyvönen 1991; Kaila 1950; Kulju 2009, 2013). However, sometimes even the Lapland War has been side-lined. As an example, in a recently published massive historical study of “Finland’s Fateful Decisions” in WWII, written by a retired General Staff Officer (Koskimaa 2016), the northern Finnish military actions were left outside of the study, including the Lapland War: “I have delimited the Lapland War against the
Germans outside the discussion because it no longer contributed significantly to solving the fate of Finland” (Koskimaa 2016:IX).

Memory of the German wartime presence maintains an important place in the local communal and familial remembrances in various parts of Lapland, although this friendly co-existence was largely ignored in the national-level historical narratives throughout the post-war decades (see Lehtola 1994, 2015b; Sääskilahti 2013; Tuominen 2003, 2015). Over the past two decades the Finnish historians have started progressively to explore also social and micro-historical aspects related to the German presence, including the period from 1940 to 1944 when the Germans, their prisoners, and the Finnish and Sámi civilians lived as close neighbours (e.g. Aikio-Puoskari & Magga 2010; Airio 2014; Alftan 2005; Jokisipilä 2005, 2007a; Junila 2000; Korpi 2010; Lähteenmäki 1999; Postila 2002; Silvennoinen 2008; Virolainen 1999; Wendisch 2006; Westerlund 2008a–b). Finno-German co-habitation was also interestingly – and debatedly – presented in the recent exhibition at the Provincial Museum of Lapland: “Wir Waren Freunde – We were friends. Encounters of Germans and Finns in Lapland 1940–1944” (Alariesto et al. 2015; see chapter 5).

The archival material related to the German presence in Finland is extremely sparse and fragmented, since the Germans destroyed in the Lapland War, besides their military installations and civilian infrastructure, also their archives (Westerlund 2008a:22–23). Also, parts of the Finnish military
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Figure 7. Original caption: “Traces of the battle at West-Lemetti”; notice the improvised snow suits and civilian clothing (SA-kuva 4262/ Lemetti/ 01.02.1940).
headquarters’ archives were deliberately torched at the end of the war (Alftan 2005:283). This absence of organized archival sources is most likely one reason that has put the historians off from studying the era more thoroughly so far. Especially the events in wilderness areas and at the PoW camps are poorly known and rely largely on scattered Finnish liaisons officers reports (Alftan 2005), recollections of Lotta Svärd members (Finnish women’s auxiliary paramilitary organisation) and Swedish truck drivers (Westerlund 2008:43-45, 143), extremely rare PoW memoirs (Mesjentsev 2007; Molkä 2007), kaleidoscopic recollections of the local elders, and the transgenerational communal histories (see Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017; Sääskilahti 2013; also Koskinen-Koivisto & Seitsonen forthcoming).

The German perspective of the war in Lapland has been described in memoirs published by several German commanders after the war (Erfurth 1951, 1954; Hölter 1953; Kräutler & Springenschmid 1962; Rendulic 1952, 1964; Schreiber 1969). However, these present typically one-sided and military-oriented views of high-ranking officers, and leave out much of the experiential perspectives that were encountered, for instance, by the ordinary German soldiers and the PoWs. As an exception, Major Wolfgang von Hessen, who oversaw the transport operations on the Eismeerstraße (Arctic Ocean Road), published personal and open memoirs of the hardships encountered in the far north (von Hessen 1986). Incidentally, his father was the Prince of Hessen who was elected in 1918 to become the first king of the newly-independent state of Finland, but this plan collapsed with the defeat of Imperial Germany in the WWI. Also, a few coffee table books with fascinating photographs of the Arctic campaign were published during the war for the German homefront (Mabre 1943–1944), and Germans printed magazines for the soldiers, such as the Lappland-Kurier published specifically for the arctic front (e.g. Valtonen 2011; also Junila 2000; Mikkonen 2016). These books and magazine articles illustrate well the exoticism and Othering of Lapland, its people and landscapes as perceived by the Germans (chapter 4).

Rare photographic evidence of the Germans and their prisoners in Lapland was recently made publicly available through the Finnish Defence Forces photographic archives (SA-kuva n.d.), and supplements the written accounts and memoirs (see Kleemola 2014, 2016) and the archaeological studies. However, German camps were officially off-limits for the Finnish soldiers and civilians. An interesting exception to the dearth of pictorial evidence is a collection of personal photographs taken by gold panner and Laanila guest house keeper Max Peronius (Fig. 8), who worked as a translator for the Germans during the war and photographed some of their encampments. His grandson Antti Peronius has kindly given us permission for the research use of the Peronius photograph collection. However, these images mostly lack any geographic information. I managed finally in the summer 2015, for the first time, to place some of the Peronius photographs in the landscape, at a German PoW camp situated at Inari Haukkapesäoja (110; number refers to Appendices 1–2; see chapter 4).
2.1 "Arktis ist nichts": "Hermans" come to Lapland

"War has never been carried out this far north ... The area is completely unsuitable for military operations."

General Eduard Dietl (in Mann and Jörgensen 2002:70)

After the Winter War Finland deemed that a new conflict with the USSR was approaching soon in the tense world political setting, with Nazi Germany waging successful Blitzkrieg across Western Europe. In this troubled situation Finland turned to the Third Reich for military and material help (Fig. 9). In 1940 Finland gave Germany a transit permit through the country to the occupied Norway, and the Germans – or “Hermans” as the locals often recall them – started arriving for example to the Rovaniemi and Inari regions in the fall of 1940 (e.g. Mikkonen 2016:16). In early June 1941 Finland allowed the German troops to move into northern Finland as preparation for Hitler’s coming attack on the Soviet Union, Operation Barbarossa (Mann & Jörgensen 2002; Vehviläinen 2002).

---

5 “Arctic means nothing”, as stated by German General Ferdinand Schörner (Carruthers 2013:192).
German troops launched their assault on the Soviet Union on 22 June 1941, and after massive Soviet air raids targeted at several Finnish cities on 25 June, Finland joined in the attack (Soikkanen 2007). Finland’s ambition in the cooperation was to gain back the territories ceded after the Winter War, and also to pursue a dream of “Greater Finland” (e.g. Kinnunen & Jokisipilä 2012; Kivimäki 2012). The German military presence in the north allowed Finns to assemble their own troops on the southern front and to concentrate on reconquering the ceded Karelia and “liberating” the Russian Karelia, often seen as the main objectives of the Finnish war effort (Mann & Jörgensen 2002:75–76).

Although no formal alliance was signed, Finland became Germany’s close co-belligerent in the fight against the Soviet Union: the term Waffenbruderschaft (comradeship-in-arms) was typically preferred, instead of alliance (Jokisipilä 2007a). Finland tried to maintain an image of separate war efforts to the Western Allies, a distancing trend that was sustained through the Cold War until the last few decades (e.g. Herva 2014; Jokisipilä 2007a-b; Paasi 1997). Owing to continuous Soviet pressure, the United Kingdom and a handful of other countries declared war on Finland in 1941 (Fig. 10). British Foreign Minister Winston Churchill expressed his personal regrets of this to the commander-in-chief of the Finnish Defence Forces (FDF), Field Marshal Mannerheim (Mannerheim 1952:366). However, this declaration of war resulted only in a single British bombing attack on the shore of Arctic Ocean at Petsamo (Sámi: Beahcán) and the internation of some ships and their crews (e.g. Mann & Jörgensen 2002:84–85; Tovey 1948; Ziemke 1963:286).

German troops on the northern front consisted mostly of the German 20th Mountain Army (Gebirgs-Armee-Oberkommando 20, hence AOK20), commanded by the Generaloberst Eduard Dietl, and supported by Finnish soldiers, SS troops, Luftwaffe personnel, and the Organisation Todt (OT) building forces. At the peak of the German military build-up they had over 200,000 soldiers in this area populated by about 150,000 locals (Jokisipilä 2005:19; Kaltenegger 2006:169–171). However, soon after the Finno-German attack was launched in June 1941, the Germans bogged down on the roadless fells and marshlands of Lapland (Fig. 11). It became clear that even the best-trained and battle-hardened German Mountain Jaegers (Gebirgsjäger, many of them actually of Austrian origin) were unprepared for the hard field conditions and poor infrastructure of Lapland (Alftan 2005). This mirrors an ignorance and arrogance with which many Germans approached the war in the Arctic, most obvious in the well-known quote by General Ferdinand Schörner: “Arktis ist nichts” (“Arctic means nothing”; Carruthers 2013:192). On the other hand, this fulfilled General Dietl’s more cautious and cynical prophesy presented during the planning phase of the attack: “War has never been carried out this far north ... The area is completely unsuitable for military operations” (Mann and Jörgensen 2002:70). Expressively, during the Winter
Figure 9. Original caption: “The Finnish and German flags fly side by side close to the frontlines on Finnish Marshal’s birthday” (SA-kuva 98972/ Kiestinki/ 04.06.1942).

Figure 10. A wartime cartoon by the famous Finnish cartoonist Kari Suomalainen in a frontal magazine “Christmas of the 3rd Btry 1941”: “Year 1941–19… Finland, contra Russki, England, Austraalia [sic], New Zealand, South Africa, India etc…” (Suomalainen 1941; Photograph Oula Seitsonen 2016).
Figure 11. Frontlines of the Continuation and Lapland War in the north: a) The advance of the Finno-German offensive in 1941 to the stationary front-lines, (b) The major Russian offensive in south in the summer 1944, (c) Troop movements during the Lapland War in the fall 1944; dates show the advance of the Finnish troops (Illustration: Oula Seitsonen 2017).
War the Finns and Russians, familiar with the local conditions, left most of the northern front guarded by ski patrols and scattered wilderness outposts, sometimes tens of kilometres apart (Mann & Jörgensen 2002:70, 72).

The northern front became effectively stationary by the end of 1941 and remained more or less so until the fall of 1944 (Fig. 11). The inefficiency of Germans to operate in the northern forest and tundra landscapes, completely alien and intimidating lifeworlds to them, caused their Finnish co-belligerents to grow disillusioned with and even contemptuous towards them (Alftan 2005:174, 192-194; Pipping 2008 [1947]:10; Junila 2000:104–105). The contrast between the northern Waffenbrüder (brothers-in-arms) could not have been much bigger, in almost every sense, starting from their external appearance and equipment (Fig. 12).

Finnish soldiers were generally ill-equipped and relied largely on improvisation and civilian clothing, whereas they were intimately familiar with the landscapes and wilderness skills ever since their childhoods (e.g. Alftan 2005; Pipping 2008 [1947]). The often unsoldierly appearance of Finns caused some German commanders to disparage them in the beginning, but they were forced to correct their opinions soon when the assault was launched and the Finnish troops showed their competence in the demanding northern landscapes (Airio 2014:189). Conversely, the German military machine was well-equipped and well-groomed. Its martial appearance was outwardly very impressive, especially for the local civilians who were accustomed with the casual look of the Finnish troops: “That German, when he stood to attention, it was like a statue, nothing moved...” (Virolainen 1999: 93; also Alariesto et al. 2015; Mikkonen 2016). However, an envious sounding German Colonel sarcastically, yet obviously aptly, summed the fundamental difference between the brothers-in-arms: “Finns put a slice of bread into the pocket and go [to the forest], whilst for Germans you have to drag along a field kitchen” (Junila 2000:104–105).

Germans were greatly impressed by the Finnish wilderness skills, such as their seemingly “supernatural” orienteering abilities in the trackless wilderness, whereas the German troops lacked even the basic survival skills needed on the northern front, from crosscountry skiing to lighting fires (e.g. Alftan 2005:190–192). As an example, a Finnish liaison officer wrote an amused report about how the German soldiers filled backpacks with piles of unnecessary gear, such as firewood and alcohol, for a mere couple of days’ long ski patrol (Alftan 2005:196–197, 199). Furthermore, the German clothing was initially ill-adjusted to the northern conditions, which offered thriving informal business opportunities for the local civilians supplying the German soldiers with warm clothes (Airio 2014:235–236). The clothing situation improved over time and, for instance, warm Finnish civilian clothing, Lapikas skiing boots, and Swedish fur hats can be seen in the wartime photographs (e.g. Franz Repper Collection n.d.; SA-kuva n.d.).
Figure 12. Waffenbrüder: German and Finnish officers in the far north. Left: Original caption: “Amongst the German troops in Lapland” (SA-kuva 57121/ Salla/ n.d.); Right: Original caption: “Lieutenant Sopanen brewing coffee” (SA-kuva 4715/ Salla, Märkäjärvi/ 07.02.1940).

Figure 13. Passage from a German manual for winter warfare: various ways of making fire in the wilderness (Merkblatt 18a/17 1943:180–181; Photograph Oula Seitsonen 2016).
Correspondingly the German military and wilderness skills improved over time as they became adjusted to their new surroundings and conditions, and many of them became eventually adept fighters through active training programmes assisted by Finnish soldiers (Airio, 2014: 238-240; Alftan, 2005: 189). This training co-operation became concretely evident in the first excavations of German military installations in Finland, which uncovered at the Waffen-SS training grounds, next to what is now the campus of the University of Oulu, the remains of a Finnish-style dugout (Koskela and Pietiläinen 2004). This was most likely built during training exercises, guided by Finnish specialists (Ylimaunu et al. 2013). Official fighting, language and other manuals were also prepared specifically for the northern theatre (e.g. Halter 1942; Merkblatt 18a/17 1942; Merkblatt 18a/26 1944; Wehrmacht 2006 [1943]) (Fig. 13). Fascinatingly, these offered guidance for example on such irregular skills as building fake tanks out of snow (Führungsstab 1c 1944:27).

2.2 Germans, prisoners and civilians: Business as usual

"...Laplanders approached the Germans from a moneymaking perspective."

Governor Kaarle Hillilä (in Mikkonen 2016:35)

owing to Lapland’s rudimentary, and in many cases nonexistent, infrastructure (Fig. 14), large numbers of the German troops were stationed behind the frontlines, for instance, in garrisons by the northern towns of Oulu, Kemi (Sámi: Giepma), Tornio (Sámi: Duortnus) and Rovaniemi, and became entangled in myriad building, maintenance and other projects, such as, building of roads, bridges, airfields, factories and railways, woodcutting, woodworking, snow ploughing, and so on (e.g. Mikkonen 2016; Otto 2008; Westerlund 2008a). Germans had a strong need for workforce, which offered employment and moneymaking possibilities for the locals, and created an important economic boom, which coined the term “Lapland mark”, referring to the higher salaries in the north (e.g. Jonas 2012; Mikkonen 2016:34; Westerlund 2008a). The German presence also essentially introduced the monetary economy to the remotest Sámi-occupied lands (e.g. Lehtola 2012:367).

Many locals and Finnish and Swedish entrepreneurs took actively part in carrying out business with the Germans, as reminisced by many of our interviewees (F11; M2; M15; M16; M17; M18; M23). Various forms of business unfolded between the Laplanders and the Germans, from the small-scale sales of products from hunting, gathering and agriculture, to the large-scale manufacturing of prefabricated dwellings, and organising of national and
international logistics (Airio 2014:235, 250–251; Mikkonen 2016:34–35; Westerlund 2008a). This allowed also for countless Lapland children their first business experiences, for instance, by bartering and selling hunted birds and other wilderness goods to the Germans (e.g. Alariesto et al. 2015; Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017) (Fig. 15).

As one example of the larger industries, the Finnish freight company Oy Höckertin seuraajat had widespread dealings with the German troops. These ranged from conveying various goods, such as barracks, building materials, timber and firewood, to diverse services, such as washing, sewing and tailoring, and arranging female workers for German cantines, clubs and hospitals. Apparently, some of these services were somewhat dubious and resembled organized prostitution, as criticized by a Finnish liaison officer, Captain Ilander:

“I inspected the ‘cleaning ladies’ ... average age of the girl children is little over 19. Small girls that is, but ... hard-bitten, drink alcohol and smoke cigarettes like real men... – I heard yesterday again, that ‘6 bundles of meat’ are headed this way.

Salary 8:- per hour and 8 hour workday. Full maintenance, new fine barracks, exclusive bed and bed linen ... even own toilet... Can a private
company practice this kind of ‘traffic’ ... that I would call ‘white slavery’.”


Lapland’s civilians lived for nearly four years as close neighbours of the German troops and their prisoners. Mostly the relations were amicable and the locals developed close personal ties with the Germans and some PoWs (Fig. 15–16). The Germans also organized many public events to win “hearts and minds”, apparently successfully (see chapter 5.6), such as Christmas parties for the local children and other forms of charity for the poor families. For instance, in Rovaniemi General Dietl and the visiting Minister Albert Speer took part in the communal Christmas celebrations with the locals in 1943 (Alftan 2005:213–214). Presence of children around the military camps and interaction with them most likely helped also mentally the German soldiers, who longed for their own families back in Germany (paper II; Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017) (Fig. 16). There were understandably also occasional clashes, for instance, over the Germans shooting freerange reindeer and damaging personal property, and even some robberies and homicides (e.g. Alftan 2005; Jokisipilä 2005). Tension was also experienced due to the presence of Germans on the Lapland homefront: the local men serving on the eastern front were jealous of the foreigners living alongside their families, sometimes even in their own homes (Virolainen 1999:131). This brought along also darker shades of cohabitation, such as illicit love affairs, divorces, and illegitimate children, which were officially silenced for decades after the war, and caused special suffering for the children born out of these relations (Wendisch 2006; Westerlund 2011).

Especially in the more remote areas the civilians of Lapland perceived the Germans, alongside the few Finnish troops stationed in the area, as their guardians against the Soviet partisans roaming in the wilderness behind the frontlines. Soviet partisan attacks targeted the isolated civilian settlements to tie Finnish and German troops behind the front, and took the lives of nearly 200 women, children and elders in 1941–1944 (e.g. Erkkilä 2011; Martikainen 2011; Martikainen et al. 2002). To the locals’ shock these terror attacks were ignored after the war and throughout the Cold War decades, and became recognized officially only in the 1990s, after the collapse of the Soviet Union (Martikainen 2004). Still, the widespread horror caused by the partisans and the danger posed by them often still governs and haunts the memories of wartime on a local level (see Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017; Tuomaala 2008; Virolainen 1999:120–123; F1, M2–3). Partisan-related sites have come into the focus of heritage studies only recently. So far some partisan bases, such as the Petäjä-Raatelmaselkä base in Savukoski, and some battlefields have been mapped (Fig. 1:16).

Since northern Finland was extremely thinly populated, the local workers could not fulfil the Germans’ need for workforce in their widespread building and maintenance projects. Therefore, Germans utilized extensively their PoWs
Figure 15. Fruits of the bartering, Luftwaffe collar insignia, on the lapels of a Finnish boy; Original caption: “Young Finnish potato farmer exhibits his achievements (SA-kuva 48777/ Kemijärvi, Ketola/ 15.09.1941).

Figure 16. Original caption: “Motorbike (German and 2 children)” (SA-kuva 21816/ Raate Road/ 01.07.1941).
and multinational forced and slave labourers in these projects. Officially about 9000 Soviet PoWs were taken on the northern front – and an unknown number was apparently immediately shot on capture during the advance in summer 1941 (Otto 2008, forthcoming; Westerlund 2008a:62). On top of this, the Germans imported some 20 000 PoWs and labourers from the occupied areas, at least from Estonia, France, Ingria, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, and Ukraine (Airio 2014:246; Otto 2008, forthcoming; Westerlund 2008a:96–99, 146–149; F1). They established nearly two hundred PoW camps in different parts of Finland to accommodate their workforce, and camps and prisoners were regularly moved to wherever workforce was most needed (Otto 2008, forthcoming; Westerlund 2008; chapter 4).

I present in chapter 4 an updated distribution map of these camps as known by 2016 (also Appendix 1–2; see paper I, for an earlier map and list as known in 2009). The rare eyewitness reports, information gathered by the Finnish liaison officers, and local communal memories suggest that conditions in different camps varied from “tolerable” to “inhuman” (Alftan 2005:117, 122; Lähteenmäki 1999:150–151; Westerlund 2008a; also F1; F4; F11; M2; M3; M23). Finnish liaison officers in fact occasionally complained that the treatment of prisoners was “too soft-handed”, whereas at some places they were treated extremely brutally; the latter is often emphasized in the local communal memories (Alftan 2005:117, 122; Lähteenmäki 1999:148, 150; Suolahti 2015:306; Westerlund 2008a:14, 18, 40, 64–69, 85; F11; M14, M23). The German troops in the Arctic, as well as also elsewhere on the eastern front, generally disregarded and violated the articles of Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War in their handling of PoWs and forced labourers, and spent them, apparently deliberately, as starved slave workers (Westerlund 2008a:256) (Fig. 17). The official death rate in the German-run camps was around 20%, slightly lower than in the Finnish-run camps (Westerlund 2008:316). On the other hand, locally the treatment of PoWs depended largely on the camp authorities. At least some of them made a conscious attempt to keep their workforce effective and in good shape to contribute to the war effort (Westerlund 2008a:288-291), and there seems to have been occasionally also room for humanity (Alftan 2005:110–122; Arvelin 2009:20; Molka 2007:42–43; Westerlund 2008a:259).

The presence of Germans and their multinational prisoners and labourers created an unprecedented air of internationalism and modernity into the thinly populated northern periphery, and had an immense impact, for instance, on the local communal memories and physical landscapes. The German presence in Lapland had also important modernising and acculturating effects on the local infrastructure and businesses, besides being a massive military endeavour in the far north and resulting in widespread destruction, yet this side is rarely remembered (see Lehtola 1994:195, 2015b; Mikkonen 2016). As an example, many of the modern roads in Lapland trail the German-built WWII-era tracks, and the cadastral plans of several towns follow those of the German barrack villages (see Ylimaunu et al. 2013).
2.3 Of Nazis and Jews: The most unlikely brothers-in-arms

“I wipe my ass with the Iron Cross, tell that to the Germans.”

Finnish-Jewish officer Leo Skurnik, rejecting an Iron Cross (in Rautkallio 1989:222)

One of the most irrational twists in the German-Finnish Waffenbrüderschaft is, that the northern front was the only place in the world where Jewish soldiers (of the Finnish Army) fought together with the Nazis against the Russians, as comrades-in-arms (Rautkallio 1989, 1994). This illustrates well the confrontations, juxtapositions and paradoxes typical for the Supermodernity in general, and modern conflicts in particular (e.g. González-Ruibal 2008). To complement the absurdity of this situation, in the Syväri area the Finnish-Jewish soldiers serving alongside Germans founded – definitively the only – functioning military field synagogue on the German WWII fronts from Africa to the Arctic Ocean. German soldiers reportedly sometimes followed the proceedings at the synagogue and “even showed a certain respect for the Jewish service” (Rony Smolar, in Kendall 2014; Rautkallio 1989:130–132).

At the same time, and at least officially unknown to the Finnish authorities (Westerlund 2008a:155), the Germans had in Lapland one punishment camp...
(Polarstraflager) north of Inari, which was apparently used also for the Russian-Jewish PoWs caught on the northern front; historian Lars Westerlund (2008a:153–155) has suggested that it might have been at Inari Hyljelahti (24). At the moment this is the only known camp reserved for Jewish PoWs in Finland (Westerlund 2008a:153), and was interestingly also marked in our public crowdsourcing (LDH 2017).

These unbelievable-sounding contradictory relations have also been brought up in interviews. As an example, one of the collectors of SS memorabilia remarked that he is ironically, yet fittingly in the northern context, an active member in both the Veljesapu, the Finnish volunteer Waffen-SS men’s memorial association (due to a family connection to a Finnish SS man), and in the Finland-Israel Association. Quite understandably, he has decided not to tell about his other membership respectively in these societies (M23).

The “German-Jewish comradeship-in-arms”, to use Rautkallio’s (1989:124) paradoxical term, was a perplexing moral issue for the Finnish Jews already during the war, since they were familiar with the Nazi racial policies, yet did not know the whole truth. The soldiers also had persistent fears of their own and their families’ fates, expressed for instance by a rumour that circulated in 1942 that “the ships are already waiting” to transport Finnish Jews to Germany (Rautkallio 1989:126, 160, 1994). Still, the Finnish Jewish soldiers decided to carry out their military duties as required by their country in this complex situation. Reserve Captain Josef Lefko described afterwards that “[W]e were granted an incomprehensible blessing … being able to fight for our freedom and human dignity while our unarmed brethren of the same faith were destroyed…” (Rautkallio 1994:53). It must be remembered that the full scale of the horrors of Nazi concentration and death camps was revealed only at the end of the war, as an utter shock to the Finnish-Jewish soldiers and many others, and forced them to re-evaluate their own participation in the war (Rautkallio 1989:123, 159–160, 195).

Mostly the relations between the Jewish and German soldiers in Finland were “businesslike”, especially on a personal level, and even friendships were forged on the front. There were understandably also contrary attitudes shown from both sides but none of these provoked open conflicts (Rautkallio 1989:158, 1994). Some of the Finnish Jews carried out acts of astonishing intrepidity, such as Major Leo Skurnik, who served as a military doctor for both the Finnish and German troops in Kiestinki. During one especially messy rescue operation he and his men saved the lives of hundreds of Germans, and he carried singlehandedly wounded German soldiers, including SS men, “to the safety from the battlefield when the others [medics] didn’t dare” (Rautkallio 1989:141). “[A] Jewish medic willing to risk his neck to carry German SS men under enemy fire to safety...” represents a sense of professional responsibility and medical ethics beyond any norms, as Rautkallio (1994: 69) has observed. Even though Skurnik downplayed his own role in this evacuation and shrugged it off as a “young and foolish” act, the
Germans decorated him with the Iron Cross – which he refused to accept rather harsly, as shown by the quote “I wipe my ass with the Iron Cross” (Rautkallio 1994:70). The Germans took offense of this refusal and demanded Skurnik to be handed over, which his commanding officer halted quickly: “Must I hand over my best doctor?” (Rautkallio 1994:92). Besides Skurnik also two other Finnish Jews, Salomon Klass and Dina Poljakoff, were awarded the Iron Cross for acts of valour, which both of them also refused to accept (Kendall 2014; Rautkallio 1994).

There were no demands made by the Germans during the war to handover the Finnish Jewish population, even though at the same time ethnic cleansings were going on all around. The Finnish government established a firm policy against handing over Finnish Jews which also the Germans realized (see Rautkallio 1994). However, if Germany had won the war, their fate would most likely have been the same as that of the millions of murdered European Jews, Roma, homosexuals and others. Finnish Jews were included already in the plans regarding the Final Solution (Endlösung) at the Wannsee Conference of the Nazi leaders in 1942 (Rautkallio 1989, 1994).

Reichsführer Heinrich Himmler, one of the principal architects of the Nazi genocide, made two visits to Finland, the first of them to Lapland in spring 1942 (Fig. 18). During this trip, he rather grotesquely inspected in Kiestinki the SS troops who served there alongside the Finnish Jews, while at the same time the first extermination camps were set in the motion in Poland (e.g. Rautkallio 1989:173, 180). On his second trip in August, Himmler asked from

Figure 18. Original caption: "German leader Himmler on a visit in the headquarters of General Hjalmar Siilasvuo" (SA-kuva 79522/ Kananainen (nowadays in Russia)/ 27.3.1942).
the Finnish Prime Minister Jukka Ragnell in a private conversation about the “situation with the Finnish Jews”, to which Ragnell replied famously and apparently resolutely: “Wir haben keine Judenfrage” (We have no Jewish question) (Rautkallio 1989:186).

However, the Finnish State protection did not extend to all the foreign Jewish refugees and Soviet-Jewish PoWs (Ylikangas 2004). In the start of the war in the north, in 1941–1942, the Finnish Security Police Valpo co-operated closely with the German Gestapo in the Einsatzkommando Finnland, which screened for example commissars and Jews from the acquired prisoners at the central PoW camps and sentenced many of them to death (Silvennoinen 2008). At least some of the Finnish Valpo officials took apparently actively part in this (Silvennoinen 2008). Also, about ten Jewish refugees from Central Europe, five of whom had already been granted an asylum in Finland, were handed over to the Germans (Ylikangas 2004). All but one of them perished in the concentration camps, including one woman and her two small children who voluntarily joined the father of the family when he was deported; shockingly, the father was the only survivor of the Holocaust (Jakobson 1999:374; Sana 2003; Ylikangas 2004). On top of this, it has been estimated that amongst some 2500 Soviet PoWs, about 50 Jewish PoWs were transferred to German hands in prisoner exchanges (Suolahti 2015:61). Fates of the Jewish PoWs involved in these prisoner exchanges are unknown, but it is probable that many of them perished in the German PoW camps (e.g. Suolahti 2015:189, 349). Finns received in these exchanges about 2000 PoWs, mostly originating from the Finnic tribes in the Russian territory, whom they planned to use in re-settling the occupied Russian Karelia after the war (e.g. Suolahti 2015:17–18). There were also some strong anti-Semitic sentiments in Finland: as an example, the decorated Jewish doctor Leo Skurnik mentioned above had planned a career as a scientist at the University of Helsinki, but the university objected because “a Jew will never be appointed as an assistant” (Rautkallio 1989:139).

Adolf Hitler also visited in Finland in 1942, on Marshal Mannerheim’s 75th birthday. Incidentally, from this event originates the only surviving recording of Hitler speaking in his normal conversational tone, secretly recorded by a Finnish engineer (YLE 2006). The Finnish Jewish community has fascinating folklore connected to this visit, that one of their most decorated soldiers, Nathan Maischlich, stood in the honorary guard which saluted Hitler in Imatra (Rautkallio 1989:125) (Fig. 19). This is impossible to confirm anymore and might be simply a legend, but Maischlich did indeed act as a liaison officer for the Italian troops in Finland and served alongside the Germans on the northern front (Rautkallio 1989:125). At the same time as Hitler was celebrating with Mannerheim in eastern Finland, the Central Committee of the Finnish Jewish congregations, amongst other well-wishers, submitted their own birthday wishes to Mannerheim in Helsinki (Fig. 19).

While the Lapland War was still ongoing and the Germans were retreating from northern Finland, Mannerheim made an ostensibly carefully considered,
statesman-like performance and visited the Synagogue in Helsinki on Finnish Independence Day on December 6 1944, to honour the Jewish soldiers killed in the wars (Rautkallio 1989:196–197). This highlighted his own role and gave
“an understanding for the Finnish Jews and the world that their ‘rescue’ resulted from Mannerheim’s intervention”, and intentionally distanced the Finnish war efforts from the German, in the face of the expected Western denunciation of the Nazi crimes against humanity after the war (Rautkallio 1989:196–197).

In the late 1940s many Finnish Jewish soldiers, some of whom had been fighting first alongside the Germans and then against them in the Lapland War, moved to Israel to take part in the Arab–Israeli Wars: as Rautkallio has hypothesized, this might have been an act of redemption for these soldiers (Rautkallio 1989:156, 1994:72). In the post-war decades, the recollections of the handing over of European Jewish refugees and Soviet Jewish PoWs (Sana 2003; Silvennoinen 2008; Suolahti 2015), the Finno-German security police co-operation (Silvennoinen 2008), and the large-scale exchanges of prisoners between the Finns and Germans (Kallatsa 2009; Suolahti 2015) were on a national level fundamentally ignored, and have been little discussed until the last decades (see Kivimäki 2012; Löfström 2015). In that sense these issues parallel the lengthy public neglect of the Soviet partisan terror attacks against the Finnish civilians and the whole German presence in Finland.

2.4 "Ragnarök": The eve of destruction and beyond

“Memory of an eight-year-old preserves what it sees: chaotic rush of people on the road, bands of soldiers, burning houses and the ‘rain’ of burning paper – Hell that I describe with the word ... ‘Ragnarök’...”

Viktor Oja (in Rautio et al. 2004:48)

In the fall of 1944 the established local social order of the Lapland civilians, Germans and their prisoners, and Finnish soldiers came to a sudden end. A major Soviet offensive on the southern front in summer 1944 forced Finland into a ceasefire treaty with the USSR in September 1944. This treaty demanded Finns to drive out the Germans on a completely unrealistic schedule, which resulted in the Lapland War between the former brothers-in-arms, from 15 September 1944 to 27 April 1945 (Ahto 1980). In the beginning, the Finns and Germans worked together and jointly evacuated the civilians from the anticipated northern warzone (e.g. Lehtola 2003; Rautio et al. 2004) (Fig. 20–21), although especially the reindeer herders and some of their womenfolk preferred to stay behind on the trackless fjells to look after their animals (e.g. Lehtola 2003; Rautio et al. 2004). Over 70 percent of Lapland’s civilian population was moved in few weeks southwards to safety in Ostrobothnia, on the western coast of Finland, and in the neutral Sweden (e.g.

---

6 The Viking Apocalypse; quote from Rautio et al. 2004:48.
Lehtola 2003:366; Rautio et al. 2004). In western Lapland the evacuation was not carried out as systematically as in the eastern and northern parts, closer to the front, which led to spontaneous evacuation across the border-river into the Swedish side (Rautio et al. 2004:57).

In our interviews the elders – especially from Finland’s southernmost Sámi village Vuotso, where I was invited in 2010 to carry out archaeological and ethnographic work – have had relatively ambiguous memories to share of their time spent as evacuees in the south; all of them were children and teenagers in 1944 (F7; M17; M18; M19). This is typical also for the southern Finnish Karelian evacuee memoirs, where people usually tell a lot of the times preceding the evacuation, instead of the evacuation journey itself (see Savolainen 2015). However, in some recollections the memories from the evacuation period have been extremely detailed (Sääskilahti 2013). Evacuation was obviously equally traumatizing for all Lapland’s displaced people, of different backgrounds and ethnicities, and evacuated to various places in the south. As an example, Oula Näkkäläjärvi has stated that the evacuated Sámi – literally and figuratively – ‘started dying’ when they were torn away from Sápmi, due to an interplay of homesickness and lack of immunity against diseases (Lehtola 1994:138–139; 2015b). About half of the refugees were young children (Fig. 21) and the death toll was especially high amongst them (Rautio et al. 2004:131).

Figure 20. “...we girls were forced to walk our cows to Sweden. I didn’t want to go there ... It took us over 20 days. And my shoes were in tatters on the third.” (F11). Original caption: “Cattle from Sodankylä Vaalajärvi on its way towards the border” (SA-kuva 163051/Sodankylä / n.d.).
Throughout late September 1944 the Finnish and German troops played mock war, so-called “Fall Maneuver”, to please the Russians, but increasing Soviet pressure turned this conflict real by the turn of October (Vehviläinen 2002; Westerlund 2008a). The Germans, disappointed with what they saw as a betrayal by their Waffenbrüder, resorted to scorched earth tactics during their retreat to occupied Norway (Fig. 22). The destruction of strategic infrastructure was part of the German retreat from the beginning (see chapter 5.6) to slowdown the anticipated Soviet invasion of Lapland. The Germans had agreed with the Finnish troops not to proceed with this during the initial mock war, which saved for instance the town of Oulu (see Kulju 2013:58), although closer to the eastern border some villages were burnt already in this phase (e.g. Ahto 1985:109). However, after the Finnish landing behind the German lines in Tornio on September 30, German troops amplified their scorched earth tactics. In the end they burnt and destroyed besides their own military installations, matériel and archives, also effectively all public and private infrastructure within their reach, such as bridges, mile posts, culverts, livestock and private property (Ursin 1980). Especially the loss of reindeer distressed many herding families who suddenly lost the basis of their subsistence (Lehtola 1994:144-146, 167; Tuominen 2015). This is still an issue that the reindeer herders recollect (M2; M3; M16; M17; M18; M19).
The Germans also dumped in the landscape vast piles of destroyed military matériel that they could not take along during their retreat. As one example, they left thousands of bottles of alcohol by the roadsides to slow down, apparently successfully, the Russian advance (Westerlund 2008a:292). They also planted their retreat routes and the surrounding landscape with hundreds of thousands of landmines and other explosives (see below; also paper III, chapter 5).

In the fall 1944 many German soldiers had also become acquainted with the Finnish forest and tundra fighting tactics. By the end of the year German troops succeeded in the massive operation of pulling most of their troops and equipment out of Finland before the coming winter – which, luckily for them, came late that year – and with the Finnish troops hard on their heels (Mann & Jörgensen 2002:185). However, the last Germans left the easternmost end of the Lyngen-Stellung fortification line in Kilpisjärvi only on 27 April 1945, when the Red Army troops were already advancing past the Tempelhof airport in Berlin, towards the Reich Chancellery (Reichskanzlei) where Hitler committed suicide a few days later, on 30 April.

Inhabitants of Lapland started arriving back to their homeland as soon as possible, immediately after the military had cleared some of the main tracks of explosives. First reindeer herders in fact slipped northwards already while the fighting was still on (F7; M17; M18). Upon their arrival, most of the people
found their homes and property in ashes and had to start over from scratch, reconstructing their lives with whatever matériel could be salvaged.

The German retreat left vast stretches of Lapland in smouldering ruins (e.g. Ahto 1980; Kulju 2013; Mikkonen 2016): about 80–90 percent of buildings were torched in the worst affected municipalities, such as Rovaniemi, Savukoski (Sámi: Suovvaqoika), Inari and Enontekiö (Sámi: Eanodat) (Seppälä 1980:197). Changes in the built environment and infrastructure were substantial, and thus as a side-product of the destruction came an unexpected modernisation (Lehtola 1994:195, 2015b). Then again, in other places there was much less destruction: for instance, in the towns of Tornio and Kemi and the municipalities of Ranua, Karunki and Tervola less than 10 percent of the buildings were affected (e.g. Seppälä 1980:197). When the Germans met unevacuated people in the villages, they most often left their houses unburnt (e.g. Mikkonen 2016:59), but conversely, there were also opposite examples (see Rautio et al. 2004).

The wide-spread reputation that the Germans gained in Finland as “church burners” in the aftermath of the Lapland War, is mostly based on the post-war distancing from the Nazis. The German troops had orders not to destroy churches, hospitals, or buildings where the inhabitants had stayed (Mikkonen 2016:59) (Fig. 23). However, also a handful of churches and public buildings were burnt, for instance, in the uncontrolled mayhem which scorched Rovaniemi to the ground. As one example, during their retreat from Kuusamo the German Waffen-SS men hid the churchbells, dating from the 1600s, to save them from destruction or from being taken to the Soviet Union (Kulju 2013:62–63; Mäensyrjä 1959). Both the Kuusamo church and the village were torched in September 1944; it is unclear whether the retreating Germans or the pursuing Russians burnt them (Kulju 2013:62). The churchbells were recovered only in July 1959 when a German colonel Franz Schreiber, who had retreated from Kuusamo to Norway in 1944, returned there and brought a message from a German veteran where the bells were hid: third grave on the third row on the northern edge of the graveyard, half a meter deep. After six days of metal detecting by Finnish borderjaegers, the bells were located and restored to their place. According to the memoirs of SS man Johann Voss (2002; Johann Voss is a pseudonym), these churchbells were saved on the orders from an SS lieutenant, who had fallen in love with a Finnish girl in the Kuusamo church while hearing the bells ringing. This love story, besides telling of the saving of local ancient cultural heritage, also touches upon the long hushed Finno-German love affairs, deemed for decades as a taboo issue (e.g. Väyrynen 2014; Wendisch 2006; chapter 5).

However, especially the powerful imagery of the ruined capital of Lapland, Rovaniemi (Fig. 24) – burnt so thoroughly apparently partly due to an accident caused by an explosion of ammunition train (e.g. Mikkonen 2016) – has grown to epic dimensions and become iconized as symbol of the “Burning of Lapland” (e.g. Jokinen 2007:240). This has gained a lasting place in the
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Figure 23. Original caption: “Church of Muonio in the midst of burning ruins” (SA-kuva 166036/ Muonio/ 30.10.1944).

Figure 24. “Views on the roadside were mournful, villages had been burnt, only chimneys stood out ... all bridges and culverts were exploded…” (Arrela 1983:26). Original caption: “Dispatch rider on the Valtakatu.” (SA-kuva 165749/ Rovaniemi/ n.d.).
Finnish public commemorations and mythology of the War in Lapland, and effectively presented Finns as victims of the Nazi terror in the post-war perceptions (e.g. Jokisipilä 2007a-b). The dominating images of annihilation by fire and explosion appear to have an active role on the national-level as an agent in maintaining the memory of Germans in Lapland (Seitsonen & Herva 2017a). However, such strong images easily mask other, subtler and multivocal local perspectives and issues, as has been shown by our interviews with the locals around Lapland (see chapter 5; Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017).

Related to the imagery of destruction, also the real danger presented by the mines and explosives, still found yearly in the landscape, is often tapped into in the generalized memoirs of war in Lapland. A mine clearance organisation acted in northern Finland from the end of the war until 1952, and reported that by 1950 they had already cleared about 80,000 mines, 3000 bombs and over 600,000 grenades (Mikkonen 2016:67; Seppälä 1980:200). The first proper study of the deaths caused by these explosives was published only a few years ago (Virkkunen 2012, 2013): hundreds of people lost their lives and nearly 2000 were injured by the mines and other explosives in the post-war years (Virkkunen 2013). Also, large numbers of reindeer were killed in the mine explosions. German explosives present still potentially a hazard, which was also emphasized, either purposefully or subconsciously, in justifying the “war junk” clearing project of PLS in 2004–2010 (see Herva 2014; Seitsonen & Herva 2017a; chapter 5). The recent popularity of the metal detecting has

Figure 25. A wooden vaulting horse on a Soviet army gymnastics ground in the forests near Ivalo, next to a Soviet Army base occupied after the war in 1945 (Oula Seitsonen 2015).
heightened this danger, as some detectorists have actively started searching and collecting also unexploded ordnance (UXO) from the landscape. This “alternative engagement” with the German material remains caused an unfortunate fatal incident in Kemi in September 2013, when a metal detectorist was killed and another seriously injured during an improvised attempt to defuse a grenade in a private garage (chapter 5; paper III).

After the end of the war, some Soviet troops became stationed until the end of 1945 deep in the modern Finnish territory in the northern half of the country. They established several military camps, for instance, in the Inari and Kuusamo areas, and made reconnaissance trips tens of kilometres further west throughout the summer and fall of 1945 (Kulju 2014). This brief Soviet occupation of easternmost Lapland is another topic that has been practically silenced for decades (Kulju 2014). Only very recently some material traces of these post-war Soviet encampments have been located, for instance, near the village of Ivalo (Sámi: Avvâl) in Inari (Fig. 25), and in the Kuusamo area (Lagerstedt 2012).
3. German WWII material legacy in Lapland

One consequence of the decades-long national distancing and toning down of the German WWII presence in Lapland, is that the abundant German material remains lack official recognition or heritage status. The matériel in the landscape has largely been ignored, and on a national level it has typically been viewed as rubbish spoiling the “pristine” natural beauty of the Lapland wilderness. This has left the WWII sites as open prey for collectors of war memorabilia (papers III–IV). The question of the German sites’ cultural heritage status was raised only very recently, in tandem with the cleaning activities of PLS and the raised public awareness and interest sparked by these activities, and most recently, with the increasing popularity of metal detecting in Finland (see paper III, chapter 5).

3.1 From an SS officer’s club to overgrown pit toilets

“That junk needs to be cleaned from endangering people and animals and ruining the clean nature! It was just a normal Luftwaffe base, there is nothing interesting to remember, and no reason to fool around! Some barracks and rubbish, and not a single treasure for the treasure hunters.”

“War junk” activist of Pidä Lappi Siistinä about the German base in Vuotso (M4 2010)

“Isn’t this a treasure! ... I can picture in my mind’s eye how the officer’s lady friend has been coming there to the barracks.”

Local history enthusiast regarding a powder box found from the German base in Vuotso (F6 2015)

Lapland’s landscapes are littered with thousands of German WWII ruins, mostly in the wilderness areas, but also to an unexpected extent around the larger towns, as the wide-scale mapping work by Mikkonen (2016) has recently shown. However, the majority of these are characterized by inconspicuous, overgrown rubble of burnt and exploded buildings and earthworks, which most people pass by without even realising what they are, even in the more populated areas (Fig. 26). Only in a few places with more substantial remains, such as stone foundations and surface finds, do the casual passers-by notice them. Illustratively, and fittingly related to Lapland’s long-lasting fame as a magical “winter wonderland”, the touristic Santa Claus Village at the Arctic Circle, Rovaniemi, is established on top of a German
WWII Luftwaffe base, of which discreet remains can be seen right behind the souvenir shops (Fig. 27). As is typical, this WWII-link is not mentioned anywhere (see Mikkonen 2016:209). These remains, like many other WWII remains, are under constant threat by the landuse, as the Santa Claus Village is every year expanding and covering more of them (Forrest 2015). The dearth

Figure 26. Easily overlooked German barrack foundations at the center of Rovaniemi, capital of Lapland, partly destroyed by a parking lot next to a shopping center (Oula Seitsonen 2015).

Figure 27. German WWII barrack foundations immediately behind the Santa Claus Village tourist attractions at the Arctic Circle, Rovaniemi (Oula Seitsonen 2015).
of German-built constructions is to some extent explained by deliberate post-war attempts to eradicate these from the northern Finnish landscapes and townscapes (see Herva 2014; Mikkonen 2016:151; Ylimaunu et al. 2013). As an example, until 1980 the log cabin of the commander of Luftflotte 5 General Julius Schultz, which had survived the burning in 1944, stood in the center of Rovaniemi. It had served for instance as a youth hostel, but finally the city tore it down since it was seen by some as a token of the Nazi German presence and was linked to the local political disputes (see Sääskilahti 2016; chapter 5). However, there are still a few notable exceptions to the general absence of German remains in the townscapes.

Currently the most outstanding exception is a still-standing Waffen-SS officers’ club in Oulu (Herva 2014; Ylimaunu et al. 2013), representing a type example of the Nazi Heimatschutzarchitektur (Homeland architecture) (Fig. 28). Oulu escaped the destruction of the Lapland War because the Germans retreated from there already during the mock war of “Fall Maneuver”, and numerous German buildings were left behind and re-used by the FDF, for instance, as accommodation facilities and supply depots. However, practically all the other structures have been eradicated since the 1950s, and the SS Officers’ Club is the last one standing as a conspicuous part of the modern townscape. This building went through a revealing re-naming as the “Mansion of Kaleva”, referring to the Finnish national epic Kalevala and effectively covering its Nazi past, which illustrates well the Finnish post-war attitudes towards the German presence (Herva 2014; Ylimaunu et al. 2013). It served a range of functions through the years, paradoxically also as a fire station, and was re-opened recently as a rental ballroom “Alpine Chalet” (Alppimaja). A detailed historical review of the Alpine Chalet’s past, including the SS times, can be found on its website (Niskala 2016).

Besides this building, it is mostly the place names that remind of the German presence in the modern townscapes: for instance, names like “Little Berlin” are still commonplace for the German WWII garrison areas (Herva 2014; Ylimaunu et al. 2013). Fittingly, also the Alpine Chalet is situated on the Tirolintie (Tyrol Road) in the Alppila (Alpine village) district, reminiscing the Alpine Jaeger presence. There are also occasional surviving German structures in the more remote northern villages, to my knowledge at least one barrack in Vuotso, Sodankylä, and another in the centre of the Pelkosenniemi village (Fig. 29).

On the other hand, in the more remote areas some remarkably well-preserved structures can still be found. These are especially typical at wilderness sites, such as the isolated woodcutting PoW camps which were abandoned by the Germans already before the Lapland War. At these places one can find partly or fully standing log houses, some still with their roof on, partly standing barbwire fences and gates, rubbish pits and dumps full of everyday waste, overgrown pit toilets, and heaps of abandoned matériel (Fig. 30–33). Especially the surviving wooden superstructures at several sites are fascinating and internationally unique. These places with standing structures
Figure 28. The Facebook page of the rental ballroom “Alpine Chalet”, a former SS officer’s club in Oulu, a prime example of the Heimatschutzarchitektur (Alppimaja 2016).

Figure 29. Reused and remodelled German barracks in the center of the Pelkosenniemi village (Oula Seitsonen 2015).

deserve careful constructional study of their own, since their architectural documentation, beyond the general mapping and photographing, has not been possible with the resources of my own field research. At many of the more remote sites one can find also the remains of various types of furniture inside
the the buildings, such as tables, benches, shelves, bunk beds and rifle racks (Fig. 34–35; also Seitsonen & Herva 2017a: Fig. 5).

Heaps of discarded and destroyed military matériel and foundations of burnt structures can be found everywhere along the German retreat routes. At more reachable places, such as along the main roads, the sites and dumps have been real treasure troves for the “treasure hunters”, that is for the militaria collectors and the increasing numbers of metal detectorists. Based on our interviews and internet discussion forums, these are known also beyond the Finnish borders as desired sources for German WWII matériel (papers III–IV; M1; M4; M12). We have chosen to call the different actors engaging with the sites treasure hunters (Fi.: aarteenetsijä), since this is the name they themselves often use. Owing to the unclear official legal or heritage status of the WWII sites, this activity cannot be labelled “looting” (see below). Also importantly, labelling these people dismissively as “looters” would risk weakening their motivation for any potential contribution in collaborating with the academic researchers. For example, that would make it more difficult to try and approach the treasure hunters for understanding the various motivations and ontologies behind their activities (paper IV).

In my opinion, a concise effort should be taken to record the WWII sites in Lapland, and also elsewhere in Finland, to get an overarching picture of the range of material and its present stage of preservation, before the nature takes them over completely and the last standing remains are lost from view. As illustrated by the recently collapsed structures in figures 31–32, and at many other places, there has been radical deterioration in the stage of preservation of the WWII structures over the past decade (Seitsonen & Herva 2017a). This appears to be partly related to the ongoing environmental change, such as wetter winters, and is one aspect that has not been so far studied in this context at all.

Mapping the range of WWII sites would provide necessary baseline data for making decisions about their cultural heritage and social value (Jones 2017) and their need for protection. The recently finished large-scale NBF survey project has done remarkable work towards this in the state-governed forest areas in 2010–2015 (Taivainen 2013, 2015). On the other hand, the constant merging together of the objects, structures and landscape, which dissolves the boundaries between natural and cultural heritage, is again one of the fascinating and unique aspects related to these sites. This contributes to their special “aura”, as mentioned by some of our interviewees, and pondered upon in the public discussions, for instance, at the hiking internet forums (see Herva 2014; see chapter 5).

The documentation of the WWII sites could be attempted in a “caressing”, co-operative and inclusive way with volunteers, and with the support of mobile mapping applications. I make some allusions in chapter 6 to how the remains might eventually be put into positive uses, for instance in cultural tourism.
Figure 30. A German guard hut with its roof on, at a beautiful lakeside spot at Inari Nangujarvi (Oula Seitsonen 2010).

Figure 31. A PoW camp barbwire gate drooping on its hinges at Inari Sulojarvi Haukkapesaaja 1, with a PoW log house standing on the background. By 2016 this gate had fallen down (Oula Seitsonen 2010).
Figure 32. A collapsed German WWII bridge at Sodankylä Huuhkajanpääänpaistama in a sudden snow storm in early June. Still in the turn of 2000s one could drive a car over the bridge, demonstrating the greater pace of decay over the past decade (Oula Seitsonen 2016).

Figure 33. A German rubbish dump outside a PoW camp at Sodankylä Purnumukka (Oula Seitsonen 2015).
Figure 34. Remains of the narrow, roughly shaped PoW bunkbeds inside a log house frame at Inari Nangujärvi Saholompola (Oula Seitsonen 2011).

Figure 35. A table along the wall of a collapsed PoW log house at Inari Slowjärvi Haukkapesäoja 1 (Oula Seitsonen 2010).
3.2 Breaking the law? Cultural heritage and "war junk"

"...I will change the status of that German base into a ‘tentative site’, since the sites from the wars [WWII] are not protected by the law – maybe they should be in Lapland, I don’t know, maybe it could be discussed more."

Official email from a NBA authority to the author (2007)

The vast majority of Finnish 20th century conflict heritage lacks any official status or recognition at the moment. On a national level the “Ancient monuments” (Fi.: muinaismuisto), as defined and maintained by the National Board of Antiquities (NBA), are automatically protected by the Finnish Antiquities Act (295/1963). Importantly, as a potential precedent for the future, the WWI defences have been classified as “ancient monuments” by the NBA. However, only a handful of other 20th century sites are included into this category, although recently the heritage authorities have acknowledged the need to protect at least some of these (see Enqvist 2014, 2015; papers I, V). Nowadays, selected WWII sites are recognized by the NBA as “nationally important built cultural environments” (valtakunnallisesti merkittävät rakennetut kulttuuriympäristöt), which are noted in landuse and planning, but are not automatically protected. These are typically defensive structures and battlefields (e.g. Kauppi 2002; Lagerstedt 2012; Niukkanen 2009), often directly linked with the acknowledged national narrative of the battle against the USSR (Kivimäki 2012). Recently NBA added also a new, rather vague category of “other cultural heritage site” (muu kulttuuriperintökohde) into their Registry of Ancient Monuments (Muinaisjäännöskirjasto). These are sites that resemble acknowledged heritage sites, but are not automatically protected by the Antiquities Act (Enqvist 2014; paper V). This is already an advancement from the situation in 2007 when I was asked by the NBA to reclassify the Peltojoki military base as a “tentative site”. Enqvist (2014, 2015) has called for a fundamental re-evaluation of the definitions of cultural heritage in Finland, and, in tandem with that, for a more multivocal “democratized heritage discourse”.

The NBF has shown one possible way for the future, with their overarching definition of cultural heritage on the lands that they control. They acknowledge in their heritage registers all material legacy regardless of its age or type, including story sites and sacred natural localities (Taivainen 2013). Their large-scale survey of the government forest regions, directed by Jouni Taivainen (2013, 2015) in 2010–2015, recorded thousands of WWII-era structures across the country. This has also changed the other heritage authorities’ views on the abundance, variety and importance of the different kinds of WWII sites within the modern Finnish borders, and the NBA added the new “other cultural heritage site” category largely as a response to the
abundant recent past sites documented by the NBF, to acknowledge them in the national heritage listings.

Figure 36 shows the current extent of WWII features in the NBF and NBA registers: back in 2009, before the NBA 2009–2012 Salpa Line survey and the NBF 2010–2015 surveys, there were only a handful of scattered sites recorded in the whole country, including the Peltojoki base in Inari. As can be seen from this figure, the spatial distributions of sites registered by the different organisations differ considerably, which is partly explained by the fact that NBF has recorded only the sites that lie on lands controlled by them. However, there is a considerable difference in the geographical distribution of the sites on a north-south axis. The NBF recorded WWII site distribution leans towards northern Finland, and especially above the Arctic Circle, illustrating the abundance of WWII sites in these sparsely populated areas and the amount of lands controlled by the NBF. Then again, the NBA site register concentrates heavily on the south-eastern border, namely along the Salpa Line defences; however, according to the NBA officials, the entry of Lapland’s WWII sites to their register is a work in process at the time of writing, and this picture will change in future. Still, many of the WWII battlefields and military installations in the south are nowadays east of the modern-day Finno-Russian border in the ceded areas.

Gaining a general idea of the range of types of the WWII sites and structures, of their current stage of preservation, and of their social meaning and value for the various involved stakeholders (Jones 2017), is essential for making any decisions about their cultural heritage value. The current situation, based on the wide-ranging NBF surveys and other actors, including my own, more limited, yet intensive contributions, allows a starting point for this, and could be, for instance, taken further with the help of public crowdsourcing. YLE crowdsourcing for conflict heritage discussed in paper V and our LDH crowdsourcing could provide a foundation for this.

NBF has also decided, based on the rights of the landowner, that it is forbidden to dig, metal detect, or collect WWII matériel on the government controlled lands. Finnish “Everyman’s right” (Ministry of the Environment 2016) allows walking, picking berries or mushrooms and camping everywhere, but you need a permission from the landowner for digging or lighting a fire. Beyond the rights of the landowner, the ownership of WWII matériel is currently a difficult and unclear question. Finnish legislation states that all military items on Finnish territory should belong to the State and the FDF, but they have no interest in the everyday rusting, overgrown remains in the wilderness. In the case of well preserved guns, badges, insignia or other “nicer” finds, as they phrased it, the Military Museum has asked me to deliver the finds into their collections, but so far I have encountered none of those at the sites we have examined.

Altogether, the ownership question of the WWII matériel needs to be cleared, at least in some form, if any kind of protection of the sites is hoped for. Illustratively, for our field studies I always apply research permits from
Figure 36. The spatial distribution of WWII localities in cultural heritage registers: Top: in the NBF registers; Bottom: in the NBA registers (Illustration Oula Seitsonen 2016).
the NBA, NBF, FDF, local Police, local Municipality, the Sámi Parliament (Sámediggi), and also verbally from the local community. Typically, they all present documents stating that they support our research but cannot give any official licence beyond the landowner’s permission to excavate. On top of this, FDF and Police forces always advise on how to act if we stumble upon UXO – which has luckily never happened, at least so far. On an unofficial level, the ownership question is further complicated, and in fact becomes much more interesting, by the local people’s strong sense of custodianship over what they perceive rightly as their own, local heritage on their “own lands” (papers IV–V; see chapter 5–6).

There have been numerous recent incidents in Finland where metal detectorists have illicitly detected and dug at “ancient monuments” protected by the Antiquities Act, which has caused anxiousness and puzzlement amongst the heritage professionals. Signs of “treasure hunting”, metal detectorists’ “excavations” and “test pits”, are encountered at most of the easily accessible WWII sites (paper III; chapter 5). While some detectorists inform the NBA and local museums of their finds, not everybody does, especially if they feel they are acting in a grey area (see Wessman et al. 2016). Furthermore, in a couple of recent cases the municipal and private landuse has also eradicated some protected conflict sites. For example, Finnish Civil War (1918) trenches were recently destroyed by a new skiing track in the town of Lahti (Lumme 2016) and Crimean War-era (1853–1856) fortifications were levelled in Kokkola. In the latter case the private perpetrator was sentenced to pay fines of several hundred euros (Vihanta 2016).

Due to the continuing lack of official recognition, ownership or status, the WWII sites in Lapland are vulnerable to treasure hunting and other uncontrolled engagements. These issues, related to the cultural heritage status and value of the WWII material legacy, its ownership, and the landuse rights, should be somehow clarified in the future, preferably in a common agreement with all the involved stakeholders.
4. Strangers in a strange land: Germans and their prisoners in an alien Arctic landscape

Lapland was in 1940s, and still is, an alien land even for most of the southern Finnish people, not to mention the foreigners who are even more distanced from its various landforms and sceneries. For the Germans thrown in 1941 to Lapland to wage war there, this sudden encounter with an alien Arctic wilderness must have been a cultural shock causing repressive and unreal feelings of “existential outsideness” (Relph 1976; Seamon & Sowers 2008). Even if there were some similar elements to, for instance, the home-worlds of soldiers from the Alpine region, like snowy winters and forests, the differences appear to have been much stronger. Even the battle-hardened veteran Gebirgsjäger were completely unprepared for the hard realities faced in this northern periphery with, from a Central European perspective, an extremely poor infrastructure. Both the vast forests and boglands of southern and central Lapland, and the vast open tundra of the northern parts, would have appeared as threatening and unforgiving environments, especially to get acquainted with under lethal battlefield conditions.

Lapland’s image as an exotic and charmed periphery was also accentuated by both the Finnish (e.g. Hustich 1942; Suova 1943) and German propaganda (e.g. Otto 2008; Wehrmacht 2006 [1943]). As an example, the onset of Operation Barbarossa on the northernmost front in June 1941 was described by the German media in rather lyrical terms: “...the German mountain corps attacked on the icy tundra ... under the midnight sun” (Kaltenegger 2006:169). According to Müller-Wille (2007), the images of “...crystal clear polar nights, colourful northern lights, icy frost, biting cold, deep snow, wilderness experience, camaraderie, and the lone guard on the edge of the Arctic...” (von Majewski et al. 1943, quoted in Müller-Wille 2007) played an important part for the visions and understandings of German soldiers serving in Lapland.

Also the southern Finns saw, and often still see, Lapland, and especially the remote Petsamo area on the shore of Arctic Ocean, as an eccentric, mythical frontier land (see Hautala-Hirvioja 2016; Uola 2012), a ‘foreign country’ as described by archaeologist Sakari Pälsi (1931). Additionally, the indigenous Sámi people have been depicted since the early-modern times as ‘primal’ nomads and especially powerful witches (e.g. Lähteemäki 2006). This stereotypical image of wandering reindeer herders with their seasonal tent camps was reiterated, mythified and strengthened by the German WWII propaganda (see Wehrmacht 2006 [1943]:99–101). It was also evident in the 1930s–40s, and even later, Finnish travel brochures and postcards, some of them intended specifically for the German audience (e.g. Londen et al. 2007; Länsman 2004; Finnish Tourist Association n.d.; Tigerstedt n.d.). This
perspective presented the Sámi fundamentally as relics from the past, in an essence of colonialist Othering (see Herva 2014) – the “Other” with capital “O” originates from Edward Said’s (1978) seminal research on postcolonialism. This caused German soldiers sent to north expect bleak views, such as pilot Konrad Knabe described: “In our imagination we saw already the inconsolable desolation: Lapps [sic] with their skin-furnished tents and reindeer, snow and ice” (Knabe 1983:20). Many German soldiers were pleasantly surprised when they arrived in Lapland and met in the northern towns, for instance in Rovaniemi, civilized townscapes with hotels and restaurants: “Girls in flower-decorated Panama hats, airy summer dresses and tasteful high heels walked on the tidy streets. Townscape was astonishing” (Lähteenmäki 2006:82).

On the other hand, the troops were also sent outside the towns to serve on the eastern front and at the wilderness sites behind the frontlines, for example in the remote Salla, Inari, Sodankylä and Petsamo regions. There they encountered what they had been expecting: seemingly unending, threatening taiga forest and open tundra, and bogs and fjells, with scattered homesteads often tens of kilometres apart. During the short summers (thermal summer in northern Lapland lasts about two months), when the German attack was launched, the wet, boggy terrain had few negotiable routes for motorized transport, it is infested with mosquitoes, and the midnight sun stays above the horizon from the mid-April to the end of July, over seventy nights. Conversely, when the winter hits, the sun does not rise at all for about two months, and the landscape is altered by the thick snowfall, the bogs, rivers and lakes freeze to form passageways traditionally known to the locals, and the temperatures can drop below minus 40 degrees Celsius (thermal winter can last over half a year).

Mobilities of various kinds, and hindrances to them, have emerged in our survey and excavation work as an overarching framework that ties diverse perspectives together for approaching the human-environmental issues (paper II). The study of mobilities has recently emerged as a vital topic across social sciences, ranging from abstract notions that life is movement and the world is continuously unfolding and dynamically “coming into being”, to concrete questions on the fluid flows of people, things and ideas, which tie our modern world together (e.g. Beaudry & Parno 2013; Cresswell 2006; Ingold 2011; Mlekuž 2013, 2014a-b; Seamon 1979, 1984, 2013; Seitsonen et al. 2017; Urry 2000, 2007). Urry (2007:10–11) has in his research into the importance and various connotations related to mobilities, identified twelve main types of mobility, including “military mobility”. Military mobilities are linked in various ways both directly and indirectly to different kinds of military encampments, such as military bases, PoW camps and refugee camps, and the 20th century has been aptly called “the era of camps” (Löfgren 2003:245, quoted in Minca 2015:75).

In the following I assess the German military camps and matériel in Lapland, for instance, with regards to the diverse forms of mobility and expressions of dislocation and alienation. The discussion centers on our pioneering studies at the Peltojoki military base in 2006–2009 (papers I–II),
but allusions will be made also to numerous other sites that we have surveyed and excavated in subsequent field seasons. These studies will be discussed in detail in our upcoming publications (e.g. Banks et al. 2017).

4.1 Soldiers' and prisoners' places and landscapes

"Wilderness, where human foot has barely stepped, became our battle terrain. Civilization, houses, and people in normal clothes have become distant, unreal concepts to us."

German war correspondent (in Lähteenmäki 2006:84)

"We shape our buildings, and afterwards, our buildings shape us."

Winston Churchill (28 October 1943)

Most of northern Finland must have appeared as uninhabited taiga and tundra wilderness for the German troops, like the above quote from a German war correspondent illustrates. However, it was and is an ancient, centuries-old cultural landscape of the Sámi herding families, as well as the Finnish settlers, and had been for long a hub and meeting zone for cultural contact networks stretching from different directions (e.g. Lähteenmäki & Pihlaja 2005). However, the arrival of over 200 000 German troops and their 30 000 PoWs and forced labourers brought these transnational contacts to an unprecedented face-to-face level when hundreds of military bases, supply depots and PoW camps were suddenly and unexpectedly established within the locals’ everyday lifeworlds along the German supply and advance routes. The German presence also revolutionized the way mobilities and contacts were thought of and maintained in this area. Traditionally mobility had happened along natural river routes and paths traversing the fjells, bogs and forests, instead of constructed roads, and during WWII the Finnish road network was still in the process of creeping northwards. For instance, the 530 kilometers long vital artery of the north, the ‘Arctic Ocean Road’ (Eismeerstraße) connecting Rovaniemi to the shore of the Arctic Ocean at the then Finnish harbour of Liinahamari (Skolt Sámi: Lin’amraš [Tanner 1928]), was finished only about a decade before the war. It had a very limited carrying capacity and was often compromised by the weather conditions (Fig. 37). German troops supervised the construction of about 500 km of roads, nearly 200 km of railways, hundreds of bridges and culverts, and the improvement of over 1000 km of old, rudimentary roads (e.g. Korpi 2010; Westerlund 2008a) (Fig. 38).

One of the best-known examples of German-built roads is the so-called Karigasniemi Road, along which the Peltojoki base is situated. Work on the road had been initiated by the Finns in the 1930s, but was cut short by the
Figure 37. Stretch of the Eismeerstraße maintained in its wartime condition as a one-lane “museum road” by the Saariselkä fjells (Oula Seitsonen 2016).

Figure 38. Building the northernmost stretch of the Eismeerstraße. Original caption: “Near Kalastajasaarento. Men of Org. Todt build first class road. Road goes so high that there is snow in many places still in July” (SA-kuva 102489/ Litsa/ 17.07.1942).
Winter War, and the Germans finished it with the prisoners and forced labourers during the war. The dirt road sets off from Kaamanen (Sámi: Gámas), where the drivable road ended when the Germans arrived. They built there also a military airport, again with the PoW workforce; other important military airfields were established by them, for instance, at Kemi, Rovaniemi and Vuotso. The Karigasniemi Road navigates through the practically uninhabited taiga and tundra landscapes in western Inari and Utsjoki, and connects from Karigasniemi (Sámi: Gáregasnjárga) to Karasjok (Sámi: Kárásjohka) on the Norwegian side and continues to Lakselv (Sámi: Leavdnja) on the coast. The road construction aimed at facilitating the communication and transportation from the Nazi-occupied Norway to the eastern front: the German military command viewed the whole Arctic Front as one theatre of operations, basically ignoring the national borders between Finland, Norway and USSR (Otto 2008; Westerlund 2008a:29, 46).

The Peltojoki base was one of several German military encampments along the Karigasniemi Road. The PoW workforce was housed at most of these sites and moved back and forth along the road as needs arose. Locals have strong communal memories of the harsh and brutal treatment of starved prisoners working on the road, and of their punishments, hangings and shootings, and in fact often remember the road as “being founded on bodies” of the PoWs buried under the road (M2; M3; also Kallatsa 2009:20). There is practically no surviving documentary information or photographs from any of these localities, since their archives were destroyed during the retreat in 1944 (Arvelin 2009; Westerlund 2008a–b; also paper I).

The German PoW administration had in Finland one official, central PoW camp, Stalag 309 (Stammlager für Mannschaften und Unteroffizieren), at Kuolajärvi, Salla (nowadays Russia), and two other central camps on the Norwegian side, Stalag 330 at Alta (Sámi: Áltá), and Stalag 322 at Kirkkonemi (Sámi: Girkonjárga). More temporary PoW and labour camps were organized under the central Stalags. Some of the camps in Finnish Lapland were sub-camps of Stalag 322, which exemplifies how the Germans ignored the national borders in the north. The number of prisoners organized under these Stalags is poorly known, and surviving archival records offer only ephemeral glimpses into their numbers and ethnicities (Otto 2008; Westerlund 2008a:34–36, 45). Prisoners were frequently moved around, wherever there was a need for work power (Westerlund 2008a), and this dynamic use of prisoners might explain some of the dearth of archival data. However, more likely it owes to the deliberate destruction of records at the end of the war.

Illustratively, when Finnish historian Lars Westerlund started studying German PoW camps at the National Archives of Finland in 2004, he had a general idea that the Germans had some camps in northern Finland during the war (also Lähteenmäki 1999:147, 155–158), but no idea about how many and where. By 2006 he had managed to find information of a few dozen camps, but in the next few years the number of known camp localities grew tremendously
when German historian Reinhard Otto joined the search with the surviving archival materials from the German archives (Otto 2008; Westerlund 2008a-b). I compiled in an earlier listing (paper I:fig. 10.4, Appendix) altogether 95 German-run PoW and forced labour camps, based on Otto’s and Westerlund’s, Lapland Society for Military History’s (LSMH; Lapin sotahistoriallinen seura) and my own preliminary surveys, and corresponding with the situation in 2009. Since then new sites have been located annually and their number has increased markedly, mostly thanks to the large-scale surveys by the NBF in 2010–2015.

The map presented here (Fig. 39; Appendices 1–2) includes altogether 181 German-run PoW, punishment, and forced labour camps in northern Finland, as known in 2016. These have not been compiled together earlier, and the near doubling up of the known sites in a decade is fairly startling. The current listing includes all the known, locatable sites in northern half of Finland, including the central PoW camp Stalag 309, the sub-camps of Stalag 309 and Stalag 322 (Teillager, Zweilager, Nebenlager), numerous work detachments (Arbeitkommandos) (Otto 2008, n.d., forthcoming), and the OT camps. Of the sub-camps, Teillager were typically in the vicinity of the main camp, whereas Zweilager could be considerably further away (Otto 2008; Westerlund 2008a). The Arbeitkommandos were more temporary work detachments sent to wherever workforce was needed (Otto 2008; Westerlund 2008a).

Most of the camps have been located based on the local, transgenerational knowledge of the sites, which allows the best available source for many camps due to the lack of archival material. Especially the reindeer herders have an intimate acquaintance of everything in their herding landscapes (paper III). Majority of sites represent small logging camps, with a few log houses or other structures. It is difficult, and often impossible, to separate between the ruins of PoW and OT camps, since the local villagers hardly ever make a difference between the PoWs and forced labourers, often referring to them generally as “Russians”. This is illustrated by the local remembrances that some of the “PoWs” were relatively free to come and go. Our informants have described that some of the “prisoners” went on home leaves, for example to Poland and Estonia, and that some had also their wives working alongside them (M1; M17; M18; M19; M20). For instance, some Estonian couples are remembered to have been present in Vuotso (F7). These remembrances most likely relate to OT labourers. There are also interesting memories that some prisoners had in the villages little workshops which they ran by themselves, and the locals could acquire materials and services from them, often in exchange for food (F11; M1; M2; M17; M18; M19). These might also have been OT workers, or then trusted PoWs with some professional skills. Then again, a considerable number of OT workers in Lapland were Soviet PoWs, for instance, at the Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo railway some 30–35 percent of the total OT workforce (Westerlund 2008a:199). In some cases, we have been able to point out probable OT sites based on the spatial plans. Archaeological excavations might also help in this.
Figure 39. Distribution of the German-run PoW, punishment and forced labour camps in northern Finland, including the known Organisation Todt (OT) camps, as known in 2016 (Illustration Oula Seitsonen 2016). Based on the studies by: Pertti Huttunen (1990, 1995a-b), Landscapes of Finnish Conflicts (LOFC), Lapland’s Dark Heritage (LDH), Lapland Society for Military History (LSMH), National Board of Forestry (NBF), Siida, Reinhard Otto (2008, n.d., forthcoming) and Lars Westerlund (2008a). See Appendix 1 for a map with the site numbers.
Especially the numerous German-run railway building camps along the Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (*Feldbahnstrecke Hyrynsalmi–Kuusamo*) have been lacking from the earlier research (Fig. 40–41). Locally this railway project is remembered as the “Railway of Death” (*Die Todesbahn*), due to the generally harsh treatment and poor working conditions of the prisoners (Koivisto 1999). Many of the camps have been located over the past few years, for example by the NBF surveyors (e.g. Kelola-Mäkeläinen & Schultz 2010), but long stretches of this massive Nazi building project lack proper survey. There is still a lot to do along this railway line, amongst numerous other places, from an archaeological and heritage perspective. Most likely there are still more camps to be found in different parts of northern Finland – some locations are known by their wartime name, but have not been located on the field or on the maps so far (see Otto 2008, n.d.; Westerlund 2008a:Appendix 1). German historian Reinhard Otto has estimated that there might be more information in the German archives about the PoW camps in the Finnish front, than from any other part of the Eastern front owing to the stationary frontlines from 1941 to 1944, but these disorganized pieces of information have not been pieced together yet. At the moment, Otto and his colleagues are compiling an encyclopedia of all the known Wehrmacht PoW camps, including the sites in Lapland (Personal communication Reinhard Otto, 21.01.2017; Otto forthcoming).

The PoW and labour camps, like most of the other German military installations, stretch along Lapland’s main transportation routes like strings of pearls (Fig. 39–40), and illustrate well the importance of the few existing roads and railroads for military mobility and logistics. Interestingly, when compared with the German troops’ own military bases, garrisons, and supply depots, most of the PoW camps seem to have been situated relatively rationally in the northern landscape. This is probably connected to the fact that especially at the PoW logging sites the Germans worked in close contact with the Finnish forestry professionals and local horsemen, and they, intimately familiar with their surroundings, probably pointed out the best site locations in sensible spatial settings. The German military had a manual for “Instructions about Space Requirements, Construction, and Outfitting of a Prisoner of War Camp” (Otto 2008), but this was very general, and emphasized, for instance, the availability of clean water, remote but accessible location suitable for surveillance, and the importance of general hygiene and waste management.

Conversely, several of the Germans’ own encampments, for instance, at the vast Lautavaara garrison and supply depot area near Rovaniemi and many other localities, are in such soggy and topographically poor locations that locals would never have constructed at those places. This notable dissimilarity in the site locations can be linked to the phenomenological readings of human-environment relations presented, for instance, by anthropologist Tim Ingold (2000). Ingold (2000) has elaborated in his studies further philosopher Martin Heidegger’s famous notions that “[O]nly if we are capable of dwelling,
only then can we build” (Heidegger 2001 [1971]:158) since “to build is in itself already to dwell” (Heidegger 2001 [1971]:144) (also Seamon 1984, 2000). Ingold (2000) underlined that the worlds must be lived-in before they can become materialized in built forms, corresponding to architect Amos Rapoport’s (1994:488) conception that “the organisation of space cognitively precedes its material expression; settings and built environments are thought before they are built”. Thus, the irrational environmental settings of many of the German encampments likely mirrors how lost and dislocated they were upon their arrival in Lapland, and their feelings of existential outsiderseness and being severed from the place (Relph 1976; Seamon & Sowers 2008). This was also reflected on their military prowess, or rather the lack of it.
Construction of the Karigasniemi road and the PoW and military camps along it, and also elsewhere along the roads and railways, express examples of military mobility in its most concrete and straightforward sense, connecting important nodes across the German logistical landscape. However, mobilities also shape in numerous other, more subtle ways human behaviour, movement, dwelling and building, for instance, within the camps, and between and within the man-made structures and natural features connected to them, and are simultaneously shaped by them. The above-quote from Winston Churchill insightfully reminds us of this: “We shape our buildings, and afterwards, our buildings shape us”. Geographical and architectural theorist David Seamon has assessed in several of his studies (1979, 1984, 2000, 2007, 2014) how people’s everyday environmental experience is directed by their embodied understanding of their particular lifeworld, “the taken-for- granted fabric and dynamic of everyday life that largely happens automatically without conscious attention or deliberate plan” (Seamon 2006:55; also Husserl 1970 [1936]:103pp; Schutz & Luckmann 1973:3). This concept is based on the phenomenological studies of especially Heidegger (2001 [1971]) and Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1962), and emphasizes that the lived body, our “primary means of being in, experiencing and encountering the world” (Seamon 2014:205), is inseparably immersed in and intertwined with place (e.g. Ingold 2000; Seamon 2013). Thus, the human bodies and places “interanimate each other” (Casey 2009:327) and the human “perception is ‘woven’ into the landscape” (Mlekuz 2014b:14). This phenomenological reading also renders
meaningless some of the common “western” binary, Cartesian dichotomies, such as the divides between nature/culture, subject/object, people/world or natural/supernatural (e.g. Herva 2010, 2014; Ingold 2000, 2011; Mlekuž 2014a–b; Seamon 2013; also papers II–III). Importantly, these notions correspond closely with the traditional Finnish and Sámi cosmologies and environmental perceptions, which are in fact characterized by all-embracing relational worldviews (see Herva 2014; Ingold 2000; Länsman 2004:99; Ruotsala 2002:331, 360; chapter 1). This also has importance for assessing the present-day perceptions of and engagements with the WWII remains, as discussed in chapter 5 (also papers III–IV).

In his seminal research, Seamon (1979) came up with three themes, which appear to capture the essential core of people’s everyday environmental experience: movement, rest and encounter (also Seamon 2006:55, 2013). Seamon highlighted in his research two corporeal ensembles providing to these: 1) **body-routines**, sets of coordinated and integrated gestures and actions aiming towards a specific, habitual aim or task at hand, such as driving, cooking, or washing, and 2) **time-space routines**, sets of more or less habitual and recurring bodily actions that extend through extensive portions of time and space (Seamon 2006, 2013). In a PoW camp setting, such as at Peltojoki, the latter could include going to stand on guard, escorting the prisoners to work, or supervising them at work. When different individual’s regular, corporeal time-space routines fuse together, they contribute collectively to the environmental and spatial dynamics of place-making, dubbed by Seamon (2006:57) as a **place ballet**, “an interaction of individual bodily routines rooted in a particular environment” (Seamon 2013:206). These views are in line with the perspective that people are “distributed beings”, and their agency is spread out and maintained in time-space through the material remains of their past or ongoing place ballets (Herva 2014; Gell 1998; Strathern 1988).

Significantly, all of the above can be assessed, to an extent, based on the past material traces, the structures and things encountered during the archaeological studies. In the archaeological contexts, these place ballets, or “choreographies of existence” (Pred 1977), appear as the traces of “different ‘temporalities’ … ‘collapsed’ into landscape” (Mlekuž 2014a:8; also Ingold 2000; Mlekuž 2013). Thus, “...landscape is time materializing: landscapes, like time, never stand still“ (Bender 2002:103; also Mlekuž 2014a). Time-geography, developed by Torsten Hägerstrand (1970) and his peers, allows a powerful, theoretically-informed conceptual framework for approaching the past mobility through the accessibility potential (e.g. Hägerstrand 1973, 1975, 1989, Miller 1991, 2005, Pred 1977, 1990). It builds on the empirical constraints and possibilities of human movement. For instance, all human activity unfolds in space and time, and all present and future acts are based, preceded and directed by earlier spatio-temporal acts (Hägerstrand 1970; Ingold 1993; Seitsonen et al. 2014). These can be approached, for instance, with the “potential path areas” which illustrate the latent accessibility from a certain starting point within a specified time-budget, and cumulatively these
potential accessibilities form a “potential path field” (Hägerstrand 1970; Mlekuž 2013, 2014a–b; Seitsonen et al. 2014). As an example, all structures, such as buildings, paths, rubbish pits, fences and so on, documented at the military encampments, direct, guide and limit the latent accessibility and the potential path fields within these sites, contribute to the place ballet, and control the potential for movement, rest, and encounter, for example between the guards and prisoners at the PoW camps.

The spatiality of German sites in Lapland varies considerably from place to place and illustrates different kinds of environmental perceptions based on, for instance, the placement of sites, their configuration related to the surrounding landscape, and their internal spatial organization, all of which provided for, guided and shaped the local place ballets. Very few of the camps that we have documented conform to any stereotypical notions of military camps planned in a gridded “Prussian order”, and instead most of them merge relatively organically into the surrounding wilderness landscape (Fig. 42). This is the case also with the Peltojoki military base and PoW camp (Fig. 43). There are even more extreme examples than Peltojoki, and some sites appear so scattered and haphazard, especially some remote logging camps, that they would be hardly recognisable as military encampments, if there were no finds or communal memories related to the WWII German presence.

Despite the lack of formal spatial configuration, the German sites appear to have had clear internal divisions into well-defined activity areas, as mirrored by different types of structures and find distributions, and also by
the treatment of various kinds of waste (see below). One of our informants had visited the Peltojoki base as a child with his mother on a cloudberry-picking trip, possibly in 1943, and his remembrances indicate that there were many more structures at the site than witnessed by the traces nowadays visible to the surface. For example, he remembered that around the kitchen and animal shelter were several light-weight kammi-like structures, that is
turf-covered, low, and roughly conical huts (Fig. 44); according to him one of them was a sauna used by the German soldiers. These were probably yurt-shaped cardboard or plywood tents, manufactured by the Finnish woodcraft industry, and insulated with turf. Fragmented, vague stone and concrete features documented in this area might relate to these, originating possibly from the stove-structures inside the tents. Based on the archaeological studies it was impossible to point out any specific area used for the PoW accommodation. Local folklore claims that “about 200 Russians” were “stored in the ground- cellars” (M3; also Arvelin 2009). However, it is plausible that the PoWs might have been accommodated in plywood or cardboard tents, for instance in the northwestern portion of the camp (near the rubbish pits S4 and S27 in Fig. 43), based on the probable stove foundations in that area.

Altogether, it seems that each German camp commandant had a relative freedom in designing the location and internal division of their “own” camps (see Otto 2008). At some sites also more regular and geometric plans are evident, for instance, in the vicinity of the northern towns (see Mikkonen 2016; Seitsonen & Herva 2017a; Ylimaunu et al. 2013). Interestingly, some of the most orderly and gridded PoW camps seem to be situated at more isolated locations. These represent typically lonely logging camps situated far in the wilderness. At these remote places the orderly site layouts perhaps mirrored a conscious attempt to “culture” the camp area (see Herva et al. 2011), inhabited by the German guards and their prisoners, and to draw a clear border towards the surrounding, “untamed” wilderness, probably felt as intimidating by both. Fascinatingly, in many of these cases, such as at Inari Nangujärvi

Figure 44. Original caption: "dwelling [sic] of the forester Kustu Vähäsarja, turf kammi; picture taken from the north” (NM SUK516:141/ Nuorgam, Pulmankijärvi, Utsjoki/ Niilo Valonen/ 1955).
Saiholompola (6) and at Salla Palojärvi (120) (Fig. 45), there appears to have been no barbwire, guard towers or other stereotypical prison camp-like elements limiting the movement of PoWs. Of course, the prisoner mobility could have been confined by verbal orders and emphasized by the armed guards, or perhaps the surrounding wilderness was seen as adequate to deflect escape attempts. For instance, at Peltojoki there is practically nowhere to run to except tens of kilometres of uninhabited and unforgiving fjells. This kind of setting might also have eroded the military hierarchies and promoted some
sense of camaradie across the guard-prisoner divisions, as both of them might have felt as confined by the surrounding wilderness (see Olsen & Witmore 2014). These potentially more informal interactions between the prisoners and guards might have gotten unexpected material representations, as suggested by some PoW-related finds from the excavations (see below; also Grabowski et al. 2014).

The fencing systems of German camps in Finland seem to have varied greatly. Some of the Germans’ own encampments were well-secured behind the barbwire, for instance, near villages and towns, whereas at other places even PoW camps had absolutely no fencing, or just parts of the camp had barbwire. For example, at Solojärvi Haukkapesäöja 2 (110) only the rear of the PoW/forced labourer accommodation seems to have been fenced. Equally, the Peltojoki base appears to have been “symbolically” fenced off along the roadside on the eastern edge of the camp in a “facade”-like fashion, as evidenced by the row of 45 post stumps and a single standing post (Fig. 43:S15). Barbwire, if it was used in the fencing, was apparently collected from Peltojoki after the war, analogous to many other camps. Practically all the useful bits and pieces of matériel were carefully collected during the reconstruction period, and even whole log houses were moved, for example from Inari Kankiniemi (15). At Kankiniemi also a considerable barbwire fencing had tightly surrounded the PoW compound, later collected by the locals (Fig. 46). As another example, at Sodankylä Purnumukka (39) (Sámi: Burdnomohkkii) the PoW compound was encircled with a double barbwire fence (Fig. 47). This site illustrates also a remote camp with a relatively

Figure 46. Rolls of barbwire collected by our informant’s (M15) father from the Inari Kankiniemi PoW camp after the war, intended for fencing off fields but never used (Oula Seitsonen 2015).
carefully ordered layout of the PoW tent placements sunken deeply into the ground, and watched over from outside the fence by scattered guard tents not sunken into the ground.

Barbwire is widely recognised as the most archetypical metaphor of 20th century incarceration (e.g. Razac 2003). It acts simultaneously as a static and dynamic element in the carceral spatiality and marks a visually permeable perimeter, typically surveilled by the panoptic gaze (Bentham 1843; Foucault 1977) of the guards from the outside. Barbwire also actively repels the incarcerated from entering the outside world and the outer world from approaching them (Razac 2003:54–55), which might have also served the purpose of providing the German soldiers psychological sense of safety and control in the remote camps.
Building a symbolic façade for a military encampment might seem at first glance like an absurd idea, but in fact it agrees with some other peculiar features documented at the German sites in Lapland. These appear related, in one way or another, to the general sense of dislocation and placelessness experienced by the Germans and their prisoners, and the spatial and material impacts of this (see below). For example, the footpaths were in many places neatly lined with cobbles, such as at Inari Kankiniemi, at several sites around Lautavaara, Rovaniemi, and at Vuotso Kolonnenhof. This seems to have been a common German custom, and might have been aimed again at domesticating the camp area from the surrounding backwoods. At Kankiniemi also the bases of some pine trees, situated next to what might have been the officer’s accommodations, were decorated with cobblestone structures in a curious garden-like fashion at this faraway site deep in the forest (Fig. 48). Analogous to the gridded layouts of some remote wilderness camps, both the stone-lined tracks and “gardening” observed at Kankiniemi most likely relate to symbolically domesticating and civilizing the wild surroundings and creating a sense of at-homeness (e.g. Relph 1976; Seamon 2014).

Another example of a seemingly useless feature in a PoW camp setting is a “moat” documented at the site of Inari Martinkotajärvi (Fig. 49). This is situated within the barbwire fence of a larger PoW camp compound, and wards off three barracks north of it, used for accommodating the PoWs, whereas the buildings on the southern side of the moat, towards the entrance to the camp,
might have been inhabited by the guards or trustworthy prisoners. However, this moat seems to have had no practical use, and could in fact have been used for hiding within the camp by any inmates who might have planned to escape. However, if placed within the wider framework of dislocation and power relations between guards and prisoners, the moat might have acted as a rather powerful and symbolic visual reminder of being incarcerated and cut off from the world for the PoWs who were lead behind it. Accordingly, the hollowed-out tent placements at Purnumukka, besides providing potential insulation and facilitating surveillance between the sunken tents, might have served a similar purpose, with the prisoner getting a feeling that he is descending into the “bowels of the earth” within a strong double barbwire fencing (Fig. 47), and being totally severed from the outside world.

Further north from the prisoner barrack foundations at Martinkotajärvi, is also a PoW mass grave (Fig. 49). It is accessed along a narrow footpath that runs behind the camp between two large boulders standing in a gate-like setting. At least nowadays this feeling is further emphasized by two Orthodox crosses standing on both sides of the path (Fig. 49, inset). These might have been there already during the war, since the graves of Russian PoW were typically marked with Orthodox crosses at the time.
Figure 50. German barracks somewhere in Lapland, possibly around Tankavaara (Max Peronius 1941–1944).

Figure 51. Extremely rare shots from inside a German-run PoW camp, liberated by the Finnish and Soviet troops that met at Ivalo in November 1944, and showing also the interior of a PoW cardboard tent. Notice the famished condition of the inspected PoW on the left, and the makeshift footwear of the PoW standing on the right. Original caption for both photographs: “Finnish doctor inspects and brings medicine to a Russian second lieutnants’ camp taken over from the Germans (Prison camp was near Ivalo)” (Left: SA-kuva 166357/ Ivalo/ 06.11.1944; Right: SA-kuva 166358/ Ivalo/ 06.11.1944).
Prefabricated barracks and tents have been mentioned as typical forms of accommodation at the German WWII camps (Fig. 50–51). For example, the sand-banked barrack foundations at Peltojoki fit the size of barracks that were sold to the AOK20 by the Finnish entrepreneurs. These sales offered a lucrative business for the Finnish woodcraft industry during the war, and this provisioning of tents and barracks essentially enabled sustaining of the Nazi war effort in the Arctic (Westerlund 2008a; paper II). Upon their arrival, the German troops lacked any suitable accommodations for both themselves and the prisoners. Besides the prefabricated buildings, also remains of log houses and kota-like structures (kota is the Finnish name for a tepee-like Sámi tent; in Sámi goahti or lávvu, depending on the structural detail) built on the spot are encountered at the sites. In fact, these kinds of log-built constructions provided in the northern environments relatively adequate accommodations (Fig. 30–31, 34–35), analogous to the local indigenous building tradition (see Banks 2011), and suggest relative adaptation to the northern conditions. Remains of saunas and outside cooking kota-structures documented at many German encampments are further examples of this.

Based on our surveys and rare wartime photographs, there seems to have been preferences for using differing forms of housing for different groups at the German encampments. The structurally unfamiliar yurt-like tents appear to have been reserved in many cases for accommodating the prisoners (Fig. 51) or for storage, and only temporarily for soldiers. Conversely, the Germans themselves preferred to reside in the barracks or log houses. This probably mirrors deliberate attempts to use structurally more familiar buildings whenever possible, to facilitate the sense of at-homeness in an already alienating situation. Still, variation to this is encountered at some sites, again emphasizing the vast diversity in German camp layouts.

4.2 Martial things and civilian things

“When the winter came the German stuff was little worse than ours... They had iron heeled shoes and mess kits clattered loosely on the side of the backpack. We had to now and then tear those off and teach silent moving to the German.”


To begin with in 1941–1942, the German equipment was ill-fitted to the northern conditions. Before the training co-operation started bearing fruits, this was further emphasized by the Germans’ lack of experience in the wilderness skills, as the above-quote well illustrates (Virolainen 1999:126–127). Especially the winter clothing and equipment situation was soon improved with Finnish civilian and Swedish military gear, as seen in wartime photographs (e.g. Franz Repper Collection n.d.; SA-kuva n.d.).
I discuss in the following the finds related to the German soldiers mainly through the *matériel* encountered in our 2009 excavations of Peltojoki military base, with allusions to some finds observed at other sites. Since the surface scatter of rusted metal was cleared from the Peltojoki site in 2008 by PLS, all finds were recovered from the test-excavated structures, such as rubbish pits and building foundations. The artefacts fall into various categories, from martial items and building materials to household waste and clothing.

The clear majority of the recovered finds came from the pits used for destroying *matériel* during the German retreat in the fall of 1944. All the supplies that could not be taken to Norway were carefully burnt and smashed, fitting the popular image of the thorough havoc the Germans spread during the “burning of Lapland”. The tail of a one kilogram incineration bomb and screw caps from handgrenades (*Model 24 Stielhandgranate*) recovered from the pits tell of the implementation of this (Fig. 52). Besides being burnt, some items like stow pipes, oil drums and “jerrycans” (*Wehrmacht-Einheitskanister*) were perforated with axe blows to prevent the pursuing Finnish troops from reusing them.

Some of the recovered finds could be straightforwardly put into anecdotal use by relating them to the worldwide carnage and atrocities at the concentration camps, in a manner of confirming and strengthening the stereotypical views of the Nazi war machine. For instance, the burnt binders could be shown as evidence of eradicating the archives (Seitsonen & Herva 2011), or as a symbol of the German orderliness and bookkeeping, which facilitated the working of the concentration camp system in the first place. In a similar vein, some of the stoves could be exhibited as being the same type as the ones used for example at Auschwitz, and the Pelikan ink bottle fragments could be linked with the use of Pelikan ink for tattooing the prisoner numbers into the arms of the inmates at the concentration camps (e.g. Steinbacher 2006). Also, the fragments of asbestos insulation plates have a connection to the Nazi forced labour camps, where asbestos was manufactured by forced labourers in inhuman conditions, while German scientists had well established its dangers (e.g. Proctor 2000).

However, even if all the above viewpoints are valid, and the universal connection of the Lapland sites to the Nazi atrocities should not be forgotten, this kind of approach to the material culture simply validates and colours the existing historical sources and narratives, and offers relatively narrow and trivialized perspectives into the material heritage of war. Instead, by considering for example the interwoven relationships of people, their material culture and the arctic landscape, new and unexpected perspectives can be highlighted and made part of the wider, transnational anthropological discussions (see Saunders 2004, 2007). These include, for instance, ecological phenomenologies (e.g. Ingold 2000, 2011; Seamon 2007), the “dark”, painful and difficult heritage of the 20th century conflict (e.g. Gonzáles-Ruibal 2008;
Logan & Reeves 2009), and the multivocality of interpretations, values and memories added to these seemingly and deceptively familiar recent past sites (e.g. Schofield et al. 2002).

Finds related to the everyday economic and household activities were common at Peltojoki, as also at other places that we have recently excavated, for example at Inari Kankiniemi and Inari military hospital. These include abundant numbers of porcelain and glass sherds, cutlery and empty tins (Fig. 53). The basis of the food economy seems to have been German military-issued canned meat and fish, some of it produced in occupied Norway and Denmark. Also, some bones were recovered from the rubbish pits. To date, there has been only vague and fragmented information that tinned foods were supplemented, according to the local memories, with reindeer meat and other wild products. The PoWs are remembered to have been, at least occasionally, fishing and hunting small animals, for example at the Inari Haukkapesäoja camps (110–111) (see Arvelin 2009).

The excavated faunal material is under analysis by Lee G. Broderick at the University of York, and will offer a so far unexplored perspective to the German presence in Finnish Lapland (see Grabowski et al. 2014; Vretemark 2013, for Norway). The ongoing faunal analyses will provide the first concrete evidence of what animals were actually used by the Germans and their prisoners at the studied sites, and to what extent. So far, a number of the bones have been identified as originating from large cows, much larger than the indigenous northern breed of Lapland cows. This opens up interesting new questions about the movement of supplies, and possibly animals, and of military logistics in the far north. These will be pursued further when we have a fuller picture of the faunal remains.
Porcelain sherds were the most numerous single find category from Peltojoki. Most of the tableware was found by the mess hall and kitchen, some smashed to the bottom of the river next to them. The sherds show an interesting mix of German military-issued tableware and civilian items of Finnish-origin (Fig. 53). Civilian products form about one third of porcelain, and are mostly products from the Arabia factories with various flowery and gilded designs.

Based on the preliminary remarks of the finds from our recent public excavations at the Inari military hospital in 2016, the ratio of military and civilian tableware seems roughly equivalent to that documented from Peltojoki. So far, no other sites have been excavated in sufficient scale to provide comparisons for these two assemblages, but it will be interesting in the upcoming excavations to see whether the civilian wares were elsewhere as conspicuous as at these two sites. Based on the field observations during the surveys, the Finnish-manufactured wares seem to be common at several sites. Besides the porcelain, one spoon found from Peltojoki is a civilian item with a flowery design, and another is a Finnish military-issue tea-spoon. The rest of the cutlery represents German military-issued items stamped “Fl.U.V” (Flieger Unterkunft Verwaltung, Flight Barracks Administration) (Fig. 53).

Some of the imported wares can be linked to the manufacturers, for instance in Bavaria and Bohemia (Fig. 54, Table 2). Alongside other finds and things, these exemplify concretely the massive long-range movement of things connected to the German war efforts in Lapland and elsewhere on the WWII fronts. Besides porcelain, sherds of bottle glass were common and indicate...
Figure 54. Artefacts linked to a manufacturer from the Peltojoki base (numbers refer to the Table 2), and the maximum extent of Axis-related territories in 1942 (Note: modern borders) (illustration: Oula Seitsonen 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenance (manufacturer, country)</th>
<th>Euclidean distance (~ km)</th>
<th>Type of artefacts, and the stamps on them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sorsakoski, Finland</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Spoons, “Sorsakoski”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Arabia, Finland</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Porcelain, “Arabia, Suomi Finlandia, 19”, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ?, (western?) Norway</td>
<td>~1300</td>
<td>Fish tin, “Norvegia, Norway”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Aktiebolaget Vin &amp; Spritcentralen, Sweden</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Alcohol bottle top, “Aktiebolaget Vin &amp; Spritcentralen”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kolding, Denmark</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Fish tin, “Danmark, 50, Kolding”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pelikan, Germany</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>Ink bottle sherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teuto Metallwerke G.m.b.H., Osnabrück, Germany</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>Cartridges, “P3695* 7 39”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ?, Bohemia, Czech Republic</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>Porcelain, “Fl.U.V., 1942, Bohemia”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Johann Haviland, Germany</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>Porcelain, “Johann Haviland, Bavaria”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Delbeck, France</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>Alcohol bottle top, “Delbeck ***”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Artefacts linked to a manufacturer from the Peltojoki base.
that alcohol was lavishly offered and consumed at Peltojoki. The vast majority of the glass sherds originated from a specialized glass dump (Fig. 43:S31) near another of the barracks, most likely the German soldiers’ accommodation. Two bottle tops show that at least French Delbeck wine or cognac and the products of the Swedish state-owned Aktiebolaget Vin & Spritcentralen were drank at the site. Also sherds of beer and schnapps glasses were found by the kitchen. The Finnish liaison officers’ reports (Alftan 2005) and local memories often refer to the Germans abundant alcohol supplies (also Steinkamp 2008). For example, The Germans often paid of wilderness products with alcohol (M17, M17, M28).

The finds from Peltojoki that can be linked to a manufacturer illustrate the position of this remote outpost in the wider network of the German military logistics, and emphasize the movement of things in a global war (Fig. 54, Table 2). For example, household and food items were imported over vast distances to Peltojoki: canned food from occupied Norway and Denmark, alcohol from Sweden and Central Europe, and porcelain from Central Europe and southern Finland. Military articles were also transported to Lapland over long distances, for instance, ammunition from Germany, and Calcium Chloride from Belgium. Building materials were transported from various locations; for instance, the concrete elements used as bases for stoves inside the barracks were of German origin, whereas the barracks and plywood/carboard tents were southern Finnish products.

The multiple places of origin of the things, in many countries and in various factories, illustrate the scale of internationalism experienced even at such remote places as Peltojoki. However, they also emphasize the role of private entrepreneurs in maintaining and facilitating the German war efforts, both in the occupied countries, such as Denmark and Norway, in Germany and Finland, and also in the outwardly neutral Sweden. These businesses were not without ethical implications. For example, the PoWs were often rented out as cheap workforce by different companies, and even private farmers, in all the involved countries, and this business activity did, at least indirectly, enable the Nazi war efforts and the connected atrocities (see Suhonen 2011; Westerlund 2008a–b). Not surprisingly, the WWII years are typically omitted from the involved companies’ historical reviews.

Connected to the massive scale of transportation of things, Lapland’s rudimentary roads were daily overcrowded by hundreds of trucks churning from south to north and back. Breakdowns and traffic accidents were not uncommon, as the German truckers were unaccustomed to the winter conditions (e.g. Alftan 2005:201–211; Mabre 1943–1944), and field workshops and resting places were established in numerous places along the transport routes, for example at Peltojoki and Vuotso. This movement of things and people provided a lucrative business for the Finnish and Swedish transport companies, and is still remembered in Sweden as the time of the “Petsamo traffic” (Petsamotrafiken; e.g. Björklund 1981; Junila 2000).
Homely and military routines at Peltojoki are witnessed, for instance, by sherds of mirror glass, remains of burnt shoe polish containers, and a razor blade. However, German army apparently approved on the Arctic front some eccentricities and deviations from their normally strict standards: so-called Arctic Ocean beards (Eismeerbart) are evident in many photographs, and differ sharply from the stereotypically smooth-shaven German military look (e.g. Kaltenegger 2006; Rottman & Andrew 2007) (Fig. 55). This probably mirrors the novelty associated with serving in this remote and wild place, and also the Special Forces status of the mountain jaegers.

Figure 55. A German officer with “Eismeerbart” in an improvised mishmash of Finnish, German and civilian winter clothing. Original caption: “German ‘panzer lieutenant’ as a fell climber” (SA-kuva 67457/ Voittotunturi/ 15.12.1941).
4.3 Prisoner's things

“\textit{I would say, that studying the material culture of Prisoners-of-War with archaeological excavations is just as meaningful as studying fashion clothes on a nudist beach.”}

\textit{Finnish battlefield archaeologist (Karkeologi 2016)}

Unlike the pessimistic view presented in the above-quote by a Finnish battlefield archaeologist (Karkeologi 2016), the archaeologically documented prisoner’s things have proven, as could be expected, to be one of the best indicators of the PoW presence at numerous German sites in Lapland, and allow unexpected insights into their experiences. In many cases, there has been no other evidence of PoWs besides the material remains in the rubbish pits and dumps, especially at the wilderness sites, due to the complete lack of archival or memory material related to those places. The self-made and self-repaired shoesoles, improvised from rubber and wood, and their manufacturing waste are particularly important in this sense. Besides Peltojoki (Fig. 56) these have been observed at several other sites, such as Inari Iso Piihtijärvi (112), Inari Pienempi Kuivajärvi (133), Inari Illeistinkaira (27), Inari Nangujärvi Joutavanlahti (113), Inari Soilojärvi Haukkapesäoja 1–2 (110-111), and Salla Palojärvi (120) (also Grabowski et al. 2014; Seitsonen & Herva 2017a). The finds from PoW-related rubbish pits, dumps and other structures allow insight into the organization of everyday activities and experiences of the prisoners, which are essentially missing from the fragmented archival records. These illustrate, for instance, the food economies of PoWs as evidenced by the faunal remains and tins – as an example, fish tins in the PoW rubbish pits are often chopped in two, suggesting perhaps halved ratios or the use of the empty tins for manufacturing something, such as pieces of “trench art” (see Saunders 2000, 2003) or some necessities.

Here I focus on the few PoW-related finds we made during the excavations of the Peltojoki base; the finds from the other sites will be discussed in upcoming publications. The most fascinating find was a self-made, heavily burnt and twisted piece of aluminium, with a Russian language engraving “\textit{От Якова}” (From Jakov) and crude decoration, both apparently made with the tip of a knife (Fig. 56). This broken piece was found in one of the pits used to destroy matériel during the retreat in 1944. The engraving most likely refers to the maker of this item, possibly a lid for some sort of piece of “trench art”, (e.g. Kimball 2004; McAtackney 2014:131; Mytum & Carr 2017; Saunders 2003, 2005). Based on analogous artefacts this has been perhaps a cigarette box or some other small box. The text suggests it was intended as a gift or memento from this Jakov to someone, yet it is impossible to tell to whom exactly. It could have been made, for instance, for a German soldier – as discussed above, being isolated in a secluded base such as Peltojoki might have promoted a certain level of sympathy between the guards and PoWs,
with a shared destiny of being confined on the northern fringe of Europe (see Grabowski et al. 2014). Then again, it might as well have been intended for some local civilian frequently visiting the camp or another inmate.

A somewhat analogous piece of “trench art”, yet on an everyday utilitarian item, was located in 2009 at Vika, near Rovaniemi, and is now on exhibition at the Salla Museum of War and Reconstruction (donated to the museum by historian Lars Westerlund) (Fig. 57). Someone has, using a similar technique as in the Jakov piece, carved mostly place names on a small battered aluminium kettle. Engravings read in Russian: “тосна / памьри?=?е / Т Красное селало / Анола / Ессу / Нарва” (Tosna / dying(?)/ Krasnoe selo / Anola / Essu / Narva). All but one of these are place names in Ingermanland, south of St. Petersburg, and in Estonia, and based on them this item could have been made, for instance, by an Ingrian PoW or forced labourer. Their presence has been recalled by many of our interviewees (F7; M17; M18). The places might signify some person’s war path, the places where he had been fighting or incarcerated, before being transported by the Germans to Finland and ending up at Vika. As alternative options, these place names might also represent homes of a group of prisoners, or were carved to commemorate someone who died in one of those places, based on the enigmatic second line of the carving with an indistinct reference to dying. On the other hand, the sequence of place names allows an interpretation that the “dying” in this case might as well be metaphorical, and refer to being captured by the Germans, perhaps at Krasnoye Selo which the Germans conquered in December 1941.
The prisoners and forced labourers in Lapland felt the effects of dislocation, forced mobility, and powerlessness even more intensely and overwhelmingly than the German troops (Mesjentsev 2007; Molka 2007). This could have materialized in a strong urge to accentuate one’s agency to gain at least some, no matter how illusory, sense of control over things, even if only by leaving behind names on a carved piece of aluminium. This could also represent a hope to leave something personal, identifying and memorizing for the future. PoW-made trench art materializes often also in the local reminiscences. Many of our informants, who were children during the war remember that they got small pieces of art in exchange for food that their mothers sent to the camps, such as wooden birds that the PoWs carved with dull knives (F1; M2; M3). The harsh treatment that the burnt and twisted Jakov piece received during the evacuation and destruction of the Peltojoki base, might have had figurative connotations to slitting the possible unofficial bonds that might have been forged between the guards and PoWs in this wilderness outpost (see Olsen & Witmore 2014; Seitsonen & Herva 2011). Thus, its thorough destruction might have metaphorically killed a gift from a prisoner – which might in fact have paralleled Jakov’s own fate.

Figure 57. A PoW-related, engraved aluminium kettle found at Vika, Rovaniemi, now at display at the Salla Museum of War and Reconstruction; Inset: Places engraved into the kettle (1–5): 1) Tosna, Russia; 2) Krasnoye Selo, Russia; 3) Anola, Russia; 4) Essu, Estonia; 5) Narva, Estonia; and 6) Vika, Finland (Illustration: Oula Seitsonen 2017).
Besides the Jakov piece, only two other finds from Peltojoki can be linked to the presence of PoWs, and were found from the same rubbish pit (Fig. 56). One is a tattered and poorly preserved button of unidentified origin, which might originate from Soviet or other equipment. The other one can again be linked with the PoW agency and handicraft talents: a self-made shoe sole roughly carved from a left-over piece of rubber, possibly from a car tyre, and with a self-carved wooden heel. As noted, analogous items and their manufacturing waste have proven to be the best indicator of prisoner presence at the German sites in Lapland. Also Finnish liaison officers paid attention during the war to the talents of many PoWs in handicrafts (Alftan 2005: 121-123). Besides being vital for their survival, crafting everyday utilitarian items such as shoes, from whatever raw material was at hand, would have allowed the prisoners at least temporary mental and psychological escape, a way to shut off the external world, their own distressed situation, and the brutal realities of the camp life.

4.4 "...if I'd send all the madmen from Berlin to Lapland..."7

"...minister Speer took special care that he was photographed ... Especially he wanted this stuff when we camped by a log fire [rakovalkea] in the woods of Inari. Often it seemed like the propaganda ... would have been most important..."

Finnish liaison officer Erkki Krantz (1944:3)

Albert Speer, Hitler’s chief architect, Minister of Armaments and War Production, and the leader of the building forces of Organisation Todt, made an inspection trip to Lapland around the Christmas and New Year of 1943. Speer’s trip has been briefly discussed in some historical studies (e.g. Mikkonen 2016:49; Westerlund 2008:202–203; also Speer 1969), and is described in a memorandum by a Finnish liaison officer who took part on the trip (Krantz 1944).8 I comment briefly on this journey, since this thesis opens from the beach next to the German headquarters where Speer visited and his trip has also been recurrently mentioned to us in the informal discussions with the locals in the Inari Solojärvi region. Speer’s experiences demonstrate also well the broader German perceptions of Lapland as an exotic and enchanted Other, as discussed above through the spatialities and materialities. Already when taken to the Ounasvaara Hill in Rovaniemi and getting his first glimpse of Lapland’s vast nature, Speer commented that

---

7 Albert Speer, quoted in Krantz (1944).
8 I want to thank historian Mari Olafson Lundemo for bringing this report into my knowledge.
“...if I’d send all the madmen from Berlin to Lapland, I would get a quick and definitive answer, if they will be healed or remain insane forever” (Krantz 1944:4). Speer’s spontaneous reaction and wonderment when facing, in his vision, the overwhelming wild northern nature, describes illustratively how even the immediate surroundings of Rovaniemi appeared to the Germans as an uninhabited wilderness, which differed totally from even the remotest parts of their homelands.

The Othering perspective is also emphasized by the photographs taken on Speer’s trip (Fig. 58). His outlandish, nocturnal skiing trip to the remote logging sites west of Inari and overnighting at a lean-to at Lake Saari-Taimenjärvi (136) were well displayed in pictorial reportages published in the magazines Stuttgarter Illustrierte and Der Frontarbeiter OT (Theunissen 1944) (Westerlund 2008:203). This excursion was also reminisced by Speer (1969) in his autobiography, and by Finnish forest technician Arrela who organized the camping (Arrela 1983). Stuttgarter Illustrierte described this occasion lyrically (also Speer 1969:320):

“Stars sparkled between the velvet black pines illustrated against the blazing polar sky. Men stood silently in the deep snow around the crackling campfire.”

(quoted in Arrela 1983:23)
Arrela (1983) was more prosaic in his description of the events, which the propagandistic German publications left out:

“A merciless snow storm came... the smoke that the gust whirled inside the lean-to made breathing difficult... One after another men leapt coughing out of the lean-to... Finally also the big boss lost his guts: he also scrambled out coughing and ordered us to spread out his reindeer skin sleeping bag into a snow hole.”

(Arrela 1983:25)

The organisation of Speer’s entourage and their activities are also illustrative of some of the bizarre juxtapositions and contradictions associated with the German presence in Lapland, for instance, the unexpected encounters of the modern and the rural, as well as the “cultured” and the “wild”. Speer had with him in the wilderness world-class artists to provide entertainment: the first violinist Siegrid Borries of the Berlin Philharmonics, and the president of Bavaria Film Company, Schreiber, who also performed as a magician “Kalanag” (Speer 1969:318). General Dietl was not apparently too impressed with the latter’s magical acts in Rovaniemi and showed it (Krantz 1944:1).

Speer’s own exotic reminiscence of his visit to the OT headquarters at Solojärvi (25) has an utterly surreal feeling to it:

“In a clearing in the heart of the primeval forest ... Lapp [sic] and German woodcutters had gathered around an artfully built wood fire, source of both warmth and illumination, while Siegfried Borries began the evening with the famous chaconne from Bach’s D-minor Partita."

(Speer 1969:319–320)

Analogous, dreamlike scenes were apparently not that uncommon at the German encampments in the far north (Fig. 59; Mabre 1943:46). At the same time as Speer and his entourage enjoyed the classical harmonies by the campfire, hundreds of PoWs, forced labourers, and convicted German soldiers suffered in the freezing temperatures just a few kilometres away, for instance, at the logging and road building camps of Haukkapesäöja (110–111), Pikkupaanteenvaara (18), Illestinkaira (27), and Karipääńjärvi (26). Next morning Speer (1969:321) complained that he had “a darting pain” in his knee after spending the night in the snowpit. Consequently, he cancelled the planned inspections of the PoW and work camps in the vicinity, and left immediately for the south.
Entangled with the north: Placelessness and dislocation

“It is a Finnish May, Wind blows over the snow and dances on the desolate land, Through the long days and grey nights, Oh, when will that snow die!”

Poem by a Polish forced labourer Josef Molka (2007: 105)

“German is no wilderness warrior (korpisoturi)... German soldier is afraid of the forest... If even a bird rustled on a tree branch, the Germans shot, so that the forest echoed.”

Finnish veteran (in Virolainen 1999:127)

The above quotes describe well the extreme sense of alienness experienced in Lapland by the Germans and their prisoners. The experience of “being stuck” and “lost” in a northern wilderness was closely intertwined with their performance and activities in the area, and affected, for instance, the mobilities, spatiality and material culture (also Olsen & Witmore 2014; Seitsonen & Herva 2011). Various material and spatial straits at the German sites appear to reflect these feelings of placelessness and dislocation. For the multinational PoWs and forced labourers this would have
been even worse than for the Germans, owing to their ambiguous and vulnerable position.

Finnish soldiers and civilians, intimately familiar with their surroundings, were disappointed with the poor performance of their comrades-in-arms, for whom they initially had high hopes, and with their constant need for guidance in what the Germans perceived as intimidating and unnavigable landscapes of closed taiga and open tundra (e.g. Alftan 2005:174, 192–194; Pipping 2008 [1947]:10). The initial inability of even the elite and battle-hardened German Gebirgsjäger to act in the arctic Lapland environment is understandable, as discussed above, from a phenomenological standpoint. This was something entirely outside their life-world, their unconscious, ‘common sense’, and routine corporeal context of everyday actions (e.g. Schutz and Luckmann 1973:3; Seamon 1979, 1984, 2007; also Husserl 1970 [1936]:103pp). Likewise, for the Finnish soldiers their at-homeness in these surroundings and their nature-based livelihoods, such as hunting, fishing and reindeer herding, since their childhood explains their good performance. Forest and tundra essentially defined these people’s life-experience. Conversely, the Finnish troops would most likely have been initially equally lost if they had ended up fighting in a Central European urban setting or in an Alpine landscape familiar to the Gebirgsjäger.

Sociologist Knut Pipping, who served in WWII as an NCO in Lapland first alongside, and later against, the Germans, wrote a sociological study of his own “[I]nfantry company as a society” (2008 [1947]). He observed that the percentage of people subsisting on rural livelihoods in Lapland was over 83 percent in 1940, and there was a prevailing strong masculine sub-culture in the northern areas, for instance, connected with the logging camps (savotta) and the floating of timber (uitto) (Pipping 2008 [1947]:218, 254). As mentioned, Lapland had in the 1940s, and still has, a fame as an exotic land on the northern periphery of Europe (see Herva 2014; Otto 2008; Ridanpää 2016). The north was a “foreign country” (Pälsi 1931) of natural wonders – and nightmares – such as swarms of mosquitoes, the inescapable silence of the wilderness, months-long midnight sun, gloomy polar night, and the Aurora Borealis. The area was approached by the southerners largely with an outsider, “tourist gaze” (Urry 2002), and especially the indigenous Sámi were, and sometimes still are, represented rather pejoratively as primal relics from the past, as “people of nature” (Ridanpää 2016:20) (Fig. 60). Lapland was widely mythified as a sublime wilderness, comparable to the way for example the Canadian north has been popularly represented as a mythical, rugged and manly northern frontier (see Hautala-Hirvioja 2016; Hulan 2002). This was also emphasized and even romanticized in both the Finnish and German wartime propaganda (e.g. Mabre 1943–1944; Wehrmacht 2006 [1943]).

No matter how exotic the surroundings were, for the German troops at the wilderness camps the sheer monotony of being stuck in the middle of nowhere, and feeling of being isolated and displaced (Fig. 61), were the worst of the hardships, for instance, according to Major Wolfgang von Hessen’s (1986).
Figure 60. Posing with the “exotic” Sámi. Original caption: “Germans photographing the Skolts” (SA-kuva 81953/ Suonikylä/ 12.04.1942).

Figure 61. German camp in the middle of nowhere. Original caption: “Tents and barrack sunken into the snow” (SA-kuva 82285/ Petsamo, Litsavuono/ 17.04.1942).
first-hand experiences. This, in turn mediated the German soldiers’ perceptions of, and conduct in, Lapland (e.g. Knabe 1983: 20; Mabre 1944). It seems that the remoteness and ‘northerness’, Lapland’s “genius loci” (Norberg-Schulz 1980; Seamon 2012) from a German perspective, affected relationally their material culture, and even personal appearances, in various ways as they became immersed in their new surroundings (see Herva 2009). This interpretational framework might explain some of the observed peculiarities related to, for instance, camp layouts and structures, such as the superficially meaningless and non-functional “façade”-like fences and moats. Since many of the multinational PoWs and forced labourers were also non-local (Otto 2008; Westerlund 2008a: 96-99), they would have shared the feelings of threatening closed forest and open tundra landscapes with the German soldiers, especially during the long Polar night (Alftan 2005: 190-194; Jokisipilä 2005:33). For the prisoners, this would have been heightened by the enduring uncertainty of their future and survival.

Being stationed in, and essentially isolated by, the frightening wilderness in such secluded localities as Peltojoki must have been mentally demanding, for both the German soldiers and their prisoners, and they had few chances to interact with other people than their own peers serving there or passing by on the Karigasniemi Road and the occasional visiting Sámi, except on leave. This feeling of seclusion and dislocation was heightened in the winter months, when the sun does not get up at all and the snow covers the landscape thickly, making mobility and transportation even more demanding. Material culture offered the Germans some ways to alleviate this alienness and helped in creating a feeling of at-homeness, but simultaneously the same material items could have accentuated the sense of being lost and cast-away on the fringe of the world (Naum 2013).

As one example, the trend observed at many German sites that, whenever possible, the structurally more familiar, house-like barracks were used for accommodating their own troops while, on the other hand, the yurt-like, more alien tents were reserved for housing the prisoners, might relate to this. In an already unfamiliar setting a completely alien form of housing might have been psychologically taxing to deal with. Naming things in a familiar way is another obvious approach to deal with placelessness (e.g. Ingold 2011). The German troops in Lapland indeed labelled many of their encampments and other structures with homelike names, such as a home addresses (Fig. 62) or other familiar German names, like “Straße der Gebirgsjäger” (Road of the Mountain Jaegers) or “Edelweisshütte” (Edelweiss Hut). Some of these still live in the local vernacular, such as “Little Berlins” (Fig. 63; see Ylimaunu et al. 2013) and “Field of Rommel”, a sandy football field in Rovaniemi.

The copious consumption of alcohol, as evidenced by the abundant bottle sherds at most German sites, offered also one way to alleviate the dislocation and placelessness, and allowed an ephemeral escape from reality. On the other hand, the glass waste at Peltojoki was carefully discarded into its own specific dump, like also the kitchen waste into another rubbish pit. These demonstrate
Figure 62. Original caption: “Finishing a German dugout dwelling, address is Hansa-Allee 30 / Hansa Allee 30 – it is the German captain’s home address also in Frankfurt” (SA-kuva JSdia766/ Alakurtti, Salla/ 26.09.1941). The builder appears to be a Soviet PoW, with a spoon tucked into his boot shaft.

Figure 63. Pikku Berliini (Little Berlin) pub in Tornio, Lapland, at the place of the WWII German barracks area (Oula Seitsonen 2016).
the orderly waste management within the site, and suggest a contrasting control-based approaches for coping with the sense of displacement. This, alongside the clear spatial organization, such as the housing of guards and prisoners in different kinds of structures at separate areas, most likely created some sense of (symbolic) control over the northern conditions. Electrifying of the barracks with generators, as observed at many wilderness camps, might also have created similar effect, and was probably also desirable from a domicile perspective besides its functional advantages, since most of Lapland was unelectrified at the time (Lehtola 2003:404-407).

Stereotypically the military material culture is homogenous, standardized and anonymous (e.g. Herva 2014), as is also expected of the martial conduct (e.g. Dunivin 1994) encouraged and embodied through this matériel. The toiletry finds from Peltojoki suggest that grooming was practiced even in an isolated wilderness setting, nurturing a sense of uniformity and illustrating the control-based approach to deal with the dislocation. In a way, this could be a secular and martial equivalent to the “superstitious” routines and charms that many soldiers developed worldwide to maintain at least an illusion of control over their fates in an uncertain and ambivalent setting (see MacKenzie 2015; Seitsonen & Herva 2017b).

However, in Lapland, and also more widely on the Eastern Front, many of the standard German military-issued items proved insufficient for, and even worked against, overcoming the demands set by the northern environmental and climatic conditions. This was materialized, for instance, by the shortfalls of German field clothing, by the reliance on motorized transports, and also by

Figure 64. A Gebirgsjäger column with mules and horses approaching the Laanila guest house, run by Max Peronius, in Inari (Max Peronius 1941–1944).
the specific use of mules as draught animals. Mules, originating from Greece where some of the German troops had been serving before ending up in Lapland, turned out to be completely unsuitable for the Lapland conditions, which resulted in the death of scores of animals in the first winter (Westerlund 2008b:49–50, 55) (Fig. 64). The observable inadequacies of German military material culture might have (perchance subconsciously) boosted the favouring of some non-military items encountered at the sites. These are mostly domestic objects, such as the civilian gilded and flowery porcelain wares and cutlery recovered at the Peltojoki and Inari military hospital excavations. Additionally, they might have been preferred to make the isolated military base more cozy and homelike, to further cope with the dislocation. Perhaps also some other eccentricities were tolerated more in the isolation of the wilderness, and owing to the observed deficiencies of the standard military-issued material, such as the Eismeerbart beards and the ad hoc use of civilian clothing (Fig. 55). The confrontation of, on the one hand, grooming and maintaining at least a performative sense of control, discipline and martial appearance in the middle of nowhere, and, on the other, allowing the rougher wilderness looks, improvised clothing, and copious use of alcohol, offers another example of the oscillation between control and escapism in dealing with the effects of placelessness.

The need to gain, at least an illusory, control over one’s own fate in an uncertain setting is most clearly exemplified by items, which can be seen as tokens of exercising one’s personal agency to “make a difference”, to express individuality, or to leave a mark of oneself, no matter how symbolic. The personalized Jakov piece from Peltojoki and the engraved aluminium pot from Vika represent this from a PoW perspective. For the prisoners, this need to leave a mark and to exercise personal agency in any kind of way, even over a piece of aluminium, wood or rubber, and to get a respite from the harsh camplife by concentrating on handicrafts, would have been even more acute than for the German guards. Without doubt, making trench art helped also the German soldiers temporally to take their minds off the austere situation they were caught in (see McAttackney 2014; Saunders 2005) (Fig. 65). One fork found from the kitchen at Peltojoki illustrates probably the personalizing and individualization of a standard object of military kitchenware by some German. This piece of cutlery has the roughly engraved letters “R K” on it (see paper II), which may indicate, for instance, someones initials. On the other hand, RK could as well have stood for the Reich Chancellery (Reichskanzlerei) or the Knight’s Cross of the Iron Cross (Ritterkreuz des Eisernen Kreuzes). Thus, the letters might even relate to an inside joke, with connotations to the Nazi upper class and high-class awards, carved on a rudimentary kitchen item in a secluded outpost in the far north. The WWII trench art from Lapland will be examined in more detail in future research.

Lapland had been involved in widespread cultural encounters before WWII, but the arrival of Germans and their multinational prisoners brought the internationalism to an unprecedentedly concrete level. Resultingly, close
relationships were tied between the German troops, civilians, and also prisoners. This was most observable in the northern towns, such as Rovaniemi, Oulu and Tornio, where vast numbers of Germans were stationed. However, their presence made apparently an even stronger impact on the people living in the rural and wilderness areas, as recounted by many of our interviewees (F2; F11; M17; M18; M20). Visits to the German camps allowed the rural children to experience previously unseen wonders, such as foreign people, electric light, candy, and even movies (e.g. Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). The internationalism was emphasized by the extensive importation of foreign consumer goods and other gear into Lapland (Fig. 54, Table 2). An extreme example of this is represented by fish tins of Brazilian origin that were uncovered from one German trash dump in Inari. The other way around, the local contacts are exemplified, for instance, by the treatment of reindeer bones in a Sámi-style to extract bone marrow, and by the adoption of certain northern structures, such as conical, tepee-like cooking huts (keittokota), and forest working equipment, such as horse-drawn water draughts (vesipasa) observed at some sites.

The isolation and dislocation might have eroded the normal military lines of demarcation between the guards and prisoners, both stuck in the wilderness (see Olsen & Witmore 2014; paper I). However, conversely, the sense of displacement could also have pushed some soldiers’ codes of behaviour the other way, and even over the edge of humanity, analogous to the effects observed at some colonial settings, for instance, at the isolated outposts in Africa. This alienation and its effects were most famously epitomized by
Joseph Conrad (1899) in his novel “Heart of Darkness”, and updated into a Vietnam War setting in the movie “Apocalypse Now” (Coppola 1979). The Germans appear to have experienced Lapland as a kind of otherworldly, outlandish and even surreal setting, completely removed from their own, normal lifeworlds. This kind of distancing from the “real world” was expressively described by a German war correspondent: “Civilization, houses, and people in normal clothes have become distant, unreal concepts to us” (Lähteenmäki 2006:84). Also the famous Italian correspondent Curzio Malaparte portrayed the atmosphere of the German soldiers on the Petsamo front: “War was far from us. We are outside it, in a remote country, in a timeless space, outside of mankind...” (Lähteenmäki 2006:84). Feelings of being “in a timeless space, outside of mankind”, totally severed from the Germans’ own normal reality, might have eroded and abolished sentiments of compassion, and endorsed the harsh and inhuman treatment of PoWs (see Glover 2010:527). This could have been emphasized all the more by the social space of war, where violence was already widely present, permitted, and even appreciated (Neitzel & Welzer 2011:52), and the Othering of PoWs (Fig. 66).

Taking a cue from their commander General Dietl, the German troops in Finland did not force the Nazi ideological, political or racial views on the Finns (Jokisipilä 2005:47) – which would have been further complicated by the

Figure 66. Amused German soldiers watch as a Russian PoW breathes in the scent of German tobacco; Original caption: “A prisoner wounded in hand, caught about 5 min before taking the picture, has received as a first thing a fistful of tobacco from the Germans” (SA-kuva 102533/ Litsa/ 27.07.1942).
“Jewish-German comradeship-in-arms” in the north. However, the segregation and discrimination of the Germans’ prisoners can be observed archaeologically through the material remains. For instance, the spatial configuration of German-run PoW camps in Lapland suggests widespread – conscious or unconscious – Othering and subhumanizing of the prisoners (Fig. 66). PoW accommodations were typically placed by the animal shelters, outside toilet areas and rubbish dumps, on the outer edges of the camps towards the, in the foreigners’ perspective, intimidating wilderness. There might also have been practical reasoning behind this kind of spatial settings, if the prisoners were used to tend animals, deposit rubbish, and empty outside toilets. However, this might also suggest, that the prisoners were, at least unconsciously, paralleled with the beasts of burden, with the disposable and replacable household items and rubbish, or perhaps even with the impure and noxious toilet waste. Thus, these spatial configurations probably mirror the influences of State-promoted intolerance, hate mongering and categorical discrimination on the German mindset and social code, and are the result of State-sanctioned segregation being presented as a scientific standard and an accepted policy (e.g. Glover 2010:418–419, 474; Neitzel & Welzer 2011:198). However, this extends already beyond the themes discussed in the papers which form this dissertation (papers I–V), and will be assessed in detail in my upcoming research.
"Who controls the past controls the future; who controls the present controls the past..."

George Orwell (1949:143)
5. Ignored and forgotten, familial and remembered: Post-war significance of the German WWII remains

Even though the WWII sites, including the German sites in Lapland, are not recognized as protected cultural heritage in Finland, and have been at the national level long neglected, the enduring transgenerational memories of the German military presence and its material traces are highly significant to the contemporary Finnish and Sámi communities in Lapland. They are subject to varying interests among the local people as relevant part of their lived-in lifeworlds and own history. Owing to this, after our pioneering studies at the Peltojoki military base and at some other sites in 2006–2012 (papers I–II), we turned towards assessing the post-war perceptions and uses of the German sites and materialities. These are at least as pertinent as the wartime use of the sites, especially from a local perspective.

In the following I will discuss, for instance, the heritage and social values (Jones 2017) attached to the German sites, and the diverse engagements with them from the end of the war to the present day through several case studies. These range from the reconstruction of Lapland after the “burning”, to the recollections of General Dietl, and include also such “alternative engagements” as collecting and “treasure hunting”, in order to tackle understandings of the involved peoples’ varying motivations and fascinations with the subject (papers III–V). Connected to the latter, for example traces of metal detecting are evident at many sites in Lapland. This hobby is increasing in popularity in Finland all the time, and resulted also in one fatal accident in 2013 (paper III; see below).

We launched our inquiries into the collecting and metal detecting initially with a netnographic survey (e.g. Kozinets 2010:4) in 2013 to preliminarily map the range of engagements and connotations (paper III). Since the launch of the LDH project in 2014 we have carried out over 30 in-depth interviews with various stakeholders related to the subject. Analysing these has just started but we already have some insights of the variety of public perceptions (paper IV; Koskinen-Koivisto & Thomas 2017; Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017; Thomas & Koskinen-Koivisto 2016). On top of this, I have carried out analyses of both the YLE and LDH crowdsourcings, which allow differing perspectives into the public importance of the WWII remains in Lapland (paper V).

Many theoreticians of cultural heritage emphasize that it is something created, maintained and constantly evolving (e.g. Lillbroända-Annala 2014). Heritage values are not transparent or universal, and they change in tandem
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with myriad other values in the society (see Harrison 2013a; Harvey 2001). Traditionally the emphasis has been on the preservation and exhibition of “important”, prestigious, and “nice” historical sites and objects, typically of national significance (Smith 2006; see paper III). This is virtually an opposite definition to Lapland’s mostly inconspicuous and unshowy, rusty German material remains, with a somewhat dubious Nazi pedigree.

Recent research has come to recognize that the definitions of heritage and its importance cannot be grounded solely on the expert opinion of, for instance, the professional archaeologists and historians. There is a need to acknowledge more widely the differing popular, subaltern or alternative perspectives, and to identify the potential existence of multiple, even contradictory, simultaneous concepts of heritage in any given society (e.g. Waterton & Smith 2010; papers III-IV). These include sometimes, from an expert perspective, also problematic standpoints and public engagements, such as metal detecting and “treasure hunting”, or “alternative” interpretations (e.g. Thomas 2015; Wilson 2012; papers III–V).

The heritage process has at times been described as resembling magic, somewhat appropriately for the “enchanted” Lapland setting (e.g. Lillbroände-Annala 2014). In the case of Lapland’s WWII objects, these officially forgotten everyday items and structures, perceived for decades as “war junk” or, if not that depressingly, as simply another layer in the local (cultural) landscape, are suddenly turned into something interesting, valuable and desirable when they are labelled as cultural heritage. This performative process makes the cultural heritage objects “privileged” (Harrison 2013a:582), and gives them added value, which does not only increase their original value, but also completely alters and transforms them, “magically”, into something immensely more valuable and preservable (e.g. Lillbroände-Annala 2014; Smith 2006). However, with the WWII material remains in Lapland this process is still in its infancy.

5.1 Past: Rising from the ashes and slow decay

“Will to reconstruct is good in Lapland, unfortunately the possibilities for its implementation are very limited for many reasons.”

*Headline in the newspaper Lapin Kansa after the Lapland War (Lapin Kansa 1945)*

War in the arctic and the Finno-German *waffenbrüderschaft* ended with the widespread destruction of northern Finland, which has come to dominate the national-level memories and the “national master narrative” of the war in Lapland (see papers I–V; Seitsonen & Herva 2017a; Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). Numerous archaeologically
documented features at the German sites relate to the German scorched earth tactics during their retreat to Norway in the fall of 1944. These illustrate often a very thorough and meticulous interest taken in destroying even the most minuscule things, in many cases well beyond military needs. The deliberate destruction, burning and shattering of, for instance, houses, tools, kitchen ware, and furniture, expresses probably another way to cope with and ease the pains of dislocation, and the helplessness of being stranded on the northern shore of Europe, while at the same time the soldiers’ homelands, homes and families were destroyed by bombing attacks and faced an Allied invasion.

When the people of Lapland started arriving to their homeland from the evacuation places in southern Finland and Sweden, they found that the destruction had been widespread and thorough. For instance, only one fence post was found standing in the village of Inari when the Finnish troops reached it, and many locals lost practically all their property; Finnish troops topped this by stripping the ruins of everything that could be used as firewood (M16). Also, whole lifeways were shattered by the border changes, worst of all for the semi-nomadic Skolt Sámi who permanently lost their ancestral herding grounds (see Lehtola 2003). Many of the Skolts were destined for years of uncertainty in temporary accommodations, for example in the ruins of the abandoned German PoW camps (Arvelin 2009) (Fig. 67).

Vigorous reconstruction commenced all over Lapland as soon as the people started coming back. Typically, men came first and started building their lives from scratch, scavenging building materials, such as bent nails and scraps of
wood, from the smouldering ruins left by the Germans. This was done clandestinely in many places, since the villagers were uncertain of the ownership status of the material, reminiscing the situation nowadays. There were rumours that all the German matériel belonged to the Soviet Union, and at the same time, a waste management company Lapin Jäte Oy was carrying out their own rather aggressive collecting of scrap metal, even from people’s courtyards. One of our informants reminisced their hostile actions as “outright robbery” (M17). The reconstruction period in Lapland took longer than elsewhere in Finland, partly owing to the demanding local geographical setting (see the above quote from Lapin Kansa), which had also so much hampered the German wartime activities.

Children took actively part in the reconstruction and subsistence activities alongside their parents, as was anyway typical in the rural areas at the time. As part of this they came into intermittent contact with landmines and other explosives. Childhood games with the UXO left apparently strong and lasting memories – and traumas – and are often eagerly and excitedly recapped by our elderly male informants (e.g. M2; M17; M19). Then again, women more often recall the tragic incidents related to UXO, such as injuries and losses of life (F7; F11). These dangerous games had possibly personally cathartic connotations, coming to terms with and symbolically to control these potentially deadly implements that had destroyed their homeland (see Carr 2014:49; Moshenska 2008). The children appear to have paralleled through these childhood games the widespread destruction that they were forced to witness at a tender age (Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017).

Especially the Sámi people’s cultural identity suffered from the cycle of evacuation, destruction, reconstruction, and the subsequent stronger State involvement and exploitation of Lapland’s natural resources (e.g. Lehtola 1994:191–224, 2015b). Visually the most distinguishable effect of this was the mixing of traditional Sámi clothing (gákti) with the clothes worn by southern “lantalainen” (literally meaning “cow dung person”, although originally apparently derived from the Swedish word “lant”=land) (Lehtola 2015b). State intervention resulted also in generations of boarding schooled Sámi children, who were often forbidden to speak their own language (e.g. Keskitalo et al. 2014; Puuronen 2014:322). This ties the German WWII material heritage also to postcolonial themes in Sápmi (e.g. Källén 2015; Spangen et al. 2015; see chapter 6).

Interestingly, Lapland emerged also as a major destination for German tourists since 1950s, when many German soldiers started visiting the places where they had served “as children”, like they described to the locals (M2). Some of them also visited their former encampments, and even camped amongst the exploded ruins (M2; M16; M17) (see Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). At first they had been a little wary of approaching the locals, owing to the “burning of Lapland”, but were positively surprised by the neutral and even friendly reception in most places (F6; F7). Of course, there were also contradictory cases and opinions, especially around the badly destroyed
Rovaniemi area (M10; M11). This theme was touched upon in the advertisement of the recent Wir waren freunde – We were Friends exhibition in Rovaniemi (see below).

After the initial rush of reconstruction, the German ruins were largely left on their own for decades: “That wood is quite rotten. It is of no use, so I just let it be” (M15). They were slowly taken over and shrouded by the nature, and vanished from the eyes of occasional passers-by as the objects and nature merged together, essentially dissipating borderlines between cultural and natural heritage (see Figenschau 2016, for Norway). On the other hand, these inconspicuous remains, which often require expert local knowledge to be found, came to be perceived by the locals as another, inseparable part of their multi-layered traditional cultural landscapes, and became absorbed into their lived-in and experienced bodily lifeworlds in the post-war decades (see papers II–IV).

5.2 Past?: Clearing of "war junk"

“no way If some clown comes to dig around on my land, no law papers will help, all kinds of ‘accidents’ can happen, if the message is not otherwise understood, all kinds of things can happen in the wilderness, when no one is seeing... [sic]”

Internet comment on the clearing of "war junk" by PLS (Alaluusua 2005)

In 2004 the enduring silence of the German material remains in Lapland was unexpectedly upset by the launch of an environmental “clearing” operation by the environmental organization Pidä Lappi Siistinä (PLS; Keep Lapland Tidy). This gave a sudden impetus to conflicting developments with unexpected consequences. It, for instance, raised the national awareness of Lapland’s unique wartime heritage, and indirectly contributed to the formation of our ongoing LDH research project, as we became fascinated by the strong public sentiments shown locally and nationally for and against the clearing project.

In winter 2015 we tried to interview the PLS officials about their “War junk project” (Sotaromuprojekti), as it was titled in 2004–2010, but much to our surprise they told us that they did not have anything to tell about the project since all the staff has changed, and only directed us to inspect their old annual reports and online material (PLS 2005, 2008, 2010–2013). No final report of the War junk project is available, unlike of their other projects; it is also mistakenly described on their current website as taking place in 2004–2005 (PLS 2016). Because the War junk project has not been discussed elsewhere beyond passing references (e.g. Heinäaho & Rautiainen 2011; Herva 2014; Seitsonen & Herva 2017a; papers I–IV), I take here a brief look at the project,
its proceedings, and consequences (Table 3). However, it merits a wider analysis in future.

PLS initiated their project in 2004 after a proposal from Lapland’s Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment (ELY) (PLS 2008) and the NBF (PLS 2013). Their work started with the GPS mapping of matériel in the vast area from Sodankylä in the south to Karigasniemi at Utsjoki in the north. This and the follow-up clearing work was done under the guidance of a local ex-military officer, with whom I have had recurring discussions about the importance and value of the wartime material heritage, for instance, at Vuotso, Sodankylä (M4; see Seitsonen & Herva 2017a).

The next year, in 2005, PLS opened its annual war junk clearing camps (PLS 2008). War junk clearing started around Vuotso and Tankavaara in Sodankylä on July 23–31 2005, and caused a strong negative local reaction (see also Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). Altogether 15 people, mostly from southern Finland, took part in the clearing work, which reminded our local interviewees in Vuotso of the destructive and aggressive actions of Lapin Jäte oy that took place at the same places after the war (F6; M17). PLS volunteers were accommodated in their own tents at the former German-run PoW camp of Tankavaara Ylisenvaara (40). The PLS mapping work continued at Ivalo in Inari, where an exploded German ammunition depot was surveyed and later cleared by the UXO specialists from the Lapland Jaeger Brigade of the FDF, and also at Enontekio, where the work was however discontinued when the Ministry of the Environment withdrew its funding (PLS 2008). In the first year two truckloads, altogether 32 000 kg, of matériel was collected and sold as scrapmetal to the metal recycling company Kuusakoski ltd (Table 3). PLS reports that cleared items included “metal junk, tins, airfield metal plates, burned cars, pontoons, exploded assault boats etc...” (PLS 2008) (Fig. 68).

In 2006 PLS work moved further north to Inari. They organized a clearing camp in co-operation with the NBF, Kuusakoski ltd, and the Inari municipality on July 22–30 2006, concentrating at Kaamanen, Inari. Unknown number of participants worked daily from 8 am to 5 pm. Age limit for the volunteer participants ranged from 18 to 69 years, due to the insurances organized by PLS. They camped at the site, and PLS organized food and a tent sauna, and part of their travel expenses were also reimbursed. Altogether 28 000 kg of metal was cleared (PLS 2008, 2012). The next clearing camp with the same partners was also based in Inari, from June 30 to July 08 2007. Some 25 000 kg of matériel was cleared (PLS 2012). In 2008 the work continued in Inari on July 19–27, and extended to the Utsjoki municipality along the Kaamanen–Karigasniemi Road. This time also the Peltojoki camp was cleared, as witnessed on site by my colleague Kerkko Nordqvist who was working with the Sámi heritage in the same area. However, as our Peltojoki excavations showed the next year, significant subsurface deposits can be found even at the sites that were “vacuumed” clean from the surface. PLS collected about 23 000 kg of metal in 2008 (PLS 2012).
Figure 68. “War junk” in the wilderness in Inari (Oula Seitsonen 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Cleared (kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Vuotso-Tankavaara, Sodankylä and Enontekiö</td>
<td>32 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Kaamanen, Inari and Kittilä</td>
<td>28 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>25 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Kaamanen-Karigasniemi Road, Inari</td>
<td>23 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Misi, Rovaniemi</td>
<td>10 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>118 000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Based on the PLS annual reports, the War junk project did not operate in 2009, and in July 2010 the activities were moved south to Misi, Rovaniemi, invited by the FDF and carried out in co-operation with the local landowners. At Misi the clearing of a large, exploded German ammunition depot was instigated. Work was slow, “because the junk was located over a large area in small fragments”, yet 10 000 kg of matériel was cleared (PLS 2010). The project was supposed to continue in 2011 with another clearing camp at Misi, but “[S]urprisingly, however, no collecting permit was obtained...” (PLS 2011).

The failure to obtain the collecting permit in 2011 was most likely influenced by the local resistance met by the clearing camps elsewhere,
especially in Inari, and the consequent incidents. For example in 2006 the rural police chief (nimismies) stopped the PLS clearing work at Kaamanen, alerted by the local history enthusiasts who were worried about the destruction of the wartime cultural heritage. He based his actions on an interpretation of the lost property law that all the military material left on Finnish soil belongs to the Ministry of the Defence, and the PLS did not have a permit from them. However, the FDF granted the permission later the same day and the clearing work continued (Alaluusua 2006a). This Kaamanen incident gave implicitly the incentive for the local history enthusiasts to establish the Lapland Society for Military History (LSMH) in 2006 (M1; M13). The goal of LSMH is to facilitate the documenting of Lapland’s wartime heritage and to prevent its casual destruction by clearing or by selling it abroad (LSMH 2016). Already at this stage there were rumours that PLS or some of its members were collecting and selling more significant and valuable finds at the war memorabilia markets, and such stories became more marked in the following years (Rehtonen 2010). In their permit in 2006 the FDF demanded that PLS inform them if anything valuable was encountered, and that their representative could check that nothing historically important would be sold as scrapmetal and recycled (Alaluusua 2006b). Conflict between the local history enthusiasts and the PLS recurred again in 2007, and few members of the LSMH stayed all week observing the clearing work of PLS at the Kaamanen airfield (Alaluusua 2007).

The confrontations in Inari and Sodankylä probably caused PLS to move their actions southwards in 2010. These incidents brought the organization also nationwide bad publicity (M1; M4; M13), despite its generally well-meaning aim to keep Lapland tidy. The local resistance and lack of permit in 2011 prompted PLS finally to get into discourse with heritage actors in 2012, including myself. PLS wanted to arrange an overarching “war junk discussion” with representatives from the Sámi Museum Siida, the Provincial Museum of Lapland, Tankavaara Gold Prospector Museum, LSMH, NBA, NBF, ELY, FDF, the reindeer grazing associations, and the Department of Archaeology, University of Helsinki, represented by me (PLS Meeting invitation 22.05.2012). The discussion took place in November 2012. PLS motivation for organizing it was described as:

“There has been lively discussion about war junk in different medias and forums. Pidä Lappi Siistinä ry (PLS ry) wishes that the interested bodies would discuss in cooperation about the principles of war junk cleaning and end up with a mutually agreed approach and decisions, according to which the concrete actions regarding the war junk will be implemented... to prevent disruptions of already planned actions, as happened with the summer 2011 clearing camp of PLS ry following the decision to ban the cleaning of war junk.”

(PLS meeting invitation 23.11.2012).
In their invitation PLS emphasized that they only clear the “metal junk that is worthless but harmful for people and animals”, and “[I]f war historically valuable material is found from the landscape, it is informed to the permit giver, who can inspect it...” (PLS meeting invitation 23.11.2012). They also noted that “PLS has no interest in cleaning war junk, if the Defence Forces and landowners and other bodies are unanimously against it in the future” (PLS meeting invitation 23.11.2012; my emphasis).

The outcome of the meeting was, that PLS decided to hold back from clearing war junk in 2013–2016 to allow the mapping of the wartime sites. However, based on our recent discussions with PLS, it seems likely that they have no interest anymore to take up the war junk cleaning. As they expressed: “The organization has enough important work for example in cleaning and maintaining hiking routes and other nature sites” (PLS meeting invitation 23.11.2012).

What both the PLS and FDF missed when launching the clearing project, and in their evaluation of what is “war historically valuable” (PLS meeting invitation 23.11.2012), is that the local perception of the so-called “war junk’s” heritage status is very different from the casual national-level interpretation. The local insights have become exceedingly clear in our interviews with various local stakeholders. Villagers in Inari and Sodankylä typically saw the PLS cleaning actions as a southern intrusion, since the organization was Rovaniemi-based and most of the volunteers originated from southern Finland. This rings a bell with Lapland’s long enduring colonialist past and sidelining. As an example, I was originally invited to several places owing to the local discontent with the PLS activities. The locals hoped that when their wartime material remains are noted, mapped and reported by the heritage authorities, this would protect them from further interference and destruction by the outsiders. From a local perspective, this actually paid off in the long run, since the clearing project was eventually withdrawn.

Importantly, for the locals the importance of the wartime material remains, that both the FDF and PLS dubbed dismissively as “war junk”, is not straightforwardly related to its material or war historical value, for instance, its exceptionality or representativity. Its local value is more based on what it stands for symbolically and socially, as part of the local cultural landscape and memoryscape. At the same time this material heritage acts as significant agent for the local communal memories intertwined with numerous other contemporary issues (see below; papers III-V; Jones 2017; Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). For example, the spokesmen of PLS in many cases emphasized that the German matériel is dangerous and unwanted in Lapland’s landscapes, also due to the real danger posed by the UXO (Herva 2014; Seitsonen & Herva 2017a; see paper III and below). This message was reinforced on their website with a photograph of “[R]emains of a reindeer that died because of war junk” (PLS 2012), showing a reindeer skeleton entwined with rusty pieces of metal. This links with the organization’s wider agenda to keep Lapland’s landscapes (artificially) authentic and pristine. However, this
view stems essentially from a colonial, “western” perception of Lapland foremost as a natural wilderness, whereas for the locals this “wilderness”, as it often appears to the outsiders, in fact embodies their enduring and lived-in cultural landscape (paper III). At least some locals perceived (M17; M20) that the aim of PLS was making their “own lands” more appealing for the national and international tourists. This associates, in turn, with the ongoing discussions about Lapland tourism: what is used – and ignored – in its promotion, how the indigenous Sámi people and their culture are represented, encountered and incorporated, and how this all ties in with Lapland’s little discussed and downplayed colonial past. However, in-depth analyses of these musings are beyond this dissertation.

Altogether, the strong reactions that the PLS clearing project triggered, illustrate well how this nationally long-ignored “war junk” in fact represents for numerous local people and communities in Lapland their own wartime material heritage. In that sense the PLS clearing project was not entirely useless from a heritage perspective, since it brought these questions and opposing views into the open, and initiated, for instance, the resultant active promotion of documentation and protection of WWII sites by LSMH (M1; M13). These discussions eventually also caused the national heritage authorities to start thinking of the “war junk” issue and connected heritage values, especially at the NBF. In the aftermath of this debate, the NBF made their landmark decision to protect all the recent past material remains on the lands controlled by them. Also, the PLS War junk project instigated nationwide discussions about the importance and value of the German matériel, and how the material remains and what they embody, still linger in the margin of national memory and consciousness as haunting reminders and representatives of downplayed histories and unresolved issues.

The heritage theorists have recently discussed how the remains of the past are converted from non-descript material legacy into heritage through active engagement (e.g. Carr 2014:12–15; Lillbroända-Annala 2014), compared by Ronnström (2007:26–27) to a magical act. In this case, it would be “magically” transforming the rusty, everyday “war junk” into something of explicit cultural value. On a national-level, it appears that the PLS War junk project in fact gave an unanticipated impetus, which pushed Lapland’s WWII material heritage into the national and official spheres of consciousness. This started an ongoing process of recognition, which is still very much in its infancy, and also, to an extent, a process of reconciliation with the haunting past. However, it must be remembered that on a local-level there have never been any questions about the importance of the wartime material remains and memories, first as a much-needed raw material source, and later as subliminal, socially valued agents of communal memories, unceasingly conversing and reconciling with the past and keeping it metaphorically alive (see Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017).
5.3 Now: Heterogeneity of time

"...for us the Second World War is not really over."

Latvian film director Viesturs Kairišs (in Rieslakki 2016)

There is an incessant presence of WWII memories in Finland, both locally in Lapland, as mediated by the material remains in the wilderness, and nationally, as maintained by the heroic “master narrative” of the war effort against the Soviet Union (e.g. Kivimäki 2012). This illustrates also some interesting perspectives related to varying understandings of time and presence, and the heterogenous temporalities, characteristic to the messy contemporary pasts and the supermodern world (e.g. Hamiliakis 2011; Harrison & Schofield 2010). This has been aptly summed up by Alfredo González-Ruibal (2008:262): “There is no archaeology of the twenty-first century but only an archaeology of the twenty-first and all its pasts, mixed and entangled”. This moves the attention on temporalities from the precisely defined intervals, such as archaeological periods or historical episodes, to continuous, and often uncertain, processes (see Riede et al. 2016).

As an example, for the historians WWII is easily demarcated as dating to 1939–1945, whereas other perspectives emphasize that WWII, or at least its material remains and living transgenerational memories, are still very much present as active parts of the local long-term cultural continuity, like the Latvian film director Viesturs Kairišs reminds: "...for us the Second World War is not really over" (Rieslakki 2016). In Lapland this heterogeneity of temporalities is illustrated concretely, for instance, by the long-term reuse of the German WWII sites and matériel, first after the war for reconstruction and accommodation, at places for many years (e.g. Arvelin 2009), and later by reindeer herders and other wilderness wanderers for temporary shelter.

Also, the fatal post-war incidents with UXO are relevant in this context of diverging perceptions of time. Should the people who were injured or died in explosions after the war be seen as casualties of WWII? On a local-level, the post-war casualties are seen integrally as war losses. As one example, in Vuotso the people who died in these incidents are incorporated into the “1939 – 1944 For the Fatherland” (Isänmaan puolesta) memorial plaque at the local school: two post-war deaths in 1945, and as the latest a young boy who died in an UXO explosion in 1959, a decade and half after the war (Fig. 69). This is also the national approach for defining the war invalid status: people hurt after the war by UXO are also encompassed as war invalids.

However, the temporal connections of the recent, more controversial, incident where a metal detectorist was killed and another badly injured in 2013 when trying to defuse an artillery grenade in their garage is more complicated (paper III). Should these men also be counted as casualties of
WWII? In theory, they could be seen as such. However, the local attitudes toward this issue were made very clear to me by three Sámi interviewees at the Vuotso shop, who scoffed: “Well hell no. Stupidity has its price. They shouldn’t go around poking and taking things from our land. Let it be. Metal men [metal detectorists] should remember that it is different for our people. We had no choice. They think they know so much of the war, but they know nothing” (M17; my emphasis).

These informants expressed very strongly that it would be practically an insult towards their own dead, if the dead metal detectorist would be seen as a war casualty. Also, the reference to “our land” is interesting, and can be associated with the stewardship and ownership expressed by the locals towards their “own heritage”, and linked with the ongoing debates about the northern land ownership, Sámi landuse rights, and related issues (e.g. Lehtola 2015a; Länsman 2004; see below).
5.4 Now: Haunting and haunted heritage

“When I walk there, it sometimes feels like someone is peeping at me.”

Local history enthusiast about visiting the German ruins at Vuotso (F6 2015)

“...inhabitants of the prison camp are said to have been haunting the cape for decades, [people] have heard sounds of wood-cutting, commands and rattling of military tools. [sic]”

User entry in the LDH public crowdsourcing (LDH 2017)

The heterogenous temporalities, and in some sense “porous” past (see González-Ruibal 2008; Witmore 2013), are also exemplified by the numerous ghost stories associated with many German WWII sites in Lapland. Many of these localities are both literally and figuratively described in the local folklore as haunted by the ghosts of war (see Harjumaa 2009; Herva 2014; also F6; M20; M28). This became evident by the public entries in both the YLE (paper V) and LDH crowdsourcing (LDH 2017).

On a figurative national-level, the German material remains haunt the memory of the entire nation, due to their unsettled character. This is, for instance, mirrored by the strong sentiments for and against the PLS clearing operations and the connected animated debate (Herva 2014). The misplaced and ambiguous material remains in Lapland’s landscapes symbolize different things for people with differing backgrounds. For the outsiders, the material remains can easily appear as illustrating the anonymous, faceless mass of the Nazi German soldiers. In this perspective, the abandoned military matériel in the wilderness “would have ’abducted’ (Gell 1998) qualities of the German army as a collective entity, and are still more or less residually charged by those qualities” (Herva 2014:306). On the other hand, for the locals with familial ties to the remains they stand out as persisting landmarks of the personal connections to the ever-present past (Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). This also explains the range of differing attitudes towards, and engagements with, the “war junk”. For instance, based on the idiosyncratic local perspectives, it is understandable that the locals feel strong custodianship towards what they perceive as their own heritage connected to their own communal past on their own lands (M17; M18).

The haunting, ambivalent characteristics of the German materialities, and the connected debates, suggest their relevance as materialised manifestations of alternative – and to some also undesirable – geographies and pasts. In a sense, the material remains reach out from the past to remind us of what they represent and symbolize as ghastly, out-of-place artefacts in the modern day landscape (e.g. Herva 2014; Pétursdóttir & Olsen 2014a–b), as “…a crumbling mixture of all its pasts, jumbled together and still living, never dead but never freshly alive...” (Brentano 1991:3). Barndt (2010), in the context of Holocaust heritage, has reflected on the (perhaps subconscious) avoidance of recent pasts
related to the Nazi reign and the preference of returns to an (imaginary) archaic pasts, based on anthropologist Marc Augé’s (2004) notions of cultural memory, recollection and disremembering. For Lapland, this emerges as the apparent decades-long national-level obliviousness of the ideologically uncomfortable and traumatic German presence. Instead, images of the outwardly “unpolluted” prehistoric pasts, the seemingly “pristine” wilderness, and the “original” Sámi “natives” and their reindeer, are typically preferred, for instance, in the tourism promotion and preservation discussions. One tourism promoter recently described characteristically: “Nature is Lapland’s Disneyland” (Morottaja 2016).

On the other hand, the character of German sites as haunting reminders of a little discussed and disturbing past, takes also the form of concrete ghost sightings and paranormal experiences in the local folklore (Harjumaa 2009; Herva 2014; Koskinen-Koivisto 2016). Lapland, and also Finland more widely, has been long viewed as an enchanted land of supernatural beings. This reputation is recreated and maintained mostly by the outsiders since the early modern times, and nowadays, for instance, connected to the tourism promotion. Still, the traditional northern cosmologies have been characterized by the relational worldviews built on animistic and shamanistic foundations (e.g. Herva 2014; Ingold 2000; paper III). In this sense the “haunted” German sites have been incorporated into the local, long-term historical and cultural frameworks and ontologies, in tandem with them being merged into the local historical landscapes and environmental perceptions (Seitsonen & Herva 2017b). Ghosts related to the German legacy illustrate also well how the stories of paranormal activity are often connected to unsettled and ambiguous issues (Herva 2014).

The stories of ghost sightings at German sites are most often related to places of death and suffering, especially to the PoW camps and military hospitals (Harjumaa 2009; LDH 2017; also paper V). Altogether 28 entries (9 percent of the total) in the LDH crowdsourcing relate to ghosts and hauntings (LDH 2017). As an example, the second quote above relates to the place of the Sámi Museum Siida in Inari where the German’s had the Juutuanjoki PoW camp (13).

In another interesting entry in the LDH crowdsourcing, a public user marked a place called “Money pine” (Rahamänty) in Kuusamo, with the lengthy description:

“A tree known as the money pine grew for hundreds of years at Korentokangas, it received its sobriquet on the basis, that according to a story [renowned Finnish artist] Akseli Gallen-Kallela used it as a model when drawing the tree for mark coins. Money pine was already historically an ancient landmark and meeting place, it is told that during the Rappa Wars oppressor Russians [vihavenäläiset] and Swedes negotiated there, one oppressor Russian was even buried near the tree. Its trunk had a large cavity, that offered a hiding place for the children and shelter from rain for the adults. During the Lapland War
a German soldier was buried at the base of the money pine, then when soldiers’ bodies were collected in 1950s to be taken to Noruajärvi [German Mausoleum] in Rovaniemi, he was uncovered. Body was well-preserved, hand in a sling. Germans also mined the whole area. [sic]"

User entry in the LDH public crowdsourcing (LDH 2017)

This entry illustrates well how the German legacy has become an integral part of the longer tradition of local folklore, as discussed above. Money pine in itself is a mythological place, as shown by the many stories through time connected to this place: Rappa Wars (Rappasodat) refer in the local vernacular to the Swedish–Russian wars of 1570–1595. There are also at least two other places in Finland known as the “money pine”, told to be the model for the tree illustrated in the old Finnish mark coins.

One more example of this embeddedness into the local folklore is an entry marking a PoW forest working site of Kaivoslampi, where according to the marker:

“Wilderness walkers have heard rattling of bones, howling, Russian language mumbling and a child crying. Story goes that at the cabin a child was born, who was smashed into a swamp grave and now cries there as a liekko.”

User entry in the LDH public crowdsourcing (LDH 2017)

Liekko (or Liekkiö) is an old character in the Finnish rural folk beliefs, defined as the howling spirit of a, typically illegitimate, child who has been killed and secretly buried into a swamp or forest grave (Ganander 2016 [1789]:90; Harva 1948:452–454). It is thrilling to observe how deeply the memories and material remains of German and PoW presence have become immersed into the older, enduring rural folk tradition, as illustrated by these and several other entries (LDH 2017). Indirectly, the same embeddedness is expressed through the caring sentiments and custodianship shown towards the German-related material remains by many locals.

The strong emotions and experiences that the German sites can generate in the wilderness for some people, became evident also to us in summer 2016. Two volunteers from our public excavations in August 2016 visited the Kankiniemi PoW camp (15), which we had excavated in 2015, and experienced something puzzling, which they perceived as a haunting. Regardless of what exactly causes such experiences, it is important from a heritage perspective that people feel something related to the WWII sites and material remains. As a result of this Kankiniemi incident, and as unplanned and unexpected public outreach of the LDH project, two months later a Greek Orthodox cross was raised at the site by me, Vesa-Pekka Herva and the local Orthodox priest father Rauno Pietarinen, and a memorial service held in October 2016 (Fig. 70). After
the service father Pietarinen explained to us the motivation for organising this service:

“When those who suffered and died at the camp during the war are remembered now, it in fact comforts them during the war when they were still alive. This might sound like a strange way for the time to behave, but this kind of spiritual time travel makes sense to us when you think of it. This cross and this service normalize this place to the same level as the surrounding lands. It doesn’t make this place good or holy, but normal.”

Father Rauno Pietarinen (October 1 2016)

This can be seen ultimately as an attempt to interfere with the past, and to prevent the place from becoming haunted in the first place (Seitsonen & Herva 2017b). I will not go to the details of this incident here, but it is an illustrative example of how the past is still very much “alive” at these sites, at least metaphorically, and can affect the present through its material traces. This is another expression of the heterogeneity and porosity of time and past(s) (Gonzáles-Ruibal 2008; see above), of how the past and present can indeed co-exist and overlap through the material remains.

Figure 70. Father Rauno Pietarinen giving a Greek Orthodox memorial service at the Kankiniemi PoW camp in October 2016 (Oula Seitsonen 2016).
5.5 Now: "Can you love a Nazi?" or "Wir waren freunde"

“It was just two young people falling in love, you didn’t ask about the nationality.”

Rovaniemi civilian of the wartime relations with the Germans (in Alariesto et al. 2015:31)

A Finnish columnist recently asked in the country’s biggest newspaper Helsingin Sanomat “Can you love a Nazi?”, related to the German WWII presence in Lapland and the long hushed love affairs, illegitimate children, and friendly co-existence between the Finnish civilians and German soldiers in 1941–1944 (Kangasniemi 2016). Such suppressed issues (e.g. Wendisch 2006) seem then to be important when processing the collective silenced traumas of the war in Lapland (Sääskilahti 2015). On a local-level they were always known and familiar, but not shown to outsiders (Seitsonen & Koskinnen-Koivisto 2017). Again, this and other recent discussions in public, illustrate how little this period has been studied, or reconciled with for that matter, in Finland even 70 years after the war (see Forrest 2015).

This became especially clear in the context of a recent exhibition organized at the Provincial Museum of Lapland, Rovaniemi. The temporary exhibition “Wir waren Freunde – We were friends. Encounters of Germans and Finns in Lapland 1940–1944” in 2015–2016 dealt with the little discussed period from 1940 to 1944 when Finns and Germans lived peacefully as neighbours, prior to the Lapland War. The exhibition was opened on the 70th anniversary of the end of the Lapland War, April 27 2015 (Alariesto et al. 2015). One of the themes presented by the exhibition was the relationships between Finnish women and German soldiers. Especially one ill-fated love story was illustrated in detail, through love letters and other items donated to the museum by the woman’s relatives (Fig. 71).

The exhibition got a very controversial reception both locally and nationally. This started out with an ingenious, yet rather daring, advertising strategy that the museum employees came up with: simple black matchboxes with the blood-red words “Wir waren Freunde” printed on them (Fig. 72) (see also Harju 2017; Koskinen-Koivisto & Thomas 2017). As mentioned (chapter 2), the “Burning of Lapland”, describing the scorched earth tactics and destruction of infrastructure by Germans during their retreat in 1944, is a commonly used proverb in Finland, and the single best remembered event of northern Finnish involvement in WWII. In the post-war decades, numerous Finnish songs, jokes, and TV sketches were centered on the Germans, fire and matchboxes, such as, “Wollen sie Marlboro oder Lapland rauchen?” (“Would you like to light up a Marlboro or Lapland?”), or “What do you call someone who burns everything? Pyromaniac. What do you call someone who steals...
Figure 71. An illustrated love story of a Finnish woman and a German soldier in the “Wir waren Freunde – We were friends” exhibition at the Provincial Museum of Lapland, Rovaniemi (Oula Seitsonen 2015).

Figure 72. A “Wir waren Freunde” matchbox, banned advertisement turned into a collectible (Oula Seitsonen 2015).
everything? Kleptomaniac. What do you call someone who burns and steals everything? Germaniac”. Also, in the past decades some people, especially around Rovaniemi (typically men), used to provocatively shake matchboxes at the German tourists.

The “Wir waren Freunde” matchboxes got immediate national media coverage (e.g. Hakonen 2014; Puoskari 2015), much wider than the museum had ever had, as the employees described to us (F3; F4; F9). However, there are still strong sentiments related to the German period in Rovaniemi, since Rovaniemi served as the German headquarters town with thousands of German soldiers in the townscape, but also became thoroughly annihilated in 1944 (e.g. Mikkonen 2016). Many local residents are still somewhat bitter about that destruction and loss of their property.

The museum staff got firsthand experience of how these strong public sentiments – at Rovaniemi mostly negative, but on the other hand also pro-German – interweave closely with the modern political divisions. Some of these political splits in fact appear to predate WWII, at least in people’s minds. One of our interviewees (M10; henceforth “Major”, a retired military officer) declared: “Our problem [in Rovaniemi] is that some people still haven’t gotten over the Civil War” – referring to the Finnish Civil War of 1918 between the right-wing Whites, backed by Imperial Germany, and the leftist Reds, backed by Red Russians. Major is an active and well-known public character in the contemporary Finno-German relations and cultural politics at Rovaniemi. From his viewpoint the museum and heritage people typically represent leftist (Red) ideals – he was also slightly suspicious of us at first when we interviewed him – whereas his peers in the military and in the local politics presented, in his view, more patriotic and right-wing (White) sentiments.

Soon after the promotional matchboxes were produced in summer 2014, Major turned them into a political issue. At first he tried directly to convince the museum employees that handing out matches was a bad idea for publicity “…but he [museum employee] just chuckled that it is a good laugh!” (M10). In an official statement, the museum director Hannu Kotivuori agreed that the matchboxes presented a polarized marketing strategy, and “[I]t is a matter of opinion, whether it represents bad taste. Everybody can make their minds about that themselves” (Kotivuori, in Vesa 2015; also M22). Kotivuori underlined that the matches were never meant as a joke, and he hoped that they could stimulate active discussion and wake people to think more closely about the Finno-German relations during the war, as well as their own stance towards the subject: “Whether you feel sympathy or antipathy towards Germans” (Kotivuori, in Hakonen 2014; also M22).

Major’s reasoning in turning the matchboxes into an issue of political debate was that according to him, some museum exhibition employees, such as ticket vendors and guides, approached him and begged for him to take action, since they were afraid of “[H]ow they could ever hand these matches to the German tourists!” (M10; also F5). Major decided to take the matter to the “highest level” (M10), to the mayor of Rovaniemi, to help these employees. We
have also interviewed the local guides, and some of them indeed hold the Major in high esteem. As a result of taking the matchbox issue to the municipality, by the time the exhibition was opened on April 27, 2015, the matches were officially banned by the town mayor (Vesa 2015). The mayor explained that "[F]eedback was received widely and we decided ... that there was no point to start inflating the issue anymore. The marketing message had already gone through, so we decided that it would be better to hide the sticks" (mayor of Rovaniemi, in Vesa 2015). The biggest issue for the adversaries of the matchboxes seemed to be the phrasing: “we were”, instead of “we are” (Koskinen-Koivisto & Thomas 2017; M10), which also the representative of German Embassy in Finland raised up in his speech at the opening of the exhibition. However, the prohibition had a somewhat contrary effect than what Major and his peers had probably hoped for. After the matches were banned by the municipality, they made the national news again, and became an increasingly interesting item and eventually a collectible. In just a few weeks all the matchboxes were gone from the museum, as people asked for them under-the-counter.

Also the exhibition received mixed feedback. For instance, in the internet discussions people accused the museum of whitewashing the German period and the Nazis by representing them in a “too” good light, for instance, by describing their commander, and devouted Nazi, General Eduard Dietl as the “Hero of Narvik” – with which most Norwegians would disagree – or passing the sufferings of PoWs and forced/slave labourers with a few fleeting mentions (see Leisti 2015; Ruotsala 2015). On the other hand, especially the German tourists expressed their gratitude for an exhibition where their forefathers’ activities during the war were not condemned, but presented neutrally as mundane relations between normal people, although only presenting a local perspective and one fraction of what happened during the global war (Harju 2017; F3; F4). Museum staff told that it was a very deliberate choice to concentrate on the mundane, everyday aspects of the German presence, which have been very little dealt with previously, and leave the wartime atrocities and the “Burning of Lapland” to the side (F3; F4; F9). They were afraid that these powerful stories and images of destruction would overwhelm the various more “silent” aspects of German presence, in a similar vein as the commanding images of destruction have come to dominate Lapland’s war histories on a national-level (chapter 2). The burning of Rovaniemi and destruction of Lapland are also illustrated in detail in their permanent display. Some people also complained that already the exhibition poster, showing a cute Finnish girl playing harmonica in the arms of a German soldier, directed the opinions on the subject (Fig. 73). As a response to the public critique, the museum staff emphasized that the visitors should have paid closer attention to the subtle messages of barbwire and a crow shown in the exhibition poster, and to the barbwire installation and PoW-related artefacts in one corner of the exhibition, all telling of the darker shades of the Finno-German relations and co-habitation (F4).
The wartime photograph used in the exhibition poster was also one of three in the exhibition that had been inventively turned into haunting digital augmented reality presentations. One character in each of these photos has been dramatized by an actor/actress, and using a freely-available mobile application (Lapin maakuntamuseo 2015), that character turns on screen towards the spectator and tells a short story related to the situation in the photograph (Fig. 73). These spectral images put the observer face-to-face with history and bring the past alive, which is especially interesting thinking of the figuratively and experientially haunting character of the German material remains (paper IV; see above).

In the end, however, the “Wir waren freunde” exhibition became the most popular temporary exhibition of all times at the museum, and managed to attract also the locals, who, according to the museum employees, are more difficult to convince to visit the museum than the tourists are. The Provincial Museum of Lapland is often included in the tourists’ tour packages (F3; F4; M22). Interestingly, this temporary exhibition was taken down in the early January 2016, just before the onset of Israeli holiday season. Israeli tourists are an important visitor group in the museum, and the staff was afraid of hurting their feelings with an exhibition describing the cordial relations between Finns and their Nazi co-belligerents, such as the Finno-German love affairs and the get-togethers prepared by the Germans for the local children (M22).
LDH organized a very successful visitor survey in the exhibition, which we have recently started to analyse (Harju 2017; Koskinen-Koivisto & Thomas 2017). A preliminary glance through the material shows that there are very diverse and opposing opinions described by the public in their responses. However, mostly the responses are positive: “The first exhibition where ‘the Germans’ are not monsters” (German male, age 45–54), “Very objective and honest presentation” (German male, age 45–54), or “I’m happy to learn from a non politied perspective [sic]” (Spanish male, age 25–34). Local people were also pleased with the mundane perspective of the exhibition, like a Finnish man (age 45–55) who commented: “...after all pretty ordinary people meet each other in exceptional circumstances”. Then again, understandably also opposite views were presented to such a politically-loaded subject:

> “An exhibition like yours would be severely criticized in Austria and in Germany, not to speak of Norway, which has a very different memory of Dietl. For a tourist, to come by such a superficial and reductionist version of a crucial time in European history, it was disturbing, to say the least. [sic]”

German male (in Harju 2017)

Public responses to the visitor survey, like also the interest shown towards our archaeological studies, emphasize how little discussed this subject has previously been in public, especially on a national-level. There appears to be a real public appeal for more information and new perspectives on this and the other little discussed histories of WWII.

### 5.6 Now: Dietl-mania

“In my opinion Dielt charmed the civilian population here in Rovaniemi”

Rovaniemi civilian about General Dietl (in Alariesto et al. 2015:46)

The commander of AOK20, Generaloberst Eduard Dietl (21.07.1890–23.06.1944), as mentioned above, was described as the “Hero of Narvik” in the “Wir waren Freunde” exhibition. Recollections of him have been recurrently brought up during our interviews, especially in the Rovaniemi area, and there appear to be numerous living memories related to the legendary reputation he gained in northern Finland. Dietl has been described as a jovial, charismatic, easy-going and cheerful person, who was popular amongst both his own soldiers and Lapland’s civilians (Alariesto et al.

---

10 Thanks to my colleague Suzie Thomas for formulating this title into its ultimate form during one (especially long) afternoon.
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2015; Junila 2000; Knabe 1983; Mikkonen 2016:42–43) (Fig. 74–75). He is still fondly remembered, especially in Rovaniemi where his headquarters were, in the communal memories and discussions as a grandfather-like figure, who apparently genuinely loved Lapland, enthusiastically practised wintersports, and was nice to children. Illustratively, the road that led to his log cabin in Rovaniemi is still remembered as the “Pompomstrasse” (“Candy Road”) where the kids waited for Dietl who always had some candy in his pockets (Alariesto et al. 2015; Mikkonen 2016; M2, M24; M25).

Dietl died in in June 1944 in a plane crash on the Austrian Alps in unclear conditions, before the outbreak of the Lapland War. This has given his memory a certain aura of mystery. Many people in Lapland were convinced in the post-war decades, and some still are, that if Dietl would have been commanding the German troops in the Lapland War, the widespread destruction would not have happened:

“Hitler ... installed a timebomb into the plane that transported the General. If that man had lived, Lapland would not have been destroyed, since Dietl was a true friend of Finland”

Finnish civilian (Virolainen 1999:92)

Local speculations that Hitler assassinated Dietl are highly improbable, since he was a devoted, longstanding party member, and took great pride in his

Figure 74. “Handsome tall man, General Dietl visited here in Rovaniemi and even I saw him. He was a clever man and correct in his behaviour.” (Virolainen 1999:91). Dietl appears to be giving an autograph to an admirer in the picture, original caption: “General Dietl in the battlefield photographer’s exhibition in Ateneum.” (SA-kuva 88237/ Helsinki/ 26.05.1942).
claim that the National Socialistic activity had been taken further in his AOK20 than anywhere else in the German armed forces (Ahto 1974:188; Mikkonen 2016:41). Despite Dietl’s devotion to the party, he had made the apparently conscious political choice that his troops did not advocate their political views in Finland. Still at the same time Dietl travelled and actively took part in political rallies in Germany (Mikkonen 2016:41).

Following Dietl’s death, the blame for the “Burning of Lapland” was placed in Finland on the shoulders of his successor, General Lothar Rendulic, who was not nearly as good in public relations and “winning hearts and minds” as Dietl. The plans for “burning” were however made under Dietl’s command (Mikkonen 2016:45). Dielt had, for instance, already in the spring of 1944 regretfully told to his good friend Colonel Oiva Willamo, the eccentric commander of the Finnish liaison headquarters in Rovaniemi known as the “Kaiser of Lapland”, that they most likely must destroy Lapland if the situation gets tough (Mikkonen 2016:45).

Dietl’s memory became evident also in the YLE (paper V) and LDH (2016) public crowdsourcings. In both crowdsourcings someone (probably the same person) marked a place, where, according to the local communal memoirs and Mikkonen’s studies (Mikkonen 2016:163; also Hartikainen n.d.), stood General Dietl’s “summer house”, a log cabin built at Oikarainen near Rovaniemi (LDH 2017). There is an intriguing, yet very ambiguous, local story...
of “Dietl’s rubbish pit with some valuables” related to this location (M5), although this story does not state what these “valuables” should in fact be. We have so far located the place of the summer house and the rubbish pit, based on the local knowledge (Fig. 76). Maybe this pit could be worthwhile to excavate in the future, as a case study of “digging folklore” (e.g. Gazin-Schwartz & Holtorf 1999). Even if it would turn out that there are absolutely no facts behind this story, it does ring a bell with the internationally common narratives of “Nazi treasures”, which have materialized in various forms in the post-war folklore surrounding the Nazis and their activities (e.g. Edsel 2013; Klein 2013; paper IV). This could provide an interesting new perspective on the local perceptions linked with General Dietl, and also more widely with the German material legacy in Lapland.

Another entry related to Dietl in our crowdsourcing presents an intriguing confusion of German generals in the mind of at least some member of the public (LDH 2017). Someone marked on the map “General Dietl’s lodge” and described that:

“Dietl, Willamo and Hillilä often spent their evenings here. Museum had saved parts of the building that was dismantled in the 1970s and those are now on display in the Arktikum [The Provincial Museum of Lapland]. Tearing down the hut that had survived the war was a great sacrilege. [sic]”

User entry in the LDH public crowdsourcing (LDH 2017)

This is an interesting mix-up of two different Generals and their log cabins. Dietl indeed had a cabin in Rovaniemi near Willamo’s log house where he spent time with Willamo and Kaarlo Hillilä, the Governor of Lapland, but it was in a different place, and was scorched in the Lapland War (see Mikkonen
The cabin that survived the burning of Rovaniemi, and was known locally as the “General hut”, belonged instead to the commander of Luftflotte 5 General Julius Schultz (Fig. 77). This log house functioned after the war as a youth hostel until 1980, and was at one point even planned to house a war historical exhibition of the Provincial Museum of Lapland (Harju 2017). However, that plan became politically debated as people feared the exhibition would “glorify fascism” (Harju 2017), and finally the building was “…torn down by the city owing to the political pressuring by the leftists and the ‘defenders of peace’…” (Mikkonen 2016:151). This emphasizes again the close intertwining of contemporary local politics and the WWII heritage in Lapland (see above; also Seitsonen forthcoming). The Provincial Museum saved some artefacts from Schultz’s cabin before it was demolished, and these were on display in the “Wir waren Freunde” exhibition, to which the user referred in her or his entry. The location of this user entry is wrong for both cabins, but it is closer to General Schultz’s cabin’s place.

Most fascinating of the entries related to Dietl in our LDH crowdsourcing was marked in the center of Rovaniemi with the tag “Ghosts of a Midsummer night”, again informative of the haunting character of the German-related memoryscape (see above). The description of the entry states:

“It is told that passers-by have met marching German soldiers on Valtakatu and General Dietl himself was receiving the parade. However probably the Midsummer’s drinks contributed to this [sic]”

User entry in the LDH public crowdsourcing (LDH 2017)
5.7 Now: Stalkers and metal men

“I know many places with the Hermans’ things. Horse shoes and eagles and all kinds of things. Metal men [metal detectorists] have offered me a lot of money many times to take them [to the finds]. But I will not do that, I am not that much after money. I keep them there. Where they are and belong.”

Local reindeer herder at Vuotso (M17 2010)

“Ylimmäinen Kuivajärvi has been a real treasure trove for the ‘Stalkers’ collecting war junk.”

Markku Arvelin (2009:30)

Two relatively opposing contemporary perspectives on the German material remains have been becoming apparent in our studies. To simplify, on the one hand, the often outwardly indifferent local views related to the living, embodied and intimately-known cultural landscape context of the German remains that promote custodianship, and on the other, the outsider views emphasizing the importance of clean, “pristine” natural landscapes that advocate the clearing of “war junk”. Besides these, in the past few years yet another differing perception and engagement with Lapland’s WWII German sites has developed and become increasingly widespread: the hobbyist metal detectorists’ and memorabilia collectors’ stance. Collectors have existed throughout the post-war decades (M17; M28; paper II), but recently these activities have been growing immensely as the metal detecting hobby, facilitated by the availability of cheap metal detectors, has become progressively popular in Finland (papers III–IV; Wessman et al. 2016).

The signs of fresh unauthorized digging are common at numerous German sites (Fig. 78). These connect directly with what the locals often want to resist: the outsiders interfering and tampering with their “own lands” (Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivistö 2017). Locally the militaria enthusiasts and metal detectorists are often named disparagingly and contemptuously as “Stalkers”, referring to the hunters of alien paraphernalia in the famous sci-fi novel by Arkady and Boris Strugatsky (1972) (Arvelin 2009), or “metal men” (M17; M19; M28). The reluctancy of locals to allow outsiders to go treasure hunting on their “own lands”, ties in with the wider issues related to landuse and ownership in Lapland. Most importantly there is an enduring confrontation between, on the one hand, the traditional Sámi landuse rights based on the unwritten laws and customs, and, on the other hand, the “western” ideas of land ownership and the Finnish “everyman’s right” (e.g. Länsman 2004:171; Lehtola 2015a; see below).

Also some of the locals collect militaria finds they encounter on their lands or cherish items collected or acquired during the war, but with different motives than the metal detectorists (F7, M17). For them these mementoes
Figure 78. Metal detectorists’ “excavation” on the edge of a German WWII barrack foundation (Oula Seitsonen 2015).

Figure 79. Small finds salvaged from the WWII sites by local history enthusiasts in Vuotso, wartime photographs, maps, and sketches of the German installations drawn by one of our interviewees (M18) (Oula Seitsonen 2015); Inset) A German helmet taken to the Gold Prospector Museum by another interviewee (M17) (Photograph: Gold Prospector Museum).
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appear to act as important and dynamic reminders of the past. Some of them also take the finds they encounter, such as helmets and other larger things, to the local museums, such as the Gold Prospector Museum in Tankavaara, Sodankylä, to prevent them from falling into the hands of outsiders and “being sold abroad” (F8; M17), and so that they would be curated (Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017) (Fig. 79). As stated by several locals (F6; M13; M17; M18), the outsider metal detectorists and collectors occasionally even offer money to be directed to potential places for metal detecting, or try to buy finds the locals have discovered. At least the people we have talked to have refused to do that. Still, for instance in Vuotso, the locals witness every year that outsiders go sporadically metal detecting at the German ruins around the village (F6; M17; M18; M19), as also suggested by the fresh signs of digging.

Based on the interviews and netnographic surveys, there is an active scene of engaging with the German and other WWII material remains, involving metal detecting, collecting and trading. Mostly the metal detectorists appear to be non-local, originating from southern Finland, and some even from abroad where Lapland is known as a somewhat fabled source of wartime memorabilia amongst metal detectorists (papers III–IV) (M12; M13). Trading seems to take place mostly from person to person, at arms fairs, and on private internet forums. Some people also sell their metal detector finds and other collectibles at the antique shops, for instance, in Rovaniemi (Fig. 80) (M9; M12; M14; M21; M22). Recently the sales of memorabilia appear to have been moving largely to closed Facebook forums, but this trading awaits closer analysis.

What seems to be of significance is that in our over thirty interviews with different stakeholders with an interest in Lapland’s WWII German heritage, ranging from militaria collectors and traders to museum people and local villagers, none has appeared as a “Nazi fan” or a (neo-)Nazi sympathizer who would carry out their activities due to a fascination in Nazis as mediated and mythologized, for instance, by popular culture (see Kingsepp 2006; Rau 2014). For most of the memorabilia collectors their interests have been sparked by personal ties to their specific subject of interest, such as relatives who served as volunteers in the Waffen-SS during the war (M9; M23). Our interviews and discussions with different stakeholders suggest that the “treasure hunting” and militaria collecting and trading in Lapland should be understood in the wider perspective of northern exoticism, and as a form of “dark tourism” (e.g. Stone 2006; also McAteckney 2013), engaging with the “dark” past and heritage in Lapland’s “enchanted” and mysterious cultural and environmental setting (papers III–IV).

Directly related to this experiential aspect of the treasure hunting in the wilderness, a “veteran metal detectorist” that we interviewed, commented significantly on the aural faculties of the sites and how they are lost if the sites are not approached and treated in a “caressing” way (M12). He started his hobby already in the 1980s when there were very few metal detectors in the whole country, and complained that the “youngsters” do not honour this and
“make a mess”, which takes away the “spirit of the sites” (M12). His concerns are echoed by the notions of many local villagers, especially of the reindeer herders, on what should – or should not – be done to the matériel in the landscape. This “veteran detectorist” had always taken special care to cover all his digging to restore the places as they were when he entered them, often as the first person in sixty or seventy years, taking only small samples of the finds and reburying the rest. For him the hobby was not so much about the finds, but about the joy of finding and wandering in the wilderness, after a winter of tedious background work in the archives to locate the potential metal detecting sites: “In the summers when I was most active in this respect, I used up to two pairs of rubber boots just walking in the wilderness” (M12). My colleagues have labelled him and his peers as “expert-explorers” in their categorization of the various kinds of enthusiasts engaging with the WWII sites in Lapland (Koskinen-Koivisto & Thomas 2017; see paper IV).

The recent fatal metal detectorist accident in Kemi illustrates tragically the factual dangers of this hobby, when engaging with the UXO that is still found in the wilderness areas (paper III). A metal detectorist was killed and another
seriously hurt when they were defusing a grenade in a private garage. Police investigation of the explosion site revealed that they had collected dozens of wartime explosives, such as artillery and mortar grenades (YLE 2013a–c). The survivor emphasized to the police that they had found all the UXO by themselves in two years with a metal detector, did not know anything of the trade on explosives or other wartime material, and were planning to use the defused grenades as interior decoration in their homes (Kaleva 2013a). Intriguingly, several of the explosives in the police crime scene photographs (e.g. YLE 2013c) appear at least analogous to, if not the same as, UXO exhibited by an anonymous detectorist in 2008–2009 in a series of photographs on the metal detectorists’ internet discussion forums. These were curiously removed from the website after the explosion. After the Kemi explosion, the collecting and sales of UXO received national attention, and the Finnish interior minister asked the police if they should start monitoring the internet and other sales of UXO (Kaleva 2013c). Also, the market potential of wartime explosives appeared in the headlines: “Ammo can be found in the northern forests for sale” (Kaleva 2013d) and “Money attracts people to search for easily exploding wartime ammunition” (Parkkonen 2013). War historian Mika Kulju has also described that he often gets inquiries about where to find guns, ammo and explosives in Lapland: “Those are not collected for own needs, but for sale” (Mika Kulju, in Marttala 2014).

5.8 Materialities of a haunting past - or present?

“The German ruins bother no one, and I think there is no need to purposefully clean them, they can just be there. They are not bothering anyone and they moulder on their own.”

A local elder who was a kid during the wartime at Inari (M15 2015)

Ever since the start of my archaeological studies of the German WWII remains in Lapland, it started to dawn on me how much social value and significance this officially long forgotten and ignored material legacy has locally, and how closely it intertwines with myriad contemporary issues (Jones 2017). This view has been accentuated since our first excavations at Peltojoki in 2009, and further in summer 2016 when we arranged public, community archaeological studies in collaboration with Siida in Inari. As an example, the Sámi media has expressed a lot of interest in our studies through the years, and many local elders have been interested to share irreplaceable memories from their childhood with us. This is not a surprise since the Sámi war experience has received even less attention in Finland than other aspects of the war in the north (see Aikio 2000; Lehtola 1994, 2003, 2015b; Müller-Wille 2007). It is unfortunately commonly overlooked in the public discussions, that
the German presence in Lapland influenced strongly both the Sámi and the Finns, and their respective lands (papers II–IV).

Many northern Lapland natives, whose families have firsthand experiences and remembrances of the German presence, express often intimate familial and personal knowledge of the overgrown ruins and objects merging into their landscape (papers IV–V). So far we have carried out the most intensive interviews about the meanings on, perceptions of and engagements with the German *matériel* in Vuotso, Sodankylä. We conducted intensive interviews with all the elders, who were children at the wartime, as well as with a local history enthusiast, who originally invited me there. We have also had informal discussions with numerous people at the local village shop, school and lodge since 2010 (paper IV; Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). Importantly, analogous sentiments to the ones in Vuotso have also been expressed in the interviews elsewhere, for example, in Inari, Salla and Enontekiö (e.g. M15; M16; M20; M26; M27). One direction of future studies is to map the range of sentiments towards the WWII material remains in detail in other places.

Notably, it appears that for many natives of northern Lapland the German ruins do not convey only memories of destruction and loss in the Lapland War, as might be expected at a first glance. Instead they stand as agents for the local transgenerational memories of the time when the villagers, Germans, and the multinational prisoners lived as close neighbours in 1940–1944, before the outbreak of Finno-German hostilities, the evacuation and the destruction by fire and explosion (Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). For the locals, the German material remains embody their and their ancestors “own”, both positive and negative, war experiences and communnal histories. Generally, the people in Lapland often feel that the official, south-centric histories have overlooked various themes important to them, such as the wide-spread terror caused by the Soviet partisan attacks (e.g. Tuominen 2003:105), which have been recapped by most of our informants.

Still, this does not mean that all the locals would take an active stance towards the German heritage, but rather see them (outwardly) nonchalantly as another layer of their cultural landscape (papers II–IV). However, this superficially casual stance becomes more nuanced when it is examined against the traditional, relational Sámi and Finnish worldviews, which escape the western dichotomies of, for instance, natural and supernatural. Academics originating from Lapland, of both Sámi and Finnish origin (see Länsman 2004:99; Ruotsala 2002:331, 360), have emphasized how in the northern environmental awareness it is not meaningful to separate between “nature” and “culture”, and instead for the locals these form a fluid, overlapping, embodied and lived-in unity, and a cognitively controlled web of relations (also paper III).

Thus, the perspectives of many locals in northern Lapland encourage stewardship and protection of the ruins and objects as part of the local resilient, long-term cultural landscape. However, this does not necessarily happen in an active way through intervention, but rather by letting the objects
be and exist on their own, embedded into their surroundings, which is in itself a form of active and conscious engagement. For instance, at Vuotso the villagers express that they want to discourage outsiders from tampering with their "own heritage" and from removing things from their "own lands" since, "...they belong where they are" (M17) and the objects "...witnessed what happened here" (F6) (Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). These local views resonate interestingly with recent developments in the archaeological theories about things (see Kobialka 2014; Figenschau 2016; Olsen 2013; Olsen and Witmore 2014; Pétursdóttir 2013; Pétursdóttir & Olsen 2014a–b). They also remind that in the context of many indigenous cultures, a division to material and immaterial as well as to cultural and natural heritage is artificial (Harrison 2015; Harrison & Rose 2010). Heritage can then be seen “as the processes and practices of keeping the past alive in the present...” through myriad multispecies relationships and connections which “...bind time, place and generations” (Harrison & Rose 2010:265; also Harrison 2013b).

Generally, it appears that the locals’ resilient, corporeal and intimate sense of place, in places such as Vuotso and elsewhere with nature-based livelihoods, is vital for defining the communal identities and collective spatial imaginations, both past, present and future (Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017; see Korjonen-Kuusipuro and Kuusisto-Arponen 2012). It has facilitated incorporating the German heritage into the longer local cultural historical continuum. In Vuotso, at least, this has been enhanced by the living story telling tradition closely tied to the local landscape, which has transformed the WWII material traces into active reminders of the transgenerational communal memories. The elders had started recapping the wartime experiences and retelling the stories at least since 1960s (Aikio-Puoskari 2010; F7; M17). Somewhat to our surprise, also many of the present-day schoolchildren that we have talked with at the local school are familiar with the German ruins and what they stand for. They told us, that they have been visiting the sites surrounding the village in the course of wilderness-based activities, such as reindeer herding, berry picking and fishing, with their parents and grandparents who have then passed on the traditional stories related to those (Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017).

Maintenance, endurance and stability of a place, and the materialities related to it, may in fact be seen as analogical to cherishing personal, as well as communal, memories (Lento & Olsson 2013:22). From this kind of perspective, the importance of ancestral landuse, long-term continuity, and transmitting of the oral traditions becomes emphasized in traditional societies: what matters are the meanings attached to the landscape and specific places in it (Ruotsala 2002:330). Importantly, thinking of the inconspicuous traces of WWII, this landscape can also be invisible or even a memory, a metaphoric space (Koskinen-Koivisto 2011) connected through the material traces to host of other issues (Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017), such as the traditional lifeways and changes in them, and the relational “sentient ecology” (Anderson 2000:16–117).
Such an invisible site of memory is presented, for instance, near Vuotso by a prisoner execution place next to the PoW camp of Purnumukka (Fig. 47). A nowadays fallen “hanging pine” is still remembered by the villagers as an “unsettling reminder” (Million 1992) of the past, which has acted as a concrete site of memory in an almost ritualistic manner with repetitive place-bound activities, such as stopping at the place and, before the tree fell, touching it (Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). This, and also other invisible or inconspicuous localities that have importance on the local-level were marked in our crowdsourcing (LDH 2017). The Purnumukka PoW camp and the hanging pine were described by a public user as:

“pow camp. in the corner of the camp was a hanging pine, into which a sickle and hammer were carved. creepy place, where travellers used to stop and touch the tree, I don’t know why, but so was the habit [sic]”

User entry in the LDH public crowdsourcing (LDH 2017)

Another example of this is an inconspicuous pit nearby in the forest, which was shown to me by one interviewee: for the locals this represents a saddening memory of one villager who stepped on a mine after the war and was killed (see Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). These both illustrate well the locals’ resilient sense of place and their intimate place attachment.

During the post-war reconstruction period, and in the aftermaths of the forced mobility and destruction, the Finnish State took a stronger hold on Sápmi and the northern areas. Especially the Sámi culture experienced an unprecedented rupture of traditional lifeways and an (involuntary) acculturation (Lehtola 1994:191–224, 2012, 2015b). The people from the parts of Lapland ceded to the Soviet Union suffered from this especially badly. The semi-nomadic reindeer herding and foraging Skolt Sámi from Petsamo were hit particularly hard when they lost their ancestral herding grounds and most of their animals, and were forced to stay in temporary accommodations for years (e.g. Tuominen 2003). Also elsewhere the reindeer herders were negatively affected after the war, as the extensive state-directed exploitation of Lapland’s natural resources spread to their herding grounds (Lehtola 1994:224, 2015b). For instance, another cycle of forced mobility was experienced in the northern parts of Sodankylä, as the remote Sámi villages and homesteads were inundated when the large reservoir lakes of Lókka and Porttipahtä were built in the 1950s–1960s, and the inhabitants resettled in Vuotso. Some of these places had been already badly hit by the Soviet partisan attacks in the war. The building of the reservoirs is remembered locally as the “re-destruction of Sompio”, first destruction referring to that by the Germans in 1944 (Lehtola 1994:223–224). In the 1970s some herding families were again forced to resettle in Vuotso as the result of new state-imposed reindeer herding-laws (Lehtola 1994:223–224).

It appears that the overgrown German ruins and rusting objects might also facilitate nostalgia (Cashman 2006; Carr 2014: 52) for the days of
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independence and traditional lifeways before the war, the consequent loss of property and lives, and the more stringent state intervention and assimilation of the Sámi into the dominant Finnish society in the post-war decades. This is a vivid reminder of the power and agency that even outwardly insignificant and imperceptible material remains can have in shaping the communal and individual identities and embodied recollections, which can then link with numerous other pressing issues than what these traces directly represent (e.g. Koskinen-Koivisto 2011; Macdonald 2006). The local perspective emphasizes the familiarity and personal memories related to the material traces, which act as dynamic agents for these links. This promotes curative, caring and protective engagements, which resiliently embed the material remains into the local, interrelated long-term cultural landscape. This also explains why many locals discourage and resist altering the remains or removing them from their place.

Conversely, for the outsiders the German matériel often appears as unwanted, out-of-place, and potentially dangerous haunting Nazi “war junk”, that spoils the beauty of Lapland’s “pristine” nature. Its dangers were also emphasized by the PLS “War junk project” (see above; Herva 2014; Seitsonen & Herva 2017a). These outsiders can include also people living in Lapland, especially settlers and others who have moved there after the war. There appear to be more critical voices about remembering the German presence in the Rovaniemi region, which was thoroughly devastated in the Lapland War. Still, at least based on the responses to our visitor survey in the “Wir waren Freunde” exhibition, these might in fact present a “loud minority”. It might be this minority that also facilitated the destruction of the “General hut” (chapter 5.6) as late as in 1980, owing to its haunting presence as a reminder of the Nazis in Rovaniemi (Mikkonen 2016:151). These perspectives link closely with the strong local political factions, extending in some people’s minds back to the Civil War of 1918 (M10). Importantly, the German ruins appear also for these people as powerful agents of memory, analogous to the sentiments expressed by people in northern Lapland, and mediating other, pre-war and post-war issues than only those directly connected to the war and the “burning of Lapland”.

The opposing perspectives on and interpretations of the material traces of the German presence facilitate different engagements with them. The outsider, in a sense “western”, view appears to be based on a subliminal division between culture and nature. This detachment enabled, for instance, the cleaning activities of PLS in 2004–2010, viewed by the locals, with a differing cosmology and environmental perception, as a “southern” intrusion eradicating their “own past”. The principally well-intentioned ideal of PLS to keep Lapland tidy is understandable as an expression of a kind of detachment from the nature. Tim Ingold (2004:329) has described this as a “leitmotif through the recent history of western societies”, as an attempt to leave the nature unmarked and unscathed by the human presence or activity.
Tourism is a vital livelihood all over Lapland, increasingly so since the 1970s, and relies in its present form largely on the images of Lapland’s clean and unspoiled nature (see Länsman 2004; Fig. 3). However, this has not been, and is not, without conflicts between the tourists and the locals, when their expectations do not correspond (Länsman 2004:133; Ruotsala 2002:342, 369–370). The southerners often expect to meet a mythological, romanticized north, a distant and foreign land (Länsman 2004:147; Ruotsala 2002:358), a “Wild West ... beyond the Finnish law” (Länsman 2004:146). This compares well with Sakari Pälsi’s (1931) pre-war description. Travelling to Lapland represents, besides a geographical journey, for many a temporal trip back in time, with expectations of “authentic” Sámi herders, or at least the popular culture image of them, dressed up in their traditional clothes, travelling with reindeer sleds and living in kota-tents (Länsman 2004:133; Ruotsala 2002:358). Also the metal detecting and treasure hunting activities, when interpreted as forms of “dark tourism”, link with this concept of a mythical, primordial northern wilderness (paper III–IV), as already tapped into in the wartime propaganda (paper II).

The expectations of “authenticity” have caused over the decades the selective appropriation of elements from the Sámi culture in tourism promotion and elsewhere, which is still unfortunately common in Finland. For instance, there is a long tradition of indifferently abusing the traditional Sámi clothing, gákti, loaded with myriad insider meanings, by the non-Sámi tourism operators, artists, celebrities, comedians, and so on. This often ties in with representing the Sámi in various discriminatory ways, such as repeating the enduring colonial myths of dirty, drunken, eroticized and mythified Sámi who are part of an ethnic natural landscape (Länsman 2004:22, 169; see Heikkinen 2016a–b; Näkkäläjärvi 2016; Toivanen 2017, for ongoing debates in media). Understandably, these kinds of views anger and disillusion the Sámi, and can create suspicion towards, for instance, the (southern) authorities responsible for travel promotion and other outsiders. These mental images and the abuse of “exotic” Sámi costumes appear to have been common also during the wartime, and already earlier (Länsman 2004:22), as illustrated by some photographs, such as the portrait of General Dietl dressed in the Sámi Four Winds Hat (Sámi: čiehgahpir) (Fig. 75). Another example can be seen below, of a Finnish Lotta dressed in a random mixture of Sámi male and female clothing (Fig. 81). This is another recurring feature also in the recent cases of appropriation of Sámi clothes (e.g. Roos 2016).

The discussed, differing perceptions on environment and heritage ownership and custodianship touch closely, and appear to build upon, the marginalization of northern Finland, which has coloured the north-south encounters and dichotomies for decades, if not centuries (papers I–V; also Herva 2014; Lehtola 2015a; Länsman 2004). From the northern standpoint the “south” is demarcated as something mentally and symbolically opposite to the north (Ruotsala 2002:18), and the “southern lords” (etelän herrat) have “the power to act and dominate...” and to threaten the northern lifeways
Figure 81. Original caption: “Lotta in lapp [sic] outfit at Kemijärvi” (SA-kuva 4674/ 02.10.1940/ Kemijärvi).

and livelihoods (Ruotsala 2002:370; also Lehtola 2015a; Länsman 2004). Conversely, the north is often perceived as peripheral and backward, yet romanticized, and has been subject to colonial practices for centuries (e.g. Lehtola 2015a; Naum and Nordin 2013). The latter were most blatantly demonstrated by the digging of Sámi skeletons from graveyards in 1800s and early 1900s, to add to the anatomical collections of the University of Helsinki. The last of these were returned only in 2001 (Harlin 2008:11; Söderholm 2002).

As another example, we asked one of our informants how she experienced the arrival of Germans to Vuotsu in 1941. She casually noted that the “big world” and foreigners were nothing new to her, since her family, and other Sámi families, had been exhibited with their herding dogs, reindeer and kotatents at fairs in 1930s in southern Finland and the Baltic countries (F7). Displaying “savages” at fairs was a relatively common and widespread phenomenon in many western countries still in the early 1900s (e.g. Andreassen 2014:9–11; McKay & Memmott 2016). The Finnish nation has been very slow at recognizing the fluctuating colonial issues, often related to the landuse rights and ownership, and at answering the interconnected “Sámi-controversy” (Lehtola 2015a; also Länsman 2004; chapter 1).
Against these images, the strong local sense of stewardship and an incentive to act as custodians of their “own heritage” on their “own lands” seems sensible as an indigenous reaction and act of self-identification, reflecting Lapland’s colonial history and marginalization by the southern authorities (Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017; Nyyssönen 2013; paper IV; also Friedmann 1992; Jones 2005, 2017). This might be also mirrored, for instance, by the inaccuracies in public entries on the maps in the crowdsourcing. Some people speculated in the Facebook discussions whether the YLE, and also LDH, crowdsourcing maps might be abused by the “treasure hunters” (paper V). Compared with the actual site locations in the landscape, only a fraction of the public entries are even close to those. Although this might be partly due to the rough background maps, this might also represent one conscious way of trying to prevent the outsiders from tampering with the local heritage.

Also, the importance of considering the kaleidoscopic multivocality and diversity of perspectives when discussing northern WWII heritage needs to be acknowledged. This includes, for instance, the viewpoints of different indigenous Sámi groups and the Finnish settlers. The WWII material remains represent also transnational subaltern and orphan heritage (see Price 2005; paper I) related to the German soldiers’, their Soviet, Ukrainian, Polish, Ingrian and other multinational prisoners’ and forced labourers’, as well as Swedish and other volunteers’ legacies. This transnational nature of Finland’s WWII heritage has been so far largely overlooked (see Koskinen-Koivisto 2016, forthcoming; Seitsonen forthcoming).
6. *Fifty Shades of Dark (Heritage)*

“I am, frankly, pissed off by the name of your project, and am not at all certain I want to talk to you.”

*Email from an interviewee to LDH, prior to the interview (M10 2015)*

“But it is true that everyone who knows something of things knows that it is not dark at all. Except the Commies and other Green party toddlers.”

*Email from a potential metal detectorist interviewee to the author (M30 2016)*

“…we have decided with my colleagues that ... since we don’t deal with dark heritage, but airplane crashsites ... we are not interested in your request for an interview. We simply methodologically document and report the sites, all the data is in our reports at the museums.”

*Email from a potential interviewee to LDH (M29 2015)*

The above quotes are all related to the name of our ongoing research, Lapland’s Dark Heritage (LDH). They express some attitudes that we did not originally expect to encounter when we launched the LDH project. When planning the project, we intended the project name to be free of political or other valuations, and saw the concept of “dark heritage” (see Carr & Corbishley 2015) as appropriate for dealing with Lapland’s German WWII material legacy, which has been controversial, ambivalent, difficult, even painful, and downplayed for decades, and to an extent still is (e.g. Koskinen-Koivisto & Thomas 2017). The public discussions, which often refer to the material remains dismissively as “war junk”, are but the most obvious example of disregarding the value of this heritage. As discussed in the chapter 1, “dark heritage” has been gaining popularity as an umbrella term which derives from the better defined term “dark tourism”. This is used in the tourism research of engaging with sites, landscapes and objects that “relate to events which might shock, unsettle, shame, or enrage” (Carr & Corbishley 2015:1; Stone 2006), such as concentration camps, execution places, gravesites or haunted places (Koskinen-Koivisto & Thomas 2017; McAtackney 2013, 2014; paper III).

As discussed above, the German legacy is still vitally important to the local people in northern Lapland as a socially meaningful, embedded part of their personal and familial histories, their “own lands”, and their cultural landscape. This connection links the German remains with a host of wider issues, than simply the “dark” ones related to the war. Fascinatingly, many darker shades

\[\text{\textsuperscript{11}} \text{Thanks again to my colleague Suzie Thomas who is a master in formulating titles into their ultimate forms.}\]
of the pre-war and post-war colonial past are linked to the WWII ruins, while at the same time these ruins convey also better memories of times before the war, of the traditional lifeways and relative independence, and of the amiable relationships between the locals, the German troops, and the multinational prisoners, stationed on their lands. Consequently, the wartime heritage, even if most directly linked with fear, destruction and loss of life, is not automatically all that dark in the people’s minds, depending on their and their communities’ idiosyncratic perspectives to it.

Interestingly, it has not been the locals who have criticised (at least not directly to us) the naming of the project. Especially many of the Sámi communities perceive Lapland’s recent past through various shades of darkness lingering over it, related to the discussed colonial issues, landuse rights, and exploitation of Lapland’s natural resources. Most of the criticism for the naming came from people who are involved in one way or another in the Finno-German cultural politics and activities, and who generally promote the remembrance of the German presence and value its material legacy as war historically important. These people typically originate from outside the northern study areas; the northermost critic that I have encountered originates from a Finnish settler family from Sodankylä. From these critics’ perspective, our project appeared to label the Germans, their actions, and their heritage as “dark” in a politically-loaded sense, in the essence of generalized “Nazis are bad guys” perspective mediated, for instance, by the Anglo-American popular culture images of “evil SS men” (see Rau 2014; paper IV). However, most of these critics understood our intentions of keeping the research politically and otherwise value-free when we got into dialogue with them, and explained that the name of the project is based on its connections with the “dark tourism” and that theoretical background. In the end, only one potential interviewee refused to give an interview to us about his and his colleagues’ activities of mapping airplane crashsites, since in their view they had nothing to do with “dark heritage”, but instead simply “methodologically” documented and reported their field trips (M29). This comment is as such an interesting example of “professional” distancing and neutralizing, in an amateur context, of their subject of interest into documented and reported data, although the crashsites are often directly connected to the deaths of pilots, and indirectly to various other darker themes, such as the bombing of both military and civilian targets.

Tourism researcher Philip Stone (2006) has suggested “a dark tourism spectrum” based on the various factors affecting the “darkness” of an individual tourist destination. In Figure 82 I present a preliminary sketch for the “shades of darkness” related to the German heritage in Lapland. In this sketch, I have evaluated the darkness of the sites first along a (horizontal) spectrum based on their historical connections, so that the PoW and forced labour camps, being places of death and suffering, are the “darkest” ones, whereas the memorials and plaques that are not directly associated with sites
of death are the lightest. The other (vertical) dimension in the figure is based on the people’s worldview and their personal relation to the perceived significance of WWII sites.

It appears that there is variance in how “dark” the German sites appear to different people based on their degree of inside knowledge, familiarity, and even “intimacy”, with the sites. People with personal and familial ties to the places appear to see them in “lighter” shades. For them these traces act as agents of memory, which communicate also various other perspectives than simply the German presence. This appears to be the case also with the people who approach the remains from a professional or (history) enthusiast perspective and have a certain degree of knowledge of them. Then again, for the “outsiders” with little or no relation to, or information of, the sites, the material remains appear more easily as “dark”, threatening and haunting traces of an anonymous past, mirrored against the internationally mediated and replicated narratives of “evil Nazis” (Herva 2014; Rau 2014; paper IV).

There seems to be also a sliding difference between the haunting character of the sites depending on the observer’s personal relationship, inside knowledge, and connectedness with the sites. In the local folklore, the WWII sites appear more often as “literally haunted”, especially for the people whose ancestors lived in the area during the war and who have familial ties to that past. These connect them to the wider, communal wartime memories, which are haunted, for instance, by the partisan terror attacks and the sufferings of PkWs. On the other hand, the “outsiders”, with a more generalized view of the material remains, more often perceive them as “figuratively haunting”, as harrowing and disconcerting reminders of a past saturated by the Nazi presence. These views link closely with the differing environmental
perceptions detected behind the opposing engagements with, and attitudes towards, the German ruins. On the one hand, the insider, traditional Finnish and Sámi environmental awareness is based on the relational ontology, and, on the other, the outsider “western” ontology approaches the sites from the perspective of a nature-culture divide (Herva 2014; Ingold 2000, 2011; papers III–IV). Due to the fluidity of Sámi environmental perceptions, the Sámi landuse and cultural landscape has been described as “invisible” for the outsiders, and consequently easily overlooked by them (Länsman 2004:90). This results, and resulted already during the war, in overlapping environmental perceptions and landscapes, with some common nodes of interaction but also with a lot of unshared space, both figuratively and literally.

Depending on the perceiver’s background, different sites can be fluidly placed in different positions on this two-dimensional field, and their placement can alter through time, when, for instance, new information is revealed to the observer or the observer’s own values change. This is also mirrored by my own immersion into the theme, as described in the chapter 1.2, as a result of which the role of Lapland’s German material heritage has drastically changed for me over the past decade. Also, the status of many sites can be ambivalent since they went through different phases over their use-lives. As an example, the Peltojoki military base was originally a PoW and labour camp, then a bridge guard, during the retreat to Norway in 1944 a supply depot, and finally accommodated the returning evacuees after the Lapland War (see papers I–II). There could arguably be many other factors and dimensions added to these assessments of “darkness”, but figure 82 can serve as a starting point for further evaluations.

6.1 Future: Positive uses?

“I don’t think those rusty remains are interesting as tourist attractions for anyone.”

A local elder of the German remains in Inari (M15 2015)

Especially the people with an “insider” perspective and some personal relationship to the WWII ruins often ponder upon the possibilities of utilizing these material remains in positive ways (F6; F8; M1; M5; M13; M16; M17; M18; M22; M26; M27; M28). This might relate from the fact that they do not perceive these traces as so “dark” as the “outsiders”, with few or no direct links to them. Many of these insiders are enthusiastic and in principle interested in supporting or developing something locally beneficial and positive based on the German sites, such as cultural tourism routes, but in most places these ideas are in a planning stage and have not yet been realized in concrete forms. Interestingly, one of these people is a German living in Lapland, who is convinced that the WWII PoW camps and other military sites combined with the nature travel would attract German tourists.
There are already a couple of examples that can be used as guide for planning the future use of, and engagement with, Lapland’s WWII heritage. I will not discuss in the following Lapland’s established museums, such as the Sámi Museum Siida or the Gold Prospector Museum, since these have been recently reviewed by my colleagues (see Thomas & Koskinen-Koivisto 2016). One of the few community-initiated and driven projects took place in the small Sámi community at the village of Purnumukka; the Purnumukka PoW camp was already been mentioned several times. Two information boards of the village history were recently raised, instigated by one culturally active local reindeer herder and funded by the European Union. Large part of the information boards is dedicated to the WWII PoW camp, German defensive structures and destruction in the Lapland War (Fig. 83). Unfortunately, these are not signposted from the main road, and one needs to have already inside knowledge to drive to the end of the sideroad leading to the village, to find these information boards in the first place. NBF has also recently been signposting some WWII sites, for instance, at Nellim, in the southeastern corner of Lake Inari.

The main German fortification lines in Lapland, Schutzwall-stellung at Tankavaara, Sodankylä, and Sturmbock-stellung at Järmä, Enontekiö, are relatively well-preserved and recognized. Both of these were built using PoW and forced labourer workforce. At the Sturmbock-stellung a small museum was opened already in 1997 and some of the trenches and positions were reconstructed as a tourist attraction. The small exhibition, with information boards and finds made at the fortification line, is open only in the summer months, but the reconstructed positions can be visited throughout the year (Fig. 84). In 2013 parts of the Schutzwall-stellung were included into a nature

Figure 83. Village history boards at Purnumukka, organized by an enthusiastic villager and funded by the European Union (Oula Seitsonen 2015).
Figure 84. Elsa Seitsonen exploring the reconstructed fortifications of the German Sturmbockstellung at Järämä, Enontekiö, in late September (Oula Seitsonen 2015).

Figure 85. Exploded remains of German anti-aircraft gun positions at Ivalo, Inari (Oula Seitsonen 2015).
trail next to the NBF Tankavaara Visitor Centre as a “War history trail”, which runs by the adjacent Gold Prospector Museum and Urho Kekkonen National Park. In 2016 also a reconstruction of a German log-built WWII dugout was opened along the trail.

The Lapland Society for Military History (LSMH) has recently, in 2015, initiated a WWII reconstruction project at Ivalo, Inari. They are building a life-size replica of a German anti-aircraft gun position at the so-called “Anti-aircraft gun Hill” (“IT-vaara”) near Ivalo Airport, that could be used as a tourist attraction in the future. Their original plan was to reconstruct the exploded remains of one of the gun positions on the hill, but after consultation with the heritage professionals, they decided instead to build a replica next to the destroyed positions (Fig. 85) (M13). LSMH attempted already in the early 2010s to reconstruct or replicate structures at two well-preserved PoW camps in Inari, for which purpose they even rented the plots where these would have been built. However, those plans failed due to unexpected land tenure issues (M1; M13), which commonly cause tensions in Lapland due to the wider problems related to the land ownership and land use rights, as discussed above (see Lehtola 2015a; Länsman 2004).

Many enthusiastic locals see especially the building of reconstructions or replicas and establishing of small exhibitions as an attractive approach for presenting the WWII sites for visitors. This is most likely based on the existing examples that they have as reference for their own plans. However, these could be supplemented or even replaced by non-material approaches, with virtual representations using current technology. For instance, replicas could be provided with virtual Building Information Modeling (BIM). BIMs could be presented onsite using augmented reality, with desired levels of accuracy. I have so far created rough, preliminary augmented reality BIMs of the structures at Peltojoki military base, which can be explored at the site on the screen of a mobile device (Fig. 86).

These kinds of BIM visualizations could take the presentation of WWII sites, and why not also other archaeological localities, to a whole new level of face-to-faceness and engagement with the past, in a similar vein to the interactive photographs that “woke up alive” in the “Wir waren Freunde” exhibition. In the preliminary Peltojoki model the structures are presented as rough sketches, but in theory there is no limit to the level of detail that one could go to when building virtual models. Also, there could be virtual signboards at the site, or as suggested in the Peltojoki test model, virtual soldiers, and by clicking those on a mobile screen one could open pop-up windows exhibiting additional information about the site. This information could be provided as listenable audio guides, and some scenes could be presented as film clips, visualized with either human actors or animated characters.

One of the local enthusiasts described also his idea that the whole Inari municipality could be treated as a large WWII outside museum with multiple stops at various sites (M1; M13) (see Flodden 1513 Ecomuseum n.d.). There
could be for example a mobile application with all the WWII localities in it, and these could be marked at the stops with signboards exhibiting some basic information. By scanning QR (Quick Response) or other codes with a mobile device on the signs one could read or listen more about the sites, and maybe also view virtual, augmented reality reconstructions. Siida has recently added some signs with QR codes next to the WWII structures in their outside museum, and by scanning these one can read more about the military history of the area (Siida n.d.; see Thomas & Koskinen-Koivisto 2016).

Another recent example of an innovative, positive approach of using the German-run PoW camps was introduced in Inari by one young reindeer herder, who also runs tourism services (M31). He is a Geocaching hobbyist (Geocaching n.d.) and has placed caches at several PoW camps and other military sites. He also provides detailed information of the local WWII history in the cache descriptions he has written at the Geocaching website (Amaskak 2013a–b, 2014a–c). His hope was that these caches could attract new and different kinds of visitors to the area in the virtual treasure hunt of geocaching. Offering additional “tourism packages” could prove to be a productive tactic for the future, for instance, by utilizing the WWII sites in cultural tourism, to supplement the existing tourism flow mostly based on nature tourism. Geocaching could be one non-destructive, worldwidely established, and beneficial approach of engaging with the WWII sites in a positive way.

Unlike the slightly pessimistic thoughts from one of our interviewees quoted above, it does appear that “those rusty remains are interesting as
tourist attractions” (M15) after all, if they are just developed and presented in a consensual and interesting manner. A recent, conspicuous definition connected with the tourism industry has been representing the north as a “Lapland of experiences”, something defined and created to meet the needs of tourists, based on the foundations of nature, northern ways of life, and exoticism (Ruotsala 2002:22). This representation annoys some of the locals, but if the local stakeholders would be involved from the start in developing and formulating these “experiences”, perhaps this could be presented in a mutually beneficial way, providing thrill to the travellers and additional income to the locals. Hopefully the WWII sites could be put into a positive use in formulating some of these experiences.

However, it must be remembered that although, on the one hand, the heritage improvement and promotion can encourage and cherish cultural values, local communal memories, and ecologically sustainable and resilient ideals, there is always, on the other, a danger of forgetting some other aspects and “aestheticizing” the past by fading unpleasant and negative experiences (Lento & Olsson 2013:24–25). The risk of fading unwanted, difficult, or “painful” pasts is especially severe when dealing with the wartime remains associated with suffering, death, and in Lapland, with Nazis. Therefore, it is vital to recognize the multivocality and heterogeneity of the remembrances and the myriad associations entwined with the WWII material traces.
7. The end

“Mun váccán duoddarii, váccán ja ozan, máttuid goahtesajiid, álodduid guottinsajiid, veahkkejoavkkuidvári, geatikki goddinbáikkuid.”

Ravggon (2016)

This dissertation approaches the German WWII material heritage in Lapland from two main perspectives. Firstly, I assess the wartime-use of the sites based on the archaeological studies, and evaluate the experiential expressions of the Germans’ and their prisoners’ material culture (chapter 4; papers I–II). This perspective stems with the early phases of my and my colleagues’ research in 2006–2010. Secondly, I discuss the post-war meanings attached to this material legacy and the various engagements with it through diverse sources by applying multidisciplinary approaches, such as netnographic data, ethnographic interviews, and various media texts (chapter 5; papers III–V). This latter perspective was raised by the public interest in our initial archaeological investigations of the German sites, for instance, at Peltojoki military base in 2009, and by the strong local reactions against the “war junk clearing” activities by Pidä Lappi Siistinä in 2004–2010 (chapter 5). The post-war importance of the German legacy has also been in the focus of our ongoing research in the project Lapland’s Dark Heritage since 2014. However, these different perspectives are by no means clear cut, and instead intertwine closely, especially through the different modes of environmental perception. To end with, I summarize briefly some of the most important findings related to both lines of research.

7.I Wartime experiences and their material traces: Displacement and alienness

“We are outside it [the war], in a remote country, in a timeless space, outside of mankind...”

Curzio Malaparte (in Lähteenmäki 2006:84)

Most importantly, when thinking of the wartime events and their traces, the material traces illustrate and highlight in many unexpected ways the experiential aspects of the German soldiers and their prisoners existence in an unfamiliar northern environment. From an outsider’s perspective most of Lapland appeared as a threatening, uninhabited and alien wilderness, though it was and is an ancient cultural landscape of the indigenous Sámi, and of the Finnish settlers, many of whom have also adopted Sámi modes of subsistence, such as reindeer herding (e.g. Ruotsala 2002; paper III). The exoticism of
Lapland’s landscapes and its natural wonders was mythologized by the German wartime propaganda, illustrated as man’s struggle over nature in this “primordial” borderland, with its “primeval” natives (e.g. Mabre 1943–1944; Wehrmacht 2006 [1943]:99–101).

It is known from the war history and local memories that the German military and other performance was hindered by the “threatening” forest and tundra, completely outlandish lifeworlds for them, which effectively stalled their advance in the north. Displacement and remoteness caused the Germans to perceive that they were essentially “…in a timeless space, outside of mankind…” (Lähteenmäki 2006:84). This sense of alienness and displacement appears to have taken many curious material and behavioural forms, as documented by the archaeological studies of the site layouts and the material culture (papers I–II).

Already the sheer number of German WWII sites in Lapland is astonishing. There are thousands of ruins, especially in the vast wilderness areas, and only a fraction of these have so far been mapped even rudimentally (see Taivainen 2013, 2015; papers I–II). This is perhaps best illustrated by the massive increase in the number of known German-run PoW and labour camps in northern Finland in little over a decade, rising from a handful of sites to the over 180 camps mapped out in this dissertation, mostly owing to the large-scale NBF cultural heritage surveys (Fig. 39; Appendix 1–2). It seems likely that there are still many more sites waiting to be documented in the backwoods (see chapter 4).

One of the most interesting notions related to the German WWII sites is a sweeping difference in the placement of, on the one hand, the Germans’ own military encampments and, on the other, many of the PoW and forced labour camps in the landscape (chapter 4). The first are often in incomprehensibly poor locations in the landscape, for instance, at the Lautavaara area and other places near Rovaniemi (see Mikkonen 2016), most probably owing to the inability to read the landscape coherently. On the contrary, many of the PoW and labour camps are placed in relatively logical topological localities. This applies especially to the remote logging and woodworking sites organized and rented by the NBF for the Germans. Finnish and Sámi professionals worked at many of these sites, for instance, as sled drivers and in other specialist positions alongside the Germans and their multinational prisoners. It is most likely due to their influence and intimate knowledge of the landscape that the sites were placed in rational settings, and some explicitly northern forms of material culture are observable at the sites, such as *keittokota* (conical, tepee-like cooking structures), saunas *vesipasa* (large horse-drawn water troughs used to freeze the sled tracks in the snow) (Fig. 87), and also reindeer bones cracked in a Sámi way to extract bone marrow. This collaboration created also close personal and family ties between the locals, Germans and prisoners. These are often recollected in the local communal memories, and these memorable familial links to the material traces explain the enduring importance of this legacy for the locals.
Mutual to all the German sites in northern Finland is that hardly any of them were established following rigid “Prussian order”, regardless of their environmental setting or function. Instead, most of them are rather organically shaped following the surrounding landscape, as seen from the site plans in chapter 4 (paper I–II). Fascinatingly, the most compact, orderly and well- demarcated sites are often also the remotest (Fig. 45, 47). This most likely mirrors the Germans’ mental need to establish a border between the “cultured” camp area and, from a German perspective, the threatening and “untamed” wilderness surrounding them (see Herva 2010). This need to cope with the alienness and threat of the unknown is probably also mirrored by some peculiar structures observed at German sites in Lapland. For instance, the setting of neatly lined cobbles along the pathways seems to have been a common “culturing” practice, as observed at many sites such as at Lautavaara, Vuotso, and Kankiniemi. Also, the fencing systems of German camps appear to mirror analogous attempts at drawing a border, no matter how symbolic. For instance, at Peltojoki only one side of the camp seems to have been fenced off, in a façade-like fashion (Fig. 43). Equivalent emblematic feature appears to be represented by an apparently useless moat dug within the prisoner compound at the Inari Martinkotajärvi PoW camp (Fig. 49). It appears to have no practical function, but could have been a powerful symbolic reminder of
imprisonment and being cut off from the world for the prisoners who were lead behind it, to be confined in the prisoner barracks.

The perceptions of Lapland as an outlandish, threatening and dangerous wilderness for the outsiders surfaced recently in the unexpected context of the unprecedented refugee flow to Lapland from Russia in the winter 2015–2016. We have discussed the fleeing material traces of this northern offshoot of the global refugee crisis in a recent essay, namely the abandoned refugee vehicles and the things inside them (Seitsonen et al. 2017). The numerous larger issues related to those resonate with themes touched upon in the previous chapters, foremost the (forced) mobility, dislocation, confinement, alienness, and placelessness. Mirroring these two outwardly very different cases, the multinational military and prisoner presence in 1940s, and the multinational refugee flow in 2010s, could in fact provide new beneficial insights on both themes through a material culture perspective. We will pursue these issues further in our upcoming research.

Besides the landscape-level effects on spatial configuration, also material items and their use appears to have been influenced by the sense of dislocation, alienation and placelessness. For instance, the high ratios of Finnish-manufactured civilian kitchenware observed at some sites might be related to creating a cozy home-like atmosphere and enhancing at-homeness at the remote outposts (Fig. 53). There appear to have been two main approaches to answer the feelings of dislocation through materiality and behaviour. Firstly, there is a control-based approach, as evidenced by the systematic garbage management, specified activity areas within the sites, and maintaining a sense of uniformity and soldierly outlooks, for instance, by grooming. Secondly, there appears to have been an approach of forgetting and “letting go”, most clearly represented by the copious consumption of alcohol which would have provided at least temporary release in an overbearing situation of being stuck on the edge of the world. This is most clearly evidenced by the abundant alcohol bottle sherds at practically all the German sites. This second approach is possibly also mirrored by the alleviations from normal military norms and outlooks, such as “tundra beards” and civilian clothing (Fig. 55).

The control-based approach is represented, at least on a metaphorical level, also by the expressions of individuality and personal agency on material items. This is most clearly conveyed by the personalized pieces of “trench art” (e.g. Kimball 2004; McAteckney 2014:131; Mytum & Carr 2017; Saunders 2003, 2005). Venting one’s agency even on small material pieces could have created temporary alleviation in a predicated situation. This need would have been even more pronounced for the PoWs, due to their vulnerable situation, than for the German soldiers. An attempt to “make a difference”, even on a symbolic level, is most clearly expressed by the PoW or forced labourer “trench art”, such as the Jakov piece from Peltojoki (Fig. 56) and the engraved kettle from Vika (Fig. 57). These might also represent individual attempts to leave at least a fleeing memory and sign of oneself when facing an uncertain future.
The means of attaining at least an illusory grip of one’s life and future in uncertain circumstances has surfaced recently in an unexpected modern context. Historian Juha Siltala (2017) has analyzed ongoing social processes of the rising attractiveness of, for instance, populism and mindfulness, and, in the Finnish context, of berry and mushroom picking and handicrafts, through the lense of a Middle-Class struggle to take back control of ones destiny, no matter how symbolically:

“Finns draw happiness from small things, which they feel can be controlled, but are becoming increasingly sceptical about big issues, which escape from their own control.”

Juha Siltala (in Berner 2017)

This illustrates in a modern setting the processes mirrored by the German and prisoner trench art, of doing something coherent, satisfying and controllable, with positive and pleasing visual results. These kinds of perceptions of getting at least an illusory control and respite from the reality, appear to have wide relevance in interpreting “non-productive” behaviour in various past and present settings.

One more example which emphasizes the relevance of traces and memories of the wartime in the present, is provided by the experiences of Lapland War-era refugees in the Swedish refugee camps. Even though the Swedish help was well-meaning and indispensable, its execution was not well-thought in all cases (Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). Upon their arrival to Sweden the refugees were subjected to delousing, watched over by the Swedish soldiers. Especially the women felt that in a vulnerable situation this was a “terribly humiliating welcome” (F11) and “A tit exhibition for Sweden’s soldiers” (Rautio et al. 2004:81). The food in the Swedish camps was plentiful, but odd tasting and unfamiliar for the northern refugees. They became “irritated ... by the abundant use of sugar and light grains... The homely rye bread and salt-rich diet was missed” (Rautio et al. 2004:86). This also has links to the ongoing 21st Century global refugee crisis. The multinational asylum seekers in the Finnish Reception Centres have recurrently complained about the plentiful, but strange food that they are offered. This increased their feelings of cultural schock, alienation and dislocation, in an already confined and troubled setting, to the extent that their discontent broke out as public demonstrations criticizing the foodstuff (e.g. Juupaluoma 2015; Olli 2016). One interviewed refugee remarked to the media that they were offered in the Reception Centres what he perceived as “dog food” (Annila 2015). These cases elucidate illustratively how important cultural sensitivity is when dealing with displaced people in distressed situations.

The few abovementioned incidents related to the 21st century refugee crisis and the plight of the Middle-Class, although somewhat anecdotal, illustrate clearly how the various interpretations of mobility, displacement, and place(lessness) demonstrated in this study through the WWII material traces,
can be put into use also when assessing modern questions. These illustrate how the recent past studies can have “social relevance and meaning, in ways that may not exist for archaeologies of earlier time periods” (Harrison & Schofield 2009:198). Archaeology and heritage studies are, or should be, in a position to find meaningful approaches to discuss the broader social topics related to, for instance, refugees and other ongoing social processes (see Giblin 2013, 2017). One just needs to find ethical and relevant ways to do this without trivializing or banalizing these issues (see Seitsonen et al. 2017; Symonds 2011). However, discussing these considerations in detail reaches well beyond this dissertation, and will be approached in my future studies.

7.2 Social and heritage value of "War junk": Colonialism and land disputes

“Where the F... is Vuotso.”

SomBy (2014)

The importance of WWII remains is further exemplified by their continuing importance as embedded parts of the local people’s everyday lifeworlds. The above-quoted question was recently posed by a distinguished Sámi rock band SomBy (2014), which hails from Vuotso. It aptly mirrors the sentiments expressed by the villagers about their “own” wartime heritage: “...Vuotso is never remembered” (M17). It resonates also more widely with the expressions of marginalization and side-lining of the north, as often met in the conversations with the locals (paper IV; Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017; Koskinen-Koivisto & Seitsonen forthcoming). For the Sámi, and also for the reindeer herding Finnish settlers who have lived in the area for hundreds of years, their lived-in, embodied relations to their inherited lands are vital for maintaining their self-identity and the spatial configuration of the world (e.g. Länsman 2004:99; Ruotsala 2002: 331, 360; see Jones 2017). This is exemplified by the traditional relational environmental perceptions, which evade the simple Cartesian oppositions and “Western” dichotomies (Herva 2014; Ingold 2000; papers III–IV). The locals’ resilient sense of place, folklore, traditional stories, belief systems and ancestral spirits all secure people into their “own lands” through the personified, corporeal landscape biographies (see Harrison 2011b; Lähteenmäki 1999:210; Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). This explains, for instance, the emphasis of our Sámi informants in Vuotso, that despite the loss of lives and material in the Lapland War, what matters most was that they still had their “own lands” that they could return to (F7; M16; M17; M18; M19; M20; M28) (Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017). Equally, this intimate connection to land explains the difficulties faced by the people who lost their “own lands”, which were ceded to the Soviet Union in the end of the war, such as the semi-nomadic Skolt Sámi.
Many enthusiastic locals appear to see themselves as custodians of their local past, including the recent WWII legacy. This is understandable based on the personal and familial ties to this material heritage. They often wish to control access and engagement with the sites in their “own lands”, and often feel that the (southern) authorities lack interest and neglect their heritage (paper IV). However, at the same time many are eager to develop positive usages for their own conflict heritage and would like to see it more widely acknowledged nationally, and even internationally. These feelings emphasize the social value (Jones 2017) of this legacy, and explain the strong local reactions expressed against the “clearing of war junk” by the PLS in 2004–2010.

Curiously, it was the PLS “War junk project”, which gave the unexpected impetus for initiating an active, wider process of recognition of the northern WWII legacy. Until then, the local people typically had an outwardly indifferent attitude towards the overgrown WWII material remains, which were lying dormant on their lands, but at the same time had become an inherently embedded part of the enduring long-term cultural landscape. Still, these material traces appear to have been acting, mostly subconsciously, as important agents maintaining the communal memories of wartime, and beyond. This illustrates how the myriad meanings associated with the heritage “...may not be obvious in the fabric of the place, and may not be apparent to the disinterested observer” (Johnston 1994:10; Jones 2017). This is consistent with the recent notions by Siân Jones that the importance of material heritage for the local communities can remain latent “in daily practices and long-term associations with place, only crystallizing when threatened in some way” (Jones 2017:26). In the Lapland case this outside threat came from the “war junk project”, and instigated unexpected processes, including indirectly the work that has led to this dissertation and to our ongoing Lapland’s Dark Heritage research.

The social importance of wartime remains as an integral, embedded part of the local historic landscape has been heightened in the Sámi communities, for example at Vuotso, by the strong bonds which tie people to their ancestral lands and landscapes. This close connection to the inherited lands is illustrated, for instance, by the lyrics quoted at the start of this chapter in Sámi, by the Sámi folk group Ravggon from Vuotso:

“I stroll to the fells, I stroll to find the old foundations of ancestors’ huts, the reindeer birthing grounds, the mountain of helping hands, the wolverine slaying grounds.”

Mannet mánnui (Ravggon 2016)

In many parts of Lapland an active storytelling tradition is maintained, which has enabled preserving the communal memories of wartime and beyond (Aikio-Puoskari 2010; Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017), and tied these
memories into the living landscape surrounding the locals (see Nergård 1997). This became clear to us, for instance, by the small schoolchildren’s knowledge of the WWII ruins in the discussions we have had with them at the Vuotso School. Children told that they have been visiting these sites with their parents and grandparents, which has facilitated, and continues to facilitate, the embedding and integrating of these traces of WWII as active mediators of the past(s) into the longer continuum of ancestral cultural landscapes and transgenerational memories (Seitsonen & Koskinen-Koivisto 2017).

The continued revisiting and reuse of the sites in the locals’ everyday lifeworld, and the close familial and even personal bonds to the material traces, has enabled the past and present to metaphorically co-exist and overlap through the material traces. This expresses well the heterogeneity of time, which is seen as typical for the sites from the recent past (Gonzáles-Ruibal 2008; Witmore 2013). The “porosity” of past and present, and the integration of German material remains into the northern mythology is demonstrated by the figuratively and literally haunting character these have in the local folklore of ghosts and hauntings.

All in all, from a local perspective the social value of wartime heritage outruns their historical or material value. What appears to mean most are the wider concepts, which have become mediated through the material remains and interwoven into them, namely what they have come to symbolize and mean for the locals. Probably partly because the impetus for the more active recognition of the WWII remains was given by the PLS “clearing of war junk”, which was seen from a local perspective as the nonchalant destruction of their own cultural legacy by the “southerners”. Thus the traces of German presence have become to stick out also as symbols of the continuing north-south confrontations and marginalization of the north (paper IV). This is based on the perception of the “south” as mentally opposite to Lapland and its people, and with a power to dominate the northerners and to threaten their lifestyle (Ruotsala 2002:18, 370; also Lehtola 2015a; Länsman 2004). The “war junk” question ties in with Lapland’s long colonial history, and the Finnish State’s slowness in answering, and often even recognizing, the complex colonial issues, intertwined with the multifaceted questions of land ownership and landuse rights (e.g. Lehtola 2015a; Länsman 2004). This stems also with the Finnish nation’s inability in ratifying the ILO 169 Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention (see Lehtola 2015a; Länsman 2004). However, recently the encouraging news was announced that the Finnish National Museum will be repatriating its Sámi collections to Siida in the near future (NM 2017), which might be a sign of rising cultural awareness of the Sámi rights and the colonial past of Finland.

The vast differences in approaching, and engaging with, the German WWII material remains, and a typical inability to engage in a meaningful dialogue from opposing perspectives, appears to derive from fundamentally different, overlapping mental templates with which the people perceive the northern
landscape, and the German presence and its importance (Fig. 88). The people propagating the “clearing” often appear to approach the subject, and the landscapes, with a “western” gaze by drawing a division between “nature” and “culture”. This ultimately labels the locals’ lived-in historical landscape as a natural wilderness (e.g. Herva 2014; Ingold 2000; papers III–IV). Conversely, in the northern environmental awareness it is not meaningful to separate between “nature” and “culture”. Instead, the landscape, including the German material remains, forms an overarching web of relations and meanings, which tie together the past, present and future into a cognitively controlled and embodied unity (e.g. Länsman 2004:99; Ruotsala 2002:331, 360; paper III).

It appears that the different stakeholders need to recognize and accept the fundamentally different worldviews and perspectives from which they engage into the debate about the importance, cultural heritage value, and the future of the German WWII material remains, before a fruitful dialogue can be instigated. This is one major challenge for the future discussions about the heritage value of Lapland’s WWII material legacy, and connected ownership and custodianship questions. These should be somehow elucidated, preferably in a common agreement with all the involved stakeholders, to allow the German and other WWII remains some official recognition, clear heritage status and protection.

Paradoxically, the Peltojoki military base is now recognized as a State-protected cultural heritage site, owing to the few Stone Age quartz lithics encountered during the 2009 excavations. This illustrates, unintentionally, a
“return to an ancient past” (Barndt 2010:138), reaching beyond the dubious Nazi pedigree of the site to the “pristine”, ancient and natural Stone Age past. Whether Peltojoki, and the other German sites in Lapland, will eventually be officially acknowledged and protected as WWII-era cultural heritage in the future, remains to be seen.
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Figure 87. Remains of “vesipasa”, horse-drawn water troughs at Inari Haukkapesäjoja 2 (Oula Seitsonen 2010).

Figure 88. Author’s family on survey at Kilpisjärvi in late September 2015; Sanna, Elvi, Sohvi and Elsa Seitsonen (from left to right) (Oula Seitsonen 2015).
Interviews

Interview records and notes will be stored in the end of the LDH project [2018] in the National Sámi archives, Inari, and in the Lapland Provincial Archives, Oulu.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Interviewers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Inari/Helsinki</td>
<td>2009-09-12</td>
<td>Oula Seitsonen (over telephone)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Vuotso</td>
<td>2010-10-06</td>
<td>Oula Seitsonen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>2015-04-28</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto, Oula Seitsonen and Suzie Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>2015-04-30</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto, Oula Seitsonen and Suzie Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>2015-06-03</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>Vuotso</td>
<td>2015-06-07</td>
<td>Vesa-Pekka Herva, Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Oula Seitsonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>Vuotso</td>
<td>2015-08-09</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Oula Seitsonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>Tankavaara</td>
<td>2015-08-11</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto, Oula Seitsonen and Suzie Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>2015-11-26</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Suzie Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>2015-11-27</td>
<td>Suzie Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>Kusfors, Sweden</td>
<td>2016-06-11</td>
<td>Mika Kunnari, Oula Seitsonen and Maria Persson*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>2009-08-09</td>
<td>Oula Seitsonen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>2009-08-11</td>
<td>Oula Seitsonen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Inari/Helsinki</td>
<td>2009-08-18</td>
<td>Oula Seitsonen (over telephone)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Vuotso</td>
<td>2010-10-06</td>
<td>Oula Seitsonen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>Espoo</td>
<td>2015-03-12</td>
<td>Oula Seitsonen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>Vantaa</td>
<td>2015-03-27</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto, Oula Seitsonen and Suzie Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>Jyväskylä</td>
<td>2015-04-07</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8</td>
<td>Jyväskylä</td>
<td>2015-04-16</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>2015-04-28</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto, Oula Seitsonen and Suzie Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M10</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>2015-04-29</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Oula Seitsonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M11</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>2015-06-03</td>
<td>Vesa-Pekka Herva, Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Oula Seitsonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>2015-06-04</td>
<td>Vesa-Pekka Herva, Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Oula Seitsonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M13</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>2015-06-06</td>
<td>Vesa-Pekka Herva, Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Oula Seitsonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M14</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>2015-06-08</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Oula Seitsonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M15</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>2015-08-06</td>
<td>Vesa-Pekka Herva, Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Oula Seitsonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M16</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>2015-08-07</td>
<td>Vesa-Pekka Herva, Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto, Oula Seitsonen and Suzie Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M17</td>
<td>Vuotso</td>
<td>2015-08-09</td>
<td>Vesa-Pekka Herva, Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Oula Seitsonen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M18</th>
<th>Vuotso</th>
<th>2015-08-10</th>
<th>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Oula Seitsonen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M19</td>
<td>Vuotso</td>
<td>2015-08-10</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Oula Seitsonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M20</td>
<td>Kilpisjärvi</td>
<td>2015-09-30</td>
<td>Oula Seitsonen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M21</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>2015-11-27</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M22</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>2016-03-21</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto, Oula Seitsonen and Suzie Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M23</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>2016-03-23</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Oula Seitsonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M24</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vesa-Pekka Herva, Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Oula Seitsonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M25</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vesa-Pekka Herva, Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Oula Seitsonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M26</td>
<td>Salla</td>
<td>2016-08-08</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Oula Seitsonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M27</td>
<td>Salla</td>
<td>2016-08-08</td>
<td>Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto and Oula Seitsonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M28</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>2017-05-03</td>
<td>Vesa-Pekka Herva and Oula Seitsonen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2015-04-01</td>
<td>Declined interview, email to the author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2016-06-14</td>
<td>Email from a potential future interviewee to the author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2017-05-12</td>
<td>Email from a potential future interviewee to the author</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Interview not recorded according to interviewees wish

World Wide Web sources


Amaskak 2013b. GC4QBKN Saunavuoro @ Haukkapesäjoen vankileiri (Traditional Cache) in Finland created by Amaskak. https://www.geocaching.com/geocache/GC4QBKN_saunavuoro-haukkapesajoen-vankileiri [Accessed 2016-06-14]


SomBy 2014. *Where the F*ck is Vuotso*. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8KsroV3kiEk](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8KsroV3kiEk) [Accessed 2015-12-24]
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Appendix I. Map of the German-run PoW and labour camps in northern Finland

Spatial distribution of the mappable German-run PoW, punishment and forced labour camps in northern Finland, including the Organisation Todt (OT) camps, as known in 2016 (Illustration Oula Seitsonen 2016, based on the studies by: Pertti Huttunen [1990, 1995a-b], Landscapes of Finnish Conflicts (LOFC), LDH, Lapland Society for Military History (LSMH), NBF, Siida, Reinhard Otto [2008, n.d.] and Lars Westerlund [2008a]). Note: Numbers refer to Appendix 2, numbering of sites 1–95 follows that in Seitsonen & Herva 2011:Fig. 10.4) (Elevation data © 2014 Esri).
Appendix 1. Map of the German-run PoW and labour camps in northern Finland
Appendix 2. List of the German-run PoW and labour camps in northern Finland

List of the mappable German-run PoW and forced labour camps in northern Finland, including the Organisation Todt (OT) camps, as known in 2016 (based on the studies by: Pertti Huttunen [1990, 1995a-b], LOFC, LDH, LSMH, NBF, Siida, Reinhard Otto [2008, n.d.] and Lars Westerlund [2008a]). Note: Some of the names have been corrected from the earlier compilation, but the numbering of sites 1–95 follows that in Seitsonen & Herva 2011:Appendix. Reinhard Otto has kindly shared with me his unpublished data on the archival material about the camps in northern Finland (Otto 2008, n.d.).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Location (NBF name in parenthesis)</th>
<th>Archival notes*</th>
<th>Main function*</th>
<th>Archaeological studies**</th>
<th>Notes**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Peltojoki</td>
<td>Kaamanen-Karjagasniemi Road, bridge building, road maintenance, supply depot (PH, LW)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2006-2007, excavation 2009 (LOFC)</td>
<td>According to the locals ca. 200 PoWs (MA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Ivalo</td>
<td>Bridge building (LW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>According to the locals ca. 100 PoWs (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Ivalo Rajankangas Saarinenitämöjärvi</td>
<td>Logging (LW) and other work</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF)</td>
<td>PoWs were also borrowed as workers to the local farms (MA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Törmänen Ivalo airfield</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Palkisoya</td>
<td>German name &quot;Palkisoya&quot; (RO)</td>
<td>Logging, road building (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2010 (NBF), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td>ca. 200 PoWs (LW), ghost stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Nangujärvi Saiholompola</td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2010 (NBF), 2011 (LOFC)</td>
<td>According to the locals ca. 200-250 PoWs (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>S end of Lake Nangujärvi</td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2010 (LOFC), 2011 (NBF, LOFC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Nellim Paksuniemi</td>
<td>Paksvuono saw mill, logging</td>
<td>Survey 2011 (NBF), 2016 (LDH)</td>
<td>ca. 220 PoWs in December 1943 (LW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Palosekä</td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Sarimniemi</td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Kaamassaari Andreasnuora</td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>According to the locals ca. 200 PoWs (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Juutuanjoki</td>
<td>Bridge building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At the place of Särni Museum Silda, ghost stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Ranta-Antti beach</td>
<td>Punishment camp for German soldiers (Straflager') (ML, LW)</td>
<td>Survey 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td>At the place of the Näkkäläjärvi souvenir shop, according to the locals ca. 50 PoWs (MA); camp moved first to Jumuruva Saari-Taimerjärvi (136) and later to Jumuruva Karjäläjärvi (26) (ML, PH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Kankiniemi (Korppivaara pohjoinen)</td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commanded by a &quot;big thin Sergeant Major&quot; (PH), according to the locals ca. 200 PoWs (MA), ghost stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Mahlatti (Kivisalmi)</td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey 2009 (Silda)</td>
<td>According to the locals ca. 100 PoWs (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Nukkumajoki</td>
<td>Road building (MA)</td>
<td>Survey 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td>According to the locals ca. 100 PoWs (MA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2. List of the German-run PoW and labour camps in northern Finland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Location (NBG name in parenthesis)</th>
<th>Archival notes*</th>
<th>Main function*</th>
<th>Archaeological studies**</th>
<th>Notes**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Pikkupaananvaara (Kotaaja)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2011 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Vuontisjärvi (Koppelovaara 1-3)</td>
<td>OT camp (PH, LW)</td>
<td>OT work camp and headquarters (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2011 (LOFC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Kielajoki</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaamanen-Karigasniemi Road</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2010 (LOFC)</td>
<td>Metal detectorist activity since early 1990s (PH), according to the locals ca. 200 PoWs (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Hanhijärvi</td>
<td>OT camp? (PH)</td>
<td>Road building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Kaamanen Haaralimäki</td>
<td>ZL Kamanen (Stalag 309), command for founding 31.03.1942 (RO)</td>
<td>Airfield building (PH)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2010 (LOFC), 2016 (LDH)</td>
<td>Ghost stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Sikovuono</td>
<td></td>
<td>Logging (LW), road building (MA)</td>
<td>According to the locals ca. 50 PoWs (MA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Hyljelehtti</td>
<td>Polar Straffager (&quot;Polar punishment camp&quot;)?, Jewish PoWs? (LW)</td>
<td>Punishment camp? (LW), logging and road building (PH)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH) &amp; 2007-2008 (LOFC)</td>
<td>According to the locals ca. 50-100 PoWs (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Solojärvi logging headquarters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Headquarters for several logging sites, also OT</td>
<td>Survey 2007-2008 (LOFC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Jumurova Karipääjärvi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Punishment camp for German soldiers (Straffager), logging (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2011 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td>Minister Speer visited the site in 1943, according to the locals ca. 200-300 PoWs worked at the camps of the area (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Illestinkaira (Venerepmäjärvet)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Logging, OT?</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), Survey 2011 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td>Commanded by the &quot;hard-handed&quot; Teodor Autt from Rovaniemi? (PH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Utsjoki</td>
<td>Kaamasmuukka</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaamanen-Karigasniemi Road, Russian officers? (PH)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2011 (LOFC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Utsjoki</td>
<td>Luomusjoki Sulaajsa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaamanen-Karigasniemi Road</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2011 (LOFC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Seipäjärvi Saarijärvi</td>
<td>ZL Seipäjärvi (Stalag 309) (RO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey 2013 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Seipäjärvi (Sokertampi 1)</td>
<td>ZL Seipäjärvi (Stalag 309) (RO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey 2013 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Seipäjärvi Myllyvaara (Myllyvaara 1)</td>
<td>ZL Seipäjärvi (Stalag 309) (RO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey 2013 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Vuojärvi</td>
<td>ZL Vuojärvi (Stalag 309), in function 30.11.1941 (RO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey 2013 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Eismeerstraße 86.5 km</td>
<td>Ukrainian PoWs (armed and uniformed by the Germans), later Sonderlager (special camp), a punishment camp for PoWs (LW)</td>
<td>Logging (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 2011 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Eismeerstraße 93 km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey 2011 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Eismeerstraße 96 km</td>
<td>Wood chopping factory (LW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey 2011 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Sattanen</td>
<td>Wood chopping factory (LW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey 2011 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Siltaharju</td>
<td>Wood chopping factory (LW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey 2011 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr.</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Location (NBF name in parenthesis)</td>
<td>Archival notes*</td>
<td>Main function*</td>
<td>Archaeological studies**</td>
<td>Notes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Tankavaara Purnumukka</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schultzwall-Stellung, fortification building (PH)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Tankavaara Yliservo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schultzwall-Stellung, fortification building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Tankavaara Pikku-Tankavaara</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schultzwall-Stellung, fortification building (PH)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2016 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Tankavaara Peuravaara</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schultzwall-Stellung, fortification building</td>
<td>Survey 2016 (LDH)</td>
<td>Ghost stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Tankavaara Vosavaara</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schultzwall-Stellung, fortification building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Jokelaistenopa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Little Berlin&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Korkalovaara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Ounasvaara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Ounasjoki</td>
<td>ZL Rovaniem (Stalag 309), in function 11.09.1941 (RO)</td>
<td>Saw mill, gathering point for PoWs intended for the XIX Gebirgs-Armeekorps in Petsamo (RO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Saarenkyo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Pallari, Road to Oikarainen 5 km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Elsmoerstraße 61,5 km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Haukivaara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Mikkala</td>
<td>ZL Mikkala (Stalag 309), camp for so-called &quot;Volksdeutsch&quot; (racial Germans)/ Volga Germans, 30.11.1941 (RO)</td>
<td>Logging (LW)</td>
<td>Logging (LW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Hirvas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Muurola Kuusivaara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Rovaniem-Kemiävä Road 69 km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Kulus Oikajärvi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Misi, Railway 42 + 7 km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Enontekiö</td>
<td>Ilto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OT camp (LW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Enontekiö</td>
<td>Silisjärvi Silastupa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Enontekiö</td>
<td>Paljoensuu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Enontekiö</td>
<td>Kipsjärvi Malla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lyngen-Stellung, fortification building (LW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Kemijärvi</td>
<td>Rovajärvi</td>
<td>ZL Rovajärvi (Stalag 309), 2 km N of the road, founded 27.11.1941, active on 28.12.1941, relocated to Kielajoki April 1942 (RO)</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Kemijärvi</td>
<td>Ketola, Rovaniem-Kemiävä Road 71 km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Kemijärvi</td>
<td>Joutsjärvi</td>
<td>ZL Joutsjärvi (Stalag 309), from June 1942 (RO), Ukrainian PoWs (LW)</td>
<td>Logging (LW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Kemijärvi</td>
<td>Korpjärvi</td>
<td>ZL Korpjärvi (Stalag 309), founded by SS- Div. Nord 10.12.1941 (RO)</td>
<td>PoW camp run by the SS (RO, LW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Kemi</td>
<td>Vallitansaari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large PoW cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Aitaniemi</td>
<td>Kalikimaal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2. List of the German-run PoW and labour camps in northern Finland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Location (NBF name in parenthesis)</th>
<th>Archival notes*</th>
<th>Main function*</th>
<th>Archaeological studies**</th>
<th>Notes**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Kuusamo</td>
<td>Kuusamo</td>
<td>ZL Kuusamo (Stalag 309) (RO)</td>
<td>Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (Feldbahnstrecke Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo), OT camp (RO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Kuusamo</td>
<td>Kuusamo-Kiestinki Road 20 km</td>
<td>OT (RO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Kuusamo</td>
<td>Kaikkonen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Kuusamo</td>
<td>Sankikangas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Kuusamo</td>
<td>Penttilänvaara (Kellariikunna 2)</td>
<td>German name Pentila, 1./BAB 191, OT (RO)</td>
<td>Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (Feldbahnstrecke Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo), OT camp (RO)</td>
<td>Survey 2014 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Taivalkoski</td>
<td>Korvua (Palokumpu)</td>
<td>Field punishment camp (Feldstraflager) II (LW)</td>
<td>Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (Feldbahnstrecke Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo), wood chopping factory, punishment camp (RO, LW)</td>
<td>Survey 2009 (NBF), map (TM)</td>
<td>Also SS troops (TM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Taivalkoski</td>
<td>Tervajoki</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (Feldbahnstrecke Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo), Ukrainian PoWs (LW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Taivalkoski</td>
<td>Metsäkylä Isokumpu</td>
<td>Field punishment camp (Feldstraflager) III (LW), OT (RO)</td>
<td>Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (Feldbahnstrecke Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo), punishment camp, OT camp, Polish forced labourers (RO, LW)</td>
<td>Map (TM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Taivalkoski</td>
<td>Inkee (Satasaari)</td>
<td>1./BAB 191, OT (RO)</td>
<td>Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (Feldbahnstrecke Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo), OT camp, Polish forced labourers (RO, LW)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Suomussalmi</td>
<td>Rapuanvaara</td>
<td>German name &quot;Rapuvaara&quot;, Ukrainian PoWs (RO, LW)</td>
<td>Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (Feldbahnstrecke Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Suomussalmi</td>
<td>Keräännäkylä, E end of Lake Sakarajärvi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Logging, so-called &quot;Wapina&quot; logging site (LW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Hyrynsalmi</td>
<td>Hyrynsalmi</td>
<td>Field punishment camp (Feldstraflager) III (RO)</td>
<td>Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (Feldbahnstrecke Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo), punishment camp (RO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Petsamo</td>
<td>Liinahamari</td>
<td>ZL Liinahamari (Stalag 322) (RO)</td>
<td>OT built 85 barracks at the camp, ca. 700 PoWs in the camp and 1500 PoWs more expected in November 1943 (LW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr.</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Location (NDB name in parenthesis)</td>
<td>Archival notes*</td>
<td>Main function*</td>
<td>Archaeological studies**</td>
<td>Notes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Petsamo</td>
<td>Peuravuono</td>
<td>ZL Peuravuonoal-Parkkina (Stalag 322), burnt down in 1943 (RO)</td>
<td>Road building, punishment camp? (LW)</td>
<td>Field punishment camp (Feldstraflager) situated somewhere at Peuravuono (LW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Petsamo</td>
<td>Numensäti</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fortification building (LW)</td>
<td>ca. 300 Pows (LW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Petsamo</td>
<td>Kap Romanow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fortification building (LW)</td>
<td>ca. 300 Pows (LW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Petsamo</td>
<td>Parkkina</td>
<td>ZL Parkkina (Stalag 322) (LW)</td>
<td>Road and house building, OT camp? (LW)</td>
<td>230-280 Pows (LW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Petsamo</td>
<td>Näsykkää</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Petsamo</td>
<td>Titekka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Petsamo</td>
<td>Ylä-Luostari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Petsamo</td>
<td>Kolosjoki</td>
<td>Festung Kolosjoki (Kolosjoki Fortress) (LW)</td>
<td>Nickel mine and smelting plant, fortification building (LW)</td>
<td>ca. 300-360 Pows in 1941-1942, ca. 1200 other workers (LW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Petsamo</td>
<td>Salmijärvi Jäkälävaara</td>
<td></td>
<td>Field punishment camp (Feldstraflager) II (LW)</td>
<td>Logging, punishment camp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Petsamo</td>
<td>Nautsi Heteoja</td>
<td>ZL Heteoja, 387 km (from Rovaniemi) / 144 km (Stalag 309 or 322?), from 01.03.1942, to 16.08.1942 (RO)</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>60 Pows (LW), according to the locals ca. 200 Pows (MA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Petsamo</td>
<td>Jäniskoski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Power plant, fortification building (LW)</td>
<td>293 Pows in December 1941, 275 forced labourers from Ingria (LW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Salla</td>
<td>Alakurtti</td>
<td>ZL Alakurtti (Stalag 309), founded 10.09.1941, still active on 08.08.1942 (RO), Ukrainian Pows (LW)</td>
<td>Railway and airfield building and maintenance, rail loading (LW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Salla</td>
<td>Kairala</td>
<td>ZL Kairala (Stalag 309), 30.11.1941 (RO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Salla</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
<td>ZL Nummi (Stalag 309), road building 07.11.1941, disturbed August 1942 (RO)</td>
<td>Road building (RO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Salla</td>
<td>Lampela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Enontekiö</td>
<td>Skirjasjohka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lyngen-Stellung, road and fortification building</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF), 2015 (LDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Enontekiö</td>
<td>Muotkkaluokta (Muotkkaluokta itä)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pow mass grave (camp?)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF), 2015 (LDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Mäntypää</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey 2016 (LDH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Pelkosenniemi</td>
<td>Pilkutunturi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>Survey 2014 (NBF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Ylipäänsänkä</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>Survey 2012 (NBF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Huikanmäki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>Survey 2014 (NBF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Ryssänlampi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>Survey 2011 (NBF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Viitaköngäs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>Survey 2011 (NBF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Pajakkalaammit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>Survey 2011 (NBF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Taivalkoski</td>
<td>Hiltusenmurto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (Feldbahnbreite Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo)</td>
<td>Survey 2009 (NBF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Taivalkoski</td>
<td>Kaupinkoski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OT?</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr.</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Location (NBF name in parenthesis)</td>
<td>Archival notes*</td>
<td>Main function*</td>
<td>Archeological studies**</td>
<td>Notes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Talvivaara</td>
<td>Iijoki</td>
<td>Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (Fieldbahnstrecke Hyrynsalmi-Kuusamo)</td>
<td>[TK]</td>
<td>Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Suomussalmi</td>
<td>Pihlajakorpi</td>
<td>Road building</td>
<td>Survey 2014 (NBF), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Suomussalmi</td>
<td>Pekkipinuro</td>
<td>PoW mass grave (camp?)</td>
<td>Survey 2014 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Soolojärvi Haukkapesäjoja 2</td>
<td>Logging, OT?</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2010 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Soolojärvi Haukkapesäjoja 1 (Haukkapesäjoki 1)</td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2010 (LOFC), 2013 (NBF), 2015 (LDH), surface collection 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Iso Pihtjärvi</td>
<td>Saw mill</td>
<td>Survey 2011 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH), excavation 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td>Self-made shoes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Joutavalahti</td>
<td>Punishment camp for PoWs</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td>Self-made shoes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Kannusselkä</td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>Survey 2013 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Savukoski</td>
<td>Määtäsaavanmaa</td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>Survey 2011 (NBF), 2016 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Savukoski</td>
<td>Iso Lusikkavaara</td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>Survey 2014 (NBF), 2016 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Kemijärvi</td>
<td>Puikkola</td>
<td>Railway building</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Kemijärvi</td>
<td>Isokylä</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Salla</td>
<td>Haudaniemi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Salla</td>
<td>Palojärvi</td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>2016 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Salla</td>
<td>Stalag 309</td>
<td>Central PoW camp (RO, LW)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Salla</td>
<td>Jänisvaara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Rasthaus Vuotso</td>
<td>Trusty prisoners</td>
<td>Survey 2012 (HM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>OT Lager Vuotso</td>
<td>OT camp</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Luftwaffe camp</td>
<td>Airfield maintenance</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PHM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>OT Lager Rovaniemi</td>
<td>OT camp</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (LOFC), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Savojärvi</td>
<td>Kaamanen-Karigasniemi Road</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2015 (NBF), 2016 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Laanjavanä Hanhijärvi</td>
<td>Kaamanen-Karigasniemi Road, OT camp? (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2015 (NBF), 2016 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Joukaisvaara</td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Palovaaranjärkä</td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Minnanlampi</td>
<td>Road building and maintenance?, Punishment camp?</td>
<td>Survey 2016 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Iso Kuivajärvi</td>
<td>Saw mill, OT? (PH), Volga Germans (MA)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Pienempi Kuivajärvi</td>
<td>Brick factory</td>
<td>2008 (LSMH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr.</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Location (NBF name in parenthesis)</td>
<td>Archival notes*</td>
<td>Main function*</td>
<td>Archaeological studies**</td>
<td>Notes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Ruohokangas Pitkäjärv</td>
<td>Archival notes*</td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td>According to the locals ca. 30-50 PoWa (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Länkivaara</td>
<td>Archival notes*</td>
<td>Logging (PH)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH)</td>
<td>Camp moved from Ranta-Antti beach (14) and later to Jyrmurova Karipääjärvi (26) (ML, PH); Minister Speer overnighted in the vicinity at a lean-to in 1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Saari-Taimenjärvi</td>
<td>Archival notes*</td>
<td>Punishment camp for German soldiers (Straflager), logging</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Kiestinki</td>
<td>Kiestinki</td>
<td>Road building</td>
<td>Road building (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Kiestinki</td>
<td>Niska</td>
<td>Road building</td>
<td>Road building (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Kiestinki</td>
<td>Tuhkala</td>
<td>Road building</td>
<td>Road building (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Kiestinki</td>
<td>7 km from Kiestinki</td>
<td>Road building</td>
<td>Road building (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Kiestinki</td>
<td>11 km from Kiestinki</td>
<td>Road building</td>
<td>Road building (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Kiestinki</td>
<td>Kuusamo-Kiestinki Road 107 km</td>
<td>Road building</td>
<td>Road building (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Kiestinki</td>
<td>Kangasvaara</td>
<td>Road building</td>
<td>Road building (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Petsamo</td>
<td>Salmijärvi airfield</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Pudasjärvi</td>
<td>Iso Niemenmaa</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Suomussalmi</td>
<td>Pesiökylässä</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Taivalkoski</td>
<td>Mustaniimunlampi</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Taivalkoski</td>
<td>Salmisenkangas 3</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Suomussalmi</td>
<td>Kuukarovaara</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Suomussalmi</td>
<td>Sarvikangas 1</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Suomussalmi</td>
<td>Sarvikangas 2</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Tomio</td>
<td>Roytä</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Kemi</td>
<td>Airfield</td>
<td>Luftwaffe 224 (RO)</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Kemi</td>
<td>Railway yard</td>
<td>Luftwaffe 224 (RO)</td>
<td>Airfield building and maintenance (LW)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr.</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Location (NBF name in parenthesis)</td>
<td>Archival notes*</td>
<td>Main function*</td>
<td>Archaeological studies**</td>
<td>Notes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Saaplane base Olga, Chikajärvi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Timber loading harbour? (LW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Sinettä</td>
<td></td>
<td>OT transition camp (LW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Eismeerstraße 10 and 11 km</td>
<td></td>
<td>OT transport base and fuel storage (LW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Suomussalmi</td>
<td>Syrjä</td>
<td>German name &quot;Syriö&quot; (RO)</td>
<td>Hyrnsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (Feldbahnumstrecke Hyrnsalmi-Kuusamo)</td>
<td>Map (TK)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Suomussalmi</td>
<td>Vääkkio (Hauta-Aho)</td>
<td>German name &quot;Vekyö&quot; (RO)</td>
<td>Hyrnsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (Feldbahnumstrecke Hyrnsalmi-Kuusamo)</td>
<td>Survey 2014 (NBF), map (TK)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Suomussalmi</td>
<td>Lippo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hyrnsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (Feldbahnumstrecke Hyrnsalmi-Kuusamo)</td>
<td>Map (TK)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Suomussalmi</td>
<td>Leino-Nord (Saarivaara)</td>
<td>Leino-Nord (RO)</td>
<td>Hyrnsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (Feldbahnumstrecke Hyrnsalmi-Kuusamo)</td>
<td>Survey 2014 (NBF), map (TK)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Suomussalmi</td>
<td>Leino-Süd (Saarinen)</td>
<td>Leino-Süd (RO)</td>
<td>Hyrnsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (Feldbahnumstrecke Hyrnsalmi-Kuusamo)</td>
<td>Survey 2014 (NBF), map (TK)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Taivalkoski</td>
<td>Harjakoki (Peuralampi 1-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hyrnsalmi-Kuusamo Field Railway (Feldbahnumstrecke Hyrnsalmi-Kuusamo)</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF), map (TM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Enontekiö</td>
<td>Stumpback-Stellung Lättäseno</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stumpback-Stellung, fortification</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (NBF), museum building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Salla</td>
<td>Iso-Sieppijärvi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ca. 200 PoWs (LW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Rättisupa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>Survey 2012 (NBF), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Villaminkangas</td>
<td>Eismeerstraße 34,6 km? (RO)</td>
<td>Supply depot (NBF), road building (RO)</td>
<td>Survey 2011 (NBF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Alajärvi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Altoniemi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply depot (PH), road building (MA)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2015 (LDH, NBF)</td>
<td>PoWs (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Martinkotajärvi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Logging? (MA)</td>
<td>Survey 2008 (Siida), 2015 (LDH)</td>
<td>Part of the same PoW unit as Kankinemi? (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Akujärvi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Road building (MA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>According to the locals ca. 100 PoWs (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Vellivaara</td>
<td></td>
<td>Road building (MA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>According to the locals ca. 100-200 PoWs (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Mustola</td>
<td></td>
<td>Logging (MA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Nellim</td>
<td>German name &quot;Nellimo&quot;, Panzerjäger-Abteilung 55 stationed in the area (RO)</td>
<td>Saw mill (MA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>According to the locals ca. 200 PoWs (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Virtaniemi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Road building, logging (MA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Iso Saarijärvi (Stuorrá Suollusjärvi)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>Survey 2010 (Siida)</td>
<td>According to the locals ca. 50-100 PoWs (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr.</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Location (NBF name in parenthesis)</td>
<td>Archival notes*</td>
<td>Main function*</td>
<td>Archaeological studies**</td>
<td>Notes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Syväjärvi</td>
<td>Kaamanen-Karigasniemi Road (PH)</td>
<td>Survey 1995 (PH), 2015 (NBF), 2016 (LDH)</td>
<td>Originally Finnish-run camp, handed over to the Germans after summer 1942 (MA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Altajärvi</td>
<td>Kaamanen-Karigasniemi Road (PH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Utsjoki</td>
<td>Karigasniemi</td>
<td>Kaamanen-Karigasniemi Road, bridge building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Pudasjärvi</td>
<td>Kajoslampi</td>
<td>Logging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ghost stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Inari</td>
<td>Konesjärvi</td>
<td>Logging, tractor repair shop? (PH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MA = Markku Arvelin (2009); PH = Pertti Huttunen; ML = Matti Lehtola; RO = Reinhard Otto; LW = Lars Westerlund

All surveys and excavations by LOFC and LDH carried out by Oula Seitsonen in 2006-2016.