

Battling to be 'European': myth and the finnish race debate

EDWARD DUTTON

Abstract. This article will examine the debate over the racial origins of the Finns in a new way by looking at the dominant perspective in terms of myth. Focussing on Kemiläinen's (1998, 2000) discussion, as one of the most salient, the article will dissect the structure of her racial myth and look at how, following Levi-Strauss and Kunin, this myth helps to uphold the contemporary, dominant idea amongst the Finnish elite that Finns are 'Western' or 'European.' It will note that Kemiläinen's discussion (in spite of counter evidence) indeed upholds the dominant cultural discourse in contemporary Finland and it will look at how Finland's status could be understood in this context.

Introduction

The Finns are one of those peoples that don't quite fit. They were ruled by Sweden (until 1809) and then by Russia until independence in 1917. They are predominantly Lutheran but their language is related to Hungarian, a string of languages across northern Russia and, some believe, Mongolian and even Japanese (see Gleason 1969). They are not quite Eastern yet they are not quite Western (see Mead 1993, Kirby 2006, blurb). And the Finns have long fascinated anybody interested in race. Many writers have just given-up and accepted what Dale (1986, 26) sees as the almost religious idea that Finns are a 'unique culture': a northern mystery that is simply beyond comprehension (see, for example, Lewis 2005). However, 'race' is one of the reasons why Finns have been seen to inhabit this mysterious twilight zone 'between East and West.'¹

The question of how Finns should be understood in racial or more recently genetic terms has provoked heated debate amongst anthropologists, geneticists and Finnish scholars for over two hundred years. Originally it was assumed that as the Finnish language was related to Sámi – spoken by tribes perceived as Mongolian in origin – and as many Finns supposedly looked 'Eastern,' that Finns were 'Mongoloid' and this view remained relatively unchallenged until the beginning of the twentieth century. Since that point, and particularly since the 1990s, it has been increasingly argued that Finns should be seen as 'European' but with a considerably more 'eastern' influence than many other Europeans. Some – almost always Finnish – scholars have argued that Finns have no eastern dimension to them at all and are comple-

tely European (for example Kemiläinen 1998, 228).

This 'struggle to be European' has all the makings of a scintillating – and yet dangerous – anthropological myth. There is strong evidence that some Finnish scholars – harbouring an overwhelming desire that Finns should be seen as 'white' – are presenting what is, alas, tendentious scholarship to the wider world in order to suppress the debate over the origins of their own people and have them accepted as 'white' without question. The genetic and physical anthropological arguments have been widely debated and, in general as will be discussed below, different conclusions are reached according to which model of analysis is employed. This article, however, is more interested in understanding the structure of Finnish racial identity as expressed by those who wish to assert that Finns are 'European.' It aims to understand exactly how this 'myth' – that Finns are completely European – actually operates and therefore understand more about how cultures that are 'struggling to be European' work, something which could be applied more broadly.

This article will mainly concentrate on *Finns in the Shadow of "Aryans": Race Theories and Racism* (1998, 2000) by the late Aira Kemiläinen (1919 – 2006) who was, at the time, 'Emeritus Professor of World History' (stated in blurb) at Finland's Jyväskylä University. This article will draw upon the most prominent Finnish-authored, English language discussion of Finnish racial identity in order to examine its dynamics as a 'national myth.' It will draw upon the English language work that it does because this, precisely because it is in English, reflects how Finland would like

to be perceived or, at least, how the author and her backers would like it to be perceived. Indeed, it is published by a substantially government-funded publisher and thus – following Andreski (1974) – is likely to reflect the worldview of the elite that fund it. Moreover, it reflects an attempt to persuade Finns towards this particular racial model. The article will examine what might be called 'the Myth of Finnish European-ness' from a primarily Structuralist perspective. It will argue that the 'myth' that Finns are European is very important in justifying its current position in the European Union, which it joined in 1995. The structural dynamic of this myth will be dissected and it will be argued that the Finnish myth is based around a binary distinction: that to be 'civilised' means to be 'European' and to be 'uncivilised' means to be 'Mongoloid'. It is this very 'civilised' nature, so runs the myth, that has pushed the historically racially ambiguous Finns into the seemingly more confident world of being 'European' and 'white'. This structure may also apply to other 'wannabe' Europeans.

Structuralism

One of the most significant structuralists was British anthropologist Sir Edmund Leach. He admitted, as do I, that Structuralism is 'a way of looking at things.' It is a method that offers 'insights' and will always be open to criticism accordingly like any such method from psycho-analysis to feminism. Gellner observes that psycho-analysis cannot really objectively prove the existence of 'unconscious archetypes' or the 'Oedipus Complex.' By definition, they are suppressed in the 'unconscious' and not open to normal empirical analysis

(Gellner 1993, 148). However, they help in structuring that which we do not understand and so, like any scientific model, offer insights and help to make sense of the world (Leach 1973, 37), albeit as a way of seeing things. Structuralism allows us to appreciate why certain groups operate in similar ways, deepening our understanding, ultimately, of human nature. This said, I will argue below that Structuralism is far more scientific than psycho-analysis.

Leach, in explaining Structuralism, argues that the business of anthropologists is the study of 'customary behaviour' and it is by this behaviour that cultures can be superficially distinguished. The presupposition of structural anthropology is that humans have broadly similar minds – because they have all developed the internal classification structure of language – and that there is, therefore, a kind of universal human mind which works through similar structures in all cultures.ⁱⁱ Thus, Claude Levi-Strauss argues that culture is like a language. Languages can differ superficially to a tremendous extent – as in the enormous differences in grammar and wording between Finnish and English. However, all languages follow certain principles – such as having a grammar system – and, thus, beneath the myriad of languages there are 'deep level universals' that can be discerned (Leach 40). Levi-Strauss argues that the same is true with human cultures. There are certain underlying principles – because all humans have the same basic drives and all employ language – and these constitute the 'deep universals' of culture.ⁱⁱⁱ

Levi-Strauss notes in *The Raw and the Cooked* that in all cultures human-being make certain 'binary distinctions' such as 'Left/Right' from which follows concepts such as 'Good/Bad' and 'Right/Wrong.' All cultures also distinguish 'Raw/Cooked' which distinguishes them from animals and from which follows other distinctions. Equally, all cultures have numerous common spatial and existential oppositions such as 'High/Low', 'Wet/Dry' and so on (Leach 48). Anthropologists such as Roger Sandall (2001) have emphasised essential differences between 'tribal' and 'civilised' culture. But these would still appear to be universals. In languages, universal structures under-pin a system of signs which are superficially random and make sense only in relation to each other but are internally coherent. The same, Levi-

Strauss suggests, is true of culture. Hence, cultures – like languages – can be categorised according to certain common features and, as with languages, some can be perceived to be closely related to each other on a structural level even if there is no evidence or a genetic or historical relationship. Cultures are distinguished by random aberrations just like languages and these can be categorised and distinguished. To give an example, Pentecostal Christianity generally wants to convert others to being in its group, at least in theory. It is thus an 'A plus B Culture' with regard to relationship with the 'other.' Hinduism does not generally do this. You are born a Hindu, in most Hindu groups, because of hereditary caste. Thus, it is an 'A not B Culture.' Levi-Strauss maintains, therefore, that there are levels of structure. S(1), most controversially, is deepest, universal structure. S(2) establishes relations between units of structure (such as myths) while S(3) is the overt culture which is likely to differ substantially even between structurally related groups (Kunin 2004).

Levi-Strauss employs myth to discern the structure of societies. A substantial body of literature exists on the subject of myths. A very useful summary of these discussions has been presented by Seth Kunin in *The Logic of Incest*. Kunin draws upon Levi-Strauss' argument that there are two kinds of society: 'hot' and 'cold.' Hot societies perceive themselves to be constantly changing and are thus very conscious of history. Cold societies perceive themselves to be static and lack a consciousness of history. All societies, Levi-Strauss maintains, are ranged somewhere between Hot and Cold. (Levi-Strauss 1985). Following this, Kunin argues that every society has some kind of symbolic system and that this system appears uniquely logical to that society even if it does not appear so to outsiders. Society, Kunin argues, needs to make sense and, as such, where there are contradictions these need to be covered in some way. (Kunin 1995, 24) Myths, Kunin claims, are that which is employed to cover contradictions in society and to render beliefs or activities seemingly natural and logical. Thus, he argues, there is no inherent reason why incest is wrong but it is rendered unnatural through myth. (24)

Myths, Kunin argues, can take a variety of forms such as hero stories, supernatural stories, perceptions of history, sacred

tales and primitive scientific understanding. A myth survives by virtue of its power and the degree to which people believe it. (25) Thus, a myth may be based around an actual historical event. But that event can still be a myth if it is employed as a symbol at the heart of society's symbolic system and if people are highly emotionally attached to it. In the same analysis, Kunin also critiques far narrower definitions of myth such as those advocated by Pitt-Rivers who claims that myth must always involve supernatural elements (26). This, perhaps, suffers from the same difficulties as a similar definition of religion. He also criticizes Robertson-Smith who saw all myth as an explanation of the 'cycles of life' and attempted to apply this narrow definition across all cultures (27). This article will thus examine the mythic dimensions of Finnish race and how this myth has developed and changed.^{iv}

The Finnish Race Debate

The Finnish-language essay collection *Mongoloids or Germanics?*, edited by Kemiläinen (1985), examines the issue of Finnish racial history in depth and each essay has a detailed English summary. I appreciate that I will hold up a work by Kemiläinen as evidence of tendentious scholarship but they nevertheless provide useful summaries of the debates that go outside social anthropology.

In this volume, Virtanen argues that race was academically categorised in terms of a hierarchy in around 1853 by French physical anthropologist Count Arthur de Gobineau. He divided hierarchically between 'whites,' 'yellows' and 'blacks' and argued, based on physical evidence, that Finns were 'yellow,' something promoted by the supposedly 'white' Finland-Swedes to further their authority to rule a supposedly inferior race (Virtanen 1985, 514). This work can only be understood in the context of Social Darwinism which argued that some races are more culturally and intellectually evolved than others and is also discussed in this volume (Kaikkonen 1985, 512). Kemiläinen (1998, 225) also dismisses the idea of race as 'discredited' and its academic proponents as racist (287). It should be noted, as an aside, that Lynn (2006, Ch. 1) defends the concept of race arguing that it is not 'discredited' as the majority of academics still accept or propound it using terms meaning the same thing such as 'cluster.' He suggests that where it is

seen as 'discredited' this is often for political rather than academic reasons as critics do not attempt to jettison taxonomies such as species and 'race' only suffers from the same difficulties – and is only as essentialist – as any taxonomy. He outlines why he believes the concept still to be scientifically valid. But this debate is beyond the scope of this discussion.

Continuing with our discussion of Kemiläinen's edited volume, Hietala (1985, 517) examines the way in which the 'Mongol Finn' idea led to eugenics and financial incentives for Finland-Swedes to have more children. Kilpeläinen looks at the way that nineteenth century anthropologist Johannes Blumenbach found that Finnish skulls were very similar to Sami and assumed Finns were 'nomads from the steppes.' Indeed, he argued that they were related to the Inuit. This was known as the Turanian theory and was developed by a Dane called 'Rasmus Rask (1818).' This further developed into the 'Mongol Theory' where it was argued that the Finns were related to Mongolians and this was substantiated by arguments suggesting that the language was ultimately mongoloid taken up by Finland-Swede M. A. Castrén. This in turn was connected to Gobineau's theory. He regarded the Finns as 'ugly and lazy' and, by the nineteenth century, a mixture of Mongoloid and Germanic (Kilpeläinen 1985). Until as recently as the 1960s Nordic encyclopaedias defined Finns as 'mongoloid' (Aro 1985, 520) and Kemiläinen (1998) provides a detailed history of how up to and throughout the twentieth century mainstream Swedes, Finland-Swedes, Finns themselves and numerous other nationalities regarded Finns as partially mongoloid. Other essays in the earlier volume discuss the political reasons behind why Finland-Swedes and Russians would want to believe that Finns were Mongoloid and Hamäläinen summarises that, 'A fundamental psychological tradition of Finnish society was that which emphasised the greater prestige of the highest Swedish-speaking social layers compared to the Finnish-speaking social layers' (Hämäläinen 1985, 527).

Theories of Finnish Origin: Migration from the East or Proto-European?

Niskanen (2002) notes two main sides to the discussion. One group propound what is called the 'Migration Theory.' In summary, they suggest that Finns arri-

ved in Europe 3000 years ago from either North East Europe or North West Siberia and the latter idea has become more commonly known. Around 2000 years ago they separated into different tribes and the Finns separated from the Estonians by moving north. As discussed, the Finnish 'mongoloid look' was originally used, along with the language, to justify this idea. Many physical anthropologists and geneticists argue that Finns are, at the very least, more 'eastern' than most Europeans. Kittles *et al* (1998) find that the 'Y Chromosome Haplotype variation' reveals that Finns have 'dual origins' between Mongoloid and Germanic. Also twenty-seven percent of Finns carry the 'Tat C' eastern genetic marker compared to only seven percent in Norway. Gugliemino *et al* (1990) argue that Finns are the most 'Eastern' of Europeans with ten percent eastern genes on average while others have estimated that Finns have a quarter or more 'eastern' genes. Ruoslahti *et al* (1968) find that Finns carry genetic markers found in the Chinese but in no other European populations. Research has also noted that Finland-Swedes are genetically hardly distinguishable from Finns and have more in common with them than with Swedes (Hyypä and Mäki 2003). As stated, Wiik (2006) argues that Finns are around a third mongoloid genetically with the genetic origins of Finnish males being in the east.

However, Niskanen argues that the Finnish 'mongoloid look' actually involves features inherited from early European (Cro-Magnon) man which have remained due to Finland's cold environment and its relatively late move to agriculture. Niskanen therefore argues in favour of the 'Continuity Theory' which began to gain a following from around 1980 onwards. In a detailed discussion of racial history, Niskanen argues that Finns are not actually 'Mongoloid.' Finland has been inhabited since the end of the last Ice Age and the Finns arrived somewhere between 10,000 and 6000 years ago in waves. Niskanen argues that Finns are a mixture of a number of European 'sub-races': Finns are 'Old Europeans,' amongst the earliest settlers to northern Europe, and Proto-Nordics, otherwise known as Cro-Magnon Man. The isolation of the Finns has meant that they have retained features from these groups explaining their distinctive and supposedly Mongoloid look, which in fact evidences adaptation

to the cold. Then, most recently, Finns have been influenced by Indo-European 'Nordics' who came originally from what is now Russia and who dominate much of Scandinavia. Wiik, however, counters that Finns (in terms of male genes) arrived from 10000 years ago onwards from the east when there were already 'Old Europeans' settled in Europe, rendering the Finns from the east (2008, 37). Villems *et al* (2000) argue that the 'Tat-C' 'eastern' genetic marker is actually a 'northern' rather than an 'eastern' marker. It is also found in the Finno-Ugric Siberian peoples and in Greenland and it appears to have migrated from Finland to the East. Also, Anttonen (132) stresses that Finnish nationalism often plays down relatively recent immigration to present the 'Finns' as a 'homogenous race.' In fact, he argues, there has been immigration from Sweden and, under Russian rule, from Russia and Tatarstan and this has mixed with the 'Finnish' population.

But whether Finns are partially mongoloid or some perceived 'mongoloids' are originally, in some way, Finnish or some Finns have maintained or evolved a mongoloid-type facial structure in response to the environment making them 'Arctic', Finns have been perceived historically as not being entirely like other 'Europeans' for linguistic, physical and more recently genetic reasons. This is an historical academic perception, though many relevant scholars still hold this view in a nuanced form and it has, in some ways, influenced Finnish self-perception. There remains this 'debate' and we might suggest that certain Finns are battling to be recognised as European.^v The very fact, it might be submitted, that Finns are 'Old European' makes them not quite 'European' – they are something distinctive from most 'European' peoples and this is expressed in a Non-Indo-European language and the fact that they are 'Proto-European' and more adapted to a colder environment as the Arctic peoples are.

The Finnish Myth

This genetically mixed idea of Finnish racial identity has become generally accepted – whatever the reality – and it is even reflected in Finnish history books. For example, Jutikkala and Pirinen (1996, 21) write that:

'Genetic research indicates that the genes carried by the Finnish population are ¾ European and ¼ Uralian or

Siberian. The differences between the eastern and western parts of the country as well as between the Finnish and Swedish-speaking inhabitants are slight. It might be countered that this is potentially based on erroneous research but it demonstrates that being at least 'slightly eastern' is, for many, part of being Finnish. Indeed, Kemiläinen (1998, 193) notes that in the 1920s, Finnish school children were told that they were Mongols and Finno-Uralic areas were marked yellow on the map along with Mongolia. However, during the 1990s in particular, many mainly Finnish scholars have played down Finland's eastern origins. Anttonen (2005, 132) observes the gradual trend is for Finns to have moved 'westwards' in terms of how they wish to be perceived: 'The emphasis on the Western-ness of the Finns is a recent phenomenon' rendering Finland's joining the European Union a 'return to Europe.' Thus, he notes that Jutikkala and Pirinen's English-language history of Finland has evolved from claiming that 'Finns are part of the East Baltic race and partially the Nordic race' in 1962 to making a more nuanced claim in 1996 (132) but even these accept that Finns are genetically partially eastern. In the most recent edition of the book - in 2003 - the idea that Finns are eastern has been dropped altogether. Moreover, Anttonen seems to imply that the desire to represent Finns as completely 'western' (or completely eastern) may be politically motivated. Thus, he notes that in Kemiläinen's work 'ideas of race and civilization are linked, as the "Western Genetic Heritage" of the Finnish population is used as an argument for Finland belonging to Western Civilization' (132). Likewise Browning (1999) notes that since the end of the Cold War - in which Finland was heavily oriented towards the Soviet Union in a policy known as Finlandization - the two main discourses in Finnish nationalism can be approximately described as 'Westernisers' and 'Easternisers' or, at least, those who do not embrace the Westernising narrative. The former are currently dominant within the elite. During the Cold War narratives of being partially eastern were more salient due to political convenience. Equally, Anttonen notes that Finnish scholars tend to separate 'language' and 'race' in order to keep Finns 'white' but conflate the two when discussing the Sámi, which then distinguishes them from the Finns despite their similar lan-

guage and relatively similar genetic heritage in many cases (133). It should be emphasised as well that Kemiläinen's volume was re-published (Kemiläinen 2000) by the Finnish Literature Society. This is a government-funded organisation run by established academics and, as Andreski (1974, 49) points out, is therefore very likely to reflect the cultural view favoured by the Finnish establishment - a view that Finns are 'Western' - in its academic publishing.^{vi}

Finnish Race and Myth

Finns in the Shadow of the "Aryans" does, indeed, appear to follow this pattern. It appears to reflect a Finnish insecurity about race and European-ness and attempts to promote - regardless of the evidence - the idea that Finns are 'European.' The use of fallacy and faulty logic is widespread in this Westernising narrative dressed-up as scholarship. Kemiläinen seems to argue that Finland is not genetically eastern because it is apparently highly democratic and children learn foreign languages: '*Finland is in many respects more European than the older members of the European Union. From the view-point of human rights, we may emphasise that there was never serfdom . . . All children learn the second national language and at least one foreign language*' (Kemiläinen 1998, 287). She also argues that a backlash against the idea that Finns are wholly white was caused by a combination of Soviet brainwashing and ignorance. '*The attitude to racism took a surprising turn in the 1960s until the 1980s when the young and often leftist and radical generation . . . began to criticise the older generation . . . because they had denied the Mongol origin of the Finns. The young people . . . accused patriotic parents of nationalist fervour . . . the young thought that nationalism and race pride prevented the first generation of an independent state accepting that their ancestors had Mongol roots. It is evident that the young did not know the nature of the racial debates . . . the drops of Mongolian blood were mentioned with a smile or with satisfaction* (284-5)

Indeed, disagreement with Kemiläinen's arguments is met with counters that might hardly be regarded as academic. One is just to assert that her critics are wrong with no attempt at justification. In response to scholars claiming that Finns have mongoloid appearance, she simply writes, 'In fact this oriental appearance

does not exist in Finland' without any attempt to justify this statement at all (Kemiläinen 1998, 80). Later, again attempting to refute opinions that some Finns look 'mongoloid,' she asserts 'The Finnish mouth is not broad' (164) without any citation.

Another tactic is to simply claim that opponents are 'racist' (287) something that I would argue is a fallacious appeal to emotion considering the contemporary power of this word, and as 'common people' (79).^{vii} She also presents half truths, arguing that stereotypes about Finns being 'disorganised' are wrong because they won the Winter War. However, they ultimately lost a lot of land, the army leader was a Finland-Swede and this has little, again, to do with race. Moreover, she ignores the articles cited above about the Dual Origins of Finns or any related work by Richard Lynn (2006, 18) which would raise at least a challenge to her thesis with Lynn summarising that only 'Western Finns' are 'Nordic' while the racial dimension of eastern Finns is more complex. Kemiläinen's language is also constantly in the first person plural with references to 'we Finns' and 'our land' as if it is a kind of nationalist appeal to the Finnish people. By using 'we' she is stirring-up a national identity - 'we' who have suffered together, 'we' who have fought together, an obvious rhetorical device. It is this kind of form which raises the very questions - that Anttonen has speculated on - over whether Kemiläinen's English summary of the racial debate is more than mere historical anthropology. What, then, is the essential mythic idea that is propounded by Kemiläinen and others in the academic writing on the Finnish race? Drawing upon *Finns in the Shadow the Aryans* - which essentially summarises in English the ideas in *Mongoloids or Germanics?* - I think we can discern the following racial myth or idea in Kemiläinen's work (as the most widely publicised example of such work):

A. Finns are white and European. Historically, they were seen as mongoloid (apart from by Finland's heroes such as Elias Lönnrot, the compiler of their 'national epic' *Kalevala*). This was because of (1) Poor scholarship employed the 'discredited' idea of physical racial differences. (2) Biased science - Finns being 'mongoloid' justified Swedish, Russian and Finland-Swede dominion over

them as mongoloids were perceived as inferior. (3) Conflation of language and race leading to the erroneous conclusion that Finns were racially mongoloid. (4) Because, during the Cold War, people had been, in some sense, brainwashed by Soviet propaganda to this effect or were just uneducated or unpatriotic.

B. Modern genetic research – mainly by Finns – demonstrates that Finns are either hardly eastern or completely European. The fact that Finland is a 'highly educated' and 'egalitarian' society further demonstrates that it is racially European as does its ability to win the Winter War against the Soviets. Finns do not look eastern and that is a fact. Moreover, those who disagree are racists.

In Kunin's sense this idea is a myth because it holds together Finland as a European country. It covers contradictions. During the Cold War, Finland was oriented towards the Soviet Union – towards the East – and, in that context, its Eastern-ness was emphasised by English-language scholars such as Jutikkala and Pirinen. Finland was eastern oriented and the idea that it had an Eastern origin, somewhere in the then Soviet Union such as Mongolia, was perhaps not un-useful. However, it also maintained relations with the 'West.' Thus, the 'mixed' model then propounded by Jutikkala and Pirinen – that Finland is in the 'East Baltic Race' – was a useful compromise. Finland was politically (in theory) neutral and so 'between east and west' (even if in reality it was oriented towards the USSR) and its race reflected that (see Lavery 2003). It was thus a kind of myth.

Now Finland is in the European Union and is substantially oriented towards the West. I would suggest, therefore, that it is now in its interests to be seen as European and 'Western' and, moreover, it has been argued that Finns always had a strong desire to be seen as white. Laine (2006) provides a detailed discussion of the Finnish inferiority complex or 'Cultural Cringe' (see Philips 1958). She claims that as a result of their history Finns are often 'discontented with their nation' and 'ashamed of themselves.' She argues that there is a history of 'self-stigmatisation' in Finland because Finnishness was defined as 'inferior to the rest of Europe' and the Finns were regarded as 'separate, mentally colonised "others"' (74). The Finns were also per-

ceived as 'lazy, children of nature, living day by day with a tendency for drinking – in opposition to other Europeans' (74/75). Equally, Enehjelm (2004) observes how Finland would promote itself abroad in the 1930s as a blonde, fair-skinned nation – despite this not being entirely the case. Clearly, then, the whiteness of the Finns is a myth in the anthropological sense. Indeed, even in the quotidian sense, the Finnish racial idea employs various less than satisfactory arguments implying that it is something far more than merely a debate for physical anthropologists.

The Structure of the Myth

What, then, is the structure of the form of racial myth propounded by Kemiläinen and how is this reflected in Finnish culture?

European (Civilised) v Mongoloid (Uncivilised)

Firstly, there is a noticeable binary opposition between 'European' and 'Mongoloid.' 'European' implies educated, civilised, egalitarian, organised and high social status. 'Mongoloid' is the very antithesis of this otherwise Kemiläinen would not conflate racial and social arguments. To be 'Mongoloid' is to be uncivilised, uneducated, aristocratic in organisation, disorganised and of low social status. Thus, she seems to accept the very nineteenth century reasoning that she condemns as illogical. European culture is clearly looked up to as a higher culture and, connected to this, a higher race. This, I would suggest, is congruous with the kind of national low self-esteem discussed by Laine. When Finns were perceived as Mongoloid they were also perceived as illiterate peasants. Now this latter perception has changed, the former must logically change too. Finns may have 'eastern genes' but civilisation pushes them into Europe. Hence, the more civilised one is, the more European one is. This may explain the strong emphasis in Finland on the importance of education (see, for example, Lander 1976, 93). There is a need to prove oneself in the light of historic negative perceptions. Laine (2006, 74) observes that: . . . *the Finnish 'backwoods culture' has been represented as uncultured, uncommunicative, impolite, culturally and biologically pathological . . . too straight forward and far too serious compared to the civilised and well-behaved urban cultures of the other European*

nations.

One way of over-compensating for this is with the relatively high number of Masters Degrees and Doctorates. Finland's relatively high level of education has been noted in for example Järvinen and Vanttaja (2001). Finnish tourist Literature equally demonstrates that Finns wish to be perceived as a highly educated people, demonstrating the importance of education for status in Finland. The website www.visitfinland.com has a specific section on 'Education.' It claims that: *That Finnish literacy rates are among the highest - if not the highest - in the world is a tribute to the effectiveness of the Finnish education system . . . Today there 20 universities in Finland, mostly owned and funded by the State. Students do not have to pay study fees. Universities are required "to attain a high international standard of research, education and instruction, whilst abiding by ethical principles and good scientific practice".* Also under 'Culture and Lifestyle' the site asserts that: *As one of the world's best-educated nations, Finns enjoy a high standard of living and hold cultural expression of all kinds in high regard. Innovative high technology infiltrates every Finnish home, but an appreciation of the simple joys of the unspoilt natural environment is equally widespread. Finland is a small country with a rich cultural heritage. Reflecting this, Finns count among the world's top readers, and libraries, theatres and museums exert an irresistible attraction. A nation of five million people continues to enrich the world with great musicians, architects, designers and dancers.*

Other tourist literature commonly includes photographs of Finns receiving PhDs – wearing the distinctive top hat that is worn by graduating doctoral students at German influenced universities (e.g. Otava 2005, 108). This further demonstrates the importance of education in Finland. Finns want foreigners to perceive them as highly educated and indeed 'cultured' people.

Past (Negative) v Present (Positive)

The second distinction is 'past' and 'present.' Kemiläinen emphasises that in the past scholarship and the understanding of Finnish race was poor quality and suspect. It was based around 'discredited' racial theories and the conflation of language with race; it was biased because Russians, Soviets, Swedes and

Finland-Swedes all held strong motives to want 'science' to prove that Finns were mongoloid; genetics had not yet been discovered and, more recently, the Cold War meant that Finns were susceptible to Soviet propaganda, supposedly undermining their critical faculties. The past involved poor science and a time un-conducive to critical research.

By contrast, modern genetics – as presented mainly by Finnish scholars – 'proves' that Finns are not Mongoloid and this is not subjected to the same critique. For Popper (1966) this kind of distinction evidences a false-rationalist acceptance of contemporary scientific knowledge as 'truth' despite the way in which rationalism should always critique the orthodox view. Equally, the possibility that modern Finnish racial theories have underlying motivations or that there might be an element of 'brainwashing' involved in these is not discussed at all. Hence, there was a time in the past when all Finns were misled in relation to their racial origins. But now genetics 'proves,' almost beyond doubt, that Finns are European.

This emphasis on, effectively, the future is highly significant in terms of Finnish identity. The idea of 'Cultural Cringe' was developed by Australian social anthropologist A. A. Philips (1958). Cultural Cringe was manifested, often in post-colonial countries, where people dismissed the achievements of their culture and regarded it as inferior to others. It is also seen, Philips argued, in a somewhat anti-intellectual attitude in some cases as well as in an emphasis on the 'the future' rather than country's past which is perceived in negative terms. Philips noted that this phenomenon was particularly pronounced amongst Australians where, Philips argued, there was the belief that their culture occupied an inferior and peripheral place in global terms. We have already discussed the way in which such an idea exists in Finland and it might be argued that Kemiläinen's racial myth reflects that. The past was mongoloid but the future is European.

Finnish Scholarship (Honest) v Foreign Scholarship (Politically Motivated)

Further implicit in Kemiläinen's presentation is that modern Finnish scholarship is reputable while foreign scholarship is somewhat less so.^{viii} Kemiläinen argues that contemporary genetics 'proves' that

Finns are European. However, what she is actually referring to is a series of contemporary mainly Finnish scholars who have emphasised that Finns are European drawing upon a certain interpretation of the information, often publishing in Finnish (see Anttonen 2005, 132). Other contemporary scholars – from many different countries such as the USA, Russia and Italy – have continued to emphasise the eastern dimension to Finns as we have seen, but these are essentially ignored in the analysis. Foreign scholars are specifically accused of political bias, with it clearly delineated – even in recent history – that Russians, Soviets, Swedes and Finland-Swedes (Finland's traditional, stereotyped 'aristocracy' due to former Swedish rule) have an essentially racist desire for Finns to be 'eastern' or 'mongoloid.' By contrast, modern Finnish scholars are assumed to be honest and without such motivations. This would be congruous with Laine's (2006) argument that to be 'honest' is regarded as an essential Finnish quality lacking in 'Europeans' and reflects low self-esteem – Finns may not be powerful but 'at least we are honest'. She highlights this as being a Finnish 'national myth' and Kemiläinen's racial ideas appear to be reflecting it. It might also be seen to imply a strongly nationalistic culture which Anttonen (2005, 125) also remarks on.

Finns (Correct) v Foreigners (Incorrect)

This distinction is related to the above point. In general, Finnish scholars are drawn upon as 'authorities' while foreign scholars – whose racial ideas are disagreeable – are heavily critiqued. This is most clearly seen, as quoted above, when Kemiläinen quotes numerous foreign observers who claim that there is some kind of Mongoloid look amongst many Finns and counters simply that, 'In fact this oriental appearance does not exist in Finland' without any attempt to justify this at all. It is thus a very clear appeal to authority – herself as a university professor perhaps. Again and again, throughout the works, Finnish scholars who argue that Finns are European are presented essentially uncritically, such as 'Dr Pauli Kajunoja' (228). Kemiläinen also dismisses a particular Estonian anthropologist because a particular Finnish anthropologist has criticised her, without even feeling the need to say what the criticism was (221). And those who disagree have

their motives questioned or are simply dismissed as incorrect. There thus appears to be a very basic Finnish patriotism here. Anttonen (2005, 125) remarks that Finland is a strongly consensus-based society which sees itself as being very united. He argues that Finns generally dislike outsiders to a greater extent than other European nations. It is thus, he argues, a highly patriotic society and this aspect of the myth may reflect that.

'Finns are European' (Cultural Heroes) v 'Finns are Mongoloid' (Racists)

This is a fascinating distinction in terms of myth. Kemiläinen makes a point of emphasising that while it was the case that during the nineteenth century there was general agreement amongst Finnish and foreign intellectuals that Finns should be perceived as Mongoloid, Finland's *de facto* 'cultural heroes' did not concur with this. During most of the nineteenth century, intellectuals, like all who were educated in Finland, were primarily Swedish-speaking. However, a divide gradually developed between *Fennomans* – who, drawing upon romantic ideas, believed that the Finnish-language and culture 'of the people' had to be promoted – and the Finland-Swedes who wanted to specifically promote a Finland-Swedish culture based around perceived ethnic difference from Finns. The former group and especially J. V. Snellman (1806-81) (a cultural expert who was actually raised in Sweden proper) and Elias Lönnrot (1802-84) (who compiled the Finnish folk epic *Kalevala*) both argued, though not perhaps scientifically, that Finns should be seen as European.^{ix} Finnish anthropologist Juha Pentikäinen (1999, 252) has observed that *Kalevala* has gained the status of a kind of 'sacred scripture' within Finnish 'Civic Religion' cementing the place of Lönnrot as a cultural hero. Kemiläinen thus points out that, 'Lönnrot remarked that the characteristics of the Mongols – as far as he knew them – did not fit the Finns . . . He considered Finns to belong to the Caucasian race, if they were not between this and the Mongolian race' (64). Snellman is slightly more ambiguous over this issue so Kemiläinen maintains that, 'The champion of the Fennomans or pro-Finnish movement, Johan Vilhelm Snellman (1806-1881), considered the question of race and racial roots insignificant' (66). Hence, both of these Finland-Swedes who have been

adopted as 'Finnish' historical national heroes are held to agree, in some way, with the viewpoint propounded by Kemiläinen.

By contrast, foreign nineteenth century scholars, with a few isolated exceptions, from Germany, Sweden, Russia, England and France regarded Finns as primarily mongoloid in origin (69). These scholars are also termed as 'racist' (68). Thus, a fascinating binary distinction is found here between the idolised heroes of Finnish culture (who believe that Finns are European or at least not Mongoloid or that race does not matter) and 'foreign racists' who believe they are Mongoloid. Thus, ultimately it would appear that in Kemiläinen's myth 'racism' against the Finns has been defeated by mainly Finnish scholarship – and Finland becoming 'civilised' – which has underlined the veracity of Finland's cultural heroes. Hence, the myth of Finland's racial origins has effectively been a battle against 'foreign racism' which Finns have ultimately won by 'proving' themselves that they are European. As discussed, racism has been defeated, in Kemiläinen's myth, in 'racist' terms whereby 'European' is conflated with 'civilised' and so on.

Anti-Racist (Logical, Acceptable) v Racist (Illogical, Unacceptable)

Of course, this also reflects an important idea that has gained strong currency in European culture since World War II – that 'racism' – or specifically an academic study of racial differences – is effectively a kind of heresy against 'truth'. Kemiläinen dismisses certain scholars simply by accusing them, due to their academically argued views, of being 'racist,' a fallacious appeal to emotion as already discussed. Therefore, we can see the broader shift from past scholarship (racist, negative) to present scholarship (not racist, positive).

Ellis (2004) argues that the dismissal of discussion of racial differences reflects a Neo-Marxist emphasis on those who are perceived to be disempowered which has moved from 'the worker' to the ethnic minority, for example.^x This itself reflects what Popper has termed a 'false rationalist' world-view. Popper (1966, 39) argues that Marxism draws on the Hegelian dialectic whereby a thesis must lead to an antithesis and synthesis. Popper argues that any Hegelian-based ideology, must always have an enemy (a contradiction) otherwise the dialectic is disproved. Moreover, Romanticism (and

thus its successor philosophies such as Nationalism, Marxism, Fascism, Cultural Relativism and the other philosophies of the Continental School) do not, and cannot, prove their premises that, for example, 'All history . . . is the history of class struggles' or 'The most natural state . . . is a single people with a single national character' (Popper 1966, 52). They are asserted as founding principles; as undisputable truths. Popper (21) observes that in Romanticism there is 'a new kind of dogmatism . . . it confronts us with a dictum. And *we can take it or leave it.*' It is an 'age of dishonesty' which does little more than 'bewitch' the reader. It asserts truth as eternal rather than constantly critique it and this is false rationalism. Moreover, the need for an 'other' makes the ideology – like all Hegelian ideologies – positively dangerous.

It might be suggested that Kemiläinen's myth reflects this intolerant, false rationalist idea. Those who portrayed Finns as mongoloid expound 'racist' ideas which can be dismissed for that very reason. Their opposites are clearly preferable, and more coherent, because they are not 'racist' and are, therefore, not 'discredited' which Lynn (2006, Ch 1) points out seems to mean 'disagreed with' by certain anthropologists no matter what the quality of their arguments or that the word 'race' has been replaced with another that means the same thing. Even the full title of Kemiläinen's volume implicitly reflects this idea. The subtitle is '*Race Theories and Racism*' and the main title puts 'Aryans' in quotation marks such that the author can distance herself from the term. It seems, therefore, that 'race theories' are all example of 'racism,' when this term is, of course, highly politically charged and relating, Ellis at least has argued, to a certain ideological construction.

Hence, we can see that implicit to Kemiläinen's myth is the idea that Finns – though they were 'between east and west' – have moved to being white because they are civilised and educated. Whiteness is something that they have effectively achieved the right to. The second thread is that present scholarship – where it is presented – is seen uncritically as fact as it, in her presentation, substantiates the idea that Finns are European. This is congruous with the Cultural Cringe dimension to Finnish culture. Thirdly, Finns are implicitly perceived as 'honest' in their scholarship

while others are generally seen as politically motivated and even 'racist' in theirs, something which may reflect Cultural Cringe as we have discussed. And finally, Finns are portrayed quite uncritically while foreign scholars are criticised, often dismissively. This may possibly reflect a Finnish cultural dimension of not engaging in public disagreement or simply a sense of Finnish patriotism. Moreover, the patriotic dimensions to the myth are further underlined by her argument that Finland's cultural heroes always believed Finns to be European while only 'foreign racists' disagreed with this. Finland has thus won an intellectual and social battle against 'foreign racists' and it has been won by Finnish scholars and by Finnish social advancement.

Conclusion

This article has conducted a structuralist analysis of a summary of the racial arguments of the prominent Finnish historian of the anthropology of race Aira Kemiläinen. It has drawn mainly upon her work because hers is one of the few summaries of the arguments over Finnish racial identity presented in English which would imply that it reflects how Finns, or at least those promoting the Finnish-European model, wish to be perceived by foreigners. Increasingly, it is this model, albeit less stridently presented, that has gained acceptance in other English-language literature on these issues published in Finland such as Jutikkala and Pirinen (2003). I quite appreciate that there are difficulties with the Structuralist method and the article attempts to address those problems. But centrally, it argues, in accord with Anttonen, that there has been a gradual change in Finnish perception – as reflected in Finnish scholarship – from an emphasis on the Eastern dimension of the Finns to an emphasis on the Western dimensions. This change, it has argued, can be seen as play for status underpinned by the implicit view that to be civilised means to be 'white.'

The article has demonstrated that Kemiläinen produces effectively a myth of the Finns' racial origins which, following the Levi-Straussian model of myth, covers up contradictions in order to justify the present or desired societal structure. Hence, this European idea has become especially significant since Finland joined the European Union in 1995. Kemiläinen's myth reflects a number of

oppositions which are congruous with other research on Finnish national identity. Firstly, there is the view that to be white and European means to be civilised and that Finns have achieved whiteness through civilisation. There is the prizing of the present over the past, which might be seen to reflect Cultural Cringe. There is the idea that Finnish scholars are somehow more 'honest' and rational than foreigners and there is essentially the view that foreign observers are wrong and Finnish scholars are correct. Finally, there is the centrality of historic Finnish cultural heroes who are pitted, intellectually, against 'foreign' and 'racist' scholars and who have ultimately been vindicated by modern Finnish scholars. Moreover, there is implicit racist (negative) v anti-racist (positive, acceptable) dichotomy whereby opponents can be dismissed as 'racist' – for propounding academic arguments - and thus supposedly not worth debating with. This is a false rationalist thought-system.

Perhaps it is not too much of an exaggeration to suggest that Kemiläinen's myth – while, of course, raising questions about Finnish scholarship in this area - is a kind of intellectual, nationalist battle. The past was a negative time for Finland when she was ruled by foreigners (Sweden and then Russia) and perceived as uncivilised and Mongoloid. But during this time there were Finnish heroes who disagreed. In the twentieth century, a combination of Finnish scholars and social advancement has proven – against incorrect or politically motivated or just racist foreign intellectuals – that Finns are European. And this is what Finland's heroes from the past had always said. Thus, Finland has won its place in Europe as an equal nation, as its heroes always believed it was. Certainly, this kind of mythic analysis demonstrates that the intellectual debate over race in Finland has civic religious and political dimensions, while there may also be scholarship in this area that does not. Many scholars agree that the question of the Finnish race remains unanswered. I would argue that on structural level, drawing upon a modern myth, they should be categorised as 'Battling to be White' which may also be the case with a number of other peripheral European nations in terms of racial scholarship. Further comparative research in this area would be of great interest such as in relation to Greenland as an example of a nation on Europe's borders.

Notes

1. They have been widely described in this way. See, for example, Otava (2005) or Rajanen (1984). Obviously, the terms 'east' and 'west' are fluid and have been widely critiqued. See Gray (2007) or Said (1979) for further discussion.
2. More recently this idea has been criticised by scholars such as Pinker (1994) and his perspective has been itself heavily criticised by Sampson (2007).
3. I am aware of the debate over the term 'culture' (see, for example, Fox and King 2002). I think much of this reflects the old argument over words between essentialists and nominalists and is nothing specific to 'culture' itself.
4. For a detailed defence of structuralism see Miles-Watson (2008).
5. Also, Marusic (2005) argues that both the Finns and the Greenlandic – as well as a J Curve of peoples down to parts of Slovenia – have a gene which means they are not resistant to alcohol. Along this curve alcoholism and suicide are very high and he connects the gene to mongoloid influence.
6. See Dutton (2008) or Wilson (1976) for evidence of a political agenda in this organisation's publishing. I should stress, however, that I have also read some very interesting works from this publisher.
7. It might be countered that this is a straw-man argument reflecting the fact that Kemiläinen's English may not have been of an especially high standard. But she emphasises in her preface that the book has edited by an English native speaker working in the language centre of her university.
8. Of course, some might suggest that the fact that the fact that arguments as illogical as Kemiläinen's got through peer-review rather raises questions about historical and anthropological scholarship in Finland.
9. Both have special 'flag days' in their honour and also both came very high in Finland's 2004 television programme 'Greatest Finns' with Lönnrot at '10' and Snellman at '24'.
10. Benoist (2004) argues that Marxism ultimately reflects a Judaeo-Christian emphasis on those who come second summarised by Nietzsche as an ideology of resentment.

References

- Andreski, Stanislav, (1974), *Social Sciences as Sorcery*, London: Penguin.
- Anttonen, Pertti, (2005), *Tradition through Modernity: Postmodernism and the Nation State in Folklore Scholarship*, Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Aro, Tuija, (1985), 'The race of the Finns in German and Nordic encyclopaedias' in Aira Kemiläinen, (ed.), *Mongols or Germanics?*, Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society.
- Benoist, Alain de, (2004), *On Being a Pagan*, Atlanta: Ultra.
- Browning, Chris, (1999), 'Come Home or Moving Home? "Westernising" Narratives in Finnish Foreign Policy and Reinterpretation of Past Identities' *UPI Working Papers 16*. Turku University.
- Dale, Peter, (1986), *The Myth of Japanese Uniqueness*, London: Routledge.

- Dutton, Edward, (2008), 'Finland's Cold War Legacy' in *Contemporary Review*, 1690.
- Ellis, Frank, (2004), *Political Correctness and the Theoretical Struggle: From Lenin and Mao to Marcus and Foucault*, Auckland: Maxim Institute.
- Enehjelm, Nina, (2004), *Missit: A History of the Finnish Beauty Pageant Industry until 1969*, Helsinki University Press.
- Fox, Richard and King, Barbara, (2002), 'Introduction' in Fox, Richard and King, Barbara, (eds), *Anthropology Beyond Culture*, Oxford: Berg.
- Gellner, Ernest, (1993), *The Psychoanalysis Movement*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gleason, H. A., (1969), *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*, Hodder: London.
- Gray, John, (2007), *Black Mass: Apocalyptic Religion and the Death of Utopia*, New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.
- Gugliemino C. R., (1990), 'Uralic Genes in Europe' in *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 83:1.
- Hietala, Marjatta, (1985), 'In search on the Finnish female type' in Aira Kemiläinen, (ed.), *Mongols or Germanics?* Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society.
- Hyypä, Markku and Mäki, Juhani, (2003), 'Social Participation and Health in a Community Rich in Social Capital' in *Health Education Research*, 18:6.
- Hämäläinen, Pekka, (1985), 'Finland-Swedes' notions of race around the revolutionary and civil war period' in Kemiläinen, Aira, (ed.), *Mongols or Germanics?*, Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society.
- Järvinen, Tero and Vanttaja, Markku, (2001), 'Young People, Education and Work: Trends and Change in Finland in the 1990s' in *Journal of Youth Studies*, 4:2.
- Jutikkala, Eino and Pirinen, Kauko, (2003), *A History of Finland*, Helsinki: WSOY.
- Jutikkala, Eino and Pirinen, Kauko, (1996), *A History of Finland*, Helsinki: WSOY.
- Kaikkonen, Olli, (1985), 'The concept of inequality, racial ideas and Social Darwinism' in Aira Kemiläinen, (ed.), *Mongols or Germanics?* Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society.
- Kemiläinen, Aira, (2000), *Finns in the Shadow of the Aryans: Race Theories and Racism*, Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Kemiläinen, Aira, (1998), *Finns in the Shadow of the Aryans: Race Theories and Racism*, Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society.
- Kilpeläinen, Jouku, (1985), 'Racial theories about the Western Finno-Ugric peoples in Central European anthropology in the 19th century and Finnish reactions to them' in Kemiläinen, Aira, (ed.), *Mongols or Germanics?* Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society.
- Kittles, Rick et al, (1998), 'Dual Origins of Finns Revealed by Y-Chromosome Haplotype Variation' in *American Journal of Human Genetics*, 62.
- Kunin, Seth, (1995), *The Logic of Incest: A Structuralist Analysis of Hebrew Mythology*, Sheffield Academic Press.
- Kunin, Seth, (2004), *We Think What We Eat*, Sheffield University Press.
- Laine, Tarja, (2006), 'Shame on us: Shame, National Identity and the Finnish Doping

- Scandal' in *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 23:1.
- Lander, Patricia, (1976), *In the Shadow of the Factory: Social Change in a Finnish Community*, New York: Schenkman Publishing.
- Lavery, Jason, (2003), 'All the President's Historians: The Debate over Urho Kekkonen' in *Scandinavian Studies*, 7.
- Leach, Edmund, (1973), 'Structuralism in Social Anthropology' in Robey, David, (ed.), *Structuralism*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude, (1985), *The View from Afar*, University of Chicago Press.
- Lewis, Richard, (2005), *Finland: Cultural Lone Wolf*, New York: Intercultural Press.
- Lynn, Richard, (2006), *Race Differences in Intelligence*, Augusta GA: Washington Summit Publishers.
- Marusic, Andrej, (2005), 'History and Geography of Suicide: Could genetic risk factors account for the variation in suicide rates?' in *American Journal of Genetics* (Part C: Seminars in Medical Genetics), 133C: 1.
- Mead, W. R., (1993), *An Experience of Finland*, London: C. Hurst and Co.
- Miles Watson, Jonathon, (2008), 'Structuralism: A Methodology for the New Millennium' in Kasi, E., *Man in India*, Delhi: Serial Press.
- Niskanen, Markku, (2002), 'The Origin of the Baltic Finns from a Physical Anthropological view' in *The Mankind Quarterly*, 53:2.
- Otava, (2005), *Facts About Finland*, Helsinki: Otava.
- Pentikäinen, Juha, (1999), *Kalevala Mythology*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Philips, A. A., (1958), *The Australian Tradition: Studies in Colonial Culture*, Melbourne: Cheshire.
- Pinker, Steven, (1994), *The Language Instinct*, New York: William Morrow.
- Popper, Karl, (1966), *The Open Society and its Enemies II: The High Tide of Prophecy: Hegel, Marx and the Aftermath*, London: Routledge, Kegan and Paul.
- Rajanen, Aini, (1984), *Of Finnish Ways*, New York: Barnes and Noble.
- Ruoslahti, E. et al. (1968), 'Identity of Transferring D-Chi from the Chinese and from the Finns' in *Nature*, 220.
- Said, Edward, (1979), *Orientalism*, New York: Vintage Publications.
- Sampson, Geoffrey, (2007), 'There is no language instinct' in *Ilha do Desterro*, 52.
- Sandall, Roger, (2001), *The Culture Cult: On Designer Tribalism and Other Essays*, Oxford: Westview.
- Villems, Richard; Rootsi, Siiri; Tarnbets, Kristiina; Adojaan, Marja; Orekhov, Vladimir; Khusnutdinova, Elsa and Yankovsky, Nikolay, (2000), 'Archaeogenetics of Finno-Ugric Speaking Populations' in Julko, Kyosti, (ed.), *The Roots of Peoples and Languages of Northern Eurasia* IV, <http://evolutsioon.ut.ee/publications/Villems2002.pdf>
- Virtanen, Anna-Maija, (1985), 'Gobineau's Racial Doctrine and the Idealization of Germanic Peoples' in Aira Kemiläinen, (ed.), *Mongols or Germanics?* Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society.
- Visit Finland, (2007), www.visitfinland.com
- Wiik, Kalevi, (2008), 'Where did European Men Come From?' in *Journal of Genetic Genealogy*, 4: 35-85. <http://www.jogg.info/41/Wiik.pdf>
- Wilson, William, (1976), *Folklore and Nationalism in Modern Finland*,