

Summary

THE FRONTIER IN FLAMES. CONTACTS BETWEEN THE INHABITANTS OF KAINUU AND PIELIS-KARELIA WITH RUSSIAN KARELIA FROM THE AGE OF THE COUNT TO THE HOMESPUN WAR (1650–1712).

Examining the research areas

The long-standing hatred between Sweden and Russia during the years 1570–1595 was brought to an end by a treaty signed in the tiny village of Täuysinä on 18 May 1595. As a result the Swedes gained Kainuu and Lapland. In dividing the eastern and southeastern portions of Kainuu the border set by the Peace of Täuysinä quite accurately followed a watershed – a ridge. In respect to the natural geography of the region, Kainuu formed a unified whole. Literally, it had "natural borders". The roots of present-day settlement extend to the mid-16th century, when the population which had primarily come from Savo settled the area under the active direction of the Swedish Crown. Prior to this settlement, the region had been the hunting grounds of various parishes of northern Ostrobothnia. The pioneers from Savo principally settled the area around Lake Oulu and Puolanka. During the 25-year war with Russia from 1570 to 1595 this settlement was almost totally destroyed. The consequent population vacuum was filled by resettlement in the early 17th century. The region's beneficial natural resources (forests suitable for slash and burn cultivation, rich fishing waters and land filled with game) attracted inhabitants from the surrounding areas. Furthermore, the tax privileges promised the pioneers by the Swedish Crown also appealed to settlers. The newcomers were chiefly from Savo, as was the case in the first wave of settlement.

In the wake of the chaos that Russia was cast into, Sweden decided to again embark on a policy of war (1610–1617), which the Treaty of Stolbova signed on 27 February 1617 ended. The conflict again resulted in Swedish expansion at Russian expense; Sweden gained the province of Käkisalmi and Ingria, along the eastern border. A belligerent and hence protracted demarcation between Russia and the province of Käkisalmi concluded with a border accord signed on 3 August 1621. This set the eastern border of Finland which was maintained until 1940. It is true, however, that the territory of Old Finland lost in 1721 and 1743 did belong to Russia until early 1812. The province of Käkisalmi was not officially part of the Swedish kingdom before 1721. It was conquered territory, the "spoils of victory", or a province in the same manner as Pomerania, Estonia or Ingria. Part of the administration of the region was standardized to conform with practices in the new motherland; local administration fell into this category. Administrative practices from the previous regime were in part retained, for example, in respect to the region's system of taxation, or

”estimated taxation”. In practice this meant that tax was assessed on the basis of an annual estimation of the individual farm and its worth. The area strongly attracted people from the surrounding provinces since there was no military recruitment in the province of Käkisalmi. As former subjects of the tsar and Orthodox by religion, the peasants were considered untrustworthy. Consequently, they were undesirable to the military. On the other hand, the region had no right to send representatives to parliament. All conquered territory was decreed the property of the Swedish Crown, which basically placed the peasants in the position of being Crown tenants. Lutheranism became a significant tool in the policy of unification, and had through conquest become the state religion. The establishment of Lutheran parishes began in the 1630s and 1650s. One of these new parishes was Pielisjärvi (1639), quite in the northern section of the province. It had separated from Ilomantsi in the early 17th century and become an independent administrative parish.

On 18 September 1650 the administrative parish of Kajaani (= Kainuu) and the parishes of Kuopio and Iisalmi (= North Savo) were combined to create a hereditary fiefdom called the Barony of Kajaani. The fiefdom was granted to the then Governor-General of Finland, Count, Baron and Privy Councillor, Per Brahe the Younger (1602–1680). He belonged to the upper echelons of the Swedish aristocracy, in whose hands Swedish political and economic power resided. The family was closely related to the Vasa family, who held the crown. Partially as a result of this, the Brahes were among the first to be raised to the rank of count in conjunction with the coronation of Erik XIV in 1561. Through his roots and family Per Brahe the Younger was a central figure at the heart of Swedish power. He was also Sweden’s largest landowner. The highlights of his career were his appointments as Privy Councillor (1630), Governor-General of Finland (1637–1640, 1648–1654), ”drots”, or the highest judicial authority in the realm and president of the Svea Court of Appeal (1641), and in that capacity twice member of the regency (1641–1644, 1660–1672) when the sovereign was a minor.

Brahe was permitted to annex the parish and town of Salo on the coast of the Gulf of Bothnia and the parish of Pielisjärvi in the northern section of the province of Käkisalmi. The town of Salo was in 1652 quickly renamed Raahe (Brahestad in Swedish). The Brahe fiefdom was the most extensive in the entire Swedish kingdom. In surface area it was larger, for example, than Denmark. By tax revenue it was also among the largest, although the bulk of the region was sparsely populated wilderness along the eastern frontier.

As part of the ”great reduction” the fiefdom was abolished in 1681 and returned to the Crown. The old aristocrat Brahe had died in 1680 at the age of 78. After the reduction, the ”province of Kajaani”, as Kainuu had already come to be called during the baron’s time, was again attached to the province of Ostrobothnia and Pielisjärvi to the province of Käkisalmi. The Kajaani administrative parish was divided in 1681 into two administrative districts, Paltamo and Sotkamo. They had functioned since 1647 as separate parishes. From 1685 until the mid-1720s Pielisjärvi’s tax-collection right was

contractually surrendered to the proprietors, or "arrendators", against a stipulated sum to be paid to the Crown. Salomon Enberg was the first of the arrendators in Pielisjärvi and was succeeded by his tax-collection scribe, Simon Affleck (c. 1660–1725).

Russian Karelia, also referred to as Eastern Karelia, is divided in two geographically. Olonets Karelia is the more southerly of the two and covers the area on the Isthmus of Olonets between Lake Ladoga and Lake Onega. Its northernmost parishes were Repola and Rukajärvi. The Svir River serves as the region's naturally boundary. The area of Russian Karelia extending north of Repola and Rukajärvi is in turn called White Sea Karelia, and is considered to stretch as far as Kantalahti on the White Sea.

In the east the neighbors of the province of Käkisalmi on the border were the "seven parishes of Lapland" (Paanajärvi, Suikujärvi, Rukajärvi, Paatene, Selki, Semsjärvi and Lintujärvi) which remained part of Russia after the Treaty of Stolbova. In actuality, the parish of Repola, which had been Russian territory in 1617, would also have part of this group. Earlier it had been part of Ilomantsi. Repola had long been part of the area that the Russian authorities had difficulty controlling. In 1649 the Lapland parishes were attached to the province of Äänisniemi, or the Ääninen ujest (in Russian *ujezd*). The town of Olonets, founded in the same year on the eastern shore of Lake Ladoga, became its administrative and military center. In addition, the volost of Kemi (a type or subdivision of a parish) and the White Sea town of Kemi north of the Lapland parishes were also incorporated into this district. Other 17th century White Sea, or Pomor, towns included Suiku and Suma. "Wild Lapland" and the Kola Peninsula north of the White Sea had by 1597 comprised the province of Kola.

In the administrative reform of the country by Tsar Peter I in the late 1710s, White Sea Karelia along the White Sea coast was included in the recently created province of Archangel, or White Sea; the administrative and commercial town of Archangel (founded 1584) served as its center. The other part of the province of Olonets was unaffected except for the fact that a new capital was selected, Petrozavodsk, founded in 1703.

The concept of frontier

Areas which the individual uses and where he wields power are always limited in some way. The border has been respected but in the competition for living conditions the signs marking it have also been destroyed. This occurred in the area under examination during the period of Swedish power as well. Many emotional significances are associated with borders, for example, exoticness and tension, even fears. This has been the case in particular along the border between Finland and Russia. Although it has often had a unifying effect (peaceful interaction, easily understood language between one side and the other, family bonds), still the notable religious difference (Lutheranism in the west, Orthodoxy in the east) has made the eastern border a rigid and at times an even repelling element.

Border concepts have been examined in particular in the field of political geography. All in all, four concepts have been created. First, is the broad concept of "frontier", which represents a zone-like political border between two nations. A more pertinent definition would perhaps be "indeterminate borderland"; the eastern border between Russia and Sweden in the 17th century would be a good example. The term is also used in speaking about the border between the settled and unsettled parts of some country. Second, there is the concept of "boundary", which depicts an exact borderline. A third concept is "border", which is used to mean some limit or the area in its immediate proximity. In any case, it is a more exact definition than the indeterminate "frontier". Fourth, is "borderland", which is a kind of transitional zone inside an actual boundary. These concepts are often employed in an overlapping way without any precise limitation.

During the period under examination movement across the border was not restricted, nor was there any control along the eastern border except in time or threat of war. Occasional stones and trees were used as reminders of the existence of the border. The eastern border which then existed cannot be considered in terms of present-day concepts. The national border was open but, on the other hand, it was also rigid, in respect to ownership and usage. Slash and burn cultivation could not be carried on beyond the border without the accompanying danger of (even political) conflict. The utilization of other natural resources – woodcraft, hunting and fishing – were not legal on alien ground, as it had been during the Early Middle Ages. The eastern border with Russia was in fact a zone-like border area. It was not yet modern, exact, controlled, nor in principle an unpassable borderline. Such a border was only established much later. In a pre-modern state, for instance, in Imperial Sweden, the control by state power of its peripheral areas and frontiers was still extremely small.

From the White Sea to the Gulf of Bothnia – many alternative transit routes

There were two types of movement. The frontier "Swedes" were often visible as visitors along the White Sea and the southern portion of Olonets. An extremely strong contribution in the contacts between groups was, however, made by Russian traders. The intensity of the interactions is demonstrated by the fact that the communication between the two sides occurred along established routes. There were numerous routes depending on destination and point of departure. In the framework of the region and period under consideration, traffic across the eastern border can be characterized as brisk and regular. Border traffic was especially lively between the White Sea, the northern section of Olonets and Kainuu. This was already the case in the early 17th century, when Carl IX (King of Sweden 1604–1611) ordered the clearing of a road to the border at Maanselkä. The intent of this was to promote and strengthen border trade contacts. Kainuu and the Oulu River watercourse formed a trunk route for "Russian

traders” to northern Ostrobothnia, Norrland (Luleå, Piteå, Torneå and Umeå) and central Sweden (e.g., Gävle and Härnösand). Turku could be reached by travelling in a different direction, along the Ostrobothnian coast road. Movement was controlled from the castle at Kajaani, which had excellent natural possibilities to perform this task. The routes from Kuhmo, Sotkamo and the northern section of the province of Käkisalme specifically passed through Kajaani. Kajaani was situated slightly before the point at which the Sotkamo route entered Lake Oulu. Authorized transit routes were restricted to Kajaani during the period of the fiefdom to ensure that the economic life of the emerging small town would grow and strengthen. The visits also brought about additional income from customs duties. Small duties were assessed at the rate of approximately 1/32 of the value of the goods.

Traffic was at its height in winter. The most important natural routes (the Hyrynsalmi and Sotkamo routes and the Lieksa River) were not necessarily extremely navigable in summer. The hardships faced by the travellers included strong currents, fast-flowing and rock-filled rapids as well as narrow and winding streams. In practice this meant finding portage for boats across unnavigable stretches as well as continual unloading and loading. In all probability connections were primarily established on the basis of more direct and less difficult winter roads. The sources include numerous mentions of winter roads. Their brisk use does not, however, entirely rule out water traffic in summer, but trade in Kajaani and Oulu was largely concentrated in winter and around sledge roads. It was convenient to transport large amounts of goods either by sledge or sleigh. Taxes were also paid in winter at fixed collection points.

There were numerous transit routes across the border between Lieksa and the northern section of Olonets Karelia. Some of them continued to the White Sea coast following the Kemi River watercourse. On the basis of the report made by Nousia Venäläinen in 1556, the Lieksa River from Repola emptying into Lake Pielinen was considered to be a key transit route to the White Sea. On the Finnish side of the border it was, however, particularly winding with a strong current and filled with rapids. In the northern area of Olonets the difficulties to navigation included stretches where the boats had to be drawn. During its use the old waterway may have provided the location for winter roads, which in suitable places utilized the watercourse.

An ancient transit route existed between the Pielinen area and Kainuu which historical research has named the "Great Karelian Road to Ostrobothnia". It probably originated in Novgorod and ended in Oulu, which was early on a significant trading place bringing together people from all points of the compass. In all likelihood it was no longer a particularly important water route since in 1639 it was reported to be extremely difficult to traverse. Difficult stretches (swift-flowing and rocky rapids, narrow in places, blocked rivers) were common to the Pielinen route and to the Lake Oulu watercourse at the northern end of Kainuu. A main road was evidently established for the traffic or at least a winter road was cleared.

Border traffic was particularly brisk between the White Sea and the northern section of Olonets and Kainuu, and there were innumerable alternatives in regard to routes. The northernmost of them went through Sarvitaipale, either to Kemi on the White Sea or to Oulu and the trading centers of western Ostrobothnia. The southernmost and liveliest connection between the Kuitti Lakes in the White Sea region and Lake Oulu lay through the border point at "Vuokinlatva". This route was briskly used both in summer and winter. As late as the Age of Autonomy it was the route most used by peddlers between the White Sea and Finland. It was common that the routes coming from the north through Suomussalmi towards or from Lake Oulu employed the Hyrynsalmi route. Due to its swiftly flowing water and substantial numbers of rapids, it was, however, a difficult route and in places even dangerous. The most dangerous rapids had to be avoided by land travel. The Oulu River was also difficult to traverse because of the rapids and the fishing dams erected by inhabitants along the route. It was, however, possible to bypass the river by means of the Oulu-Säräisniemi high road opened in the 1610s.

A second important transit route was through present-day Kuhmo along the Sotkamo watercourse. There, too, several different routes existed depending on point of departure and destination; there were, however, numerous rapids if travelling by boat. In winter there was a road through Kuhmo from the tip of Säräisniemi to Maanselkälampi at the border and on through to Kiitehjärvi in Russian Karelia. This route was a continuation of the previously mentioned Oulu-Säräisniemi high road.

Jyskyjärvi, in Russian Karelia, was a major traffic junction and the confluence of two key routes which then joined to become the road leading to the White Sea coast. Of the two, one originated in the north at the Kuitti Lakes and the other further south, along the Tširkkakemi River. The Kuitti Lakes traffic was directed to the White Sea and Hyrynsalmi route while the Tširkkakemi was used by those travelling to northern Olonets (e.g., Repola and Rukajärvi), the Sotkamo routes and to Lake Pielinen. The distance from Jyskyjärvi to Kemi on the White Sea was 122 leagues, or approximately 134 kilometers. From Kemi it was 232 leagues, or about 251 kilometers, to the border. The distance to Oulu was 54 3/4 leagues, or about 585 kilometers.

Security from the bottom up – the border peace institution

One of the most influential forces on the frontier milieu was conflicts and the way inhabitants adapted to them. The border set inherent challenges – positively charged (= opportunities) ones as well as negative (= dangers) – to people living in the vicinity. In contrast, these challenges did not exist for those living further away. During the conflicts, in the worst scenario, frontier inhabitants lived in fear of being attacked. A second possibility was that those living along the border would be forced to fend for themselves, and forced to choose between remaining in their homes or fleeing their home district and moving to a more secure area.

In addition to the above, one further solution can be cited – border peace agreements. This refers to the accords made by two warring groups of border inhabitants to maintain the peace and help one another. They involve a type of non-aggression pact, local crisis control and resolution. The main point in them was the provision of advance information and warning about coming hostilities which would permit the threatened party to flee for their safety along with their possessions. They promised to notify the other party of even potential threatening intentions and rumors. These border agreements were concluded in peripheral frontier areas where state control was weak and significant agreements were formalized in southern Sweden along the former land border between Sweden and Denmark and along the Swedish-Norwegian border. Similar agreements existed in the east, on the Russian border, ranging from areas as north as Kuusamo and Pudasjärvi to Ilomantsi. The question was chiefly one of protection, since distant and unstable state power was unable to provide sufficient security for its subjects living on the fringes. In contrast, the actions of central power often raised threats that they were unable to resolve. Border peace agreements along the Danish border were mentioned as early as the Middle Ages and research notes that they were previously referred to as "peasant peace agreements" (in Swedish *bondefred*), but this is a misleading and even incorrect term since other social groups than just peasants were also often involved in order to protect their own interests. Hence, a more correct expression to cover the entire frontier and its population groups is "border peace agreement" (*gränsfred*). The peace agreements sought primarily to avoid war and the accompanying destruction, suffering, forced taxation and looting. Security was also achieved by regulations concerning vagrancy, disturbing the peace and robbery, to prevent restless criminal elements from gaining a safe haven on the other side of the border and carrying out their operations there. Highwaymen, forest bandits and other such vagabonds were a common problem on the frontier. Especially during times of threat of war, pressure from restless elements in the frontier forests increased and took on massive proportions. An important factor was also the protection of border trade and traffic. Border trade was a significant source of income for local residents. Cross-border trade contacts were a particularly key element in creating harmony between neighbors.

One common feature to the previously mentioned areas was their location in peripheral frontier regions. The weakness of state control there was accompanied, from the inhabitants' point of view, by an insufficient defense against external threat. The need for border peace agreements arose precisely from the need for protection. The frailty of state control was also evident in the inability of the local administrative machinery and the judicial institution to function against a threat from within, against individual criminals and bands. Many fringe phenomena existed in peripheral areas which were a thing of the past in the centers. Examples of these phenomena include organized crime (bands of robbers), vendettas and a general tradition of violence. The inhabitants had become accustomed to this, that their lives and property and those of their relatives were continually under threat. Consequently, they always

had to be prepared to take up arms to defend themselves. An added condition, the high rate of the felonious assault, resulted from the area repeatedly serving as a theater of war. The tradition of violence only began to crumble when the external threat, war, subsided.

In the course of time the tradition of border peace came to an end on Sweden's southern and western border. Sweden gained a sea border when Denmark was pushed beyond the Kattegat. Swedish security positions on the western border improved markedly in 1645 when it won two regions of Norway, Jämtland and Härjedalen, from Denmark.

Gustav Vasa's successors to the Swedish throne were forced to adapt to the conditions of the border peace tradition on the eastern border with Russia, though in that region the tradition included a negative feature, provincialism, which the kings tried in every way to eliminate in order to strengthen the authority they represented. The border peace tradition of the eastern border was, however, to become a great advantage to Swedish central power in future wars. Through border peace agreements they were able to keep a significant portion of the eastern border and the surrounding frontier outside the conflicts. From the perspective of the interests of central power, the local-level agreements were particularly valid when war was being fought simultaneously on several fronts. This permitted the freeing up of resources, the prevention of destruction in their own territory and the possible blockage of attack routes.

State control over border peace agreements increased beginning in the 1520s. The task of negotiating passed to the highest local authority. On the Russian side Moscow's control over separate agreements was strengthened during the war with Carl X Gustav (1656–1658), which forebode the destruction of the power of the Monastery of Solovetsk (founded in about the 1430s) in northwest Russia. Provincialism gave way to a centralized society and its growing interests and needs. Border peace agreements, however, retained their position along the eastern border as the main pillar of peaceful interaction.

In respect to the border peace agreements concluded along the eastern border, it is justified to speak of a long-standing tradition. The first evidence of border peace agreements in the area is from the early stages of the 25-year-long war with Russia in 1570–1595. From that date on border peace agreements appeared in every war between Sweden and Russia: 1610–1617, 1656–1658, 1700–1721, 1741–1743 and 1788–1790. In all probability border peace agreements were still in effect during the Finnish War of 1808–1809, when Finland was severed from Sweden and annexed to Russia as an autonomous grand duchy. Thus began the "pax russica" and the "useful old method", the border peace institution, became unnecessary after centuries of use.

Usually the border peace agreements were observed. For instance, during Carl X Gustav's War with Russia Kainuu was spared military actions specifically because of a border peace agreement. Effective defensive measures can also be seen as a second factor. On the other hand, from the perspective of Moscow's overall objectives, the area was then basically irrelevant. Conversely, from the point of view of the Monastery of Solovetsk, the political, military and religious center of northwest Russia, and its interests, the west was an extremely

important direction in the then-prevailing military and economic sense. By means of the border peace agreements Solovetsk sought to protect its production and sale of salt, its massive land holdings in the White Sea region and also the monastery area itself.

In practice, maintaining border peace was left to the so-called "messengers" (in Swedish *budbärarne*), who made regular visits at short intervals to the border or at villages behind the border to meet Russian Karelian leaders. The primary objective of these visits was to ensure continuance of the border peace agreement and these men also procured military intelligence concerning prevailing attitudes on the other side of the border and threatening dangers which might arise. The messengers were recruited exclusively from the ranks of the farm-owners. With few exceptions, they were members of large families, which permitted one member's, usually the landowner, complete dedication to the task without household or more important tasks suffering. They lived in the main houses in their home district or at least came from one of them. In many cases they were able to augment their fixed property even in bad times (war, crop failure). Their position was also bolstered by the fact that their family had usually settled along the eastern border at an early stage. The leadership tasks (messenger, juryman, member of parliament) of the local community appear to have been concentrated among these households. In the socio-economic sense, they were the area's most prestigious men, who through their stable and respected position were able to negotiate border peace agreements and convince their counterparts of the steadfastness of peaceful intentions. The messengers' own interests (border trade, security), too, had to be taken into account when recruiting them for this task.

A reconstruction of scattered sources would show the conclusion of border peace agreements to have generally observed the following pattern:

The outbreak or threat of war – The prevailing uncertain atmosphere among the inhabitants of the frontier initiates contacts to bring about a traditional border peace agreement – An initiative is made to the authorities, either to the clergy or to the officials of the Crown – Lower officials request permission from their superiors (the governor-general on the Swedish side, the voivode on the Russian), who convey the request to higher echelons (in Sweden to the Royal Council [earlier the Privy Council], the Defense Commission [during the Great Bothnian War 1700–1721] or directly to the king) – Permission to conclude a border peace agreement is granted – Well-known, trusted men with sufficient prestige are appointed by both parties to negotiate the accord – Following the negotiations the agreement is signed amid great ceremony and declarations – The messengers then call at the border or on the opponent's side to assure them of the desire to maintain peace. The messengers also function as intelligence agents to prevent the opposing party from operating dishonestly to break the agreement.

* * *

From the standpoint of the security of Kainuu Pielisjärvi was a factor of uncertainty both in the mid-17th century and in the early 18th. During Carl X Gustav's War with Russia 1656–1658 the Orthodox minority rebelled and swore allegiance to the Grand Duke of Moscow as a protest against the western control, religious discrimination and influx of Lutherans that had occurred in almost five decades. The Orthodox still held a slight majority in the 1630s until 1637, when the tide turned in Pielisjärvi in favor of the Lutheran newcomers. The Orthodox then migrated to various parts of Russia, for instance, Olonets, the White Sea district as well as the Moscow and Valdai regions. The Finnish Governor-General Brahe was aware of this Orthodox out-migration, which affected him directly. He had Orthodox peasants in his fiefdom as well as Lutherans who paid tax to him. The Orthodox in the area, however, generally came from wealthier classes, both as older more established peasants and as traders.

The unsuccessful rebellion along with the Russian attack further accelerated the out-migration. In the eyes of the Swedish Crown and Brahe the migration was an act of desertion. Brahe did not fail to act, and wrote of the situation to Carl X Gustav in February 1657 describing his deserter problem in detail. The only solution that Brahe saw to the problem was to extend the borders further east to Svir, Lake Onega, the White Sea and the Kola peninsula. He sought to establish a security zone which would prevent desertion from Finland and the province of Käkisalme to nearby areas on the Russian side of the border. At the same time his objective was to gain control of the massive Monastery of Solovetsk and, above all, of the northern trade route between Western Europe and Russia. Brahe's proposals formed the basis for Sweden's official territorial demands in the peace negotiations. The Treaty of Kardis did not, however, bring such changes to the border. We can only guess how much Brahe's fiefdom would have enlarged in the east had the peace objectives been successful. According to the terms of the Treaty of Kardis all those who had deserted during the period 1617–1661 were permitted to remain in Russia. The number of Orthodox in Pielisjärvi decreased through 1696, sometimes dramatically. In that year there were only seven Orthodox households in the entire parish. The Lutheran in-migration, however, offset the Orthodox population losses to the parish. The result was an "ethnic cleansing caused by the push of Sweden and the pull of Russia". It would be incorrect to call the Orthodox flight from the province of Käkisalme an "ethnic cleansing" since the Swedish authorities did everything in their power (coercion, prohibition and punishment) to retain their Karelian peasants. In fact, at the start of Carl X Gustav's War with Russia the Orthodox who had gone over to the attacking side were declared outlaws.

The tax-rent period which began in 1685 awakened strong dissatisfaction in Pielis-Karelia, for example, in the form of the agitation of the "hunger revolt" at the turn of the year 1696–1697. Approximately ten years later the situation was still the same. The rebels wished to rid themselves of one of the tax-renters, Simon Affleck, the "Simo Hurtt" or "Aplek" of popular legend, at all costs. Such was the case with the breaking of the border peace agreement in January 1708. The agreement was probably made by Affleck himself. While it prevailed and

times were stable Affleck engaged in border trade and was able to collect rents from the tenants in his area. By breaking the border peace agreement the Pielinen peasants sought to lure the Russians into making a reprisal raid on Lieksa and the Crown camp there. The Russians did not at that time enter Lieksa. The Pielinen peasants made another destructive pillaging raid in January 1709 dragging Kainuu into a series of events which badly disturbed frontier peace. In March 1712 border peace was broken fully as a consequence of the short but more dramatic "Homespun War". The immediate cause of the war the seizure of four traders who had come from beyond the border and their loss of 3 000 ells (approx. 1 800 m) of homespun. In reprisal a Russian military detachment destroyed and badly pillaged the town of Kajaani and the parishes of Paltamo and Sotkamo. The interests of both parties (border trade, security) demanded that relations speedily return to normal. Thus by February 1713 the border peace agreement was again instituted between the province of Kajaani and Russian Karelia. In these contexts the mysterious arrival of Hilippa Simonpoika during the investigation of the Homespun War and his subsequent escape from prison under strange circumstances must be considered. The Homespun War in any case became a concept. The Russian Karelians still threatened the inhabitants of Kainuu for decades to come with a new Homespun War when relations became aggravated to the point of open conflict.

The many dimensions of border trade

Trade balanced oppositions on the eastern border. The frontier it enclosed was part of the "great trade vision", part of the northern trade between Russia and Western Europe. The northern trade route was opened in 1553 when the English explorer Richard Chancellor, in search of the riches of the east, was lost in a storm and found himself at the mouth of the White River on the White Sea. While the Northwest Passage was not found at that date, English-Russian trade contacts were, however, opened via the Arctic Ocean and the White Sea. The sea powers England and Holland desperately required Russian products, for example, to satisfy their shipbuilding needs. There was also a significant demand for northern furs and Russian traders obtained them through Sweden to meet the Western European requirements. At the same time they sold their own as well as such products of the Western European traders as cloth. Sweden did not let this activity go unobserved. It has its own plans: either expansion, thrusting itself further east and north in order to control the northern trade and its routes, or by attempting to attract Russian and Western traders to the Swedish-controlled ports on the Baltic by means of trade policy measures.

In practice the movement of people and goods was free. The free movement, however, led to a great increase in land trading, the trade carried on in the countryside. This had long been forbidden by law and statute, but water-tight ways of preventing it did not exist. One method of accomplishing this was to bring the trading, the border trade and the accompanying land trade, to the markets and the towns. Russian trade was concentrated as a monopoly in 1645

in Oulu until it was legalized in 1661 in accordance with the Treaty of Kardis between Russia and Sweden. The growth and abuses of land trade, however, soon led in 1664 to Russian trade again being concentrated in Oulu, the economic center of the Gulf of Bothnia, and its Russian markets. It must, however, be remembered that the Russian traders were still permitted to travel via Kajaani. Brahe established the town in 1651 as the administrative and military center of his fiefdom. The town was also known for its great markets which regularly attracted Russian traders from the other side of the border, both Russian Karelians as well as "real" Russians.

The town of Kajaani was situated along the transit routes extending from the northern province of Käkisalme and Russian Karelia. It controlled traffic, but more importantly it attracted the inhabitants of the surrounding areas to its two markets. The visitors came from Brahea, Kemi, Nevanlinna (the site of the present-day city of St. Petersburg), Sortavala, Tornio, Turku and Russia. The goods flowed from as far away as Western Europe. These western products were transported first by English and Dutch vessels through the ice-free port of Archangel to Kemi on the White Sea and then to Kajaani either via the White Sea region or the northern section of Olonets. The bulk of the merchandise was probably transported onwards to the area around the Gulf of Bothnia. Kajaani had the misfortune of being located in a remote section of the Oulu trade region and throughout its entire history existed in the shadow of the wealthy Oulu burghers. The golden age of commerce in Kajaani was the 17th century. Its collapse began in 1716, when the small town was destroyed by war. It was also partially affected by its distance from the commercial mainstream. With the establishment of the city of St. Petersburg east-west trade shifted from Archangel and the White Sea to the Baltic, where the Swedes had hoped that trade between Western Europe and Russia would turn in the 17th century.

Brahe founded the town of Brahea at the mouth of the Lieksa River in 1652. His express dream was for its markets to attract Russian traders and their merchandise. The border markets had been the idea of his father, Per Brahe the Elder (1520–1590), to direct border trade and land trade into legal channels and, on the other hand, to benefit himself as the proprietor of the fiefdom in the form of a wealthy bourgeoisie and customs duties. The markets of Brahea do not appear to have succeeded because the conditions and Brahe's plans changed. The bourgeoisie of Brahea campaigned very actively and successfully against this both in their own home district and in the surrounding trading locations. When the fiefdom came to its end the town of Brahea was forced to go the way of many other small towns. It no longer suited the greater visions of itself, especially when the fiefdom was abolished and its powerful proprietor, Per Brahe the Younger, had died.

In 1680 all restrictions were lifted on Russian trade throughout the Swedish kingdom after a hiatus of almost 20 years, as part of Carl XI's policy of peaceful relations with Russia.

The records of the customs duties of the town of Kajaani as a group offer an extremely long 15 volume set of source materials. For example, such records were only kept in Oulu for a period of two months. These records are a window

on what was brought to town to sell or trade. They permit a varied examination of the different types of merchandise and traders. The duty was to be paid by all – subjects of the Swedish Crown as well as Russian traders from beyond the border.

During the 1650s Russian traders made surprisingly few visits to Kajaani. In five of the surviving customs records only 42 mentions are made of them. There are several reasons for the small number of citations. Kajaani had only recently been founded and in terms of its bourgeoisie and capital it was a modest, young inland town. Oulu, where trade in the Russian markets had been centered in 1645, probably attracted the bulk of Russians trading in Sweden. This also suggests that for the most part the customs duties paid by those visiting Kajaani were rather small. The "prime pickings" of the merchandise in all probability went to Oulu. Kajaani mainly received smaller lots of goods both in number and value. It must also be remembered that there was a break in trading contacts at the end of the period due to the war of 1656–1658.

In the course of the 1670s the amount of traders and income from customs duties began to rise in Kajaani. Initially, the customs duties collected in the other important town in the Kajaani barony, Raahe, were in a class of their own. By the end of the decade Kajaani had begun to narrow the margin. Its attraction was its particularly well-known winter markets. The last decades of the 17th century, in which the customs records are no longer extant, were probably the golden age of trading in Kajaani. The importation of merchandise was already in the 1670s increasing both quantitatively and qualitatively. The rise in the Russian trade in Kajaani was also fed by the 1664 parliamentary decree that traders coming from Russia would be directed to Oulu but would return home via Kajaani. There is no information concerning the effect of the decision to legalize Russian trade in 1680. In all likelihood, Kajaani had by then already established itself to such an extent that its position could no longer decline. Kajaani was able to enjoy its favorable position at the center of the important Russian trading routes.

Unfortunately, only in respect to a few Russian traders is their origin clear. Some conclusions can, however, be drawn. A significant portion of them came from the northern section of the province of Käkisalmi, i.e. from the Orthodox parishes of Brahea, Ilomantsi, Liperi and Pielisjärvi, an area belonging to Sweden. They carried on their traditional occupation – active and extensive trading. There are only few notations of traders from the White Sea area or northern Olonets but, in contrast, there are numerous mentions of traders from Kemi on the White Sea. Other sources also support a view of regular visits by traders from the coast of the White Sea to Kajaani. They played a key role in the chain of shipping which began in Western Europe and progressed through the Arctic Ocean to Archangel in northwestern Russia, Kemi on the White Sea and finally to Sweden. In addition to professional traders the visitors to Kajaani also included peasants, who brought with them their own household products to sell. Many of the Russian traders from Russia or the province of Käkisalmi visited Kajaani regularly, some even twice or three times a year.

The largest item brought to Kajaani was fishing products. This was followed by farm products, livestock and game, cloth, spices, other (paper, beer, spirits and tobacco), handicrafts and, finally, fruit. The Russians clearly controlled the import and sale of cloths (e.g., linen, burlap, homespun and heckled flax, but finer cloths as well), spices (chiefly from the salt works on the White Sea), handicrafts products and fruit (e.g., anis, plums, raisins and figs). Rye was the most imported of agricultural products. Other key imported goods in this same group included hemp and flax, which were important in the outfitting of ships and the production of fishing equipment. Pike was clearly the dominant item among fishing products.

The land trade – the illegal dimension of border trade

Trading in the form of border and land trade was a major occupation on both sides of the border. It was the basis for both income and paying taxes. For instance, in Pielisjärvi tax was paid either entirely or for the most part in cash. Therefore, illegal trading contacts were tolerated and even ignored by the authorities. In the northern province of Käkisalme the land trade had traditionally been lively, though formally prohibited by law until it was legalized by the decree of Governor-General Jöran Sperling on 24 January 1684. This was not an expression of "surrender", but the interests of the Crown were plainly taken into account by the decree. It was desirable for the Crown and its growing needs (e.g., in reforming the military) that the peasant had an income and, above all, could pay tax. This was something that Per Brahe the Younger had also desired. Be that as it may, reality and mercantile demands, with their laws and placards, conflicted with one another.

The ban on land trading was commonly and widely broken. In this respect we can concur with the conclusions about the frontier. Geographers perceive the central factor affecting the frontier milieu to be *otherness*, which is a consciousness this extraordinary environment brought to the inhabitants. The people of the frontier viewed themselves as Other compared to inhabitants further inland. Their location distant from the heartland and their interaction with foreigners "diluted" their nationalistic feelings. It was morally and culturally correct, they believed, to break regulations concerning trade and other subsidiary activities which disturb the cross-border interaction founded on the "natural order". They had their own laws, a popular right to act in ways they deemed suitable. Their own order was a reaction to what they considered incongruous, unrealistic rules. They believed that the authorities did not sufficiently take into account the feelings and interests of the inhabitants of the sparsely populated and distant frontier. A consequence of the isolation of the frontier milieu from the central areas is that many traders perceived themselves to be more self-sufficient, independent and self-directed members of the frontier community than the "average people", whose behavior would strictly follow the national norms. In particular, feelings of economic independence were accompanied by a practice of bending laws which they did not accept.

Finances were very developed in the 17th century on the eastern frontier, as the amount of money involved in crime against property indisputably indicates. The development of a money-based economy was aided – paradoxically – by the relatively weak position of agriculture. Trade brought needed income. Developed finances required a turnover of goods, active large-scale movement and trade. A unique aspect is that such an economy thrived in an area considered to be isolated and undeveloped monetarily. Life was not based on a passive natural economy or with few connections. On the contrary, we can question whether the eastern frontier during the era of Imperial Sweden was in fact an isolated corner of the empire. In the light of trade it certainly was not. Large sums of money flowed through trade, credit and taxation, especially in the northern province of Käkisalmi.