

JYU DISSERTATIONS 98

Jukka Nissinen

Finnish Diplomats as Interpreters of Finland's Foreign Policy 1955–1971

Question of Neutrality and Divided Germany



UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND
SOCIAL SCIENCES

JYU DISSERTATIONS 98

Jukka Nissinen

**Finnish Diplomats as Interpreters of
Finland's Foreign Policy 1955–1971
Question of Neutrality and Divided Germany**

Esitetään Jyväskylän yliopiston humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellisen tiedekunnan suostumuksella
julkisesti tarkastettavaksi yliopiston vanhassa juhlasalissa S212
kesäkuun 19. päivänä 2019 kello 14.

Academic dissertation to be publicly discussed, by permission of
the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of the University of Jyväskylä,
in building Seminarium, old festival hall S212 on June 19, 2019 at 2 pm.



JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO
UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

JYVÄSKYLÄ 2019

Editors

Pasi Ihalainen

Department of History and Ethnology, University of Jyväskylä

Timo Hautala

Open Science Centre, University of Jyväskylä

Copyright © 2019, by University of Jyväskylä

Permanent link to this publication: <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-7798-6>

ISBN 978-951-39-7798-6 (PDF)

URN:ISBN:978-951-39-7798-6

ISSN 2489-9003

ABSTRACT

Nissinen, Jukka

Finnish Diplomats as Interpreters of Finland's Foreign Policy 1955–1971: Question of Neutrality and Divided Germany

Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 2010, 348 p.

(JYU Dissertations

ISSN 2489-9003; 98)

ISBN 978-951-39-7798-6 (PDF)

During the Cold War, between the years 1949–1973, Finland did not recognize either one of the states of the divided Germany, the socialist German Democratic Republic (East Germany) or the democratic Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany). This policy was initiated by the cautious stance of President J.K. Paasikivi, and it continued during President Urho Kekkonen's multiple terms in office. By using previously not holistically scrutinized source material, the political reporting of Finnish diplomats that were posted in the divided Germany, this study brings forth a transnational and multifaceted view of the functionality of the policy.

This research utilizes as a theoretical and methodological framework the constructivist theory of international relations, in conjunction with the ideas concerning symbolic interaction and new political history that views politics as discursively constructed processes. Through this theoretical and methodological framework we can conceptualize how the Finnish German policy ultimately began to function as a part of the symbolic order of Finland's neutrality policy. In this regard, the policy's symbolic value was also increased by the phenomenon of Finlandization, which has been used to denote the subservient political culture that developed in Finland in relation to the Soviet Union during the Cold War (through self-inflicted obsequiousness by Finnish politicians, journalists, intellectuals, and other members of the cultural elite towards the Soviet Union).

In the political reporting of the Finnish diplomats the official policy was, however, viewed critically and also in a more international and transnational context. The reporting showed to Finnish foreign policy makers back home that, in many cases, the policy's appearance was not really holding up. In this regard, the policy's basic premise, the façade of Finland's neutrality, often stood on shaky ground. Finnish diplomats also noted the paradox of West Germans worrying about the possibility that Finland might move increasingly towards a recognition of East Germany as a state, while at the same time the West Germans acknowledged that Finland was represented in divided Germany with more than mere commercial or consular relations. According to the Finnish diplomats' reports and West German Foreign Office documents, the neutrality of Finnish policy was also challenged by President Kekkonen's rhetoric against West Germany, especially in the latter half of the 1960s, which catered to the interests and slogans of the Eastern bloc.

In this respect, the diplomats also functioned as a counterbalance who by their actions formed a testimony of a capitalist and Western-oriented Finland. The documents of the West German Foreign Office show not only its officials' trust and positive evaluation of the Finnish diplomats but also that the relationship reached a level where Finnish diplomats could openly express their anti-communist stance. Such an action would have been an aberration and a target of abhorrence in the domestic political culture of Cold War Finland.

Keywords: Finland, West Germany, East Germany, cold war, neutrality, Urho Kekkonen, diplomats, Finnish Foreign Ministry, foreign policy, Finnish Foreign Service

TIIVISTELMÄ

Nissinen, Jukka

Finnish Diplomats as Interpreters of Finland's Foreign Policy 1955–1971: Question of Neutrality and Divided Germany

Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 2010, 348 p.

(JYU Dissertations

ISSN 2489-9003; 98)

ISBN 978-951-39-7798-6 (PDF)

Kylmän sodan aikana vuosina 1949–1973 Suomi ei tunnustanut kumpaakaan jaetun Saksan valtiota, sosialistista Saksan demokraattista tasavaltaa (Itä-Saksa) tai Saksan liittotasavaltaa (Länsi-Saksa). Poliitiikka sai alkunsa presidentti J. K. Paasikiven varovaisesta asenteesta kehittyviä suurvaltoja Neuvostoliittoa ja Yhdysvaltoja kohtaan, ja se jatkui presidentti Urho Kekkosen virkakausien aikana. Tässä tutkimuksessa Suomen Saksan-poliitiikkaa tarkastellaan yllirajaisen historiantutkimuksen näkökulmasta käyttämällä aikaisemmin kokonaisvaltaisesti tutkimatonta lähdemateriaalia, jaetussa Saksassa toimineiden suomalaisdiplomaattien poliittista raportointia. Tutkimuksessa selvitetään, millaisena Suomen Saksan-poliitiikka sekä sen olennaiset ulottuvuudet kuten esimerkiksi Suomen puolueettomuuspolitiikka ja Länsi-Saksan yksinedustusvaatimus, ns. Hallsteinin oppi, näyttäytyivät diplomaattien poliittisessa raportoinnissa.

Tutkimuksessa hyödynnetään teoreettisena ja metodologisena viitekehyksenä kansainvälisten suhteiden konstruktivistista teoriaa eritoten symbolisen vuorovaikutuksen näkökulmasta sekä ns. uuden poliittisen historian ymmärrystä politiikasta diskursiivisesti rakennettuina prosesseina. Tämän teoreettisen ja metodologisen viitekehyksen kautta voidaan paremmin ymmärtää, kuinka Suomen Saksan-poliitiikka muodostui vähitellen osaksi Suomen puolueettomuuspolitiikan symbolista järjestystä. Tältä osin politiikan symbolista arvoa lisäsi myös ns. suomettumisen ilmiö, jota on käytetty ilmaisemaan Suomessa kylmän sodan aikana kehittynyttä yliherkkää alistumisen kulttuuria suhteessa Neuvostoliittoon.

Tutkimus osoittaa, että suomalaisten diplomaattien poliittisessa raportoinnissa virallista politiikkaa tarkasteltiin kuitenkin kriittisesti ja myös suuremmassa kansainvälisessä yhteydessä. Se osoitti suomalaisille ulkopoliittisille päätöksentekijöille, että monissa tapauksissa politiikka näytti ulkopuolelta katsottuna varsin erilaiselta kuin sen toivottiin näyttävän itse politiikan muotoilijoiden näkökulmasta. Tältä osin politiikan lähtökohta, Suomen puolueettomuuden julkisivu, oli usein huteralla pohjalla. Diplomaatit toivat myös esiin ristiriidan siinä, että Länsi-Saksassa oltiin huolestuneita mahdollisuudesta, että Suomi voisi siirtyä yhä lähemmäksi Itä-Saksan tunnustamista valtioksi, mutta toisaalta myönnettiin Suomen edustautuvan Saksoissa enemmän kuin pelkillä kaupallisilla tai konsulaarisilla suhteilla. Raporttien ja Länsi-Saksan ulkoministeriön asiakirjojen mukaan poliittisen puolueettomuuden haastoivat myös presidentti Kekkosen retoriikka Länsi-Saksaa vastaan, joka varsinkin 1960-luvun jälkipuoliskolla palveli itäblokin etuja ja myötäili sen iskulauseita. Tältä osin diplomaatit toimivat vastavoimana ja todisteena länsimyönteisyydestä Suomen poliittisessa järjestelmässä. Länsi-Saksan ulkoministeriön asiakirjat eivät ainoastaan osoita luottamusta suomalaisiin diplomaatteihin ja heidän myönteistä arviointia, vaan myös sen, että se oli tasolla, jossa suomalaiset diplomaatit pystyivät ilmaisemaan avoimesti esimerkiksi antikommunistiset kantansa. Sellaisten esittäminen julkisesti kylmän sodan ajan Suomessa olisi ollut äärimmäisen haitallista ulkoasiainhallinnon virkamiehelle.

Asiasanat: Suomi, Länsi-Saksa, Itä-Saksa, kylmä sota, puolueettomuus, Urho Kekkonen, diplomaatit, Suomen ulkoministeriö, ulkopolitiikka, Suomen ulkoasiainhallinto

Author's address

Jukka Nissinen
Tyypäläntie 6 F 49
FIN-40250 Jyväskylä
jukka.t.nissinen@jyu.fi

Supervisors

Professor Pasi Ihalainen
Department of History and Ethnology
University of Jyväskylä

Professor Pertti Ahonen
Department of History and Ethnology
University of Jyväskylä

Reviewers

Associate Professor William Glenn Gray
Department of History
Purdue University

Dr. Johanna Rainio-Niemi
Department of Philosophy,
Contemporary History and Political Science
University of Turku

Opponent

Associate Professor William Glenn Gray

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
ABSTRACT/TIIVISTELMÄ
NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

1	INTRODUCTION	13
1.1	Research questions and themes of research.....	13
1.2	Previous research of the Finnish Cold War foreign policy of neutrality and the German question.....	20
1.3	Theory: Politics as discourse and the constructionist view on international relations	32
1.4	Political reports as sources	38
1.5	Structure of the analysis.....	46
2	BACKGROUND: THE FORMATION OF FINNISH FOREIGN POLICY OF NEUTRALITY: FROM THE END OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR TO THE 1950S.....	51
2.1	The new foreign policy after the War	51
2.2	Influence from outside: the Soviet intrusion to Finnish field of politics	55
2.3	Finland's postwar foreign policy formulation in the larger geopolitical context.....	58
3	1955–1962: ESTABLISHMENT OF FINNISH COMMERCIAL CONSULATES AND THE BEGINNING OF REPRESENTATION.....	65
3.1	Questions of representation's status	69
3.1.1	Attitude towards Finnish commercial consulates	69
3.1.2	Status of the missions as a source of confusion	79
3.1.3	The Federal Republic unwillingness to use the commercial consulate of representation in its own foreign relations	85
3.2	Foreign policy of neutrality and the question of Germany	94
3.2.1	Austria as an example.....	94
3.2.2	The Night Frost and the Note Crises and their aftermath: Finnish foreign policy seen as an absolute neutrality, but also as a part of Finland's Eastern policy.....	104
3.2.3	Aftermath of the crises: part two	115
3.3	Views on the Hallstein Doctrine.....	123
3.3.1	Finland no exception to the rule	123
3.3.2	Brotherus' first impressions and the challenging of the Hallstein Doctrine	127
3.4	Conclusions: precarious and difficult establishment of the policy	139

4	1963–1968: FINLAND’S GERMAN POLICY STABILIZED BUT ALSO QUESTIONED	142
4.1	The beginning of the Ostpolitik: advances and setbacks	149
4.1.1	Better relations with socialist countries alluring, yet could also cause a drawback	149
4.1.2	Eastern countries still too distant diplomatically	163
4.1.3	The implications of the breakdown of Erhard’s cabinet and the inauguration of the Grand Coalition.....	177
4.2	The Hallstein Doctrine: revisionist views	196
4.2.1	The Doctrine from the perspective of international law	196
4.2.2	Doctrine’s execution is not automatic	204
4.2.3	The number of challengers rise and Finland gets into strange company	217
4.3	Conclusions: 1960s, constructing and defending the policy’s neutrality	233
5	1969–1971: THE OVERTURE FOR THE CONFERENCE FOR SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE: SEEING THE GERMAN QUESTION TO ITS SOLUTION.....	238
5.1	Ostpolitik in full motion and the increasing amounts of the Doctrine’s challengers	244
5.1.1	The Brandt government might succeed where Erhard failed ..	244
5.1.2	The eastern policy causing a widening rift between the Soviet Union and East Germany	258
5.1.3	Flood of the challengers; Finland not comparable	270
5.2	Conclusions: advice of caution inside the convulsions of the détente	286
6	CONCLUSION: SYMBOLISM TESTED, ATTESTED, AND RELINQUISHED	291
	YHTEENVETO (SUMMARY).....	302
	REFERENCES.....	310

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In addition to the author's brain and finger dance on the keyboard, this work owes much to the other people and their feedback. Partners in work include, main supervisor, Professor Pasi Ihalainen, who has been supportive and critical of the work at hand in all of its stages. I am grateful for his constant positive attitude, trust and wish to make me cross the boundaries that I thought were difficult to cross. In this regard, I was (gently) forced to practice my skills of public presentation, professional communication, methodological understanding and every other implication of this kind of project; it ensured my growth as an academic professional. The supervision of the project received reinforcement when Professor Pertti Ahonen joined the ranks of the department of history and ethnology and took the task of acting as second supervisor. The dynamics of Pasi's and Pertti's kind of bad cop-good cop supervision method functioned well. Pasi keeping his inexhaustible observative skills in the mefistotelian act of being the devil's advocate, while Pertti swaying in his feedback in the loose manner of 1970s soft rock. I am also in gratitude for Associate Professor of European History William Glenn Gray from Purdue University, Indiana, and Docent of Political History Johanna Rainio-Niemi, from the University of Turku, for examining my work and providing valuable feedback.

In general, I wish to thank all the persons in the department of history and ethnology, too many to name in general. Special thanks goes also to university's library, for providing constant support in the search of databases and their own collections. Also, my working facilities most of the research period were provided by library, my office in Mattilanniemi library was peaceful and easy-to-concentrate environment for working. Other equally important support has been provided by information service of the Finnish Foreign Ministry (*UM tietopalvelu*) and the staff of the Finnish Foreign Ministry archives, Pekka Lähteenkorva in the archive of Urho Kekkonen (*Urho Kekkonen arkisto*), providing also humor and excellent conversational company concerning film-trivia. I am also in great gratitude for Finnish government's information service (*Valtioneuvoston kanslian tietopalvelu*), and especially Irmeli Ahonen, who was always willing to reply to the author's constant emails concerning the proper translations of often dated official titles of Finnish government officials and diplomats that were discussed in the research.

In financial respects, the department of History and Ethnology funded my research for over two years. After that, the continuity of the work was guaranteed by the kind assistance of Ella and Georg Ehrnrooth's foundation and Emil Aaltonen's foundation. My travelling expenses to the archives of the Federal Republic of Germany's Foreign Office were kindly reimbursed by ICARUS mobility grant program.

Finally, special thanks goes to friends, relatives, my family and colleagues for the support, conversations and critique concerning the work. Petteri Karpinen for transforming the photos of microfilm cards to more readable form, Tomi Nissinen for lending digital camera, Dahlia for love and support, and last

but not least, to the academic coffee table croneys Konsta Kajander, Aarni Virtanen, Jyri Mäkelä, A.P. Mäkelä and Martti Korhonen, for the excellent philosophical, political, historical and personal discussions. Without them, the academic life would have been lacking so much in its environment that offered plenty for the inquisitive mind. Sincere thanks to all of you!

Jyväskylä, May 2019
Author

NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

The terms, titles, and names of the study are generally translated to English using customary translations. In the case of Finland, an exception is made, and the official translations are used. For the official translations, the Finnish government's translation service (*valtioneuvoston kanslian terminuovonta*) as well as the government's Valter-database and the archives of the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs have been consulted. However, in the text, the Finnish representation in Germany is referred with more general terms "Finnish representation", or "Finnish trade mission", instead of the clumsy sounding official Commercial Consulate. Also, in the case of the Federal Republic, the term Foreign Office is used as this is the term that West Germans used (and in the united Germany still use) to refer to their Foreign Ministry. With regards to the central concept of the study, the neutral foreign policy, the term neutrality has been chosen instead of the term "neutralism". Even though not invariably, the "ism" is traditionally linked to more articulated and theoretical ideologies (for example, attached to liberalism, conservatism, socialism, and feminism, and omitted from certain others, such as green ideology)¹ than to the quite pragmatic neutral stance of not taking a side in foreign policy. However, it might be possible to talk of neutralism in the Finnish case during the 1960s when the policy was more theoretically conceptualized. For the sake of coherence, I have opted for neutrality even when discussing this period. Regarding the central concept of the Cold War historiography, the term bloc, either Eastern or Western, I have opted to use it. This is despite that the research has shown that there was not only rivalry inside the blocs², but also interaction between the blocs, for example, through diplomats but also through other individuals, unofficial networks, organizations, and corporations that trespassed the barrier of the East-West divide.³ In this research the term bloc is used as it was often used by the diplomats and other contemporaries, and in the sphere of international politics it was, naturally, a very real division.

¹ Freedon 1996, 7.

² E.g. Between the East Germany and the Soviet Union, see Harrison 2005.

³ Mikkonen & Koivunen 2015, 3.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research questions and themes of research

On 6 April 1948, after the defeat in the Continuation War⁴ against the Soviet Union that Finland had fought with the support of German troops, Finland was forced to sign a friendship treaty with the Soviet Union: The Agreement of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance (FCMA Treaty), *Sopimus ystävydestä, yhteistoiminnasta ja keskinäisestä avunannosta* (better known in Finland by its acronym: YYA-sopimus). The first article of the treaty posited that in case of German aggression against Finland or the Soviet Union, Finland would defend its territory either alone or in co-operation with the Soviet Union's armed forces.⁵ This initiated a period of forced "friendship" between the two nations

⁴ In the Second World War Finland allied with Germany after the Winter War which was fought after the Soviet Union attacked Finland in November 1939. The Winter War lasted three and a half months and ended with the Moscow Peace Treaty on 13 March 1940, which began a so-called period of Interim Peace in the Finland-Soviet relations. In fear of a new Soviet attack as well as to regain lost Finnish territories and multiple other reasons (including hopes of Greater Finland in certain Finnish political circles), Finland allied with Germany and attacked the Soviet Union as part of Operation Barbarossa in June 1941 beginning the Continuation War between Finland and the Soviet Union.

⁵ *Sopimus ystävydestä, yhteistoiminnasta ja keskinäisestä avunannosta Suomen Tasavallan ja Sosialistisen Neuvostotasavaltain Liiton välillä, 1. artikla* (Finlex, "Asetus Suomen ja Sosialististen Neuvostotasavaltain Liiton välillä ystävydestä, yhteistoiminnasta ja keskinäisestä avunannosta Moskovassa 6 päivänä huhtikuuta 1948 allekirjoitetun sopimuksen voimaansaattamisesta" <https://www.finlex.fi/fi/sopimukset/sopsteksti/1948/19480017/> [accessed 19 April 2018]. Finnish historian Matti Klinge has claimed that the Treaty, in fact, presented historical continuity in Finland's relations with Russia. He compares it to the treaties of Hamina and Turku, 1809 and 1812, which guaranteed that Finland would not ally itself with the enemies of Russia (Klinge 2001, 31). The Finnish neutrality is a complicated concept that can be challenged. Even important politicians of the era, e.g. Paavo Väyrynen (b. 1946), MP during 1970-1995, MEP during 1995-2007, 2014, Chairman of the Central Party (before 1965 Agrarian League) 1980-1990, minister in eight cabinets and who acted as a last Foreign Minister for Kekkonen during 1977-1981, has later acknowledged

sanctified by the texts and interpretations of the treaty as well as its intermittent renewal.⁶ In time, the treaty began to resemble something that could be described, in a sense, as a conceptual border that the Finnish political discourse was unable to cross – the discourse that was extremely limited during President Urho Kekkonen’s terms in office (1956-1982). The FCMA Treaty became an innate part of his Eastern oriented foreign policy which he appropriated skillfully (to his own and Finland’s advantage) through his personal relationship and diplomacy with the Soviet Union’s leadership.⁷ The treaty’s role as the basis of the Finno-Soviet relations did not allow deviation from the “official” discourse of the period that exalted the Finno-Soviet relations – especially when it was combined with the phenomenon of so-called Finlandization.

Finlandization as a term was initially a West German accusation of Finland’s foreign policy being tailor-fitted to suit the needs of the Soviet Union. Even though it was coined earlier, it spawned in the West German political discussion more extensively during the late 1960s and early 1970s, and was used by the West German conservative politicians such as Franz Josef Strauss.⁸ However, Finlandization was not merely a West German accusation concerning Finland’s foreign policy. Later, in Finnish historiography and political discussion, the term has been used to denote the subservient political culture that developed in Finland in relation to the Soviet Union during the Cold War (by self-inflicted obsequiousness by Finnish politicians, journalists, intellectuals, and cultural elite towards the Soviet Union). The existence of this phenomenon cannot be denied. It resulted

openly that neutrality was something that Finland was not supposed to emphasize in the context of its relations with the Soviet Union. This, of course, implies that the Finnish neutrality was not willingly acknowledged by the Soviet Union. Väyrynen’s views can be regarded as a contemporary interpretation of a politician that supported the Kekkonen’s foreign policy line. (See Väyrynen 2016, 420. For a contrary view, see Klinge 2001, 24.) Neutrality could then be seen as a political tool to keep distance to the Soviet Union (Apunen 1977, 213.) For the complexity of the neutrality in general in the international politics, see Apunen 1977, 215.

⁶ For the significance of the Treaty in Finland’s politics, e.g. see Vares 2009. The Treaty was, however, different than the ostensibly similar treaties that the Eastern Bloc countries signed with the Soviet Union, Finland’s one referred to the military consultations with the Soviet Union only in the case that Germany or some other country would use the Finnish territory to attack the Soviet Union (see, e.g. Talvitie 2009, 15). The Treaty that established the Warsaw Pact and was signed between the Soviet Union and others socialist states in Eastern Europe noted the necessity of consultations “...whenever, in the opinion of any one of them, a threat of armed attack on one or more of the Parties to the Treaty has arisen...” (article 3, Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance Between the People’s Republic of Albania, the People’s Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People’s Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People’s Republic, the Rumanian People’s Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Czechoslovak Republic, May 14, 1955, Wilson Center digital archive, <http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/123891> [accessed 13 June 2018].)

⁷ Androsova 2009, 28. However, the Treaty also restricted the political maneuvering room of Kekkonen as well as Finland in general in the foreign policy (Androsova, T. 2009, 29).

⁸ Väänänen 1991, 135-138.

in the use of the alleged anti-Soviet stance as a political weapon in Finnish domestic politics against and even to the discussions and co-operation of Finnish politicians with the security officials of the Soviet Union.⁹ These policies also partly stemmed from a tradition: during the late period of Finland as part of the Swedish realm, the support of Russia had occasionally been used in politics¹⁰ as it had been used by the Fennomans preferring appeasement in the latter years of the era of Grand Duchy of Finland (autonomous state in the Russian Empire from 1809 to 1917). In that period, the politics of Finland was defined by two opposing positions: those who considered concessions to Russia important as a way to safeguard the Western political system in Finland and the constitutionalists who regarded this policy as excessively submissive.¹¹

Despite the inevitable political link that the FCMA Treaty created with the Soviet Union (especially more extensively later through Finlandization), Finland officially pursued the foreign policy of neutrality. In fact, in the rhetoric of President Kekkonen, the Treaty, or Finland's adherence to it, was an integral part of neutrality.¹² Its utmost goal was not to intervene in the conflicting interests of the superpowers. Finland's new postwar foreign policy culminated in Finland's German policy: the predicament of upholding the diplomatic equality as Finland's foreign policy position concerning the divided Germany troubled the Finnish foreign policymakers since the (unofficial) formation of the two German states in 1949. Finland did not officially recognize either side of the divided Germany: neither West Germany (the Federal Republic of Germany) nor the East Germany (the German Democratic Republic). Instead, it opted to be represented in both German states only through trade missions, officially titled commercial consulates.

The non-recognition of the West German state (that represented the historical continuity of Germany that Finland had previously affiliated with and continued to affiliate with culturally) and treating it equally with the socialist and undemocratic East German state, backed by the wartime adversary Soviet Union, represented a drastic re-orientation of Finland's foreign policy. This was especially true as Germany had held an important role in relation to Finland historically.¹³ Germany had been (from the mid-19th century on), along with Russia, the

⁹ Vihavainen 1991, 289; Bäckman 2001, 14; Alholm 517; Uola 2006, 14-22; Seppinen 2006, e.g. see 617.

¹⁰ For example, see the actions of Gustaf Mauritz Armfelt (1757-1814).

¹¹ Ylönen 2001, e.g. see 74-80; Line of appeasement from Armfelt, Georg Magnus Sprengtporten, and Robert Henrik Rehbinder to Johan (Juhana) Vilhelm Snellman, see Vihavainen 1991, 10.

¹² E.g. see Kekkonen's speech in Lahti 28 December 1967, in it he criticized his contender in the Presidential race, Matti Virkkunen, for detaching the neutrality from the FCMA Treaty (*Etelä-Suomen Sanomat* 29 December 1967).

¹³ the Finnish political culture as well as culture in general was much influenced by the bourgeoisie German culture Lane 2000, 21; Laukkanen & Parry 2014, 9; see also, Hentilä & Hentilä 2016. For the common roots of the Finnish political culture with Germany, see Ihalainen 2016b, 96; Ihalainen 2017, 23-36).

most important trading partner of Finland, and the religious, cultural and intellectual ties reached even further back but were especially relevant from mid-19th century onwards in the context of Finnish nation building that was conceptualized mainly through German theorists.¹⁴ Little before Finland's independence in 1917, Finnish troops were trained in Germany from 1915 on with the background intention of separating Finland from the rule of the Russian Empire. In the post-independence Civil War of Finland between nonsocialist Whites and socialist Reds in 1918, there was a German intervention in support of the Whites.¹⁵ After this, there was also an attempt by the Finnish right to have the German Prince of Hessen, Friedrich Karl, throned as the king of Finland.¹⁶ The interwar period formed an exception in the German relationship, however, only briefly. Between the wars, Finland was distanced from Germany especially by the influence of the Anglophile Foreign Minister Rudolf Holsti (1919-1922 and 1936-1938).¹⁷ He also strived for the "de-Germanization" of the Finnish Foreign Service as he actively worked to purge German-minded and monarchist-oriented diplomats and officials from the Foreign Service.¹⁸ However, as already noted in the beginning of the section, in the Second World War, the connection with Germany was restored only to be cut off after Finland lost the war to the Soviet Union and the Soviets started influencing Finland's politics.¹⁹

In the case of divided Germany, there seemed to be no other alternative than the non-recognition policy of the two German states that were officially recognized by their respective Eastern and Western allies in 1955. The recognition of only West Germany, as other Western democracies did, was feared to irritate the Soviet Union. On the other hand, the recognition of both German states was not an option either.²⁰ This awkward situation was caused by the so-called "Hallstein Doctrine", which was a West German demand for the sole representation of the German nation. It indirectly posited that the Federal Republic of Germany might even terminate its diplomatic relations with any such state that would recognize

¹⁴ Lehtonen 1998, 77-82; Kouri 1998, 59.

¹⁵ At the end of the war, the German navy landed Finnish shores. However, at that point, war was already won by Whites.

¹⁶ See Vares 1998; Hentilä & Hentilä 2016.

¹⁷ The options for the foreign policy were seen first in the possible alliance of Finland with Poland, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia against the possible expansionism of the Soviet Union as well as Germany, in his later tenure he promoted the association with the Nordic countries (Kunttu 1994, 4).

¹⁸ Kunttu 1994, 4; Roiko-Jokela 1995, 12; Soikkanen 1985, 13. Germany had also influenced the resignation of "anti-German" Holsti in 1938.

¹⁹ This was first done through the Allied Control Commission that was, in practice, controlled by the Soviets and stationed in Finland from 1944-1947. It guaranteed that Finland's immediate postwar political decisions, especially the ones concerning foreign policy, would be congenial with the interests of the forming, neighboring superpower. Later the already mentioned FCMA Treaty would replace the commission as a guarantee of the continuity of the congenial line.

²⁰ Finnish neutrality's most clearly articulated goal was not to take part in the "conflicting interest of superpowers. For example, see speech of Ahti Karjalainen in Ambassadorial meeting of 1966, where he viewed even the events in the Third World such as Vietnam in relation to German question (UKK Suurlähettiläskokouksia 1959, 1965-1967, speech of Karjalainen 20 June 1966).

the German Democratic Republic of Germany.²¹ This was thought to pose a real threat also in the case of Finland, and thus, it deprived Finland of the possibility to recognize both German states.

Eventually the non-recognition policy with regard the two German states became such an innate part of Finnish foreign policy (until the recognition of both German states by Finland in 1973) that it was not expected to be questioned. This was especially due to its relation to Finland's Eastern policy, the discourse of which was becoming increasingly restricted during the offices of Kekkonen and the subsequent political culture of Finlandization. After all, in this regard the policy held substantial weight as Finland was the only capitalist country that did not recognize West Germany. It is the main hypothesis of this work that, as a consequence of the aforementioned aspects, in the long run, the Finnish German policy achieved such symbolic value in the Finnish foreign policy discourse that it was considered to be a sort of a scale balancing Finland's position in relation to the two superpower blocs of the Cold War. The recognition of either one of the German states was considered to have sent a message that Finland had tilted in the direction of the respective superpower supporting that particular side of Germany. In the German question, and more generally as well, Finland was positioned between the two blocs perhaps more tightly than any other nation. Therefore, as the West German representative in Helsinki, Karl Kruno Overbeck, put it, Finland could be seen to be functioning as a "barometer" regarding the East-West tensions.²² In Finland, revealingly, the scrupulousness of staying on the policy line of the equal treatment of the German states even extended to the concern of the Finnish foreign minister regarding the proper commentary of the German state borders on Finnish state airline company maps in 1965. Foreign Minister Karjalainen had approached Finnair because the areas such as Oder-Neisse were marked on the maps as being "for the time being under the Polish administration", a definition which he probably feared might irritate the Eastern bloc.²³

²¹ The original formulation of the policy was done by Bonn's Foreign Office Legal Adviser Erich Kaufmann, after Adenauer had conferred with his cabinet on 31 March 1954 to reveal his intention to "warn the world community, using statements grounded in international law (völkerrechtlich), against taking up diplomatic relations with the Pankow government." Kaufmann suggested that Bonn would consider it as "acta peu amicale" – an unfriendly act if states having relations with the Federal Republic were to recognize the GDR as well. However, Adenauer refrained from using this phrasing in his speech in Bundestag and referred to moral obligation of world states to refrain from the recognition of East German regime that was based on communist rule of terror. (As cited in Gray 2003, 23.)

²² PAAA B 23 bd. 93, report from K.K. Overbeck 11 March 1958 "Finland im Spannungsfeld zwischen Ost und West".

²³ However, Finnair CEO Gunnar Korhonen had complained that when they had used the maps without any commentaries, the West Germans had been irritated and approached Finnair on such scale that they had relinquished the use these maps. Risto Hyvärinen from foreign ministry ultimately proposed using commentary that noted the state borders being demarcated by the prevailing de facto circumstances. UM 7 D II 308 memo from Risto Hyvärinen 15 July 1965; letter from Gunnar Korhonen to Ahti Karjalainen 24 June 1965.

At the forefront of this foreign policy re-orientation and its discourse were the Finnish diplomats posted on both sides of the divided Germany. Their mission was to interpret as well as function as agents of Finland's new foreign policy that seemed to become most evident in the German question. The subject of this study, the political reporting of the Finnish diplomats as part of the Finnish foreign policy discussion, will help to understand how Finland's foreign policy and its symbolic aspect concerning Finland neutrality in the German question seemed to function. In this regard, the discursive input to the Finnish foreign policymaking by Finnish diplomats posted in the Finnish missions in West Germany (the Federal Republic of Germany) and East Germany (the German Democratic Republic) during the years 1955–1971 will be subjected to analysis. Their evolving views concerning the subjects that were relevant from the standpoint of Finland's German policy will be of interest. In relation to this, and especially to the main hypothesis of the study, the notion that the German policy became discursively constructed as a symbol of the Finnish neutrality will be an important contextualizing factor. The diplomats are regarded as transnational actors who could transcend the national borders in their views and bring cross-national influences and interaction to Finnish foreign policy discourse.²⁴ However, not disregarding the fact that they were still functioning inside a bureaucratic world that was an extension of the state they represented. The Finnish foreign policy discourse will be scrutinized not only with the necessity of noting the mediation, or transnational diffusion and transference of concepts and political ideas and views that the diplomats relayed, but also noting the interpretations and the revising of them in different national contexts, in this case, Finland's.²⁵ It needs also to be reflected against the larger Cold War context and the shifts of its discursive groundplates, to speak metaphorically, that took place in different periods.

The discursive, transnational, and comparative analysis of diplomats should therefore bring new standpoints to national political history.²⁶ Attempts to study the discourses of transnational actors and use it as the main source of inquiry into national political history to provide a fresh perspective has been so far scarce. Even though the views of the diplomats have been utilized as sources in more traditional narrative approach to the political history, building a coherent and holistic image of their views concerning the Finnish foreign policy has been lacking.

In Finland, the focus on the transnational has been in other areas, such as studies concerning conceptual history where the necessity to understand the transnationality of reconceptualizations in the Finnish political discourse has already been long recognized.²⁷ A search of the Finnish databases with keywords concerning history, Finland, discourse, and transnational gives only a few results.

²⁴ See Cohen & O'Connor 2004, xiii; Middell & Roura 2013, 10; Iriye 2013, 15. For diplomats as transnational actors and interpreters of national politics from outside, see O'Connor 1998.

²⁵ Ihalainen 2017, 24; Werner & Zimmermann 2006, 40. See also, Marjanen 2017.

²⁶ See, Ihalainen 2017, 25.

²⁷ Marjanen 2017, 144. For example, see Pekonen 2014; Hyvärinen 2003.

An EBSCOhost database of historical abstracts, when searched with keywords “Finland” and “transnationa*” (the star indicating a Boolean cut of the search term), gives results mostly concerning immigration studies, whereas political history is by and large absent.²⁸ However, it has to be acknowledged that the term transnational has not been necessarily included in studies that may have nevertheless approached their subject matter through it.²⁹ Yet, these results give at least some indication of the current situation.

The main research questions of this study concern the discursive input of the Finnish diplomats in Germany to the Finnish foreign policy discourse, i.e. what kind of views were they transmitting to the national foreign policy discourse of Finland of the period. The discourse that was (at least later on) affected by the phenomenon of Finlandization has so far not been contextualized seriously from a transnational point of view. In this regard, the analysis of the reports provides the possibility to add the element of comparative and transnational to the national and to compare the degree to which these views converge or diverge and to speculate on the possible reasons for this.

In this respect, the topics that were relevant for Finland’s German policy and its different dimensions are subjected to analysis. The focus is based on a few large areas of discussion relevant for the German question, and they will consequently produce more nuanced topics under scrutiny. Inside the earlier mentioned larger, sort of general aspects of discussion, the analysis will have to follow in many ways the subjects that arise from the corpus of sources. This is because the reporting was not categorized in certain areas but was often idiosyncratic and related to the issues that were politically relevant at the time. Therefore, the views on the main topics of research need to be read from the discussions that might not directly address those topics. On the more empirical level, also the actions of the diplomats and how they functioned as the carriers or messengers of the Finland’s German policy are discussed when this is possible to interpret from the source material.

The general outline of the analysis is laid out in the structure of the analysis chapter, but the essentials of the analysis are the subjects that could not be bypassed in relation to Finland’s German policy. They were the question of Finland’s neutrality, especially in German policy but also in the larger Cold War context, the threat of the Hallstein Doctrine, the progress, or devolution, of the Eastern relations of West Germany, and, of course, the status and standing of the German Democratic Republic in the international arena, especially through its increased diplomatic status elevated by the newly independent Third World states that were beginning to acknowledge its existence, especially towards the end of the 1960s. The analysis of the reporting forms, in a sense, a hermeneutic spiral that will, in conjunction with the material from the foreign ministries of Finland, East Germany, and West Germany, produce a possibility for the questioning of the reifications of particular views concerning Finland’s Cold War policy. The discursive element of the policy and the limitations of possibilities that

²⁸ Search conducted on 16 April 2018.

²⁹ Mikkonen & Koivunen 2015, 7.

it provided need to be analyzed further, along with the circumstantial evidence that the recordings of the actual events have produced so far. It is necessary to understand that the significance and the meaning of these events can alter drastically if their accompanying discursive level is conceptualized differently. This approach will be elaborated further in the following chapter's discussion on the transnational approach towards the history.

1.2 Previous research of the Finnish Cold War foreign policy of neutrality and the German question

The study of Finnish foreign policy from the standpoint of the Finnish Foreign Ministry and its diplomatic corps has to rely on Timo Soikkanen's research concerning the functioning of the Ministry during the Cold War, his *Presidentin ministeriö. Ulkoasiainhallinto ja ulkopolitiikan hoito Kekkonen kaudella 1956–1969* (*The ministry of the president. The Finnish Foreign Ministry and the execution of Finnish foreign policy during the era of Kekkonen 1956–1969*) (2003) sekä *Uudistumisen, ristiriitosten ja menestyksen vuodet 1970–1981* (*The years of renovation, conflict and success 1970–1981*) (2008), is a seminal (and the only) work concerning the functioning of the Ministry during the Cold War. It gives a thorough overview of the Finnish Foreign Ministry's development and actions during Kekkonen's era. However, as his study focuses on the functioning of the Foreign Ministry holistically, it cannot provide a detailed investigation of different aspects of the Finnish Foreign Service during this period, for example, the functioning of the Finnish diplomatic corps during the Cold War. The action of the Finnish diplomatic corps have so far been depicted mostly in the biographies of diplomats and officials themselves, or the focus has often only been cast on diplomats turned into politicians, such as Rudolf Holsti.³⁰ A general overview of prolific Finnish diplomats is found in a book edited by Arto Mansala and Juhani Suomi, *Suomalainen diplomaatti: Muotokuvia muistista ja arkistojen kätköistä* (*A Finnish Diplomat: portraits based on memory and the crevices of the archives*) (2003) which presents multiple articles concerning prolific Finnish diplomats. However, it does not focus on their reporting but merely on the anecdotal narration of their biographies as well as their professional lives.

Finnish Cold War foreign policy and neutrality in the international Cold War context have been studied in books such as Johanna Rainio-Niemi's *Small state cultures of consensus: State traditions and consensus seeking in the neo-corporatist and neutrality policies in post-1945 Austria and Finland* (2008) and *The Ideological Cold War: The Politics of Neutrality in Austria and Finland* (2014). In her studies, Rainio-Niemi compares Finland's neutrality with Austria, especially from the vantage point of differing (political) cultures and attitudes towards neutrality. Jussi Hanhimäki's *Containing coexistence: America, Russia and the "Finnish solution"* (1997) reveals the mixed response and the threats that US policymakers perceived

³⁰ See Roiko-Jokela 1995; Holsti & Heiskanen 1963; Soikkanen 1985.

in Finnish neutrality policy but it also highlights the beneficial element that the Finnish neutrality provided to the Nordic region. A book edited by Sandra Bott, Jussi Hanhimäki, Janick Marina Schaufelbuelh, and Marco Wyss, *Neutrality and Neutrality in the Global Cold War: Between or Within the Blocs?* (2016), provides a collection of articles that shed light on the foreign policies of neutrality as well as non-alignment, providing especially new insights into the interaction between the East, the West, and the Third World during the Cold War. Rinna Kulla's *Roots of the Non-Aligned Movement in neutrality: Yugoslavia, Finland and the Soviet political border with Europe 1948–61* (2016) emphasizes the differing attitudes of the non-alignment movement in comparison to neutrality through case studies and comparison of Finland's and Yugoslavia's divergent paths from their initially similar attitudes towards a neutral foreign policy.

Finland's German policy in relation to East German foreign policy can be conceptualized also in the context of East German policy towards other Nordic countries. This is discussed in the studies of Andreas Linderoth (2002)³¹ and Alexander Muschik (2005, 2006), and in the book edited by Jan Hecker-Stampehl, *Nordeuropa und die beiden deutschen staaten 1949-1989: Aspekte einer Beziehungsgeschichte im Zeichen des Kalten Krieges* (2007), which contains articles from multiple authors regarding East German's policy towards Northern Europe. However, the closest comparison to Finland from the Nordic countries, neutral Sweden, chose an ostensibly very different path in its German policy. It sent a diplomatic representative to Bonn soon after the constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany. However, even in Sweden, there were figures, such as Foreign Minister Östen Undén, who were critical of the sole representation demand of West Germany and stated that the German Democratic Republic's existence could not be simply ignored.³² More general overview of the East German foreign policy is offered by Hermann Wentker in his book *Außenpolitik in engen Grenzen: Die DDR im internationalen System 1949-1989* (2007).

With regards to the contextualization of West German foreign policy and its demand for the sole representation of the German people that was especially relevant for the Finland's German policy, Werner Kilians book *Die Hallstein-Doktrin: Der diplomatische Krieg zwischen der BRD und der DDR 1955-1973* (2001) and William Glen Gray's book *Germany's Cold War: The Global Campaign to Isolate East Germany, 1949-1969* (2003) are helpful. They recapitulate the different phases through which the doctrine went between its onset until its ending. The latter part of the doctrine's life and the German question can also be referenced through Mary Elise Sarotte's book *Dealing with the devil: East Germany, Détente, and Ostpolitik, 1969-1973* (2001). In the book, the final complex phases of the unsettled German question are surveyed through the different demands and stakes that the East and West had in the negotiations that led ultimately to the Basic Treaty between the two German states.

³¹ According to Linderoth, Finland and Sweden were the two most important countries for the East German foreign policy during the 1950s and 1960s (Linderoth 2002, 310.)

³² Muschik 2006, 528. After Adenauer's demand of sole representation Swedish position was unclear with regards the East Germany, Swedish statements posited that for the time being they would not recognize the GDR de facto or de jure (Gray 2003, 23).

The Finnish foreign policy of neutrality and the German question have been studied mostly in Finland. International research has often overlooked the role of Finland in the Cold War as well as its pursuit of a neutral foreign policy. Finland's position has been hard to pin down as it was a special case and, in a sense, between the blocs but yet not considered completely neutral either (for example, due to the FCMA Treaty). According to the Finnish historian Seppo Hentilä, the little attention to Finland can be explained by the factor, seen from the broad perspective, that Finland had only a side role in the superpower conflict of the Cold War.³³ Yet, it could be argued that special cases such as Finland can actually reveal something more than the standard "cases" of the Cold War. Still, even the German studies of the Cold War and German foreign policy ignore the Finnish aspect of German recognition. An exception to the rule is an article by Thomas Fischer, "Ending the Cold War in Europe: 'A mustard seed grew into a bushy tree': The Finnish CSCE initiative of 5 May 1969" (2009). This article discusses the Finnish initiative to organize a European security conference (Conference for Security and Co-operation in Europe) in late 1969. This initiative led to the realization of the Conference in the early 1970s and to its closing session in Helsinki in 1975. Fischer rebuts the interpretation that the idea originated from the Soviet Union and emphasizes that the Finnish CSCE initiative was actually a political "tool" of Finnish foreign policymakers to bring resolution to the question of recognizing two German states.

A historical overview of Finnish foreign policy and the German question during the Cold war is Pekka Visuri's and Tuomas Forsberg's *Saksa ja Suomi: Pohjoismainen näkökulma Saksan kysymykseen (Germany and Finland: Nordic view to the question of Germany)* (1992). The study surveys Finnish-German relations during the Cold War from a wider perspective in the framework of geopolitics and international relations. However, its general standpoint does not allow it to go into details of different aspects of Finnish foreign policy, and it also does not utilize primary sources.

The most important and detailed studies of the question of divided Germany in Finland's foreign policy are Dörte Puttensen's *Im Konfliktfeld zwischen Ost und West: Finnland, der Kalte Krieg und die deutsche Frage (1947–1973)* and Seppo Hentilä's *Kaksi Saksaa: Saksan-kysymys Suomen puolueettomuuspolitiikan haasteena (Two Germanys: The question of Germany as a challenge to Finnish foreign policy)* (2003), which are seminal studies regarding the German question from the Finnish perspective. Puttensen's book was the first comprehensive study that discussed Finland's non-recognition policy during the Cold War vis-à-vis divided Germany. It is a good overall survey of the subject utilizing both German and Finnish sources. It points out that, in many respects, the two German states formulated their relations with Finland from their own perspectives. For West Germany, the relations were considered more of a pragmatic continuity of its economic interaction with Finland, whereas for East Germany, the political

³³ Hentilä 2003, 10, 11.

sphere was emphasized. For East Germany, the perceived possibility of receiving a diplomatic recognition from a Western state was alluring.³⁴

Hentilä's study relies on Puttensen's groundwork, but he seems to look at the relations more from the standpoint of bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and Finland, with a primary focus being still on the Finnish side. According to Hentilä, Finland's relations with both Bonn and East Berlin were connected to Moscow.³⁵ The hypotheses of this study also rely on Hentilä's observations, including that the glossary promoting ingeniousness of Finland's German policy was provided and cultivated by the policymakers afterwards³⁶. In other words, that the Finnish foreign policymakers began to explain the German policy as part of the Finnish neutrality only afterwards, even though the policy was initially merely a pragmatic calculation of President Paasikivi.

However, there still are aspects of Finland's German policy that can benefit from further scrutiny. For example, the scale of the importance of Finland's German policy inside the general Cold War framework of Finland's East-West relations.³⁷ The argument that the German question was always essential in Moscow's foreign policy as well as the West's is hard to rebut. However, there is nevertheless still room for further examination regarding the proper position of Finland in this respect. For example, one case that points intriguingly to the aforementioned question is the case of Austria.³⁸ Austria moved boldly to recognize the Federal Republic in 1955. The discussion of the subject of this study, the reporting of Finnish diplomats from divided Germany, shows that this option was not seen as impossible for Finland at the time either.³⁹

³⁴ Puttensen 1999, 302, 303. In East German political system the trade became an instrument of the foreign policy, see Wentker 2007, 51-58.

³⁵ Hentilä 2003, 198.

³⁶ Hentilä 2003, 202.

³⁷ According to Hentilä Moscow wanted to sign the continuation of the FCMA Treaty before it would sign the renouncement of violence treaty with Germany (Hentilä 2003, 199).

³⁸ Also Johanna Rainio-Niemi has seen parallel's in the Soviet policy towards Finland and Austria at this period (Rainio-Niemi 2014, 63).

³⁹ After the Second World War Austria was even more in the control of the Soviet Union than the Finland. Austria was occupied by the Soviet troops after the War, whereas in Finland the Soviets only swayed indirect rule through the Allied Control Commission. However, even this organ was already disbanded in 1947, well before the formation of the German states, especially the period when these states were officially recognized internationally in 1955. This speaks for the interpretation that, perhaps, for Moscow, important was the neutrality (in Finland's case as well), and less, the relations with West Germany. It has to be remembered that Moscow itself also established diplomatic relations with West Germany in 1955, and was in favor of neutrality in general at this period. One could therefore argue that differing factor between Finland, and other neutrals, especially the Austria, was then the FCMA Treaty. However, this interpretation can be challenged as well, it has to be reminded that the Treaty did not prevent Finland's recognition of West Germany later in 1973.

Another topic that should be put under further scrutiny regarding Finland's German policy and neutrality formulation is the question of Finlandization.⁴⁰ The Finnish historian Timo Vihavainen, whose book concerning Finlandization, *Kansakunta rähmällään – Suomettumisen lyhyt historia (Nation flat on its face – the brief history of Finlandization)* (1991) has been perhaps one of the most influential discussions of the subject matter. It notes that the phenomenon changed throughout the period from the 1940s to the 1980s.⁴¹ In a simplified manner: in the 1950s, the origin of the phenomenon was a real political calculation of Finnish foreign policymakers, whereas in the 1960s it was emanating from not only political, but academic,⁴² intellectual, artistic, and journalistic⁴³ culture as well.⁴⁴ According to the Finnish historian Esko Salminen, one of the most important aspects of Finlandization, self-censorship, was introduced to Finland during the period of Paasikivi by his strong guidance of the Finnish press towards foreign policy. Therefore, the abolishment of the censorship law in 1947 was, at that point, a mere formality.⁴⁵

How influential, then, was “Finlandization” regarding Finnish foreign policymaking and the functioning of the Finnish Foreign Service? That question, as already mentioned, has to be taken into account when evaluating the views of the Finnish diplomats. Rinna Kullaa, who has studied the functioning of the Finnish Foreign Ministry, has concluded that Finlandization was, in fact, a matter of domestic and not foreign policy.⁴⁶ It seems safe to say that the phenomenon was definitely most notable in domestic politics, but it cannot be totally isolated from foreign policy either. After all, much of foreign policy originates from the discursive possibilities that are formed in the sphere of nationally located political discussion. The former Finnish diplomat Björn Alholm, on the other hand, has claimed that most problematic for the Foreign Ministry's officials were the situations where Finnish foreign policymakers had discussed certain matters with the Soviet Union's officials or politicians while Finnish Foreign service officials working in Moscow were not informed.⁴⁷ The findings of Jukka Seppinen, in his study of Soviet intelligence in Finland during the Soviet Union's existence, on the other hand, point some blame towards the officials. According to Seppinen, there were “numerous” contacts between the Foreign Ministry's officials and members of the KGB. However, according to him, the influence of Finlandization in the ministry began in substantial amounts only from 1971 onwards as a result of the

⁴⁰ Refers to the voluntary and involuntary influence of the Soviet Union in the Finnish domestic politics, for example through self-censorship, the personal relations of Finnish politicians with the Soviet Union's agents and officials, and later, in the 1960s as a general admiration of the Soviet system. (See Vihavainen 1991; Tiusanen 2011).

⁴¹ Vihavainen 1991, 31. Some have also interpreted that the phenomenon actually began only the latter part of the 1960s (see Klinge 2001, 23).

⁴² See Kolbe 2001; Seppinen 2006, 182, 183.

⁴³ See Tervo 2001.

⁴⁴ See Vihavainen 1991.

⁴⁵ Salminen 1979, 199, 200.

⁴⁶ Kullaa 2012, 19.

⁴⁷ Alholm 1996, 517.

politicization of the recruitment of officials⁴⁸ and through the initiation of the official foreign affairs course, “kansainvälisten asioiden kurssi Kavaku” (International affairs course), as a recruitment “tool”. According to Seppinen, *Kavaku*’s recruitment process reflected the demands of the Finnish Communist Party (and the political culture of Finlandization, i.e. pro left), who regarded the ministry as “official-centered” and called for its “democratization”. A similar view was held by the East German mission in Helsinki, which evaluated the personnel of the Finnish Foreign Ministry as “reactionary”.⁴⁹

Alholm also claims that the fact that the diplomats knew Kekkonen was an avid reader of political reports led to the situation where critical remarks concerning his foreign policy were not put in the reports. Similarly, he claims that independent opinions concerning executed policy were curbed and discouraged in the Ministry.⁵⁰ However, President Kekkonen himself did not seem to exert this pressure (at least to his own knowledge), for example, in his letter to Jussi Mäkinen in 1969, he explained that he regarded it as a prerogative of a diplomat to present his differing, even contradicting, opinion concerning the foreign policy line of the government.⁵¹ This shows that despite Kekkonen’s foreign policy making is considered as authoritative or exclusive, the impact of the most important tool in its execution, the foreign ministry and its diplomatic corps, has to be considered; as the quote reveals, he did not expect only conciliatory or complementary views concerning the foreign policy from the diplomats.

At the same time, Alholm notes that in the pragmatic level of their offices (e.g. in private discussions), diplomats could relinquish the official liturgy of Finnish foreign policy and that they were trying to explain the policy for the benefit of Finland without the official façade.⁵² In Alholm’s view, the Finnish German policy was clearly tilted towards East Germany. In this regard, he refers mostly to the relations between Finnish politicians and parties such as the Agrarian League (*Maalaisliitto*) with their East German “counterparts”.⁵³ Even though Alholm’s views present only an individual standpoint and are autobiographical in their nature, it is clear that the possible effects of the phenomenon have to be considered in the research, as the effects of Finlandization were so ingrained and holistic in Finnish society.⁵⁴ However, this can also explain the quite dramatic claim of Seppinen concerning the contacts of ministry officials with Soviet intelligence: they were part of the normal interaction in the political culture that formed during Kekkonen’s presidency and were a safe bet for the advancement of one’s career. This does not justify the phenomenon, but, contextualized this

⁴⁸ Especially through the new Soviet friendly course of SDP that began in mid-1960s (Seppinen 2004, 462, 463).

⁴⁹ Seppinen 2006, 574.

⁵⁰ Alholm 1996, 518; Soikkanen 2003a, 46.

⁵¹ UKK vuosikirjat 1958-, 1969 letter of President Kekkonen to Finnish diplomat Jussi Mäkinen, 14 October 1969.

⁵² Alholm 1996, 518.

⁵³ Alholm 1996, 520.

⁵⁴ For Finlandization and political culture, see Vihavainen 1991, 69.

way, it can be claimed that most of the ministry's officials with these contacts would not have regarded themselves as informers or spies.⁵⁵

In the previous research, it has not been observed that Finnish foreign policy leadership would have tilted exceedingly to the will of Moscow regarding the German question—at least in the measures that could be described as fulfilling the criteria of Finlandization. This conclusion might be made on a good basis, as there is no lack of literature in Finland on the importance and threat of the Soviet Union to Finland during the Cold War. However, there still remains the possibility that the perception of the German policy could have been influenced by the distorted political culture of Finland during Kekkonen's period as well as by the distorted historiography of the period.⁵⁶

In this regard, the construction of the historical picture of Finland's Cold War era politics is not only challenged by the matter of distortion of perception in Finland in the period but also by the problem that the previous research concerning the era of Kekkonen has been starkly politicized. The mainstream scholarship seems to accept the phenomenon of Finlandization, but arguments rise concerning how much the foreign policy of Kekkonen was subservient to the interests of the Soviet Union. The views bifurcate: some scholars, such as Juhani Suomi, who has written the extensive political biography of President Urho Kekkonen (comprised of eight volumes, covering the years 1936 to 1981), has been accused of portraying Kekkonen's actions in a very positive manner.⁵⁷ Suomi has also edited the diaries of President Kekkonen in collaboration with Mikko Majander.⁵⁸ In the studies of Suomi, Kekkonen is, in some respects, portrayed as the lonely protagonist and patriot, using Machiavellian tactics only in the best interest of his country. The same category of authors who have adopted sympathetic stances towards Kekkonen's political style also includes Jukka Seppinen, who wrote the biography of Kekkonen, *Urho Kekkonen - Suomen johtaja: poliittinen elämäkerta (Urho Kekkonen - Leader of Finland: a political biography)* (2004).

Contrary to this approach towards Kekkonen's policies stands above all Hannu Rautkallio. In his interpretation, Kekkonen is depicted nearly in the role of an agent of the Soviet Union, consequently compromising the sovereignty of Finland—while at the same time acting also in his own favor in order to solidify his power in Finnish domestic politics. For example, in the study *Neuvostovallan asialla: NKP:n vaikutus Suomessa 1960-luvulla (Serving the Soviet rule: The influence of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in Finland during 1960s)* (1993). Rautkal-

⁵⁵ Seppinen 2004, 111.

⁵⁶ see Rautkallio 1993.

⁵⁷ Juhani Suomi: *Urho Kekkonen. 1936-1944, Myrrysmies* (1986); *Urho Kekkonen. 1944-1950, Vonkamies* (1988); *Urho Kekkonen 1950-1956, Kuningastie* (1990); *Urho Kekkonen. 1956-1962, Kriisien aika* (1992); *Urho Kekkonen. 1962-1968, Presidentti* (1994); *Urho Kekkonen. 1968-1972, Taistelu puolueettomuudesta* (1996); *Urho Kekkonen. 1972-1976, Liennytyksen akanvairrassa* (1998); *Urho Kekkonen. 1976-1981, Umpeutuva latu* (2000).

⁵⁸ Juhani Suomi & Mikko Majander: *Urho Kekkonen päiväkirjat. 1, 1958-62* (2001); *Urho Kekkonen päiväkirjat. 2, 1963-68* (2002); *Urho Kekkonen päiväkirjat. 3, 1969-74* (2003); *Urho Kekkonen päiväkirjat. 4, 1975-81* (2004).

lio brings out his basic premises, which are prevalent throughout his other studies as well. In his view, the Soviet Union managed to influence different aspects of Finnish politics by Kekkonen's tendency to use foreign policy (that is, the threat of the Soviet Union and his personal relations with Soviet leaders) as a way to manipulate domestic politics to his own advantage. One of Rautkallio's basic theses is that Kekkonen created an atmosphere of fear in the Finnish political culture and society by taking advantage of his close relations to Soviet Union.⁵⁹ This is not, however, how the bulk of the Finnish historiography sees things. Therefore, Rautkallio claims that in Finland there is a distorted historical image of this era because most of the historians believed that the politics executed during the era were the only possibility. In his view, the historians took Finland's status as an economically successful independent nation at the end of the Cold War to be proof of the successful foreign and domestic policy executed during Kekkonen's era. The debate between Rautkallio's and Juhani Suomi's views has formed one of the most formidable ones in Finnish historiography, along with the debate concerning Finland's role in the Second World War.⁶⁰

Even though some of Rautkallio's conclusions might be debatable, his studies cannot be bypassed when one wants to have critical look at the political culture of Finland during Kekkonen's Presidency. However, the truth might lay – as often is the case – somewhere in between the extremes. In his study concerning the image of President Kekkonen in the West, Finnish historian Vesa Vares has noted that the perception of Kekkonen in the West was not labeling him as a “sinister demon, a traitorous power-hungry satellite or an agent of the KGB” and that their image of Kekkonen was not, as some studies have suggested, based totally on the sources belonging to the opposition of Kekkonen.⁶¹ The results of this study seem to support the Vares' views, especially the argument that the image of Kekkonen was more nuanced than often posited – and contingent temporarily, that is, that it changed as time passed.

The latest attribution to the research of Kekkonen's era and especially the question of Finlandization has been Antti Kujala's *Neukkujen taskussa? Suomalaiset puolueet ja Neuvostoliitto 1956-1971 (In the Pocket of the Soviets? Finnish Parties and the Soviet Union 1956-1971)* (2013). Whereas Kujala agrees with the critical disposition of Rautkallio towards Kekkonen and acknowledges that he used the influence and the threat of the Soviet Union extensively for his own advantage, he also reminds the reader that, in the end, Kekkonen acted also for the benefit of Finland.

To avoid these problems presented by such contrary views to the political history of Kekkonen's era, it is necessary to view Finland's German policy not only from a national view point of Finland and the German states, but in an international context which allows it to be seen as a part of the general Cold War struggle between East and West. This struggle was not, as sometimes narrowly perceived, only a real political game of chess between the two blocs but also a

⁵⁹ See e.g. Rautkallio 1993.

⁶⁰ Soikkanen 1995, 114.

⁶¹ Vares 2002, 48.

struggle of concepts and how things ought to be conceptualized. For example, in the context of this study a case in point is the term neutrality, which was promoted by the Soviet Union in the 1950s but abhorred by the United States foreign policymakers. A similar case was the Soviet Union's foreign policy of peace or the rhetoric of friendship between Finland and the Soviet Union which ultimately formed a liturgy that was always based (and its ultimate reference always being) on the FCMA Treaty. Outside of bilateral relations, the friendship rhetoric and also allowed the Soviet Union to promote Finland as a showcase of friendly co-existence between the socialist superpower and the small capitalist state next to it.

Recent historical studies have emphasized exactly how these kind of conceptualizations can travel across borders and adapt to local conditions. To understand them better, it has been considered necessary to survey the experiences of past agents who transcended political as well as cultural borders.⁶² This study subscribes to the notion contemporary historians Jan Palmowski and Geoffrey Barraclough suggest – that the international vantage point is important when one studies what Barraclough would call a “contemporary” era political phenomenon.⁶³ In practice, this means that it is not enough to study the Finnish foreign policy and the German question solely from a national vantage point, but a study of the dynamics between these two nations' foreign policymaking in the Cold War context is also needed. After all, the Cold War was a period when the interconnectedness of the world, both economically and politically, and the increase in the amount of international organizations, was constantly gaining importance in international politics – and national politics were constantly executed in relation to the bloc on either side, albeit somewhat more clearly on the Eastern side, with the more hegemonic leadership of the Soviet Union.⁶⁴ This was also a world that was no longer European-centered but was influenced increasingly by the United States and the Soviet Union. From events such as the Suez crisis, which proved the nullification of the old European powers for the benefit of the United States and the Soviet Union, it was clear that a new system had emerged. It was also a system that was influenced and shaped by the emerging independent states of the Third World, which could form large entities by geography and population, such as Nehru's India, or Mao's China.⁶⁵ This was exemplified also by the response and concern of the United States with regards to the newly independent states after the European powers began to retreat, or had already re-

⁶² Marjanen 2017, 142.

⁶³ See Palmowski 2011, 656, 657; Barraclough 1964, 2, For Transnational approach to history, see Cohen & O'Connor 2004; Haupt & Kocka 2009; Iriye 2013; Middell & Roura (Eds.) 2013.

⁶⁴ Kullaa 2016, 33.

⁶⁵ Barraclough 1964, 16, 28; Schulzinger 2002, 231. This was exemplified well also in the Finnish Foreign Policy discourse, see UKK suurlähettiläskokouksia 1959, 1965-67, files concerning years 1966, 1967.

treated from, these former colonial areas when they were experiencing their national awakenings and independence.⁶⁶ Whereas the United States relied (initially) on multilateral organizations to cater for its security interests in these parts of the world, the Soviet Union, on the other hand, promoted revolution and the socialist model where it could discern aptitude for it.⁶⁷

The more international viewpoint can help to avoid the pitfalls of what Matthias Middell and Lluís Roura call “methodological nationalism”⁶⁸, in this case meaning that the “nation creates an effectual framework” of the study.⁶⁹ This means that, in this case, the history of Finland’s German policy is not merely the history of Finland, or the history of Germany, but it is history of their interaction in the larger Cold War framework and the history of in many respects transnational agents and ideas that formed entangled connections in it.⁷⁰ In many respects, transnational history often entails the possibility, and even the necessity, to compare “entangled” national histories that do not form hermetic shells of individual units but have always been in interaction, on a regional, but also global, scale. Diplomats are, in many respects, a prime example of persons that were functioning as the agents of the transfer of concepts, ideas, and interpretations between nations, in addition to modern or contemporary phenomena such as the increasingly cross-national discourse conveyed by mass media.⁷¹

Of course, the nation as a framework of historiography cannot be bypassed either, which is proven even by the work on comparative, international, or transnational history.⁷² They have very much determined the political conditions of the past during their existence and have been the most definitive form of organizing either society, culture, intellectual or almost any other aspect of human society since their breakthrough from the late 19th century onwards.⁷³ The argument in favor of transnationality does not, however, exclude the nation as a unit. It does not strive to debunk comprehensively the notion that there are, in reality, specific cultures or histories that have transpired very much on the level delineated by the geographic, cultural, and majority ethnic composition of the nation-

⁶⁶ Rainio-Niemi 2014, 66. Washington was to achieve security and stability in these parts same way as it had in Europe: by multilateral organizations for political and economic co-operation, for example, through Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) (1954), and Baghdad Pact (1955). (Rainio-Niemi 2014, 66.)

⁶⁷ Zubok 2007, 95; Mueller 2011, 48. However, according to Robert Schulzinger the United States was caught off-guard by the independencies of these nations (Schulzinger 2002, 231).

⁶⁸ The phrase “methodological nationalism” emerged in the discourse concerning social theory in 1970s (Marjanen 2017, 140).

⁶⁹ Middell & Roura 2013, 9.

⁷⁰ Halonen, Ihalainen & Saarinen 2015, 17. Halonen, Ihalainen & Saarinen use also the concept of “rhizomatic” by Deleuze and Guattari (1987) to denote the interconnectedness and coming together of different, for example, discourses or ideas. For interconnectedness and transfer, see also Werner & Zimmermann 2006, 38.

⁷¹ Ihalainen 2017, 24; O’connor 2004, 140; Sluga 2004, 108. For comparison in historiography since March Bloch, see also Espagne 2017, 39, 40.

⁷² Marjanen 2017, 139, 142.

⁷³ Ihalainen 2017, 23, 24; Marjanen 2017, 139, 142. For the view on diminished power of nations since 1970s but also on the possible reversal of the phenomena, see Maier 2000.

states.⁷⁴ Also, in historiography, the focus on the national is to, a certain extent, a choice driven by necessity, for example, concerning the data-collection in archives which are usually nationally organized.

Yet, it has to be remembered, as it was already noted in the context of the discussion on Finlandization, that purely national focus also poses, to a certain extent, a danger of the distortion of view. If there is a concentration on one nation alone, it can appear that this particular nation was in a very significant role. However, as Hentilä has noted, in German historiography, the role of Finland has been, in fact, bypassed.⁷⁵ This seems to denote that the policy's intricateness and symbolic value did not appear in the more general framework quite the same as in the more bilateral, nationally-oriented framework of Finno-German, or Finno-Soviet relations. Transnational views can challenge the self-evident facts of national history by problematizing the possible and impossible that were argued and posited in the discourses that took place in the past.

The possible confusion resulting from this study's epistemological premises that concern international relations but also appropriate the term transnational view in relation to the producers of its primary source material could be clarified by the following categorization. Diplomats are considered as transnational actors who were, however, functioning inside a world or system that was international. This divide means, borrowing the succinct and astute glossary of Akira Iriye, that the international refers then to the relations among nations as sovereign entities. Transnational, on the other hand, refers to the cross-national connections, whether through individuals and concrete actors or as objectives that are "shared by people or communities regardless of their nationality".⁷⁶ The large context of this study, the German question, was in fact a transnational as well as international phenomenon as its solution was shared not only by certain states but large non-national entities such as Eastern bloc, or the United States-led West in the Cold War – and of course, neutral states such as Finland.

In the reporting of the diplomats subjected to analysis in this study were viewpoints from informants from different geographical as well as politico-economic backgrounds. This means that the diplomats not only spoke to people such as Western officials and other diplomats, but also to the corresponding persons from the Eastern bloc as well as from non-aligned states and the countries that could be labeled under the general category of Third World or developing world. All these "worlds" could possess drastically differing interpretations of the international political process that diplomats would mediate to Finland in their reporting.

Their views, then, can help to analyze the possible national distortion of political discourse in the Cold War in Finland, i.e. Finlandization. In this regard, it is possible to posit also a question of negation, i.e. how much was the nation's policy and its discourse not influenced by the conceptualizations and discourse of the international context? In other words, I wish to study if the policy was

⁷⁴ Petruszewicz 2004, 146.

⁷⁵ Hentilä 2003, 204.

⁷⁶ Iriye 2013, 15.

perhaps distorted by the domestic political atmosphere and hegemonic views of the period. The reporting of the diplomats can produce, if not more objective, at least more multifaceted perspectives on Finnish foreign policy compared with the sources produced inside Finland during this period.

This way of looking at the reporting of Finnish diplomats provides, then, in certain measures, the possibility for comparison: the resulting reality, meaning what actually was executed in Finnish politics, can be reflected against the (implicitly) seen potentialities in diplomatic reports. The reporting can offer a chance to look at the past in a different light and to see it as only one of the possible directions that could have been chosen.

In addition to a more international (and transnational) view to the Finnish foreign policy discourse during the era, the study of the political reporting of Finnish diplomats also contributes to modern administrative history and sheds light, for example, on the questions concerning the functioning of administration, the solutions it produces, and the interaction between politics and the administration.⁷⁷ In general, it is possible to note the lamentable fact that in the historiography of Finnish foreign policy, the role of the administration has been paid only scarce attention⁷⁸. The exception is Timo Soikkanen's historical study of Finnish Foreign Ministry's functioning during Kekkonen's terms in office.

However, internationally, the role of the foreign policy administration has been understood as a relevant part of the decision making process of the political system, and, consequently, a necessary part to be studied in order to form a holistic image of a country's foreign policymaking.⁷⁹ As Antonio Gramsci noted, administrative process and the role of civil servants should be, then, seen as an innate and organic part of the (in Gramsci's view, bourgeoisie) democratic process⁸⁰. It can be also argued that the true test of democracy and its legitimacy is the capability of its administrative machinery to retain its integrity and critical view towards the policies that they are trusted to execute.⁸¹ In other words, they

⁷⁷ Nevakivi, Hentilä & Haataja 1993, 41.

⁷⁸ Fortunately, in this respect, there has been progress towards an increased amount of literature concerning the functioning of Finnish Foreign Service. For example, Jussi Pekkarinen has published a number of studies concerning the functioning of the Foreign Ministry's diplomatic corps. For example, Pekkarinen, J. (2012) *Maailmanluokan tarkkailupaikka: Suomen Lontoon suurlähetystön historia*. (2015) *Kohtu 4: Suomen Tallinnan-lähetystön historia*.

⁷⁹ E.g. See Workman, S. (2015): *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy in the U.S. Government: How Congress and Federal Agencies Process Information and Solve Problems*; Hamilton, K. & Langhorne, R. (2010): *The Practice of Diplomacy: Its Evolution, Theory and Administration*; Raymond A. Jones (1983): *The British Diplomatic Service, 1815-1914*; Heinlein, Frank (2002): *British government policy and decolonisation, 1945-1963: scrutinising the official mind*; Robinson, Ronald E.; Gallagher, John; Denny, Alice (1961): *Africa and the Victorians: the official mind of imperialism*.

⁸⁰ Böök 1979, 19.

⁸¹ E.g. see Flores & Himma 2013. Contrary views have also been presented where the growth in the power of bureaucracy has been seen as inimical to the democratic process (Raunio & Wiberg 2014, 7). With regards the democratization of foreign policy, see Ihalainen & Matikainen (ed.) 2016.

are to be the defense of democracy against the perils of extensive executive politics as well as against a distortion of the political culture, as was the case during the period of Kekkonen and the controversial phenomenon of Finlandization.

1.3 Theory: Politics as discourse and the constructionist view on international relations

The theoretical background of this study is laid out by the constructivist approach to international relations in conjunction with the so-called “Cambridge-school” in the history of political thought that has emphasized that it is especially on the discursive level that political history can be understood.⁸² The common denominator with both of these approaches is that the interpretation and meaning of events is as important as the action that took place.⁸³ Historians Quentin Skinner and J. G. A. Pocock from this approach fought against the reductionists who attributed only peripheral role to the conceptualizations in the history.⁸⁴ In this regard, the understanding of the multilayeredness and multi-sitedness of political discourses can help to overcome the ostensible contradiction between the history of events, and history of discourses on the other hand.⁸⁵ It is a debate that has seen the classic event-oriented political historians and social historians accuse the historians concentrating on discursive level while renouncing the analysis of structures and events. In the historical research the understanding of multi-sitedness would mean that the studied discourses do not happen in solitude or are never a mere colloqui. They are connected to the macro-level structures as well as to micro-level actors.⁸⁶ They are also constantly executed in relation to the “continuous presence of past experiences, remembrance and constructions of the past – that is, the ideological use of interpretations of the past in political arguments, or history politics...”⁸⁷ The language and its use cannot be separated from the historical connotations and contexts that are present in words and conceptualizations.

In short, this study regards policy-making as a constructed discursive process and, in this respect, the diplomats as essential agents in this process.⁸⁸ The politics and its possibilities (as any other field of human social behavior) are then defined in the discursive process, which is in interaction with the material and structural level such as institutions and events.⁸⁹ The concepts of the discourse

⁸² Most well-known scholars as well as the originators of this school are scholars of political such as Quentin Skinner, Peter Laslett, John Dunn and J.G.A Pocock.

⁸³ Skinner 2002, 1, 4, 128, 129. For the constructivist and historical approach to international relations, see Reus-Smit, 2008.

⁸⁴ Bevir 2011, online, section “Theoretical Justifications”

⁸⁵ Halonen, Ihalainen & Saarinen 2015, 4.

⁸⁶ Halonen, Ihalainen & Saarinen 2015, 15.

⁸⁷ Halonen, Ihalainen & Saarinen 2015, 4.

⁸⁸ Halonen, Ihalainen & Saarinen 2015, 5; Steinmetz & Freedden 2017, 1, 2.

⁸⁹ Steinmetz & Freedden 2017, 1, 2.

are not stable, but constantly in change, and their meaning, as Quentin Skinner has noted, can be only understood in their historical context.⁹⁰ For a historian, the potential contexts of this kind of process are basically infinite. Consequently, it is then necessary as a historian to make distinction which of these contexts were relevant for the contemporaries in the creation of meaning.

This study subscribes to the notion of Marc Trachtenberg that historical research can benefit from a (in this case, multidisciplinary) theoretical abstraction of its findings as long as its basic groundwork in the corpus of sources is achieved through the methods of the discipline's basic craftsmanship that is empirically oriented.⁹¹ In other words, it means that historical research can venture even further than the mere possibilities that the linguistic turn in humanities offered for history as a discipline.⁹²

The constructivist approach to international relations, that is applied in this work, shares its roots, however, with the linguistic approach as they both were part of the general constructivist "turn" that took place in the humanities in the 1960s and 1970s, orientating from the sociological and philosophical theories emerging during the period. They emphasized the idea that the conceptions we have of the world are (to a certain degree) socially constructed and therefore do not necessarily have correlation with the material reality. In international relations, it strives to explain why agents (for example certain states) act toward other agents the way they do on the basis of conceptions they have of the other agents.⁹³ The constructivist approach also had an impact on cultural history and the history of ideas, for example, in the works of Eric Hobsbawm, Ernest Gellner, and Benedict Anderson. For them, constructivism forms an unsurpassable epistemological axis.⁹⁴ However, in the Cambridge school approach or the international relations theory of constructivism, the constructivism does not mean the same as in some of the extreme approaches such as post-structuralism and post-modernism that have basically denied the possibility of attaining objective or value-free knowledge, and consider everything as subjective. Contrary to this, the "soft" version of constructivism, as it is understood here, acknowledges the existence of material facts, so to speak, and the possibility of evaluating the weight or value of different causes and explanations.⁹⁵ The emphasis here is on the self-conceptions of agents and the conceptions these agents wish to convey of themselves to other actors.

⁹⁰ See Skinner 2002. This does not exclude the notion that material reality affects this discourse. However, the longevity of unsuccessful state organizations, such as the Soviet Union, or even East Germany, proves that discourse can by and far disregard the problems that the reality has manifested.

⁹¹ See Trachtenberg 2012. The benefits of historians appropriating theories of international relations is increasingly recognized, e.g. see Kennedy-Pipe 2000; For the possibilities of overcoming methodological challenges of individual disciplines by multidisciplinary approach see Halonen, Ihalainen & Saarinen 2015, 5.

⁹² Halonen, Ihalainen & Saarinen 2015, 4, 5.

⁹³ Wendt 1992, 396, 397.

⁹⁴ Middell & Roura 2017, 17.

⁹⁵ Adler 2002, 95.

All of these aforementioned approaches⁹⁶ agree, however, on the basic ontological premise that the social world is inter-subjectively and collectively produced.⁹⁷ When this is applied to the interpretation of international relations, it means that agents that function inside its “constructed world” (for example foreign policy-makers, diplomats, etc.) have different ways of viewing each other and constitute together a complex network of interaction. The meanings and conceptions are constructed in this network and form the outcome of the international “system”.⁹⁸ They are then often carried out in the relations between states by the “diplomatic mechanism”, to use the term of Headley Bull.⁹⁹

The principles regarding behavior are constructed, for example, by the past experiences with the other agent, the religion the other agent propagates, or the ideology it attests to, etc. Each agent, on the other hand, holds certain beliefs of itself, its constituting factors, its role in the system or environment, and so on. These self-identities are then grounded in the theoretical abstractions, which the agents hold to be true.¹⁰⁰ This kind of understanding of the cognitive models that pre-organize the perception regarding the policy analysis will affect how the actors perceive different events. It is easy to agree with Marc Trachtenberg that it is not much different from historical analysis of international relations either, as it is based always, in some regards, on the way one conceptualizes how the system works.¹⁰¹ This of course applies only in the case when some kind of speculative analysis of historical process is presented. In this study, ideas from Alexander Wendt’s take on constructivism have been borrowed due to its concentration on the symbolic level of the interaction in the realm of international relations.

Much of the messaging in the realm of international relations can be understood only through symbolic interaction, i.e. the actions can constitute meanings overtly disconnected from them.¹⁰² This applies not only to the actions of persons, but also – even at the risk of anthropomorphism – to the actions of institutions

⁹⁶ On the difficulty of clear-cut categorization of IR theories, see Guilhot 2011, 2.

⁹⁷ Adler 2002, 100.

⁹⁸ This notion has been appropriated also by data analyzing institutions in service of the foreign policymaking, such as intelligence services. According to Richard Heuer (whose study was published by the CIA) it is extremely difficult to judge the international interaction without cognitive bias. He notes that “in order to understand international interactions, analysts must understand the situation as it appears to each of the opposing forces, and constantly shift back and forth from one perspective to the other as they try to fathom how each side interprets an ongoing series of interactions”. He continues by comparing the effort to perceive an adversary’s interpretations of international events to subjective interpretation of looking at the psychological pictures that resemble two different objects but appear to be only one of them depending on the viewer’s cognitive bias. He proposes that “there is a natural resistance to other perspectives.” (Heuer 1999, 13.)

⁹⁹ See Bull 1977, 176.

¹⁰⁰ Wendt 1992, 398; Heuer 1999, 7. This also reflects W.H. Walsh’s notion that in order to understand actions of other agents in a certain context, every actor (e.g. on the sphere of international relations) needs some sort of historical knowledge how these particular agents generally have behaved in the particular contexts (Walsh 1960, 56, 57). M. Sarotte has argued that these kind of pre-appropriated conceptions guided especially the politicians of the German states in the era of Ostpolitik and European Détente in the late 1960s (Sarotte 2001, 7).

¹⁰¹ Trachtenberg 2012, 62.

¹⁰² Blumer 1986, 3; Wendt 1992, 396, 397.

such as states, ministries, etc. From the constructivist position, this means that the agents contribute to the construction of the community, or a shared world of meanings, and that much of the dynamism of international relations (which is produced in the social interaction of politicians, foreign ministries, international organizations, diplomats, head of the states, etc.) can only be understood in this regard.

Symbolic reference can be very useful in the foreign policymaking of a state (assuming that the policy aims for building a coherent and lasting image) since one of the strengths of symbols are that they are relatively stable. This is especially useful for small states such as Finland, as they lack real political bargaining power. Thus, in its essence during the Cold War, it was especially important for Finland's foreign policy to focus on this level of actions (that would construct the perception of Finland on the international arena) as well as to the discursive construction of the Finnish Foreign policy. In Finland's German policy, these levels seemed to actually converge, as it was initially a policy of pragmatic action (non-recognition) that was ultimately altered as part of the symbolic order of the neutrality policy.

In this regard, the basic theoretical hypothesis of the study is formed by the interpretation of Finland's German policy as a discursive construction of a symbol in the Finnish foreign policy, i.e., that it was a pursuit to alter the German policy to a concept inherently linked with the "symbolic order" of Finnish foreign policy of neutrality. The diplomats are then considered as emissaries of this policy but also as its interpreters.

There are three factors that speak for the interpretation that Finland's non-recognition policy towards divided Germany can be regarded as symbolic action that the Finnish foreign policy makers strove inherently to link with the symbolic order of Finnish neutrality. Firstly, it is important to understand the meaning of a divided Germany regarding the superpower alliance setting of the Cold War and Finland's neutrality: one of the reasons why the German question was so difficult in the Cold War was because of the stakes of prestige, to use the term of Hans Morgenthau, implicit in it.¹⁰³ The German states were not only states as such but were also seen as showcases of the different economic and political systems of East and West in the Cold War. Therefore, the German states, with the backing of their respective superpower alignment in the Cold War, wanted to gain political and international credibility for themselves by assuming a larger role in international relations with more prestige; diplomatic recognition, especially in the case of the German Democratic Republic, was one of the methods of achieving this. It was against this kind of pursuit of acquired prestige on the stage of international politics that Finland's refractory policy of not recognizing the two German states was explained; the main goal of Finnish foreign policy was,

¹⁰³ Morgenthau 1980, 83-93; Gray 2011, 17. Also East German State Secretary and Deputy Foreign Minister Otto Winzer used the term to refer to the problem of West Berlin (PAAA B23 bd. 228, interview of Otto Winzer by Otto Rutanen of Finnish television channel Tesvisio, March 1963).

after all, to avoid intervening in the conflicting interests of the superpowers and therefore not to help either of them or their allies to acquire this sort of victory on the level of prestige. It was in this respect that the equal treatment of the German states could be seen as part of the neutrality policy.¹⁰⁴

Secondly, the question of a divided Germany was also relevant for Finland regarding one of the most important aspects of its postwar foreign policy: the FCMA Treaty. As previously explained, this treaty, which Finland was forced to sign with the Soviet Union in 1948, guaranteed that Finland would never again allow Germany or its allies to use Finland's soil in order to attack to the Soviet Union. The FCMA Treaty inevitably linked the question of Germany with Finnish foreign policy in relation to the Soviet Union. Consequently, the German question gained even more importance in Finland's foreign policy as the treaty became one of the most important aspects of Finland's relations with the Soviet Union.¹⁰⁵

Thirdly, through the aforementioned aspects the German question also gained more importance due to the domestic politics of Finland during this era. The domestic politics during the era of Kekkonen became somewhat tainted by the indirect influence of the Soviet Union.¹⁰⁶ Certain politicians even used their connections with KGB officials to receive and give information as they were striving to advance their political careers. The example was set by Kekkonen, who utilized his close ties with Soviet leadership (especially with Nikita Khrushchev) to manipulate Finnish domestic politics and advance his political career. This became evident most clearly in the Night Frost Crisis (1958) and the Note Crisis (1961) episodes.

The Night Frost was a period of diplomatic and economic halt in the Finnish-Soviet relations that began in September 1958. It is regarded that the basis for the episode was in the new cabinet of Finland which did not include the socialist organization, Finnish People's Democratic League (*Suomen Kansan Demokraattinen Liitto, SKDL*), which united the forces left of the Social Democrats in Finland and had won the largest popular vote in the preceding elections. The Note Crisis began when the Soviet Union sent Finland a diplomatic note on 30 October 1961 and asked for military consultations, referring to the threat of West Germany. The military consultations were feared to be a precursory act for the possibility of the Soviet Union to gain increased control of Finland (or its politics). Both of the crises were solved by President Kekkonen's personal actions and contact with the Soviet Union, which has led to a controversy in Finnish historiography regarding whether Kekkonen possibly had "ordered" these crises to gain political power, especially as the Note Crisis guaranteed Kekkonen's re-election in the next year's election. However, both of the crises seemed to have at least some

¹⁰⁴ See also Finland's UN votings.

¹⁰⁵ Haataja 1995, 22; see also Vares 2009.

¹⁰⁶ Vihavainen 1991; for a more lenient interpretation of the influence of the Soviet Union on Finnish domestic politics, see Kujala 2013.

connection to the situation in divided Germany, as they happened in the immediate aftermath of the heated East-West confrontation over the status of Berlin.

For Finland's German policy, the symbolic dimension was useful because it did not have to converge directly with reality.¹⁰⁷ For example, the aspect of the non-recognition policy that was brought up in the primary sources of this study was that it actually functioned on the level of diplomatic representation, and not only as commercial representation in the form of trade mission.¹⁰⁸ As in this case, often this kind of symbolic action can be very fallible; it can induce feelings, emotions, beliefs, and even action by the virtue of notion that has no exemplification in the real world.¹⁰⁹ However, the symbolic aspects still retain power to affect that reality.¹¹⁰ It is exactly this symbolic dimension infused by the non-directness and ambivalence where one of the benefits of symbolic action, such as political language, lies. It gives the speaker the possibility to convey a multiplicity of messages simultaneously. Or as J.G.A. Pocock has put it, "[i]t is of the nature of rhetoric and above all of political rhetoric – which is designed to reconcile men pursuing different activities and a diversity of goals and values – that the same utterance will simultaneously perform a diversity of linguistic functions. What is a statement of fact to some will symbolically evoke certain values to others..."¹¹¹ Later, the West German Foreign Office would also exploit this dimension by referring to Finland's representation as an example that was modified in the West German Foreign Policy discourse to suit the needs of the particular situation.¹¹²

However, despite the innate ambivalence of the symbolic action, at some point a shared interpretation is established regarding its meaning. At this point, the individual symbolic references start to form a totality, or an "order". After this, there is a tendency in all groupings inside the order to form an integrated system, in other words, they begin to share a world view or an ideology. Common and overtly shared values also exert pressure on the parts of the system and require conformity. This could be described as a "reversed entropy": contrary to the chaos, the symbolic order pushes, with centripetal force, towards homogenization. Ultimately, when the required amount of time has passed, institutionalization occurs. At this point, the practice with symbolic value becomes accustomed or installed inside the system of already existing institutions, such as political, economic or cultural institutions.¹¹³ In Finland's case, the non-recognition policy can be interpreted to have become an innate part (institutionalized) in the

¹⁰⁷ His idea is quite similar to the Northrop Frye's idea of symbolic function in literature: the factuality is subordinated to the aesthetics. In Frye's words: "reality-principle is subordinate to the pleasure-principle." (Frye 1957/1973, 75.)

¹⁰⁸ E.g. see section 3.2.3, discussion between Heinrich Böx and Karl Carstens.

¹⁰⁹ Whitehead, 1985, 6.

¹¹⁰ Cohen 1976, 35.

¹¹¹ Pocock 1989, 17.

¹¹² See discussion of the Syrian case in section 3.1.2.

¹¹³ Cohen 1976, 37, 38. These institutions are, in their origins, theoretical (they are built on the reflection of individual or individuals) and have no direct causation in the pragmatic reality, and they do not have to look logical to outsiders, who have not been socialized within its sphere. However, to legitimize it, institution has to be situated in the symbolic universe of the already existing institutions. (Berger & Luckman 1967, 104.)

symbolic order of Finland's neutrality during the 1960s. It became a concept that was, at this point, part of the same system of meanings that the rhetoric of friendship in the relations with the Soviet Union formed; the rhetoric that always found its catharsis in the re-ification of the importance of the FCMA Treaty.

Through the abstraction of this theoretical discussion, it is then possible to survey the political reporting of the Finnish diplomats and conceptualize it, in addition to its contextualization in temporal and spatial empirical reality, not only as a reflection of Finland's German policy but also as to how the policy's symbolic element was, or was not, present. In other words, I ask how this policy's symbolism as part of the Finland's neutrality was, or was not, functioning from the standpoint of a transnational view that the Finnish diplomats could provide to the Finnish Foreign Ministry and foreign policy leadership.¹¹⁴

1.4 Political reports as sources

The most important group of primary sources in this study are the political reports produced in the Finnish commercial consulates in East and West Germany during the period of 1955–1971. As already mentioned, the previous use of the political reports in the Finnish historiography has been supplementary. Some of the political reports that the Finnish diplomats in Germany produced have already been utilized to some extent as sources in the previous studies regarding Finland's German policy.¹¹⁵ However, none of the studies has taken the reports and the views of the diplomats as their main subject. In other words, the reports have yet to be subjected to thorough and systematic research that would have enabled the historical narration and contextual analysis of the views of Finnish diplomats. These reports form a large quantity of text¹¹⁶ from which all the reports that are relevant for the subject matter and the themes discussed in this study have been subjected to the further analysis. In addition, the other documents of the Finnish Foreign Ministry, as well as the West and East German foreign ministries, have been studied in conjunction with the reporting.

The political reporting was a task usually assigned to the chief of the office. However, the reporting was also occasionally written by young officials in the mission (who perceived the reporting as a way to progress in their careers).¹¹⁷ The amount of these reports in the corpus of source material is so small (only few pages in the totality of approximately 3000 pages of reports analyzed) that they are only discussed when they contain information that has been essential to study.

¹¹⁴ For the conceptual and discursive approach to political history at the University of Jyväskylä, see e.g. Häkkinen 2014; Kaarkoski 2016.

¹¹⁵ See, for example, Hentilä 2003; Puttensen 1999.

¹¹⁶ Approximately 1000 pages from Finland's representation in East Germany and 2000 pages from the representation in West Germany.

¹¹⁷ Soikkanen 2003a, 334.

Finland's Foreign Service did not initially have a specific training program for the diplomats. The only official requirement was an academic degree. This led to the diplomats having varied educational backgrounds but not an educational program that would have, in some regards, "unified" their thinking. The diplomats that were posted in Germany during the period of this research hailed from two educational backgrounds: they either held a degree in law (5), or in humanities (7).¹¹⁸ The Foreign Ministry initiated a common training program only in 1970: the already mentioned *kansainvälisten asioiden kurssi, Kavaku*. In the background were societal changes and a more complicated reality of international affairs (such as multilateralism and an increased amount of international organizations). But behind the idea was also the fact that in Finnish society there was demand, in the vein of general cultural radicalism that began in the 1960s in Western societies, for the democratization of the governmental administration (along with other spheres of society), which led to a program that would allow gifted individuals from all social strata to pursue careers in the Foreign Ministry.¹¹⁹

However, the time period of this study means that the diplomats whose reporting is discussed were each coming from individual intellectual and educational backgrounds. The unifying element in their "world view" was then the previous functioning inside the machinery of the Finnish Foreign Service and, of course, the national culture of Finland, with all its ramifications. However, it can be argued that the profession was, in a sense, elitist, as its members all held academic education. However, Finland's socio-economic stratification is very difficult to discern during that period, especially in relation to the state bureaucracy, as there were increasing numbers of officials with academic education who did not fit otherwise inside the traditional class-taxonomy in the upper class, or bourgeoisie, stratum.¹²⁰ Their family origins were diverse, but seem to point generally towards the upper stratum of society – considering the status of the household was defined by the patriarch of the family. For example, the parents of the diplomats included the following: housewife and sea captain, school teacher and arch bishop, merchant couple, housewife and professor of political science, housewife and engineer, housewife and (ecclesiastical) provost, housewife and engine driver. It seems safe to say, however, that, in general, the most probable world view they possessed was infused by the classical bourgeoisie culture of early 20th century Finland – that was, by and large, German-influenced.

In the political reporting, the diplomats strive to present information that will be helpful in the decisionmaking of the foreign policymakers back home. The focus of the reporting is usually on the subjects that are interesting for the foreign policy of the home country. In addition, the diplomats need to follow the developments in the domestic and foreign policy of the base country as well. A good

¹¹⁸ The register of Finnish Foreign Service does not specify their field of study more specifically.

¹¹⁹ Pulkkinen 2016, 28, 29.

¹²⁰ Virrankoski 2001, 846.

reporter is then able to relate all this information to the larger context, for example, developments in the international political and economic relations, and produce as coherent and holistic reports as possible. Diplomats need to establish relations with the important actors in the base country's policymaking, which does not mean only the politicians but also persons such as political journalists. Diplomats need to also work in close connection with the base country's foreign ministry, and often the ministry can become their ally in propagating the desired message for the base country's government.¹²¹

In the Finnish political system during this era, the reports were circulated for the president, prime minister, minister for foreign affairs, and the state secretary. In addition, there were also two copies delivered for the director general of the Political Department in the Foreign Ministry, who then, according to his own consideration, decided which of the reports were advanced for larger circulation, for example, for the chair of the parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee, members of the Ministerial Committee on Foreign and Security Policy and for the other missions.¹²²

There was also a possibility of sending reports directly to a particular official of the Foreign Ministry, circumventing the ordinary circulation round of the reports; these were so called "croney letters" (*Hyvä Veli -kirje*). These letters were addressed either to the president, foreign minister, state secretary, or the director general of the Foreign Ministry's Political Department.¹²³ The croney letters were informal in their essence. They were especially used by Jaakko Hallama, who was Kekkonen's trusted man and posted as a diplomat in Moscow. Hallama was extremely wary of sending normal reports that were circulated to the ministry, fearing that they might leak from the political department and harm the reputation of President Kekkonen.¹²⁴

Considering the political reporting critically as a source material, the reporting should represent the views and evaluations of the particular reporter quite honestly. After all, the reporting is one of the most defining and important tasks of a diplomat. This does not, however, exclude the fact that partisan politics sometimes affected the views of the reporter. This connection between domestic and foreign policy should also be regarded in the research in certain measures. What is already known, and has to be especially noted with regards to this factor, is that the most problematic cases were those in which there was a member of Finnish People's Democratic League (*SKDL*) operating as a diplomat in the socialist countries. Their views and opinions were severely distorted by the socialist ideology they subscribed to.

It can also be argued that the reporting was actually one of the few platforms for foreign policy debate in the Finnish political system during this period (in addition to ambassadorial meetings in Helsinki in 1959 and 1965-67 and, to a

¹²¹ Valtasaari 2013, 15. In the United States, the intentional leaks from trusted journalists of politicians are part of the political strategy.

¹²² Soikkanen 2003a, 335.

¹²³ Soikkanen 2003a, 335.

¹²⁴ Seppänen 2007, 197.

certain extent, to the Foreign Affairs Committee)¹²⁵. This is because, as the West German trade mission in Helsinki noted, after the war, it was not until late 1971 that the first foreign policy debate in the Finnish parliament took place.¹²⁶ What this implies is that the making of Finnish foreign policy during the most of the studied period was not parliamentary.¹²⁷ It could be described better as personified, but also technocratized.¹²⁸ This means, in practice, that President Kekkonen, especially since the beginning of his second term in 1962, was the unquestioned leader of Finnish foreign policy, especially through his personal relationship with the Soviet Union's leadership.¹²⁹ In its essence, the Finnish foreign policymaking during this period was unparliamentary: it was led by the president in conjunction with the cabinet. In the era of Kekkonen, even the role of the cabinet was reduced as he often handled the foreign affairs directly through the ministry and circumvented the foreign minister. In the Ministry, Kekkonen' relied on his personal contacts. Partly the reliance of Kekkonen to his few trusted persons in the ministry could be explained by his view that the ministry favored the foreign policy opposition.¹³⁰ The President also did not evaluate highly the professionalism of the officials and diplomats, but thought that only a small proportion was up to their tasks and could produce quality analysis.¹³¹

The closest aspect of foreign policymaking towards parliamentarism was the parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee.¹³² However, the Committee was not executive with regards to foreign policymaking, and it was often reduced to the role of inspecting international treaties and revising them.¹³³ The results of Juha Törmikoski, who has researched the role of the committee, show that it was even avoiding debating difficult matters, such as Finland's neutrality policy and the difficult matters relating to the Soviet Union.¹³⁴ The results of the browsing through the Committee minutes supports this conclusion; for example, in 1957 the German question was mentioned in the Committee session only briefly when the leftist members MP Hertta Kuusinen and MP Mauri Ryömä (both from the SKDL) inquired about the matter. Kuusinen asked if the subject of diplomatic

¹²⁵ See, Eduskunnan kirjasto, Minutes of meetings; UKK arkisto, 21/91 Suurlähettiläskouksia 1959, 1965-1967.

¹²⁶ PAAA B31 bd.364 report of Detlev Scheel 16 November 1970 "Aussenpolitische Debatte des Finnischen Reichstages am 5. November 1970", p. 6.

¹²⁷ For the parliamentary control of the foreign policy, see Ihalainen & Matikainen (ed.) 2016.

¹²⁸ Soikkanen 2003a, 43, 44.

¹²⁹ See explanations concerning Finlandization p. 8, 18 and Kekkonen's personal involvement in Finland's two foreign policy crises, the Night Frost Crisis (1958) and Note Crisis (1961) p. 30.

¹³⁰ Soikkanen 2003a, 46.

¹³¹ Soikkanen 2003a, 45. However, it is known that Kekkonen read voraciously the reporting (Soikkanen 2003a, 46; Alholm 1996, 518).

¹³² It was formed from the most experienced (in ministerial years, age, and years as MP) and prestigious members of the parliament (Törmikoski 2009, 24). Kekkonen sometimes also circumvented the ministry by handling matters through his trusted man in the ministry (Törmikoski 2009, 26).

¹³³ Törmikoski 2009, 24.

¹³⁴ Törmikoski 2009, 27-32.

relations with both German states had surfaced recently. The answer by Foreign Minister Ralf Törngren from the Swedish People's Party of Finland (*Svenska folkpartiet i Finland; Ruotsalainen kansanpuolue*) was brief: Törngren noted that the subject matter had not been discussed and that "West Germany would not tolerate diplomatic relations with East Germany". He closed the subject even more briefly as he replied to Ryömä's inquiry concerning the possible recognition in the future. Here Törngren stated that "there was no reason to act against West Germany".¹³⁵ According to Timo Soikkanen, the Committee began tighter collaboration with the Ministry only in 1969, but, in general, the attitude of the Foreign Service officials was that the Committee could not be trusted as it had leaked information.¹³⁶

In the case of diplomats as informants, it is also reasonable to consider that the persons they encounter and their informants are aware of the diplomats' role as an information channel to the diplomat's home government. Therefore, this was sometimes exploited. For example, the Swedish ambassador, Ingemar Häglöff, who began his tenure in Helsinki in 1964, reminisced that Helsinki was a hotspot of diplomatic rumors. Certain diplomats – Häglöff mentions the British and American colleagues – were especially inclined to receive information from sources that they knew were more than willing to tarnish the image of President Kekkonen. The ultimate goal was to influence the view of foreign observers regarding the president and to support his adversaries.¹³⁷

The critical evaluation of socialist countries was also avoided to some measure by other diplomats, as there was a fear of reports leaking and straining the relations of Finland and the Soviet Union.¹³⁸ This has to be regarded, but it should not hinder the research substantially as the reports were produced to deliver information and analysis; the overt normative approach is not customarily found in the reports in any case. The mission of the diplomats was, after all, to analyze, not to judge. Therefore, within the questions and framework of this study, even if a certain amount of euphemisms are found with regards to actions of the Soviet Union, they should not produce difficulties when analyzing the views of the diplomats in general.

Another point to consider when utilizing the reports as source material is the fact that they contain, in many respects, somewhat "constrained" views on political matters. They rarely suggest any specific policy directly and, as mentioned above, also usually abstain from direct normative standpoints. With these kinds of documents – as is usually the case most of the time in historiography in general – the researcher has to avail oneself of his interpretive powers and critical understanding of the context in order to reconstruct what was the "main message" of the producer of a certain document.¹³⁹ In the well-known dictum of Quentin Skinner, the researcher must try to construe what were the producer's intentions

¹³⁵ Foreign Affairs Committee minutes, session 7 February 1957.

¹³⁶ Soikkanen 2003a, 67, 68.

¹³⁷ Suomi 1994, 299.

¹³⁸ Soikkanen 2008, 414–417.

¹³⁹ Walsh 1960, 67.

in order to fully understand the texts he or she produced.¹⁴⁰ Therefore, regarding this work's source material, it can be said that the overarching intention of the writers of the political reports was to advise Finnish foreign policymakers. In some instances, it is possible that the writer of the report was motivated to write in a way that was beneficial for the advancement of one's personal career. This does not, however, exclude the possibility that the information and interpretation in the report was still a somewhat valid expression of his or her personal view. In these cases, the personal as well as professional interest would have been inextricably intertwined. To summarize, in general, it can be said that the reports, even the ones that do not contain overt suggestions, were directed to guide the Finnish foreign policy. For example, even by choosing a particular subject to write on, a diplomat could emphasize a certain aspect of a particular matter that he thought needed attention. Therefore, it is possible to regard every report as in some measures containing interpretation, no matter how overtly non-normative the information might appear to be in the first reading. This view was also occasionally expressed by the diplomats themselves.¹⁴¹

However, regarding the validity of the views of the diplomats, there has also been criticism. In the Finnish methodological literature concerning the sources of political historiography, there is a pessimistic view from Jukka Nevakivi, Seppo Hentilä, and Lauri Haataja concerning diplomats as informants. They posit that "only in exceptional cases can the information given by the emissary of a foreign state give authentic description of the phenomenon or event of a base-country".¹⁴²

While this might be sometimes true, there is some unfairness in such questioning of diplomats' validity as informants. This is because, in most cases, the same criticism could also be applied to any individual or historical agent, foreign or local. For only rarely can one person give anything but a very limited perspective to a certain event or a phenomenon. In the defense of diplomacy, it could be noted that the diplomats are sent to their posts to not only execute foreign policy of their home country but to also gather first-hand information. Therefore, even if the diplomat cannot give a first-hand description, the diplomat usually gathers this from people such as politicians and other diplomats, who can. The reports are documents that do not only present the individual perspective of a diplomat but often a synthesis and analysis of information gathered from multiple sources. However, diplomats form their own elitist sphere in capital cities, *corps diplomatique*, which is somewhat secluded from general society.¹⁴³ In this regard, it should be regarded that their views are formed inside this sphere, in conjunction

¹⁴⁰ Skinner 2002, 100.

¹⁴¹ See report of Marri Salomies from Cologne 16 March 1968, p. 4. He referred to his previous information presented in the report as an interpretation.

¹⁴² Nevakivi, Hentilä & Haataja 1993, 57. However, this could be a guideline in the narrative history writing, but in the studies that discuss the foreign policy discussion the factual validity of the reports is not the loci or focus of the research.

¹⁴³ Suomi 2001, 100.

with the elites of the base country and the views of the base country media. However, this is also the transnational sphere where international politics is executed and therefore should not present an obstacle for the understanding of its dynamics. In the Cold War, in addition to this traditional diplomacy, an important role was also held by the cultural diplomacy that was generally targeting and affecting the general populace of other countries. In the scope of this research, this aspect is taken into consideration only when it crossed with traditional diplomacy, for example, if it was mentioned in political reporting.¹⁴⁴

The reporting from the Finnish trade missions in West and East Germany was chosen on the premise that their focus, when compared to other missions, was most extensively on the question of divided Germany. This was the consequence of the quite self-evident custom in political reporting that diplomats were guided to focus on their base countries and to the crucial political questions concerning them. However, the dossier system in the archives of the Finnish Foreign Ministry allows the study of the reports of other Finnish missions in the cases that their reports were related to the German question.

There is also some discrepancy in the degree to which the analysis concentrates on the reports from East and West Germany, as well as on the views that the West German and East German diplomats presented for their home countries' foreign ministries. This is for two reasons. First, in many respects, the reports from the "open" democracy of West Germany could delve more inside the politics of the base country than in the East German society, which was a democracy by its official appellation but not in practice. In East Germany, the decision-making was executed in the opaque higher echelons of the dictatorial SED party (*Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands, SED*) and, ultimately, the power was concentrated on the party leader, Walter Ulbricht.¹⁴⁵ The political power was structured as a pyramid from top down, and became, in its essence, lodged in the personal loyalties and links. In some regards, the system was reminiscent of the pre-modern era feudal system with its actors each dependent on each other.¹⁴⁶

The consequence of the undemocratic power structure was that there was hardly any "public sphere" to report on in East Germany: newspapers, television, and social and political organizations were controlled by the state, in other words, by the SED. The party limited not only the physical space of the state with its borders and the infamous Berlin wall but also the boundaries of the allowed discourse of the people.¹⁴⁷ The limitations of receiving unbiased (that is, from a non-socialist standpoint) and relevant information in East Germany was also noted

¹⁴⁴ Mikkonen 2011, 2.

¹⁴⁵ Berger 2000, 160, 163. After the GDR's workers' revolt of 17 June 1953, which was quelled by the assistance of the Soviet troops, composer Bertold Brecht described the East German system as a governance where the government should dissolve the people and elect them anew, wikipedia, "Die Lösung", https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Die_L%C3%B6sung [accessed 13 March 2019].

¹⁴⁶ Greiffenhagen, 1993, 372.

¹⁴⁷ Fullbrook 2005, 250.

by the Finnish representative in East Germany, Alexander Thesleff.¹⁴⁸ The numeric data also shows this: from East Germany there was approximately 1000 pages of reports sent during the period of study (1955–1971), whereas from West Germany the number was double.¹⁴⁹

The drive behind the state bureaucracy's growth and the dissipation of political debate as a foundation of the political society was brought about not only by socialism but also by the personal traits of Walter Ulbricht. His thinking was dominated by organizational development, power, and tactical considerations; they had, according to W. Leonhard, overtaken Marxist ideals. He was obsessed by the leadership position and political organization, to an extent that art, literature, music, and nature held merely instrumental value for the leader; they possessed no meaning for him unless they were related somehow to the interests of the party.¹⁵⁰

The second reason for the more extensive focus on West Germany is that the basis of the Finnish German policy was, after all, in the West German demand for sole representation, *Alleinvertretungsanspruch*, later dubbed the Hallstein Doctrine. West Germany was also unquestionably more economically important to Finland, not only in trade, but also as a link to the Western political (not only economic) sphere – an aspect of relations that the West German Foreign Office also noted in their documents. All the risk of the German policy was considered to lie in the fact that Finland might have to recognize East Germany due to the pressure from the Soviet Union. The risk would have been the execution of the Hallstein Doctrine. Therefore, it is the West German side that poses the more interesting question: how real was the threat of the doctrine? Or, how did West Germans view the Finnish policy and how did it relate to views of the Finnish diplomats? The picture of the Eastern side of the German policy is more simplified and is, in some respects, less relevant: the most important goal of the East German state in relation to Finland was to receive recognition from Finland.¹⁵¹ Finland was seen as a gateway for an East German diplomatic breakthrough outside the Soviet bloc. In addition, the ideological basis of the state led to a system where state bureaucracy produced documents that were more or less ideologically loaded and not based on empirical observation. Consequently, it seems that in order to study such a country's foreign policy, a more comprehensive look is needed than is possible while relying purely on the documents of the foreign

¹⁴⁸ UM 12 L SDT, Croney letter from A. Thesleff to State Secretary R.R. Seppälä 10 October 1955. Thesleff noted that if Finland would recognize East Germany and send non-commercial official representative to East Germany, the diplomat would be totally isolated from the West. By this he probably referred to the problems it would cause for the political reporting since trade matters had already been handled by the mission for five years.

¹⁴⁹ See UM, 5 C 5 Kaupallinen edustusto Berliinissä, 5 C 5 A Kaupallinen edustusto Köln/Bonnissa.

¹⁵⁰ Leonhard 1990, 151.

¹⁵¹ Putensen 1999, 80; see also Hentilä 2004.

policymaking bureaucracy.¹⁵² Consequently, with regards to the reconstruction of the East German view, the research relies more extensively on the previous research and especially on the studies of Seppo Hentilä (2004, 2003) and Dörte Putensen (1999) than in the case of the West German standpoint.

1.5 Structure of the analysis

The temporal starting point of this study is the mid-1950s, as this was approximately the point when Finland began to explain its policy of non-recognition of German states due to neutrality and in reference to articles of the FCMA Treaty and Paris Peace Treaty.¹⁵³ In addition, it was in 1955 that the Soviet Union started to acknowledge that two German states were probably a permanent solution.¹⁵⁴ The permanence of the division was manifested especially by the ratification of the Paris Agreements on 5 May 1955, which granted sovereignty to the Federal Republic and made it a member of Western European Union and NATO. On the Eastern side, the Soviet decree of 25 March 1954 in effect granted East Germany the ability to take control of its own matters. After that, East Berlin's signing of the Warsaw Treaty with the Soviet Union and six other European socialist states, creating the Warsaw pact on 14 May 1954, solidified the statehood. Even before, but especially since, this acknowledgment began the pursuit of the German Democratic Republic for the diplomatic recognition of its statehood and the counterreaction from the Federal Republic in the form of the Hallstein Doctrine. The studied time span reaches to the point when the German question in the Finnish foreign policy was, in a sense, brought to a conclusion by the publishing of Finland's initiative to recognize both German states in September 1971. This timeline will allow the study to have a comprehensive view on the Finnish foreign policy of neutrality and its non-recognition policy of the two German states. The stages leading from the publishing of the recognition initiative to the recognition of Germany by Finland in 1973 have been studied in more detail by historians Timo Soikkanen, Seppo Hentilä, and Dörte Puttensen. I will suggest the reader to refer to their works for more detail. In this study they are not discussed; this is for a few reasons. First and foremost, at that point, the significant events of the détente (German-German negotiations, Four Power negotiations, and negotiations between the Federal Republic and the Soviet Union) were progressing at such a fast pace that most of the reporting concerning it could only be a mere notification of the process. Over such a short time period any predictions and evaluations

¹⁵² For example, see Linderoth for the role of "public diplomacy" in the GDR foreign policy (Linderoth 2002, 310). Comprehensive study of the East Germany's public diplomacy in Finland is Seppo Hentilä's *Harppi-Saksan haarukassa: DDR:n poliittinen vaikutus Suomessa* (2004)

¹⁵³ Hentilä 2003, 27.

¹⁵⁴ Hentilä 2003, 31.

were almost impossible to make. Also, the negotiations were kept effectively secret; this was noted also by the diplomats, as Finnish representatives in Bonn Martti Salomies and Yrjö Väinänen observed in their reporting that it was difficult to get information from the Berlin negotiations.¹⁵⁵ Often they were forced to rely on some general information from the West German Foreign Office and the press as well as the speculations of other diplomats concerning the progress of negotiations.¹⁵⁶ It seems that more explicit information was received from other channels than the reporting (from Germany). For example, as the Soviet ambassador to Helsinki, Beljakov, revealed to Kekkonen, the renunciation of the use of force treaty included a hidden appendix concerning the normalization of relations between the German states.¹⁵⁷ However, a brief recapitulation of events from September 1971 (the publishing of the Finnish initiative) which led to Finland's official recognition of both German states in 1973 is given at the end of the study.

The analysis part of the research is divided into three chronologically different chapters: 1955–1962, 1963–1968, and 1969–1971. Each of the chapters is further divided thematically to the subject areas that were especially interesting during the particular period with regards to the main research questions of the work. The choice to not follow a purely diachronic organization of the analysis corresponds with the notions already presented concerning the interconnectedness and simultaneousness of the discourses. This challenges the idea that the historical process forms a coherent narrative or story.¹⁵⁸

The first chapter covers the years 1955–1962, including a background discussion of the pre-1955 period and the establishment of Finnish trade mission in the two German states during that period. It was an initiation of the policy and could be conceptualized as a pragmatic reaction to the dispute that the German question formed in the Cold War during the beginning of the 1950s. However, this period also witnessed the slow redefinition of the policy as a concept linked to neutrality. This second phase, a phase of action, began as the Cold War relations stabilized from the mid-1950s onwards and brought the first era of lessening tensions between the superpowers. A permanent explanation for the odd

¹⁵⁵ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 12 June 1970 "Onko Bonnin idänpolitiikka lähestymässä päämääriään?", p 3.

¹⁵⁶ E.g. see the following reports and telegrams during the negotiations: UM classified report Bonn 12 June 1970 "Onko Bonnin idänpolitiikka lähestymässä päämääriään?", p. 3; UM telegram from Bonn 9 July 1970; Discussions with British acting chargé d'affaires, UM classified report 12 September 1970 "Neuvottelut Berliinin asemasta ja idänpolitiikan jatkuminen". General statement from the ambassador of the United States concerning the negotiations, UM telegram from Bonn 5 November 1970. General statement from Four Powers after first round of negotiations, telegram from Bonn 17 November 1970; Telegram from Bonn 20 January 1971. Discussion with West German Foreign Office's Director General of the Political Department von Staden, Classified telegram from Bonn 10 March 1971. UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 5 April 1971 "Brandtin idänpolitiikan vauhti hidastumassa". Discussion with West German Foreign Office's Director General of the Political Department von Staden, secret telegram from Bonn 12 May 1971.

¹⁵⁷ Soikkanen 2008, 312.

¹⁵⁸ Iggers 2005, 3.

stance of Finland with regards to Germany was in demand. The solution was to tie up the non-recognition of Germany as part of the Finnish foreign policy of neutrality and its symbolic order. Possibly the first time this was officially put on paper was in the memorandum of State Secretary R. R. Seppälä written in February 1955, in which he pondered the possibility of referring to the 10th article of the Paris Peace Treaty which demanded Finland to remain neutral towards all the victor states¹⁵⁹. This article tied the Finnish German policy to the superpower prestige invested in the German question. It also linked it to the continuum of Finland's dictates set by the FCMA Treaty with the Soviet Union. In fact, the first article of the treaty declared that Finland wished to remain outside of the conflicting interests of the great powers, which gave even more basis for the non-recognition policy towards the divided Germany as part of the official Finnish foreign policy of neutrality.

The first theme of the chapter is the question of how the Finnish solution of using only commercial consulates was received in both German states and seen by Finnish diplomats. The second theme of the chapter is the image of Finnish neutrality in general, which is reflected against the background of another neutral country, Austria, recognizing West Germany in 1955. Also of interest are the views and reporting of the diplomats after the Finnish neutrality was challenged by the Night Frost and Note crises. The third theme of the chapter is how the crucial reason for the Finnish German policy, the Hallstein Doctrine, was seen by Finnish diplomats after its formulation by Adenauer's second cabinet in 1955.

The second analysis chapter (1963–1968) focuses on the period of stability in the German policy and in Finnish neutrality in general during 1963–1968. It is conceptualized as static phase in Finland's German policy. In this period the weight of the Finnish German policy as part of neutrality was increased by the institutionalization of an over-sensitive political atmosphere regarding the relations between the Soviet Union and Finland. This contributed to the abolition of dynamism from Finnish foreign policy as even the slightest rupture in Soviet-Finnish relations was increasingly feared in Finland. This passivity was also noted by the West German representative in Helsinki, Karl Overbeck, who noted in his memorandum regarding the Finnish foreign policy position for the West German Foreign Office that the Finnish foreign policy was imbued with passivity.¹⁶⁰ Therefore, especially after the Night Frost and the Note crises from the early 1960s on, it was increasingly imperative for Finland to keep every aspect of this relationship steady – including the German policy. It had become a static part of the symbolic order of Finnish neutrality. A possible change in the policy

¹⁵⁹ After the break in the relations due to the end of the Second World War, the representation was established in the beginning of 1948. Soon the Soviet occupation regime in (SMDA) Germany demanded from Finland that it should open an office in East Berlin to deal with commercial relations. Originally, Finland had only one in Berlin and it represented the whole of Germany. (Hentilä 2003, 39.)

¹⁶⁰ PAAA B 23 bd. 93 memo from FRG's trade mission in Helsinki 22 March 1958. In the memo, the Finnish foreign policy passivity was noted in the context of Finland's tendency of withholding to take a stance in the United Nations resolutions "In fast allen Fällen hat sich die finnische Delegation bei Abstimmungen der Stimme enthalten und damit die Passivität der Finnischen Aussenpolitik demonstriert".

became linked with worst-case scenarios of Finland falling victim to the Hallstein Doctrine, consequently leading to the loss of connection to the West and an irretrievable drift inside the Eastern sphere of influence.

However, this was also a period when the basic foundation of the Finnish German policy was beginning to erode. The Hallstein Doctrine of West Germany was put to the test in increasing amounts. This was done especially by the so-called Third World states that began to seek the favor of the Soviet Union by recognizing East Germany. However, the domestic policy pressure in favor of recognition was also increasing in Finland and Finnish politicians' interaction with the German Democratic Republic was increasing. Due to this, Lennart Sumelius, head of the Finnish trade mission in East Berlin, felt it necessary to warn Finnish Foreign Ministry's director general of the Political Department, Max Jakobson, by implying that this could harm the image of Finland in the West.¹⁶¹

During this period, the domestic political developments in Germany were also beginning to brand the doctrine obsolete: the hard line of Konrad Adenauer was questioned and his long era of Chancellorship ended in 1963, when Ludwig Erhard (CDU/CSU) took the helm of the new government on 16 October. More clearly the demands for a new policy were manifested by the first coalition government of Social Democrats and Christian Democrats led by Kurt Georg Kiesinger in December 1966. It was this government that issued (by the significant influence of Foreign Minister Willy Brandt on the new policy) the new direction in the Eastern policy, known simply by the German name "*Ostpolitik*", perhaps best translated as the "Eastern policy".

The themes of the second chapter are derived from the aforementioned developments in the German foreign policy as well as in the world politics. The first theme is how diplomats saw the eroding of the credibility of the Hallstein Doctrine and how they discussed it. The second theme then focuses on how the diplomats saw the implications of the reformist foreign policy of Germany (*Ostpolitik*) on Finland's German policy. In the third theme, the discussion revolves around the question of Third World states recognizing East Germany: how it was interpreted to affect the German question and through that, indirectly, the Finnish German policy.

The third and final chapter (1969–1971) focuses on the period in the Finnish German policy that was defined by Finland's active neutrality. This was a phase of action initiated, almost as a side-product, of a new phase of Finland's foreign policy, titled by Kekkonen as the "active neutrality". Finland acted, during 1969–1971, as a member in the United Nations Security Council, and in the fall of 1969 the negotiations to limit the strategic arms (Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, SALT) of the Soviet Union and the United States began in Helsinki. The pinnacle of this activity was Finland's proposal to host the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) in May 1969. During this period began the active pursuit of Finland to recognize both German states. The main reason for this was Finland's wish to host the Security Conference. In order to realize the Conference, it was necessary to bring the non-recognition policy of both German states to an

¹⁶¹ UM 7 D II 306 Letter from Lennart Sumelius to Max Jakobson 14 December 1963.

end. Otherwise, the possibility of getting both German states represented in the conference would have most probably failed. The themes of the chapter are therefore analyzed in the context of the Finnish initiative for the conference, the possibility of a solution to the German question by four victor powers as well as the rapprochement in the German–German relations. The themes in the chapter discuss these issues through aspects that were already introduced in chapter two: the reformist foreign policy of West Germany, the Ostpolitik (that was gaining even more momentum during this period), and the increased amount of Third World states either recognizing or establishing closer relations to the German Democratic Republic. These were crucial factors in relation to Finland’s German policy and the goal among Finnish foreign policy makers to find a solution to it through a recognition of both German states.

This phase continued until September 1971, when the Finnish initiative to recognize both German states was published. The simultaneous recognition of both German states was to become the pinnacle, or a catharsis, of the Finnish neutrality, and, in a way, sanctify one of its most guarded tenets. After the initiative was published, the Finnish German policy was, in a way, brought to its end, and the policy became once again reactionary as Finland was forced to wait for the answer of West Germany, which became dependent on the Four Power Berlin negotiations and the German–German negotiations. Ultimately, the recognition was achieved only two years later, and it can be argued that the conclusion of Finland’s German policy was somewhat tactless and not at all in the vein of the discreetness of the whole previous diplomatic maneuvering in the matter. Finland had, in many respects, especially from the West German point of view, jumped the gun during that critical period of establishing European Cold War relations between the superpowers as well as the two German states. However, it managed to receive a permanent solution for the dilemma that had pestered Finland’s neutrality since Paasikivi’s era: the equal treatment of both German states.

2 BACKGROUND: THE FORMATION OF FINNISH FOREIGN POLICY OF NEUTRALITY: FROM THE END OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR TO THE 1950S

2.1 The new foreign policy after the War

After the Second World War, Finland had to create its foreign policy completely anew. There was no possibility of having a foreign policy continuum from the prewar and war era since it had failed catastrophically as Finland had lost the war fighting in its last phase as an ally of Germany. There was also the challenge of domestic political instability and a perceived threat of Bolshevik takeover in Finland similarly to the East European states.¹⁶² This was not least feared due to the fact that some among the Finnish left had, in the beginning of Finnish independence, radicalized and referred to the Bolshevik Revolution as a democracy (in their view meaning a goal to pursue in order to realize a liberty and just division of power in society), which led Finland to a Civil War.¹⁶³ Another factor in this respect was that in the beginning of the Second World War, members of the Finnish left also established an auxiliary Finnish government, the so-called Terijoki Government (Terijoen hallitus) led by Otto Wille Kuusinen, a Finnish communist. Its mission was to legitimize the Soviet Union's attack on Finland by posing as the official representative of the Finnish people and governmental body that had invited the Soviet intervention to Finland.

However, in the postwar period, the democratic institutions of Finland held despite the agitation from the leftist parties. In 1946, Juho Kusti Paasikivi was elected by the Finnish parliament as the president of Finland, and, in 1950, he also won the first direct democratic presidential election after the war. Paasikivi

¹⁶² E.g. see Seppinen 2008; Uola 2013.

¹⁶³ See Ihalainen 2017, 264, 266.

was to shape the basic tenets of Finnish neutrality in the foreign policy and, especially, Finland's relations with the Soviet Union.

In the beginning of his presidency, Paasikivi immediately rearranged the handling of foreign affairs by appointing several new officials. The general policy of the president was that the posts should go to the strongest applying official. However, he also made some political nominations to these posts because he wished to modify foreign representation to suit the postwar foreign policy line. His exceptions to the rule of appointing officials according to their years in service and their place in the office hierarchy were the critical missions with regards to the establishment of new Finnish foreign policy, for example, with Moscow. From the officials appointed in the crucial posts, he expected political advice; his disposition was that the matters of trade could always be handled solely with delegations if nothing else.¹⁶⁴ In this respect, Olavi Munkki, whose reporting is discussed in the following chapter, was fulfilling Paasikivi's hopes by his critical views especially with regards to the political (unbeneficial) implications of having only the commercial consulate form the representation in both German states.

Intellectually, the education of political science and theoretical thinking concerning the administration in Finland was formally beginning to develop in 1924 with K.R. Brotherus' first professorship in political science at Helsinki University. In general, Finnish political science (along with other branches) was deeply rooted in the German academic thinking, especially the critical approach towards the constitutional law appropriated in the *Allgemeine Staatslehre* tradition.¹⁶⁵ Not surprisingly, Brotherus' main influences were also from Germany: he came from the tradition of Karl Lamprecht and subscribed to the idea of the need to understand the collective instead of the individual as the driving force of history.¹⁶⁶ Another important person was the academic Yrjö Ruutu whose social and normative ideas of progress were contrary to more the pragmatist and empirically oriented Brotherus.¹⁶⁷ Ruutu became directly involved in the drafting of Finland's foreign policymaking in the postwar era, and his ideas for a Finno-Soviet defense alliance after the war were later realized in the form of the FCMA Treaty.¹⁶⁸

The intellectual discussion of foreign policy in Finland challenged some of Paasikivi's designs of the new foreign policymaking of postwar Finland's political system. The powerful role of president-oriented foreign policy decision making, the connection between domestic and foreign policy, and the unstabilized position of Finland on the international arena were especially criticized.¹⁶⁹ How-

¹⁶⁴ Nevakivi 1988, 211.

¹⁶⁵ Palonen 1983, 98. Also the Swedish academic tradition was important, for example, the *Swedish Statskunskap* (Palonen 1983, 98).

¹⁶⁶ Paakkunainen 1985, 23. For the problems of defining the foundation of Finnish political science, see Palonen 1983, 94.

¹⁶⁷ Paakunainen 1985,

¹⁶⁸ Soikkanen 2002, "Ruutu, Yrjö (1887-1956)", *Kansallisbiografia*, <https://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kansallisbiografia/henkilo/5253/> [accessed 12 September 2017].

¹⁶⁹ Paakkunainen 1985, 232.

ever, in Finland, unlike in the neighboring Sweden, the scarcity of the government's resources in the 1950s hindered the synchronization of the academics and the administrative strata as it prevented establishing committees that could have produced scientific views for administrative use.¹⁷⁰ Therefore, it can be claimed that in the 1940s and 1950s especially the Finnish foreign policymaking was clearly pragmatic problem solving and not a coherent policy line that had been designed by strong theoretical minds.

The first and most important task in the Finnish foreign policymaking of the postwar era was the organization of relationship with Moscow, especially when the director general of the Political Department of Finnish Foreign Ministry was Eero A. Wuori. Wuori was appointed in May 1953 and was Paasikivi's personal link and direct contact to the Ministry. The appointment was the child of necessity as there had been a risk of fracture in the line of contact to the Ministry as Paasikivi's old friend, Carl Enckell, left his post as a foreign minister. Wuori favored careful policy in the matters relating to superpowers and matters such as the German question. This was well exemplified in his reserved stance in relation to the United States which was trying to establish a closer relationship with Finland after the war: in Wuori's view, the tighter contact with Washington could be disposed off in order to keep the Kremlin happy.¹⁷¹

Such were the precautions during this time to avoid irritating superpowers that the political reporting was officially prohibited from the Finnish trade missions in Germany in the early 1950s. However, Kekkonen considered it important to know the political development in Germany and sent his personal friend, Jussi Mäkinen, as a press assistant to the Finnish trade mission in the Federal Republic to assist in gathering information in 1954. The head of the mission, Olavi Munkki, was irritated as the official directions of the ministry prohibited political reporting and he felt that Kekkonen bypassed the ministry.¹⁷²

Wuori's appointment, on the other hand, established a custom during the terms of Paasikivi and Kekkonen that the director general of the Political Department was president's main contact in the foreign ministry, with whom he could have direct contact, circumventing the foreign minister of the particular government. However, initially even the post of foreign minister was regarded from the standpoint of continuity and technocracy: after the war, the post of foreign minister was given, as a rule, to a professional minister (during the years 1944–1950). Foreign political symbolism of this arrangement was twofold: it sent a signal that the foreign policy line was to be kept intact and steady despite the politically changing governments. This was also done to avoid the relationship between the minister and the president from being burdened by domestic politics. However, the arrangement ended in the early 1950s, when the post of foreign minister had become the boon the governing parties. After that, the role of the foreign ministry (and especially the director general of the Political Department) became even

¹⁷⁰ Nousiainen 1983, 214.

¹⁷¹ Hanhimäki 1997, 158.

¹⁷² Soikkanen 2003a, 87, 88.

more emphasized as the president's direct assistant for foreign policymaking.¹⁷³ It is difficult to evaluate how this affected the independence of the ministry in its work. For example, according to Timo Soikkanen it might have. He implies that Osmo Orkomies who became, in January 1959, director general of the Political Department during the period of the Night Frost Crisis (which underlined the controversiality of Kekkonen's foreign policy) might have experienced it first-hand: Kekkonen had heard rumors that his views were differing from Kekkonen's official foreign policy line and this could have been the reason for his brief tenure as director general and quick transfer as a diplomat in Bern.¹⁷⁴ However, Orkomies was later appointed to the same post (in February 1966), which might indicate that maybe the post of director general was designed to be temporary in the first place.¹⁷⁵

Soikkanen has also noted that the general ambiguity in the arrangement of Finnish foreign affairs, especially the swiftly changing personnel in the 1950s, led to confusion in the Finnish Foreign Service and it was lagging behind the level of other Nordic countries. The situation was bettered only in 1964 when the committee of Castrén presented its report analyzing the systematic development of the ministry.¹⁷⁶

As already implied, considering the reporting and news coming from Germany during the latter part of the 1950s, the leading figure of Finnish foreign policymakers, President Kekkonen, was, according to all historiographical knowledge, very interested in it. He seemed, already at this point, to regard the question of Germany as essential to Finland's foreign policy and paramount to Finnish relations with the Soviet Union. In his thinking, the German question even threatened world peace, and he believed that the division of Germany would continue for a long time. He was especially concerned about the re-arming of the Federal Republic; in his thinking, an armed Germany would be very hard to bridle and meant a constant threat for the Soviet Union.¹⁷⁷ It was this aspect that seemed to worry the president most, and he claimed that the fear of Germany in Russian minds must be regarded, for it would directly influence their disposition towards Finland.¹⁷⁸ This thought can be seen as the essence of Kekkonen's foreign policy thinking with regards to Germany. During the coming years he would also express, especially in the 1960s, his quite alarmist attitude towards Germany in the Finnish foreign policy discourse and thinking. It also revealed one of the differences in the foreign policy thinking of Paasikivi and Kekkonen: in Paasikivi's line, Germany was secondary and he was mainly concerned of bilateral relations with the Soviet Union. For Kekkonen, Germany and the Soviet Union were bundled together and their relationship was crucial to Finland¹⁷⁹, he was considering the foreign policy in a more multilateral sense.

¹⁷³ Jakobson 1980, 18, 19.

¹⁷⁴ Soikkanen 2003a, 170.

¹⁷⁵ Ulkoasianhallinnon matrikkeli 1996, osa 2, 71, 72.

¹⁷⁶ Soikkanen 2003a, 171.

¹⁷⁷ Suomi 1990, 314, 315.

¹⁷⁸ Suomi 1990, 315.

¹⁷⁹ Hagglöf's report from December 1964, cited in Suomi 1994, 287.

2.2 Influence from outside: the Soviet intrusion to Finnish field of politics

As the discussion above had already hinted, in order to understand Finland's postwar foreign policy it is crucial to understand the factor of the Soviet Union in the postwar Finnish foreign policymaking and discourse. Leaders in the Kremlin, through the decades of the Cold War, wished to guarantee their influence in the Finnish foreign as well as domestic politics. Stalin, however, decided that he would be better served by not allowing the Finnish communists to radicalize – indicated by his stance when the Soviet Union and Finland concluded a separate peace treaty. The indirect influence of the Soviet Union to Finnish politics can be interpreted to have already begun when Paasikivi became prime minister in November 1944. He wished to give a gesture of confirmation and trust towards the East and included communists in his government. The government consequently had multiple communist ministers who acted also as leading figures in Finnish-Soviet Society (*Suomi-Neuvostoliitto Seura*), which became one of the main channels of Soviet influence in Finland.¹⁸⁰ As a consequence of the communist minister of interior, Yrjö Leino, the Finnish State Police¹⁸¹ (*Valtiollinen poliisi*) was manned by communists. It gave the left the possibility to attack its enemies, for example, by claiming that their actions were against the Paris Peace Treaties, which were, along with the FCMA Treaty, the basis of the relations between Finland and the Soviet Union (for example, it limited the Finnish defense force's armament types and quantities).¹⁸²

Another clear indication of the Soviet Union's power in Finnish politics after the war was the fact that Finland had to refuse to accept US aid for Western Europe in the form of the so-called Marshall Plan. It could be interpreted as a first step towards the Finnish postwar neutrality, or the appeasement policy towards the Soviet Union. In any case, the indirect reward of this submission to Soviet wishes was that the Soviet Union agreed to ratify the Paris Peace Treaty, which officially ended the war between Finland and the Soviet Union. The most important consequence from this was, however, that, in addition to the indication that Finland was still an independent nation, the Soviet-controlled Allied Control Commission left Finland on 26 September 1947.¹⁸³ Ultimately this possibility of the Soviet Union to influence Finland's politics led also to the phenomenon of Finlandization that was discussed in the introduction. It was, in its essence, a

¹⁸⁰ Seppinen 2004, 87–90; Mikkonen 2015, 1, 2. These societies were also founded in other Western countries and were important part of the Soviet Union's promotion of its foreign policy objectives. It allowed the Soviet Union to execute directly people-to-people diplomacy. (Mikkonen 2015, 1.)

¹⁸¹ State Police was Finnish security and intelligence agency of Finland in charge of national security and operated in the areas such as counterintelligence under the jurisdiction of the Interior Ministry. It transformed in 1949 to the Finnish Security Intelligence Service (*Suojelupoliisi*, *Supo*), and was purged of the communist officials.

¹⁸² Uola 2013, 81, 339.

¹⁸³ Tarkka 1992, 20.

voluntary subservience to the Soviet Union's interest by Finnish politicians, and also later affected the whole academic and cultural dimensions of Finnish society.

Regarding foreign policy, the most important way for the Soviet Union to influence Finnish politics became the personalization of the Finnish foreign policy at the top-level, which culminated in President Urho Kekkonen from 1956 on. Ultimately, the strategy led more and more to the position where the Finnish foreign policy was solely the domain of the president. Despite the fact that the Finnish constitution bestowed sovereignty in the foreign policy decision making for the president, it was the non-parliamentary secret diplomacy between the president and the Soviet Union foreign policy leadership that became the *modus operandi* in Finnish politics. Politicians that were questioning this were branded not only by Kekkonen's allies but began to receive a general castigation in Finnish society.¹⁸⁴ This was manifested partly in the late 1960s when Kekkonen described two of his prominent opponents, Georg Ehrnrooth from the Swedish People's Party of Finland and Tuure Junnila from the National Coalition Party (*Kansallinen Kokoomus*), as far-right politicians and menaces to the democratic principles.¹⁸⁵ However, it was clear that both of them were committed parliamentarians (in Ehrnrooth's politics especially the constitutionality was a constant theme); they were merely questioning the hegemonic political discourse of the period.¹⁸⁶

Along with the personalization of foreign policy, one of the most important aspects for the Finnish relations with the Soviet Union in the years of the Cold War would become the – already mentioned – Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance signed with the Soviet Union on 5 April 1948.¹⁸⁷ This agreement bound Finland to the Soviet Union and exacerbated the possibility of the Soviet Union and its supporters to achieve increased power in Finnish politics.¹⁸⁸ The treaty and its formulations would then find its way into every communicate the Soviet Union produced with Finland. Keijo Korhonen, professor of political science, who worked in a significant role in the Finnish Foreign Ministry (also later as foreign minister by the request of Kekkonen) later made an analogy

¹⁸⁴ E.g. see Keski-Rauska 2015, 420.

¹⁸⁵ Keski-Rauska 2015, 140.

¹⁸⁶ Keski-Rauska 2015, 411.

¹⁸⁷ Meanwhile, while Finland was negotiating the FCMA Treaty, the Western powers were in the midst of redefining the Brussels Treaty (Signed in 17 March 1947), which led ultimately to a creation of new security and military alliance in the form of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in April 1949. Due to the Soviet Union, Finland was already, at that time, in an impossible position to even consider participating in the negotiations. Consequently, the greatest concern on the Western side was if Finland might experience the destiny of Czechoslovakia and fall under Soviet rule to become a satellite of the Soviets. US Secretary of State George Marshall was at this point especially worried, and cast on Kennan his doubts if the Finns were to fall under Soviet rule. Kennan, however, was more assured and believed that Stalin would behave according to his predictions in the long-telegram: in his view, Stalin wished only to achieve security guarantees from Finland and not to conquer it. (Tarkka 1992, 28-29.)

¹⁸⁸ Haataja 1995, 22.

that the communiques became a scholastic liturgy which had to be adopted each time to the basic tenets of the FCMA Treaty.¹⁸⁹

In fact, the future president, Urho Kekkonen, was already involved in the negotiations concerning the treaty. He played a crucial role in negotiations by being the trusted man of President Paasikivi. Kekkonen wrote from the negotiations, led by Foreign Minister V.M. Molotov on the Soviet side, that he believed the treaty would be satisfactory even to the Western bloc as it differed from the same kind of treaties the Soviet Union had negotiated with Romania and Bulgaria – which was, at least on the official textual level of treaty, true.¹⁹⁰ Kekkonen wrote in his letter that the omitting of decrees referring to general commitment to consultations with the Soviet Union in case of war made the treaty of Finland different from the ones signed by Romania and Bulgaria. Finland only agreed to consultations with the Soviet Union in a case if some third power was to use Finnish soil for the advantage of attacking the Soviet Union.¹⁹¹

The treaty was formulated in co-operation with Finns and Russians. Especially on the Finnish side a lot of attention was paid to the text that was to be finally printed in the treaty. President Paasikivi demanded that in the introduction of the treaty there was to be a statement that Finland wished to avert and remain outside of great power conflicts.¹⁹² This vigorous focusing on the details and phrases was to become the precedent of the way of dealing with the Soviet Union later on; it was a sort of a diplomatic balancing by not pushing the boundaries of the Soviet patience too far while at the same time avoiding excessive concessions. According to Korhonen, the main battle of Finland against the intrusion of the Soviet Union to abolish Finnish sovereignty altogether was fought later on by the re-interpretation of the treaty each time in a way that did not allow the Soviet Union to use it to snare Finland inside its sphere of influence.¹⁹³ The view of Korhonen has also been later validated by and large by the research: the treaty held significance as a political symbol and definer of Finland's position in international politics. This also meant that it could only be interpreted in an objective manner after it lost its significance when the Soviet Union collapsed.¹⁹⁴

In the era of Stalin, his willingness to let Finland decide much of the formulation of the FCMA treaty was probably best explained by his wishes to stabilize the situation on the north-west border of the Soviet Union. By manifesting solidarity of the Finns and heeding to their wishes, this could also function as a message for Swedes after Norway had refused neutrality and positioned themselves clearly with the Western alliance that would later evolve into the North Atlantic

¹⁸⁹ Korhonen 1999, see also Laine 1996, 574. Korhonen sees that one possibility why Russians were so keen on this reliance on the official texts was in the Byzantine tradition of the Russia, which revered the sanctity and non-reformist attitude towards the holy scriptures (Korhonen 1999, 159). According to Jukka Seppinen, the communiques, despite of the liturgic nature, reflected the state of the relations (Seppinen 2004, 447).

¹⁹⁰ Talvitie 2009, 15.

¹⁹¹ Seppinen 2004, 144.

¹⁹² Seppinen 2004, 145.

¹⁹³ Korhonen 1999, 156, 157.

¹⁹⁴ Vesa 1998, 7, 8.

Treaty Organization (NATO). In short, Stalin's decision was probably implying to Sweden that their sovereignty was to be respected, but only in the case that they should not compromise it by aligning with the West.¹⁹⁵ The developing Manichean worldview between the superpowers was also reflected in the Finnish attitude to international relations after the war. In Finland, the world of international relations was consequently constructed in the light of national realism, which meant, in effect, that the international order between the nations was seen in Helsinki to be dictated by the great powers and their selfish interests.¹⁹⁶ There was not a hint of idealism that either Western liberal democracy or proletarian solidarity of communism would not, in the end, stop great powers demanding their share of influence in the geopolitical reality.

2.3 Finland's postwar foreign policy formulation in the larger geopolitical context

In postwar Finland, neutrality was not the only option to position Finland with regards to its security policy. One of the most important ideas in this regard was the Scandinavian defense union (with Norway, Sweden, and Denmark). This idea was a Swedish proposition from 1948 and it promoted the Swedish style of neutrality for Denmark and Norway.¹⁹⁷ The idea was revived by Prime Minister Kekkonen in January 1952. The initiative was diluted in the end by the lack of credibility: the union would have lacked military power to form a credible defense to retain its neutrality in the event of a superpower conflict. Contrary to this, it would have relied heavily on arms supplies and monetary aid from the West if it was to achieve sufficient military power. This, of course, compromised its neutrality from the viewpoint of the Soviet Union.¹⁹⁸ Also the United States did not consider the option viable since it had interest in including Norway and Denmark in the nascent Western defense alliance that would form into NATO.¹⁹⁹

In the latter half of the 1940s, the West saw the Finnish position in the north as a stabilizing factor.²⁰⁰ An independent Finland formed a buffer state against the Soviet Union and contained its expansion in the north. This also meant that

¹⁹⁵ Tarkka 1992, 26–27.

¹⁹⁶ Möttölä 1993, 68, 69.

¹⁹⁷ Rainio-Niemi 2014, 40.

¹⁹⁸ Tarkka 1992, 30–31. According to Finnish diplomat and Foreign Ministry official Risto Hyvärinen, after the collapse of real-political integration to Nordic countries that the defense alliance would have formed, Finland pursued a policy that was to associate it with Nordic countries by the form of increased co-operation and connection with them. The idea was to prevent Finland from being associated with the Eastern Europe, and the harmful implications it had with the regards the Foreign Policy, especially with the Soviet Union that regarded the Eastern Europe as its sphere of influence. (UM 12 K 1955-1964, representation of Risto Hyvärinen in "Polttopisteessä-neuvottelupäivät" 17 April 1966.)

¹⁹⁹ Rainio-Niemi 2014, 40, 41.

²⁰⁰ Rainio-Niemi 2014, 50.

Sweden could retain its neutrality, since it had the buffer zone of Finland between it and the Soviet Union. Looking at it from the Soviet side, on the other hand, this arrangement kept Sweden out of NATO.²⁰¹ This so-called Northern equilibrium was, by all probability, beneficial to Stalin who came to renounce the idea of world revolution and was focused on the internal development of the Soviet Union.

However, from the Western side, Finland was seen, in a sense, as a beneficial, yet disposable, buffer zone. This line of thinking was manifested also in the memo of the United States National Security Council titled NSC 68. It stated that the United States could not give any guarantees of help for Finland in the event of a Soviet Union intrusion on Finnish soil. The United States State Department was also frank concerning this position and already let Finland know this in 1950.²⁰² Based on this knowledge, then, it is possible to claim that Finnish politicians were aware early on of the pragmatic and real-political nature of thought in the United States Department of State. The United States line of thinking was also dominant in the other Western countries, for example, French and British foreign ministries wished to support the Finnish struggle to remain as an independent Western liberal democracy, but they were also resigned to the scenario that little could be done if the Soviets were to adopt a hard line against Finland. From Finland's viewpoint, this bore unsettling resemblance to the configuration preceding the Second World War; Finland was to survive by its own means.²⁰³ This was naturally part of the underlying explanation in Finland's extremely careful German policy; by not recognizing either one, the neutrality between East and West remained.

Finland's position started to look even more isolated in the beginning of 1950s as the era saw Western Europe growing stronger and more unified. This was achieved by military organizations such as NATO but also in economic aspects. The Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC) had emerged already in April 1948 from the organizational foundation of the Marshall Plan, and on 8 April 1951, the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) was established by the Treaty of Paris. This integration of Western Europe did not only make Finland appear more isolated, but it also gave Finnish foreign policymakers new challenges. The Western integration led to a backlash from the Kremlin and consequently to a growing tension in Europe. For Finland, this development was alarming as well; the FCMA Treaty with the Soviet Union tied Finland to the Soviet Union's security interests in Europe. After all, the treaty was drafted to secure the Soviet Union from the use of Finnish soil as the attack route of Germany or its allies – which was, at this point, recovering swiftly from the war and growing stronger. For Finland, the treaty thus posed a dual dilemma: Finland was obligated to resist against the threat of states that it wanted to associate itself with politically, economically, and culturally. Already before the mid-

²⁰¹ Tarkka 1992, 32–34.

²⁰² Tarkka 1992, 32–33.

²⁰³ Seppinen 2004, 146–147.

1950s, Soviet Union's Foreign Ministry's own internal brief manifested the fact that the FCMA Treaty's unwritten goal was to increase the influence of the Soviet Union in Finland.²⁰⁴

These developments, however, also had some positive impact for the Finnish foreign policy. The great powers began to appreciate the policy of neutrality, especially in the wake of the Korean War. Neutrality as a chosen foreign policy of a particular state was often beneficial from the great power perspective: it alleviated pressure from both sides of the Cold War as neither one had to waste resources on a large scale by trying to implant either a socialist or capitalist system inside these particular states. The exception to the rule of "neutrality-as-promoted-policy" by the superpowers were of course the states that had previously been clearly aligned on the either side. A prime example of this was Tito's Yugoslavia, which diverted from the communist bloc and defined its own neutral foreign policy, defying Stalin. Curiously enough, initially, Yugoslavia took, in some respects, Finnish neutrality as their model of foreign policy. However, later, from 1958 on, they opted for a neutral foreign policy inside the framework of the Non-Aligned Movement.²⁰⁵

Finland, on its part, started to solidify and formulate its foreign policy to a more intricate entity. However, in general, the idea of Finnish neutrality was kept low-profile during this period.²⁰⁶ The first attempt to make this more overt was the so-called "night gown pocket speech" (*pyjamantaskupuhe*), released in the *Maakansa* newspaper on 23 January 1952, in which Prime Minister Urho Kekkonen revived the idea of a Scandinavian defense union. In his speech, Kekkonen managed to avert the boundaries of the FCMA Treaty by linking the defense alliance to the FCMA Treaty and Swedish neutrality. He emphasized that possible aggression against the Soviet Union referred in the FCMA Treaty could only come through the Nordic countries. By this interpretation, he concluded that it would be beneficial for the Soviet Union to have a Nordic blockade in the form of a defense alliance against a possible invasion. Kekkonen stipulated that for this kind of an alliance to be viable, Sweden had to remain neutral.²⁰⁷

However, Kekkonen's promotion of neutrality was viewed with suspicion in West. For example, the head of the West German trade mission in Helsinki informed his home country Foreign Office that there were speculations that Kekkonen was speaking on behalf of the Soviet Union's wishes to form a zone of neutral states in Central Europe.²⁰⁸ However, Jukka Tarkka has noted that the

²⁰⁴ Polvinen 2003, 191.

²⁰⁵ Kullaa 2012, xiv.

²⁰⁶ Rainio-Niemi 2014, 54, 55.

²⁰⁷ Tarkka 1992, 37–38.

²⁰⁸ PAAA B 23 bd. 13, report of R.F.Koenning 10 February 1956 "Neutralitätspropaganda des Staatministers Kekkonen". Koenning suggested that there were rumors in Finnish publicity that Kekkonen had even taken a private trip to Austria in 1953 to promote co-operation with the Soviet Union and neutrality.

speech also referred to NATO countries Norway and Denmark, and could be interpreted as a complimentary move towards the Western bloc in that regard.²⁰⁹

These unsuccessful attempts were soon seen as unnecessary as the second half of the 1950s began the short era of the first *détente* in the Cold War superpower relations. For Finland, this meant a pause in the pressure from the East. Alleviation of the tensions in the relations was manifested by the return of Porkkala Naval Base, and Finland's unobstructed (Soviet Union held a veto right) accession to the United Nations in 1955, followed by the semi-official recognition of Finnish neutrality by the Soviet Union in 1956 in the communique of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.²¹⁰ However, for Finland, the price was the continuation of the FCMA Treaty for twenty years.²¹¹ As already mentioned, the treaty became an instrument for the Soviet Union to curb Finland's Western orientation in economic policy as well as in security policy.²¹²

In the general Cold War setting, stability and release of the superpower tensions was caused not least by the strengthened positions of both side: the Marshall Plan had refortified Western Europe economically and NATO had integrated its security interests, as had the Warsaw Pact on the Eastern side. The Geneva meeting in July 1955 appeared to be the first step towards the normalization of the relations between the East and West. However, Cold War historian Vladislav Zubok has argued that, in reality, for the American foreign policymakers, President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and the majority of American Soviet experts, the ostensible claims of peaceful co-existence by the Kremlin meant only a disruption to their pursuit of building the European center of power based on the true face of communism: the threat it posed for liberty and democracy.²¹³ In a sense, the Americans were right and wrong: for the Soviet leaders, the peaceful co-existence did not mean the abandonment of expansionism, but merely that it could be achieved peacefully.²¹⁴

The clearest manifestations of this spirit of *détente* were the granting of general sovereignty to both German state, and the creation of an independent and neutral Austria on 5 May 1955. The case of Austria was especially of interest for

²⁰⁹ Tarkka 1992, 29. In general, the reactions were mixed internationally (Rainio-Niemi 2014, 55).

²¹⁰ Visuri 2006, 138. Resolution of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union stated that the Soviet Union wished to pursue friendly relations with neutral nations such as Sweden, Austria, and Finland. This was a semi-official acknowledgment of Finnish neutrality from the Russian side, although the statement of Finnish neutrality had already been included in different communiqués released from the official meetings. (Seppinen 2004, 216.)

²¹¹ Suomi 2001, 30. Seppinen 2004, 216.

²¹² Seppinen 2008, 311.

²¹³ Zubok 2007, 94.

²¹⁴ Sakwa 1998, 254. Inside the Eastern bloc, the looming status quo led to contradictory consequences: Khrushchev's decision to loosen control in the satellite states in East Europe led to the uprisings in Hungary and reformist attempts by Władysław Gomułka of Poland. It appears that the decision of the Americans/NATO not to intervene (similar to the events of Prague in spring 1968 during the second *détente*) solidified the status quo on both sides of the so-called iron curtain. (Garthoff 2001, 25. Ouimet 2003, 10.)

Finland since it was the first nation in Europe that was officially acknowledged as neutral. Even more comparison could be drawn to Finland's case since Austria had also fought on the side of the National Socialist Germany in the war (albeit, officially, Austria was part of Germany, joined to it by Anschluss on 13 March 1938, whereas Finland had allied with Germany as a separate state). It seems that Austria especially interested Finnish foreign policymakers due to the similarities in the postwar situation.²¹⁵ Initially, however, it had been the Austrians that had consulted Prime Minister Kekkonen in the summer of 1953 to learn about the experiences concerning the negotiations with the Soviet Union. Later, the Austrians publicly admitted that the meeting had bolstered their daring to negotiate the Austrian State Treaty.²¹⁶

The Austrian success in its neutral policy ignited speculations in the Finnish Foreign Service. Olavi Munkki, the Finnish representative in Cologne, saw possibilities for Finland in the Austrian model. However, in the Ministry, the cautious stand remained, exemplified by the memo from September 1955 that pondered Finland's possibilities to recognize the German states from the standpoint of international law. According to the memo, the Paris Peace Treaty did not cause an obstacle for the recognition of the Federal Republic. This was exemplified by the recognition of it by both the Western allied powers as well as the Soviet Union. However, the conclusion of the memo was that Finland should not push for the recognition of both German states as there was the possibility that only the German Democratic Republic would accept the establishment of relations in the case of "dual-recognition" and Finland would end up having diplomatic relations with only East Berlin.²¹⁷ The memo contradicted the previous stance of the Foreign Ministry articulated by State Secretary R.R. Seppälä, who had previously been concerned that it was article 10 of the Paris Peace Treaty that prevented Finland from making initiatives with regards to the recognition of Germany.²¹⁸

Also, the West German trade mission in Helsinki noted that Finland attributed great importance to the Paris Peace Treaty, and reported that in the conversation with R.R. Seppälä, there had been a certain noticeable satisfaction in his voice regarding the new Western alliance that was forming against the Soviet Union.²¹⁹ This was probably one of the first pieces of evidence (of the later man-

²¹⁵. According to Tatjana Androsova, documents of the Russian archives state that the Soviet Union's leadership regarded Kekkonen was steering Finland's neutrality towards the model of Austria (Androsova 2009, 29), something which the Finnish diplomat Olavi Munkki suggested for the Finnish foreign policymakers after the Austrian State Treaty, see UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 19 January 1956, liite: muistio pp. 5, 6.

²¹⁶ Tarkka 1992, 43. The treaty that granted Austria back its independence and by which both, East and West recognized it as officially neutral state.

²¹⁷ UM 7 D II 303, memo of V.J. Ahokas 27 September 1955 "Suomen ja Saksan suhteiden järjestäminen".

²¹⁸ UM 7 D II 303, memo of R.R. Seppälä 16 February 1955 "Suomi ja Saksan kysymyksen ratkaisu".

²¹⁹ PAAA B 23 bd. 13, report of R.F. Koenning 4 January 1955 "Finnlands Verhältnis zur Sowjetunion".

ifested type of Finnish diplomats in Germany) to West Germans that, in the Finnish foreign administration, there were officials with a strong inclination towards the West, and who held stern resistance towards the communism and succumbtion for the Soviet wishes. This was not the last positive news effusing from West German representation to Bonn's Foreign Office; only a little later, the mission also reported that the Finnish parliament had refused the invitation from the East German equivalent of the house of representatives, The People's Chamber, *Volkskammer*.²²⁰

During the latter half of the 1950s, there was a necessity for Finland to become increasingly aware of its actions on the international arena due to its accession in the United Nations (accepted on 14 December 1955). Despite the fact that this required more precise consideration for the Finnish foreign policy actions, it also entailed that Finland could no longer assume a passive stance in the international arena either.²²¹ An active role was also encouraged by Ralph Enckell, Finnish Foreign Ministry's director general of the Political Department from 1955-1958. In his view, the neutral states should participate in the integration process in political as well as in economical arenas. He also considered that the tension between the East and West would prevail for a substantial period of time. However, in his view, this offered Finland a unique possibility as a mediator, considering Finland's in-between-blocs position.²²² Curiously, this position between blocs was later exploited also by the Third World non-aligned nations, an aspect of their foreign relations noted by the Finnish diplomats. However, Enckell's thinking probably emphasized the idealistic negotiator role, not the real-political Cold War bargaining evident in the undertakings of the aforementioned states.

The official international recognition of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic (1955) ended the era of uncertainty that described the first half of the 1950s. This period was defined by multiple international conferences, conventions, and treaties which often focused most on the permanent settlement of German question that was more and more defined by the division between the eastern part occupied by the Soviet forces and the western part occupied by Western Allied Powers.²²³ The culmination of these interna-

²²⁰ PAAA B 23 bd. 13, report of R.F. Koenning, 19 February 1955, "Einladung der ost-deutschen Volkskammer an den finnischen Reichstag".

²²¹ Reimaa 2013, 30; Törnudd 2003, 353.

²²² Reimaa 2013, 30, 31.

²²³ For example: Bonn Conventions concerning the relations between the German Federal Republic and the United Kingdom, France, and the United States on 26 May 1952. Moscow negotiations concerning Soviet-East German relations on 22 August 1953. Meeting of Western Foreign Ministers in Berlin Conference held between 25 January and 18 February 1954. Nine-Power Conference held in London between 28 September and 3 October 1954. Conference of the six European Defence Community Powers, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Canada held in London on 3 October 1954. Paris Conference on 23 October 1954. All of these conferences formed the process in which West Germany became part of the Western European Union (which replaced the failed attempt to bring the Federal Republic as part of the European Defense Community, blocked ultimately by French National Assembly on 30

tional strivings for the solution of the postwar Europe configuration was the ratification of Paris Agreements on 5 May 1955. The Agreements granted sovereignty to the Federal Republic and made it a member of the Western European Union and NATO.²²⁴

This was also the period when the Federal Republic of Germany defined its main foreign policy tenets for the coming decades. In September 1955, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer reassured the Bundestag that the Federal Republic's demand for sole representation was bound for continuity. The neutral states were not excluded from the consequences of the doctrine, which was criticized already at this point heavily by the opposition in the Federal Republic.²²⁵ In many respects, the Hallstein Doctrine was the culmination of the process of West Germany's metamorphosis from an occupation zone into a real statehood—it was now a legitimate state entity that could demand the sole representation of the German people; albeit the sovereignty was still limited by foreign troops and the lack of a peace treaty. The next chapter will discuss, in more detail, the actual formation of the Finnish Foreign Service as a body responsible for the execution of foreign policy itself and, in this regard, naturally, its beginnings in relation to the German states.

August 1954), NATO, and a sovereign state. (Selected documents on Germany and the Question of Berlin 1944-1961 (1961), 12, 13.)

²²⁴ Selected documents on Germany and the Question of Berlin 1944-1961 (1961), 13.

²²⁵ UM 5 C 5 A, report Cologne 23 September 1955, "Liittokansleri Adenauerin Moskovan-matkan tulokset", p. 2.

3 1955–1962: ESTABLISHMENT OF FINNISH COMMERCIAL CONSULATES AND THE BEGINNING OF REPRESENTATION

As the previous chapter showed, the Finnish foreign policy after the Second World War was built comprehensively anew. The same philosophy applied for the actual handling of the foreign affairs and its organizational construction, which was also dictated by the short history of the Finnish Foreign Service and its consequent organizational juvenilia. The Foreign Service's diplomatic network already reached the level it had been on prior to the war at the end of the 1940s. The general tendency in the Foreign Service was to return to the organizational form that had prevailed before the war. However, the development of the enlarging foreign trade and the international relations required some restructuring of the Foreign Service.²²⁶ In 1951, a new statute was given that was to guide the organizational development of the Foreign Service for the next 20 years. In general, for a small nation such as Finland, the growth that began in the Foreign Service was dictated mostly by trade interest.²²⁷ Only later, during the 1960s, was the growth also guided by the principles of more active foreign policy and Finland's strive for more distinctive role on the international stage.

When it came to rekindling the relations between Finland and Germany, the most natural conduit was found in trade as well. In the negotiations during the summer and the fall of 1947, the Allied victors supported the establishment of a Finnish trade mission in Berlin. The idea of the Finnish representative office had the initial agreement and support of all the victors and they agreed that it could handle the trade relations throughout Germany. This situation was then to change due to the worsening relations of the Soviet Union and Western allied powers – causing the beginning of the Cold War. Therefore, when, in May 1948, the Finnish trade delegation in Berlin brought the subject of permanent Finnish

²²⁶ Nevakivi 1988, 249.

²²⁷ Nevakivi 1988, 261, 262.

representation up again, Western officials proposed the establishment of an independent consular office in Frankfurt am Main to handle the trade with Western sectors. Another office was established to the East of Berlin to conduct trade related issues with them.²²⁸

When the two German states were officially founded in 1949, the political turbulence concerning the form Finnish representation in two German states began, even more so in the German Democratic Republic. The first Finnish representative in the German Democratic Republic was Toivo Heikkilä (1906–1976), an official with an agrarian background who had worked as a reporter for the Agrarian League affiliated newspaper *Maakansa*.²²⁹ However, according to Heikkilä himself, he was an apolitical official and did not support any particular political orientation²³⁰. He had begun his career in the service of the Finnish Foreign Service in 1931 as an acting assistant. Prior to his assignment to the Finnish trade mission in East Berlin he already had experience in Germany by the virtue of two previous posts in service of the ministry. It seems that he was a person that was trusted in the ministry; this is implied by the fact that he was sent to Germany a third time after he had held the post there in the Finnish diplomatic mission during the establishment and construction of the Third Reich in 1934–1938.²³¹ His second short term in Berlin had not come at any less of a dramatic time; he was stationed as the mission's First Secretary in 1940, after Finland's Winter War with the Soviet Union, the re-establishment of the connection with Germany (that is, Finland's war alliance with Germany against the Soviet Union), and the second year of the Second World War after Hitler was making headway in Europe by invading Norway and Denmark in Scandinavia, while attacking France, Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxembourg in central Europe (disregarding the latter three's neutrality).²³²

Heikkilä began receiving pressure from the representatives of the German Democratic Republic's government immediately after taking his post.²³³ They were expecting full diplomatic recognition from Finland, as they were from all the other nations as well. However, only the socialist countries had so far recognized the German Democratic Republic and an indication of larger representation in the ranks of recognizers was not to be seen in the near future. East Germans were trying to exploit the unclear status of Heikkilä and allure him to become a proponent of the establishment of diplomatic relations - even threats of

²²⁸ Paloposki 2001, 31.

²²⁹ Ulkoasianhallinnon matrikkeli 1993, osa 1, 211.

²³⁰ Heikkilä 1965, 10.

²³¹ Also implied by the fact that during the years 1945–48 he acted as a secretary of Prime Minister Paasikivi. Later he published memoirs concerning those years, see Heikkilä 1965.

²³² Ulkoasianhallinnon matrikkeli 1993, osa 1, 211.

²³³ UM 6 O 5 SDT a-b, memo by Trainee Henrik Räihä 19 April 1971, "Saksan Demokraattisen Tasavallan kaupallisen edustuston perustamisesta Helsinkiin ja sen kansainvälisoikeudellisesta asemasta" p. 4.

closing down the Finnish commercial consulate in East Berlin were levied as a bargain.²³⁴

According to Seppo Hentilä, Heikkilä's wavering in this matter kept the question from disappearing. There had been a discussion between the German Democratic Republic's Foreign Minister Dertinger and Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl in which the subject had been brought up. Dertinger had claimed that the Finns would finally give in.²³⁵ However, Dertinger did not clarify what was the basis of his assumption and one can claim that its basis in the supposed weakness of Heikkilä is debatable. Heikkilä was, after all, on a diplomatic mission and was supposed to execute Finnish foreign policy in a discreet fashion.²³⁶ Dertinger's assertion seems to have been based on the reliance of the Soviet support in pressuring Finland to recognize the German Democratic Republic, yet, this support was never fully realized. The same happened with neutral Sweden as well. When Sweden sent representative to only Bonn, Moscow's reaction was critical, but, in the end, resulted only in the Soviet Union's ambassador in Stockholm, Konstantin Rodionov, reprimanding the Swedish Foreign Ministry that they should live up to their neutrality and consequently send a representative to East Berlin as well. However, Sweden's Foreign Minister Undén had rejected the idea by referring to the undemocratic nature of the East German regime.²³⁷

The East German focus seemed to be also in the already previously mentioned unclear status of Heikkilä. According to Finland's Foreign Ministry's State Secretary P.K. Tarjanne, Heikkilä's status or position was "loose"; he was not either consul or on the diplomatic list. Tarjanne continued to describe him as a "some sort of vague phenomena" who is merely tolerated and acts as a mediator in trade matters. In 1950, the East Germans finally gave in and conceded that the establishment of a trade mission would suffice—yet, they expressed that they would interpret it as de facto acknowledgement of the German Democratic Republic.²³⁸ The Finnish Foreign Ministry documents show that this, in fact, was also the interpretation of the Finnish Foreign Ministry as well.²³⁹ The East German mission in Helsinki began its functioning in 1953. The earlier interpretation of its form (that is, the East German interpretation) was perhaps promoted

²³⁴ Soikkanen 1999, 68.

²³⁵ Hentilä 2003, 27.

²³⁶ Also exemplified by Finnish Foreign Ministry's guidance to Heikkilä, which shows how delicate matter the establishment of missions were. It advised Heikkilä to try to avoid signing official paper declaring that he would in the future handle the matters with East German Foreign Ministry. (UM 12 L SDT, memo by Otso Wartiovaara 4 September 1953.)

²³⁷ Muschik 2006, 523.

²³⁸ Paloposki 2001, 32.

²³⁹ UM 12 L SDT, memo by Consulting Counsellor (*neuvotteleva virkamies*) V.J. Ahokas 29.5.1955. Ahokas' interpretation probably held significant value as he was an experienced official who had served in the ministry already since 1925. From 1946 on he had handled the relations of ministry with the Allied Control Commission and was also responsible for an investigation concerning the realization of the terms of a provisional peace treaty and the matters concerning extradition of POV's. In 1949 and 1950 he acted as permanent representative in the UN international organizations in Geneva. (Ulkoasiainhallinnon matrikkeli 1993, osa 1, p 94.)

through some back-channels to West Germany by East Germans, as the Swedish press and West German periodical *Die Welt* published a report claiming that the East German representative, Hans Bahr, began his post with an exequatur and, therefore, as an first official diplomat of East Germany in the capitalist nation.²⁴⁰

The Finnish representatives in the Federal Republic were working in a more emphatic environment when it came to the question of diplomatic recognition and received, from the onset, less pressure. First, the representatives were posted in Frankfurt am Main and, in June 1950, the consular office was moved to Cologne. Contrary to the common rule of representation being established in the capital, Cologne, as a base for Finland's representation, was probably partly a strategic choice to keep a low profile in the representation – the office moved to the capital, Bonn, only in 1968.²⁴¹ However, there was a period of uncertainty when the German states were founded in 1948. After that, the occupying powers did not extend the license of Finnish consular office to continue under that name due to the Soviet Union's apprehensions with regards to the representative offices mushrooming in Bonn. In 1952, the situation was brought to a resolution as Finnish diplomat Olavi Munkki began his post in the Federal Republic and delivered a letter stating the alteration of the title of consular office to a less diplomatic sounding commercial consulate. This arrangement seemed to suit all parties involved for the time being; no one could predict that it would remain as the solution to Finnish representation for over 20 years.²⁴² The fact was that, with this arrangement, Finnish representatives were forced to a diplomatic grey area while being also deprived of the prestige of the official status that would have otherwise belonged to them.

Olavi Munkki took his post during the formation of Finnish foreign policy. Finland's position had been vague throughout the early 1950s, for example, the Soviet Union still held a military base on Finnish soil in Porkkala, close to the capital, Helsinki, which seemed to, by certain measures, compromise Finnish sovereignty altogether. Despite this, the Paris Peace Treaty in 1949 had liberated the Finish Foreign Ministry to be free to function independently and Finland's maneuvering possibilities in foreign affairs enlarged. Increased activity in foreign affairs was proven by the cumulating number of multilateral treaties; compared to the prewar and immediate postwar years, they quadrupled. If generally the ministry's functioning enlarged, the functioning of Finnish missions was, on the contrary, advised to become more focused: the developing communications technology allowed press and news agencies to relay information faster between

²⁴⁰ UM 6 O 5 SDT a-b, letter from Finnish commercial agent T.H. Heikkilä from in Berlin 11 October 1954 "Itä-Saksan edustus Suomessa"; letter from Finnish mission in Stockholm 15 October 1954. Heikkilä noted for the ministry that *Die Welt's* information bureau was known for fake news. Finnish Foreign Ministry debunked the news in its comments for Finnish newspaper *Helsingin Sanomat* by noting that the exequatur would not be granted for the East German mission even if its was applied for (UM 6 O 5, 18 October 1954 letter from ministry to lähetystöavustaja Richard Tötterman, Finnish mission in Stockholm, unnamed).

²⁴¹ Soikkanen 2003a, 85.

²⁴² Paloposki, 32.

more distant places. This phenomenon of the 20th century technological explosion led the ministry to advise heads of the missions to concentrate in their reporting solely on the matters of interest with regards to Finnish foreign policy, foreign policy of the base country, and matters of interest with regards to foreign policy-making in general.²⁴³

By considering the background discussion above, it is worthwhile to study the reporting produced during the latter half of the 1950s as foreign policy interpretations and discreet policy suggestions during the period of upholding and construction, or reconstruction of Finnish foreign policy of neutrality. Reconstruction in the sense that, after the rupture to Finnish foreign policy in the Second World War and its aftermath, the (from this day's view, once again heralded) nascence of the new world order and beginning of the Cold War required this sort of reconfiguration. Therefore, despite the fact that the Finnish foreign policy leadership was extremely cautious and conservative, this was also the time of possibilities. In many ways, the configuration of the Cold War system was taking place during this period and even small actors, such as Austria, could seize the momentum and reclaim their neutrality – and, in Austria's case, also to recognize the Federal Republic of Germany.

The first section of the analysis part following this chapter will concentrate on how the Finnish form of representation and its official status in Germany was discussed in the reporting: what its implications were and to what kind of contexts it was related. The second section of the analysis chapter concentrates on how Finnish neutrality was viewed by the diplomats, and according to their information, how it was viewed in Germany. The third, and last section of the first analysis chapter discusses the onset of the Hallstein Doctrine by The Federal Republic Foreign Office and consequently how the diplomats saw its implications for Finland.

3.1 Questions of representation's status

3.1.1 Attitude towards Finnish commercial consulates

From the mid-1950s on, the Finnish representation in divided Germany by trade missions could be regarded as somewhat stabilized, and, for the time being, a permanent solution for handling of the relations. Still, even after that, it was naturally of interest in the Finnish Foreign Ministry how the solution was functioning in practice. Even more so as the ministry was troubled with rumors that Finland might act as a "rogue" player in the solution of the German question.²⁴⁴

²⁴³ Nevakivi 1988, 268, 269.

²⁴⁴ UM 7 D II 302, secret telegram from Moscow by Eero. A. Wuori 28 November 1955. The telegram stated that American news agencies had spread rumors that Finland's representatives in Yugoslavia had suggested solution for the unification of Germany.

The diplomats addressed the representation's functionality few times in the reporting of the latter half of 1950s. According to the reporting, it seemed that, in general, there were not too many practical problems in the interaction of the Finnish trade missions with the administrative bodies of the German states, most importantly, with the foreign ministries. This kind of information was delivered to the Finnish Foreign Ministry also from outside the divided Germany in an indirect way. Finland's Ambassador to the United States, Johann Nykopp, had received views regarding the matter from his German colleague, Ambassador Krekeler. The German ambassador had expressed to Nykopp that Bonn, in fact, was happy with the current solution of Finnish representation. He had pointed out that most important for the Federal Republic was that Finland would not recognize the Pankow government. According to Krekeler, it would have forced the Federal Republic to take "countermeasures" against Finland.²⁴⁵ The same stance was indicated for the Finnish ministry multiple times also by the reporting from Cologne, which noted that the Federal Republic's foreign office appreciated the status quo in Finland's current solution to the problem of representation.²⁴⁶ Krekeler's statement was of course substantial since it came from the official representative of the West German government and especially as the postwar West German foreign office did, in fact, represent more than the previous ones in German history: not only the technocratic view of the organization but also the political aspects of the nation's governance. The new foreign office and its training program emphasized that the foreign office should work more as an extension of the cabinet. The rationale was that this way it would more directly reflect the views of the German people.²⁴⁷

However, despite the general non-problematic attitude that seemed to prevail in Cologne towards the Finnish representation, some of the reports from Cologne claimed that the mission's work was hindered by its low status and the consequent treatment it received from the Federal Republic's officials. These claims were made to the Finnish Foreign Ministry by Olavi Munkki, who became a representative in Cologne in 1952.²⁴⁸ Before his post in Cologne, Munkki already had twenty years of experience in the ranks of the Finnish foreign service. He had started in 1937 as a civil servant trainee working after various assisting positions in the foreign ministry. His first foreign post was that of second secretary in Washington while also functioning as a consular officer. Munkki was the offspring of a trading family from Vyborg and already was, by his origins, involved deeply in the matters of business and trade: an indicator already of his probable attitude against anti-free market economy and state of the Soviet Union.²⁴⁹ Possibly his background was also the reason for his assignment in West Germany

²⁴⁵ UM 7 D II 302, 1 November 1955 Johann Nykopp's report from Washington.

²⁴⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 16 June 1955, "Tilanteesta ennen konferensseja"; 17 August 1955 "Liittokansleri Adener'in matka Moskovaan"; 10 January 1958 "Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan suhteista 1957"; 3 February 1959 "Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan suhteista 1958".

²⁴⁷ Lewin 1966, 658.

²⁴⁸ Soikkanen 2003a, 86.

²⁴⁹ Soikkanen 2003b, 421.

(an important trade partner of Finland). Another reason could have been the possible Western contacts created during his Washington years that might have also improved his functioning possibilities in the Allied-commanded West Germany.

Considering that Munkki's personality was quite jagged, it was clear that the post in Germany – which demanded the utmost discreetness and tact – was not in accordance with this part of his character. The earlier mentioned lamentation can be understood – at least partly – in the light of his quite non-conformist character. Before his post, the Foreign Ministry had, in fact, advised him to keep a low profile. Initially, the guidance seemed to have the desired effect: Munkki had himself proposed that the initially suggested title for him, *Leiter der Handelsvertretung der Republik Finnland* (Chief of the the Commercial Consulate of Finland) be simplified and changed to an even less diplomatic sounding, *Handelsvertreter*, which referred to him as a commercial agent.²⁵⁰

However, his character and individuality regarding the role of the civil servant as a subject of the ministry led him to strife with the Ministry. Munkki retaliated by quitting the political reporting for a two month period during the autumn of 1956.²⁵¹ One part of Munkki's irritation with the ministry was probably Kekkonen's involvement in the matters of the Finnish trade mission in Cologne. In 1954, Kekkonen had appointed Jussi Mäkinen, one of his trusted men in the ministry, as a press assistant in Cologne. However, he had also given Mäkinen a "secret" mission to execute political reporting from Germany. One explanation for this policy was the fact that before 1954 the Ministry had advised the Finnish trade mission to withhold political reporting (to guard the neutrality and the undiplomatic nature of the representation).²⁵² This incident actually also reflected the general relationship between Kekkonen and the foreign service: neither one trusted each other. Matti Klinge has interpreted that Mäkinen functioned as Kekkonen's tool in the Ministry to deliver message the officials that their loyalty should be to the political leadership, not to the foreign service. This was done by the strong personality of Mäkinen and the common knowledge of his loyalty to Kekkonen.²⁵³ Latter research has also shown that Kekkonen detested Munkki personally yet seemed to regard him as a skilled diplomat. One can deduct from the fact that Munkki remained in the service of the ministry is that Kekkonen did not intervene directly to the appointments in the ministry or that he was willing to let professional qualities override personal character as a criterion for the office.²⁵⁴

In January 1956, Munkki gave the first indications that, in his view, the representation's level was becoming a diplomatic burden. His interpretation was

²⁵⁰ Soikkanen 2003b, 423.

²⁵¹ Soikkanen 2003a, 335.

²⁵² Soikkanen 2003b, 423.

²⁵³ Klinge 2005.

²⁵⁴ See Soikkanen 2003a, 423. Kekkonen wrote in his diary that "Munkki is one derelict villain, yet, we have to keep nominating him to the offices of the Foreign Ministry!". Cited in Soikkanen 2003b, 423.

that there was certain disappointment that could be discerned in the Federal Republic with regards to the Finnish foreign policy's solution to the problem of treating both German states equally. However, according to him, in general, officials' as well as private citizens' dispositions towards Finland were benign and friendly in their essence, despite the disappointment that the relations between these two countries had not developed further.²⁵⁵

However, despite his views concerning the representation, it seemed according to Munkki that the only thing that could truly harm the relations was the possibility that Finland would develop its relations further with the German Democratic Republic. He had deducted this from the reactions of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office to the news that speculated Finland would recognize the German Democratic Republic. According to Munkki, during the previous year "a shadow had been cast on relations of Finland and the Federal Republic" by the newspaper articles that had speculated on the issue of Finland possibly pursuing the policy to recognize East Germany simultaneously with the Federal Republic. Munkki believed that the news had their origins in Moscow. However, despite the dubious sources of the news, they still had had an effect that consequently the officials from the Federal Republic's Foreign Office inquired him, on several occasions, concerning the validity of these rumors. This gave Munkki a boldness to warn the Finnish ministry that the previously mentioned approach most probably could have seriously hurt relations between Finland and the Federal Republic.²⁵⁶

Munkki's observations that pointed out the stark interest towards the Finnish form of representation were understandable: Finland was the only capitalist country in which East Germany held such high level of representation. For example, in Sweden, East Germany was represented through the government's trade body (*Kammer für Aussenhandel, KfA*), whose officials did not have diplomatic status but worked as the officials of KfA.²⁵⁷

In this light, it was also no wonder that Munkki did not see the Federal Republic's government as being satisfied with the status quo either and pointed out that Bonn was trying to secure a firmer lead in the representation. Munkki's evaluation was that the basic attitude of the Federal Republic's government was the same as before: their main goal in the relations with Finland was to achieve full diplomatic recognition. There was, however, a basic stipulation that Bonn was not willing to pay: the price of Finland recognizing Pankow Government as well.²⁵⁸

²⁵⁵ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 19 January 1956, "Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan suhteista vuonna 1955" p. 1.

²⁵⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 19.1.1956, "Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan suhteista vuonna 1955" p. 1.

²⁵⁷ Hentilä 2004, 32.

²⁵⁸ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 19 January 1956, "Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan suhteista vuonna 1955" p. 1.

Munkki's views appeared to reach the gist of issue at this point: according to the reporting of the Federal Republic's Helsinki trade mission, the West German Foreign Office was keen to observe any advances in the relations during this period. For example, in the report later that year, the West German mission in Helsinki reported the slightest signs of empathy in Finland towards the sole-representation claim of the Federal Republic. The mission had noted Finnish Foreign Minister Ralf Törngren's television speech that had emphasized the close relations of Finland to Germany, and most importantly, referred to East Germany as the *Ostzone*, East Zone. In the report, the term was emphasized by bold letters.²⁵⁹ This evaluation, was of course, positive, as Törngren had not mentioned the official name of the East German state.

The willingness of Bonn to further relations with Finland could also be interpreted from the official statements of Bonn. Munkki wrote that the recent statement of Bonn with regards to relations between the Federal Republic and Finland had been so plain and stripped off adjectives and plain that this could have been regarded as a possible sign of frustration with regards to relations between the two countries. Munkki saw reason for this in the rising profile of the Federal Republic on the international arena. In this context, the non-recognition policy of Finland could be seen as possibly tarnishing the façade of the Federal Republic's image and willingness to present itself as the sole representative of the German people. Munkki wrote, "considering the last year's development in the status of the Federal Republic on the international arena, it was hoped that the relations with Finland had "normalized" more than they had".²⁶⁰

As the previous discussion showed, Munkki was not very convinced of the rationality of the Finnish solution to the problem of representation. His report could not – or did not even strive – to hide the undertone that, in Munkki's view, there was a constant wish in the Federal Republic to advance the relations to the next level. It seemed also clear that Munkki himself was more than willing to promote this line of action. There was perhaps evidence already at this point of a clash of interpretations between Munkki and the Finnish foreign policymakers concerning the rationale of the Finnish policy. Munkki had obviously interpreted the last years' developments as positive, similarly to Western states and Adenauer, who had, in his speech concerning the entrance to NATO, emphasized that the inclusion of the Federal Republic in NATO was a sign that West Germany was on its way becoming a member of the community of independent and free nations on the world stage.²⁶¹ In fact, Munkki was not the first representative

²⁵⁹ PAAA B 23 bd. 13, telegram from the FRG trade mission in Helsinki 19 December 1956.

²⁶⁰ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 19 January 1956, "Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan suhteista vuonna 1955" p. 1.

²⁶¹ Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik, III.Reihe/Band .1961, p. 21. 9. Mai 1955: Erklärung des Bundeskanzlers Adenauer bei der Aufnahme der Bundesrepublik Deutschland in die NATO. "Ich danke im Namen der Bundesregierung und im Namen des deutschen Volkes den im Atlantikpakt vereinigten Mächten dafür, daß sie Deutschland auf den Weg in die Gemeinschaft der freien Nationen geleitet haben und daß sie

concerned with his status. The previous representative, Osmo Orkomies, had lamented to the ministry that the elevation of the title might be appropriate due to the on-going metamorphosis of West Germany to a "great power".²⁶² The rising status of his base country could be also the sole reason for Munkki's dissatisfaction with his humble office title. However, another reason could have been that the head of the Finnish foreign policymaking was now Kekkonen, not Paasikivi. Perhaps the initial proposition by Munkki for his humble office status is explained partly by his reverence towards the known stance of Paasikivi against the pompous titles of foreign representation. The former president regarded that small countries such as Finland did not need the titles of Embassy and Ambassador, which, in his view, belonged to the sphere of great powers.²⁶³

In fact, in Finland, the increasing profile and status of West Germany as part of the Western alliance, especially its rearmament through NATO, had caused worry in Kekkonen and Paasikivi. This was because Moscow had countered the threat they perceived in the West German rearmament by a note to European states sent on 13 November 1954, which suggested the creation of a collective European security system. Finnish foreign policy leadership, however, had managed to navigate a way to reply with the diplomatic declination to the Soviet note, which was, in its essence, a Soviet offensive against the arming of West Germany.²⁶⁴ However, the overt feeling of threat peaked in late 1954 and had already begun to wane during the latter half of 1955. At that point, West German extensive sovereignty (certain limits remained) was guaranteed²⁶⁵, and it joined NATO. The Soviet Union, in a Moscow conference in May 1955, initiated the Warsaw Pact alliance in the form of multilateral military co-operation treaties (which resembled in many respects the one Finland had signed with the Soviet Union in 1948) with the attending countries at the conference.²⁶⁶ A little later, on 7 June 1955, the Soviet Government invited Chancellor Adenauer to visit Moscow in order to discuss the establishment of the diplomatic relations between the Federal Republic and Soviet Union.²⁶⁷

Yet, if Munkki was increasingly concerned of the Finnish representation, just the opposite seemed to be taking place in East Berlin. As already mentioned, in East Berlin, the Finnish representative, Heikkilä, had initially received some pressure from East German officials. However, his reporting from the mid-1950s gave implications that this was no longer the case. He could already at that point evaluate that the actions of the East German officials "were pragmatic and not

mit uns zusammen sich zum Ziel gesetzt habe, Deutschland in Freiheit und Frieden wieder zu vereinigen."

²⁶² UM 6 O 5 SDT a-b, memo undated, quoting Orkomies' letter to kansliapäällikkö Tarjanne 25 April 1952.

²⁶³ Keränen 1990, 38.

²⁶⁴ Suomi 1990, 365-368.

²⁶⁵ Conference of the six European Defense Community Powers, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Canada was held in London on 3 October 1954. Selected documents on Germany and the question of Berlin 1944-1961, 12.

²⁶⁶ Suomi 1990, 374.

²⁶⁷ Selected documents on Germany and the Question of Berlin 1944-1961, 15.

implying dissatisfaction with regards the status of Finnish representation".²⁶⁸ Heikkilä's information of the benign disposition in East Germany was an indication of the larger shift in the East German foreign policy with regards to Finland. During this period, East Germans began to realize that it could only expect change in the level of its diplomatic relations with Finland if the international situation was altered or its own propaganda actions in Finland would start to bear fruit.²⁶⁹

When it came to etiquette and protocol questions, parity with the East German trade mission in Helsinki was suggested. Heikkilä could base his views on the enquiries he had done concerning the subject from the Protocol Chief of the German Democratic Republic, Ferdinand Thun. Heikkilä clarified that he had expressed having a wish to know the unofficial stand of the German Democratic Republic. This seemed to imply that Heikkilä was suggesting a certain discrepancy in official directions and on the practical level of handling these issues in East Germany. Heikkilä explained that in order to give some point of reference to Thun he had mentioned how the head of the German Democratic Republic's mission in Helsinki, Head Consul Bahr, had decided to execute his reception in Helsinki; it had been attended by Finland's Chair of the Parliament and Foreign Minister.²⁷⁰

Thun had stated that they considered it suitable to act in a similar manner as the consulate of the German Democratic Republic had operated in Helsinki. This meant, in other words, that the Finnish consulate was allowed to invite the Chairman of the People's Chamber (*Volkskammer*) and the Foreign Minister. In order to alleviate the burden of the Finnish mission concerning these questions, Thun had then delivered a list that contained names of the other persons that could be invited. He had continued by stating that the Protocol Department of the Ministry of Foreign Trade would provide their own list of people to be invited from the areas of trade and economy.²⁷¹ What is notable here is Thun's dividing of these lists to the different spheres of politics and commerce. In this respect, the report gave implications that the Finnish commercial consulate was already acknowledged to function as the Finnish political representation, and not merely as a commercial consulate, which it was by its official title.

According to Heikkilä, Thun had added that when it came to the diplomatic community, the Finnish consulate should invite the representatives of the countries that had diplomatic relations with Finland.²⁷² This, of course, also implied the diplomatic (or, interchangeably, the political) nature of the Finnish mission in the perception of East Germany's officials. Heikkilä's reporting was perhaps also reflecting the decision in the East German Foreign Ministry during this period to put the focus on the development of its Nordic relations with Sweden. Curiously enough, it seems that Finland's close relations with Moscow were the

²⁶⁸ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 8 January 1955, "Seremoniat Berliinissä" p. 1.

²⁶⁹ Hentilä 2003, 44.

²⁷⁰ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 8 January 1955, "Seremoniat Berliinissä" p. 1.

²⁷¹ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 8 January 1955, "Seremoniat Berliinissä" p. 1.

²⁷² UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 8 January 1955, "Seremoniat Berliinissä" p. 1.

motive for this policy change; in East Berlin it was realized that every policy alteration concerning Finland needed Moscow's approval.²⁷³ This, of course, then again pointed out, that Moscow was not, in any substantial manner, interested in pushing Finland's German relations by force to the direction of recognition of East Germany — despite the fact that the matter was sometimes discussed. Had any encouragement towards that direction come from Moscow, the German Democratic Republic would have been keen to hold on to that option.

Two years later in Cologne, Munkki, however, still felt that the representation's low status was harming the functionality of his office. He wrote: "Yours truly is well aware that the random and limited reporting executed does not compare qualitatively and quantitatively with the reporting of a normal mission."²⁷⁴ Perhaps his insistence on the matter was partly explained by the fact that the Finnish Foreign Ministry had already once elevated the status of Heikkilä and Munkki by titling them as consul generals (*pääkonsuli*) in 1954.²⁷⁵

However, the jaded representative also reported that mostly, on the level of praxis, the tasks assigned for his office could be executed normally. According to Munkki, there had been no alteration in this respect, and the administrative bodies in the Federal Republic responsible for its foreign policy were constantly sympathetic and understanding towards the basis of the Finnish foreign policy. He also noted the fact that the tender question of the special status of the Finnish representation was not even once addressed officially.²⁷⁶

Similar sympathetic disposition seemed to be stabilizing in East Berlin too. Olavi Wanne (1906–1970), the new representative in East Berlin who began his post in November 1957, sent the same message as his predecessor, Toivo Heikkilä, who had already noted that there were no more problems with Finnish representation's interaction with the administrative bodies of the German Democratic Republic. Wanne began his service of the ministry in 1932. His law degree (Master of Law, *ylempi oikeustutkinto*) subject was international law, and his Master of Arts degree consisted of studies of economics, practical philosophy, general history, and political science. In languages, Wanne was fluent in French, German, English, and Swedish.²⁷⁷ Before Cologne, he was posted to foreign assignments in Leningrad, Oslo, Riga, Ankara, and Budapest. He could therefore imbue his analysis with the credibility of an official with over 20 years of experience with varied posts abroad.²⁷⁸ According to him, the prevailing benign and unproblematic attitude towards the Finnish representation had been present in occasions such as his visit to the East German's representative to Finland.²⁷⁹

However, he still used the term satisfactory concerning the state of relations and, by this, was perhaps implying that the state of relations between Finland

²⁷³ Scholz 2007, 21.

²⁷⁴ UM report Cologne 22.2.1957, p 1.

²⁷⁵ UM 12 L SDT, Croney letter from R.R. Seppälä to T.H. Heikkilä 3 February 1954.

²⁷⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 22 February 1957 "Suomen ja Liittotasavallan suhteista v. 1956", p.2.

²⁷⁷ Baa Nimikirjat, UM, Olavi Wanne.

²⁷⁸ Ulkoasianhallinnon martikkeli 2, 283.

²⁷⁹ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 7.1.1958, "Suomen ja Itä-Saksan suhteista 1957", p. 1.

and East Germany was not completely approved. In his view, it was clear that East Germany was, with great precision, seeking all the possible signs that could lead to the addition of its diplomatic weight – which Wanne regarded to be non-existent outside the socialist bloc. He seemed to sense, however, that there was a change looming in the situation. In his view, the pursuit of the German Democratic Republic for a more prominent role in the international arena might ultimately lead to the establishment of more commercial consulates in East Berlin. Official circles in the German Democratic Republic had given this interpretation more basis by explaining to Wanne, with great satisfaction, how there was a plan to establish Egypt's (by its official state name known as the United Arab Republic during 1958–1971 as it had formed a short lived political union with Syria during 1958–1961, from here on referred to just as Egypt) commercial consulate to East Berlin.²⁸⁰ Wanne denied, however, there existing any pressures for transforming the status of Finnish representation and wrote that the question of elevating Finland's representation status had not been brought up in any form.

Wanne's remark concerning the disappearance of the overtly expressed wishes regarding the status of the Finnish mission indicated that, at this point, East Berlin had relinquished its efforts to achieve its ultimate goal: diplomatic recognition from Finland by influencing Finnish diplomats.²⁸¹ However, the notion in the East German leadership concerning Finland as the most probable Western nation to recognize the German Democratic Republic had not disappeared either. This was manifested just a couple of years later when the East German Foreign Ministry again launched a campaign for achieving diplomatic recognition from Finland at the turn of the 1950s and 1960s.²⁸² However, at least at the time of Wanne's report in early 1958, it did not include direct attempts to use Finnish diplomats in East Berlin for these purposes as had been the case in the early 1950s, exemplified by the pressure put on Finnish representative T.H. Heikkilä.²⁸³

Yet, even though the Finnish representation in East Berlin was left outside the crude persuasion attempts manifested earlier, the work towards the basic goal of the East Germany, its diplomatic recognition, had already begun on Finnish soil. On 30 May 1956, the meeting took place in Hotel Tornio which established the friendship society of Finland and the German Democratic Republic (*Suomi-DDR-Seura*). Finland's acknowledgement of the German Democratic Republic was actively propagated also by the German Democratic Republic's mission in Helsinki. The main form of its line of action in this regard was found in its strivings to form contacts with Finnish politicians and influence them.²⁸⁴

However, in East Berlin there also seemed to be, from time to time, hints that indicated the underlying basic configuration in East Berlin's foreign policy. This had been noted by Wanne when dealing with the bureaucratic dimension of

²⁸⁰ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 7.1.1958, "Suomen ja Itä-Saksan suhteista 1957", p. 1.

²⁸¹ It seems that the greatest push to influence Finland was executed by East German actions in Finland, see Putensen 2000.

²⁸² Hentilä 2004, 11, 30, 31.

²⁸³ See part 3, background discussion.

²⁸⁴ Hentilä 2004, 54, 55.

handling the matters in East Berlin. He informed the Ministry that in relation to a certain juridical matter—which he did not explicate—there had been mentioned that the normalization of the relations between Finland and the German Democratic Republic would have eased the resolving of the juridical issues. Wanne interpreted this as not only being a harmless side note, but a possible test of reactions and a possible implication of Finland's direction. However, after this observation, he continued by noting that, all in all, the attitude towards the Finnish mission had been, in every aspect, friendly in all the administrative bodies of the German Democratic Republic, and, most importantly, with the foreign ministry. Wanne had not noticed any sort of discrimination against Finland in these bodies. The only negative remark Wanne had was concerning the bureaucratic rigidity of the system, but this he attributed belonging to the generic features of the East German "system".²⁸⁵

The system was, in fact, a radical change to the previous one that had prevailed during the Third Reich and Weimar era. In its essence, it had formed a total transformation, even in comparison to the similarly totalitarian National Socialist system. National Socialism had left basic institutions of society such as bureaucracy and property in landed estates and industries largely untouched. However, the new East German socialist ideology, and especially the party-controlled state and society, demanded the radical reform of the bureaucracy as well.²⁸⁶ According to Jean-Claude Garcia-Zamor, who has studied East German bureaucracy, the new administration was rigid and the civil servants were extremely keen on adhering to the official rules of the system—even to the extent of becoming illogical. This was—at least partly—explained by the notion that, in East Germany, the rules of administration were the glue that held the society together. It was, however, in many respects viewed as modern but still diverting from the classical definition of bureaucracy by Max Weber.²⁸⁷

Wanne returned to the subject of commercial relations and assured that they were developing without delays or problems by either party's actions. The ministry of trade was, according to him, friendly in their interaction with the Finnish office and the continuance of the trade seemed to be already certain for the year 1958 as well. In his analysis of trade, he also noted that the Leipzig fair had gone well and East Germans had been especially elated because there had been a member of the Finnish government among the visitors.²⁸⁸

What is notable here is the purely informative style of Wanne to inform of the visit of the Finnish government member to East Germany despite that this was an obvious act in favor of the German Democratic Republic's international prestige. When it came to foreign policy victories, there were almost none of them for East Berlin during the 1950s—especially with regards to the Western states. Fin-

²⁸⁵ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 7 January 1958, "Suomen ja Itä-Saksan suhteista 1957", p. 2.

²⁸⁶ Garcia-Zamor 2004, 4.

²⁸⁷ Garcia-Zamor 2004, 5. See Weber 1980/1925, 551-579.

²⁸⁸ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 7 January 1958, "Suomen ja Itä-Saksan suhteista 1957", p. 2.

land formed an exception in this respect and, the fact that Finnish politicians participated in events such as the Leipzig fair was propaganda as well as a foreign policy victory for the East Germans. Even though the fair was nominally concentrated on trade, the event had political implications too. Especially since in the German Democratic Republic everything, even the culture, was seen as a medium for politics.²⁸⁹ Wanne's remarks can only be understood in the light of the new emerging political culture of postwar Finland where it was more suitable to advocate friendly relations with East Germany than with West Germany. This was exemplified by the fact that the friendship society between Finland and the German Democratic Republic (*Suomi-DDR-seura*) was formed in 1956, whereas the similar society for Finland's relations with West Germany was formed four years later, in 1960. This was explained already in the introductory section which discussed the matter of Finland's complete inversion of its foreign policy after the Second World War. The image of West Germany was linked to the historical Germany, the root of the Finnish intellectual as well as artistic culture, but also to the war era Germany, and Finland's alliance with it. Even more precisely, the friendship society with West Germany could be interpreted as a continuum of a war era Finno-German Association (*Suomalais-Saksalainen seura*), which naturally contained a reference to the war era National Socialist Germany.²⁹⁰

However, as the discussion in this part has pointed out, it seems that according to reporting that the aforementioned political aspects did not intervene with the functionality of the missions. The parity in relations was accepted by both, East German as well as West German foreign ministries, shown by the unhindered praxis in the actions of the missions – despite the fact that the solution was not ideal for either one of the German states.

3.1.2 Status of the missions as a source of confusion

However, despite the trade missions seeming to be functioning well (especially in matters imbued on them by their appellation alone, trade), the symbolic functionality of missions as beacons of neutrality was more dubious. It became evident during the appointment of the new Soviet ambassador to East Berlin. Munkki had intended to make a visit to the Russian embassy to welcome the new representative. However, the Russians had been confused by the status of the trade mission and declined the visit of Munkki to meet the new Ambassador Zorin. Instead, Munkki was visited by an official from the Soviet representation,

²⁸⁹ Janhunen 1997, 80; for comprehensive research on East German society, see e.g. Fullbrook 2005; Dale 2006; Leonhard 1990. E.g. in 1960 the East German news agency ADN relayed the news of Kekkonen's son, MP Matti Kekkonen visiting the fare and lauding the great efforts of East Germany for the peace. He also noted the importance of developing relations further between Finland and East Germany. (UM 12 L SDT Uusi Suomi article "Sama tahti on askelten: Matti Kekkonen ylistys I-Saksalle 4 March 1960.)

²⁹⁰ Hentilä 2004, 59.

Minister-Counsellor Kudrow, who was interested in the status of the Finnish office.²⁹¹

The overtures leading to the final arrangement of the visit exemplified how normative rules are constructed in practice in international diplomacy. Zorin had first approached Munkki by letter informing him that he had left his mandate to Federal President Heuss. Consequently, Munkki had replied by an inquiry when he could visit Zorin. Munkki informed the Finnish Foreign Ministry that he wished to be the one to make the visit, as this was the correct approach according to discussions with the protocol section of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office. Munkki clarified that, when he had discussed this matter with the protocol department, it had also been considered generally better that Munkki, as the head of the trade mission, would, in his reply letters, ask for the first visit and not wait for the new head of the particular foreign representative office to come visit him.²⁹²

One week later, the Soviet embassy asked Munkki if he was able to meet Minister-Counsellor Kudrow. Munkki had strived to retain his protocol orders and pleaded for the possibility to make the first visit. An adamant reply of the Soviet Embassy retained the stance that Kudrow should make the first visit. After the realization of Kudrow's visit, Munkki stated that the Minister-Counsellor had been interested in the status of Munkki's office. Munkki pursued extinguishing the curiosity of the Russian by informing of the pragmatic beginnings of the office, he had noted that it was originally founded in 1952 to handle the rising trade and consular relations between Finland and the Federal Republic. However, he admitted that the officials of the mission also held diplomatic rights and status.²⁹³

The motive behind the Soviets' intrigue with the Finnish mission had been probably at least partly revealed by their keenness to learn what the status of the Finnish mission in Berlin was. Perhaps with some relief, Munkki was able to truthfully state that the statuses of the two missions were exactly equal and that they held similar rights and privileges. Munkki had clarified that the arrangement was tantamount to the statuses and relations of the two German missions in Helsinki.²⁹⁴

It seems that this uncertainty of Kudrow regarding the status of the Finnish mission in Cologne and Berlin was not a limited phenomenon in the ranks of the other diplomats. According to Finnish representative Jaakko Ahokas in Prague, even two years after Munkki's report there was still confusion among his diplomatic colleagues concerning the statuses of the Finnish missions in the two Ger-

²⁹¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 26 January 1956, "Neuvostoliiton suurlähetystö ja edustusto".

²⁹² UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 26 January 1956, "Neuvostoliiton suurlähetystö ja edustusto", p. 1.

²⁹³ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 26 January 1956, "Neuvostoliiton suurlähetystö ja edustusto", p. 1.

²⁹⁴ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 26 January 1956, "Neuvostoliiton suurlähetystö ja edustusto", p. 1.

man states. It appeared that the Western diplomats were judging Finnish representation in the light of other neutral Western countries, as among them was, according to Ahokas, a common presumption that the Finnish representation in Cologne had diplomatic rights, whereas the representation in East Berlin was only an unofficial representative office.²⁹⁵ Marko Janhunen, who has studied East Germany's efforts to achieve diplomatic recognition from Finland, has also noted the same phenomenon. According to him, the personnel of the Soviet Union's mission in Helsinki were quite unaware of the Finnish German policy and its rationale was based on their reporting to the Kremlin.²⁹⁶

After reporting of the details of Kudrow's visit, Munkki contemplated what had been the meaning of the Soviet Union embassy only having sent Minister-Counsellor to visit and not Ambassador Zorin himself. In Munkki's view, it was difficult to give an opinion of what the Embassy of the Soviet Union wished to emphasize by the peculiar way it carried out the first personal contact to the Finnish mission. So far, no other representative office had chosen the same method. Munkki considered especially odd the Soviet approach in the light of the recent past, as he had already previously met Ambassador Zorin. Munkki's interpretation was that it was possible that by delegating the first contact to the second highest ranking officer after ambassador the Soviet Embassy wished to send a message to officials of the Federal Republic that the Soviet Union did not consider Finland's representation in the Federal Republic to be normal. On the other hand, Munkki noted, it was also possible that the Soviet Union wished to send a similar message to Finland. In both cases, the message would have been, in its simplicity, that the Finnish head of the office was not comparable to other heads of the offices in the Federal Republic. Munkki did not take a stance whether the implicit message had been in fact strictly protocol related, or if it had also contained political implications. These options of course did not exclude each other. In any case, Munkki wrote that after the visit he felt that he could not directly approach Ambassador Zorin but instead had to seek the consultancy of Minister-Counsellor first. This sudden drop to a second class in the diplomatic hierarchy was clearly something Munkki felt uneasy about, given his twenty-year career in the Foreign Service.²⁹⁷

As Munkki already noted, there is not one clear-cut explanation to the contested protocol issues that had transpired between the Finnish mission and the Soviet Embassy. For one thing, there is no doubt that the Soviet foreign policy-making was bureaucratic and complex. In it, the leaders, in collaboration with the politburo, made the most important decisions. Generally, however, foreign policymaking involved four bodies that were interlinked in the decision-making process: the politburo, the central committee, the foreign ministry, and the international department.²⁹⁸ It is not an unlikely situation that the details, such as the Finnish form of representation in Germany, could have been lost in the criss-

²⁹⁵ UM 7 D II 304 report Prague 25 September 1958, "Saksa ja Tsekkoslovakia".

²⁹⁶ Janhunen 1997, 61.

²⁹⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 26 January 1956, "Neuvostoliiton suurlähetystö ja edustusto", p. 2.

²⁹⁸ Roberts 1999, 12.

crossing of information between the multiple bodies. Viktor Vladimirov, a former Soviet diplomat who was stationed in Finland for four decades from 1955 on, gives some indication of the logic of the Soviet diplomacy in his memoirs. According to him, a good diplomat was not evaluated on the basis of information he was able to achieve; more important was the diplomat's ability to influence the host country and its politicians.²⁹⁹ In this respect, if there was not a genuine confusion in question, the actions of the Soviet Union's embassy could have been directed towards the Federal Republic's foreign office and government, not towards the Finnish consulate.

According to reports, the aforementioned case was not the sole case of confusion with regards to the Finnish representation in divided Germany. Later the same year Munkki reported concerning another incident that supports the view that the Finnish form of representation was in fact somewhat of a vague solution. The situation was spawned by the rumors implying Syria's possible partial recognition of the German Democratic Republic, more precisely, its plans to establish a consular office in Damascus. Rumors had originated from the Associated Press News Agency from news that claimed West Germany's representative to Syria had protested the Syrian government's intention to allow the German Democratic Republic to open a consular office in Damascus.³⁰⁰

Munkki wrote, after attending a news conference of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office concerning the matter, that the representatives of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office were already discussing the matter in a much calmer fashion than they had previously. They had given an impression that Bonn would have nothing against the German Democratic Republic opening an office to attend to the German Democratic Republic's commercial interests in Syria. They had also emphasized that the Federal Republic had, so far, no such information that would imply that this kind of body would assume a form that would include the recognition of the German Democratic Republic's government by Syria.³⁰¹

In order to buttress this message, Bonn gave, on 11 October 1956, another warning to Damascus. Instructions for the West German envoy, Hans-Joachim von der Esch, in brief, emphasized that the Federal Republic would not condone dual representation of Germany. Therefore, the Syrian government should not allow the East German consulate to operate in Damascus, and especially they should not grant an *exequatur* to East German representative. After a while, the Syrian president, al-Quwatli, met von der Esch and assured him that he had stopped certain factions of Syria's political life to bring about the representation of East Germany. However, Syria had decided to opt for the model of Egypt and allow a trade mission with limited consular rights.³⁰²

However, from Finland's viewpoint, the most interesting aspect of the situation was the comparison of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office official,

²⁹⁹ Vladimirov 1993, 28.

³⁰⁰ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 26 October 1956, "Saksan Liittotasavallan ja Syyrian suhteista", p. 1.

³⁰¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 26 October 1956, "Saksan Liittotasavallan ja Syyrian suhteista", p. 1.

³⁰² Gray 2003, 67.

which had juxtaposed Finland with Syria. The official in question had referred to Finland as a positive example with regards to the relations of East Germany with so-called “third countries”, the term referring to the relations with any other country than West Germany. He had remarked that Helsinki already had the kind of office that was executing the mission of promoting East Berlin’s commercial interests abroad, and that the government of the Federal Republic had not taken any actions against this form of relations.³⁰³

This comparison pointed once again to the vague nature of Finnish representation in the German states. It implied that the representation’s vague status was not a solely negative phenomenon but could – as the Syrian case showed – function in a positive manner helping West Germans to convince outside world that the representation that was attending to the commercial matters were not a diplomatic recognition of the *de facto* form. This positive view was also a necessity in the context of the previous statement from the Allied Powers in 1949 in the aftermath of the official recognition of the German Democratic Republic by the socialist states of Eastern Europe as well as by China and North Korea. It had noted that any governmental level relations that could be interpreted as either *de facto* or *de jure* recognition would be avoided by the Allied Powers.³⁰⁴ This statement had, in its essence, stated that there would be no difference between the official and semi-official diplomatic relations. As the Allied Powers partly controlled West Germany, it was clear that Bonn was indirectly a party to his proclamation. In fact, even in the United States, the National Security Council was willing to pick the positive from the ambivalent Finnish position; later in the decade they were willing to utilize Finland as an example for the promotion of more independent role for the Soviet satellites of Eastern Europe.³⁰⁵ Of course, one could ask if this juxtaposition was very flattering.

In this light, it is understandable why the Federal Republic’s Foreign Office might resort publicly to quite a far-fetched interpretation of the Finnish representation and omit certain facts from its functioning. Contrary to the public light-hearted approach to Finnish representation manifested by the Syrian case, in their confidential inner exchange of information, the West German Foreign Office was, in reality, concerned that Finland’s East Berlin mission formed a potential harmful gateway towards the status of true statehood of East Germany. On behalf of this interpretation proves on its part the scrutiny that they had targeted at the end of the previous year to the invitations of certain West Berlin diplomats to the celebration held in honor of Finnish Independence Day in Finland’s East Berlin mission. The Foreign Office was concerned if the invitations in fact held political implications regarding the status of the Finnish East German mission in the political dimension.³⁰⁶

³⁰³ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 26 October 1956, “Saksan Liittotasavallan ja Syyrian suhteista”, p. 1.

³⁰⁴ Scholz 2007, 16, 17.

³⁰⁵ Vares 2002, 40.

³⁰⁶ PAAA, B 23, bd. 13. telegram of the Federal Republic’s Foreign Office 13 December 1955.

The willingness of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office to publicly belittle the importance of the Finnish trade mission in East Berlin in the wake of the Syrian incident had stirred a widespread interest in the diplomatic circles of Bonn. Olavi Munkki reported that he had managed to gather more information regarding the incident from Swedish ambassador Jödahl. Jödahl's views were especially of interest as he had discussed the matter with the creator of the Hallstein Doctrine, State Secretary Walter Hallstein, as well as with the Syrian representative.³⁰⁷

Jödahl had inquired State Secretary Hallstein how the case of Syria Adenauer's declaration of the Hallstein Doctrine (which had stated that the Federal Republic would reconsider its relations with any such third nation that would recognize the German Democratic Republic) would apply. Hallstein had, according to Jödahl, answered that the statement was still valid, and that the Federal Republic's Foreign Office would still find it necessary to reconsider its relations with any such nation that would take any such actions which could be considered as a recognition of East Germany. However, the founding of the trade mission would not be considered as such an action, even in the case that it would handle certain consular functions as well. Yet, if a consular exequatur was to be granted, this would be considered as stepping inside the boundaries of the Hallstein Doctrine.³⁰⁸

The Syrian representative had been, according to Jödahl's narration, baffled by the obscurity of the situation regarding the representation and its permitted forms. Especially the representative had been surprised by the strong reaction in the West German press. He found it odd since his office was in fact going to be a trade mission, which would handle, however, certain consular functions. In this regard, he had been very interested how Finland had organized its representation in East Germany. The West German Foreign Office's answer had not, however, given a clear answer for the Syrian. This implied that the Foreign Office was not comfortable explicating the reality of the Finnish representation and its true implications. Especially the Syrian case was revealing as it gave the first strong indications of the special status that Finland was afforded in West Germany.

These cases discussed above (the case of Syria as well as the narration of the confusion concerning the protocol questions with the Soviet Union embassy) reveal that the Finnish form of representation was, at this point, considered by multiple parties as a vague solution. Even nations with such vital interests in Finland as the Soviet Union had were not aware of the intricacy of the Finnish German policy. However, this did not stop the Federal Republic from exploiting the vagueness politically. Therefore, when it came to problematic situations such as Syria, they could refer to the Finnish "model" as an example. This case, as already mentioned, began to reveal the special status of Finland's representation. Further

³⁰⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 26 October 1956, "Saksan Liittotasavallan ja Syyrian suhteista", p. 2.

³⁰⁸ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 26 October 1956, "Saksan Liittotasavallan ja Syyrian suhteista", p. 2.

clarification on the situation was to follow indirectly through the Federal Republic's own stance regarding the trade mission as a representative form. This will be discussed next.

3.1.3 The Federal Republic unwillingness to use the commercial consulate of representation in its own foreign relations

As the reporting discussed above showed, in the Federal Republic as well as in the German Democratic Republic, there seemed to exist a fair tolerance of the Finnish form of representation. This did not, however, mean that the foreign office of the Federal Republic was willing to use the same *modus operandi* itself.³⁰⁹ Olavi Munkki had become aware of this matter already in March 1955. One of his reports from that period explicated the attitude of the Federal Republic's foreign office with regards to the diplomatic representation executed through trade missions. At the same time, the report indicated how careful the Federal Republic was at this point with its relations with the Eastern group countries.

Munkki delved into the subject from the viewpoint of the Federal Republic's relations with its socialist neighboring countries, or "countries of the Eastern group", as Munkki referred to them.³¹⁰ The Federal Republic's official and semi-official bodies, Munkki noted, had established commercial treaties with certain countries of the "Eastern group"; the countries in question were Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania. Contrary to their example with the Soviet Union or the Albanian Federal Republic, Bonn had no kind of relations at all, and the same rule applied for Asian states belonging to the Eastern group.³¹¹ According to Munkki, the currently enforced arrangements, disregarding one exception, were based on those commercial treaties that were signed via the Joint Export-Import Agency (JEIA), the body that was founded by American and British occupying forces in 1949 to handle West Germany's trade in their sectors. Munkki thought it was probable that without this organization it would have been impossible for the Federal Republic to make trade treaties with the Eastern countries.

In his analysis, Munkki seemed to have managed to reach some of the logic behind Bonn's Eastern relations – at least when it came to how its Eastern relations might have affected Finnish policy. The reporting from Helsinki by West German representative K.K. Overbeck affirmed that the Federal Republic was, at this period, on guard regarding the possible implications its own relations had for the credibility of its demand for sole representation in the case of Finland. Overbeck noted for Foreign Office that in case the Federal Republic should establish direct relations with "certain" countries of the Eastern group, Finland

³⁰⁹ However, in 1957 there were speculations by Adenauer whether the trade representation might be possible in Eastern capitals (Gray 2003, 74).

³¹⁰ "Itä-alueen valtiot" (UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 30 March 1955, "Liittotasavallan suhteet ns. Itä-alueen valtioihin").

³¹¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 30 March 1955, "Liittotasavallan suhteet ns. Itä-alueen valtioihin", p. 1.

might draw conclusions from this. His upshot was according to his knowledge gathered from the Finnish Foreign Ministry that Finns would then consider it legitimate to have equal diplomatic representation by both German states in Helsinki.³¹²

The blooming relations of Bonn with Eastern group countries did not only cause a certain amount of aggravation in the Federal Republic's foreign office. A memo from the Foreign Office revealed that the Finnish representative to Bonn during 1961-1963, Torsten Tikanvaara, had "grieved" when reminiscing with West German Foreign Office officials about the establishment of these Eastern relations by Bonn. This memo reveals that there had existed, in Tikanvaara's view, a window of opportunity for Finland to tilt westwards in its German policy at that point. In the wake of the Bonn's renewed Eastern relations, there had been an failed effort—either by Federal Republic's Foreign Office or by the Finnish Foreign Ministry, or by them both—to raise the title of the Finnish representative in Cologne as well as the title of the West German representative in Helsinki. Foreign Office even speculated that Tikanvaara's brief tenure as a representative might have been explained by this failed attempt to elevate his title.³¹³

The interest of foreign office extended also to the titles of the East German mission in Helsinki. For example, in 1963, some anxiety for West Germans was caused by the change in the title of the East German head of the mission. The earlier titles that had been appropriated had been more modest in their reference to the East German head of the mission, titles such as counsellor ("Conseiller") and secretary ("Secrétaire") had been used to refer to him in the Finnish diplomatic index. Concern of the West German representative in Helsinki, Heinrich Böx was aroused when the title was, in 1963, discreetly and apparently without the notification of West Germans, changed to the more diplomatic—and somewhat pompous—sounding "*Envoyé extraordinaire et Ministre plénipotentiaire*".³¹⁴ Initially, Foreign Office did not seem to be alarmed by Böx's information. However, a few months later when the diplomatic index in Finland had apparently overstepped the boundaries set by the *Alleinvertretungsanspruch*, demand for the sole representation of the German people by the Federal Republic. The Finnish index referred to the East German mission as "The Representation of the German Democratic Republic in Finland", *Vertretung der Deutschen Demokratik Republik in*

³¹² PAAA, B 23, bd. 93 report from the K.K. Overbeck 16 October 1958, "Finnisches Interesse an der Entwicklung der Beziehungen zwischen der Bundesrepublik und den Oststaaten". Report stated "Wenn dann in Warschau die Bundesrepublik durch eine Handelsdelegation und die Sowjetisch besetzte Zone durch eine Botschaft vertreten seien, so könne von gewisser Seite aus der finnischen Regierung nahegelegt werden, eine ähnliche Regelung zu treffen".

³¹³ PAAA B23 bd. 227, FRG Foreign Office memo circa November 1963, "Aufzeichnung: über die Persönlichkeit des Finnischen Generalkonsuls Dr. Karl Torsten Tikanvaara".

³¹⁴ PAAA, B23 bd. 227 report from H. Böx 28 June 1963, "Führung diplomatischer Titel im Finnischen Diplomatenverzeichnis". FRG Foreign Office seemed to actually address the issue with a slight retaliation. They demanded the change of the title of the Finnish trade mission's press assistant from press attaché to a title of consul or vice consul (PAAA, B23, bd. 228, 20 May 1963, "Anmeldung zum Protokollverzeichnis für Angehörige der finnischen Handelsvertretung").

Finnland. Bonn's Foreign Office got anxious. The office suggested, for Böx, a possibility of a demarche in the Finnish Foreign Ministry. However, the Foreign Office advised Böx that, at this same occasion, he should emphasize that they possessed understanding of the reasons behind Finland's German policy.³¹⁵

Back in 1955, Munkki, on the other hand, summed that the relations of Bonn with each country seemed to be quite identical and that trade was extremely controlled and licenses were needed for each particular trade interaction. After the discussion concerning each particular country, the report also included the official titles of their representative offices, and all of the offices held a title referring to a commercial representative office.³¹⁶

Munkki had noted already, at this point, the same aspect of the Federal Republic's relations with East European countries that he would also express later in his reporting. He noted that there was a conflict between the Adenauer regime foreign policy and with the interests of the business circles of the Federal Republic: most of the East European countries held some kind of commercial representation in West Germany whereas the Federal Republic did not hold any kind of representation, official or semi-official, in these countries. The disparity in relations that Munkki explicated indicated once again that the Finland's solution to representation was in fact unique, and from the viewpoint of prestige not suitable for Bonn at this stage. Munkki stated that "There has not been success in finding a form for the Federal Republic's representation that would fulfill the commercial needs and at the same time would be politically suitable".³¹⁷

In short, Munkki's information showed for the Finnish Foreign Ministry that its counterpart in the Federal Republic had reservations with regards to any form of representation in the German Democratic Republic and imbued political implications even for the offices that would only handle commercial matters. So far the question had been solved by using a sort of proxy agency: the Joint Export-Import Agency JEIA. By handling the Federal Republic's trade matters through JEIA, Bonn had managed to dodge the need to establish actual representation in the socialist countries of the East. The direct contact with these countries via established missions in these countries were, according to Munkki, at this point considered too much of a giveaway for the German Democratic Republic with regards to admitting its existence as a *de jure* state. The importance of the matter of representation was emphasized also by the fact that, despite the pressures

³¹⁵ PAAA, B23, bd 227. FRG's Foreign Office to representative H. Böx 17 December 1963, "Tätigkeit der Handelsvertretung SBZ in Finnland".

³¹⁶ Titles of the offices were: Polnische Handelsvertretung (Poland), Vertretung Tschechoslowakischer Aussenhandelsgesellschaften (Czechoslovakia), Vertretung der Bulgarischen Aussenhandelsunternehmen (Bulgaria), Vertreter der ungarischen Aussenhandelsunternehmen (Hungary), Vertreter der rumänischen Staatsgesellschaft für Einfuhr und Ausfuhr (Romania), (UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 30 March 1955).

³¹⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 30 March 1955, "Liittotasavallan suhteet ns. Itä-alueen valtioihin", p. 5. "...ei ole onnistuttu löytämään edustukselle muotoa, joka samalla kuin se tyydyttäisi kaupalliset vaatimukset olisi poliittiset näkökohdat huomioon ottaen perustettavissa." (UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 30 March 1955).

from the business circles towards the more functional Eastern relations, Bonn had held on to its stance in the matter.

It became, in the following years, more and more evident for the Federal Republic's Foreign Office that when it came to trade missions they could function as a political bridgehead. This was indicated by the activity taken by the East German representation in Helsinki and its resources for executing this function. The staff of the representation increased throughout the 1950s and had, by 1960, grown fourfold compared to the West German trade mission. A good indicator of the East German activity is given by comparing that the West German mission was representing a state with three times the population of East Germany, and exceeded in its trade with Finland East Germany tenfold.³¹⁸

This painstaking carefulness Munkki was implicating with regards to Bonn's representation and the guarding of the form of its Eastern diplomacy was more openly discerned later on, in the beginning of the 1960s during the transition era from Adenauer to Erhard government. Despite Gerhard Schröder, who guided the foreign policy during the transition, being more of a pragmatist especially regarding trade with the Eastern nations, he was still adamant to make sure that, at that point, established trade missions in the East European countries were circumscribed – unlike the Finnish missions in Germany – to solely trade matters and would not exercise diplomatic functions.³¹⁹ However, in the inner exchange of information of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office, the Finnish representation in East Germany was held tantamount with the representation of East European countries (that had recognized East Germany) in East Berlin.³²⁰ Therefore, in reality, in the case of Bonn establishing relations with its East European neighbors, Finland's representative position vis-à-vis West Germany would not have differed from these East European countries had Finland recognized the German Democratic Republic or not.

At least part of the explanation for Bonn's continuing adamant position in the issue was that parallel representation with the German Democratic was, during this period, especially delicate as it was only the previous year's spring when the Western allies had launched a diplomatic backing of the Federal Republic's demand for sole representation. On 5 April 1954, France, Britain, and the United States had agreed that their diplomatic corps would promote a non-recognition policy towards East Germany. Diplomats of these nations were to make sure that their host governments understood that it was crucial for Western allies that as few nations as possible recognized the Pankow government.³²¹ It was considered that the more prestige the German Democratic Republic gained in international politics, the harder it was for Western allies to reach a pleasant solution concerning Germany in negotiations with the Soviet Union. Yet, it seemed that the Federal Republic could be quite creative coming up with interpretations of the status

³¹⁸ Hentilä 2004, 36.

³¹⁹ Gray 2003, 142.

³²⁰ PAAA B 23 bd. 228, FRG Foreign Office memo 20 July 1963.

³²¹ Gray 2003, 23.

questions when it came to the demand of sole representation. This was exemplified not only in the previously discussed Syrian case, but also on the eve of the Geneva conference of July 1955 and the impending establishment of the diplomatic relations between Bonn and Moscow. The new West German foreign minister, Heinrich von Brentano, had stated in a press conference that parallel representation of German states, whether it was consular representation with diplomatic rights or full diplomatic representation, did not mean that the represented countries (meaning two German states) acknowledged each other either *de jure* or *de facto*. He especially mentioned Helsinki as an example of parallel representation.³²²

This remark of Brentano, combined with the reporting of Munkki, revealed once again the curious paradox in the relations of Finland and the Federal Republic during this period. The policy of Finland, that was extremely unpleasant for the Federal Republic, was presented now in the Federal Republic's foreign policy discourse as its mirror image: the Finnish German policy was an example of the successful representation of both German states. This was, to say the least, a remarkable manifestation in the trickery of parlance from the Federal Republic's Foreign Office. It also explains why the West German Foreign Office was constantly interested in the official appellation or status of the Finnish mission, and not so much in its practical functioning.³²³ The need to appropriate Finnish German policy as an example required keeping it on the level of its official title.

Documents of the West German Foreign Office show that, at least partly, the tolerance of Bonn towards the Finnish equal representation in the German states emanated from the fact that Finnish diplomats in Germany were clearly oriented towards the old bourgeoisie Germany that the Federal Republic represented. This had much to do with the fact that the diplomats coming from the Finnish age cohort that was affected deeply by the German culture in early 1900s, a period that saw a transnational phenomenon of extraordinary amount of intellectual and artistic exchange between Scandinavian countries and Germany.³²⁴ Consequently, the Finnish diplomats were almost always fluent in the German language, and it is reasonable to assume that they, more importantly, due to their cultural background, held a strong stance of anti-communism. This was not only

³²² UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 16 June 1955, "Tilanteesta ennen konferensseja", p. 3.

³²³ See section 3.1.3 and PAAA B 23 bd. 13, telegram from Koenning 30 December 1955; PAAA, B23, bd. 227 FRG Foreign Office to representative H. Bök 17 December 1963, "Tätigkeit der Handelsvertretung SBZ in Finnland"; PAAA B23 bd. 227, report from H. Bök 28 June 1963, "Führung diplomatischer Titel im Finnischen Diplomatenverzeichnis". FRG Foreign Office seemed to actually address the issue with the slight retaliation. They demanded the change of the title of the Finnish trade mission's press assistant from press attaché to a title of consul or vice consul (PAAA B23 bd. 228, 20 May 1963, "Anmeldung zum Protokollverzeichnis für Angehörige der finnischen Handelsvertretung").

³²⁴ Lane 2000, 21; Laukkanen & Parry 2014, 9. For the common roots of the Finnish political culture with Germany, see Ihalainen 2016b, 96. There was also an attempt to have the German Prince of Hessen, Friedrich Karl, throned as the legitimate king of Finland (see Vares 1998).

shown indirectly, but it was also shown in the reporting of Munkki and later in the evaluation of the Foreign Office concerning Torsten Tikanvaara's grievance over the missed possibility to elevate the level of West German representation in relation to East Germany in Finno-German relations.³²⁵ The foreign office documents directly show a positive evaluation of the officials too, and, at least in one case, they expressed their disposition openly for the West German diplomats as in the case of Finnish representative Thesleff in East Berlin, who had openly admitted his anti-communist stance and repulsion against communist administered Germany.³²⁶ Considering all this, it was clear that the Federal Republic's Foreign Office could feel, at least on some level, assurance despite the ambiguous Finnish solution to representation in divided Germany.

Yet, the reporting of Munkki showed that it was not only these factors that were alleviating the pressure against the Finnish solution of informally acknowledging East Germany. It was the pragmatic necessities posited by the growing foreign trade of West Germany that also forged Bonn's foreign policy at this point to a more lenient stance regarding its demand for the sole representation of the German people and state; it began to overtake the political expediency in Eastern relations. Munkki had obtained the information from inside the Federal Republic's Foreign Office, which revealed the interest to better Eastern relations especially from the standpoint of finding new markets. It had been brought up in the discussions between Munkki and the officials of the Foreign Office that the "official" Federal Republic already acknowledged the harms that ensued from the lack of representation in those countries.³²⁷

It was not only the economical strata of the Federal Republic that was allured towards the bettering of Eastern relations. There existed also political will for establishing relations with the Eastern countries, not only in the opposition party SPD, but also inside Adenauer's cabinet ally, FDP. The trailblazer in this matter inside FDP was the strong-willed Karl-Georg Pfeleiderer, who was also known as a critic of the Hallstein Doctrine. However, party leadership resisted the attempts to bring the more open Eastern policy to the public platform until their exited from the Adenauer's cabinet in 1956.³²⁸

Munkki summed up the situation in a way that he was perhaps at some level aware of these political undercurrents regarding the Eastern policy. He wrote that while the harm of the lack of diplomatic relations with the

³²⁵ PAAA B23 bd. 227, FRG Foreign Office memo circa November 1963, "Aufzeichnung über die Persönlichkeit des Finnischen Generalkonsuls Dr. Karl Torsten Tikanvaara".

³²⁶ Concerning Thesleff "Wenngleich er naturgemäss weder mit meinem Amtsvorgänger noch mit mir unmittelbare gesellschaftliche Beziehungen unterhalten hat, so zeigte er sich doch im Gespräch am dritten Ort stets freundlich und aufgeschlossen und machte aus seiner Abneigung gegen den Kommunismus und das sowjetische Staatswesen in Mitteldeutschland kein Hehl." (PAAA B23 bd. 13, report for FRG Foreign Office from Berlin 21 September 1957. See positive evaluation of Finnish Foreign Ministry's State Secretary T.O.Vahervaara (PAAA B2, bd. 13, report from German representative in Copenhagen 12 August 1957).

³²⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 30 March 1955, "Liittotasavallan suhteet ns. Itä-alueen valtioihin", p. 6.

³²⁸ Ahonen 2003, 123, 124.

Eastern countries had been acknowledged, at the same time, it had been emphasized that the current political situation most likely would not avail possibilities for the founding of official representative offices in the capitals of Eastern group countries.³²⁹

In the analysis section discussing the information presented, Munkki noted that on the realization of the possibility that the victor states would arrive to uniformity on the German question and Germany would be united, the representation's problematics would be naturally solved. However, this he deemed very unlikely in the near future and speculated that the current divide of Germany would also prevail for a time to come. The speculations of Munkki were quite real-political – and even somber – in the light of the some of the contemporary thinking of the period. For example, a few months later, during the Geneva Summit, British Prime Minister Anthony Eden saw two reasons that might give impetus to the unification of Germany: a unified Germany as a mitigating factor for peace, and the increased destructive capabilities of war machinery (that made upholding the peace ever more important).³³⁰

Munkki, on the other hand, did not consider a flourishing future for uniting Germany under a two-state system either. He deemed that, in order to give momentum for the re-unification pursuit, the Federal Republic did not want to acknowledge the existence of the German Democratic Republic, and therefore it would not want to establish parallel representative offices, even if provided the chance, to the capitals of the Eastern group countries.³³¹ In his view, this would be the case even if the *de jure* Federal Republic's offices were only handling trade. Munkki's conjectures were based on the premise that the offices were, in any case, going to hold full diplomatic rights, and consequently they would have been compared to the German Democratic Republic's embassies resulting in a loss of prestige on the Federal Republic's part.

The information of Munkki seemed to be correct at least as long as the ruling party in West Germany was CDU/CSU, which was interested in the Eastern relations but not ready to advance as far as the opposition SPD³³². This was exemplified by the stymied suggestion by the West German Social Democrats to drive a more progressive Eastern policy. However, in this case, Finland once again interestingly entered the Federal Republic's politics. Yet, this time not as a positive example but as an untenable approach in having diplomatic representa-

³²⁹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 30 March 1955, "Liittotasavallan suhteet ns. Itä-alueen valtioihin", p. 6.

³³⁰ Statement by The Rt. Hon. Sir Anthony Eden, M.P., at the Second Meeting of Heads of Government in Geneva on 18 July 1955. Selected documents on Germany and the Question of Berlin 1944-1961. 1963, 215.

³³¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 30 March 1955, "Liittotasavallan suhteet ns. Itä-alueen valtioihin", p. 6.

³³² The concept of necessity of establishing relations with the Eastern socialist countries was originating largely from FDP's Karl Georg Pfeleiderer who had formulated the necessity of the relations in his speech in June 1952 in the city of Waiblingen (Bark & Gress 1989 (1), 375.

tion without actually having it. Social Democratic MP, Dr. Kalbitzer, had suggested that the Federal Republic should establish trade missions in Eastern countries in the similar manner they had done in Helsinki, parallel with East Germany's representative offices. However, Kalbitzer's suggestions had not been deemed as a viable option in the official circles of the Federal Republic, noted Munkki.³³³

Kabitzer's suggestion bolstered the general view of the report, which indicated for the Finnish Foreign Ministry that whatever the official link to the German Democratic Republic was going to be, it was still regarded very seriously among the politicians and officials of the Federal Republic. This cautiousness was extended to the countries of the Eastern group as well. Yet, from the perspective of Finland, the information offered a sobering point of view: it could be interpreted that the Federal Republic considered a representation, even in the form of trade missions, to be very close to official diplomatic representation. This was suggested by the fact that even trade missions in the capitals of the Eastern group were viewed as an unviable option. The reasoning behind this revealed the gist of the issue: such offices, despite being only sort of semi-official offices, were still evaluated to be competing in the prestige with the full diplomatic offices of the German Democratic Republic. One reason for the reluctance to use the trade missions as a form of representation could have rested in the very nature of the socialist states. As the commerce and industry in socialist states were state controlled, establishing trade relations through governmental bodies such as trade mission meant, in practice, establishing relations on a state-to-state level.³³⁴

Despite the pessimistic views Munkki initially posited, he was soon forced to revise, to some degree, his previous prognosis concerning the Eastern relations of the Federal Republic. The context of his revision were the events that took place against the background of the wish of the superpowers to stabilize the situation in Europe, evidenced during the Geneva Summit. Both sides, West and East, had seen that they would not gain any immediate new victories in Europe and decided to settle for the status quo. This new search for stability came in a multiplicity of forms, for example, it was manifested by the accession of the Federal Republic to NATO and the Soviet Union's renouncement of its promotion of Austrian-style neutrality in Europe. Instead, Moscow, at this point, pursued solidifying the Eastern alliance by signing the treaties of Friendship, Co-operation, and Mutual Assistance with Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Romania.³³⁵ Perhaps most evident, however, the spirit of this mini-détente was in the establishment of diplomatic relations between Moscow and Bonn (which was turning blind eye to the Hallstein Doctrine in this case).

Despite this general development, Munkki regarded the offer to establish diplomatic relations with the Federal Republic (in the form of a note from the

³³³ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 30 March 1955, "Liittotasavallan suhteet ns. Itä-alueen valtioihin", p. 6.

³³⁴ Gray 2003, 14.

³³⁵ Painter 1999, 33.

Soviet Union offered via its representative office in Paris), came as a surprise for Bonn. Munkki noted that something like this had been expected, but what actually had come to realization was more decisive than could have been presumed. A few days after the note's arrival, the government of the Federal Republic was forced once again to take a stance in the parallel representation of the German states. In the press conference, Foreign Minister von Brentano was asked if the parallel representation looming in Moscow could be executed without implicitly acknowledging the existence of two German states.³³⁶

In von Brentano's answer, Finland was used as an example, as it had already been used by the Federal Republic's Social Democrats and FDP. Now the full circle of the parties with a significant role in the Federal Republic's politics had taken a similar stance von Brentano, as a member of the CDU/CSU, took advantage of the vagueness of the Finnish solution. Yet, once again the Finnish analogy seemed to be something used as a foreign policy "cannon fodder" for the Federal Republic's foreign office when it came to its public stance and dealing with the press. In closer scrutiny, the Finnish solution could, however, easily be discerned in its unpleasant form that it posed for the West German Foreign Office.

This became evident from the information Munkki had received from the Foreign Office, von Brentano had emphasized that the situation in Moscow *was not* going to resemble situation in Helsinki. According to him, in Moscow, the Federal Republic would hold full diplomatic representation. Von Brentano had explained that the purpose of referring to Finland *was not to imply* that the representation in Helsinki was full diplomatic representation. Von Brentano had summed up by noting that the parallel diplomatic representation, whether it was representation with diplomatic rights or normal diplomatic representation, did not mean that the represented nations acknowledged each other *de facto* or *de jure*.³³⁷

Statements by the West German foreign minister were of course not tenable from any logical standpoint: what he was saying, in essence, was contradicting the Hallstein Doctrine. He was practically admitting that the Federal Republic approved diplomatic relations with such countries that also had diplomatic relations with the German Democratic Republic. After all, this was to be the case in Moscow – which by Bonn was regarded as an exception due to the power and weight of the Soviet Union. It seems that the reference to Finland was superimposed over the unpleasant fact that Bonn was contradicting its own doctrine, and used as a way to confuse the observers of Bonn's foreign policy.

Munkki concluded the report by noting that the Federal Republic had debunked all the speculations of the possibilities of the Soviet Union to drive a wedge between the Federal Republic and its Western allies. Bonn had made clear that in its Eastern relations, it abided with the common line of its allies. However, Munkki seemed to be pointing out the hypocrisy, not only in the case of the Hallstein Doctrine, but in the West German Eastern relations in general. He interpreted that the Federal Republic latently wished to normalize its relations with

³³⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 16 June 1955, "Tilanteesta ennen konferensseja", pp. 1, 2.

³³⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 16 June 1955, "Tilanteesta ennen konferensseja", p. 2.

the states of the Eastern region. However, he saw inimical ramifications in the progressive Eastern policy. In his view, the fast establishment of relations with the Soviet Union would serve more Soviet Union's interests than the Federal Republic's. His background in trade also made him capable of analyzing the economic aspects of the Federal Republic. He pointed out that neither the export and domestic production sectors were in a dire need for the establishment of relations in the East, as they already functioned on full capacity. In addition, the on-coming establishment of the West German army, *Bundeswehr*, was going to reserve part of that capacity in the near future.³³⁸

Regarding these endnotes of Munkki, it was clear that he did not see it as acutely necessary or even sensible for the Federal Republic to rush ahead in this looming Eastern policy. His report also pointed out the unpleasant fact that Finland was holding such representation in East Germany that was, at this point, an unviable option for the Federal Republic itself. It was not willing to go this far with its relations with the Eastern countries. However, the information he represented gave some pacification for Finnish foreign policymakers: it showed that Finland was given some breach in the logical integrity of its representation being a "non-representation". It also showed that Bonn was willing to take a similar stretch of imagination in its own foreign policy as well, otherwise it could not have explained the Hallstein Doctrine's adaptability in the case of diplomatic relations with Moscow.

To summarize, the discussion in these previous sections has, in general, shown that from the standpoint of functionality, the missions were fulfilling their task, despite being a vague solution. Yet, the fact that the representation was regarded as a sort of non-representation made the matter concerning their symbolic value as agents of Finland's neutrality another issue. This will be covered in the next section.

3.2 Foreign policy of neutrality and the question of Germany

3.2.1 Austria as an example

As discussed in the introduction chapter, from the mid-1950s on, Finland's German policy was becoming slowly but steadily linked with the Finnish neutrality, officially manifested in the memo of R.R. Seppälä, in which he had pondered the possibility of referring to the Paris Peace Treaty as the basis of Finland's non-recognition policy.³³⁹ In the memo he stated:

Recently certain circles in our country have proposed that Finland would have to officially contribute to the solution of the German question as part of the general peace campaign in Europe. When this matter is discussed it is necessary to keep in mind the

³³⁸ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 16.6.1955, "Tilanteesta ennen konferensseja", p. 4.

³³⁹ UM 7 D II 302, memo of R.R. Seppälä 16 February 1955, "Suomi ja Saksan kysymyksen ratkaisu".

10th article of the Paris Peace Treaties "Finland commits to acknowledge the peace treaties signed with Italy, Romania, Bulgaria, and Hungary and the full validity of other treaties and arrangements that the Allied Powers have in relation to Austria, Germany, and Japan in the benefit of the restoration of the peace." 2. Finland has made a peace treaty not only with the Soviet Union but also with Great Britain and other countries and the treaty bounds us juridically equally in relations to all victor powers. Finland cannot thus, without the violation of the Peace Treaty or without taking stance against its general stipulation to commence making arrangements with some other power in relation to Germany in order to "restore peace"³⁴⁰

In the reporting, the link to the treaty was indicated indirectly in the mid-1950s. The context was from the Finnish standpoint the extremely interesting case of Austria, which signed its state treaty on 15 May 1955 and was declared neutral. It seems according to reporting that there were already speculations at this point that Austria would follow the trail of other Western neutral states and recognize the Federal Republic of Germany because the Finnish representative Olavi Munkki had inquired about the matter from Austria's representative to Cologne, Adrian Rotter.

Munkki reported that he had acquainted the elder Austrian diplomat – already active in the time before Anschluss – on several occasions before. Perhaps he was implying that there was already a basis for some mutual trust, and thus there could be expected some frankness in the information he had managed to receive. Regarding Munkki's inquiries concerning the possible elevation of the status of the Austrian mission, the diplomat had met an adamant declination. Rotter had noted that Austria had the chosen neutral position in the conflict between East and West. He could not see the logic, consequently, in the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Bonn government while not establishing similar relations simultaneously with East Germany. On the other hand, he had stated that Austria did not want to be the first nation to acknowledge both German states either.³⁴¹

By reporting of having these discussions with the Austrian diplomat Adrian Rotter, Munkki pointed – at least overtly – to the direction that Austria would officially be very much appropriating the same attitude as Finnish foreign policy leadership with regards to recognition of the German states: an attitude that was

³⁴⁰ UM 7 D II 302, memo of R.R. Seppälä 16 February 1955, "Suomi ja Saksan kysymyksen ratkaisu", "Viime aikoina ovat eräät piirit maassamme esittäneet, että myöskin Suomen olisi virallisesti osallistuttava Saksan kysymyksen ratkaisuun osana Euroopan yleisessä rauhankampanjassa. Asiasta keskusteltaessa on syytä pitää mielessä Pariisin rauhansopimuksen 10 artikla, joka kuulu[sic] seuraavasti: "Suomi sitoutuu tunnustamaan Italian, Romanian, Bulgarian ja Unkarin kanssa tehtyjen rauhansopimusten sekä niiden muiden sopimusten ja järjestelyn täyden sitovuuden, joista Liittoutuneet ja Liittyneet vallat ovat sopineet tai sopivat Itävaltaan, Saksaan ja Japaniin nähden rauhan palauttamiseksi." 2. Rauhansopimuksen Suomi on tehnyt ei ainoastaan Neuvostoliiton vaan myös Iso-Britannian ym. Maiden kanssa ja sitoo sopimus juridisesti meitä yhtäläisesti kaikkiin allekirjoittajavaltioihin nähden. Suomi ei näinollen voi, rauhansopimusta rikkomatta tai ainakin sen tarkoituksen vastaisesti ryhtyä jonkun muun vallan kanssa tekemään joitakin yleisiä järjestelyjä tai ottamaan kantaa Saksaan nähden "rauhan palauttamiseksi"."

³⁴¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 27 May 1955, "Keskustelu Itävallan edustustopäällikön kanssa", p. 1.

extremely careful. This was of course understandable since it was only in the previous year, 1954, when the Soviet Union had still regarded the question of Austrian sovereignty tied together with the German question. In other words, it had seemed that Austria would not regain its sovereignty necessarily in the imminent future. The sudden change had happened in February 1954 when Molotov had abruptly declared that the Soviet Union wished not to delay the Austrian state treaty further.³⁴² Consequently, in Austria, there was great satisfaction in the way things had transpired. Austrians were naturally careful not to push too far the boundaries of their newly won sovereignty from the Soviet Union.

However, despite the somewhat overt similarities Finland and Austria initially held regarding their neutrality and the German question, it seems that Austrian foreign policymakers were, after the Austrian State Treaty, unwilling to compare their neutrality with Finland's. For example, Bruno Kreisky, undersecretary in the Foreign Affairs Department of the Austrian chancellery at the time, had given the Austrian journal *Forum* an interview during this period in which he had articulated the current and historical framework of Austrian neutrality. He had contrasted the Austrian version with the Swiss and Swedish versions of neutrality, whereas he had omitted Finland from his comparison of neutral countries completely.³⁴³ Kreisky's opinion is not merely an isolated case but holds more value as an evidence concerning the Austrian neutrality discourse as he was one of its leading architects.³⁴⁴

The questioning of Finland's neutrality was no wonder abroad as, at this point, there was increased questioning even inside Finland concerning the image of Finnish neutrality. The discussion was partly initiated by National Coalition Party MP Tuure Junnila's provocative questioning of Finland's neutrality in Finnish parliament. To make his point, Junnila had cited multiple American newspaper articles in which the Finnish neutrality was seen in a critical light. The articles were basically posing a question if Finland was "slipping" away from the neutral line delineated by President Paasikivi. The West German mission in Helsinki was worried from this direction too, but seemed to rely on its strongest ally's, Washington, support. According to its reporting, in the United States State Department there was, at this point, the understanding of the strong need to steer Finland away from drifting further inside the Soviet sphere of influence³⁴⁵. Especially of concern for the West German Foreign Office must have been the analysis of the West German mission that implied that the so-called friendly relations with the Soviet Union would no longer be the exclusive area of certain leading politicians from Agrarian League and Communists in the future,

³⁴² Jelavich 1986, 266.

³⁴³ Rainio-Niemi, 2008, 327.

³⁴⁴ Rainio-Niemi 2014, 56.

³⁴⁵ PAAA B23 bd. 13, report of R.F. Koenning 19 February 1955, "Reichstagsanfrage zur finnischen Aussenpolitik". PAAA B23 bd. 13, report of R.F. Koenning 6 May 1955, "Veröffentlichung des "Economist" über Finnlands Beziehungen zur Sowjetunion und ihre Wiedergabe in der finnischen Presse".

but that the Social Democrats were moving towards them as well in order to have their part of the spoils from this political symbiosis.³⁴⁶

Considering the aforementioned, it seems that Kreisky's omission of Finland from the list of neutrals was no accident. To this direction points also the reporting of Munkki's colleague in Prague, Finnish representative Urho Toivola, who was accredited to Vienna. Toivola had reported amidst the festivities for the newly signed Austrian State Treaty and informed that he had discussed with Chancellor Kreisky in the gala-dinner party held for the celebration of the state treaty. Kreisky had brought up the subject of Finnish neutrality – according to Toivola “in the spirit of the day” – and had started to ponder the goodwill that the Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov had shown lately. Kreisky had claimed that the benign mood and willingness to compromise Molotov had shown recently might make it possible for Finland to achieve such alterations to its status as a state that its international position and neutrality would have resembled the one that Austria had achieved.³⁴⁷

What Kreisky had almost directly pointed out here was the interpretation that Finland had come in second when it came to drawing goodwill from the Soviet Union during this mid-1950s era of *détente*. The remark of Kreisky could not be necessarily attributed solely to the uplifted mood of recent Austrian sovereignty. There seemed to be general will among the Austrian politicians to signal towards Finland that her neutrality was becoming diminished in the light of the Austrian State Treaty. Implications of such a comparison could be discerned as Toivola noted in his report that the subject had also been brought up in his discussions with Austrians before. In this regard, Toivola's answer to Kreisky had quite liturgical overtones in its conformity to the official Finnish foreign policy line. Toivola reported to the Foreign Ministry that, in his answer, he had stated that “the foreign policy goal of Finland, which strives to remain outside the great power conflicts, includes the idea of neutrality”.³⁴⁸ Kreisky had debunked the view by noting that, in his view, the FCMA Treaty contradicted the idea that Finland's neutrality could be unconditional. Toivola's answer had been short, but whatever eloquence was missed in its scarce wording, the answer made up in its boldness as an implicit suggestion to the Foreign Ministry. Toivola noted that “the permanent recognition of Finland's neutrality might be worth striving for”.³⁴⁹

This was, of course, quite a clear expression that Toivola largely concurred with the Kreisky's views regarding Finnish neutrality. At least he saw that it was not standing on as firm ground as Austria's was after the Soviet Union had officially recognized it. In his last remark, Toivola seemed to be encouraging Finland to move in the direction of Austria – similarly as Olavi Munkki did later. Of course, for Kreisky, the push for the “real” neutrality was easier as he did not have a large domestic communist faction in the political topography of his nation

³⁴⁶ PAAA B23 bd. 13, report from R.F. Koenning 17 February 1955, “Innenminister Leskinen über das Verhältnis Finnlands zur Sowjetunion und zu Schweden”.

³⁴⁷ UM 5 C 25 report Vienna, 18 May 1955 p. 1.

³⁴⁸ UM 5 C 25 report Vienna 18 May 1955, p. 1.

³⁴⁹ UM 5 C 25 report Vienna 18 May 1955, p. 1.

such as Finland had in the form of the communist party, *Suomen Kommunistinen Puolue*, SKP (Communist Party of Finland), which, in elections, joined its forces with other leftist (but not necessarily communist) organizations of Finland through the umbrella organization called *Suomen Kansan Demokraattinen Liitto*, SKDL (Finnish People's Democratic League).³⁵⁰ As already mentioned, the communists even reached ministerial posts in postwar Finland.

The views and the perception of the Austrians regarding the Finnish neutrality were, actually, the mirror image that Prime Minister Kekkonen was propagating at this point. Kekkonen had – as the West German mission in Helsinki also noted – put Finland forth as the foremost proponent of the neutrality policy in his interview for German periodical *Die Welt*. He had not only juxtaposed Austria's neutrality, after the state treaty, with Finland, but suggested that the Austria actually was the "*Nachfolger*", follower or successor of Finnish style of neutrality.³⁵¹

When one looks at the surface level of Finnish foreign policymaking at this period there forms easily a picture that, for Finland's foreign policymakers, Austria's neutrality appeared as an extensive temerity, and that another direction was appropriated by Kekkonen. While he was in Moscow, negotiating with Paasikivi in September 1955, Kekkonen had taken the chance to cultivate his personal diplomacy with the Eastern leaders. During the visit, Paasikivi had only briefly greeted Walter Ulbricht and Otto Grotewohl, whereas Kekkonen had initiated discussions with the two and already made promises concerning the recognition of the German Democratic Republic by Finland. The political "séance" with Eastern leaders had ended with Kekkonen's foreboding of the recognition of East Germany in two weeks' time.³⁵² However, according to documents Tatjana Androsova has found in the Russian archives, before the negotiations, around mid-1955, Kekkonen had, by the interpretation of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, strived to redefine Finland's neutrality towards the Austrian model neutrality³⁵³. Perhaps Kekkonen's views concerning the neutrality were not differing that much from the views of the Finnish diplomatic corps, after all. He might have, in reality, heeded the implications evident in the report of Toivola, which implicitly underlined that the Finnish neutrality was weakening in comparison to Austria's model. However, as noted above, in the negotiations, by September 1955 Kekkonen had been already willing to go with the wishes of the Soviet Union's definition of Finnish neutrality and even suggested the recognition of East Germany.

Yet, it has to be noted that Kekkonen's promises were made before the Hallstein Doctrine's official announcement. After Kekkonen's promise, it had become

³⁵⁰ Tiusanen 2011, 77. SKDL formed one of the biggest communist parties in Europe, consistently gaining over 20 percent support at its best in the Finnish parliamentary elections (Paastela 1991, 234).

³⁵¹ PAAA B23 bd. 13, report from the trade mission of the FRG in Helsinki 24 May 1955, "Auseinandersetzungen über die finnische Neutralität in der finnischen Presse".

³⁵² Polvinen 2003, 243.

³⁵³ Androsova 2009, 29.

evident that the alteration of the Germany policy was more than the Finnish parliament and government were willing to venture. After Bonn had notified Finland of the Hallstein Doctrine that it would soon announce, it released Kekkonen's from his premature promise without losing face.³⁵⁴

However, when it came celebrating neutrality, it seems that Austrian diplomats held a timider stance than the Austrian politicians. This was already exemplified in the earlier discussion between Munkki and Adrian Rotter, in which Rotter had emphasized equality in the German question. At the same time Rotter had also emphasized to Munkki the pragmatic approach of Austria to the question of representation; Rotter had made clear to Munkki that representation was going to have diplomatic rights in any case. Rotter had confessed that for him it was insignificant by what title his mission was referred to as long as it had all the privileges and rights as an embassy would have.³⁵⁵ Rotter did not seem prone to delve into theoretical discussions about the implications his missions' status might have for the Austrian neutrality. In this respect, he was taking a real political view on titles and their value in defining his country's foreign policy and neutrality. For him, praxis was important, not the overt implications made by the official level of policy such as office titles.

A few months after this initial discussion with Austrian diplomat Rotter concerning the status of Rotter's mission, Munkki returned to this subject as it became acute as a result of Austria's new policy in its relations with German states, that is, the diplomatic recognition of West Germany. The writing day of the report had continued also to witness, in addition to Rotter leaving his mandate to function as an ambassador, other diplomatic relations consummated in the Federal Republic as the Soviet diplomat, Valerian Zorin (already familiar from the earlier discussion concerning the status of Finnish representation), French diplomat Louis Joxe, and Turkish diplomat Seyfulla Esin had also left their mandates to function as ambassadors.³⁵⁶

At this point, the West German Foreign Office seemed to be working towards damage control concerning their own dangerous example of establishing diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, a nation that had recognized East Germany. It seems that, in this respect, it was Finland that was one of the nations that preoccupied the thinking in the Foreign Office. The message came to the Finnish Foreign Ministry in an indirect way: a little while after the news of the agreement concerning the diplomatic relations between Bonn and Moscow broke, Switzerland's Foreign Ministry had received a note from the West German government which they forwarded to von Knorring, the Finnish representative in Bern. In the note, Bonn had stated that the diplomatic relations, that were recently

³⁵⁴ Polvinen 2003, 243.

³⁵⁵ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 27 May 1955, "Keskustelu Itävallan edustustopäällikön kanssa", p. 2.

³⁵⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 7 January 1956, "Uusia suurlähetystöjä - uusia suurlähettiläitä", p. 1.

agreed to be established between Moscow and Bonn, did not allow for the interpretation that West Germany had relinquished its demand for the sole representation of the German people and state.³⁵⁷

Munkki, however, focused on Rotter's reflections concerning these events. The reason for this could have been—besides that Rotter's late actions must have been, naturally, of much interest to Finnish foreign policymakers—that the events reflected what, in his own opinion, should take place on the part of Finland's representation in Germany. The reporting of Rotter's views was especially intriguing as Munkki had managed to receive non-official statements from Rotter on a reception held in Bonn. On this occasion, he had received Rotter's outlook on the diplomatic situation between Austria and Germany just two days before Rotter had delivered his mandate to function as an ambassador for the Federal Republic's government. According to Munkki, the Austrian had delivered his analysis to an audience consisting of heads of the foreign missions in the Federal Republic.

Rotter began his explanation by indirectly noting the détente attitude now prevailing in the Soviet leadership. In his words, not even on one occasion in Vienna, or during the visit of chancellor Raab in Moscow, had there been produced a demand from the Soviet side for the Austrian government to establish relations with the Pankow government. Rotter also revealed that the relations between Vienna and Bonn had been a subject of discussion long before the state treaty. Vienna had taken a position that as long as Austria was an occupied state it should not establish relations with the Federal Republic as not all of the occupying nations had themselves acknowledged the Federal Republic officially. Even immediately after Austria had received its sovereignty back by the state treaty, it was still considered that its neutrality stipulated that it should not recognize the Federal Republic.³⁵⁸ However, in the following lines of Munkki's report—which emanated the cold *raison d'État* of Austria's diplomatic approach—seemed to turn the explanation of Austria's further actions after the state treaty to an implicit attack towards the Finnish German policy. Munkki stated that the Austrian attitude had changed because the Soviet Union had recognized the Federal Republic. After this, the question of representation had resurfaced in the Austrian foreign policy discussion. Consequently, when the Federal Republic's foreign minister, von Brentano, had visited Vienna, the opportune of the moment had been seized, and the decision to establish diplomatic relations made.³⁵⁹

The rest of Munkki's report continued to bombard Finnish policymakers with Rotter's logic against the rationale of the Finnish German policy that now seemed very solitary among the democratic capitalist states as it had lost, through Austria's late actions, its only non-recognition policy partner among them. Rotter's justification for the Austrian approach seemed to be logical: in Vienna, it had been considered that the practical matters to be handled with the

³⁵⁷ UM 7 D II 302, secret letter of H. Von Knorring from Bern 6 October 1955, "Länsi-Saksan nootti Sveitsille Itä-Saksan asiassa".

³⁵⁸ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 7 January 1956, "Uusia suurlähetystöjä - uusia suurlähettiläitä", p. 2.

³⁵⁹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 7 January 1956 "Uusia suurlähetystöjä - uusia suurlähettiläitä", p. 2.

German Democratic Republic did not require official diplomatic relations with the Pankow government. The economic interaction between Austria and the German Democratic Republic was minimal and there were no difficulties concerning transit matters. Neither did Austria have its citizens' in the East Germany in numbers that would have needed an official attendance through diplomatic relations. The conclusion of Austrians had been that there were no such matters between Austria and the German Democratic Republic that required an official level of representation there. Lastly, Rotter had also found a juridical basis for Austria's new position in the German question: all the victor powers of war had, according to him, recognized the Federal Republic, but only the Soviet Union had recognized the Pankow government. Munkki concluded this passage by expressing his own approval for Rotter's views on the Austrian approach in the German question. He referred to the aforementioned fact of the official acknowledgement of the Federal Republic by the victor powers and noted that this argument should be applicable in the case of Finland too. This approach was, as Munkki had explicated in his report, supported by pragmatic as well as juridical basis.³⁶⁰

However, Austria's and Finland's neutrality had not been comparable to begin with – at least if one had asked most of the Austrian politicians. As already implied by Toivola's discussions with Kreisky, most problematic in the Finnish neutrality was the FCMA Treaty, which linked Finnish neutrality to the Soviet sphere of influence. The link of neutrality to the Soviet interest was especially true when the idea of neutrality emerged among Austrian political discussion at the beginning of the decade. At that point, the Austrian communists began a campaign for promoting neutrality. Ironically, the Soviet Union asked them to halt the campaign in 1953/1954 to make neutrality acceptable for the Austrian people whose political affiliation was mostly directed towards the two major parties, the moderate left Austrian Socialist Party (SPÖ) and the catholic Austrian People's Party (ÖVP). Both major Austrian parties had their advocates for neutrality, from ÖVP's Karl Gruber (Foreign Minister 1950–1953) to Julius Raab, (Chancellor from 1953 onwards). Among the socialists, Karl Renner was the most prominent advocate of neutrality. He especially considered the Swiss style neutrality as the most fitting alternative for Austria. Surprisingly enough, it was ÖVP's Raab who was one of the Austrian politicians who was actually willing to learn something from the Finnish model as well.³⁶¹

Munkki concluded that Austria's establishment of diplomatic relations with the Federal Republic was a victory for the cabinet of Konrad Adenauer. The hard-line statements from this government were, in Munkki's view, causing even the few states that were earlier contemplating recognizing East Germany – mostly Far East states – to now drop these intentions. Austria being a neutral state and acknowledging West Germany gave, in Munkki's opinion, significant weight to the Federal Republic's claim to be the sole representative of the German people.³⁶²

³⁶⁰ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 7 January 1956, "Uusia suurlähetystöjä – uusia suurlähettiläitä", p. 2.

³⁶¹ Rainio-Niemi 2008, 330, 331.

³⁶² UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 7 January 1956, "Uusia suurlähetystöjä – uusia suurlähettiläitä", p. 2.

However, in Finland, Kekkonen's fifth cabinet did not budge in the matter. Even the government program seemed to reflect the order of importance in foreign relations: it declared in its first passages that the pursuit of government was to better the relations with the Soviet Union and, secondly, the similar willingness with regards to the Western neighboring countries.³⁶³ From the standpoint of the textual hierarchy, it is possible to note that the sequence of these statements was revealing: the priority was given to the Eastern relations, namely with the Soviet Union³⁶⁴. The bend towards the left in the policy was emphasized as the government increased its trade and loans from the socialist countries, especially from the Soviet Union, while the opposition accused it of trading with totalitarian countries.³⁶⁵ Even the government's economic policy program appeared to be influenced by the ideology of the Eastern neighbor: it was catering to the wishes of the employees, unions, and small-holders while receiving harsh criticism from the right³⁶⁶.

Munkki, on the other hand, clearly saw some kind of window of opportunity to alter the German policy – and, through that, the configuration of Finnish neutrality – that Finland had chosen previously. He pondered the different options regarding the representation, which, of course, symbolized the German policy in general. In his view, there were three options. The first option was that Finland could keep its representation's status as it was. The second option he saw was keeping the title of the representative office the same but changing his title to Head of the Office. The first one he overtly denounced as dysfunctional based on the problems that he had already reported: the vagueness of the representation's status and the obstacles (which he did not articulate) that the lack of official diplomatic relations produced. Munkki evaluated the second option, the elevation of the Finnish representative's status to the level of Head of Mission, as an outdated solution: it would not have made as much of a beneficial impression it would have, had it been executed earlier. However, his third option was the imitation of the Austrian way, that is, the recognition of the Federal Republic of Germany.³⁶⁷

As a reason for his third option, Munkki pointed out that the basis of the Finnish German policy had changed drastically after the Soviet Union established diplomatic relations with Bonn. He pointed out that now all the Allied Powers had recognized West Germany, which, in his view, also had implications regarding the situation in the field of international law. He wrote:

³⁶³ Government program of Kekkonen V cabinet, 21 October 1954 http://valtioneuvosto.fi/hallitusohjelmat/-/asset_publisher/39-paaministeri-urho-kekkosen-v-hallituksen-ohjelma [accessed 16 April 2018].

³⁶⁴ Halliday 1985, 58. For the view of textual elements and the arrangement as a resource pool for soliciting of meanings, see also Heikkinen, Vesa, Hiidenmaa, Pirjo & Tiililä, Ulla 2000.

³⁶⁵ Suomi 1990, 359.

³⁶⁶ Suomi 1990, 353.

³⁶⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 19 January 1956, "Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan suhteista vuonna 1955", appendix memo "muistio koskien Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan suhteita", p. 5.

... Finland has by the Paris Peace Treaty subjected itself to abide by the arrangements that the allied powers have agreed or will agree, with regards to Austria, Germany or Japan, as well as acknowledge their full validity. The arrangement that all the allied powers have executed in relation to the Federal Republic, is the recognition its sovereignty and the establishment of full diplomatic relations with it. This is also the basis that Austria has chosen for the establishment of its representation in Bonn, it might be recommendable to evaluate, does the example of Austria offer possibilities, and if so, what kind of, for Finland as well.³⁶⁸

These were the concluding lines of the report and offered quite a clear proposition that it might be time for Finland to re-evaluate its stance with regards to the German question. The conclusion of the report is in line with Munkki's earlier reports during the previous year. Already in them, he was demarcating for Finland a line that was reflecting, in many respects, Austria's approach in the German question. The report was written in January 1956 at the time when the Soviet Union agreed to return Porkkala Naval base to Finland; ostensibly as a gesture of good-will. In reality, this was more likely because the base had become obsolete in the dawning era of intercontinental missiles and air force. One of the most influential and prominent figures in the Finnish foreign administration during the Cold War, diplomat Max Jakobson (nominated as Finnish Foreign Ministry's director general of the Political Department in 1962, an ambassador to the United Nations in 1965, also a candidate for secretary general of the United Nations in 1971), saw this moment as a pivot point for Finnish neutrality in the context of international relations. It was only after Porkkala and the repatriation of the Soviet troops that the Finnish government could postulate a claim to true neutrality.³⁶⁹ According to Jakobson, until that moment the naval base of the Soviet troops meant, in the event of war between the Soviet Union and Western Allies, an excuse for the West to breach Finnish sovereignty. In the background was, additionally, the spirit of the Geneva Conference. Already before the Conference, Finnish Foreign Ministry's secretary of state, R.R. Seppälä, had tied the Finnish German policy to the international context as well: he had declared that Finnish decisions concerning the question of Germany had to be made in the pan-European context of peace building. What this meant was that Finland would tie its German policy to the development in the superpower relations and refrain from independently initiated alterations in the German policy.³⁷⁰

³⁶⁸ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 19 January 1956, "Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan suhteista vuonna 1955", appendix memo "muistio koskien Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan suhteita", pp. 5, 6, 7 "Toiselta puolen on Suomi Pariisin rauhansopimuksessa sitoutunut tunnustamaan niiden sopimusten ja järjestelyjen täyden sitovuuden, joista Liittoutuneet ja Liittyneet Vallat ovat sopineet tai sopivat Itävaltaan, Saksaan ja Japaniin nähden ja ainoa "järjestely", jonka Saksaan nähden kaikki Liittyneet ja Liittoutuneet suurvallat ovat toteuttaneet, on Liittotasavallan suvereniteetin tunnustaminen ja diplomaattisten suhteiden solmiminen sen kanssa. Tälle pohjalle on Itävalta rakentanut diplomaattisen edustustonsa perustamisen Bonnin ja ehkä olisi syytä tutkia, tarjoaako ja mitä mahdollisuuksia Itävallan esimerkki Suomelle."

³⁶⁹ A similar view was held also by Finnish professor of international politics, Finnish Foreign Ministry's Assistant Director of Bureau 1972-73 Osmo Apunen (Apunen 1977, 214).

³⁷⁰ Puttensen 2000, 65, 66.

Against this background, it is not unreasonable to assume, Munkki was perhaps seeing this as a chance for Finland to begin pursuing more Western oriented neutrality.³⁷¹ However, it seems that Kekkonen had already, behind the scenes, closed the path for Finland to follow the Austrian path. As already mentioned, in the Moscow negotiations he had, already few months before Munkki's report, suggested Russians the possibility of Finland striving for Austrian style neutrality. However, later he had already discarded the idea and moved to opposite direction by suggesting the recognition of East Germany.

3.2.2 The Night Frost and the Note Crises and their aftermath: Finnish foreign policy seen as an absolute neutrality, but also as a part of Finland's Eastern policy

Despite the implicit suggestions from Urho Toivola in Vienna and Olavi Munkki in Cologne in the mid-1950s regarding the possibility of Finland to advance on the path of Austria and redefine the Finnish neutrality and German policy, the advice went – at least ostensibly – unheeded in the Finnish foreign policy. Yet, Finland's neutrality policy did not remain stable but was redefined, not by endogamic decisions, but due to the external pressure as end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s brought up major challenges for the Finnish foreign policy in the form of the Night Frost and the Note Crisis.³⁷² Both crises, in their essence, saw the Soviet Union exerting pressure towards Finland in order to influence its domestic politics, and this way would indirectly guarantee the continuance of the Finnish foreign policy line that took in consideration the interests of the Soviet Union and was anchored to the FCMA Treaty.

Both crises also seemed to have a connection to the German question in a sense that their timing was simultaneous with the tensing situation in Berlin between the Soviet Union and the United States.³⁷³ However, with regards to Finland, the crises had dual implications: on the one hand, they affected the domestic policy configuration (for the benefit of President Kekkonen), and, on the other, they cast a dubious light on the Finnish foreign policy position as a neutral state.

Paradoxically, the situation was brought about by Khrushchev's wish to promote neutrality in the West, which led him to launch a political offensive against

³⁷¹ Jakobson criticized that, in Finland, Porkkala's implications for Finland's international status and most of the foreign policy discourse was not seen. In Finland during 1955-1956, Porkkala was only seen in the context of bilateral relations between Finland and the Soviet Union. Even Paasikivi avoided tying these developments with the construction of Finnish neutrality and in his speech on 1 March 1956 noted: "The foreign policy position of our nation, which after the wars was in fact and also officially, in state of confusion, has now focused and stabilized".³⁷¹ He omitted the word neutrality and only appropriated implicit concepts to refer to the Finnish foreign policy position. (Jakobson 1980, 74, 75)

³⁷² For more detailed explanation of the crises, see section 1.4.

³⁷³ This connection was also noticed by Finnish Ambassador Eero. A. Wuori in his reporting after the onset of the Night Frost crisis, UKK vuosikirjat 1958-, 1958 report from Moscow 13 December 1958.

the West, initiated by his speech on 10 November 1958. In this offensive, the Soviet leader wished to make West Germany renounce its plans for atomic weapons and promote the neutralist forces in West Germany as well as in France and Great Britain.³⁷⁴ Khrushchev was, at this time, encouraged to “play” with the status of Berlin also because he knew that the West was not unanimous regarding the divided Germany: for example, in the British Foreign Office the image of war-obsessed Germany remained. Consequently, there was a strong sentiment in favor of keeping Germany divided and weaker. Some of Britain’s NATO allies went even further and were considering the occupation of Berlin by Western forces useless.³⁷⁵

At the period of the Night Frost Crisis, the Federal Republic’s Foreign Office held a keen eye on the Finnish position and Foreign Office’s state secretary had held a discussion with the West German representative in Helsinki, K.K. Overbeck, regarding the Finnish position. They noted the Finnish wish to integrate to the West through the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), but also evident was the fact that Finland did not want that to endanger its trade relations with the Soviet Union³⁷⁶. It was also partly trade that Overbeck saw behind the Night Frost Crisis, and not solely the political pressure against the Finnish government. He referred to the increasingly dwindling trade between Finland and the Soviet Union.³⁷⁷

In Helsinki, Overbeck had already, before the Night Frost Crisis, branded the Soviet Union’s official press agency’s (TASS) campaign against Finland as an effort to intervene in Finland’s domestic politics and effect outcome of the elections. He saw TASS’s attack against the “anti-Soviet” literature, articles, and movies circulating in Finland as a strategy to increase the divide inside the SDP and to redistribute its votes in the coming elections for the league of the Finnish communist parties (*Suomen Kansan Demokraattinen Liitto, SKDL*).³⁷⁸

If Khrushchev’s plan was to promote neutrality in the West, he did not succeed when it came to Finland and its role as a showcase of neutrality-made-possible next door to a socialist superpower. Exactly the opposite took place. In Germany, already after the first crisis, the Night Frost, Finland’s situation was deemed pessimistic and Finland’s ability to keep its sovereignty (and neutrality) was questioned. Bonn’s Foreign Office noted, in their memo concerning the possible government change in Finland, that the new cabinet might be forced to recognize the German Democratic Republic. In preparation for the worst-case scenario, they sent Overbeck the directions to inform the Finnish Foreign Ministry that the Federal Government still regarded the recognition of the German Democratic Republic as an unfriendly act, and that there was no possibility to exclude

³⁷⁴ Bark & Gress 1989 (1), 435, 436.

³⁷⁵ Newman 2007, 51-53.

³⁷⁶ PAAA B23 bd. 93, a memo from 21 March 1958, “Unterlagen für die Besprechung des Herrn Staatssekretärs mit Herrn Generalkonsul Overbeck am 24.3.1958”.

³⁷⁷ PAAA B 23 bd. 93, “Aufzeichnung; betr. Lage in Finnland”, 9 December 1958.

³⁷⁸ PAAA B23 bd. 93, report from K.K.. Overbeck 31 March 1958, “Sowjetische Presse-kampagne gegen Finnland”.

any perceivable consequences.³⁷⁹ Karl Carstens, the Head of the Foreign Office's West European Department, regarded the information to be of such importance that he circulated the memo also to Adenauer.³⁸⁰

In the West German press, the crisis was observed with disbelief, especially as it had been noted that the Fagerholm government had strong parliamentary support. It should have, according to *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, guaranteed stability and continuity in the Finnish foreign policy for the Soviet Union³⁸¹. The *Süddeutsche Zeitung's* article probably reflected the general Western attitude where there had been high hopes for the Fagerholm government. After all, it had served as a relief for the West as it had left out the communists, who had become the largest party in the elections (50 out of 200 MPs).³⁸²

In the West German press it was also believed that Fagerholm would be in any case backing President Kekkonen's foreign policy line and was a suitable figure in this respect as well. However, there had also existed some doubts among the press. For example, Walter Bauer-Heyd of *Frankfurter Rundschau* had expressed that Väinö Leskinen as a minister might cause problems.³⁸³ Leskinen's position was analyzed correctly; he was still persona non grata in Moscow's eyes. Not only because of his position as a prominent figure of SDP's anti-Soviet section but also as a consequence of his visit to Bonn in the latter half of 1958. Rumors had been relayed to Moscow claiming that Leskinen had promised to turn the Finnish SDP, with the aid of the National Coalition Party, against the Soviet Union.³⁸⁴

In Helsinki, representative Overbeck evaluated, however, that the analysis in the West German press was too pessimistic. He sent to his ministry a report noting that the West German media seemed to be painting an overly gloomy picture of Finland on its way to becoming a satellite, and it was even suggesting that it would be appropriate to resign from the attempts to keep Finland in the West. He stood up in defense of Finland. In his view, the articles were invalid assessments of the situation.³⁸⁵ The Head of the West European Section One in the West German Foreign Office, Karl Carstens, seemed to concert Overbeck's views and

379 PAAA B23 bd. 93, memo 25 November 1958, "Aufzeichnung: über die gegenwärtige Lage Finnlands und die von Seiten des Auswärtigen Amtes ergriffenen Massnahmen".

380 PAAA B23 bd. 93, memo 25 November 1958, "Aufzeichnung: über die gegenwärtige Lage Finnlands und die von Seiten des Auswärtigen Amtes ergriffenen Massnahmen".

381 Teräväinen 102

382 Vares 2002, 44.

383 Teräväinen 2003, 101–103

384 Suomi 1992, 166.

385 PAAA 23 bd.93, telegram of K.K. Overbeck 24 November 1958, "...hielte ich es fuer falsch, wenn deutsche oeffentlichkeit etwa durch dramatisierende presseartikel zur auffassung gelangte, finnland sei auf dem wege zum satellitenstaat und müsse abgeschrieben warden". Not all West German press took an overly alarmistic attitude, for example, West German newspapers such as *Die Welt* and *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, saw reasons for the crisis in the international goals of Khrushchev, and not in the pursuit to "people's democratize" Finland (See Teräväinen 2003, 116, 117).

had not lost hope in Finland's case.³⁸⁶ In his memo, he pondered the possibility of the Federal Republic influencing Norway, Sweden, and Denmark to refrain from inviting Khrushchev for state visits, which, in Carstens' view, could make the Finnish situation look even worse.³⁸⁷ The reasoning was probably that the omission of Finland from Khrushchev's Nordic tour would have made Finland look isolated while at the same time sending the message that the other Nordic countries were silently approving the Soviet behavior.

The overview of West German papers seems to permit Seppo Hentilä's conjecture that the Night Frost Crisis worsened the image of President Kekkonen in the Federal Republic – which in many aspects was not very positive before either due to Kekkonen's inherent dislike towards Germany and the consequent stinging remarks against the Federal Republic.³⁸⁸ However, it seems that Kekkonen was himself also interested in the German connection in the crisis and how it was seen from the West German perspective, as he had cut out from the German newspaper a report from its correspondent in Helsinki. In the article, the writer quoted Scandinavian "political observers" who had warned that Kekkonen's proposal of including extreme leftist forces in the new government might lead to the path that Czechoslovakia had taken in 1948.³⁸⁹

On the part of the political reporting and the functioning of the Finnish Foreign Service, the crisis brought to surface some of the first unflattering implications of how the foreign policy would be executed during Kekkonen's presidency. This was exemplified during the crisis by the actions of voluntary self-censorship from the part of Finland's representative to Moscow, Eero A. Wuori. He refused to analyze the situation by referring it to be too controversial in Finland politically (his rationale was probably that the crisis was brought about by the government Kekkonen had not backed up). Only after Kekkonen's trusted man Ahti Karjalainen – a figure of rising status in the Finnish Agrarian Union party at the time – had told Wuori that his evaluations would be appreciated by the president,

³⁸⁶ Karl Carstens 1914-1992, Lemo, Lebendiges Museum Online <https://www.hdg.de/lemo/biografie/karl-carstens#jpto-1950/> [Accessed 9 October 2017].

³⁸⁷ PAAA 23 bd. 93, memo 25 November 1958, "Aufzeichnung: über die gegenwärtige Lage Finnlands und die von Seiten des Auswärtigen Amtes ergriffenen Massnahmen".

³⁸⁸ Hentilä 2003, 50. After the Night Frost crisis, the Finnish position had to be clarified soon by Kekkonen as the Soviet Union had issued on 2 March 1959 a suggestion for a German peace Treaty. The Finnish Foreign Ministry regarded the need to answer the Soviet proposal as uncomfortable, but also as a possibility to make more known the Finnish stance in the German question. Consequently, the Finnish Foreign Ministry replied with the erudite diplomatic manner how the situation in Germany was threatening the European peace and that it was important to act for the prevention of war in the multilateral negotiations of great powers. Kekkonen gave an interview to the Finnish correspondent of the New York Times lauding that Finnish neutrality was manifested by the equal treatment of German states. (UM 7 D II 302, memo of Osmo Orkomies 24 March 1959; UM 7 D II 302 memo, "Finnish statements regarding the German question since 1959).

³⁸⁹ UKKA, yearbook 1958, newspaper clip, undated. In 1948 Czechoslovakian government was taken over by the communists with the Soviet Union's backing. It led to the Sovietization of the country.

did Wuori dare to continue reporting, but not through the normal route. Instead, he sent reports as so-called croney letters directly to Kekkonen, bypassing the normal circulation routes of the political reports. He capriciously refused to forward his reports for other interested parties, such as Agrarian League's Kauno Kleemola, who had wished to see them.³⁹⁰ He also refused to admit even Prime Minister Fagerholm access to his analyses. The situation became exacerbated as it was found out that Finnish Ambassador to Peking, Cay Sundström, had also written reports directly to Kekkonen circumventing Fagerholm and Foreign Minister Ralf Törngren. The result of the whole debacle concerning the reporting led to a reprisal letter from Fagerholm to Wuori. It formed also a unique moment in Finnish diplomatic history when the prime minister in office had to send a stinging reprisal to a civil servant in his own administration.³⁹¹

In reporting from divided Germany there was not a thorough analysis found regarding the Night Frost Crisis, despite the fact that in the background of Moscow's toughening policy towards Finland was the tensing of the situation in Berlin.³⁹² It seems that either this connection was not seen in the Finnish Foreign Service, or it was regarded that missions should not report on the situation that was ostensibly a crisis between the Soviet Union and Finland exclusively. From the German viewpoint, this connection was apparently not as evident as the research has later shown. According to Erkki Teräväinen, even the West German press did not link the events.³⁹³

Despite the scarce reporting from Germany concerning the Night Frost Crisis, in the wake of the crisis, Veli Helenius's reporting from Cologne gave some implications regarding the matter. Helenius had been assigned in the service of the ministry in 1940, and his foreign service posts before Cologne were in Tokyo during the Second World War, and then in Hague and Ankara. His educational background was in law. Helenius was posted to Cologne in July 1958 just before the onset of the Night Frost Crisis.

The impetus for his writing seemed to originate from the view of West German press concerning Finland. Helenius' take on the subject was that there was an exaggeration in the West German press when it came to implications of the crisis for the Finland (bearing similarity to Carsten's analysis) – the speculations extended even to the continuity of Finland's national existence. Helenius could ascertain that the government of the Federal Republic had evaluated Finland's

³⁹⁰ Soikkanen 2003a, 211.

³⁹¹ Soikkanen 2003a, 213. Soikkanen's conclusion is that Kekkonen's action in solving the crisis (forcing Fagerholm to step down and appoint a new government that was known to be approved by the Soviet Union) were heavily influenced by Wuori's analysis and reports from Moscow. Later Kekkonen was infuriated as he heard that Wuori claimed Kekkonen had interpreted reports too pessimistic and thus the crisis as overly threatening.

³⁹² On 10 November 1958, Khrushchev delivered a speech in which he demanded the withdrawal of the Allied occupation forces from West Berlin within six months. The speech led to three years of turbulence over the status of Berlin and culminated in the building of the Berlin wall. (Office of the Historian, *The Berlin Crisis, 1958–1961* <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1953-1960/berlin-crises> [accessed 16 April 2018].)

³⁹³ See Teräväinen 2003, 111.

situation – despite certain worrying – in a rational and calm fashion. This was, in his view, especially notable as certain periodicals were writing sensational articles on Finland from time to time. Helenius made some implications of his own, clearly quite unalarmed, stance to the crisis by noting that the articles were not based on reality. In his view, they were coming from biased sources, by which he referred to the West German correspondents in Stockholm and Copenhagen. Helenius attributed the “sober and dispassionate” (*asiallinen ja kiihkoton*) stance of the West German Foreign Office in the matter being as a result of the excellent awareness of Finland’s situation, which in turn, was a consequence of Finland being under keen attention in the Federal Republic. This was, in Helenius’ words, shown in the Federal Republic’s foreign policy leadership’s “astute knowledge of the Finnish politics as well as in the substantial amount of columns that the periodicals are willing to spare for Finland”.³⁹⁴ Helenius’s analysis seemed to manifest not only the ostensible level of the political analysis in the report, but he also give a hint of his calm personality, which was exemplified further a little later when the Federal Republic’s Foreign Office invited him to the audience concerning their protests against the actions of the East German Chairman of the People’s Chamber (*Volkskammer*), Hermann Matern. During his visit to Finland, Matern had heavily attacked, in his rhetoric, West Germany. However, in his reporting, Helenius did not even bother to mention this episode and his resulting address in Bonn’s Foreign Office.³⁹⁵

However, despite this still existent trust in Bonn after the Night Frost Crisis that Helenius reported, there was probably an ambiguous attitude prevailing in in Bonn when it came to the disposition towards Finland. According to Seppo Hentilä, on the one hand, Bonn was glad to see Finland retain itself as a sovereign Western democracy, but, on the other hand, they were aware that Finland had shown a great level of subservience to the East. The West German representative, Overbeck, noted another possible indication of the tumbling of the Finnish defenses against the Soviet Union. It was the visit Fagerholm made after his government’s fall to the Leipzig Fair in East Berlin. The Fair formed one of the most important propaganda events along with the Baltic Sea Week (*Ostseewoche*) and saw the city plastered with placards and banners toting the political demands of the East German government.³⁹⁶

Especially the visit was noted due to Fagerholm’s remaining important role in the Finnish political system as a chairman of the parliament, the role in which he led the Finnish parliamentary delegation to the fair. In Overbeck’s view, the visit of the delegation “greatly enlarged the aspirations and the remarkability of

³⁹⁴ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 3 February 1959, “Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan suhteista v. 1958”, pp. 1, 2. “...yksityiskohtaisen tarkassa Suomen poliittisen kehityksen tuntemuksessa että siinä runsaassa palstatilassa, mikä lehdistö melkein pä päivittäin uhraa Suomen poliittisten tapausten selostamiseen.”

³⁹⁵ Hentilä 2004, 40. It is, however, also possible that the Foreign Office had notified Helenius that the West German mission in Helsinki would relay the stance of the Foreign Office for the Finnish Foreign Ministry.

³⁹⁶ New York Times, 3 March 1964, “East Germans' Leipzig Fair Shuns Propaganda”.

the “East Zone”.³⁹⁷ However, Fagerholm later described to Overbeck his negative impression over the East German society.³⁹⁸ Fagerholms negativity was reciprocated by East German evaluations that regarded his attendance as an attempt to regain his credibility as a politician subscribing to Finland’s friendship policy towards the Soviet Union.³⁹⁹

In general, the rivalry between the two German states intensified at the end of the 1950s in Finland. The East German representation’s intensive work towards establishing contacts with Finnish top politicians had also begun to pay off: in June 1959 an Agrarian League delegation visited East Germany by the invitation of its “sister” party in the German Democratic Republic, The Democratic Farmers’ Party of Germany (*Demokratische Bauernpartei Deutschlands, DBD*).⁴⁰⁰

A more detailed analysis of the possible indirect effects the Night Frost Crisis concerning the Finnish neutrality can be found only two years after the crisis. In this reporting, Veli Helenius recapitulated his previous observation immediately after the Night Frost that the “the development of the general political position of the Finland was constantly a target of keen attention...” However, Helenius’ next lines implied that it was not all unconditional empathy towards Finland either. The official stand towards Finland was, according to him, “reserved”. The lukewarm stance had been manifested in his view by the striving at the official level to abstain from commenting on the political position of Finland. Helenius mentioned also the visit of Khrushchev to Finland in 1960 and reported of the inhibited response to it in the Federal Republic. He wrote that the Federal Republic’s Foreign Office had only briefly noted the visit and remarked that “it was very much for the benefit of Kekkonen politically”.⁴⁰¹ The interpretation of the West German Foreign Office seemed to echo the general view in the West. For example, *The New York Times* described the visit as a propaganda show of the “Soviet dictator” and as a way to “build up the reputation of the controversial Finnish President as a leader whom the Soviets could trust”.⁴⁰²

The observation of Helenius, that the West German Foreign Office was not keen on discussing Finland’s position and was “reserved” in this respect, was not without basis. Just a few months later, the directions of Foreign Minister von Brentano for the new West German General Consul in Helsinki, Heinrich Böx, stated that Finland was at the crossing between West and East, and that the Soviet Union was striving to make Finland a satellite in case the West did not manage to exert enough support for Finland. However, curiously enough, it seemed that the Foreign Office was discreet in its internal communication as well. The memo noted that despite the fact that the FCMA Treaty was interpreted as an factor that

³⁹⁷ PAAA B 23 bd. 93, report from K. K. Overbeck 16 March 1959, “Anerkennung der SBZ durch Finnland”.

³⁹⁸ Hentilä 2003, 53.

³⁹⁹ Hentilä 2003, 54.

⁴⁰⁰ Putensen 2000, 111.

⁴⁰¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 17 February 1961. “Suomen ja Saksan liittotasavallan välisestä suhteista v. 1960”, p. 1.

⁴⁰² New York Times, 3 September 1960, “Khrushchev Lauds Finns on Arrival: Khrushchev, on Visit, Praises Finland”; New York Times 5 September 1960 “Prelude at Helsinki”.

prevented Moscow from intervening in Finnish politics (probably meaning that it functioned as a guarantee or token of Finland's position vis-à-vis the Soviet Union), in practice there was a long history of Moscow tampering with Finland's domestic politics. The memo contained a precise foreboding as it speculated that the Soviet tampering of Finnish politics would probably continue in the upcoming election of 1962 as well (the elections that took place after the note from the Soviet Union to Finland asking for military consultations by referring to the FCMA Treaty and its effect as dropping out Kekkonen's competition Olavi Honka from presidential race). Despite Kekkonen not being named, it seems that the memo implicitly accused Moscow for breaching the limits of appropriateness in supporting him. As a first sign of the Moscow's disposition the memo noted that the challenger of Kekkonen, Olavi Honka was castigated in the Soviet press.⁴⁰³

It seems that, as a sort of counterreaction to Kekkonen's solidifying ties politically towards the Soviet Union after the Night Frost, there was willingness in West Germany, as was already implied before, to fight for Finland's alignment in the Cold War. In this case, West Germans, after seemingly losing ground in the political sphere, put the emphasis on the battle on the economic front, and more precisely, in Finland's case, on the membership of Finland in the European Free Trade Association (EFTA).⁴⁰⁴ Helenius stated that there had been various assertions to him in Cologne that, despite the fact that Finland's inclusion to free trade area would not be beneficial to the Federal Republic's foreign trade with Finland, the inclusion would be welcomed because of its political implications.⁴⁰⁵ From Moscow's perspective, of course, the things looked opposite. Everything relating to the West European integration was conceptualized in the East inimical to it interests.⁴⁰⁶

The political dimension could not be bypassed from the trade treaties of the Cold War. From Moscow's perspective, in the case of EFTA, it was especially clear: from the six EFTA countries, four were members of NATO. And it was not only EFTA itself that was perceived as a possible threat, there were fears of a possible enlarged consortium, i.e. that EFTA would be later united with the EEC.⁴⁰⁷ Therefore, it was imperative for Moscow that Finland would not take part in the actual functioning of EFTA and remain as an outside member. Not surprisingly, the Finnish left was echoing the Soviet views, in the Finnish parliament,

⁴⁰³ PAAA B 23 bd. 129, memo from Von Brentano 18 August 1961, "an den Leiter der Handelsvertretung der Bundesrepublik Deutschland in Finnland Herrn Generalkonsul Dr. Heinrich Böx".

⁴⁰⁴ See analysis of FRG trade mission in Helsinki 11 April 1963 "Besuch des ersten stellvertretenden Ministerpräsidenten der Sowjetunion in Finnland" (PAAA B23 bd. 228).

⁴⁰⁵ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 17 February 1961, "Suomen ja Saksan liittotasavallan välisistä suhteista v. 1960", p. 1.

⁴⁰⁶ Seppinen 2008, 316. In the the historiography the interconnectedness of the Cold War and the European integration has often been failed to be discerned (Ludlow 2010, 179, 180).

⁴⁰⁷ Seppinen 1997, 183.

member of the Finnish Communist Party (SKP), and the leader of the parliamentary group of Finnish People's Democratic League (SKDL) Hertta Kuusinen attacked the treaty by claiming that it tied Finland to "closed Western economic areas".⁴⁰⁸

The EFTA period was viewed with worry by East Germans as well; its report from May 1960 noted – along with its socialist rhetoric how the treaty increased profits of Finnish monopolies – that the treaty also politically aligned Finland more to the West and to the more close relations with the "aggressive" NATO. However, the general tone in the note seemed to imply some resignation as the reporter Dr. Bauer was forced to note that the opposition to the treaty was only possible from the SKDL, and that the other parties, the Finnish trade unions, and large segments of workers supported the treaty⁴⁰⁹. Another report in the beginning of 1961 noted that all the Finnish ministers that had been invited to the Leipzig Fair had refused the invitation by referring to the workload caused by the EFTA negotiations. The reporter considered this as an excuse, despite admitting that it had some basis. All in all, the report posited that there was threat that Finland was sliding towards the West, and that the mission should undertake more efforts to influence the Finnish attitudes.⁴¹⁰

When Helenius was discussing the economic aspects of the Federal Republic's relations with Finland (and their concomitant political ramifications), Helenius was in fact touching the core of the new approach in the West in general towards Finland. During the Night Frost period, the Western allies had pulled back their overt support for Finland when it had started to seem that the Fagerholm government would not be able to survive the pressure. The West had wished to avert losing face on the side of a nation that might have, in the next moment, compromised its sovereignty for alleviating the pressure from the Soviet Union. Instead, the new strategy of Western powers was to emphasize the trade as a medium that could keep Finland tied to the Western sphere.⁴¹¹ In this respect, it was understandable that the Federal Republic, which was relying on constant NATO support, was willing to sacrifice some of its own trading benefits for this larger victory in the Cold War battle between the spheres of influence.

However, it seems that in Finland's case even the positive element concerning Western integration could not diminish the fact that the EFTA issue once again involved a recapitulation in Moscow's direction. According to Helenius, in the Federal Republic's press, Finland's EFTA treaty had been covered in a politically colored fashion. It seems probable that by this Helenius referred to the fact that the treaty included the special clause for the Soviet Union, which guaranteed for it the equal access to Finnish markets. In the West German Foreign Office Helenius had observed that the most reservation was caused not by the special

⁴⁰⁸ Valtioapäivät 1961. pöytäkirjat III. 13 December 1961. Tulo- ja menoarvio vuodelle 1962, Hertta Kuusinen, 2044, 2045.

⁴⁰⁹ PAAA Mfaa L43 A14080, report from Dr. Bauer 27 May 1960, "Finnland und die EFTA".

⁴¹⁰ PAAA Mfaa L43 A14116 Aktenvermerk 3 March 1961.

⁴¹¹ Kesselring 2009, 211.

clause with the Soviet Union itself, but by the clandestine air surrounding the negotiations. Helenius' interlocutors in the Office had noted that, as long as the contents of the treaty were not known, there was no possibility to make judgments regarding the true meaning of the treaty and its indirect effect on the Federal Republic.⁴¹² The irony was that, despite the feeling of threat that imbued the West German interpretations in the EFTA issue, Moscow was at the time actually working for the benefit of West Germans – albeit indirectly. They advised East Germans to be patient in the recognition issue with Finland, as the Kremlin seemed to find at this point that a discreet approach was a better way to influence Finland's position in the general Cold War configuration⁴¹³. The secrecy of the treaty resulted in speculations on the other side of the Atlantic too. Ultimately, they forced Finnish Foreign Ministry to debunk the rumors published in the *New York Herald Tribune* which had claimed that as a precondition to the EFTA treaty Finland had promised to the Soviet Union to recognize the German Democratic Republic.⁴¹⁴

Despite of all these worries, Helenius felt that it was still possible in West Germany to discern a growing understanding of the international position of Finland. This was manifested best, he noted, by the undertones in the already mentioned articles covering the EFTA issue, but also in the benign reporting (unlike in *The New York Times* discussed earlier) concerning Khrushchev's visit to Helsinki as well as Kekkonen's visit to Moscow. Also, the sixtieth birthday of President Kekkonen was covered widely in newspapers. Especially the representative was elated by the "objective", articles in German newspapers written by journalists that had visited Finland. Yet, it seems as though Helenius regarded that the political sphere of Finland was not the true indication of its quality as a nation when he noted that the articles in question had been retained in the sphere of economic and culture political issues.⁴¹⁵

Curiously enough, after noting the maladies attributed to the Finnish foreign policy on both Cold War camps, Helenius saw that the Finnish neutrality had, nevertheless, received an acceptance to a certain extent:

The concern that Finland would recognize the other German state was no longer as evident as before during the recently passed year. It seems as if the stand of absolute neutrality Finland has taken to German question has begun to receive more assent to its part. This goes for the official level as well as for the press. It should be noted that in the speculations concerning what nations might recognize the other German state, Finland was no longer mentioned. The question had been inquired from yours truly only once by the Foreign Ministry [of the Federal Republic] and even then it was inquired only unofficially. At the same occasion the suspicion was expressed that if some non-socialist country might recognize East Germany, as a consequence Finland too

⁴¹² UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 17 February 1961, "Suomen ja Saksan liittotasavallan välisistä suhteista v. 1960", p. 1.

⁴¹³ Putensen 2000, 130.

⁴¹⁴ UM 7 D II 305, telegram from Finnish Foreign Ministry, undated.

⁴¹⁵ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 17 February 1961, "Suomen ja Saksan liittotasavallan välisistä suhteista v. 1960", pp. 2, 3.

might recognize both German states. This would not correspond to stand of the Federal Republic which sees that the current trade mission as form of representation best serve the interest of both nations.⁴¹⁶

The quote shows that some sort of shift had taken place in the stance of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office. They seemed to be sending a message that they no longer feared Finland might alter its chosen policy of representation in the German states. Noteworthy is especially the wording Helenius used; he was tying Finland's German policy directly to the neutrality. In his words, the Finnish non-recognition policy was now understood as an "absolute neutrality". This could be taken as an indication that, in the Finnish Foreign Service, the German policy had begun amassing the symbolic value it was to achieve towards the end of the decade which it had so obviously lacked in the 1950s as the discussion on the previous chapters concerning reporting from that era showed.

After attributing certain credibility to the functionality of Finnish German policy as an indicator of neutrality, Helenius implicitly pointed out that the fluctuations in this regard were keenly observed and astutely addressed. He reported that the Federal Republic had wanted to counterbalance a series of visits from Finland to the German Democratic Republic by inviting representatives from different fields of society to the Federal Republic to familiarize them with certain aspects of Federal Republic life.⁴¹⁷

In sum, it seems, according to reporting, that Finland's neutrality was actually receiving more empathy from the Federal Republic after the first major crisis

⁴¹⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 17 February 1961, "Suomen ja Saksan liittotasavallan välisistä suhteista v. 1960", pp. 1, 2. "Huoli siitä, että Suomi tunnustaisi toisen Saksan ei kuluneena vuonna enää ollut niin selvästi havaittavissa kuin aikaisemmin. Näyttää siltä kuin Suomen nimenomaan Saksan kysymykseen nähden ottama ehdoton puolueeton asenne on vähitellen alkanut saada parempaa ymmärtämystä osakseen. Tämä koskee sekä virallista tahoa että lehdistöä. Merkille pantavaa on, että spekuloidessa mitkä maat mahdollisesti saattaisivat tunnustaa toisen Saksan ei Suomen nimeä enää mainittu. Kysymystä kosketeltiin allekirjoittaneen kanssa Auswärtiges Amtin taholta vain kerran ja silloinkin epävirallisesti. Tällöin esitettiin epäily, että mikäli joku ei-kommunistinen maa tunnustaisi toisen Saksan, Suomi mahdollisesti voisi päättää tunnustaa kummankin Saksan. Tämä ei vastaisi liittohallituksen kantaa, jonka mukaan nykyiset kaupalliset edustusuhheet toistaiseksi parhaiten vastaavat kummankin maan etuja."

⁴¹⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 17 February 1961, "Suomen ja Saksan liittotasavallan välisistä suhteista v. 1960", p. 2. The visit was done by a parliament delegation Finland led by the chairman of parliament. The delegation had been invited by Chairman Gerstenmaier of the Federal Republic. It was clear that the visit was considered important as the Federal President Lübke and Chancellor Adenauer had received the guests. Helenius also noted that the relations were also flourishing through the active operation of three different Finnish-German friendship societies. One society was also recently founded in Finland and it had Minister V. R. Fieandt had as its chair. The Hannover fair had also been a success according to Helenius. It was hosted by the Federal Republic's Minister of Trade Ludwig Erhard, and it received visitors from Finland such as Finnish Minister of Trade Pauli Lehtosalo, along with prominent Finnish industrialist Heikki H. Herlin. During the fair Minister Fieandt and Herlin had given presentations concerning the economical peculiarities and certain trade political aspects of Finland

of Finland's foreign policy in the postwar period. However, the crisis had tarnished the image of Finland in West Germany as the following section will show.

3.2.3 Aftermath of the crises: part two

The fact that Finland and its foreign policy's image had not gotten over the first major crisis of Finland's political integrity and independence in relation to the Kremlin without consequence became evident from the otherwise overtly reassuring reporting of Veli Helenius. This was manifested by a statement of West German President Heinrich Lübke. It also, in some respects, put Helenius in the ungrateful position (especially after his reporting painting a very benign picture of the Finno-German relations in general) to report the critique of West German president, implicitly, towards President Kekkonen.

Lübke had stated to the Finnish representative Helenius that he would have liked to visit Finland but that it "was not a free country" (*kein freies Land*), and that Finland was in such tight grip of the Soviet Union that one could not breathe freely there. Kekkonen was stunned by the statements and discussed the matter with the West German representative to Helsinki, Overbeck. The West German State Secretary Carsterns strived for damage control and explained that Lübke had merely meant that his visit at this point would not be "in the benefit of Finland".⁴¹⁸

Ironically enough, this was only a few months before the next test of Finland's foreign policy and neutrality. The next crisis, the so called Note Crisis, once again saw Finland's politics intruded indirectly by the Soviet Union. The crisis also coincided with the tensing situation in Berlin, which was perhaps appropriated as an excuse, in Finland's case, for the Soviet intrusion in the form of a note asking for military consultation by referring to the FCMA Treaty. The official culprit for the Soviet actions was the concretization of the political boundary already dividing Berlin; the building of the Berlin Wall. Consequently, the soviet leadership, as part of the general diplomatic onslaught against the West, sent Finland a note asking for common military consultations referred to in the FCMA Treaty in the case of West German military threat. The crisis abated faster than the Night Frost and the relations were – once again – normalized by President Kekkonen's personal diplomacy (once again) in the form of a visit to the other side of the border. Kekkonen travelled to Novosibirsk to meet Khrushchev less than month after the onset of the crisis, on 24 November 1961.⁴¹⁹ The Crisis was solved conveniently just before the upcoming presidential elections in the beginning of 1962

⁴¹⁸ "...ettei hän sitä voi Suomen oman edun vuoksi tehdä." (UM 12 K report from Cologne by T. Tikanvaara 14 June 1961). UM 12 K report from Cologne by T. Tikanvaara 14 June 1961; UM 12 K, Finnish Foreign Ministry memo concerning discussions of Kekkonen and Overbeck, same period undated.

⁴¹⁹ In domestic policy, the note crisis depicted President Kekkonen in the light of being an indispensable partner of the Soviets and solidified his power in Finland. However, this did not stop accusations against him that he had ordered the note. Yet, the accusations remained only speculations until the defection of the Soviet spy Anatoli Golitsyn who served in the Soviet Union's embassy in Helsinki. Golitsyn claimed to

and it also led to the dropping out of Kekkonen's main challenger, Olavi Honka, from the elections.⁴²⁰

It is, perhaps, possible that the negative press during the previous Night Frost Crisis had prepared President Kekkonen and his supporters for the negative coverage abroad. This interpretation seems to be supported by the fact that at the end of the second crisis the negative press was countered by the Finnish foreign policy's main discussion forum *Ulkopolitiikka* periodical in an article by Eino S. Repo, a supporter and a trusted man of Kekkonen, and later the editor in chief of Finnish broadcasting company Yle (known for the leftist bias during Repo's tenure), which reminded readers of the subjectivity of the Western press.⁴²¹ In the next edition could be found President's Kekkonen's article, which seemed to lean similarly towards the skewed view of Finland abroad as well. It appropriated history as a tool for political argumentation and reminded readers of the sensational writings in the foreign press before the Crimean war concerning Finnish war enthusiasm, an observation made by J.V. Snellman, the most important spiritual founder and intellectual of the Finnish nationalism and nation building.⁴²²

It was not only in West Germany that the crisis brought up heated discussion. In fact, for the lack of foreign policy discussion in Finnish parliament, the political adversary of President Kekkonen, Tuure Junnula from the National Coalition party, took advantage of the budget discussion (also a reminder that there was not officially reserved a debate slot for parliamentary foreign policy discussion in the Finnish parliament) in Eduskunta in December 1961, and shifted his speech to address the current on-going crisis. In Junnula's view, President Kekkonen had, by his actions, led Finland to the ongoing situation as he had narrowed the maneuvering space of Finland regarding foreign policy. He noted in its essence that Kekkonen (Junnula used the general term foreign policy leadership, but it was clear whom he mainly referred to) had monopolized the Eastern relations for his and his party's (the Agrarian Union) benefit while, at the same time, casting distrust in Soviet leadership towards other political forces in Finland. Now, according to Junnula, a member of the right-wing forces in the government immediately marked foreign policy distrust by the Soviet Union.⁴²³ He also pointed out the Finnish constitution (*valtiomuoto*) did not imbue the president with such exclusive foreign policy leadership that had come to realization during Kekkonen's office.⁴²⁴

CIA and Finnish Security Intelligence Service (Suojelupoliisi, Supo) that Kekkonen had taken part in the planning of the note. However, his claims could not be validated. Still, it is probable that information was relegated by the United States to the Federal Republic as well. (Rentola 2009, 34).

⁴²⁰ The supporters of Honka backed down in fear that the note crises would not be solved if the challenger of Kekkonen remained in the presidential race

⁴²¹ *Ulkopolitiikka* 1 / 1961. Nootin jälkeen. Eino S. Repo. 24 November 1961.

⁴²² *Ulkopolitiikka* 2 / 1961. Paasikivestä. Urho Kekkonen, undated.

⁴²³ Valtiopäivät 1961. pöytäkirjat III. 13 December 1961. Tulo- ja menoarvio vuodelle 1962. Tuure Junnula, 2066.

⁴²⁴ Junnula 1980, 167, 168.

Junnila's speech also juxtaposed Finnish neutrality in a non-flattering comparison with the neutralities of Sweden, Austria, and Switzerland. He noted that if, in these countries, if a foreign entity would suggest who is eligible to partake in the government, they would debunk the suggestion as a breach of sovereignty and unsuitable for their "party-politics".⁴²⁵

The reception of Junnila's open attack was inimical even among his own party's members (also the National Coalition party Chairman Jussi Saukkonen disowned Junnila's views), which implied that the Finnish political culture was already tense regarding the critique of foreign policy and the Soviet Union's influence. Foreign Minister Karjalainen (Agrarian League) addressed National Coalition party directly and wished to know if it could stand behind Junnila's views. However, the most direct manifestation was that Junnila did not renew his MP position in the next elections, which he himself regarded as the result of his bold foreign policy speech.⁴²⁶

Junnila wrote a comprehensive analysis of the situation and it was published as a book.⁴²⁷ Later research and even memoirs of the Soviet Ambassador to Finland have proven his observations astute that the note was not only the result of tensing international situations, especially in Germany, but it was also sent to assist Kekkonen and his supporters in the next elections to destroy his opponent, Olavi Honka, supported by Junnila.⁴²⁸ A month later, Junnila was branded in *Pravda* along with Väinö Leskinen (Social Democratic Party of Finland), Georg C. Ehrnrooth (Swedish People's Party of Finland, from 1973 on founder and member of Constitutional People's Party, later named Constitutional Right Party) as a prime example of "revanchist circles", reminiscent of Finnish advocates of the war alliance with Germany.⁴²⁹

The West German mission's reporting in Helsinki seemed to note the larger implications of the crisis and noted a holistic change in the political atmosphere of Finland as well. According to its report in January 1962 immediately after the note, clever propaganda by Moscow and the Finnish foreign policy leadership and the Moscow-friendly circles of Finland had managed to infuse the Finnish people with distorted views regarding the foreign policy matters. The reporting quoted an inquiry executed in Finland in which the majority respondents had stated that, of all the foreign nations, the Soviet Union had shown the most goodwill towards Finland. The report also stated that, contrary to facts, the majority also believed that the Soviet Union was the most important trading partner of Finland. The report noted that for Finnish people the German question and the dynamics between the two German states were viewed "without warmth" in a

⁴²⁵ Valtiopäivät 1961. pöytäkirjat III. 13 December 1961. Tulo- ja menoarvio vuodelle 1962. Tuure Junnila, 2068.

⁴²⁶ Junnila 1980, 168.

⁴²⁷ See Junnila 1962.

⁴²⁸ E.g. See Rentola 2009, 34; Rautkallio 1992, memoirs of the Soviet Ambassador Viktor Vladimirov 1993, 115-135. For more lenient view on the note, see e.g. Suomi 191992, 548-549.

⁴²⁹ PAAA B23 bd. 205, report from West German embassy in Moscow 1 January 1962, "Sowjetisch-finnische Beziehungen".

sense that the competition between them were seen as a danger to world peace. In that regard, Finland's own destiny was also seen to be at stake.⁴³⁰

According to archive material of the West German Foreign Office, the West German embassy in Moscow had earlier discussed Tuure Junnula's views and were aware of the domestic political implications of the resulting situation after the note. In their analysis, one of the purposes of the *Pravda* article after the note was to strengthen the popular front, "*Volksfrontierende*", interpretation of history in Finland, which argued that Lenin had donated independence to Finland. It was an interpretation that Kekkonen started defending later on, especially in 1970, which was hundredth birthday of Lenin and in the wake of new historical interpretations emerging in Finland that Lenin had been forced to agree to Finland's independence.⁴³¹ In fact, Kekkonen had already made a similar, but modified, interpretation after the death of Stalin. In his radio speech as prime minister on 6 March 1953 he emphasized how Stalin had suggested to Lenin to grant Finland independence.⁴³² According to the West German embassy, the *Pravda* article's purpose was to remind Finland of the Soviet Union's importance and prevent the re-elections of politicians such as Junnula. The embassy's report concluded with the statement that after the note Finland continued with independence that was more "relative" than before.⁴³³

A few months after the crisis, the West German trade mission in Helsinki continued to follow the situation worried. They noted that the increased propagation of the Finno-Soviet relations lingered and especially pointed out the Finnish-Soviet Friendship day, which toted the importance of the relations.⁴³⁴ The mission also noted the substantial number of Finnish guests, including secretary of the Agrarian League, Pekka Silvola, at the Moscow World Peace Conference in July and, a month later, stated that "the Finnish state leadership in increasing amounts strives to strengthen the interaction of Finnish youth in the Finno-Soviet friendshipwork".⁴³⁵ This phenomenon was part of the increasingly extraordinary politico-cultural interaction between Finland and the Soviet Union (by and large through the Finnish-Soviet Society), which culminated in the 1980s when it had spread its influence to practically every municipality in Finland.⁴³⁶

In the same fall when the Soviet Union threatened to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany and concede the control of Berlin occupations zones to

⁴³⁰ PAAA B23 bd. 205, report from West German trade mission in Helsinki 5 January 1962, "Ergebnisse einer Bevölkerungsumfrage in Finnland".

⁴³¹ Suomi 1996, 420.

⁴³² Kekkonen's radio speech 6 March 1953, Yle elävä arkisto, <https://yle.fi/aihe/artikeli/2006/09/08/suomalaiset-muistelevat-j-v-stalinia> [accessed 20 June 2018].

⁴³³ PAAA B23 bd. 205, report from West German embassy in Moscow 1 January 1962 "Sowjetisch-finnische Beziehungen".

⁴³⁴ PAAA B23 bd. 205, report from West German trade mission in Helsinki 13 July 1962 "Finnisch-sowjetische Freundschaftstage".

⁴³⁵ PAAA B23 bd. 205, report from West German trade mission in Helsinki 13 July 1962 "Finnische Teilnahme am "Weltfriedenskongress" in Moskau". PAAA B 23 bd. 205, Report from West German trade mission in Helsinki 27 August 1962 "Erziehung der finnischen Jugend zu größerem Verständnis für die Sowjetunion".

⁴³⁶ Mikkonen 2015, 3.

the German Democratic Republic, the West Germans became even more vexed with the situation⁴³⁷. The head of the West German mission in Helsinki, Heinrich Böx, met with the Secretary of State Karl Carstens and discussed the possible measures to prevent Finland from following the Soviet example and sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany. Carstens and Böx pondered four options to use as a threat. The first one was the termination of the relations between Finland and the Federal Republic.⁴³⁸

This option was very interesting as it seemed once again to prove that Finland in fact held more than consular relations and had already, in a sense, recognized both German states. This can be deduced as Carsten and Böx had evaluated why the option was dysfunctional; in their view, the situations would have resulted in the “continuation of consular relations and trade” and that the severance of the relations would have little effect.

The fact that they believed that after the rupture there would have still existed consular relations is important. It means that the relations subject to discussion were something more than mere consular relations, which was, after all, the official level of relations. This deduction can be made despite the fact that in international relations the function of consular level relations has varied, and the functions can overlap in some respects.⁴³⁹ The tasks of the diplomatic and consular missions were codified actually during the period when the discussion of the German foreign policymakers was taking place (in 1961 and 1963) there were universal conventions being held concerning them. The conventions determined that the function of the consular relations was to oversee the interests of the home nations’ trade and seafaring and the pragmatic assistance of the home nations’ citizens in certain judicial and legal matters. Diplomatic missions, on the other hand, were, in general, to focus on the advancement of home nations’ interests on the political and official state-to-state level, in the gathering of information, the advancement of cultural and scientific relations, and the negotiations with the government of the base country.⁴⁴⁰

The second option that Carstens and Böx regarded in the case of Finland’s possible separate peace treaty with East Germany was the diminishment of trade. However, it was considered ineffective by Carstens and Böx as well since West Germany imported most of its goods from countries other than Finland. Yet, they

⁴³⁷ The United States government, Central Intelligence Agency, intelligence memorandum 24.2.1967, Strains in Soviet-East German relations: 1962–1967, p. 1. Intelligence Memorandum: 24.2.1967 Strains in Soviet-East German relations 1962–1967. https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/docs/DOC_0000969854.pdf [accessed 19 February 2017].

⁴³⁸ PAAA B23 bd. 205, West German Foreign Office memo 17 August 1962, “Memoranden Generalkonsul Dr. Böx”.

⁴³⁹ Initially, the consular relations were appropriated in the late middle age by Spanish and French merchants as a way of securing the commercial interests in other nations. After that, their importance grew as a general way of upholding relations to other nations until the 17th century when permanent diplomatic missions began to be established. The growing international trade in the 19th century once again lifted the importance of consular relations as well. (Hakapää 2010, 329, 330.)

⁴⁴⁰ Hakapää 2010, 330–332.

pondered that the general trade-boycott of Western countries could have been an option worth considering.⁴⁴¹

The third option in Bonn's possible counter-measures was the opposition to Finland's inclusion in the EEC. This threat was considered to hold weight since the main trade partners of Finland were either in the EEC or EFTA. This was the option that was deemed as carrying the most substantial consequences as Böx and Carstens regarded that it would, in essence, drive Finland to dependency of the Soviet Union. The memo did not articulate in which aspect the dependency was defined, but it can be assumed that the trade dependency in their view also would have led naturally to an ever-tightening political dependency as well.⁴⁴²

The fourth and final option was the one that the seemed, according to the memo, most suitable for the Germans: it appears that the memo ultimately favored a method of positive reinforcement of Finland's Western relations. Carstens and Böx thought that they should imply to the Finns that West Germans could further Finland's position in the negotiations concerning her association to EEC. This was, of course, only if Finland's behavior in the separate peace treaty issue would concede to the wishes of Bonn.⁴⁴³ All this, however, gives an impression that some sort of low was reached in the bilateral relations after the two consequential crises in connection to the German question. Yet, it still shows that there was also some remaining sympathy in Bonn, but that it was clearly infused with the real-political calculation of the general framework of the Western alliance in the Cold War. The West Germans were considering the loss that might be incurred by the Western alliance in case of retaliation by trade relations.

As during the Night Frost Crisis, there was no reporting from Germany during this latter crisis concerning its implications from the German point of view. It is hard to give a definite answer for this, but one reason could have been that it was considered too politically loaded domestically by the diplomats and they did not wish to intervene in any way – similar to Finnish Ambassador Eero A. Wuori in Moscow.⁴⁴⁴ However, the immediate aftermath of the crisis shed some light on the issue and its implications in the reporting. The Finnish Foreign Ministry seemed to be especially interested, naturally, in the implications of the crisis for the image of Finnish neutrality as they had asked Finland's Permanent Representation in the United Nations to report concerning it.⁴⁴⁵

In February 1962, a couple months after the crisis had abated, a customary yearly report concerning the development of relations between Finland and the Federal Republic gave the first indications regarding the matter in the Federal

⁴⁴¹ PAAA B23 bd. 205, West German Foreign Office memo 17 August 1962, "Memoranden Generalkonsul Dr. Böx".

⁴⁴² PAAA B23 bd. 205, West German Foreign Office memo 17 August 1962, "Memoranden Generalkonsul Dr. Böx".

⁴⁴³ PAAA B23 bd. 205, West German Foreign Office memo 17 August 1962, "Memoranden Generalkonsul Dr. Böx".

⁴⁴⁴ See p. 104, chapter 3.2.2.

⁴⁴⁵ UM 12 K 1955-1964 report from the Permanent Representation in UN, 16 March 1962.

Republic.⁴⁴⁶ The task of this customary report was assigned to consul Lares by Torsten Tikanvaara, the head of the mission (perhaps as the report usually was quite a general overview of the relations without deeper analysis of the particular matters). The report seemed to confirm the position already assumed by Helenius in his report in early 1961, in which he implied that Bonn was tying Finnish German policy not only to its ostensible cover of neutrality, but with its actual *raison d'être* which lay in Finland's Eastern policy.⁴⁴⁷

The Note Crisis was addressed in this report and Lares stated that the note had received substantial attention in the Federal Republic, as the wording in the note had explained it to be directed against the threat of West Germany and its allies' against European peace. The Federal Republic's government reacted calmly and passed off the note's claim of the Federal Republic's threat as absurd. The official level of the Federal Republic had not discussed the subject widely, whereas the public opinion had reacted fiercely. Yet, according to Lares, there had been no critique towards the Finnish foreign policy. Contrary to this, the press had actually appraised the actions of the Finnish political leadership and President Kekkonen as skillful and successful. Still, this did not mean, according to Lares, that they believed the same possibilities and success would prevail in the future. Lares had observed a tone in the press writings that was empathetic but infused with pessimism. However, Lares sought to explain this by the international Cold War position of the Federal Republic. In his reasoning, it was because the Federal Republic was a NATO country located on a collision point of power-groupings of East and West, which consequently exacerbated its propensity to see Finland's position as quite dire.⁴⁴⁸

Lares was astute to point out that the NATO affiliation affected, at that point, the perception of West Germans concerning Finland. The crisis-ridden years of 1958–1961 changed the perception of Finland in the North Atlantic alliance. Until the Night Frost at the end of 1958, the West had regarded that Finland had already managed to evade the Soviet Union's influence in its policymaking. However, after the crises, and especially after Kekkonen's personal involvement in Novosibirsk to solve the Note Crisis, it was once again deemed that Finland might overwhelmingly succumb to Soviet influence.⁴⁴⁹ The persistence of this view in the West German foreign office might have been not least buttressed by the pessimistic reporting that it was receiving from its representation in Finland – even years after the crises.⁴⁵⁰

⁴⁴⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 19 February 1962, "Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan väliset suhteet vuonna 1961", p. 1.

⁴⁴⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 19 February 1962, "Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan väliset suhteet vuonna 1961", p. 1.

⁴⁴⁸ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 19 February 1962, "Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan väliset suhteet vuonna 1961", p. 1.

⁴⁴⁹ Kesselring 2009, 211, 212.

⁴⁵⁰ E.g. see report of FRG trade mission 15 March 1963, "Besuch des finnischen Ministerpräsidenten Karjalainen in der UdSSR vom 21. Februar bis 1. März 1963 (PAAA B23 bd. 228); Telegram from FRG embassy in Moscow 5 December 1963 (PAAA B23 bd. 228).

Yet, paradoxically, Lares interpreted that all this actually increased Finland's maneuvering space in German policy. His deduction was based on the ongoing (involuntary) unveiling of Finnish foreign policy to its truthful image. In Lares' words, "...in the Federal Republic the Finnish stance to German question is seen in the light of our Eastern policy".⁴⁵¹ What Lares expressed here, in practice, was that in the Federal Republic there was an ability to see through the façade of Finnish foreign policy. This interpretation of his meaning seems especially valid as he added that from time to time there was expressed the possibility that Finland might be forced to recognize the German Democratic Republic. Due to this, it was deemed in the Federal Republic that the current form of representation, in which, according to Lares, Finland "did not have diplomatic relations with either part of Germany", was in these circumstances the best solution.⁴⁵² Lares' views seemed to receive partial confirmation from Finland's Permanent Representation in United Nations. It reported that the stability of Finnish neutrality had become well-known during the six years that the Finland had acted in the organization but noted that the doubts concerning the direct Soviet influence had existed earlier⁴⁵³. However, the doubts had not yet totally vanished. For example, at the same period, the director general of Finnish Foreign Ministry's Political Department, Max Jakobson, received an invitation from the West German representative in Helsinki, Heinrich Böx, to make a lecturing visit to the West German foreign policy association (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik*) in order to rectify certain misconceptions concerning the Finnish neutrality.⁴⁵⁴

Lares' interpretation that Finland's German policy was linked in the West increasingly to Finland's Eastern policy received indirect evidence few months later as Finland negotiated for the purchase of British air defense missiles. At this occasion the United States' ambassador to Finland, Bernard Gufler, had approached the Finnish Foreign Ministry and wished for rebuttal of the rumors that Finland might alter its German policy, that is, to recognize East Germany. He needed this assurance to have his government's approval for the missile purchases, which also needed the approval of three of four victor powers according to the stipulations of Paris Peace Treaty.⁴⁵⁵

All in all, the reporting after the crises seemed to indicate that, if anything, the crises had garnered more understanding but perhaps less sympathy from the

⁴⁵¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 19 February 1962, "Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan väliset suhteet vuonna 1961", p. 2.

⁴⁵² UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 19 February 1962, "Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan väliset suhteet vuonna 1961", p. 2.

⁴⁵³ UM 12 K 1955-1964, report from the Permanent Representation in UN, 16 March 1962. The report noted that Earlier it was feared that Finland was under direct influence of the Soviet Union.

⁴⁵⁴ UM 12 K 1955-1964 memo of Max Jakobson 9 February 1962. Jakobson gave also representation in Lund's foreign policy association (Utrikespolitiska Föreningen) in Sweden the following year, which implies that the promotion of Finnish neutrality with this method was deemed effective in the ministry. (UM 12 K 1955-1964 "Osastopäällikkö Max Jakobsonin esitelämä Lundin yliopiston ulkopoliittisen yhdistyksen kokouksessa 13 November 1963.)

⁴⁵⁵ Karjalainen & Tarkka 1989, 126, 127.

Federal Republic for Finland's German policy. It was now seen as part of Finland's Eastern policy. Yet, this had not repelled fears that Finland might be unable to hold this position. But, as noted before, in this respect the status quo of the policy increasingly seemed, from the Western, and Bonn's, viewpoint, a small victory. And, as if to express that this state was something Finland should retain and be satisfied with, Consul Lares ended his previously discussed report by noting that, on a functional level, the solution did not hinder Finland's relations with the Federal Republic. Contrary to the evaluation of Olavi Munkki in the mid-1950s⁴⁵⁶, the opinion of Lares was that the lack of consular and diplomatic relations was not, in any manner, affecting the work of the consulate.⁴⁵⁷ However, this did not exempt the diplomats in any way from constant probing in relation to the possible threat of the Hallstein Doctrine in the worst-case scenario of Finland's German policy – not after or before the aforementioned crises. It was, after all, the real rationale, instead of the ostensible neutrality, behind Finland's (as the previous discussion has shown) quite vague form of representation in divided Germany. The next chapter will cover further the topic of the Hallstein Doctrine and its relation to Finland.

3.3 Views on the Hallstein Doctrine

3.3.1 Finland no exception to the rule

As the previous chapter showed, especially after the crises of the late 1950s and early 1960s between Finland and the Soviet Union, Finland's German policy was seen in the framework of Finland's Eastern policy – in effect meaning Finland's decisions regarding the German policy were seen as contingent of the particular actions of the Soviet Union. It also showed that in Bonn there was a certain understanding of Finland's awkward position between East and West. The latter aspect does not, however, merit an interpretation that Finland could have been calculated out of the Hallstein Doctrine's target list just because it was forced to consider the superpower next to it in its foreign policy. Quite the contrary, in fact, from the West German perspective, the aforementioned (in case realized by the Finnish foreign policy leadership) combined with the dilution of the doctrine could have meant that Finland might have been tempted to act on the German question for its own (or Kekkonen's) and the Soviet Union's benefit.

In general, however, the doctrine was – especially from Finland's standpoint because it prevented Finland from recognizing either of the German states – a deviation from the main aspect of the Federal Republic's foreign policy in the 1950s. Bonn's new foreign policy after the war was contradictory to the old

⁴⁵⁶ See section 3.1.1

⁴⁵⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 19 February 1962, "Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan väliset suhteet vuonna 1961", p. 2.

great power and nationalistic policy of Germany, it also emphasized peacefulness, obedience towards treaties, readiness for international co-operation and compromise, and consideration towards the interests and sensitivities of other nations. These goals were taken as self-evident throughout the party-political spectrum in West Germany.⁴⁵⁸ In other words, the new German political culture was in development with its main purpose to obliterate the remains of the Prussian tradition leaning towards the anti-parliamentarism that had remained to some degree even after the First World War.⁴⁵⁹ All this was, of course, not very compatible with the idea of the Hallstein Doctrine, which was threatening to terminate relations unilaterally by the Federal Republic with any such nation that would recognize the German Democratic Republic.

Bonn's assertive stance was legitimized by the backing of three victorious Western powers: France, Great Britain, and the United States. They did not wish to acknowledge the existence of a new socialist state in the middle of Europe. An attitude that was partly a response to the victory of Mao Tse-tung in mainland China.⁴⁶⁰

The first time Finnish diplomats were faced with the task of interpreting the Hallstein Doctrine's applicability in the case of Finland was in early 1956. This was due to the case of ambiguous statement from the West German foreign minister, von Brentano, who was to become one of the central political figures during the Adenauer era, and a trusted man of the chancellor.⁴⁶¹ The statement was interpreted as giving implications that the doctrine actually did not apply to Finland. The incident took place in an interview of Brentano by a Swedish correspondent for *Svenska Dagbladet* and *Uusi Suomi* newspapers and it forced the Finnish consulate to become active in probing the stance of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office.⁴⁶²

According to Olavi Munkki, who was the head of the Finnish mission in West Cologne at this time, he had already earlier learned from a Swedish correspondent that the correspondent was interested in von Brentano's stance concerning the Finnish representation in divided Germany. Despite Munkki's plea that the Finnish mission was not "in the habit of bringing up questions regarding the status of the representation in the Federal Republic, but much rather kept quiet about these things", the correspondent questioned von Brentano regarding the matter.⁴⁶³

⁴⁵⁸ Schwarz 1981, 453, 454. The higher goal of serving democratic society's needs was not only limited to the sphere of politics, but also research in humanities, including history, were in some areas subjected to this purpose. The historiographical research especially strived to search for answers why the totalitarian society had come to existence in Germany. (Spohr-Readman 2011, 514.)

⁴⁵⁹ Ihalainen 2016a, 26.

⁴⁶⁰ Gray 2003, 13. Officially, the stance of three Western powers was decided in a meeting in Paris in November 1949.

⁴⁶¹ Schwarz 1981, 41.

⁴⁶² UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 25 February 1956, "Ulkoministeri von Brentanon haastattelun 16/2 Suomea koskeva osa".

⁴⁶³ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 25 February 1956, "Ulkoministeri von Brentanon haastattelun 16/2 Suomea koskeva osa", pp. 1, 2.

From the minutes of the interview, Munkki was able to quote in verbatim what von Brentano had stated. The answer had been a complex diplomatic statement, resembling the earlier statements of the foreign office concerning the Finnish representation.⁴⁶⁴ Von Brentano posited that Bonn did not wish to enter “in the vicious circle” where it would “not establish representation where the German Democratic was represented”.⁴⁶⁵

In principle, it was possible to interpret von Brentano’s statement evidencing that the Federal Republic had renounced its claim for the exclusive representation with regards to Germany. The statement, after all, claimed that the Federal Republic did not wish to enter the “vicious circle” where it would *not* establish full diplomatic representation where the German Democratic Republic was represented.

The interpretation of Munkki, however, started from the standpoint that in the complex statement which consisted of several negations, von Brentano had simply lost his train of thought. Munkki regarded that the previous stance concerning the Hallstein Doctrine still held and wrote “I dare still to retain the position that Foreign Minister Von Brentano’s statement should not be interpreted this way [that it renounced Hallstein Doctrine], and that the stance of the Federal Republic’s foreign office is still the same as earlier.” However, because Munkki had not received any directions regarding the issue from the ministry, he stated that he had not yet discussed the issue with the official of the Federal Republic’s Foreign Office. He also noted that previously there had been vagueness in von Brentano’s statements regarding the relations of the Federal Republic with Finland.⁴⁶⁶

Munkki concluded the report by noting that, when all the circumstances were taken in consideration, it was probable that the Federal Republic’s foreign office would settle for the current arrangement with regards to relations with Finland. They were not, he continued, likely to strive to change them either, provided that the current representative offices in both countries were provided with as large operational rights as possible, and that there would not be a strive to emphasize their special status on the protocol related basis.⁴⁶⁷

Munkki assigned Press Assistant Jussi Mäkinen to investigate further regarding the subject. Consequently, an audience had been arranged between

⁴⁶⁴ See section 3.1.2, Syrian case, and chapter 3.1.3, Heinrich von Brentano’s statement in press conference before the Geneva conference of July 1955.

⁴⁶⁵ The original German text: “Wir wollen und werden die freundschaftlichen Beziehungen zu Finnland pflegen, wir wollen sie in keiner Weise belasten. Aber wir können – das werden Sie verstehen – nicht in diesen *circulus vitiosus* eintreten, dass wir dem eigenen Grundsatz untreu werden, dass wir eben keine vollen diplomatischen Beziehungen dort errichten, wo die Deutsche Demokratische Republik vertreten ist.” (UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 25 February 1956 “Ulkoministeri von Brentanon haastattelun 16/2 Suomea koskeva osa”, pp. 1, 2.)

⁴⁶⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 25 February 1956, “Ulkoministeri von Brentanon haastattelun 16/2 Suomea koskeva osa”, p. 2.

⁴⁶⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 25 February 1956, “Ulkoministeri von Brentanon haastattelun 16/2 Suomea koskeva osa”, p. 2.

Mäkinen and von Brentano's Press Secretary Diehl, who was, according to Mäkinen, titled as "the right hand" of von Brentano.⁴⁶⁸

The narration of Mäkinen's meeting with Diehl made clear how tender the subject of Finnish representation was at that time for Finnish representatives. Mäkinen wrote that he had planned with Munkki before the meeting how he would react if the subject of Finnish representation was brought up (initially the meeting was arranged for Diehl to hand over the transcripts of von Brentano's interview). The representatives had decided that it was necessary to let Diehl discreetly know that Hakansson (who had inquired about the status of Finnish representation from von Brentano) had not acted on the request of the Finnish consulate. This was done, according to Munkki, in order to retain a coherent line in the actions of the mission, as it was customary that the Finnish mission did not want to bring this subject up on its own behalf.⁴⁶⁹

The issue of representation had been, however, brought up just as Munkki and Mäkinen had predicted. Diehl stated to Mäkinen that the Federal Republic's government did not want to put the Finnish government in a difficult position by suggesting the establishment of diplomatic relations. Diehl had followed with a surprisingly explicit statement admitting that the Federal Republic's Foreign Office, in fact, understood Finland could not establish mutual embassies with Bonn because the result would be that Finland then would have to establish similar diplomatic relations also with the Pankow government.⁴⁷⁰

However, despite the sympathy presented on Bonn's behalf by Diehl regarding the Finnish position on the German question, he seemed to find it somewhat void in its symbolic essence. Manifestation of this doubt concerning the policy was revealed at the end of the discussion as Diehl had wondered whether it really was such a drastic issue if the Finnish representative in Bonn and the Federal Republic's representative in Helsinki would be titled as ambassador, consul, or something else. In Diehl's view, the upshot of the current affairs was that both parties acted as if a normal diplomatic mission was in question.⁴⁷¹

Yet, the reporting revealed also that the matter of representation was not something Bonn was not willing to easily toy with either. The industrious propaganda actions of the German Democratic Republic's trade mission in Helsinki had especially caught the attention of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office. Diehl had revealed that Bonn had plans to send a press-assistant to Helsinki to counterbalance the East German propaganda. All this was brought about by the complaints of the Federal Republic's representative Köning in Helsinki, who had

⁴⁶⁸ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 1 March 1956, "Ulkomministeri von Brentanon haastattelun Suomea koskeva osa II. – Keskustelu lähetystöneuvos Diehlin kanssa", p. 1.

⁴⁶⁹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 1 March 1956, "Ulkomministeri von Brentanon haastattelun Suomea koskeva osa II. – Keskustelu lähetystöneuvos Diehlin kanssa" p. 1.

⁴⁷⁰ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 1 March 1956, "Ulkomministeri von Brentanon haastattelun Suomea koskeva osa II. – Keskustelu lähetystöneuvos Diehlin kanssa", p. 2.

⁴⁷¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 1 March 1956, "Ulkomministeri von Brentanon haastattelun Suomea koskeva osa II. – Keskustelu lähetystöneuvos Diehlin kanssa", p. 2.

stated that the propaganda actions of the German Democratic Republic had begun to bear results.⁴⁷²

3.3.2 Brotherus' first impressions and the challenging of the Hallstein Doctrine

After the incident of reporter Håkanson and von Brentano's vague statement regarding the Hallstein Doctrine and Finland, the question of the Doctrine's applicability arose in the reporting again a year later. Now the interpreter of the Doctrine for the Finnish Foreign Ministry, however, had changed: the reporting was done by the successor of Olavi Munkki. It was possible that Munkki's unwillingness to cope with the low status of the representation, over which he had clearly expressed his regret, and the reporting "strike", which he had put on earlier, might have led the ministry to deduce that Munkki was more suitable to serve in other posts more fitting for his prestige, that is, where he could function on the ambassadorial level.

Munkki's replacement, Heikki Brotherus, was similarly to Munkki: he was a seasoned diplomat whose service in the ranks of the ministry was already well into its second decade. He had begun his service in the Finnish Foreign Ministry by working in the Finnish missions based in Nordic countries: in 1935 he had begun as a trainee in Copenhagen, and, after a period of working in the Foreign Ministry back in Finland, he had been appointed in 1943 to work as a first secretary in representative offices in Stockholm and Oslo.⁴⁷³

Yet, if the predecessor of Brotherus had proven to be somewhat capricious, the same would prove to be true regarding Brotherus. Brotherus, by all indications, belonged to a category of men whose personality exceeded the subtleness usually expected from the foreign administration's civil servants. A trait that seemed to result in either one of the following opposite options: it either provided those men with an excessively successful career, or it could manifest openly at behest of it.⁴⁷⁴ In the case of Brotherus, the latter would be the case. His choice to discuss, outside the Ministry, the secret memo the Soviet Union had ceded to Finland concerning Finland's Efta negotiations⁴⁷⁵ cost him his post in divided Germany and ultimately ended his career in the foreign ministry in 1960.⁴⁷⁶

The case that ousted Brotherus from the German post was the Blechinberg incident. It was a case in which the Danish secretary of legation in Denmark's embassy in Bonn had taken three documents concerning Denmark's co-operation with NATO forces. When Blechinberg had been asked for the documents he claimed he had lent them to Brotherus, who was willing to vouch for the story of

⁴⁷² UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 1 March 1956 "Ulkomisteri von Brentanon haastattelun Suomea koskeva osa II. - Keskustelu lähetystöneuvos Diehlin kanssa", p. 2.

⁴⁷³ Ulkoasiainhallinnon matrikkeli 1993, osa 1, 130.

⁴⁷⁴ The example from the first type were figures such as Ralph Enckell, and Max Jakobson, who both made remarkable careers in the Finnish Foreign Administration (see Reimaa 2013; Tarkka 2010).

⁴⁷⁵ Supo, newspaper clip of Maakansa 15 May 1960, hs XXVIIA-226.

⁴⁷⁶ Supo, newspaper clip of Maakansa 15 May 1960, hs XXVIIA-226.

his friend and colleague, Blechinberg. However, as the case grew to a scale Brotherus had not foreseen, he was forced to reveal that, in his narration of the events concerning the case, he had been willing to concede verifiable facts for the betterment of the situation facing his friend – in other words, he falsely vouched for him. This led him to be relinquished from his post in Bonn on 31 May 1958.⁴⁷⁷ Blechinberg, on the other hand faced more dire consequences by being accused of selling the documents for the Soviet Union and he ultimately received an eight year sentence.⁴⁷⁸

However, in the fall of 1957 all was still calm when Brotherus reported on the subject of the Hallstein Doctrine. This time it was in the context of Bonn's bifurcated foreign policy goals: on the one side, Bonn's ever-increasing alignment with the West, and on the other, its pursuit of bettering its relations with its Eastern socialist neighbors. According to the reporting, oddly enough, the possibilities in the latter were the result of the former (the Bonn's increased alignment with West). In this regard, the reporting pointed out that the only problem with the relations was now the Hallstein Doctrine, and especially the challenge of it that originated from Yugoslavia. It also showed the Finnish Foreign Ministry that the Doctrine still deserved the unconditional attention, the focus and worth which it derived from its position as the most important factor in Finland's German policy.

In this regard, Brotherus could begin his reporting from Germany with satisfaction, as he could, almost from the very beginning of his post, inform the Finnish Foreign Ministry that he had managed to achieve the blessing of the Finnish foreign policy from the highest echelons of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office. His informants had been Foreign Minister von Brentano and the father of the Doctrine himself, Secretary of State Walter Hallstein. Still, the assurance had obviously not been done as wholeheartedly as the Finnish foreign policymakers might have wished for. The duo of top men of Bonn's foreign policymaking had resorted to diplomatic euphemism as they commented on the Finnish German policy. This was indicated by their reference to Finland as a nation in a "special position", which according to Brentano and Hallstein, was understood in the Federal Republic perfectly. It had been, of course, reference to Finland's – from

⁴⁷⁷ Ironically during Brotherus' post in Stockholm, he was suspected, contrary to Bleichingber case, by communists for giving information to the benefit of the right-wing politicians. The left-leaning Finnish Security Police (so-called Punainen Valpo) made a report of Brotherus' actions indicating that Brotherus was keeping Swedish newspapers informed of Finnish politics. The file claimed bluntly that Brotherus "could not keep anything secret" Supo hs XXVIIA-226, 15 January 1946). The Security Police was at this point was purged from nationally minded war-era officials (who had worked in collaboration with German security police), in favor of the new left-oriented direction, personified by the new de facto leader of the security police, vice-president Aimo Aaltonen, also the chairman of the Finnish Communist Party (SKP). His position as the "invisible" leader of the security police was secured by the Soviet Union, who could exert their influence in the organization of Finland's domestic security by holding sway in the Allied Control Commission. (Lackman 2009, 248; Rentola 2009, 250, 251.)

⁴⁷⁸ Putensen 2000, 90-94, Viikkosanomat 23 May 1958.

the Western standpoint – disquieting symbiotic relationship with the Soviet Union, for example, by the barter/clearing trade and the FCMA Treaty.⁴⁷⁹

However, it was clear that whatever reservations von Brentano and Hallstein had in relation to Finland's position vis-à-vis the Soviet Union, they had not wished to make it a hindrance for the relations between Bonn and Helsinki. In fact, it looks that the men had wanted clearly to vanquish Brotherus' doubts concerning the functionality of the representation. According to Brotherus, Hallstein and Brentano had assured him that the Finnish representative would be treated within the limitations of normal protocol guidelines as if he were a normal head of a diplomatic mission. Of course, in this, the Foreign Office was also cementing the Finnish stance of non-recognition of East Germany, which for them was of utmost importance.⁴⁸⁰

This overtly benign stance and brimming sympathy was explained – as the discussion in the previous chapters already showed – by the reference that Bonn's foreign policymakers were using Finland, i.e. their willing attribution of distinctiveness to Finland's status which in their view was the result of the Soviet Union's influence, and which in their view dictated not only Finland's domestic policy, but also the foreign policy position. Brotherus could assure that the empathetic attitude of Bonn's foreign policymakers had not manifested only in their parlance, but also on the level of diplomatic praxis as all his visits had been organized smoothly and he had not had been "kept waiting" before having an audience with anyone.⁴⁸¹

Brotherus evaluated that the core of the Federal Republic's foreign policy was now formed by its relations to the West and especially to the United States. And, there was no sign that this line was going to change. Even the Social Democrats' foreign policy line could not offer an alternative and reach a better result in the current atmosphere of the tensing international relations Brotherus saw. However, the Western-oriented foreign policy led Brotherus' to the paradoxical conclusion that the policy actually gave Chancellor Adenauer more maneuvering space to better relations with the East. The only obstacle left in this regard was then the Hallstein Doctrine. However, despite this, the improved relations with the Eastern states (who had recognized East Germany) were a constant goal of Bonn. Foreign Minister von Brentano himself had told Brotherus that in this respect there was not going to be any negligence. Considering the possible interpretation that could ensue from this statement – that Bonn might even be willing to bend on the Doctrine – might have motivated Brotherus to make sure that he did not build too high expectations in the Finnish Foreign Ministry. He advised that in Bonn's foreign policy – which lacked, in his view, the possibility to take initiative – cautious waiting was considered better than daring experimentation. This tendency was, according to Brotherus, the target of the domestic opposition of Adenauer's foreign policy and not so much the basic principle of the policy itself.⁴⁸²

479 Tiusanen 2011, 92.; Laurila 1995, 11.

480 UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 4 October 1957, "Ensivaikutelmia", p. 1.

481 UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 4 October 1957, "Ensivaikutelmia", p. 1.

482 UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 4 October 1957, "Ensivaikutelmia", p. 2.

Brotherus' view indicated well the prevalent stance in the West German society during the 1950s concerning the foreign policy: it needed to be internationally oriented and tied to the context of increasing co-operation between European states. Yet, Adenauer held real political views in this respect, and did not "dream" of a fast pace forward.⁴⁸³ In the Bundestag elections preceding Brotherus' reporting, he had campaigned with the slogan "Keine Experimente", no experiments.⁴⁸⁴

However, if some progress was to be made in the Eastern policy, the first stepping stone was to be the relations with Poland, Brotherus evaluated. The relations with this significant Eastern neighbor of the Federal Republic had been, according to Brotherus, "long under construction".⁴⁸⁵

All this had imbued Brotherus with surprising optimism regarding the development of the relations, especially as he still, paradoxically, seemed to believe in the sustainability of the Hallstein Doctrine. In Brotherus' view, Bonn could, by guaranteeing its peaceful disposition towards Poland and the disputed Oder-Neisse line (the areas of former Germany that were after the WWII Polish territory), reach an agreement that would even result in the establishment of diplomatic relations with Warsaw. However, it seems that by diplomatic relations Brotherus meant something below the ambassadorial level, perhaps possibly even the Finnish model. His reference to a scenario resembling at least partly the aforementioned configuration can be deduced as he added that Bonn could not live with the fact that Poland had, at the same time, diplomatic representation in East Germany. He evaluated that the Federal Republic still "held steadfast to the thesis which did not allow dual representation". If any government that had diplomatic relations with Bonn was to establish relations with the Pankow government, the Federal Republic would "draw its own conclusions", he continued.

In Brotherus' view, this obstinate attitude had kept so far, and in fact had, at least ostensibly, borne some results as well: it had kept Yugoslavia and certain Arab states from establishing diplomatic relations with the German Democratic Republic. This led him to predict a possibility of a domino effect that could threaten to ensue from the dissolution of the Doctrine; if an exception was to be made in the case of Poland, the other recognizers would follow suit. Due to the aforementioned reasons, the Federal Republic was in no hurry, in the case of Poland, to establish relations, but resorted to "observe the development of the situation", as Brotherus quoted the words of the State Secretary Hallstein.⁴⁸⁶

In these views, Brotherus was implicitly emphasizing the importance of Finland's role in the German policy when he pointed out that, in Bonn's Foreign Office, even socialist nations such as Poland were evaluated as a possible trailblazer in the German question. The logical train of thought in this was that if socialist Poland could function in the aforementioned role, then naturally Finland could as well. Even more so as Finland did not belong to either bloc but was a

⁴⁸³ Bühner 1993, 125.

⁴⁸⁴ Schwartz 1981, 464.

⁴⁸⁵ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 4 October 1957, "Ensivaikutelmia", p. 2.

⁴⁸⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 4 October 1957, "Ensivaikutelmia", pp. 2, 3.

neutral Western capitalist state which made it an even more suitable “pioneer” in the international recognition of the East German state.

What Brotherus might have also implicitly pointed out was that the neutrals were perhaps the most “feared” actors in the German question in Bonn. In this regard Brotherus’ conjunctures might have been drawn from his familiarity with the Swedish policy in the German question through his earlier post in Stockholm. As a consequence of that office, he probably could not have overlooked the certain predilections towards the progressive Eastern policy held by Swedish Foreign Minister Östen Unden, who had been unwilling to totally preclude the possibility of the recognition of GDR in the future.⁴⁸⁷ In fact, Unden had seriously also pondered the idea of Sweden following some sort of third way and not positioning itself clearly in the German question with the East or West.⁴⁸⁸ The unclear and vague attitude of Unden, and especially his support for the ideas of the Stalin Note (Soviet Union’s proposal for neutral and re-unified Germany) in 1952, had branded Sweden as a possible threat in the question of GDR’s recognition in the eyes of Bonn’s foreign policymakers.⁴⁸⁹ As the discussion in chapter 5.1.3 will show, the role of a neutral trailblazer was, in fact, viewed as a (dreaded) possibility for Finland by the West Germans in the late 1960s.

However, Brotherus himself toyed with the idea that the solution for nations in the grey zone with regards to the German question could be found in the form of using the Finnish mode (representation in the form of a trade mission) as the representation’s official form. In this, he already seemed to imply the revelation that was to follow in his next lines. That is, that the representation’s official form could supersede, and hide, the fact that these kind of representations could also “function as normal diplomatic offices”. However, while this solution could have worked for West Germany in the case of “grey zone” nations, he debunked the idea’s viability in the case of socialist nations. In his view, in their cases the Finnish solution could not survive when it would be put to the test of the diplomatic reality. This was, according to Brotherus, because Finland, in fact, was a special case in the German question. This was also the reason why Brotherus regarded it doubtful that Poland would be satisfied with the trade mission-style solution to the representation because he had been told in Bonn’s Foreign Office that the Polish commercial consulate would not receive the same diplomatic “privileges” as Finland’s consulate had.⁴⁹⁰ In these lines, Brotherus was bringing forth what Olavi Munkki had already implicitly tackled, as he had reported, in March 1955, that the Federal Republic was not willing to use a trade mission as a form of representation itself since it could be interpreted as a *de facto* diplomatic representation.⁴⁹¹ Both these reports were strong indications of the “special position” – as mentioned earlier by Bonn’s foreign policy leadership – attained by

⁴⁸⁷ Muschik 2006, 528.

⁴⁸⁸ See Nilsson 2008.

⁴⁸⁹ Muschik 2006, 525.

⁴⁹⁰ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 4 October 1957, “Ensivaikutelmia”, p. 3.

⁴⁹¹ See report of Olavi Munkki from Cologne 30 March 1955 in chapter 3.1.2

Finland. It also implied the readiness of West Germans to accommodate the Finnish Foreign Ministry's wishes in 1952 that they would not name their trade mission as an official consulate with an *exequatur*.⁴⁹²

Especially problematic was that Brotherus saw that the hard line of the Federal Republic, with regards to the recognition of the German Democratic Republic, was not a phenomenon that could be insulated from its general foreign policy – especially with the socialist countries. In his view, it was the “stone blocking the entrance to the development of the Eastern relations”. And, so far, the Federal Republic had not budged from this hard-line stance. However, Brotherus saw that time and the continuance of the German bipartition worked against the Federal Republic; for Bonn, in the long run, it was impossible to avoid the establishment of the new representative offices in East Berlin. In this regard, Brotherus could sense a change coming to the current foreign policy attitude in Bonn; the mushrooming of representative offices in East Berlin might force the Federal Republic towards the attitude adjustment when it came to acknowledging the existence of two German states.⁴⁹³

Considering all this, Brotherus challenged – albeit on the precondition of an undefined temporal span – the threat underlying Finland's German policy. He thought it was unrealistic, in the case of the realization of the scenario that he had described above, that Bonn would have “such far reaching conclusions as to sever the diplomatic relations” with such nations that would recognize the German Democratic Republic. Brotherus pointed out that reprisive actions of Bonn would not, in any case, remove the existence of the fact that Germany was divided.⁴⁹⁴

Brotherus had, in fact, a concrete basis for his doubts concerning the longevity of the Doctrine: the opposition for Adenauer's Eastern policy had not originated only from the SPD, but from the FDP as well. It had already burdened the relationship of Adenauer and the CDU with their coalition-partner, the FDP, in previous cabinets. Within the FDP, in 1952, there had been opposition to Adenauer's adamancy in the German question to take as his starting point in every option the free elections in whole Germany. Karl Georg Pfeleiderer of the FDP especially did not believe the viability of this scenario, and he explained to his fellow party members that no one could believe that the Soviet Union, being a great power and holding an important position in Europe through its occupation zone in East Berlin, would allow the fate of this position to be decided in the elections of which results were unpredictable.⁴⁹⁵ After the FDP had left the CDU-led government in 1956, it was officially in the opposition of Adenauer's Eastern policy. During the late 1950s it openly denounced the Hallstein Doctrine.⁴⁹⁶

⁴⁹² UM 6 O 5 SDT a-b, undated memo quoting memo of Osmo Orkomies concerning his discussions with the Head of the Political Department of Bonn's Foreign Office Dr. Kordt.

⁴⁹³ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 4 October 1957, “*Ensivaikutelmia*”, p. 3.

⁴⁹⁴ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 4 October 1957, “*Ensivaikutelmia*”, p. 3.

⁴⁹⁵ Genscher 1976, 109, 110.

⁴⁹⁶ Genscher 1976, 113.

Just after two weeks of these initial analyses of Brotherus, the Hallstein Doctrine was put to the test by Yugoslavia, which had on 15 October recognized the German Democratic Republic. The consequent termination of the diplomatic relations between the Federal Republic and Yugoslavia by Bonn seemed to prove that the Doctrine was still a viable threat—and speaks to the shortcomings of Brotherus' earlier analysis. However, even at this point, Brotherus was still disapproving the Doctrine's functionality as the main line of Bonn's foreign policy, which was implied by the title of his report, "Dead-End", a reference to Bonn's policy which he saw in the light of recent events as deconstructive. However, Brotherus—who had almost certainly been surprised by the Doctrine's execution in the light of his previous reporting—was omitting the skeptical attitude towards the Hallstein Doctrine he manifested earlier and described its execution as a logical continuity of Bonn's public theses regarding the representation of the German Democratic Republic. Yet, he still kept another part of his earlier stance and questioned if the chosen action truly served the interests of the Federal Republic's foreign policy goals—which included also the establishment of relations with its Eastern socialist neighbors.⁴⁹⁷

Brotherus had not been the only one to be taken off guard regarding the Doctrine. On the other side of Cold War Germany, in East Berlin, the head of the Finnish trade mission, Olavi Wanne, reported that he too had been wondering if Yugoslavia would indeed go through with the recognition. As if to emphasize the idiosyncratic element present in the actions that had taken place, he noted that what had happened was in his view "the most peculiar diplomatic event of 1957". He seemed similarly to point out that even the actors themselves in the situation had not prepared for the outcome. This was, according to him, manifested by the fact that the actual establishment of the relations seemed to come to a slowdown after the countermeasures of Bonn. A few months after the declaration, the actual Yugoslavian ambassador-level representation was not yet in East Berlin. This contrasted with the usual procedural speed, as normally the matters of diplomatic representation were, according to Wanne, handled in socialist countries with the utmost swiftness.⁴⁹⁸

In fact, if the earlier evaluation of Brotherus was now, to a certain extent, besieged by an air of miscalculation, it was only due to the contingent behavior of the Yugoslavian leader which could not be analyzed inside the standard framework of actions executed in international relations. Overall, so far, the neutral or non-aligned nations of the Third World had surprisingly curbed their latent sympathies for the GDR, which promoted itself in the Third World (and especially non-aligned nations) as an advocate of oppressed and downtrodden people in the international arena.⁴⁹⁹ This position was probably even emphasized in contrast to the increasing economic performance of the Federal Republic, which was steadily rising to become one of the most affluent nations in the world.

⁴⁹⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 23 October 1957, "Umpikujassa", p. 1.

⁴⁹⁸ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 7 January 1958, "Suomen ja Itä-Saksan suhteista 1957", p. 1.

⁴⁹⁹ Gray 2003, 58-60.

Even Moscow was not actively promoting the recognition to its non-aligned "friends". On the contrary, the Soviet diplomats were advising their East German colleagues to refrain from any attempts to further this goal.⁵⁰⁰

In certain respects contradicting his previous stance, Brotherus summed up the events by explaining that, in the case of Yugoslavia, Bonn had now exemplified, in a steadfast way, how it held on to its foreign policy principles and simultaneously had given a warning to those countries that "might be tempted" to follow the example of Beograd. This indicated that Brotherus seemed to be certain that the line of action Bonn had undertaken was not a mere result of a foreign political whim, but, as his previous analysis already implied, a logical continuum of Bonn's foreign policy line. In this regard, he evaluated that Foreign Minister von Brentano was telling the truth, as he had explained in his speech that Bonn's actions were not an "emotional" response to the Yugoslavia's decision. The foregoing interpretation was, according to Brotherus also supported by the fact that the Foreign Office of the Federal Republic had already had a long time to prepare for this, as the threat of recognition had "a significant amount of time shrouded the horizon of Beograd". He highlighted, in conjunction with Tito's speech in 1956 in which Yugoslavian leader had stated that there existed two states (East and West Germany), that it would have been wrong to not recognize the "state organism of East Germany". At that time, the joint communique of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia had also stated that the negotiations between the two German states were necessary in order to realize the unification of Germany. However, Brotherus stated that it had taken a surprisingly long time before Tito had decided to actually move forward on the issue of recognition. Brotherus interpreted that this meant that both parties had had the chance to weigh all the possible consequences.⁵⁰¹

However, Brotherus was still puzzled by the actions of Tito; he reported that from Bonn it was hard to tell what made Tito choose this line of policy. Yet, as he did not rebut the opinion he reported to exist in Bonn that Tito made his decision under the pressure from Moscow, or that he wanted to express his support for Khrushchev. Brotherus might have himself also subscribed to this view that was from the vantage point of current knowledge exaggerating the role of Moscow. According to William Glen Gray, Moscow was, in fact, curbing the attempts of East Germany to receive recognition.⁵⁰²

Still, after all this, Brotherus noted that there was a lot of speculation in Bonn, but much less information. Due to this, he admitted that he resorted to guessing whether Tito had not been willing to sever relations with West Germany and might have miscalculated the seriousness of Bonn with regards to claim the of sole representation. He was not the sole representative among the Finnish Foreign Service's diplomatic corps adopting this stance. The Finnish Ambassador Leo Tuominen from London had discussed with his Yugoslavian colleague who, according to his interpretation, had implied that Yugoslavia had not believed that

⁵⁰⁰ Gray 2003, 58.

⁵⁰¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 23 October 1957, "Umpikujassa", p. 1.

⁵⁰² Gray 2003, 58.

the Federal Republic would go as far as terminating diplomatic relations. The ambassador had rationalized the chosen policy by noting that no one in Yugoslavia had believed that Adenauer seriously would, at this point, believe that the isolation policy of East Germany would lead to results.⁵⁰³ However, the Finnish representative in Beograd, Otso Wartiovaara, saw – admittedly only by speculation – possible reasons in the larger framework of the Eastern bloc. He referred to the oncoming revolution celebration in Moscow, which Tito would, with all probability, attend and the Eastern German participation in the Yugoslavian aluminium industry plan as the factors that might have increased the dare of Yugoslavia.⁵⁰⁴

Brotherus, on his part, pointed out – almost haphazardly – a few more possible factors that might have led to the misguided policy. One was, in his view, the distorted image of the Federal Republic's foreign policy in its media. It was, according to him, in constant opposition to Adenauer's hard line Eastern policy. This, in addition to the Federal Republic's mild form of protestations against Tito's speech with regards the Oder-Neisse line in the official communiqué of Poland and the Federal Republic, might have led Tito to believe that pragmatism ruled over the ideals of Federal Republic's Eastern policy. Oddly enough, none of the diplomats saw any connection between the recent visit of the Soviet Minister of Defense, Georgi Zhukov, to Beograd. In the West, the visit was interpreted as a sign of deepening co-operation between Beograd and Moscow. Zhukov was also believed to be equipped with an arms deal of Russian weapons for Yugoslavia.⁵⁰⁵

However, what the diplomats also did not consider – or express was that their very reporting might have been one of the factors in the puzzling equation of Yugoslavia's actions. There was a possibility of a skeptical view concerning the Hallstein Doctrine in the Finnish Foreign Ministry (due to the reporting that downplayed its threat), and the consequence that this view could have effused in certain measure to the minds of the Yugoslavian foreign policy makers. This possibility cannot be ruled out as the Yugoslavian Foreign Ministry was keen to follow the examples from Finland's foreign policy of neutrality during this period, and it is known that Tito followed the advice of his foreign ministry's officials.⁵⁰⁶

This interpretation is bolstered by the fact that the Yugoslavian Ambassador to Finland visited the Finnish Foreign Ministry just before Yugoslavia's recognition of East Germany. He appeared to be probing for last minute evidence that would support the rationality of Yugoslavia's coming actions. The ambassador had spoken with State Secretary T.O. Vahervuori, and explained that there were many aspects supporting the interpretation that the Federal Republic would not follow the Hallstein Doctrine. He referred to, as an example, the relations of the Federal Republic with the Soviet Union, which had recognized both

⁵⁰³ UM 7 D II 303, report London 12 December 1957, "Keskustelu Jugoslavian suur-lähettilään kanssa", p. 1.

⁵⁰⁴ UM 7 D II 303 report Beograd 23 October 1957, "Itä-Saksan tunnustaminen", p. 3.

⁵⁰⁵ Helsingin Sanomat 8 October 1957.

⁵⁰⁶ Kullaa, 135, 139

German states, and Finland that held equal representation in both German states. The Yugoslavian ambassador's interpretation had clearly emphasized the aspect of equal treatment, probably caused by the awareness of the de facto diplomatic nature of Finnish representation.⁵⁰⁷ As was already noted in the discussion of the reporting earlier, the Finnish form of representation often caused confusion among the foreign diplomats and could be interpreted in multiple ways. One more factor adding to the Yugoslavian skeptical view concerning Bonn's seriousness regarding the Hallstein Doctrine was, according to William Glen Gray, Adenauer government's abstruse Eastern policies. For example the speculation in July 1957 concerning possible permanent representation in Eastern capitals. These kind of ambiguities might have obscured its still underlying stance towards East Germany and deceived Tito.⁵⁰⁸

In the wake of the Doctrine's execution, Finnish diplomats on different sides of Germany seemed to differ on the consequences of Bonn's hard-line foreign policy. Their analyses concerning the "aftermath" of the Doctrine formed almost a dialectic exchange of views from the opposite sides.

Brotherus seemed to question the effectiveness of the Doctrine despite von Brentano's estimations that Bonn had now closed the door in front of some 25 or 30 countries that might have followed Yugoslavia's example.⁵⁰⁹ Brotherus questioned this domino theory which he earlier appeared to have subscribed to. He now, contrary to his previous stance, opted for a critical attitude by claiming that it was highly doubtful if such estimations were correct, and if there actually had been any followers of Yugoslavia on the path of the German Democratic Republic's recognition.

Yet, contrary to this critical evaluation of the Doctrine's functionality by Brotherus, Wanne in East Berlin saw it as a more effective tool for Bonn's government. He saw the credibility of the Hallstein Doctrine's threat increasing and in this respect considered the operation of Bonn successful. The representative interpreted that the Pankow government's main target—achieving diplomatic recognition outside the socialist camp—was, after the diplomatic rupture of West Germany with Yugoslavia, uncertain.⁵¹⁰

Wanne started the closing chapters of his report by analyzing the causes for the current diplomatic isolation, and by speculating on its future. He appeared to be contradicting Brotherus and subscribing to the domino theory that Brotherus had already discarded. Wanne evaluated that there were nations that would, either because of commercial or ideological causes, wish to be represented in Berlin. In public, there had been discussion of Scandinavian countries and India, but Wanne interpreted this to be only the beginning of the list of these kind of countries if the diplomatic "dam" was to be broken. The counterbalancing force was the Federal Republic, which held everything in check by its political and economic power—along with the adamant stance of its government.⁵¹¹

⁵⁰⁷ UM 7 D II 303, memo from T.O.Vahervuori 14 October 1957.

⁵⁰⁸ Gray 2003, 75.

⁵⁰⁹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 23 October 1957, "Umpikujassa", p. 2.

⁵¹⁰ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 7 January 1958, "Molemmat Saksat ja Jugoslavia", p. 2.

⁵¹¹ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 7 January 1958, "Molemmat Saksat ja Jugoslavia", p. 2.

However, Wanne attributed the staying power of the capricious stance to be built only on the support of a few strong figures. He wrote that the big question was still how firm the resistance towards the acknowledgment of East Germany as a state was. Wanne had asked the opinions of his colleagues in West Berlin and stated that the diplomats, among who had been Norwegian, Swedish, and Belgian representatives, had almost in unison expressed the opinion that West Germany had, by its own actions, brought the situation of two German states to a political impasse. He also interpreted that the general stance that severe measures must be taken in the case of Yugoslavia was actually only supported by a few people in Bonn's political system, yet, those people were in powerful posts and strongly influenced Bonn's foreign policy. Similar opinions had been expressed to Wanne by Polish and Czechoslovakian diplomats who he had met in East Berlin.⁵¹² The waning support of the Doctrine had, in fact, become already evident earlier – almost immediately after the severing of diplomatic relations. In his consultation session with the special committee formed by the members of all the parties, Adenauer had learned that the support for his policy expressed by the members of his cabinet was not the prevailing attitude among the MPs. They had regarded the actions of Bonn as overly harsh.⁵¹³

Wanne ended the report by suggesting the “battle of wills” continue and that it might be better to withhold from making predictions – a stand possibly inspired by the prediction of Brotherus that had underestimated the severity of the actions of Bonn in the case of a third country recognizing East German state.⁵¹⁴ However, Wanne added that it felt like some kind of “fork in the road” was approaching.⁵¹⁵

Brotherus, on the other hand, in his concluding remarks, saw the incidence as a juridical victory for Bonn, but not a gain in its prestige on the international arena. In his view, it had merely postponed the reunification – Bonn's main political goal – in the distant future. Which was, in Brotherus' estimation, an unbelievable scenario as no one could expect that the Soviet Union would give its approval for reunification under Bonn's hegemony, and, without Bonn recognizing the German Democratic Republic.⁵¹⁶

Brotherus, in other words, was not hesitant to suggest the importance of the Soviet Union and the recognition of East Germany for the Finnish foreign policy-makers. In another report of his from just a few months later, he seemed to, in fact, give implicit support for the notion that the East German state had to be recognized at some point. This can be deduced as he noted that Bonn's demand

⁵¹² UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 7 January 1958, “Molemmat Saksat ja Jugoslavia”, p. 3.

⁵¹³ Helsingin Sanomat 19 October 1957 “Titon kurittamista vastustetaan Bonnissa: Adenauer pitää päänsä”. Helsingin Sanomat 20 October 1957 “Bonnin suhteet Titoon poikki ”tunnustusvyöryn” pelosta: Päätöksellä länsivaltain siunaus, kauppasuhteita ei purettane”.

⁵¹⁴ The case of Yugoslavia discussed earlier.

⁵¹⁵ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 7 January 1958, “Molemmat Saksat ja Jugoslavia”, pp. 2, 3.

⁵¹⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 23 October 1957, “Umpikujassa”, p. 2.

for sole representation had not ceased the German Democratic Republic to increase its prominence as a state.⁵¹⁷ In his bold view on Finland's German policy, he seemed to be well insulated from the on-going outburst in Finland from the right against Kekkonen's foreign policy. The opposition of Kekkonen asserted that his policy catered to the Soviet Union's needs. The domestic opposition to Kekkonen's foreign policy had grown overall since the mid-1950s, possibly by the opposition's interpretation of the recent goodwill gestures by Moscow – such as the granting of neutrality to Austria and repatriation of Porkkala Naval Base – as a weakness marking the unnecessary of being hesitant in the relations with the Soviet Union.⁵¹⁸

Brotherus, however, did not see the recognition in a negative light or as a capitulation to Soviet interests; he even went as far as to suggest the pending international recognition as a hindrance to the solution of the German question. In his view, it did not close the path to reunification but was more likely to be a stepping stone towards it. He pointed out that the same stance had been appropriated by the Yugoslavs as the basis for their recognition of the German Democratic Republic. According to Brotherus, the Yugoslavians had emphasized that only the recognition of the East Berlin regime could lead to reunification – an explanation which, according to Brotherus, was reminiscent of Moscow's views in June 1956.

As the discussion above has shown, during the period of the first tests to the Hallstein Doctrine, the views of the Finnish diplomats did not converge regarding its functionality. It was seen as either a functioning barrier against the wave of recognition, or as a diplomatic impasse for Bonn. In the case of Brotherus, the Doctrine's threat and viability were initially, to a certain extent, underestimated. This resembled a view that might have conduced to a critical attitude in the Finnish Foreign Ministry, and, consequently, in the Yugoslavian Foreign Ministry as well, towards the actual execution possibilities of the Hallstein Doctrine. Especially as Yugoslavia also might have been deceived by the example Finnish representation's exceptionality (and equality in both German states) seemed give in regards to Bonn's tolerance in its foreign policy.

⁵¹⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 10 January 1958, "Suomen ja Saksan liittotasavallan suhteista 1957", p. 2.

⁵¹⁸ There was an upsurge of books published in Finland which viewed the Soviet Union directly as a threat to Finland and interpreted Finland's post-war policy as subservient to the Soviet Union's interests. The accusations culminated in the figure of Kekkonen, and they received even more of an impetus from the destalinization campaign of the Soviet Union and the events in Hungary in 1956. (Suomi 1992, 93, 94).

3.4 Conclusions: precarious and difficult establishment of the policy

From the mid-1950s on, the Finnish representation in both German states became stabilized: both sides (but especially East Berlin) showed acquiescence and relinquished their previous, somewhat incandescent, search for the immediate elevation of the status of the relations. The Finnish representative Toivo Heikkilä could, at this point, report that the most problematic areas were the etiquette questions, not the pressure earlier exerted by the East German government for the establishment of full diplomatic relations.

Finland's first representative in West Germany, Olavi Munkki, however, seemed to be partially frustrated with the representation's status. Initially, he too had been in favor of a low profile in Germany, but as the role of the Federal Republic in the international arena grew, it appears that this growth correlated, in Munkki's thinking, with the needs of the representation's status level. However, it was clear already at this point that, despite the solution being logical from the Finnish standpoint, from a foreign view it appeared perplexing. The first and most evident time that this was manifested was when the Soviet Union's ambassador to Federal Republic inquired the Finnish mission about its official status. It seems that the representative of the state that was the ultimate reason behind Finland's solution to representation was not aware of the logic behind it. It could have been simply a manifestation or demonstration concerning the discontentment of his home government regarding the status of Finland's representation in East Germany. However, it could have been also a simple way of guarding that the representation's level was not, by some furtive method, elevated higher in Cologne than it was in East Berlin.

Of course, it has to be noted that, at this point, the logic behind the solution was quite unclear for the Finnish foreign policymakers as well. The symbolic element of equal representation as a token of Finland's neutrality was, at this point, not strongly expounded. However, the discussion of the reporting at this period showed that the pragmatism of the solution with its origins in the unclear situation after the war was increasingly losing its basis. In this regard, the argument for the representation's basis as a source of stability for Finland's foreign policy was waning by the fact that the solution was one of a kind.

One dimension that brought up the uniqueness of the Finnish representation's form, and the possible exclusive liberties given for it, were the relations of the Bonn government with its neighboring socialist Eastern countries. In these relations, Bonn, and especially the trade circles of the Federal Republic, saw great potential as an export area. However, Bonn was unwilling to use the trade mission type of solution in its own relations. Olavi Munkki in Cologne could offer an explanation for this ostensible double standard: he pondered that if in fact the West German trade missions would have been established in those countries, they would have lost in prestige as their East German counterparts would have been holding statuses of embassies.

Also, the uniqueness could also be taken advantage of. In this respect, the diplomats noted how the West German government was exploiting the vague status of Finnish representation in its guarding of the demand for sole representation. It was exemplified in the case of Syria, where the need to avoid severing relations with the Syrian government led to the appropriation of the Finnish representation as a political smokescreen. In the Syrian case, the non-application of the Doctrine was explained by noting that the relations were comparable to Finland's solution to representation in divided Germany. However, requests for more explicit explanations were met with silence or the dodging of a direct answer by the Federal Republic's government regarding the nature of the relations for the interested parties, such as foreign diplomats or the press.

Despite the Finnish representation not yet really being tied to neutrality, this aspect was naturally present in the policy. The onset of the so-called first *détente* in this same period also gave diplomats new aspects to look for. In this regard, Austria especially offered an interesting new vista concerning the bargaining possibilities between the East and West for small states such as Finland. Olavi Munkki's discussions in the Federal Republic with the Austrian ambassador, in conjunction with Munkki's colleague Urho Toivola's reporting from Vienna, showed that the Austrians were moving ahead of Finland in their newly achieved neutrality: a foreign policy orientation which they achieved as corollary of their sovereignty by the state treaty of 1955 conducted with the occupying Soviet Union.

Contrary to the Austrian one, the Finnish neutrality was challenged at the end of the decade by two almost consequential crises in the relations with the Soviet Union: the Night Frost Crisis in 1958, and the Note Crisis in 1961. These crises showed that the Soviet Union could influence Finnish politics by exerting political pressure strategically, for example, by ignoring already promised trade deals and calling home its representative to Finland. Even though the crises have been interpreted of having been linked to tensed international situations, especially in Berlin, the reporting from the trade missions was scarce. It shows, however, that, in some regards, the foreign policy perspective was missed by the diplomats, or that they did not wish to report on the matter that was directly touching the domestic politics of Finland. However, after the crises, there were some reports that very explicitly revealed that the crises had not only tarnished the image of Finnish neutrality, but President Kekkonen as well. Even as far as the officials of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office were openly admitting that Kekkonen was, politically, a very difficult person for them and that this prevented close cooperation with the West German foreign office on the practical level, such as visits.

When it came to guarding the Hallstein Doctrine, it appears that West Germans were not, according to reporting, willing to regard Finland as an exception. However, in the reporting there was a striving to see any beneficial signs to Finland in the interpretation of the Doctrine. In this regard, Foreign Minister von Brentano's vague statement in early 1956 stirred the interest of Olavi Munkki.

However, after the statement's more exact recording it was clear that von Brentano, despite articulating the Federal Republic's wish to have relations with all countries, was not making any implications that it was willing to establish them with any such nation that held diplomatic relations with East Germany.

A more critical stance than his predecessor was espoused by Heikki Brotherus, who was stationed in Cologne in 1956. He was challenging the applicability of the Doctrine and regarded it as merely a threat, but not a plausible foreign policy act. His views should – at least partly – be interpreted in the light of the general postwar-war orientation of West Germany. The second German republic emphasized in its foreign policy the importance of international orientation, friendly relations to all other nations, and the reliance on the co-operation between different states while denouncing the old Germany's national interests prioritizing policies. Brotherus was, however, forced to review his stance as it became evident that Yugoslavia's recognition of East Germany did, in fact, entail the execution of the Hallstein Doctrine. However, as later analysis in the work will show, his evaluations were not misleading in the larger context but merely contingent on the particularity of the Yugoslavian case. His bold analysis was catering, after all, to wishes of the foreign ministry, which encouraged the diplomats to imbue their reports with strong analysis and glossing of the political events, and not be content with mere summary of the local press or the view of the diplomatic community.

In general, this period formed a preliminary stage of the Finnish German policy and it seems evident that the reporting reflected the general infancy state of the policy. The multiple standpoints in the reporting towards Finland's representation in Germany speak for this. The diplomats noted, for example, the exceptionality of Finland's case by comparing it with the unwillingness of the West Germans to use a similar solution in their own relations and the unclear statements of the Soviet officials regarding Finland's trade mission form of representation. Even the idea of relinquishing the policy altogether was suggested (by Olavi Munkki), and Finland's exceptionality in the matter of Hallstein Doctrine's execution (by Heikki Brotherus) were all posited at this point – either implicitly or explicitly in the reporting. On the other hand, the reporting showed that the Federal Republic could appropriate the vagueness of the Finnish policy to benefit their own goals. All in all, the reporting revealed the ambiguous nature of the policy when looked at from the outside; the policy was not clearly based on any solid foundation, either idealistic neutrality or to real-political praxis.

4 1963–1968: FINLAND'S GERMAN POLICY STABILIZED BUT ALSO QUESTIONED

At the beginning of the 1960s, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's government and his successful infusion of staying power to the conservative politics in postwar West Germany were nearing an end. German politics followed the general pattern in the Western world where there was, especially among the academic youth, a strong will to question the old authorities and conservative, or what the new generation branded as reactionary, politics.⁵¹⁹ It was manifested most strongly a few years later in the hippie movement that wished to rekindle society's connection with nature. Ultimately, Konrad Adenauer withdrew from his office on 15 October 1963, and along with his withdrawal, one era of postwar Germany ended.⁵²⁰ Successor of *Der Alte* (The nickname Adenauer received) was Ludwig Erhard, Adenauer's rival inside the CDU party. He continued with Adenauer's CDU/CSU and FDP coalition cabinet with only a few alterations in ministerial positions, yet with new policies, which are discussed more detail later.

The changes in the West German chancellorship reflected not only domestic political currents in the Federal Republic, but also on its position in the international arena. At the last stages of Adenauer's era in the late 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s, the German question had become even more important in world politics with the Berlin crises and the building of the Berlin wall. At that time, West Germans had still felt a need to recourse to the geographical and demographical reality of *ante bellum* Germany, and consequently hoped to change the European status quo with the abrupt solution to their national problem – in practice, to bring about *Wiedervereinigung*, re-unification. When it came to this goal, the West German Foreign Office was aware that Finnish Foreign Ministry viewed it with extreme pessimism. The West German mission in Helsinki re-

⁵¹⁹ Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 5.

⁵²⁰ Hildebrandt 1984, 19.

ported that the Finnish Foreign Ministry based this pessimistic stance on its analysis that the Soviet Union would not agree to the re-unification on West German terms, which, in its essence, rendered the return to the unified German state impossible.⁵²¹

However, as the decade moved on, the solutions and the attitude to the German question changed in the Federal Republic as well; there was no longer a striving for a fast solution. At this point, the releasing of international Cold War tensions and the convergence between East and West Germany was seen as a roadmap to pacified existence of either one, or two, German states. This disposition reflected the general tendency in both superpowers where to search for *détente* and a shared understanding to relieve the tension in the Cold War-fatigued Europe.⁵²²

In Germany, it was especially the building of the Berlin Wall in August 1961 that had sent a message to the rising West German politicians such as the Mayor of West Berlin, Willy Brandt, and his future foreign policy adviser, Egon Bahr, the head of the Press and Information Office of West Berlin and spokesman of the West Berlin senate, that the solution to the German question would go only through Moscow. The unilateral actions of the West and the Federal Republic would not suffice, and in the worst case, might lead to situations such as Cuban and Berlin crises.⁵²³

The building of the wall and the simultaneous threat of Khrushchev's ultimatum on 4 June at the Vienna Summit demanding solution to the German question by 31 December of the same year induced the Finnish Foreign Ministry to search for possible foreign policy pointers from neutral as well as non-aligned countries. On 11 August 1961, the ministry sent a secret telegram for Finnish representatives in Beograd, Bern, Cairo, New Delhi, Rio de Janeiro, and Vienna, asking for the missions to report how their particular base countries were responding to the Soviet Union's demands regarding the German question.⁵²⁴ All the replies from the missions emphasized the discrete disposition of their base countries in the German question. However, Veli Helenius from New Delhi wrote, in a secret telegram on 19 August, concerning Nehru's statement a few days earlier which had claimed that India had actually already *de facto* recognized the German Democratic Republic since it held a trade mission in there. Helenius had inquired regarding the subject from Indian Foreign Secretary Dess and was able to calm the Finnish Foreign Ministry. His information indicated that India might not meddle in the German question after all. According to him, Dess had explained that the Nehru's statement meant only acknowledgement of the state of the matters; it did not, according to Dess, mean that India was going to change

521 PAAA B 23 bd. 93, report from K. K. Overbeck 11 March 1958, "Finnische Stellungnahme zu aktuellen politischen Fragen".

522 Hildebrandt 1984, 21. Macintyre 2007, 174.

523 Sarotte 2001, 11.

524 UM 7 D II telegram of Yrjö Väinänen 11 August 1961.

its stance on the German question.⁵²⁵ However, despite the reassuring news at this point, the prolongation of pacificity in the German question was soon to be challenged by the Third World states during the decade. These challenges will be discussed further later in analysis section.

As well as the new political shifts emerging in the western part of Germany, some alterations were spawning inside – the now wall-cloaked – East Germany. It was, to a certain extent, contradicting the prevailing view in the West of a stagnant communist society. The 1950s had seen the East German state strongly curbing all dissident action and critique: it had crushed the worker’s revolt in 1953 and continued on the same hard line during the latter part of the 1950s. However, the launch of Khrushchev’s new phase of de-Stalinization in the 22nd conference of the Soviet Union’s communist party, in October 1961, forced Walter Ulbricht’s regime to follow some reformist lines as well. For example, the conference granted the East German state party’s, SED, functionaries legitimacy to express critique towards the repression of the 1950s and the suppression of revolts that followed the building of the Wall.⁵²⁶

Ulbricht’s answer was the pursuit to build and showcase East Germany during the 1960s as a model socialist society on par with the Western democracies. He was especially keen to improve economic competitiveness and for this purposes he introduced the New Economic System, *Neues Ökonomisches System* (NÖS), in 1963. In some respects, the system returned to the idea of profit as a basis of economic system, it also allowed greater legal and economic independence to factories. However, the system still retained reliance on central planning.⁵²⁷

Ulbricht’s search for economic competence explained also his willingness to respond to the overtures of Ludwig Erhard’s Eastern policy. The NÖS policy was dependent on Western imports of the latest technology which consequently required functional relations with the Western countries. Ulbricht wished to surpass the Western economies by combining three factors: the high productivity by high-end Western technology, cheap raw materials, e.g. oil, acquired from the Soviet Union, and the superb labor input by the socialist workforce. On the other hand, Ulbricht could not venture quickly into new foreign policy despite the needs dictated by the NÖS. He had to take in consideration the consequences of possible mistakes in the new policies, which might have given an advantage to his intra-party opposition especially when the NÖS policy was resisted by prominent East German politicians such as Politburo members Eric Honecker, Willi Stoph, Hermann Axen, and Stasi chief Erich Mielke.⁵²⁸

⁵²⁵ UM 7 D II report Beograd 22 August 196; UM 7 D II, report Rio de Janeiro 17 August 1961; UM 7 D II ,secret telegram New Delhi 19 August 1961. Nehru later took a more stark stance in the German question which caused disapproval from Western countries as Nehru’s stance was seen favoring the Soviet Union, see report New Delhi 28 August 1961.

⁵²⁶ Weber 1985, 331, 332.

⁵²⁷ Sarotte 2001, 18, 19.

⁵²⁸ Sarotte 2001, 19.

East Germany also appropriated dynamism in its foreign policy during this period. As the socialist camp was already depleted of possible recognizers of its statehood, Ulbricht directed his gaze increasingly towards the Third World. There was also a good reason to do so; the advancing decolonization process seemed to spring new states in Africa and Asia faster than it was possible to keep track of. In 1960 alone, there emerged sixteen new African states. However, none of them immediately recognized East Germany. Most of the tug-of-war happened in the case of Guinea (which was also a target of keen attention in the reporting of Finnish diplomats), but in the end it too came to respect Bonn's demand for sole representation.

Increasingly during the 1960s, West Germany strived to block recognizers from the Third World by offering development that was contingent on their abstinence on the German Democratic Republic's recognition. However, East Germany utilized similar methods and granted substantial loans as well as cultural and scientific exchange in order to lure new allies – and to receive ultimately diplomatic recognition.⁵²⁹

It seems that the foreign political re-focusing on the Third World ceased, at least in some respects, the German Democratic Republic's attempts to receive recognition from Finland – a goal that they had worked heavily towards in the early 1950s. This was indicated in April 1960 by the visit of East German Foreign Ministry's Head of the Department Meissner to Helsinki. The main concern of the visit had been the issues related to the European Economic Community (indicated by the focus of his speeches). Consequently, the Finnish Foreign Ministry's director general of the Political Department, Jaakko Hallama, noted in his memo that the speech had not even touched upon the subject of Finnish relations with the German states.⁵³⁰ A similar stance was also indicated three years later when the East German foreign minister, Lothar Bolz, approached the Finnish Foreign Ministry's director general of the Political Department, Max Jakobson, with a letter suggesting the improvement of trade, seafaring and transit connections, technical-economic relations, and cultural and youth exchanges. However, at the same time he had expressed his satisfaction with relations as they were, as Finland treated both German states equally. Jakobson seemed to discern advancement of any kind in the relations as being negative. He emphasized in a memo that contacts should not be increased and that Finland should refrain from signing any kind of state-level agreements with the German Democratic Republic.⁵³¹

However, it is also possible to deduce, concerning the discussion in the previous part of the research, that perhaps there was no urgent need in the German Democratic Republic to raise the level of relations with Finland, as the already prevailing status suited their needs in many respects. After all, as the Finnish

⁵²⁹ Gray 2003, 116-139

⁵³⁰ UM 7 D II 304, telegram of Jaakko Hallama to Bern 2 April 1960 concerning the visit of Meissner.

⁵³¹ UM 7 D II 306, memo of Max Jakobson concerning the letter of Lothar Bolz 21 September 1963. kuva 37

diplomats reported, Finland's ambiguous solution to representation in the German states could be, and in practice, was, interpreted as normal relations by Bonn as well as East Berlin. However, as the discussion also showed, the vagueness of the Finnish solution could also be exploited in the political discourse of a third country concerning the relations with either East or West Germany.⁵³² It could be appropriated also in the foreign policy discourse of both German states. This was manifested also in November 1962, when Ulbricht stated in an international press conference that maybe neutral states such as Sweden could establish normal relations with the German Democratic Republic since this kind of arrangement already worked out well with neutral Finland.⁵³³

The status quo held in the Finnish German policy for most of the decade, despite the domestic political pressure for the recognition of East Germany at the end of the decade.⁵³⁴ The pressure was caused by the Finnish Social Democratic Party and the leftist academic youth that both began increasingly express statements demanding the recognition of the German Democratic Republic during the latter half of 1960s. The official statement of the Finnish Social Democratic Party on 4 April 1968, which somewhat vaguely posited the existence of two German states, led the Finnish representative in Cologne, Martti Salomies, to write the ministry for directions as he suspected that he might be soon inquired by West Germans concerning the statement. He based his alertness on the fact that the Social Democrats were currently the largest party in the government.⁵³⁵ Director general of the Political Department, Risto Hyvärinen, however, did not seem to be excessively concerned by the social democratic activity in the field of Finnish foreign relations. He reminded Salomies as well as the deputy Head of the Federal Republic's trade mission in Helsinki that, in Finland, party statements did not stipulate the foreign policy of the government, which was conducting the foreign policy in collaboration with the president.⁵³⁶

Most radical left-wing elements of the Finnish academic youth, "taistolaiset", adherents to the views of the Finnish Communist Party's (SKP) opposition faction led by Taisto Sinisalo and were keen on promoting the recognition.

⁵³² For example, see the case of Syria in chapter 3.1.2.

⁵³³ UM 7 D II 306, report Prague 5 November 1962. In its essence the same stance was later noted by the memo of the East German foreign Ministry., see memo circa 1967 MfAA L43 C1174,7. Alexander Muschik has argued that Finland, in fact, was truly neutral in the German question, contrary to Sweden. According to Muschik, Finland treated both German states equally, whereas Sweden took clearly the Western stance in the German question and recognized only the Federal Republic of Germany (Muschik 2006, 519).

⁵³⁴ The Finnish social democratic party began to express statements demanding the recognition of the German Democratic Republic during the latter half of 1960s. Also, the Finnish academic youth communist movement "taistolaiset", adherents of the views of Finnish Communist Party's (SKP) opposition faction led by Taisto Sinisalo, were keen on promoting the recognition.

⁵³⁵ UM 7 D II 307, secret telegram from Salomies 9 April 1968.

⁵³⁶ UM 7 D II 307, telegram of Risto Hyvärinen 10 April 1968; memo from Risto Hyvärinen 5 April 1968.

This could have been another factor that caused the German Democratic Republic to back off from its direct demands for recognition; it could rely on the belief that the aforementioned Finnish groups were working for its goals.⁵³⁷

The increased connections on this non-official lower level between Finland and East Germany also caught the attention of Finnish diplomat Lennart Sumelius in East Berlin who wrote a letter to the Finnish Foreign Ministry's director general of the Political Department, Max Jakobson, warning him that even the unofficial visits of Finnish politicians were often interpreted in the Eastern press as official visits for propagandistic exploitation. The increased interaction between the Finnish and East Germans had, according to Sumelius, led a Berlin correspondent of *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* to plan writing a critical piece on the increased contacts between Finland and East Germany.⁵³⁸

Much of the stability in Finland's relations with the German states had an indirect link to the relations between Finland and the Soviet Union as well. The interaction between the often-uneasy neighbors appeared to be positioned on the path, which guaranteed continuity. The Soviet Union did not express interest in seeing alterations to the Finnish foreign policy tenets, such as equal treatment of the German states, and Finland was in no need of asking for them. In fact, the 1960s began with a statement from Khrushchev in November 1960, in which he claimed that, with Kekkonen as the president, the Soviet Union would "trust Finland even with eyes closed". However, as the statement of the Soviet leader implied the catch in the stabilized Eastern relations: the personification of the Finnish foreign policy in the figure of President Kekkonen. Recently manifested by Kekkonen's personal diplomacy (in the form of visits to the Soviet Union) that resolved the Finno-Soviet crises such as the Night Frost and the Note Crises (which led Kekkonen's opponents to suspect that he had collaborated on the onsets of the crisis as well to assure his re-election). Accumulation of power concerning foreign policymaking for Kekkonen was noted also in the Finnish foreign ministry as officials hinted at the re-institution of an elective monarchy in Finland.⁵³⁹

With the Finnish German policy stabilized, it was natural to link it to the general strategy of the Finnish foreign policy. According to Timo Soikkanen, it was during this period that the Finnish German policy became a basic tenet of Finland's neutrality. The policy was interpreted this way and guarded in the ranks of the foreign ministry by the prominent officials such as Max Jakobson (director general of the Political Department 1962–1965), Risto Hyvärinen (director general of the Political Department 1967–1972), and Keijo Korhonen (Secretary of Section 1967–1969, Head of the Section 1970), who regarded the policy crucial for the credibility of Finnish neutrality.⁵⁴⁰ Curiously enough, this did not stop Kekkonen from bargaining with the possible recognition of the German Democratic Republic during this same period. He had discussed it during the

⁵³⁷ Hentilä 2004, 12.

⁵³⁸ UM 7 D II 306, letter from Lennart Sumelius to Max Jakobson 14 December 1963.

⁵³⁹ Soikkanen 2003a, 43.

⁵⁴⁰ Soikkanen 2003a, 88.

leadership of Khrushchev, and, later on, Kekkonen returned to the subject with the followers of the ousted leader.⁵⁴¹

Despite the general stability in the Finnish German policy, there was, however, a need to keep a keen eye on the changes in the domestic politics of Germany, which – as mentioned in the beginning of the chapter – influenced, as well as was influenced by, the changing configuration of international relations. Expectations of change emanated not least from the figure of the new Chancellor, Ludwig Erhard, who was considered to possess differing foreign policy outlooks than his predecessor. Erhard was interpreted as an internationalist who viewed the nation-state as an obsolete way of organizing a political community. This was, of course, in many respects contrary to the conservative, and more nationalistic, Adenauer. Erhard was liberal also in economic aspects and emphasized that Germany should to be part of the Western free markets and, through them, adhere to the tenets of Western economic policy and its liberal political philosophy.⁵⁴²

Another important figure initiating change was Erhard's foreign minister, Gerhard Schröder. He was appointed to his post during Adenauer's term in office, but, at that time, his actions were considered to be limited by Adenauer's waning power. Diminution of his power was inversely correlated in his strengthening opposition. As a result, Adenauer became pressured by his own party to resign midway through his last four-year term he had won for himself in the 1961 Bundestag elections.⁵⁴³ However, even during Erhard's era, Schröder's foreign policy was not seen as comprehensively reformative: on the one hand, he seemed to wish for better relations with the Soviet Union and the socialist countries in general, but, on the other hand, he seemed to hold on to the tenets of the Hallstein Doctrine⁵⁴⁴. However, later research has solved the contradiction by the interpretation that Schröder's policy was an honest attempt to better the eastern relations in order to isolate East Berlin's regime from its socialist allies by virtue of the Hallstein Doctrine.⁵⁴⁵

Behind these ostensibly new idealistic approaches to foreign policy, West Germany continued during the 1960s with strong real-political reliance on the arms of the United States and NATO. Still, even this well-known dependency had an angle to it: as the United States was promoting détente for Europe, Erhard's government could not endorse these ideas without reservations. They still clung to the Hallstein Doctrine and could see unconditional improvement of relations with Eastern countries done without abolishing the Doctrine. However, Erhard still seemed to subscribe to the major strategy of Robert McNamara in the Pentagon: it posited that arms control was achieved by the continuous assertion of mutual destruction and that détente was dependent on that threat.⁵⁴⁶

⁵⁴¹ Soikkanen 2003a, 44.

⁵⁴² Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 12.

⁵⁴³ Ahonen 2003, 181, 182.

⁵⁴⁴ See Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 14.

⁵⁴⁵ For example, see Ahonen 2003, 182, 183.

⁵⁴⁶ Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 41.

As a conclusion, it is possible to argue that during the 1960s the unlocking of the German question and the issues related to it – such as the Hallstein Doctrine and the status of Berlin – started to become increasingly entangled with the superpower détente, and the consequential Federal Republic's diplomatic reach towards the socialist countries. Due to this connection there was naturally a keen focus in the reporting of Finnish diplomats to the events regarding the eastern policy. The reporting concerning the new eastern policy is discussed in the first chapter of the section. The second chapter continues the discussion of the views of diplomats on the Hallstein Doctrine. The third chapter of the section brings yet another new dimension under scrutiny: how diplomats viewed the increasing amount of newly independent ex-colonial nations often willing to recognize the German Democratic Republic with regards to the German question and the Hallstein Doctrine. All these aspects were essential in relation to relevant advice for the Finland's German policy during this period. Especially as at this point the policy received its value increasingly as a symbolic dimension in the conceptualization of Finland's neutrality.

4.1 The beginning of the Ostpolitik: advances and setbacks

4.1.1 Better relations with socialist countries alluring, yet could also cause a drawback

A couple months after the governmental change in the Federal Republic, in October 1963, Torsten Tikanvaara, the Finnish representative in Cologne, reported his views regarding the beginning of Ludwig Erhard's new government's eastern policy. Tikanvaara's educational background was in law (Master of Law 1936, and Licensiate in Law 1948) but after one year he had changed from practicing his educational profession to the position of trainee in the Foreign Ministry in 1937. In 1961, he shifted from his post as Foreign Ministry's director general of the Administrative Department to the representative post in the Finnish trade mission in Cologne.⁵⁴⁷

In regards to Bonn's eastern relations, Tikanvaara focused on the development of relations between Poland and the Federal Republic, a subject already discussed by Brotherus before him. Tikanvaara seemed to emphasize the double-edged approach of Erhard's cabinet and the foreign minister Schröder towards the Eastern countries: the simultaneous betterment of relations while clinging to the principles of the Hallstein Doctrine.

Tikanvaara noted especially the interaction and conflict between the Federal Republic's trade interests and its foreign policy (also already a subject of the reporting of Finnish diplomats in Germany in the 1950s). This time in the background was Finland's earlier accession to the EFTA, which was, according to

⁵⁴⁷ Ulkoasiainhallinnon matrikkeli 1996, osa 2, 249, 250.

West German Foreign Office's documents, an utmost interest for the Foreign Office.⁵⁴⁸ Part of the reason was, of course, that for West Germany the international European organizations such as the EEC, EURATOM, and, later, the EFTA represented a possibility for more European integration and internationalism, which was the leading idea in the foreign policy of postwar West Germany.⁵⁴⁹

According to Tikanvaara, the relations between Poland and the Federal Republic had been vacillating from the very beginning, but, despite this, the trade had been flowing steadily since 1956, and Poland had already in 1948 established a trade mission in Frankfurt am Main, founded by the mandate of occupying powers.⁵⁵⁰ A real trigger for the development of relations had, however, been the recent trade treaty signed the previous year in Warsaw. Tikanvaara attributed its realization to the political and economic aspects; that is, to the pressure put on by West German heavy industry to establish relations and the inauguration of Schröder as a foreign minister. Yet, Tikanvaara saw that the contents of the treaty – due to the contradicting political interest of both parties – had been purely commercial and this could fit also inside the boundaries of the Hallstein Doctrine.⁵⁵¹ The fact that the Doctrine still held sway in Eastern relations had been already earlier implied by Tikanvaara in his letter to the Foreign Ministry's director general of the Political Department, Max Jakobson. Tikanvaara had stated that the Federal Republic had tried to establish similar trade relations with Hungary as well but that the attempt had failed because Hungary had demanded the inclusion of a section that would have stipulated the realization of diplomatic relations between the two countries in the future.⁵⁵²

Tikanvaara pointed out that the current treaty stipulated for the establishment of a trade mission of the Federal Republic in Warsaw, which consequently had been realized. The representative seemed to imply that there was more to this treaty than just the commercial aspects. He noted that, despite the commercial nature of the office, the position of the head of the office had been given to a career diplomat, the Federal Republic's former ambassador to Luxemburg, Mumm von Schwarzenstein. The Polish trade mission was to be moved to Cologne during the spring of 1964. Similar to its German counterpart in Poland, its chief, Trade Council Lachowski, would be accredited under the ministry of trade.⁵⁵³ Earlier, Tikanvaara had also heard from the Federal Republic's Foreign Office that by the treaty Bonn wished to assure Poland that the Federal Republic held no "revanchist intentions".⁵⁵⁴ Tikanvaara's views were concerted by the

⁵⁴⁸ E.g. see file PAAA B26 bd. 354.

⁵⁴⁹ Hafterndorn 2006, 59.

⁵⁵⁰ Initially, Poland viewed strong German (both Eastern and Western side) economies as a possible threat and opposed, in the West German case, the Marshall plan from the Morgenthauian self interest of keeping Germany weak. (Lehmann 1979, 217.)

⁵⁵¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 25 January 1964, "Länsi-Saksan ja Puolan nykysuhteista", p. 1.

⁵⁵² UM 7 D II 306, letter of T. Tikanvaara to Max Jakobson 9 April 1963.

⁵⁵³ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 25 January 1964, "Länsi-Saksan ja Puolan nykysuhteista", p. 2.

⁵⁵⁴ UM 7 D II 306, ulkoasianhallinnon tiedotuksia, report from Cologne by T. Tikanvaara 20 March 1963, "Bonn idänsuhteitaan parantamassa", p. 2.

Finnish representative to Warsaw, Martti Ingman, who emphasized the “political aspect” of the negotiations. He also revealed that the initial goal of the German negotiators had been to achieve establishment of a trade mission bearing similarity to Finland’s missions. Especially in his wording concerning the missions’ rights and privileges, Ingman seemed to be carefully balancing his words to not posit that Finland held something drastically more than merely trade relations with German states. He stated that the Germans had wished to achieve missions like Finland’s with “certain diplomatic and consular rights”.⁵⁵⁵ It seems that the German side had similarly diminished the diplomatic aspect of Finnish solution.⁵⁵⁶ This was natural as the Polish side would have keenly went for full diplomatic relations, as it would have meant the permanent recognition of the Oder-Neisse line.

According to Tikanvaara, the long term of the renewed treaty had been a Polish wish. He noted that Poland had originally demanded a five-year term, but the Federal republic could only agree to a three-year term, as it was also the period of the trade deals signed with the Soviet Union. Tikanvaara evaluated that the politically valuable part of the agreement for the Federal Republic had been the inclusion of the so-called Berlin clause which the “Polish side had not managed to avert”.⁵⁵⁷

The Berlin clause Tikanvaara referred to was the passage already introduced in the previous trade treaty between Poland and the Federal Republic. The clause was an ostensibly minor issue since it acknowledged an existing state of matters, that is, that the Federal Republic represented West Berlin diplomatically. However, Tikanvaara’s interpretation that the clause had been included in the new treaty was perhaps slightly simplistic. The clause issue had actually manifested the diplomatic tug-of-war Bonn had to constantly attend to in its relations with the socialist countries. The Polish negotiators, having received pressure from the divided Polish government and communist party, as well as from the part of East Germany, had not agreed to include the clause in the new treaty. They had actually proposed a compromise that the new treaty would not include the Berlin clause but would also not cancel the previous clause included in the payment protocol of the treaty of November 16, 1956.⁵⁵⁸

The actual interest of Poland for the renewal of the trade treaty with West Germany received an impetus from the international economic and political alterations, mostly from the Western European integration. The economic aspect of the integration was especially causing, at this time, worry in Poland as well as in other Eastern bloc countries. In Poland, the agricultural sector saw a threat for their exports in the lowered tolls in the trade between EEC countries and wanted to secure access for their exports to West Germany’s large market.⁵⁵⁹

⁵⁵⁵ Ingman’s quotation “...tietyin diplomaattisin ja konsulaarisin oikeuksin”.

⁵⁵⁶ UM 7 D II 306, ulkoasiainhallinnon tiedotuksia, report from Warsaw Ingman 19 March 1963 “Puolan ja Länsi-Saksan kaupallinen sopimus”.

⁵⁵⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 25 January 1964 “Länsi-Saksan ja Puolan nykysuhteista”, p 2.

⁵⁵⁸ Hofhansel 2005, 10.

⁵⁵⁹ Hofhansel 2005, 9.

In this regard, the treaty was indirectly countering the possible harms from European integration; it was most probably to great interest to the Finnish foreign ministry, especially since, during this period, Finland was also taking part in the West European integration. As already mentioned, the EFTA treaty signed in 1961 had cemented Finland's foothold in the West in economic aspects despite the large amount of Finnish trade being executed with the Soviet Union. And, as the earlier reporting after the Night Frost and Note Crisis showed, West Germans were noting the implications that Finland's association with the economic integration of Europe would have, not only from an economic, but also a political standpoint.⁵⁶⁰

In this respect, Tikanvaara's interpretation was omitting the fact that the "politically important" clause had not been actually included in the treaty, and, on the contrary, emphasized the conciliatory attitude of communist countries such as Poland in the clause issue was perhaps a tacit suggestion – or an unconscious wish – for Finland to continue with boldness in its dealings with the socialist countries. This kind of attitude was possible and also needed more than ever from the standpoint of someone being concerned by the influence of the Soviet Union in Finnish domestic politics, especially when considering the temporal context: Moscow's favorites, Kekkonen and the Agrarian League, were solidifying their power base and the prime challengers, the Social Democrats and the National Coalition Party, were becoming politically impotent.⁵⁶¹ Poland especially was a country that could direct attention to the dubious phenomenon taking place in Finnish political life, as the President's son, MP Matti Kekkonen, had stated, during this period, his controversial claim that Poland proved how a communist nation could be as independent as a capitalist one.⁵⁶²

The West German trade mission followed the tumultuous re-configuration of the Finnish field of politics. The mission reported on and followed, with keen attention, the Social Democratic party conference in order to sense the coming direction of the Finnish moderate left. They noted that the previous anti-Soviet

⁵⁶⁰ See section 3.2.3 Discussion between Karl Carstens and Heinrich Böx.

⁵⁶¹ Seppinen 2004, 431. Social Democrats were split into two factions, from which the main one was led by Väinö Tanner, a persona non grata in the Soviet Union, and could not form a believable governing faction, whereas the coalition party was not allowed in government by Kekkonen due to their inimical status in the eyes of Kremlin. However, Kekkonen was trying, in the beginning of the 1960s, to form a strong majority government from the National Coalition Party, the Agrarian Union, and opposition faction of the SDP, which formed in 1959 under the party name the Social Democratic Union of Workers and Smallholders (*Työväen ja Pienviljelijäin Sosialidemokraattinen Liitto* (TPSL)). The attempt was stymied by the resistance of the parties to coalesce in the government. Antti Kujala has interpreted that the split of the social democrats was an ambivalent phenomenon for Kekkonen: the split weakened his possibilities to form a strong government with Agrarian Union and the unified SDP, but, on the other hand, the right wing faction of the party, whose main figures, Väinö Tanner, Väinö Leskinen, Kaarlo Pitsinki, and Olavi Lindblom, were declared as non-valid co-operative persons by Khrushchev, worked as a warning sign for the results of defying the wishes of Moscow, and benefited Kekkonen's use of Moscow's threat in Finnish politics. (Kujala 2013, 100, 108.)

⁵⁶² Keski-Rauska 2015, 105.

line was now, at least ostensibly, gone since the former Chairman, Väinö Tanner, was not a candidate for the party's leadership in the coming party congress in June 1963. The new candidate, Rafael Paasio, was branded as "colourless" and unprofiling in the foreign policy questions. The mission noted that so far the anti-Soviet social democrats Kaarlo Pitsinki, Olavi Lindblom, and Väinö Leskinen had not expressed in their speeches and statements if they were going to assume Kekkonen's line (Soviet-friendly) line in foreign policy.⁵⁶³

Possibly even more worrying was that Kekkonen was, during this period, planning to challenge the parliamentary democracy's basic principles by attempting to build a coalition cabinet from all parties – including communists, which even exacerbated the matter. This would have left the government *with* communists *without* opposition. Finland's most prominent political cartoonist, Kari Suomalainen, a constant critic of what he saw as Kekkonen's authoritarian leadership and subservient Eastern policy, relayed an implicit warning to Kekkonen by portraying him in a garden being stung by a red rose (Suomalainen's metaphor for communism).⁵⁶⁴

The West German trade mission also reported on the alarming government formation which consequently was a target of keen attention in West German Foreign Office. This is implied by the underlinings in the report concerning Kekkonen's proposal for an all party government, "*allparteienregierung*". However, the report also implied that the West Germans perceived the Finnish people to share their view on the situation, which must have increased their tolerance for the official façade of neutrality in the Finnish foreign policy. The report noted that the majority of the Finnish people regarded the all-party government with communists unacceptable.⁵⁶⁵ In fact, Kekkonen's cabinet choices were not only a Finnish and West German concern; for the Americans and British in the 1950s and 1960s the litmus test of the Finnish Cold War position – as well as Kekkonen as a trustworthy politician – were the Finnish governments: as long as the communists were excluded, Kekkonen's antics in the Eastern policy could be tolerated.⁵⁶⁶

Another factor that was disquieting from the West German standpoint as well as from the Finnish right's standpoint was the balance of the state visits; Kekkonen was making more visits than he was hosting. The Western "big" states especially had not reciprocated the visits: United States, France, and Britain had not offered a countervisit, despite the invitations.⁵⁶⁷

⁵⁶³ PAAA B23 bd. 228, report of H. Böx from FRG trade mission in Helsinki 7 June 1963 "Sozialdemokratische Partei Finnlands; Rede des Vorsitzenden dieser Partei V. Tanner am 23. Mai 1963 in Tampere".

⁵⁶⁴ Suomalainen, K. 1964, Comic strip in Helsingin Sanomat 22 September 1963.

⁵⁶⁵ PAAA B23 bd. 228, report of H. Böx from FRG trade mission in Helsinki 25 September 1963 "Versuche zur Regierungsbildung in Finnland".

⁵⁶⁶ Vares 2002, 41. Earlier in 1958, before the Night Frost crisis and the dissolution of Fagerholm government, the American Ambassador had reported to Washington that "...Communists will not, repeat, not be admitted to government unless President Kekkonen in effect goes nuts" (as cited in Vares 2002, 44).

⁵⁶⁷ PAAA B23 bd. 228, report of H. Böx from FRG trade mission in Helsinki 17 January 1963, "Offizieller besuch des finnischen Staatspräsidenten in Jugoslawien".

The reach towards the East can be seen in the Agrarian Union-affiliated periodical *Maakansa*, which quoted an article in *Neues Deutschland* (the official paper of the East German regime) by Wilhelm Thiele, head of the East German trade mission. It was clear the quotation itself was alarming since *Neues Deutschland* was not among the usual sources for Western newspapers. The article was exalting the Finnish equal representation in the German states as a prime testimony to the friendly co-existence of different economic and social systems. This article could be also interpreted as a push towards attaching Finland's German policy increasingly towards the symbolic order of the Finnish neutrality and Kekkonen's dictates of the neutrality.⁵⁶⁸

However, it is clear that, on the Western side, this possibility of interpreting the relations of Finland with Germanies was constantly worrying, especially if the diplomatic aspect of the relations could somehow grow.⁵⁶⁹ For example, at this period they could not wholeheartedly support the suggestions of their representation in Helsinki for the establishment of the branch offices of the trade mission. The Foreign Office supported the idea in principle, but were holding reservations due to the fears that the East Germans might appropriate the same line of action, and even worse, discreetly imbue its branch offices with consular rights as a step towards full diplomatic relations.⁵⁷⁰ The reprehension towards the increased German representation was reciprocated by the Finnish Foreign Ministry: in its memo the next year, the Ministry hoped that the revived idea of a branch office, presented by West German representative Kempf, would "die away".⁵⁷¹

Tikanvaara continued on the line that was implicitly bolstering the validity of the resistance towards the conformity in relations with the socialist bloc. The representative showed that even inside the socialist bloc there was a latent seed of disintegration that might be helped into bloom by strong Western diplomacy. According to him, Poland was one the countries in the socialist group that had originally stirred interest in the Federal Republic by its domestic political developments. The West German press had already, in the mid-1950s, taken a substantial interest in the progress of Poland towards political non-dependency from the Soviet Union.⁵⁷² Tikanvaara solicited inside-knowledge of the actions of Bonn's foreign office during 1956, which showed that, behind the official non-interaction policy of the Adenauer era towards the Eastern countries, there had already been diplomatic approaches towards them, especially in relation to Poland, to challenge the totalitarian socialism. Tikanvaara explained that, at that time, when the Hallstein Doctrine had been still in its "swaddles", Bonn had nearly proposed the establishment of diplomatic relations for Warsaw. This suggestion had been

⁵⁶⁸ PAAA B23 bd. 227, report from Helsinki trade mission 10 October 1963, "Wiedergabe des Artikels des Leiters der SBZ-Handelsvertretung Thiele in "Neues Deutschland" vom 3 October 1963 durch "Maakansa" und "Kansan Uutiset".

⁵⁶⁹ See PAAA B26 bd. 354, reports and documents from the late 1963 and early 1964.

⁵⁷⁰ PAAA B26 bd. 354, telegram from West German Foreign Office to trade mission in Helsinki 24 January 1964.

⁵⁷¹ UM 6 O 5 SLT, Cronney letter to Kaarlo Mäkelä from Finnish Foreign Ministry 26 October 1965.

⁵⁷² UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 25 January 1964, "Länsi-Saksan ja Puolan nykysuhteista", p. 3.

planned to offer support for reformist Wladyslaw Gomulka's alterations to the distribution of power in Poland. It was hoped, that his example would have a cumulative effect on other East European countries – especially in East Germany.⁵⁷³ This was, of course, critique of the socialist system from Tikanvaara. Its boldness can be understood better by noting that, for Kekkonen at this point, it was not clear at all whether the capitalist system was to be the victor of history. After all, the legitimacy of his policies relied – at least partly – on the interpretation of the socialist system as a legitimate way of organizing the political and economic administration.

The Adenauer era initiatives Tikanvaara referred to had, as already mentioned, taken place during 1956; the tumultuous year of the Hungarian uprising along with the so-called Polish October (preceded by workers' revolt and marking a change in the politics of Poland as the reformist Wladyslaw Gomulka rose to power). Afterwards, Bonn had begun a serious search for new Eastern policy alternatives. Gomulka's ascension to the leadership in Poland put the minds of Bonn's foreign policymakers on the prospects of promoting more independence in the Eastern bloc satellite states. The rationale had been that by causing disintegration the goal of re-unification of Germany would have become more reachable.⁵⁷⁴ However, the attempts had been stymied, which Tikanvaara also pointed out in his report. According to his information, the Federal Republic's incumbent foreign minister at the time, von Brentano, had been personally intrigued about the possibility of offering diplomatic relations for Poland. Tikanvaara attributed Brentano's willingness to draw closer with Poland as an unconscious guilt felt by mid-generation Germans (a reference to the invasion of Poland).⁵⁷⁵ However, as mentioned earlier, the attempts had been ultimately blocked; Tikanvaara's guess was that they had most likely been stopped inside the Foreign Office by the father of the Hallstein Doctrine, secretary of state at the time, Walter Hallstein. Later, towards this direction, pointed also the report of Heikki Brotherus, who wrote that during the office of Walter Hallstein as state secretary the incumbent foreign minister von Brentano could not be a "master in his own house". This he attributed to Hallstein's strong will, his trusted relationship with Adenauer, and the official right of the state secretary to present initiatives to Chancellor.⁵⁷⁶

However, the Foreign Office as a whole had not actually debunked the development of the Polish relations as Tikanvaara seemed to suggest. Inside the Foreign Office there existed differing views on the importance and possible results of the Eastern policy during the Adenauer era. In the latter half of the 1950s, the advocates of the active Eastern policy had been top-level officials such as Herbert Blankenhorn and Wilhelm Grewe; they had also been Adenauer's trusted men, which consequently added to the value of their views.⁵⁷⁷ And even Foreign Minister von Brentano's role had not been exactly clear. In fact, it appeared confusing: he seemed to have considered Eastern policy activity important during

⁵⁷³ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 25 January 1964, "Länsi-Saksan ja Puolan nykysuhteista", p. 3.

⁵⁷⁴ Ahonen 2003, 123.

⁵⁷⁵ For a post-war psychological aspects of West German society, see Feldman 2014.

⁵⁷⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 13 February 1958, "Muutokset Auswärtiges Amtissa", p. 2.

⁵⁷⁷ Ahonen 2003, 125.

the latter half of 1950s despite the fact that he had previously publicly denounced the attempts to move closer to the Eastern countries. This stance was manifested in the speech he addressed to the Bundestag in June 1956, in which he equaled establishment of the diplomatic relations with the Eastern bloc countries as tantamount to abandoning the “dream of the German unification”. He had stated that since the Eastern bloc countries had already acknowledged the East German state, the Federal Republic would have implicitly acknowledged its existence too by establishing diplomatic relations with the Eastern neighbors.⁵⁷⁸

However, this seems to have been only the official stance of the government, not the real reflection of its goals when it came to Eastern countries. Towards this direction pointed the fact that after the Polish October von Brentano had sent a prominent West German diplomat to gather information about the prospects of establishing diplomatic relations with Poland. The scouting had been done in meetings arranged in Washington. Despite the interest expressed from the Polish side, the attempts were abrogated by the approaching Bundestag elections of 1957. The elections required Adenauer’s cabinet to take a hardline once again to win the support of their voters—including the powerful lobby groups of expellee organizations, which formed a major voter base.⁵⁷⁹ Other factors that contributed to the revival of the Hallstein Doctrine at the time was the diplomatic surprise of Yugoslavia, which had suddenly and without warning established diplomatic relations with East Berlin (leading to Bonn terminating diplomatic relations with Beograd). However, as the later discussion in this research will show, the case of Yugoslavia, according to the reporting of Finnish diplomats, did not perhaps, after all, constitute an actual test of the Doctrine.

In Tikanvaara’s view, the rationale behind Hallstein’s decision to stop the convergence with Poland had been the fear of betting on a “wrong horse”. Yet, Tikanvaara thought that even Chancellor Adenauer had been at that time interested in the effects of Gomulka’s reforms in Poland. However, when the Federal Republic’s government had realized that Gomulka was going to continue relying on the Soviet Union rather than any other nation, and that Gomulka was not going to alter Poland’s stand on Oder-Neisse line, the whole Polish question was thrown to the background in the Federal Republic’s Foreign Office.

The case of Poland exemplified how the political sympathy prevailing in Bonn could be from time to time – especially in the vicinity of coming elections – sacrificed for the expediency in relation to domestic politics. This was because all the parties in the Federal Republic clung to the re-acquisition demand of Oder-Neisse and Sudeten German areas in order to not alienate their expellee voter base, who had organized powerful homeland organizations to lobby their cause.⁵⁸⁰ This seemed to be the implicit thought behind Tikanvaara’s report in the Poland’s case as he explicated the powerful roles of expellee organizations in

⁵⁷⁸ Gray 2003, 72.

⁵⁷⁹ Ahonen 2003, 127.

⁵⁸⁰ Ahonen 2003, 175.

domestic politics.⁵⁸¹ However, the issue whether these areas should be retrieved was increasingly debated in the Federal Republic during the first half of 1960s. Media and journalists especially appropriated a critical stance towards the claims of the expellee organizations, which caused prominent rows between them.⁵⁸²

It seemed that, especially at times such as these, the Federal Republic's foreign office had a hard time keeping up with the wishes of the cabinet. In fact, later research has shown that, in the Poland's case, the last minute save in the convergence of relations had been even tried by the head of the Political Department at that time, Wilhelm Grewe. He had written a memo in which he suggested the establishment of a trade mission to Poland.⁵⁸³ However, as the issue of Eastern relations had been already sucked into the election battle of 1957, the CDU/CSU camp had regarded that even the establishment of a trade mission was too much of a giveaway and would be possible weapon to their opponents in the election battle. The idea of a trade mission had hibernated until 1962 when the impetus for change had come from West German industry – as Tikanvaara noted in the beginning of the report. At that time, Krupp's main representative, Barthold Beitz, had, with Bonn's tacit agreement, contacted Warsaw, which consequently led to the signing of the trade treaty.⁵⁸⁴

Tikanvaara stated that he had discussed the Poland matter very recently with the political secretary of state of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office, Karl Carstens. Carstens was a professor of constitutional and international law and was considered as Schröder's right hand in the ministry. He was a proponent of the Federal Republic's diplomatic isolation campaign of East Germany, and fought hard inside the foreign office against the erosion of the Hallstein Doctrine in the Third World.⁵⁸⁵ This of course means that he was no friend of clear-cut concession in the Federal Republic's sole representation policy either, and the following discussion with Tikanvaara seems to solidify this interpretation.

While discussing the views of Carstens concerning Bonn's Eastern policy, Tikanvaara seemed to once again take the chance to critique Finland's (or interchangeably, Kekkonen's) Eastern policy. The representative wrote that "it should be noted" that Carstens had expressed to him that he regarded President Kekkonen as a very significant person in a political respect. He also expressed a wish to one day be able to talk with Kekkonen personally in order to delve into Kekkonen's political outlook and to familiarize himself with his views concerning the Nordic policy. Yet, the following comment of Carstens had once again pointed out how delicate Finland's neutrality was in the context of Kekkonen's Soviet relations. Carstens had evaluated that if he did visit Helsinki, some unpleasant conclusions might be drawn from the perspective of both countries.⁵⁸⁶

⁵⁸¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 25 January 1964, "Länsi-Saksan ja Puolan nykysuhteista", p. 4.

⁵⁸² Ahonen 2003, 164-169.

⁵⁸³ Hofhansel 2014, 9-23.

⁵⁸⁴ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 25 January 1964, "Länsi-Saksan ja Puolan nykysuhteista", p. 3.

⁵⁸⁵ Gray 2003, 134.

⁵⁸⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 25 January 1964, "Länsi-Saksan ja Puolan nykysuhteista", p. 5. Secret letter from trade mission in Cologne favors both interpretations. It shows

It is impossible to say what Carstens meant exactly with his statement. If one takes a positive approach from Finland's neutrality standpoint, it could have meant that East Germans and Russians could have interpreted the visit as a preparation for establishment of diplomatic relations. From a negative standpoint, it could have been, in its essence, a thank-you-but-no-thank you for Kekkonen's policy line. This interpretation is bolstered by the fact that statement concerning Kekkonen was brought up directly after Carstens had mentioned the Eastern propaganda's claims of West German revanchist attitudes; a parlance which Kekkonen was also increasingly appropriating during the 1960s.⁵⁸⁷ Of course, at this point, even the term neutrality itself – especially in Finland's case, when the neutrality was connected with Kekkonen's policies – was not such neutral as an attribute. As already earlier discussed, the Soviet Union had proposed the idea of neutrality for central Europe already in the 1950s with Kekkonen's support. Even in the early 1960s the neutrality was in some regards "hijacked" by the East, as it was promoted as a solution for the status of Berlin by Soviet leadership and Walter Ulbricht.⁵⁸⁸

Perhaps one of the most interesting parts of the report followed in the continued discussion concerning the case of Poland. Tikanvaara reported that he had received information that the establishment of full diplomatic relations with Poland had also been a subject for negotiations. However, contrary to Ingman's view from Warsaw, which had emphasized that the trade mission style of representation had been a West German wish, and that it had emphasized the limited aspect of diplomatic dimension in this solution, Tikanvaara posited exactly the opposite. According to Tikanvaara, it was the Poles that had suggested the trade mission as a solution but that they had proposed it in the all ramifications of Finland's solution. That is, they had suggested presenting an exequatur for the Federal Republic's representative (which can be interpreted as a prerequisite for the official state level, meaning *de facto* diplomatic relations). The demand had been probably sidetracked by the intrigue from Poland: in the exequatur they had demanded a reference of its validity also for the "former German region now belonging to Poland", the disputed Oder-Neisse area. This would have of course meant a sort of a semi-acknowledgment that those regions were now under Poland's sovereignty. Due to this, the suggestions could not be acquiesced by the Federal Republic considering its main tenets of the current foreign policy, Tikanvaara explained.⁵⁸⁹

This aspect of the unsettled border issue with Poland might have also been, as Tikanvaara perhaps implied, a factor in prolonging the Hallstein Doctrine

that Carsten's views echoed an earlier statement of West German President Lübke, who in May 1961 had declared that he would like to visit Finland but found the possible visit disadvantageous for Finland. However, Lübke had also declared, according to Tikanvaara's predecessor Helenius, that Finland was not a free country (*kein freies land*). Kekkonen had discussed the statement with West German representative Overbeck. (UM 12 K, report from Cologne by T. Tikanvaara 14 June 1961.)

587

Suomi 1994, 435.

588

PAAA B23 bd.228, interview of East German State Secretary and Deputy Foreign Minister Otto Winzer by Finnish television channel Tesvisio March 1963.

589

UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 25 January 1964, "Länsi-Saksan ja Puolan nykysuhteista", p. 5.

since it prevented the diplomatic relations with these countries. In both, Prague as well as in Warsaw, the prevalent thinking was that the border issue was final: the previously German areas that were now in their control and would remain that way. Consequently, Foreign Minister von Brentano had explained in his speech in the fall of 1958 that the establishment of diplomatic relations with these countries would mean, in practice, the acknowledgment of the Prague-Warsaw interpretation of the Oder-Neisse issue. Whereas in Bonn, the view was that the border issues would be ultimately solved simultaneously with German reunification.⁵⁹⁰

However, at the time of Tikanvaara's reporting, the peak of the Oder-Neisse conflict with Poland and Germany had long since passed, the climax of the conflict having been at the end of 1940s.⁵⁹¹ And, it had been since the mid-1950s that the Oder-Neisse quarrel began to lose its edge, and Adenauer had resigned himself tacitly to acknowledge the status quo. However, despite him coming to terms with the issue, he could not officially resign from the goal of reunification of the Oder-Neisse areas with Germany, or from the reunification of Germany in general.⁵⁹² Adenauer's stance once again manifested just a few months before Tikanvaara's report, in June 1963, when Kennedy had tried to persuade him – to no avail – to recognize the Oder-Neisse line. The US interest to conclude the border issue was part of Washington's *détente* pursuit during this period.⁵⁹³

In this respect, Tikanvaara's notification that Bonn was unwilling to discuss the matter of granting *exequatur* for its representative to the Oder-Neisse region showed that neither this new government in Bonn wanted to advance in its Eastern policy at the cost of the possible domestic electoral base losses, which the acquiescence in the Oder-Neisse would have caused. However, even the purely economic relations, free from the pressures of the domestic electoral base, were without hindrance. Contrary to the Oder-Neisse issue which hinged on domestic policy factors, the economic relations could be hindered by superpower-related political factors. This was noted by Tikanvaara's successor in Cologne, Kaarlo Mäkelä. Mäkelä, who had a degree in humanities, was a son of a sailor (his father was a captain) and had begun his service in the ranks of the Finnish Foreign Service over thirty years ago. His experience in foreign posts was already substantial; he had begun them in Third Reich Hamburg in 1934 as an acting office clerk, after that he held posts in Stockholm, Rio de Janeiro, New York, Washington, London,

⁵⁹⁰ Ahonen 2003, 129.

⁵⁹¹ Lehmann 1979, 182.

⁵⁹² Lehmann 1979, 181. There was also a new generation of German youth that had grown up in divided Germany. It was becoming eligible for the ballot boxes and willing to acknowledge the undisputable existence of two German states. In addition to this factor, even among the West German populace in general, the question of reunification was losing its importance at this point. (Bark & Gress 1989 (1), 481, 513.) However, according to Julia von Dannenberg, the re-unification hope still lived in West Germany, but was merely projected to the more distant future (Dannenberg 2008, 1).

⁵⁹³ Rehbain 2006, 53.

and Geneva. In the Foreign Ministry he had functioned as deputy director general of External Economic Relations (*kauppapoliittinen osasto*). He was posted to Cologne on 1 February 1964.⁵⁹⁴

He noted the economical interaction with socialist countries might be interpreted as threatening in the Soviet Union.⁵⁹⁵ These aspects were, in his view, indicated in possible backlash of the bettering economic relations of the Federal Republic with the Eastern countries. He reported that the first signs of the countermeasures of the Soviet Union might have been already evidenced, as he wrote that the Soviet telegram agency (Tass) had presented a series of accusations towards the Federal Republic. Simultaneously, he noted, "the relations have been fraught by the diplomatic incidents such as the Naupert-case". The case referred to the expulsion of West German Economic Counselor Heinz Naupert from the West German embassy in Moscow in March 1964.⁵⁹⁶ According to Mäkelä, the initial plan in the Federal Republic had been to repel these attacks by ignoring them completely. However, the fact that the Tass's interpretations were according to Tass authorized by the government of the Soviet Union meant that they could not be let go without notice.⁵⁹⁷

Despite the fact that the Federal Republic had initiated a response to the attacks, Mäkelä did not want to over-emphasize the meaning of the exchange of statements. Perhaps it was his 30 years of experience that gave him the confidence to discredit the political discourse of the second superpower as mere empty rhetoric. According to him, the Federal Republic politicians were used to the over a decade of the Soviet Union's harsh language. The result was that not even the hardest Soviet attacks could stir much interest in the Federal Republic. According to Mäkelä, the prevailing view in West Germany was that the Soviet Union was not going to change its attitude towards the German question in the coming years.⁵⁹⁸ This laconic notion resembled the tone of the report that was infused with pessimism and futility regarding the Federal Republic's foreign policy goals that were, in Mäkelä's view, unrealistic.

If it is taken as a premise, as it is here, that during the mid-1960s the goal of a unified Germany was acknowledged as an unviable option but retained in existence by the domestic voter base, then Mäkelä was pointing out more directly what Tikanvaara had only implied: the necessities of domestic politics stipulated the foreign policy of the Federal Republic. The tendency to focus on the re-unifi-

⁵⁹⁴ Ulkoasiainhallinnon matrikkeli 1996, osa 2, 38.

⁵⁹⁵ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 16 April 1964, "Tassin selitys 7.3. ja Liittotasavallan vastaus 10.4.64", p. 1.

⁵⁹⁶ The reasons for the ousting were unclear, but it was suspected as the Soviet retaliation for the expulsion of I. A. Morozov, first secretary in the Soviet Embassy in Bonn earlier. (New York Times, 20 March 1964: 3.)

⁵⁹⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 16 April 1964, "Tassin selitys 7.3. ja Liittotasavallan vastaus 10.4.64", p. 1.

⁵⁹⁸ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 16 April 1964, "Tassin selitys 7.3. ja Liittotasavallan vastaus 10.4.64", p. 2.

cation was, according to him, the “innate” problem lodged inside the Federal Republic’s foreign policy of rapprochement with the East.⁵⁹⁹ Every action in the policy had to be “harmonized” according to this goal. Yet, the coming elections meant that despite this impasse, the government needed to show some activity. This was especially in demand as the other parties were planning to use the critique of the current government’s foreign policy as their main weapon in the elections. They were proposing undisclosed and open-minded discussions with Moscow to get ahead in foreign policy. According to Mäkelä, even Erhard’s visit to the United States was criticized by suggesting that the visit’s destination should have been in the exact opposite direction (that is, in Moscow’s). Erhard had commented that the prerequisites for that kind of visit did not yet exist: it would have meant the full support of other NATO countries and the certainty that the trip would have achieved some results.⁶⁰⁰

Mäkelä concluded that “when one looked at the foreign policy of the Federal Republic in general, one could not help but wonder the amount of limitations and restrictions the lacking peace treaty ensued for all foreign policy plans in West Germany”. He added that the support and sympathy of France was needed in order to alleviate the fears of being encircled. Every gesture and contact between Paris and Moscow was abhorred in the Federal Republic. In addition to this, the NATO power of the United States and Britain was needed.

This part of Mäkelä’s analysis targeted the most divisive factor of the Federal Republic’s foreign policy during the 1960s: the division of the nation’s foreign policymakers into two factions: Gaullists and Atlanticists. Foreign Minister Schröder was one of the latter and he explicitly brought up the main point of this affiliation – the reliance on the US support – as he wrote that it was “impossible to talk of Europe without referring to the United States of America. With great foresight they have supported the movement for European unity, and they are still supporting it. ... We must never lose sight of the fact that Europe needs the political, economic, and military power of the United States in order to stand firm against expansionist policy of the communist bloc.”⁶⁰¹

On the opposing side, the Gaullists, most often found on the right wing of the CSU and CDU, had been disappointed by the US Policy in the Berlin crisis. This faction included prominent figures such as Strauss, Huyn, Krone, Guttenberg, Gerstenmaier, and most importantly, Adenauer. They called for more independent political power for Europe and the ending of dependency on the United States. They also accused Schröder of abandoning the claim of the Federal Republic to be the sole representative of the German people.⁶⁰²

The pull of Adenauer towards France was exacerbated also by his fear that along with the US, the British might sell out the protection of the Federal Republic

⁵⁹⁹ This same tendency was noted by Henry Kissinger year later, see Hildebrandt 1984, 187.

⁶⁰⁰ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 16 April 1964, “Tassin selitys 7.3. ja Liittotasavallan vastaus 10.4.64”, p. 2.

⁶⁰¹ Cited in Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 22.

⁶⁰² Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 22.

in order to achieve their goals of superpower détente. On 28 July 1961 MacMillan's cabinet had taken a stance that Britain should pursue discouraging the US from taking a rigid attitude with the Soviet Union. They had also expressed that it might result in positive advances in the superpower relations to accord de facto recognition to the German Democratic Republic.⁶⁰³

The result of all the insecurity and flexibility of the Anglo-American approach towards the Eastern bloc after the Berlin crises had caused the speculations of a looming Franco-German alliance and nuclear co-operation in the early 1960s. No longer able to resort to the certainty of US support, the two countries would have formed their own defense barrier against Eastern expansion. However, this did not mean that de Gaulle was truly ever promoting the inclusion of West Germany in the nuclear club. Quite the opposite, he actually worried about German nuclear capability. However, his plan was to use the threat of the Franco-German alliance and their possible concerted efforts to achieve nuclear capability to achieve concessions from the US; he wished for the US to ultimately agree to donate nuclear weapons to France.⁶⁰⁴

It was not so much the credibility of France's own military capability calculations that led de Gaulle to attempt to attain the aforementioned weapons. It was more the same reasons that the Federal Republic had in its Atlantic relationship: the wavering of the support of NATO and the United States was seen in the Federal Republic as directly resulting in the weakening position of the Federal Republic in the international arena.⁶⁰⁵ In de Gaulle's view, the existence of French nuclear force would have forced the US to hasten its assistance for France in case of war.⁶⁰⁶

However, Similarly to Tikanvaara, Mäkelä emphasized that it was now economic factors rather than the threat of nuclear weapons and the Franco-German alliance that were driving the Federal Republic's Eastern policy. According to him, there were high hopes bestowed by the Federal republic's government upon the current line of establishing trade missions to socialist countries. The economic clout of West Germany was surpassing all expectations and clearly superseding the economy of East Germany. This aspect also gave possibilities to widen the interest towards West Germany in other areas, such as in the cultural field.

With the aforementioned in mind, it can be claimed that if West Germany was symbolizing the Cold War struggle, then Mäkelä's interpretation was pointing towards the direction that ultimately this battle might be fought on the economic front. At least he saw that West Germany's superiority over East Germany in the international arena was due to its economic strength. However, it seems

⁶⁰³ Mahan 2003, 59.

⁶⁰⁴ Mahan 2003, 71.

⁶⁰⁵ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 16 April 1964, "Tassin selitys 7.3. ja Liittotasavallan vastaus 10.4.64", p. 2.

⁶⁰⁶ Mahan 2003, 70. Also, for de Gaulle, it was long overdue that the French took responsibility for European security and regain their status as an important international actor. It was a status that France had increasingly lost after the debacle of June 1940: losses to French prestige were brought about by the defeat of France in the First Indochina War and the Algerian War. (Gordon 1993, 24, 25.)

that Mäkelä was perhaps less prone than his predecessor to see that the results of this trade diplomacy, could be positive.⁶⁰⁷ Yet, he was not willing to believe that the Soviet Union had already started to interpret the trade diplomacy as a Trojan Horse, despite the fact that in Bonn there had been claims that these approaches of the Federal Republic towards the socialist countries were actually the reason for the Soviet Union's rhetorical attacks against the Federal Republic.

However, the aforementioned aspects of the Federal Republic's foreign policy led him to question the benefits of the warming of relations with the Eastern countries. His interpretation was that "if the Federal Republic would actually succeed in that policy, it would only lead to the tightening relations with that particular country that the German question was dependent on". By this, he was obviously referring to the Soviet Union.⁶⁰⁸

Mäkelä ended the report by quoting Erhard on the basic hypothesis of the Federal Republic's current foreign policy, and expressing his own doubts concerning it. According to him, Erhard had stated that "it would be for the benefit of the Soviet Union to accept certain re-organizations in the central Europe as way to alleviate tension. In return, the Federal Republic would condone to relay substantial economic benefits". However, in Mäkelä's view, the result for the time being was probably the increasing of tension, not its alleviation by the "new friendly Eastern policy that seems to be the fad of the day". Its functioning was still hindered by the "deep etched distrust of socialist countries, which was showcased by the example of Poland", he concluded.⁶⁰⁹

What these reports showed is that both Mäkelä and Tikanvaara were, at this point, putting substantial emphasis on trade as one of the key factors in West Germany's Eastern relations. However, they pointed out that in the Eastern relations, the Hallstein Doctrine still held sway, despite the allure of its dissolution in exchange for the benefit of trade. According to reporting, it could, however, also be interpreted that one possible reason for the Doctrine's tenability was the fact that the most important eastern neighbours had extremely difficult borders issues with the Federal Republic that had domestic political implications for the Federal Republic's politicians. For Finland, this reporting did not forebode any possibilities in the reconfiguration of the German policy. It seemed that, for Germans, the German-German policy and the Eastern policy in general that was contingent on it, was, in fact, more ambiguous and enmeshed than ever.

4.1.2 Eastern countries still too distant diplomatically

After the overtures with Poland discussed in the previous chapter, Erhard's cabinet's campaign for better relations with East European countries continued after

⁶⁰⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 16 April 1964, "Tassin selitys 7.3. ja Liittotasavallan vastaus 10.4.64", p. 3.

⁶⁰⁸ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 16 April 1964, "Tassin selitys 7.3. ja Liittotasavallan vastaus 10.4.64", p. 3.

⁶⁰⁹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 16 April 1964, "Tassin selitys 7.3. ja Liittotasavallan vastaus 10.4.64", p 3.

the initial period of warming relations in the spring of 1964. Yet, all along during this so-called “movement” campaign of tightening relations with Eastern Europe and repelling fears of West Germany, the Foreign Office paid scrupulous attention that the established trade mission with these countries were circumscribed legally to pursue only economic interests and not venture towards consular rights.⁶¹⁰

Yet, less than a year later, in March 1965, there was more optimism in the air regarding the possibilities of Eastern policies. One example was the rumored establishment of diplomatic relations between Bonn and Romania. Mäkelä regarded that there existed a certain basis for the rumors to initiate. In this respect he was pointing at the different foreign policy outlooks among the Federal Republic’s parties, even among the coalition partners, the FDP and CDU. Mäkelä noted that in the recently held FDP party conference there had been unequivocal support for the establishment of diplomatic relations with certain socialist countries. In their case, the only problem was the Federal Republic’s self-made barrier of the Hallstein Doctrine. This group of countries had included Romania, along with Bulgaria, Hungary, and Yugoslavia.⁶¹¹ The view of Mäkelä was that Romania had, almost on a week by week basis, started to look more alluring as a partner to West Germany. This was also exemplified by the planned visit of Secretary of State Lahr to Romania.⁶¹²

On the other hand, he discerned that inside the general framework of Eastern countries, there were variations when it came to Bonn’s relations: in Poland, (which he had already discussed earlier) there was already a commercial representative office established by the Federal Republic, but with Czechoslovakia, the Federal Republic’s negotiations regarding the matter had long been standing still.⁶¹³

This image of contradiction burdened Bonn’s foreign policymaking that Mäkelä presented formed, in some respects, a mirror image of Finland’s own foreign policy entanglement with domestic politics: in Bonn, the domestic policy and national security needs prevented certain aspects of the foreign policy to be pursued, whereas in Finland, the foreign policy and national security needs prevented certain aspects of the domestic policy⁶¹⁴. For example, the practical exclusion of the National Coalition Party to partake in government and the division of

⁶¹⁰ Gray 2003, 142. Despite this friendliness towards the East, Bonn’s isolation campaign of East Germany did not, however, lose its significance. On the contrary, the isolation policy gained more speed by the springing up of newly independent states in Africa and Asia, discussed further in chapter 4.3. (see also Gray 2003, 146.)

⁶¹¹ UM telegram from Cologne 31 March 1965 “Länsi-Saksan itäsuhteista”, p. 1.

⁶¹² UM telegram from Cologne 31 March 1965 “Länsi-Saksan itäsuhteista”, p. 1.

⁶¹³ UM telegram from Cologne 31 March 1965 “Länsi-Saksan itäsuhteista”, p. 2.

⁶¹⁴ Rinna Kullaa has even argued that it was solely the domestic policy of Finland, not the foreign policy, that was influenced by the Soviet Union (Kullaa 2012, 19). However, as already argued in the introduction, the phenomenon was definitely most notable in the domestic politics, but it cannot be totally isolated from the foreign policy either, see section 1.2, discussion on Finlandization.

the Social Democratic Party led to the impossibility to create large coalition governments⁶¹⁵. However, President Kekkonen (and the Agrarian League) also exploited these splinter tendencies inside the Social Democratic Party for his advantage in the domestic politics.⁶¹⁶

Yet, the Federal Republic's Foreign Office received interesting information at this point which showed that, despite the Eastern-oriented foreign policy of Kekkonen and the resulting affiliation of the Agrarian League with this same policy, inside the party there was a willingness to realign policy. This was communicated to West Germans by the Agrarian League's General Secretary Sihvola who told the Germans that the Party had tied itself too much to Eastern relations. The West German representative in Helsinki, Heinrich Böx, also pointed in a similar direction. He noted that even Kekkonen had emphasized the necessity of keeping communists out of the government for the credibility of the Finnish neutrality (the option that he had earlier not disregarded, as the previous discussion showed, to the great worry of West Germans). The West German Foreign Office had underlined these parts of the report, which implies that the information, especially in the immediate years following the crises discussed in the previous chapters, was somewhat reassuring concerning the Finnish German policy.⁶¹⁷

However, despite this somewhat reassuring information considering Kekkonen's cabinet choices, the West German representation in Helsinki was still frustrated with Finland's foreign policy that seemed to still be taking multiple directions. The Federal Republic's trade mission in Helsinki noted that, despite the willingness of Finland to be associated with the West, the political visits pointed towards the East. West German foreign representation's documents offer a transnational view to the Finnish political culture that seem to show that the phenomenon of Finlandization was noted as a reality even before the term's official coining, and its consequent adoption by the West German right.

The report of the Federal Republic's trade mission put it bluntly: according to the report, "hardly a week" went by without a visit from the socialist bloc states or a Finnish delegation's trip to them.⁶¹⁸ This perception was strengthened a few months later when it seemed that, in some respects, Finland was becoming a bridgehead of the East German propaganda intrusion towards the West Europe. The World's Peace Conference (*Maailman rauhankongressi*) in Helsinki during June of the following year became a platform of East German attack rhetoric against West German militarism, a rhetoric that was also echoed by President

⁶¹⁵ Kekkonen refused to nominate National Coalition Party to government, as he feared the reactions of the Soviet Union. Kekkonen's use of the Soviet factor caused also the aforementioned division of the Social Democratic Party as he had tried to help the leftist Skogian faction of the party to gain more power in the inner-party struggle.

⁶¹⁶ Kujala 2013, 55.

⁶¹⁷ PAAA B26 bd. 249, report of the FRG trade mission in Helsinki 18 December 1964 "Politische Entwicklung in Finnland".

⁶¹⁸ PAAA B26 bd. 354-1967, Jahresberichte 1964. "...beinahe keine Woche vergeht, ohne dass irgendeine Ostblocksdelegation im Finnland herumreist oder eine Finnische Delegation sich in diese Staaten begibt...".

Kekkonen during this period.⁶¹⁹ As a platform, the conference was natural for this kind of action as it was organized by the World Peace Council, which was considered as an organization funded by the Soviet Union to propagate a socialist world view. The activity of East Germans in Helsinki was natural since Northern Europe, especially Finland, played an important role in the foreign policies of both German states and, in the case of East Germany, represented an important option towards international recognition.⁶²⁰

Reaction of Bonn's Foreign Office was to make a politico-diplomatic battle plan for the upcoming year. This was not only caused by the increased East German activity that immediately filled any political vacuum left by the Federal Republic in Finland, the Foreign Office also saw the situation in the larger international context. The support for Finland was seen as important in the Cold War battle for influence in general, the Foreign Office wanted to see at least one Federal Republic Minister visit Finland during the 1965.⁶²¹

However, with regards to Bonn's own policy in the Cold War context and, more precisely, in its Eastern policy, there seemed to be similar inconsistencies still. In East Berlin, the Finnish representative, Lennart Sumelius, reported on this subject. Sumelius' career in the Finnish Foreign Service had begun in 1948. His foreign posts had been in Stockholm, Rio de Janeiro, Beograd, and Oslo. He was transferred to East Berlin from his one-year tenure as acting deputy director general of the Administrative Department in 1963.⁶²² In this regard, he was probably well aware what kind of information was valued in the ministry and the crucial focal points of the reporting that a writer was expected to tackle during this period.⁶²³

It was perhaps one of the reasons why he decided to analyze the – at least the ostensible – transformation in the politics of the Federal Republic as Adenauer had receded in favor of Erhard. Sumelius cited opinion from the higher echelons of the German Democratic Republic's politicians, from Krolkowski, the vice foreign minister of the German Democratic Republic. The minister had informed Sumelius that, in the German Democratic Republic, it was regarded that during

⁶¹⁹ E.g. Kekkonen's column under alias Liimatainen 14 October 1967 "Hakaristin varjo" (Shadow of the Swastika), 1967 "Ratkaisuna kolmas maailmansota?" (Third World War, a solution?) Speech at the dinner of the Soviet Union's embassy in Helsinki 24 February 1965 "Suomen suhtautuminen monenkeskisten ydinvoimien luomiseen" (Finland's position on the creation of multilateral nuclear force), speech in Vaasa 6 January 1967 "Suomen tie jännitysten maailmassa" (Finland's path in the world of tensions). (Doria, Urho Kekkonen julkaistu tuotanto [<http://www.doria.fi/handle/10024/7353>, accessed 23 October 2017].) PAAA B26 bd. 354-1967, article in in Neues Deutschland 14 July 1965 "DDR warnt vor Bonns Kriegskurs". In November 1965 FRG Foreign Office also received information that in 1966 there was to be held a DDR-week in Finland (PAAA B26 bd. 354-1967, report from FRG trade mission in Helsinki 8 November 1965 "Finnland-Woche in der Sowjetischen Besatzungszone mit Spiegeldoppel").

⁶²⁰ Hecker-Stampehl 2007, 7, 8.

⁶²¹ PAAA B26 bd. 354-1967, "Aufzeichnung: Deutschlands Politik gegenüber Finnland", 19 October 1965.

⁶²² Ulkoasianhallinnon matrikkeli 1996, osa 2, 208.

⁶²³ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 21 November 1964, "Eräs keskustelu", p. 1.

Erhard's cabinet the Federal Republic had not had a consistent foreign policy. The most prominent problem was perceived to lie in the fact that, in some respects, the Federal Republic had continued the Adenauer's line, for example in the Hallstein Doctrine, whereas in others, overt wavering was to be discerned.⁶²⁴

Sumelius commented that it seemed Krolikowski honestly believed that the contacts between the two German states were not going to lessen. Yet the discussion had left, for the Finnish representative, an impression that the German Democratic Republic was ready for negotiations as long as they were kept from the public. This was implied also by Krolikowski's lament that even the smallest matters seemed to quickly leak from Bonn.⁶²⁵

Here Sumelius was once again implicitly bringing forth (the consistent theme in the reporting of the Finnish diplomats) the problematic nature of the governments' official stance and the vested interests in foreign relations. Curiously enough, his informant, one of the representatives of the most bureaucratic state in the world, was not only lamenting the unsecrecy of democratic state-machinery but also its bureaucratic dysfunctionality. According to the East German minister, there was a lack of co-ordination between the different bodies and offices in the Federal Republic that caused confusion also for the German Democratic Republic, as it did not know with which official it was supposed to negotiate with on particular subjects. However, sometimes this had also led to a favorable outcome for the German Democratic Republic as it had achieved, to its own surprise, the best possible resolution.⁶²⁶

However, the lamentation of Krolikowski could be a manifestation of not only self-conditioning under the totalitarian system of his socialist state, but the expression of the still remaining anti-parliamentary feelings in postwar Germany that originated from the failed parliamentarism of the Weimar Republic. In fact, in the Federal Republic, the transparency of the governance and accessibility of the people to the process of decision-making was considered an idea that would resemble the anti-parliamentary idea of the unmediated (non-representative) link between people and the decision-making.⁶²⁷

It is hard to say if Sumelius was bringing up this discussion of problems of transparency in the foreign policymaking to implicitly critique the unparliamentary nature and the secrecy and personalization of Finnish foreign policy, or if he was merely commenting on the procedural difficulties present in the German question. This information Sumelius presented implied that the time of improved East-West contacts was looming; the same kind of views had also been expressed to Sumelius in his discussions in West Berlin with some "well-informed" persons. However, the phenomenon was, according to him, not a clear-cut process. Sumelius added that his informants, had also emphasized that in the Federal Republic the politicians were generally not "mentally" prepared to assume a totally new

⁶²⁴ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 21 November 1964, "Eräs keskustelu", p. 1.

⁶²⁵ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 21 November 1964, "Eräs keskustelu", p. 2.

⁶²⁶ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 21 November 1964, "Eräs keskustelu", p. 2.

⁶²⁷ Biefang & Schulz 2016, 76.

stance towards the German Democratic Republic. Still, Sumelius had not heard any expectations that, in the Federal Republic, there would *not* be a re-evaluation of the policy towards the East Germany after the elections.⁶²⁸

What Sumelius was pointing out here was the phenomenon that followed from the West's pursuit of détente during this period. The growing interest in the West of better relations with the Eastern bloc also forced Bonn to a more lenient stance towards East Berlin.⁶²⁹ The result of this détente phenomenon was also the newly found contacts and leniency between the Federal Republic's Social Democrats and the East German SED members. This surprising alliance was all the more puzzling as social democracy had been traditionally evaluated by communists as the worst enemy of socialism⁶³⁰. Yet, the approach of the East German regime at this point can be understood by considering what SED was ultimately hoping to gain from West Germany's *Ostpolitik*: the permanence of the German division. Whereas, in the unified Germany – proponents of which the West German social democrats had been throughout the 1950s – it would have been clear that the social democrats – once allowed to exist again – would have splintered out of the SED once the unification had been achieved. After 1945 it had been clear that the SED could not retain a majority in any electoral districts of the Soviet occupation zone.⁶³¹

What speaks for this interpretation that the SED was only looking out for its own benefits in supporting the West German SPD and not actually reforming its core attitudes was the fact that, generally, the improvement of relations with Eastern countries by the West was not reciprocated in East Berlin. On the contrary, it led to the regime actually solidifying its own power in virtual isolation from contacts with the West during 1961-1966.⁶³²

Yet, contact with Finland formed an exception. Among the Western countries Finland presented, for the German Democratic Republic, a possibility to elevate its international status, as it was an enduring perception in East Berlin that Finland might, at some point, recognize the German Democratic Republic. For this purpose, the head of the East Germany's trade mission in Helsinki, Wilhelm Thiele, had contacted the General Secretary of the Finnish Communist Party (SKP), Ville Pessi, on the previous January of the writing year of the previously discussed reports of Mäkelä and Sumelius⁶³³. Thiele had asked Pessi if he was able to get the Finnish parliament's Committee for Foreign Affairs to invite their counterpart body in the German Democratic Republic's People's Chamber (*Volkskammer*⁶³⁴) to visit Finland. Pessi most probably already knew without inquiring that the task was impossible: the social democrat members of the Finnish

⁶²⁸ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 21 November 1964, "Eräs keskustelu", pp. 1, 2.

⁶²⁹ Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 14.

⁶³⁰ Berger 2000, 170.

⁶³¹ Berger 2000, 170.

⁶³² McAdams 1985, 69.

⁶³³ This attempt to generate policy through the local communist party was similarly executed by East Germany in Sweden, see Muschik 2005, 246.

⁶³⁴ Volkskammer resembled only ostensibly the idea of parliament. It was undemocratic in its composition and parliamentary procedures. Different sections of the parliament

Foreign Affairs Committee, Karl-August Fagerholm, Rafael Paasio, and Kaarlo Pitsinki were leaning towards West Germany in their support. Also the chair of the Committee, Sukselainen from the Agrarian League, was known to lack socialist sympathies.⁶³⁵ SED's hopes of building influence in the official Finnish foreign policy through Finnish communists were futile because, in Finland, the most important government parties, the Social Democratic Party and the Agrarian League, wanted to formulate their German policy through their own policy goals, and not appear as buttressing the communist foreign policy.⁶³⁶ Of course, in this case, the affiliation with such an undemocratic body as the *Volkskammer* would have made the whole policy look even more unflattering for Finland from the standpoint of Western democracy.

In general, this was also the situation that was described to the Federal Republic's Foreign Office by its trade mission in Helsinki. It could assure that, despite its attempts, the efforts of East Germany to move closer towards Finland had been stymied. This was a remarkable win for Finnish neutrality especially in the light of the previous information that the Federal Republic's Foreign Office received from Helsinki; the reporting of its trade mission pointed towards the Eastern bias in the Finnish foreign policy especially when it came to official visits.⁶³⁷

In Bonn, Mäkelä could discern more particular reasons for the Federal Republic's more lenient policy towards East Berlin than the general détente tendencies in the international sphere. These reasons had caused certain politicians and journalists to speak of the looming establishment of diplomatic relations with the socialist countries that had already recognized the "so-called Pankow government", Mäkelä explained. Interesting was his use of the term Pankow government, which was the designation the West German government used to refer to East Germany, especially during the Adenauer era. However, during the 1960s it was increasingly customary to refer to it as East Germany or the German Democratic Republic or DDR. Yet, as Mäkelä used the term in conjunction with the recognition issue, he could have also made an implicit distinction that the recognition of the German Democratic Republic was not a recognition of either a legitimate *de jure* state, nation, or people, but a recognition of the ruling powers in there. In this case, the language would have also revealed his clear-cut identification with West Germany's long standing Adenauer-era policy.⁶³⁸

As if to emphasize his own, probably critical, view of the legitimacy of the East German state, he pointed out indirectly that the policy of Bonn was not

consisting of parties and mass organizations could express opinions, but in reality the decisions were already made on the governmental level. Plenary sessions were reiterations of socialist rhetoric of SED. Their uncontroversiality was manifested in the total number of 1375 interruptions during the forty years of its existence, the amount corresponds roughly with the daily number of interruptions in the Bundestag. (Burkhardt 2016, 184, 185.)

⁶³⁵ Hentilä 2004, 108.

⁶³⁶ Hentilä 2004, 111.

⁶³⁷ PAAA B26 bd. 354 Jahresberichte 1964, undated.

⁶³⁸ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 31 March 1965, "Länsi-Saksan itäsuhteista", p. 2.

based on the sudden realization of the legitimacy of the East German state. Contrary to this, behind the policy he saw real-political reasons: the new stance was, according to him, based much on the case of Egypt, which had forced Bonn to the semi-abandonment of the Hallstein Doctrine. The real political calculation behind it was that it would have been unwise to leave Cairo having relations only with East Germany, even though Cairo had, by its actions, basically recognized East Germany.⁶³⁹

The case of Egypt that Mäkelä referred to was one of the most significant ones when it came to the possible alterations in the Federal Republic's foreign policy during this period. The year 1964 had seen the Federal Republic blunder in its relations with the Arab world and the debacle had manifested in the relations with Nasser's Egypt. For the whole year, the Foreign Office had prioritized the lobbying of a favorable outcome for the Federal Republic in the upcoming non-aligned nations conference in Cairo.⁶⁴⁰ This was natural since the non-alignment movement became more notable on the international arena during the 1960s. There were quantitative and qualitative reasons for this: in the former respect, the increased amount of newly independent nations that emerged during the 1960s were joining the movement. The amount of members rose from initial 25 participants in the Belgrade conference to 47 in Cairo⁶⁴¹. In the latter respect, the movement gained momentum also by the virtue of its charismatic leaders, not only Nasser in Egypt, but also Jawaharlal Nehru of India, Kwame Nkrumah in Ghana, Sukarno in Indonesia, and Josip Broz Tito in Yugoslavia. Throughout the decade, these leaders managed to intervene in pressing contemporary debates such as nuclear disarmament, mediations between East and West, and the reform in the United Nations.⁶⁴²

Another reason why Foreign Office had wished to establish a permanent foothold in Cairo and maintain good relations with its leaders was because it was also a city that was important from a diplomatic point of view. It served as a diplomatic bridgehead to Africa and the Middle East.⁶⁴³ Bonn's Middle East experts in the Foreign Office had expected a moderate stance from Nasser in the German question. After all, Nasser had expressed indication towards this kind of disposition in the Belgrade conference of 1961. However, the congenial stance of the Middle East's charismatic leader did not come for free: Egyptians had discussed openly the returns they expected to gain from Bonn. Yet, Bonn also knew how to play "tit-for-tat" and had not agreed to immediately give aid to Egypt's next five-year plan. Instead, they had expressed that the decision would be postponed until the Cairo conference was over. Naturally, this put pressure to Nasser to hold his Belgrade stance during the Cairo conference as well.⁶⁴⁴

⁶³⁹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 31 March 1965, "Länsi-Saksan itäsuhteista", p. 2.

⁶⁴⁰ Gray 2003, 170.

⁶⁴¹ Dinkel 2016, 108.

⁶⁴² Lüthi 2016, 90, 94. However, it has to be noted that the gallery of strong willed personae in the forefront of the movement was also fraught with internal divisions; especially the question of excluding or including China caused division (Lüthi 2016, 90, 94).

⁶⁴³ Gray 2003, 166.

⁶⁴⁴ Gray 2003, 166, 167.

The second point Mäkelä brought up as a factor influencing a more tempered policy from the Federal Republic regarding East Berlin was actually a derivative of the failed Arab relations. Mäkelä quoted a view from West Germany that posed the rhetorical question that, if it was unwise to continue the Hallstein Doctrine in the case of Egypt, why would it then be necessary for the Federal Republic to be harsh to the nations that were forced to recognize the Pankow government. After all, there were already the embassies of both German states in Moscow; therefore, West Germany should continue its policy of disengagement and improve its relations with the East.⁶⁴⁵

In this regard, he then made a surprisingly frank juxtaposition as he directly equated Finland with the Eastern bloc countries, which, of course, were the countries that he referred as those forced to recognize East Germany. He noted bluntly that Finland could also be included in the Federal Republic to the category of nations that were forced to recognize East Germany. As evidence, he cited *Kölnische Rundschau* which had included Finland in this very group. He quoted the article with the following: “in the case of Finland the situation is similar, withstanding few exceptions, especially the fact that Finland is not a Soviet satellite”. This had been, according to Mäkelä, the only sentence with regards to Finland in the article.⁶⁴⁶ Of course the direct accusation of Finland being in the category of Eastern nations in the West German press must have sent some shivers within the Finnish Foreign Ministry. However, the ending of the article gave at least some mercy in its assessment by a friendly, but yet somewhat obligatory appearing disclaimer, which noted to its readers that Finland was in fact not a Soviet satellite. Yet, even this addition could have been infused with irony.

However, to look at the quote in a friendly manner, perhaps Mäkelä was merely implying, in all good will, that if Finland were to recognize the East German state, for example, to abide with the wishes of Moscow, it would have been interpreted in the correct light in the Federal Republic. Or, he could have been pointing out that, in many respects, Finland was already included among the countries that had de facto recognized the German Democratic Republic but not by its own initiative.

What his analysis, in any case, exemplified was the role that speculations, images, and perceptions played in international politics – even if they had no basis in reality. As the Finnish historian Vesa Vares, who has studied Kekkonen’s image in the West during the Cold War, has pointed out, the perception and image largely determined the Western policy towards Finland – it was all there was available for the Western policymakers.⁶⁴⁷ In this case, the interpretation in the West German press that Finland would have been forced into its current policy towards East Germany would not have been exactly correct. Moscow had actually never directly demanded any particular policy from Finland. The original decision to withhold recognizing either of the German states had been caused by

⁶⁴⁵ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 31 March 1965, “Länsi-Saksan itäsuhteista”, p. 2.

⁶⁴⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 31 March 1965, “Länsi-Saksan itäsuhteista”, p. 2.

⁶⁴⁷ Vares 2002, 15, 16.

Paasikivi's timid stance towards the superpowers. Later, the Finnish representative Olavi Munkki had even suggested the possibility for Finland to follow the Austrian way of recognizing West Germany.⁶⁴⁸

In fact, it seems that the Soviet Union had not changed its stance towards Finland's German policy even in the 1960s, despite the fact that the recognition, and the international status of the German Democratic Republic, was rising. The status quo in the attitude of the Soviet leadership was manifested at this time in the discussions of the Finnish communist party's delegation in Moscow just one month before Mäkelä's report. The delegation included prominent Finnish communists such as Chairman of Finnish Communist Party (SKP) Aimo Aaltonen, Secretary General Ville Pessi, Hertta Kuusinen, MP, part of the leadership of Finnish-Soviet Society, the head of the SKDL's parliamentary group, Aarne Saarinen, MP and also a construction workers' trade union leader), and Erkki Tuominen editor in chief of party's paper *Kommunisti* (Communist) and a member of party's political committee. Urged by the SED, which was frustrated by Moscow's passive stance toward Finland in the issue of East Germany's recognition, Finnish communists had entered into discussions with Brezhnev, Suslov, and Ponomarev. They had hoped to get clarification on Moscow's stance on the issue. However, the Russians had been reluctant to discuss the matter, and the Finnish delegation had reported in their travel communique that the representatives of the CPSU had not "taken the bait".⁶⁴⁹

The reserved stance of the CPSU was possibly explained by Kekkonen's actions at the time. He was promoting Finnish neutrality in favor of the Soviet Union quite brashly at the end of the same month that Finnish communists visited Moscow. On his trip to the Soviet Union, he had improvised overnight a foreign policy speech that condemned the NATO's Multilateral Force plan (MLF). The MLF, a United States plan to form a NATO fleet consisting of multinational crews and armed with ballistic nuclear missiles. It would have given, in practice, access to nuclear weapons to all NATO countries, including West Germany, which alarmed the Soviet Union. The speech received large publicity due to the fact that it was first published in *Pravda*, the official paper of the Soviet regime. In addition, the speech declared that Finland could remain neutral only in the case that the state of peace remained in Europe. This was considered, on the Western side, a statement that implied Finland would, in case of war, discard its neutrality. Kekkonen had completely overtaken the Finnish Foreign Ministry on the issue. According to Hannu Rautkallio, this was Kekkonen turning around the tenets of Paasikivi's real-politics and combining his own political realism with the wishes of the CPSU's central committee. Yet, Kekkonen still wanted to present himself as a defender of neutrality. This created the gargantuan task of his official assistants having to explain Kekkonen's active foreign policy, like the

⁶⁴⁸ See Olavi Munkki's report 19 January 1956, "Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan suhteista vuonna 1955", appendix memo "muistio koskien Suomen ja Saksan Liittotasavallan suhteita" pp. 5, 6 in chapter 3.2.1.

⁶⁴⁹ Hentilä 2004, 109.

MLF speech, in a favorable light with regards to the Finnish neutrality.⁶⁵⁰ Perhaps due to these aforementioned aspects, especially the dimension that Mäkelä brought up (the unclear image of Finnish neutrality) the Ministry took an active interest towards the promotion and formation of this image later in this period.⁶⁵¹

However, in the light of Mäkelä's analysis of the political configuration in the Federal Republic, Finland would still have to retain the German policy intact. There seemed to be no willingness in the governing party of the Federal Republic to drastically initiate a new approach towards the East. Concluding the report by referring to the party statements regarding the FDP's novel ideas with regards the Eastern policy, Mäkelä stated that, in the convention, the CDU had rejected FDP's ideas for the Eastern policy. Also, the opposition party, the SPD, were taking a negative stance on the issue. CDU's Eugen Gerstenmaier, President of the Bundestag, had especially warned about the purported weakening of the Hallstein Doctrine. His stance had been that it could be either kept or abolished – there was no in-between. Mäkelä's take on the issue was that Gerstenmaier was correct in his opinion with regards to the Doctrine. However, he thought that the government had already made such long reaching interpretations regarding the Doctrine that its weakening was already a fact.⁶⁵² And, as the detailed discussion of Mäkelä's views regarding the Doctrine later later will show, he would two years later debunk it completely.⁶⁵³

All this political confusion surrounding the Eastern policy and its relations to the German question (also reported by Sumelius from East Berlin) pointed out to the Finnish Foreign Ministry that the German question was nothing but a clear-cut situation for the West German parties. In fact, it offered possibilities for politicians to raise their profile by making bold statements regarding the issue, or function as a trailblazer for their party to indicate how far it was possible to advance in the matter, and, most importantly, whether it was worthwhile politically.

However, despite the controversy surrounding Eastern policy that became evident from the reporting, in general, it could be noted that, during the Erhard era, his cabinet's Eastern policy had made some advances: trade treaties were signed with Poland, Romania, and Hungary in 1963, and Bulgaria joined the pack in early 1964. However, with Czechoslovakia the policy received its first setback. The trade negotiations went on from the end of 1963 to March 1965, and ended without result.⁶⁵⁴ Ultimately, Schröder's foreign policy did not seem to meet its foremost goal: it had not established diplomatic relations with any of the Eastern countries. It had come closest in the case of Romania that had shown interest in establishing relations with only scant preconditions, yet, even the Romanian chance faded before Erhard's cabinet ended in November 1966. However, the

⁶⁵⁰ Rautkallio 1993, 161.

⁶⁵¹ See Finnish Foreign Ministry documents concerning the seminar in 17 January 1969 "Suomen kuva maailmalla" discussing the Finnish image (UM 12 K 1968-1970).

⁶⁵² UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 31 March 1965 "Länsi-Saksan itäsuhteista", p. 2.

⁶⁵³ See section 4.2.2, Mäkelä's analysis of West Germany's Yugoslavian relations.

⁶⁵⁴ Ahonen 2003, 186, 195.

most important stumbling block for Erhard and Schröder was that the key countries to unlocking the situation in the East, Poland and Czechoslovakia along with East Germany, had become more adamant in their stances regarding the establishment of relations and were not willing to compromise. Towards the mid-1960s, they were moving towards more synchronized co-operation with the German Democratic Republic when it came to relations with Bonn.⁶⁵⁵

This development was noted by Sumelius in East Berlin as he reported in May 1965 information that pointed to the scant optimism he and Mäkelä had shown in their earlier reporting regarding the Eastern policy which was now possibly outdated. Sumelius analyzed that Ulbricht was now going to bring a halt to the convergence of the East bloc countries and West Germany.⁶⁵⁶ Behind this new momentum he saw the economic aspects and evaluated that the SED party was getting more assertive, as the German Democratic Republic had managed to overcome its economic crisis and due to the fact that it had recently achieved some foreign policy victories. The latter was exemplified by Ulbricht's visit to Cairo. Sumelius also saw that the industrial output of the German Democratic Republic and the Peking–Moscow dispute had contributed to its more self-assured disposition. Ulbricht had managed to exploit the dispute and tie Moscow to back up East Berlin's foreign policy.

However, Moscow seemed to be looking for more security and not so much foreign policy victories; just over a week earlier Premier Alexei Kosygin had stated in Berlin to a correspondent of *Le Monde* that, in the German question, the status quo was enough for the Kremlin. The Finnish Foreign Ministry had perhaps seen new inroads to be found in the German question due to Kosygin's recent statement and asked for clarification regarding the statement from Finnish representatives in London, Paris, Washington, Moscow, East Berlin, and Cologne. Paris and London were concise in their answers and noted that Kosygin's statement had not received comments.⁶⁵⁷ In Washington, Olavi Munkki – who had previously been stationed to Cologne during the mid-1950s and, as discussed earlier, suggested the possibility for Finland to recognize West Germany in the fashion of Austria – seemed to retain a certain hint of the frustration with the sensitivity that the Eastern bloc views and the German question were causing in the Finnish Foreign Ministry. In his answer, he laconically noted that the US newspapers had not even noted Kosygin's statement. Only *The Washington Post* had released news of the subject, however, it had not received commenting at all. He stated – perhaps also not missing a chance to gibe at Finland's Eastern-oriented foreign policy – that, in the United States, Vietnam and the Dominican Republic were dominating the news stream and the less-current European

⁶⁵⁵ Ahonen 2003, 187.

⁶⁵⁶ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 19 May 1965, "Huomioita sodan loppumisen 20-vuotisjuhlallisuuksien vaiheilta" ..

⁶⁵⁷ UM 7 D II 307, secret telegram from London 14 May 1965; secret telegram from by K. Kara Paris 15 May 1965, K. Kara in Paris noted that Kosygin's statement was echoing the stance Gromyko had expressed in Paris.

problems were not receiving attention, “which they otherwise would have earned”.⁶⁵⁸

Finland’s Ambassador to Moscow, Jorma Vanamo, however, replied with a possible explanation regarding Kosygin’s statement. According to him, the Kremlin knew that it could not reach a solution to the German question in its preferred way – by signing peace treaties with both German states – in the current tense political situation. However, according to him, it was still its goal in the long run, and, for its own benefit, Moscow had now relinquished the “cockstrut threats of Khrushchev era” as it had seen their results unfruitful. All in all, he noted that Moscow’s stance was unchanged.⁶⁵⁹ In Cologne, Mäkelä concerted Vanamo’s views and pointed out that because the stance of Moscow was known to be unchanging in the Federal Republic it did not stir much interest. The Kosygin-statement had not spawned any editorials, and *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* also stated that even though de Gaulle was backing Moscow’s claims, his views were futile because France did not recognize the two German states, and thus could not benefit from the realization of the two German-state peace treaty.⁶⁶⁰

These views must have been somewhat sobering to Kekkonen, who, at this point, was looking towards the direction of France and de Gaulle as a key to stability in Europe. He sent de Gaulle a letter in which he denounced the United States’ Vietnam policy and expressed his concern over world peace. Kekkonen also saw the relations with France as a counterbalance for the Finnish relations with the Soviet Union. In this regard, France was suitable also because de Gaulle was warming the relations with Eastern Europe, which, for France, was a historically familiar foreign policy from the turn of the century.⁶⁶¹ This manifested the fact that De Gaulle had wished in the 1960s to mediate between the East and West relying on this peculiarly French experience. In his memoirs, President Richard Nixon stated that de Gaulle did not trust the Americans and branded them as “uncontemplative” in diplomatic matters.⁶⁶² De Gaulle called for *l’Europe européenne*, an autonomous Europe – with Britain excluded. He especially disdained the hegemony of the United States in NATO, and wished the trans-Atlantic co-operation to be returned to the intergovernmental level. However, France’s European partners considered the French-led European security system too weak to contain the Soviet Union and the possible rising German nationalism.⁶⁶³ For Kekkonen, the counterbalance of France was probably suitable due to the fact that this way he did not go too far in the West. This was guaranteed not least by

⁶⁵⁸ UM 7 D II 307, report Washington 18 May 1965, “Pääminister Kosyginin lausunto Le Monde -lehdelle”.

⁶⁵⁹ UM 7 D II 307, report Moscow 20.5.1965, “Kosyginin lausunto Saksan kysymyksestä Le Monde’lle”.

⁶⁶⁰ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 4 May 1965, “Neuvostoliiton ja Liittotasavallan välisistä suhteista”.

⁶⁶¹ Suomi 235, 234; Mankoff 2012, 13.; The period of so-called Franco-Russia rapprochement, e.g. see, The Franco-Russian Alliance Military Convention – 18 August 1892 (Lillian Goldman Law Library http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/frumil.asp/ [accessed 16-4-2018]).

⁶⁶² Nixon 1982, 65.

⁶⁶³ Mockli 2008, 22.

the reciprocity of the animosity; de Gaulle was, in general, not in the favor of American foreign policymakers either.⁶⁶⁴

However, if Moscow's policy seemed to be static, in the shadow of this stability of its "big brother's" [Sumelius' reference to the Soviet Union in relation to East Germany] foreign policy, East Germany had, according to Sumelius, managed by the dynamic foreign policy to establish itself as an equal nation among the Eastern bloc countries. It was a position which it had not been regarded to hold only a few years earlier. To back up this interpretation, Sumelius pointed out that in a recent speech Ulbricht had even went so far as to claim that it was the German Democratic Republic which now represented the whole of the German people.⁶⁶⁵

It was especially the recent actions by the United States that had provoked the assertiveness of East Berlin. According to information Sumelius had managed to receive from "unbiased" diplomats in the West as well as from the German Democratic Republic's Foreign Ministry, the United States, with the Federal Republic, had presented substantial economic aid for Poland and Czechoslovakia, an international guarantee of their borders, and a non-aggression treaty. There had been a condition included that these nations would have to stop backing East Germany. Ulbricht had replied by declaring that if postwar borders were to be altered in Europe, this was not to be done at the expense of the German Democratic Republic.⁶⁶⁶

The conclusion of Sumelius was that the main goal of the German Democratic Republic was now to hinder the bettering of relations between the Federal Republic and the Eastern bloc countries. In this respect, it also tried to get the Soviet Union involved by emphasizing its security interests with regards to those relations. Also, the more prominent international position of the German Democratic Republic was, according to Sumelius, reflected by its more aggressive attitude towards the West. At the same time, it was also more starkly promoting its own interests inside the socialist bloc.⁶⁶⁷ All this was, in its essence, a clear message from Sumelius that the Eastern policy had now reached its first major obstacle, and that it was not so much the Soviet Union, but Ulbricht in East Berlin, that was building obstacles to block it. He seemed to show that all the overtures from the West with the Eastern bloc countries were seen by Ulbricht in an inimical geopolitical context.

What was evident by these reports was that there was an extensive wish in the Federal Republic to better the relations with its Eastern neighbors. However, this seemed to be reciprocated, contrary to expectations in the West, with suspicion from the part of the Eastern bloc. Now only were the foreign relations of West Germany wrought with the problematic of domestic politics, but in East

⁶⁶⁴ Nixon 1982, 65.

⁶⁶⁵ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 19 May 1965, "Huomioita sodan loppumisen 20-vuotisjuhla-lisuuksien vaiheilta", p. 3.

⁶⁶⁶ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 19 May 1965, "Huomioita sodan loppumisen 20-vuotisjuhla-lisuuksien vaiheilta", p. 4.

⁶⁶⁷ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 19 May 1965, "Huomioita sodan loppumisen 20-vuotisjuhla-lisuuksien vaiheilta", p. 4.

Berlin, Walter Ulbrich legitimized his governance with the implacable rhetoric against West Germany. However, as the discussion in the next chapter will show, the hope of better relations seemed to be burdened too much by the temporal and political proximity of previous CSU/CDU government for the successful alteration and success in policy to happen. Therefore, the breakdown of the Erhard government and the speculation for the new government, which now included the SPD as a viable partner (after the FDP had rejected to coalesce with the CSU government with party chairman Strauss as a member), naturally formed a subject in need of covering as the new configuration of parties in the government might also ensue new policies.⁶⁶⁸

4.1.3 The implications of the breakdown of Erhard's cabinet and the inauguration of the Grand Coalition

As analysis had already pointed out, much of the Federal Republic's foreign policy after the Adenauer governments was still burdened by the legacy of his era. This was partly explained by the fact that when Ludwig Erhard took chancellorship after Adenauer in October 1963, he changed Adenauer's cabinet only a little. The most notable change was the installment of FDP Chairman Erich Mende as the minister for all-German affairs.⁶⁶⁹ The Bundestag elections of October 1965 did not alter the picture drastically either despite the gathering impetus of cultural change and radicalism that was taking place in the mid-1960s. The results of election was somewhat conservative: the CDU/CSU was once again the victor in the elections.⁶⁷⁰ It received 47.6 percent of the votes, whereas its main opponent, the SPD, received 39.3 percent (however, it was the winner in a sense that its increase in votes was the biggest at 3.1 percent), and the FDP received the remaining 9.5 percent of the votes. The resulting second cabinet of Erhard was to be short-lived, and a year later he was forced to resign as the head of the minority government after the FDP had already earlier left the coalition.⁶⁷¹

In the latter part of 1966 there began the building of the new cabinet to replace Erhard's second one that had broken down. Lennart Sumelius in East Berlin had some optimistic hopes for the new Eastern policy. A few weeks before the inauguration of the new government, Sumelius had predicted that the government change in West Germany might open new possibilities when it came to the Federal Republic's foreign – including the Eastern – policy. In his report, Sumelius wrote that despite the fact that the evaluation of the invisible “inside alterations” of the Federal Republic's politics was from his post in East Berlin impossible, he still regarded that the even the observable overt surface phenomena had significance in the future.⁶⁷²

⁶⁶⁸ Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 57.

⁶⁶⁹ Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 11.

⁶⁷⁰ Gilcher-Holtey 2001, 29, 30. For example, the event in Freie Universität Berlin 7 May 1965, “Restauration oder Neubeginn – die Bundesrepublik zwanzig Jahre danach”.

⁶⁷¹ Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 37.

⁶⁷² UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 5 November 1966, “Asia: Uusi vaihe”.

Sumelius had, as another report revealed, in the previous June, witnessed first-hand the blossoming bud of the Federal Republic's Eastern relations, as he had witnessed in a garden party the meeting of Brandt and the Soviet Union's Ambassador Abrassimov. This had been, according to Sumelius, the first time in four years that Abrassimov had attended an event in West Berlin, which gave Sumelius reason to believe the meeting was arranged.⁶⁷³ This phenomenon that Sumelius noted was part of Brandt's behind-the-scenes diplomacy. Brandt had not notified Chancellor Kiesinger of these meetings, as the first time he officially announced a planned meeting with Abrassimov, in the spring of 1967, Kiesinger refused the meeting.⁶⁷⁴ Therefore, what Sumelius was in fact reporting was the unofficial clandestine contacts already in realization between West Germany and the Soviet Union.

Sumelius also could shed light on the content of Brandt and Abrassimov's discussions. According to him, the two had been circling around the issues discussed in the recent conference of social democrats in May.⁶⁷⁵ The meeting was a natural subject since it marked the overture for what later was dubbed as the "all-German Spring": the SED had sent an open letter to the SPD party conference suggesting the exchange of speakers between the parties. Despite that the exchange did not come into realization, the letter might have contributed to the fact that the SPD conference delineated new parameters for its Eastern policy and stated that the German question would not be solved by the Four Powers and that independent German initiatives were necessary.⁶⁷⁶ Another subject had been Herbert Wehner, who, according to Sumelius, had become the focal point of Eastern critique. This has been later explained by the fact that Wehner was the key figure in the SPD in the negotiations with the SED, and that he was steadfast on keeping the SPD within the parameters of West German foreign policy.⁶⁷⁷ Another aspect that cannot be discounted is Wehner's background as a member of the German Communist Party prior to him becoming member of the SPD in 1946. Therefore, for East Germans, he was, without a doubt, also a political traitor. However, Sumelius was not either aware of either these aspects or did not regard them as worth mentioning in the context of his report.

In his analysis concerning the possibilities of the new Eastern policy by the possible coalition government, Sumelius pointed towards the bolder than before statement by the West German Social Democrats as an indication of the possibility of a revised Eastern policy. He evaluated the statement as being the probable

⁶⁷³ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 10 June 1966, "Asia: Neuvostoliiton suurlähettiläs tapaa Willy Brandtin". In his memoirs Willy Brandt revealed that he and Abrassimov met during the period from May to November 1966 multiple times and discussed the Soviet-German relations, and the problems of Berlin among other issues. With regards the forming of grand coalition Abrassimov had been according to Brandt "restless". (Brandt 1989, 174.)

⁶⁷⁴ Dannenberg 2008, 78.

⁶⁷⁵ UM Berlin 10 June 1966, "Asia: Neuvostoliiton suurlähettiläs tapaa Willy Brandtin".

⁶⁷⁶ Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 244, 245.

⁶⁷⁷ UM Berlin 10 June 1966, "Asia: Neuvostoliiton suurlähettiläs tapaa Willy Brandtin" p. 2. Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 244, 245.

basis for the government negotiations with the CSU/CDU. The statement had stipulated eight main tasks that the new government had to tackle. Half of them were foreign policy related. It stated, firstly, that the government should organize again its relations with Washington and Paris. Secondly, the federal government should renounce its pursuit of having control over atomic weapons on its soil. Thirdly, the Federal Republic should aim for the normalization of its relations with its Eastern neighbors. Lastly, the social democrats regarded that it was essential that the new government would find out what its “political-leeway” was with regards to the powers-that-be in East Berlin.⁶⁷⁸ Sumelius recalled also the words of Willy Brandt for him earlier (which he had also reported to Finland) that it was not sensible to replace the government with a new government that was as weak as its predecessor – a stance initially propagated by Herbert Wehner, but not Brandt.⁶⁷⁹ This statement led him to the conclusion that the coalition of the SPD and the FPD did not seem plausible. Sumelius speculated further that if the coalition was in fact to be born, it would be reasonable to assume that parts two, three, and four of the social democrats’ stipulations would be the basis of the new government’s foreign policy. That is, renouncing the strive for atom weapons, bettering Eastern relations, and probing more clearly the stance of East Berlin with regards to the Federal Republic’s foreign policy. However, Sumelius could not see immediate policy change ahead. In his view, before that was to happen, the majority of West Germans would have to be made to realize the need for more flexible and dynamic foreign policy. Secondly, it seemed that it would take substantial amount of time before the suspicion in the Eastern countries towards to the Federal Republic was vanquished.⁶⁸⁰ In this, Sumelius was bringing forth prerequisites from the Eastern bloc for better relations with the Federal Republic: the need of nuclear disarmament had been the mainstay of the rhetoric of socialists, adapted also by Kekkonen, for the last few years. The documents of West German Foreign Office show that, in West German eyes, Kekkonen was promoting the Soviet stance, and also the ideas of the Sweden’s left leaning former Foreign Minister Östen Unden.⁶⁸¹

Sumelius pointed out that lot of hurdles for finding better *modus vivendi* between the two German states still remained in East Berlin. The leadership of the German Democratic Republic had rejected the reformist ideas of the social democrats. The press had strived to present the governmental crisis in West Germany in as a displeasing light as possible. There even had been – in socialist rhetoric quite normal – hyperbolic predictions cast that the new government would lead to a dictatorship. The reason for this ostracizing of the new developments in

⁶⁷⁸ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 5 November 1966, “Asia: Uusi vaihe”, p. 2.

⁶⁷⁹ Hildebrandt 1984, 244. UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 5 November 1966, “Asia: Uusi vaihe”, p. 2.

⁶⁸⁰ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 5 November 1966, “Asia: Uusi vaihe”, p. 2.

⁶⁸¹ PAAA, B23, bd. 228 telegram of FRG’s embassy in Moscow 4.12.1963; PAAA, B23 bd. 228 report of H. Böx 13 December 1963, “Der Besuch Staatspräsident Kekkonens in der Sowjetunion im Spiegel der finnischen Presse”.

the Federal Republic's policy was, according to Sumelius, the German Democratic Republic's sole goal of achieving diplomatic recognition – not the resolution in the relations of the two German states.⁶⁸²

Sumelius saw practical, ideological, and cultural reasons for the German Democratic Republic's inflexible stance. Firstly, he regarded that it was clear that the leadership of the SED would not have benefited from the solution of the relations. It had to continue to pose an aggressive stance due to domestic political reasons as the leadership's popularity – which, according to Sumelius, was ebbing – depended on it. The ideological reasons Sumelius attributed to the union of communism and German perfectionism: it required that communism would prevail throughout Germany. For the SED, the recognition of the German Democratic Republic, therefore, was not the end of its foreign policy, but merely a means to an ultimate goal – the socialist SED rule over the whole of Germany.⁶⁸³

The analysis of Sumelius was clearly building heavily on the premise of the SPD being the key player between the two German states. This was a notion that was not only telling of the views of Sumelius, but probably also revealed something regarding his working conditions. He was most probably often forced to rely on the published information outside his authoritarian base country.⁶⁸⁴ This is supported by the fact that the views he was reporting were somewhat prevalent in the West German press at the time: the SPD's Eastern policy formulations were backed by the majority of published opinion in the Federal Republic. Papers such as *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, *Frankfurter Rundschau*, *Die Zeit*, *Stern*, and *Der Spiegel* constantly presented the SPD as a progressive force in the eastern policy – contrary to the image of the CDU/CSU that they were an obstacle for the development of Eastern relations. With regards to the leadership of the Federal Republic, the public opinion favored the creation of a small coalition of the SPD and FDP, which they regarded as a governing entity that would move faster towards the normalization of Eastern relations and, ultimately, towards the recognition of the German Democratic Republic. Kiesinger was extremely irritated by the SPD's public support derived from its stance on the Eastern policy, and he consequently branded the party pejoratively as a “recognition party”.⁶⁸⁵

However, as Sumelius' information had already, before the creation of the coalition government, revealed to the Finnish Foreign Ministry, not even Brandt at the end of the 1966 supported the small coalition, and thus it was possible that he was skeptical of the full head-on policy in Eastern relations (as with the CSU/CDU as a coalition partner it's likelihood would be reduced). Neither did Sumelius himself uncritically advocate a conciliatory line for building relations with the German Democratic Republic. As his previous analysis revealed, he seemed to regard the fickle nature of the undemocratic regime as a challenge and

⁶⁸² UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 5 November 1966, “Asia: Uusi vaihe”, p. 2.

⁶⁸³ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 5 November 1966, “Asia: Uusi vaihe”, p. 2.

⁶⁸⁴ Something that the Finnish Foreign Ministry discouraged in its guidance to diplomats. According to the ministry, the reference to newspapers was relevant only with the addition of diplomats' analysis concerning the subject matter. (UM, Suomi p 6, “Raportointi” undated.)

⁶⁸⁵ Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 90.

as an unreliable partner for making long-term policy decisions. This could have been also an implicit warning towards the direction of Finland where the Finnish Social Democrats were exerting increasing pressure for the benefit of the recognition of the German Democratic Republic. As he pointed out from the more transnational standpoint, the recognition would not form an ultimate solution for the German question, as the Ulbricht regime was politically hungry to increase its power through the whole of Germany.

The cautious line of Sumelius was actually reflecting the perceptions of the two German states of Finland at this point: according to Dörte Putensen, for the Federal Republic, the Finnish ministry stood as a reliable institution guarding the coherency of Finnish German policy; for the German Democratic Republic, on the contrary, the ministry presented a particularly stern opposition towards their goals.⁶⁸⁶ The results of this study seem to confirm Putensen's interpretation, this was shown already in chapter 3.1.3 (p. 86) through the positive evaluations of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office concerning the personnel of the Finnish Foreign Service.

Possibly the skeptical view of Sumelius had been bolstered by the meetings of West Germany's SPD and SED party earlier that year during April and May. Both parties had tried to initiate dialogue regarding the German question. However, East Germans had soon become reluctant to compromise or take a moderate stance. The bulletin from SED block parties attacked against the Federal Republic and condemned its (international) actions against East Germany.⁶⁸⁷ Ultimately, the talks were severed in June 1966 by the SED using as an excuse the Bundestag law which granted an exemption from arrestment to SED members. The law was drafted in order to allow SED members to enter the Federal Republic for negotiations, as the SED was, according to the Federal Republic's law, an illegal entity.⁶⁸⁸

In November 1966, the new coalition government was built, aptly titled as a "Grand Coalition" since it comprised the two major parties, the CDU and the SPD. This new government saw the SDP take government responsibility for the first time, and a reformist attitude could be expected especially from its Foreign Minister Willy Brandt, former Mayor of West Berlin. However, the CDU/CSU retained the symbolically important prime position of power as Kurt Georg Kiesinger (CDU) was chosen as the new chancellor on 1 December 1966. Immediately after the inauguration of the new government, Sumelius' colleague Kaarlo Mäkelä reported from Cologne and seemed to be echoing Sumelius' previous

⁶⁸⁶ Putensen 2000, 183.

⁶⁸⁷ Weber 1985, 372.

⁶⁸⁸ Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 43. The judicial and jurisdictional questions were problematic between the two German states especially in the cases when the accused had fled East Germany to avoid the sentence. East German court, however, often proceeded with the trial proceedings executed in absentia, meaning that the accused could be sentenced without his presence. West German constitutional court ruled that in absentia trials did not carry judicial power in the Federal Republic. (See Schlesinger 1953, 392-399.)

positive evaluations concerning the government's possibilities in the Eastern policy. He evaluated that in the domestic policy the government had a lot of weaknesses, but when it came to the foreign policy, the new government could actually be very functional.⁶⁸⁹ This news must have been pleasing for the Finnish foreign policymakers, as this was the period of Finland's increased activity in the international arena. Now, as the reporting was to point out, there perhaps existed also possibilities in the German question as well.

However, as already noted, in domestic policy, Mäkelä still saw problems in the fact that the government was made up of the two major parties in the country, and, in a sense, this rendered the role of the parliament incapable of true opposition politics. The only party left in the opposition was the minuscule FDP. This, according to Mäkelä, could favor the "radical fringe parties on left and right".⁶⁹⁰ Also problematic were, in his view, the strongly controversial persons of Kiesinger and Franz Joseph Strauss. Kiesinger had been a member of NSDAP (*Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei*, The National Socialist German Worker's Party) in the 1930s and during the war served in the foreign ministry's radio propaganda department followed by his tenure in the Goebbels' Ministry of Propaganda.⁶⁹¹ The other controversial figure, CSU's Franz Joseph Strauss, could, according to Mäkelä, cause turmoil inside the cabinet, as he was "a full-fledged politician". He was also a disliked figure in the left due to his openly pro-American and NATO views, and even more so after the *Der Spiegel* affair in 1962, in which he had the chief editor of the leftist-oriented magazine arrested on false accusations that Strauss later admitted.⁶⁹²

However, as already noted, when it came to foreign policy, Mäkelä's critical stance was reversed and he evaluated the possibilities of the government in an optimistic manner. As a benefit in this regard he saw that Kiesinger was valued in both Paris and in Washington and was also well-known in Moscow. He also noted that the maneuvering space in the foreign policy was increased by this government, and it was possible that the government could achieve "significant resolutions" regarding the German question, and that they also could help the security policy in Europe. In Mäkelä's view, the government offered a chance for the Soviet Union as well: if the Kremlin wanted to change its previous attitude, the new government was much more flexible, for example, with regards to the nuclear policy.⁶⁹³

This optimistic note from Mäkelä sent a signal to Finland that implicated a possible era of dynamism in the German question, and also possibly an era of

⁶⁸⁹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 1 December 1966, "Länsi-Saksan uusi hallitus: suuri koalitio".

⁶⁹⁰ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 1 December 1966, "Länsi-Saksan uusi hallitus: suuri koalitio", p. 2.

⁶⁹¹ Kurt Georg Kiesinger 1904 - 1988, Lemo, <https://www.hdg.de/lemo/biografie/kurt-georg-kiesinger.html> [accessed 9-7-2018]

⁶⁹² Bark & Gress 1989 (1), 499-509.

⁶⁹³ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 1 December 1966, "Länsi-Saksan uusi hallitus: suuri koalitio", pp. 2, 3.

positivity from Finland's perspective. This can be interpreted against the background that it was only the previous summer that the last chancellor Erhard had advanced in exactly the opposite direction. He had traveled to Washington to ask for access to nuclear weapons for West Germany.⁶⁹⁴ The idea of a nuclear armed Germany was initiated by the MLF plan⁶⁹⁵, which had actually caused a rift also in Finland's relations with the Soviet Union. At the end of the previous year's February when Kekkonen visited the Soviet Union, Mikojaan had, multiple times, expressed his concern for Kekkonen regarding the MLF plan.⁶⁹⁶ In fact, Mikojaan had, as a last resort, referred even to the FCMA Treaty as one of the factors that also required a negative stance from Finland in relation to the plan.⁶⁹⁷ Juhani Suomi has interpreted that it was possibly Kekkonen's belief of the actual danger of the Soviet Union asking for the FCMA Treaty based military consultations if the MLF issue aggravated, and that it was this belief that made Kekkonen take the stance in the issue.⁶⁹⁸ This was executed in the already mentioned MLF speech. Yet, Finland was not the only non-socialist country to denounce the plan; it has to be remembered that already France, Denmark, Norway, and Turkey had also taken a negative stance on the issue.⁶⁹⁹

Juhani Suomi has also evaluated that the onset of Brandt's Eastern policy gave the Soviet Union a possibility to pressure Finland for the recognition of the German Democratic Republic.⁷⁰⁰ Finnish diplomat Alpo Rusi, who has written on subject, supports this view and states it was evidenced by the fact that, in 1967, twelve members of the German Democratic Republic's Council of Minister's, *Ministerrat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, visited Finland and the KGB leader, Vladimir Stepanov, began to promote the idea to Kekkonen. Also, the deputy Foreign Minister Mazurov had suggested the recognition in the twenty-year celebration party of the FCMA Treaty.⁷⁰¹

These interpretations, however, come dangerously close to teleologism, as they regard the progress of Brandt's eastern policy as evident already at that point. The reporting shows that the contemporary view was more nuanced: after the government had published its program on 16 December, the reporting from Cologne dashed some of the hopes preceding the inauguration of the new government. The analysis from the Finnish diplomats challenge the idea that Brandt's foreign policy dynamism was guaranteed from the onset.

Mäkelä informed the Foreign Ministry that the observers in Bonn did not consider the government program to mean new foreign or Eastern policy for the Federal Republic. Contrary to this, it was, according to Mäkelä, interpreted that the scrupulously honed wording and phrases concerning the policy indicated that Kiesinger had strived for the continuation and development of the policy

⁶⁹⁴ Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 55.

⁶⁹⁵ See section 4.1.1.

⁶⁹⁶ Suomi 277

⁶⁹⁷ Suomi 279

⁶⁹⁸ Suomi 287.

⁶⁹⁹ Suomi 279.

⁷⁰⁰ Suomi 2010, 410, 411.

⁷⁰¹ Rusi 2014, 232.

already started during the office of Schröder as a foreign minister in the Erhard cabinet. Mäkelä himself, however, evaluated that, in this respect, all was not lost in the Eastern policy. From the more positive vantage point, Mäkelä noted that at least it was an indication that the new government would probably also continue to improve the Eastern relations. He pointed out that the Federal Republic's government had in fact, for the first time, expressed in its program that it wished to establish diplomatic relations with East European countries when it was "possible in the prevailing circumstances", as Mäkelä quoted. He added that it was especially notable that the program did not mention the Hallstein Doctrine, which had so far been a hindrance for the development of the relations. However, the program still did not live up to the hopes of those who expected radical outbreak from the impasse of the Federal Republic's current foreign policy, Mäkelä concluded.⁷⁰²

Even if Mäkelä was somewhat reserved in these his initial analyses of the Kiesinger government, his skepticism was not nearly on the same level as President Kekkonen's. In October when the news of the new coalition government was published, Kekkonen had discussed the issue with Norwegian Prime Minister Per Borten. According to Kekkonen's diaries, they had concerted with each other when it came to evaluation of Willy Brandt and branded him rudely as a "scary figure that talks like a member of a SS squad".⁷⁰³ It seemed that Kekkonen could not lose his antipathy towards Germany even at this point. From time and time again during the 1950s and 1960s he would let his interlocutors – often Western diplomats – know his stance towards Germany, which he saw as threatening to the European peace.⁷⁰⁴

However, in Cologne, Mäkelä, despite his subtle disbelief he shared with Kekkonen towards the major shift in the foreign policy of the Federal Republic's new government, could also discern some new openings in Kiesinger's foreign policy led by Foreign Minister Brandt. Mäkelä pointed out that in some questions, which had burdened the Eastern relations, Kiesinger had wished to manifest German good will. He had offered rapprochement for Czechoslovakia and renounced the Munich Agreement and Hitler's policy that had aimed for the destruction of Czechoslovakia. The Oder-Neisse border issue with Poland was discussed as well. Regarding the issue's settlement, Kiesinger had posited that it had to be solved by an agreement signed by a unified pan-German government.⁷⁰⁵

The rapprochement policy of the program was also manifested in the fact that East Berlin had been included inside the non-aggression declaration. Mäkelä clarified that this could only be understood by Erhard's statement, which acclaimed that he was ready to tie together the unsolved issue of the German divide with Bonn's earlier offer of an agreement of non-aggression with East European

⁷⁰² UM 5 C 5 A secret telegram from Cologne 16 December 1966, pp. 1, 2.

⁷⁰³ Diary of Kekkonen 6 October 1966, Suomi (ed.) 2002, 286.

⁷⁰⁴ Vares 2009, 270.

⁷⁰⁵ UM 5 C 5 A secret telegram from Cologne 16 December 1966, p.2.

countries. However, Kiesinger's program still stated that the West German government was the only legal and freely elected government representing the whole of the German people.⁷⁰⁶

In this respect, Mäkelä's reporting of the new government swiftly sent a message to the Finnish Foreign Ministry that any immediate conclusions regarding the Eastern policy's reconciliatory nature or concession-giving should be avoided. In the same manner were messaging the actions of the head of the West German mission in Helsinki, Raimond Hergt, who had visited Martti Salomies, the deputy director general of Finnish Foreign Ministry's Political Department, and informed him that Bonn had taken notice of Prime Minister Pertti Paasio's interview in the official voice of the East German regime, *Neus Deutschland*. Paasio had proposed his support for the (at this point, promoted by the Eastern bloc) European security conference that would be attended by "both sides of Germany", "*beider Teile Deutschlands*". This wording perhaps caused Hergt to worry as he had seemed to probe for affirmation that this was, in fact, not the case. He told Salomies that Bonn believed that *Neues Deutschland* might have altered the wording to suit its goals, as the article implied that Finland had appropriated a "theory of two Germanies". Hergt had explained that Bonn, however, did not want to make a big deal of the issue, but had noted that the Foreign Office would probably be pleased to hear some kind of explanation regarding the matter.⁷⁰⁷ Hergt's notes were perhaps at least partly the reflection of the worries concerning the larger political framework of the time in Finland: the pressure exerted inside the Social Democratic Party of Finland for the recognition of the German Democratic Republic of Germany.

At the same meeting, Hergt had pointed out that in Bonn Finland's actions in the United Nations was listed in the Foreign Offices's document as "unfavorable". The reason had been Finland's speech in the general assembly concerning the United Nations membership of such countries in Europe and Asia that were not yet members. The speech had been interpreted in Bonn's Foreign Office as being in favor of the entry of the German Democratic Republic. According to Hergt's information, in addition to Finland, this idea had been discussed in the assembly only by Guinea, Mongolia, and Poland. Salomies had calmed the consul by explaining that Finland had only supported the idea of the general secretary in the assembly and that Finland's stance on the German question was unchanged.⁷⁰⁸

Of course, Salomies' answer was somewhat untenable in a critical light; the fact that Finland had supported the general secretary's proposal did not eradicate the fact that Finland was bundled among the Third World and communist nations by its United Nations' behavior. In East Berlin, Finnish representative Lenart Sumelius had already noted in 1963 Finland's odd company in the sphere of international relations in a report.⁷⁰⁹ Even earlier, the voting of Finland in the

⁷⁰⁶ UM 5 C 5 A secret telegram from Cologne 16 December 1966, p. 3.

⁷⁰⁷ UM 7 D II 307, memo from Martti Salomies 9 December 1966, p. 1.

⁷⁰⁸ UM 7 D II 307, memo from Martti Salomies 9 December 1966, p. 2.

⁷⁰⁹ See section 4.3.3. UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 27 September 1963, "Üusin kaupallinen edustusto".

United Nations was questioned in the Foreign Affairs Committee by National Coalition's MP Kyllikki Pohjala, who had inquired why Finland had relinquished its neutrality on the line of other Nordic nations and joined the Afro-Asian group. The reply of Foreign Minister Ralf Törngren (Swedish People's Party of Finland) was revealing as he noted that Finland was in most questions in line with the Nordic states but that it was Finland's necessity to take into consideration aspects that other Nordic states did not need to.⁷¹⁰

In fact, Finland's membership and actions in the United Nations, part of the Finland's new constructive 1960s foreign policy, were against the ideas of the progenitor of Finland's postwar-war neutrality, President Paasikivi. He had regarded that when it came to international organizations such as the United Nations, small countries such as Finland would serve themselves better by remaining outside of them. In his view, these organizations would put Finland exactly in the middle of the conflicting interests of the great powers. His views concerning the role of small nations and the international organizations starkly contradicted Finland's, or Kekkonen's, active foreign policy that began in the latter half of the 1960s. In this sense, Finland's partaking in the United Nations was contradicting its neutrality policy as a basis for the German policy as well.

Sumelius also reported from East Berlin his views concerning the new government. The onset of the government actually affirmed one of his earlier reported predictions on the possible repercussions of the new foreign policy of the Federal Republic; that is, that East Berlin did not even wish for the betterment of inter-German relations.⁷¹¹ A little over a month after the inauguration of the Grand Coalition in January 1967, Sumelius wrote that the altered foreign policy stance of the new Federal Republic's government has led to the increased tension in the stance of the German Democratic Republic towards the Federal Republic and West Berlin. This was manifested in the "constant polemic" in the German Democratic Republic's press not only with regards to the foreign policy of the Federal Republic but also its financial and economic policies. Concrete evidence of this was the nullifying of the Christmas visit permits for the West Germans to visit their relatives in the East (which the new government's foreign minister, Willy Brandt, had negotiated as the mayor of West Berlin in 1963). Also, the minutes signed in September with regards to the visiting permits for the West German relatives of terminally ill East Germans were not renewed. "Potent feeling of restlessness prevails", as Sumelius described the atmosphere in the Eastern side.⁷¹² This mood was reflected in the discussions of the German Democratic's Foreign Minister, Otto Winzer, with his Finnish counterpart, Ahti Karjalainen, a few months later, in May 1967. Winzer had stated that he did see anything positive or new in Bonn's Eastern policy. In his view, its purpose was merely to isolate East Germany from other socialist states.⁷¹³

⁷¹⁰ Foreign Affairs Committee minutes, session 14 December 1956.

⁷¹¹ See UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 5 November 1966, "Asia: Uusi vaihe", p. 2.

⁷¹² UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 9 January 1967, "Ulbrichtin uudenvuodenpuhe", p. 1.

⁷¹³ UKK vuosikirjat 1958-, 1967 memo concerning discussion of Ahti Karjalainen with Otto Winzer, 25 May 1967.

The newspaper articles had given the impression to Sumelius that the German Democratic Republic had begun its counter-offensive, especially in the capitals of the other Eastern bloc countries. One sign of this offensive could also have been the New Year speech of Ulbricht. In his semantic analysis of the speech, Sumelius noted that, in its domestic policy part, Ulbricht had strived to replenish the patriotism of East Germans by using phrases such as "our people". In the foreign policy part, he had formulated a "minimal program" for the co-existence of the two German nations. The East German Foreign Ministry also joined in to amplify the effectiveness of the speech. The speech had been circulated to the heads of the missions one day before it had been delivered with the note that the speech included interesting initiatives for the German question.⁷¹⁴

Sumelius did not see that the speech could live up to the expectations the note from the Foreign Ministry had raised; he saw that most of the initiatives were revived old ones. On the other hand, he evaluated that the ones that could be regarded as manifesting aspects of novelty were clearly impossible for Bonn to approve. Naturally, the speech had included the proposal of the two German states to recognize each other. It had also proposed for the acknowledgement of the current borders in Europe, non-aggression agreement, a reduction of arms expenditures, and the abolishment of nuclear weapons. The speech had also recapitulated the old idea of declaring the German states as neutral and issued proposals regarding the status of West Berlin and the relationship of West Berlin's senate and the German Democratic Republic. The aforementioned terms were overtures to the ultimate solution in Ulbricht's mind: the founding of a confederation of the two German states. Ulbricht had also noted that the re-unification of the two German states depended on the "substantial democratic reform" in the Federal Republic which, in Sumelius' view, was little more than Ulbricht's euphemism for his wish to see a socialist revolution in West Germany.⁷¹⁵

The conclusion of Sumelius followed from these demands, and it did not bode well for the realization of Ulbricht's initiatives. Sumelius regarded that if these demands were to be accepted, it would mean, in practice, the abolishment of NATO and the abandonment of West Berlin at the mercy of the German Democratic Republic. The precondition as well as the result of the reunification would have been a communist Germany. The representative ended up thoroughly branding the propositions as a manifestation of a "mere hysteria" that could not be taken seriously, even on the Eastern side. These evaluations were once again a cold reality check regarding the nature of the East German state. In this, they were buttressing the previous evaluations of Sumelius that were messaging to Finland that East Germany could not be regarded as an internationally valid entity by its own standards and whose leadership was possessing, as Sumelius put it, qualities of delusion.

All in all, these propositions could, however, be taken as a sign of the future foreign policy of the German Democratic Republic, Sumelius deducted. In his opinion, it seemed that the German Democratic Republic would, in the future,

⁷¹⁴ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 9 January 1967, "Ulbrichtin uudenvuodenpuhe", p. 1.

⁷¹⁵ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 9 January 1967, "Ulbrichtin uudenvuodenpuhe", p. 2.

adopt a sort of a “hedgehog-position and be completely deaf for the more discreet propositions originating from the West”. It would also most probably try to build hurdles between the socialist nations and West Germany. According to Sumelius, there was a pursuit in the German Democratic Republic to develop a sort of inverted Hallstein Doctrine; it would dictate that the precondition for the relations between West Germany and socialist countries would be the recognition of East Germany by Bonn first. The slogan had been already contrived to support the claim: “the German Democratic Republic, the representative of the interests of all the peace-loving Germans”.⁷¹⁶

In the following analysis, Sumelius seemed once again to juxtapose actions of a particular nations and the requirement of the general configuration in international relations, as he saw that the German Democratic Republic had seized the moment in recent years and exploited Bonn’s “unconstructive and wavering” foreign policy that had not been “compatible” with the general developments in international politics. The German Democratic Republic had therefore managed to represent itself as a peace-propagator in Europe – the rhetoric that the Soviet Union also exploited and even the moderate Finnish left, SDP, began to appropriate⁷¹⁷. This had come to pass more because of the mistakes of the Federal Republic than of the successes of East Berlin. In the end, the German Democratic Republic had gained politically from the tension in Europe, Sumelius concluded.⁷¹⁸

Surprising in this part of Sumelius’ report was the frank see-through analysis of the Eastern propaganda promoting the socialist foreign policy as a policy of peace. Sumelius, of course, was not a flower-child of the ongoing cultural revolution in the Western countries, which included, in Finland, the odd metamorphosis into an admiration of the Soviet Union. He was critically destroying the world view of the adherents to the revolution: journalists, students, and academic intellectuals, who were uncritically subscribing to the Eastern propagation of peace politics. Not only was he attacking the aforementioned groups, but in fact, he was also implicitly discrediting the rhetoric of President Kekkonen, who had paid lip-service to the Eastern foreign policy agenda but who probably knew, as well as Sumelius, that it was by and large a façade.⁷¹⁹ In fact, it was Kekkonen’s rhetoric (coming from such a authoritative political figure) that might have been part of the puzzling equation why a significant part of the academic youth of Finland went all the way to the deep end of the conservative socialist discourse, and could be branded even as Stalinists – contrary to the

⁷¹⁶ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 9 January 1967, “Ulbrichtin uudenvuodenpuhe”, p. 2, 3.

⁷¹⁷ Soikkanen 2008, 49-51.

⁷¹⁸ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 9 January 1967, “Ulbrichtin uudenvuodenpuhe”, p. 3.

⁷¹⁹ It appears that this aspect of Kekkonen’s politics was not missed by the prominent Soviet foreign policymakers either, for example, the Soviet embassy’s officials in Helsinki received directions that Kekkonen’s strivings for a Soviet-friendly policy should not be taken at face value but should be evaluated in the framework of his political tactic. Similar thoughts were put down in his diaries by Viktor Lebedev, the Soviet ambassador to Finland (Androsova 1996, 4).

other European and North American New Left thinking that sought to criticize the old left.⁷²⁰

On the other hand, it seemed that, during 1966, Kekkonen's rhetoric had some honesty as its base and that he actually worried about the Federal Republic: not necessarily as a threat to European peace but certainly as a possible disturbance in the relations between Finland and the Soviet Union. The pressure the Soviet leadership put on him during this period can explain this. In June 1966, when Kosygin visited Finland, he had spent a considerable amount of time to prove to his Finnish hosts that the Federal Republic's policy was inately linked with a threat of war. The Soviet impetus for their unordered lecture had originated from the recent statement of the Finnish Minister of Defense, Kai-Uwe Von Hassel. Hassel had, before the visit, given an interview to the Finnish broadcasting company Yle that the articles of the FCMA Treaty (which was, in its essence, directed against the threat of Germany) were merely declaratory.⁷²¹ In his discussions with Kosygin, Kekkonen had confessed that history had shown that the strengthening of Germany had an effect on the position of Finland. In order to relieve the pressure put on him by his guest, Kekkonen had assured Kosygin that Finland opposed the arming of West Germany with atomic weapons, and rebuked Hassel's statement as "incomprehensible". Kekkonen had ultimately withdrawn to the shelter of neutrality and the minuscule role of a small country – curiously enough, right on the eve of the active Finnish foreign policy on the international arena at the end of the decade – and reminded Kosygin that, in international affairs, Finland could affect only the security and neutrality of its geographical vicinity.⁷²²

Yet, if Kekkonen was forced to at least pay lip-service to the rhetoric of the socialist camp, in East Berlin Sumelius – as the previously discussed part of his reporting showed – had no reservations to discredit in his analysis the overtly benevolent ideas from the socialist camp. He totally debunked Ulbricht's idea of a German confederation. Behind this proposal, Sumelius discerned mere domestic political motivation, and not so much a genuine strive to solve the German question. According to him, the German Democratic Republic's ultimate motive behind the proposal was to caress the deep-ingrained feeling of unity among the

⁷²⁰ Horn 2007, 156; Hooper 1995, 16; Mäki-Kulmala 2004, 68; Vilkuna 2013, 22. E.g, Stalinization on the part of Jyväskylä University's student organization, Jyväskylän Opiskelevat Sosialistit (JOS), *the Studying Socialists of Jyväskylä*, see Vilkuna 2013, 170; SOL:n taisteluohjelma Suomen opiskelijoille, 1973. Of course, one could have also interpreted the phenomenon by the Spenglerian and Nietzschean view of the cultural and civilizational shifts. From this perspective the 20th century offered no deliverance for Finnish, or Western culture in general. The early century the national romantic view of history and its use as a legitimation of totalitarian regimes marked from Nietzschean perspective the mis-use of history (Nietzsche 1999/1874, 19-24. Halmesvirta 1999, 91). In Finland it led to the rise of fascist tinted political movements such as Lapuan Liike. However, from Spenglerian view, its counterreaction in the 1960s in the form of discourse of peace, equality and human rights offered no salvation either but marked waning power of a culture in the state of decline (Spengler 2016/1931, 40,41).

⁷²¹ Suomi 426, 432.

⁷²² Suomi 433.

German people. The confederation would have also made meddling with the internal affairs of West Germany possible, as well as the propagation of the East's political ideology by using West Berlin as a wager to "extort" the West.⁷²³ It is clear, considering the context in which Sumelius brought this proposal up, that he was regarding it as unviable from the beginning – a view probably shared unequivocally among other Western observers at the time as well.

And, as Sumelius discerned weakness in the credibility of the discourse of the German Democratic Republic's foreign policy, he also saw frailty in its "current elevated position on the international arena" and regarded that its self-made role as a guardian of peace could easily be lost. This was the "basic reason for the current restlessness in here", Sumelius wrote. He saw possibilities of a counter-offensive towards the status of East Germany in the renovation of the Federal Republic's foreign policy. He regarded that if the Federal Republic could truly appropriate a new policy – which would include the renouncement of nuclear weapons, the recognition of Poland's current western border, the resolving of the disputed issues with Czechoslovakia, and the bettering of its relations with the Soviet Union – it could then shed off its role as a threat for peace in Europe.

This reference of Sumelius to West Germany as a threat for peace in Europe seemed somewhat "contorted" when his reporting generally seemed to evaluate, in a non-normative manner, the German question. Perhaps the use of wording "threat for peace" was merely noting the Eastern view of the matter. In this regard, as he had already debunked the idea of East Germany as the messenger of peace, it could have even been a critique of the idea of West Germany as a threat for peace. This conjecture is bolstered by his following evaluation that if the Federal Republic would pursue this goal it would be very hard for the German Democratic Republic to discredit it. The mitigating factor in this respect was that it was in the interest of the small socialist countries to build good relations with the Federal Republic, Sumelius added.⁷²⁴ Sumelius' views, and perhaps partial predictions, for the constructive West German foreign policy there seemed to exist a high possibility of realization. His predecessor in Cologne, Olavi Munkki, now an ambassador to Washington, reported, with a positive tone, of a new West German foreign policy. His optimism emanated from the discussions with State Department's official who had shed light on Brandt's talks in the White House. According to this information Brandt's active Eastern policy was in accordance with Washington's goals and received support in this regard. Munkki also steered against Kekkonen's rhetoric and noted that even the nuclear armament should not cause problems as Brandt had "most probably" given an assurance that the Federal Republic would join the non-proliferation treaty.⁷²⁵

Sumelius predicted that this kind of betterment of political atmosphere and situation in general could also, in the long-term, lead to more liberal domestic policy in the socialist countries. It would be hard for the German Democratic Re-

⁷²³ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 9 January 1967, "Ulbrichtin uudenvuodenpuhe", p. 3.

⁷²⁴ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 9 January 1967, "Ulbrichtin uudenvuodenpuhe", p. 3.

⁷²⁵ UKK vuosikirjat 1958-, 1967 secret report of O. Munkki to FFM 20 February 1967.

public to exclude itself from that development. Yet, he evaluated political and societal liberalism as non-complacent with the administration of a state without nationalism as its progenitor. In his words, the liberal domestic policy would be challenging for the German Democratic Republic since it did not possess the “quality of nation-state” and the government did not enjoy the majority support of the people. Therefore, Sumelius saw that the German Democratic Republic actually was the weakest link in the Socialist bloc when it came to cohesion of the nation and to domestic policy.⁷²⁶

Sumelius concluded the report by a strong evaluation that the general situation had now changed in the German question. The Federal Republic was no longer striving to alter the situation and was satisfied with the status quo in the short term; the re-unification was postponed for the distant future. The status quo also included the continuing non-recognition of the German Democratic Republic by the non-socialist nations and the betterment of the relations of the two German states was also left as much in the hands of the East Berlin leaders as to the foreign policymakers of Bonn. All this was, in Sumelius’ thinking, already a small victory for West Germany: there was more dissatisfaction with the situation on the “Eastern side of the Elbe than on the Western”.⁷²⁷

In his analysis, Sumelius, in its essence, pointed out that the general situation of the German question had changed. However, it was not only due to the new government in Bonn – the role of which Sumelius was naturally prone to emphasize as he was reporting from Germany – but also due to global political factors, especially the United States seeking to establish further *détente*, in Europe. Less than one month before the inauguration of the Grand Coalition, President Lyndon B. Johnson had delivered a speech on 7 October in which he had expressed that the United States wanted to reconstruct Europe in equilibrium between the United States and the Soviet Union. He also called for the healing of the division that went through Europe and separated people from each other. He stated that there should be a transition from close co-existence to peaceful engagement. Of course, behind the idealistic words was also the real political need to reduce commitments to Europe. This was due to the escalating involvement of the United States in Vietnam, which was increasingly tying up its military resources. At this point the Federal Republic was, in a sense, between rock and a hard place: the United States, as well as domestic opinion at large, was dissatisfied with the *détente* policy’s lack of pace on the Federal Republic’s part; on the other hand, in Moscow and East Berlin, the strive to better relations with East European countries was interpreted as a pursuit to isolate East Germany internationally.⁷²⁸

However, Moscow and East Berlin’s view was not the whole of the socialist camp. Contrary to the situation with the German Democratic Republic, in regards to the other socialist countries, the new government seemed to be appropriating

⁷²⁶ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 9 January.1967, “Ulbrichtin uudenvuodenpuhe”, p. 3.

⁷²⁷ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 9 January 1967, “Ulbrichtin uudenvuodenpuhe”, p. 4.

⁷²⁸ Görtemaker 1999, 462.

a dynamic attitude and receiving a warm reception. In the beginning of January 1967, Kiesinger had expressed the wish to establish relations with Yugoslavia again, and this had been received with enthusiasm in Yugoslavia.⁷²⁹ Also, the negotiations in Romania had ended with promising results, and Hungary seemed to be lining up as well with regards to the friendship of the Federal Republic. However, the discussions of the Federal Republic with Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union were expected to be much harder, and the case with Yugoslavia was burdened by the Hallstein Doctrine. After all, it had been the doctrine's first victim of the Federal Republic's demand for the sole representation.⁷³⁰

After having observed the foreign policy strivings of the new Federal Republic government for a few months, Mäkelä in Cologne was contradicting the hint of optimism noted in Sumelius's views. Despite the promising start that he himself, like Sumelius, had discerned in the policy initially, he now viewed that the policy had – in many respects – come to a standstill: East Germany had managed to stop the Eastern expansion of the Federal Republic by making an alliance of three socialist nations that held opposing relations with West Germany. The partners in the German Democratic Republic's counter-offensive were Poland and Czechoslovakia.⁷³¹

Mäkelä wrote that the parts of the "old Germany" were now forced to reconsider their views as a result of the Grand Coalition government. Mäkelä regarded that it was now even possible to speak of the "new phase" in the Federal Republic. He then quoted Soviet Ambassador to the Federal Republic, Semjon Zarpkin, who had expressed, in the Bremen interview, that good relations between West Germany and the Soviet Union were possible. The only obstacle was, in Zarpkin's view, the Federal Republic's demand for sole representation. Zarpkin had also expressed that there were lots of positive phenomena in the Federal Republic, which Mäkelä interpreted as referring to the positive statements regarding the recognition of the German Democratic Republic. They had posited the recognition of the German Democratic Republic as recognition of the existing reality. Mäkelä added that the statements had not claimed the recognition to be necessary to be validated by international law.⁷³² His addition seemed to forebode the theme around the recognition issue further on in his report: the fact that recognition of the German Democratic Republic was viewed in the Federal Republic from multiple viewpoints, and the fact that it was differentiated in various spheres: jurisdictional with regards to international law, political, and to the empirical by the acknowledgement that the state in reality existed whether it was acknowledged or not. From the latter two of these aspects, the one referring to the existence of East Germany on a *de facto* level was, according to Mäkelä, taking more hold in the Federal Republic. According to him, the government had already, before Kiesinger's chancellorship, posited that the re-unification should

⁷²⁹ UM 5 C 5 A telegram from Cologne 16 January 1967, p. 1.

⁷³⁰ UM 5 C 5 A telegram from Cologne 20 January 1967, p. 1.

⁷³¹ UM 5 C 5 A secret report Cologne 5 April 1967 "Länsi-Saksan ja Itä-Saksan suhteista", p.1.

⁷³² UM 5 C 5 A secret report Cologne 5 April 1967, "Länsi-Saksan ja Itä-Saksan suhteista", pp. 1, 2.

be regarded as a historical process and not as an act executed by a practical political decision. This was also the reason for Bonn's non-aggression agreement offer made to the German Democratic Republic. Yet, it was still impossible for the Federal Republic to advance in the German question further than the Allied Powers, and exceed the limits of the Potsdam agreement, Mäkelä pointed. In this context, Mäkelä also noted an interesting aspect that might have been previously overlooked by the Finnish foreign policymakers. In Mäkelä's view, it was only recently that the Soviet Union itself started to emphasize the independent statehood of the German Democratic Republic in the future. Yet, he evaluated that the Soviet Union still acknowledged the possibility for the different parts of Germany to unite, as long as they have reached an agreement by themselves. However, in his view, the Soviet Union was prone to evaluate that, with those terms, East Berlin might not agree to the unification.⁷³³

All in all, it seemed that Mäkelä was implying that there was a certain political shift underway in the Federal Republic. Yet, it was still too furtive to show up directly in the discourse of the major parties – which was exemplified by the CDU/CSU MP Ernst Majonica's article a couple of months earlier noting that the goal of Eastern policy was still re-unification – despite the positive changes in Europe⁷³⁴. The only party that had shown proclivity for true reform was the FDP, evidenced by its bold "rebellious" statement during the Hannover party conference that advocated the recognition of the DDR.⁷³⁵

However, Mäkelä continued by rebutting the possible effectiveness of the new Eastern policy in the Federal Republic. He regarded that the policy had, for the time being, only strained the relations between the two German states. Also, Mäkelä evaluated that Ulbricht's counter-offensive against West Germany's overtures towards its socialist neighbors had been surprisingly successful – later dubbed as the so-called Ulbricht Doctrine. The Ulbricht Doctrine was drafted on 24 January 1967 in the SED politburo meeting. It stipulated that the socialist countries should not establish relations with West Germany unless certain preconditions were fulfilled. The preconditions were the recognition of the Oder-Neisse line as a border between East Germany and Poland and the recognition of West Berlin as a separate political entity from West Germany. In addition, the abolishment of the Munich Agreement from 1938 was required. The Doctrine managed to rupture Hungary's and Czechoslovakia's relations with Bonn, the two Warsaw Pact countries that had recently warmed their relations with Bonn the most.⁷³⁶ Mäkelä saw the tightest collaboration happening in the Warsaw-Prague-DDR axis. He dubbed this tripartite rejection of Bonn as the "iron triangle" and was possibly emphasizing the open border and territory issues with these countries and West Germany as the decisive factor. He seemed to have missed the recent

⁷³³ UM 5 C 5 A secret report Cologne 5 April 1967, "Länsi-Saksan ja Itä-Saksan suhteista", p. 2.

⁷³⁴ Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik. 1984. V. Reihe / Band 1. 15. Februar 1967: Artikel des Abg. Majonica (CDU/CSU): Deutsche Ostpolitik.

⁷³⁵ UM 5 C 5 A secret report Cologne 5 April 1967, "Länsi-Saksan ja Itä-Saksan suhteista", p. 3.

⁷³⁶ Janhunen 1997, 23; Gray 2003, 200.

bettering of relations between Prague and Bonn. Yet, he still did not subscribe to the image of the cohesive bloc that the recent Warsaw Pact meeting had strived for. Mäkelä noted, contrary to ostensible appearances, that the Soviet Union had never been particularly impressed with the targets of the policy and had with certain suspicion followed the politics of the three. However, due to the circumstances, it had approved the policy so far. According to Mäkelä, the triangle's political significance reached to the East and West, and its challenge could be difficult to handle for any actor of the international politics. He noted that most of the benefits of this tripartite pact were reaped by Poland.⁷³⁷

Regarding Ulbricht's counter-offensive against the West's overtures, Mäkelä seemed to be summing up well the view inside East Germany. The East German government was paradoxically fearful of any gestures of a more lenient Eastern policy, as it feared its isolation inside the Eastern bloc. In this regard, the actions of the West German coalition government were very difficult for it to interpret. On the one hand, there was the innovative SPD with the foreign minister Willy Brandt, on the other hand, Chancellor Kiesinger's CDU still seemed to retain the statutes of the Hallstein Doctrine and the demand for the sole representation.⁷³⁸ The official history of East Germany, published a decade later, branded Bonn's policies in the latter half of the 1960s as a ruse. According to it, "The anti-détente forces of monopoly capitalism and Social Democratic politicians and ideologues in the service of the Bonn government developed concepts by which they hoped to use the tendencies toward détente in order to make the GDR's borders 'permeable,' to 'overcome' them, and to 'open' the country to the FRG and the other NATO states . . . These anti-revolutionary aims confirmed that the principles of peaceful coexistence could only be carried out in a bitter and long-lasting class struggle against imperialism". This was a clear interpretation that showed the need of East Berlin to belittle and vilify everything that could be regarded as conciliatory from the West. Partly the reason must have been in the needs of the socialist narrative, which needed a constant enemy-image.⁷³⁹

Mäkelä viewed the triangle from a real-political viewpoint and regarded that the official formulations, such as the communiqués the three had so far produced, were not a real hindrance for the Federal Republic's Eastern policy. According to Mäkelä, the texts produced so far did not include anything that would have posed a challenge for building new diplomatic relations nor, according to Mäkelä, for Bonn's new attempts at building diplomatic relations with Eastern countries. Yet, he saw that, due to the triangle, there could be a substantial intermission looming between the present and future establishment of diplomatic relations with a socialist country after Romania.

A bold suggestion followed from Mäkelä: a way out of the impasse of the Eastern relations could be achieved if the Federal Republic would re-establish relations with Yugoslavia and achieve a new speed for its Eastern policy. This

⁷³⁷ UM 5 C 5 A secret report Cologne 5 April 1967, "Länsi-Saksan ja Itä-Saksan suhteista", p. 3.

⁷³⁸ McAdams 1985, 71.

⁷³⁹ Geschichte der SED (1978) as cited in McAdams 1985, 68.

was, of course, a clear opinion from Mäkelä that the Hallstein Doctrine was a politically obsolete hindrance. He speculated further by noting that Yugoslavia would be willing to renew relations, but, as a former target of the Hallstein Doctrine, it was difficult for Bonn's foreign policy.⁷⁴⁰ Despite the various achievements, it could be said, according to Mäkelä, that Kiesinger's policy was still in progress. In his view, the results could only start to spawn after some kind of agreement with Moscow.

Mäkelä concluded the report by finding it suitable to compare the basic attitude of the West German Eastern policy to Paasikivi's views on politics. The impetus for this analogy came from the recently published memoirs of Paasikivi which had stirred lots of discussion which Mäkelä found interesting. In Mäkelä's opinion, West German politicians were now viewing Eastern relations in more of a pragmatic and real-political manner – which was Paasikivi's take on politics. Despite this, there was not extensive progress to be expected from Kiesinger. He was, according to Mäkelä, a typical real-politician and expected to receive a tit-for-tat style return in such foreign policy in which the interests of the parties were mutual, or close to each other. In his view, this was Kiesinger's "creed" (*uskontunnustus*) of foreign policy; it was only the mutual interests that created successful foreign policy decisions – as Paasikivi would have put it.⁷⁴¹

As the discussion above has shown, all in all, the reporting from the period of Erhard's second cabinet breakdown and the onset of the Grand Coalition took a somewhat critical stance both towards the foreign policy of West Germany and also the actions of East Germany; in the case of West Germany, a more pragmatic approach was suggested as a solution. The clinging to partly new and partly old principles had produced a wavering foreign policy that actually had benefited East Germany. In this regard, the reporting laid some possible hopes on the new political spectrum in the form of a coalition cabinet in West Germany. In fact, the more real-political and pragmatic approach could have functioned as a victory for the Federal Republic. It was noted by Lennart Sumelius in East Berlin that the elevated position East Germany had managed to achieve on the international arena was built on a very fragile basis. This basis, could, according to him, crumble under the new Eastern policy, and, what was important from Finland's standpoint, the discarding of the Hallstein Doctrine. The Doctrine, and the increased analysis and critique its viability received in this period will form the discussion in the next chapter.

⁷⁴⁰ UM 5 C 5 A secret report Cologne 5 April 1967, "Länsi-Saksan ja Itä-Saksan suhteista", p. 3.

⁷⁴¹ UM 5 C 5 A secret report Cologne 5 April 1967, "Länsi-Saksan ja Itä-Saksan suhteista", p. 4.

4.2 The Hallstein Doctrine: revisionist views

4.2.1 The Doctrine from the perspective of international law

As the relations between the Federal Republic and its East European neighbors warmed during the 1960s, the opposition towards the Hallstein Doctrine in the Federal Republic increased. Bonn's demand to be the sole representative of the German people was more and more perceived as obsolete and unreasonable. In the reporting, the opposition to Adenauer's foreign policy's basic tenet, the Hallstein Doctrine, was noted from the mid-1960s onwards.

In June 1964, Kaarlo Mäkelä approached the basis of the German question from the view point of international law, which brought out the problems of the Federal Republic's demand for sole representation explicitly and also gave implications with regards the Hallstein Doctrine. International law was also the conceptual body that Adenauer had referred to extensively when he was formulating the foreign policy of the Federal Republic in the early 1950s.⁷⁴²

Mäkelä's emphasis of international law could be understood partly in the context of the growing importance of the international bodies such as the United Nations, but also against the framework of increased Finnish activity on the international stage (in the UN as well) and the alleviation of the tension between East and West since the tumultuous beginning of the 1960s⁷⁴³. One could also speculate, if perhaps the publishing of the new edition of Carl Schmitt's *The Concept of the Political* (*Der Begriff des Politischen*) the previous year had given some inspiration to Mäkelä's analysis, as he noted that in the end, despite the discussion of the German question in the framework of international law, the subject of the discussion (i.e. the German state and its right to represent German people, and its corollary Hallstein Doctrine) had to be conceptualized politically – an analysis that bore much resemblance with Schmitt's notion and understanding of state as the derivative of the discussion and the definition of the political.⁷⁴⁴

In Finland, during this period, the academic thinking concerning international relations had stabilized its position,⁷⁴⁵ and it was also taking another line

⁷⁴² Gray 2003, 23.

⁷⁴³ Partly the breakthrough of more a theoretical approach was exemplified also by appointment of Veli Merikoski, one of the most respected Finnish researchers of law and a professor in Helsinki University, as Foreign foreign minister in the government of Karjalainen during 1962-1963. Merikoski was especially interested in constitutional-ity, public law, and administrative law. (Hallberg 2005, "Merikoski, Veli (1905 – 1982)", Kansallisbiografia, <https://kansallisbiografia.fi/kansallisbiografia/henkilo/2043> [accessed 2 January 2018]). For the jurisprudential approach to Finnish neutrality see Merikoski's representation in Finnish Political Science Association 29 March 1963 (UM 12 K 1955-1964, "ulkoasiainministeri V. Merikosken esitelmä Valtiotieteellisen yhdistyksen kokouksessa 29.3.1963").

⁷⁴⁴ Tutkijaliitto, p. 8, in Schmitt 2015. For the conceptualization of state through political, see Schmitt 2015, 23.

⁷⁴⁵ Exemplified also by the establishment of Paasikivi Society, a forum of foreign policy discussion, and its publication, a foreign policy concentrated periodical *Ulkopolitiikka*

in addition to the realist school that had dominated throughout the 1950s. The new, more idealist approach towards international co-operation and the development of the international system was advocated by academics such as Göran von Bonsdorff and Klaus Törnudd, who also later functioned as a diplomat.⁷⁴⁶ Törnudd's dissertation in 1961 discussed the Soviet Union's attitudes towards the non-military regional co-operation and the dynamics of the power-political and ideological motivations behind the Soviet foreign policy.⁷⁴⁷ The professionalization of international relations research was indicated also by the establishment of new professorships and the diverting paths of the degree requirements between different departments of political science during the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s.⁷⁴⁸

The idealization and theoretization of Finnish foreign policy was also noted by the Federal Republic's representation in Helsinki, which saw it as a wish to push the image of neutrality closer to nations such as Sweden.⁷⁴⁹ This, of course, implied that, in West German eyes, the Finnish neutrality had suffered losses in the early Finland-Soviet crisis of the later 1950s and early 1960s. Yet, Kekkonen was still also reminding of the "pragmatic" basis of the Finnish neutrality, which was stated explicitly in his interview for Austrian TV during this period.⁷⁵⁰

However, the aforementioned theoretical approach to neutrality was more likely in Mäkelä's mind, as he analyzed the German question in the light of the emerging discourse on international law. Mäkelä's impetus for writing on this subject matter had, according to him, emanated from the fact that the "East-West relations related questions arise almost every day in one form or another". Therefore, he had seen it fitting to clarify the basis of the Federal Republic's current policies. Mäkelä also saw it also as a possibility, within that context, to simultaneously make the Federal Republic's government's action and statements more understandable. According to Mäkelä, in this respect, they could be understood not as merely foreign policy, but more of a matter of legislation.⁷⁵¹

Mäkelä started by using recent NATO meeting as the latest example that the Federal Republic considered itself as a heir of the former Germany and therefore also as justified to be the solicitor of the cause of whole Germany. The interpretation of Mäkelä was based on the reinterpretation of German history in East Germany and the consequent support for the Federal Republic's willingness to proclaim itself to be the heir of former Germany by East Berlin.⁷⁵² Mäkelä explicated that, contrary to the West German acknowledgement of being a state built

(Antola 1983, 250, 253). It also had a purpose of helping to establish Kekkonen's foreign policy line that he dubbed as continuum of Paasikivi's foreign policy thinking. Therefore it was dubbed as Paasikiven-Kekkosen linja.

⁷⁴⁶ Antola 1983, 250..

⁷⁴⁷ Antola 1983, 250, 251.

⁷⁴⁸ Antola 1983, 254.

⁷⁴⁹ PAAA B26 bd. 354, FRG trade mission in Helsinki, Jahresbericht 1964.

⁷⁵⁰ PAAA B 26 bd. 249, GDR trade mission in Helsinki, telegram 21 July 1964.

⁷⁵¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 11 June 1964, "Liittotasavallan ulkopoliittikan valtio-oi-keudellisista perusteista", p. 1.

⁷⁵² The East and West German historiographies interpreted very differently the past. In the German Democratic Republic, the historiography was controlled by state and

on the ruins of Weimar Republic and the national socialistic Reich, in East Germany the Marxist state theory presumed that the former German state had been abolished and a new one formed. However, despite not representing official claims, such as the historical continuity with the old Germany as Bonn did, the GDR still considered justified to speak for the whole Germany, Mäkelä noted.⁷⁵³

Mäkelä saw that the jurisprudential basis of the Federal Republic's claim to sole representation was resting on a note the three Western Allied Powers had produced on 23 October 1950. In it, the Federal Republic had been acknowledged as the heir of the Reich, as it had been declared as the legal subject of the re-organization of the Reich's debts. The same notion was also included in the concluding minutes of the conference of nine powers 3 October 1954 as well as to the minutes of the Federal Republic of Germany joining NATO 23 October 1954. All the aforementioned documents declared that the divide of Germany was not acknowledged.⁷⁵⁴

However, Mäkelä considered that the documents did not acknowledge the Federal Republic to be identical with the Reich. This interpretation of Mäkelä was based on the chain of events regarding the governing of Germany at the end of war. When the Dönitz government had been disbanded on 23 May 1945, the supreme power had been shifted to the Allied Control Council. However, Mäkelä noted that the council had not convened since 20 March 1948, when the Soviet Marshall Sokolowski had walked out of its meeting. However, the Council had not been officially abolished either, therefore the supreme power in Germany was theoretically still vested on that Council. Mäkelä concluded that "the status of the Federal Republic of Germany as an heir of the Reich is not theoretically explicitly justified. However, most of the nations had actually approved that the Federal Republic was the heir of Reich by accepting reparations from it."⁷⁵⁵ The German Democratic Republic, on the other hand, did not demand the position as

took the Marxist-Leninist view on the past, whereas in the Federal Republic the different authors differed in their views. However, they had certain common emphases also, which contrary to East German one, argued in a political and moral sense for the open democratic society against totalitarianism. However, East and West German historiographers had connections with each other and belonged to a common union (Verband der Historiker Deutschlands) until the union's Trier convention of September 1958 where the relations were severed. (Hentilä 1994, 40-44.) In East German historiography there was unsuccessful attempt to create concepts corresponding to the socialist ideology, and therefore also the historiography of the state (Middell & Roura 2013, 7).

⁷⁵³ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 11 June 1964, "Liittotasavallan ulkopoliitiikan valtio-oikeudellisista perusteista", p. 2.

⁷⁵⁴ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 11 June 1964, "Liittotasavallan ulkopoliitiikan valtio-oikeudellisista perusteista", p. 2.

⁷⁵⁵ "Liittotasavallan asema entisen Saksan valtakunnan seuraajana ei siis teoreettisesti ole riidattomasti perusteltavissa, mutta suurin osa maailman valtoja on tunnustanut tilnateen tällaiseksi mm. hyväksymällä hyvityksiä Liittotasavallalta." (UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 11 June 1964, "Liittotasavallan ulkopoliitiikan valtio-oikeudellisista perusteista" p. 2.).

the heir of Reich, and 75 percent of the German population resided in the Federal Republic, Mäkelä added.⁷⁵⁶

Mäkelä saw that a lot of writers discussing the territorial issues relating to the German question were using arguments in an ad hoc manner either from the international jurisprudence or purely based on politics. None of them were, in his opinion, close to the crux of the issue. Mäkelä pointed out that most of them were forgetting that the government of the Federal Republic could not afford to be “flexible” in the matters concerning the geographical area of the Germany. This was the direct result of the fact that there was no actual peace treaty. When the Western Allied Powers had divided Germany into occupation zones, they had stipulated the basic territory of Germany to be the same as it had been on 31 December 1937. Both German states had been founded on this area.⁷⁵⁷

It is not impossible that all this discussion around the matter of detailed jurisprudential basis of the German question was Mäkelä’s implicit critique towards the Finnish foreign policy leadership, which could be interpreted (for example, by the East German Foreign Ministry in their memo) to have officially renounced the jurisprudential basis of the West German sole representation demand.⁷⁵⁸ The Finnish leadership, at least implicitly, by not recognizing West Germany, had actually not legitimized its claim to be the heir of the earlier Germany, and the German people. What then can be interpreted from Mäkelä’s report was that perhaps he was implying that the basis of the Finnish foreign policy could not be explicitly justified, and therefore should not have been justified by reference to the international law. What was then left was that the German policy of Finland, was based on the politics, after all, and should be argued from that vantage point, but not, however, with ad hoc manner but by planned and consistent way.

In fact, from the vantage point of international law theory, Finland’s position in the German question was untenable, as the subject of international law is a recognized state.⁷⁵⁹ Finland, having not recognized either one of the German states, was, in theory, unable to argue through the jurisprudential framework of international law. However, in general, international law did not, and does not, form a coherent and holistic body of rules. The basic stipulations of the law are

⁷⁵⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 11 June 1964, “Liittotasavallan ulkopolitiikan valtio-oikeudellisista perusteista”, p. 2.

⁷⁵⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 11 June 1964, “Liittotasavallan ulkopolitiikan valtio-oikeudellisista perusteista”, p. 3.

⁷⁵⁸ Memo from DRG Foreign Ministry circa 1967, MFAA, L43, C1174/76. The memo referred to Finnish president and foreign minister. Memo possibly referred to the Second Minister of Finance (and President Kekkonen’s trusted man) Ahti Karjalainen’s statement in 1958, when he noted that even though Finland did not recognize – as the Soviet Union did – the existence of the two German states, it could not either support the opposing view that the Federal Republic was the only German state. (“Ohne, wie die Sowjetunion, die Existenz von zwei deutschen Staaten anzuerkennen, teilt Finnland auch nicht die entgegengesetzte Ansicht, daß die Bundesrepublik der einzige deutsche Staat ist”), cited in Putensen 2000, 112.

⁷⁵⁹ Hakapää 2010, 76.

generally provided in article 38 of the United Nations' Charter of the International Court of Justice.⁷⁶⁰

Based on the aforementioned facts, Mäkelä's conclusion was that the destiny of the regional definition of Germany was pending on the future peace conference. Therefore, it was understandable that the Federal Republic was not unilaterally able to decide on the borders of the old Germany; it could not either cede or accept certain territory such as the Oder-Neisse line as the border of Germany. Mäkelä saw this as the reason for the often-criticized adamancy of the Federal Republic's government regarding these issues. The aforementioned approach would not change no matter what parties formed the government of the Federal Republic. However, the West German government was also criticized during this period by Henry Kissinger of hiding behind legalism in its politics that was plagued by the three revolutions since the beginning of the century.⁷⁶¹ The last time this matter had been manifested to Mäkelä was in his discussion with a prestigious member of the SPD party. Mäkelä seemed to, however, regard the jurisprudential aspect as more valid than Kissinger did, as he noted that of course the government could give a declaration of its policy with regards to the matter, but that kind of declaration, however, would not be valid from the vantage point of international law. The statement of the Federal Republic's government that it had no territorial demands towards Czechoslovakia was based on the borders drawn during the occupation of Germany. It was not based on the treaty of Munich from 1938, Mäkelä deduced. The fact that the Federal Republic government had not abolished the treaty implied that it might wish to keep it as a stake in the possible future negotiations regarding Germany.⁷⁶²

This lengthy consideration concerning the legitimacy of certain Federal Republic foreign policy actions and tenets served as a preamble to the crux of the report, which presented views on the Hallstein Doctrine from two contrasting vantage points: jurisprudential and political. Mäkelä evaluated that the Doctrine had "offered substantial amount of reasons for critique". He saw that the Doctrine's basic tenet (non-acknowledgment of the other part of a divided nation) was not particularly a German invention. Also, the other divided nations were adhering to its principles; for example, the Peoples' Republic of China was fol-

⁷⁶⁰ Hakapää 2010, 25. According to the article, the court applies the following sources in its deliberation: "a. international conventions, whether general or particular, establishing rules expressly recognized by the contesting states; b. international custom, as evidence of a general practice accepted as law; c. the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations; d. subject to the provisions of Article 59, judicial decisions and the teachings of the most highly qualified publicists of the various nations, as subsidiary means for the determination of rules of law." (Statute of the International Court of Justice, <http://www.icj-cij.org/en/statute> [accessed 16 April 2018].)

⁷⁶¹ Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 55.

⁷⁶² UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 11 June 1964, "Liittotasavallan ulkopolitiikan valtio-oi-keudellisista perusteista", p. 3.

lowing that policy. In general, the adherence to the Hallstein Doctrine had, according to Mäkelä, become harder. Yet, he could see no signs for the abrogation of the Doctrine.⁷⁶³

Mäkelä concluded by noting that this information explicated the basic principles why Bonn had not recognized the German Democratic Republic. The justifications based on politics were, in the end, more important than the legal constitutional basis of the policy. Mäkelä saw that the recognition of the other German state might actually bode poorly and worsen their relations. This claim he based on the viewpoint that it was more severe to meddle in the matters of another acknowledged nation. And in the German question, according to him, this would have certainly been the case because half of the population of West Germany had relatives on the Eastern side.⁷⁶⁴

Interesting in this analysis of Mäkelä regarding the possible state-to-state intervention in the case of the German states was that it was the first one from the Finnish diplomats in Germany that took the viewpoint of international law and viewed the foreign policy of the Federal Republic through it. The reference to international law and international treaties became the mainstay of Finnish foreign policy during this decade. This was later exemplified by the extensive appropriation of international jurisprudence in their argumentation for Finnish foreign policy by Risto Hyvärinen and Keijo Korhonen, the members of the so-called “*junta*” (*everstijuntta*) in the Finnish Foreign Ministry in the latter half of the decade.⁷⁶⁵ Hyvärinen and Korhonen were theoretically oriented academics that formed the leadership of the Foreign Ministry’s Political Department from 1967 on.⁷⁶⁶ Hyvärinen was a doctor in the field of international relations and entered the ministry out of the normal diplomatic career route. He had worked in the Ministry of Defense before this new office. His dissertation discussed the different theories in the study of international politics, and he strived to address the different methodological problems inherent in each of them.⁷⁶⁷ His academic work gives implications that he considered important the methodological understanding of the international politics, despite the fact that the each method had

⁷⁶³ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 11 June 1964 “Liittotasavallan ulkopolitiikan valtio-oikeudellisista perusteista”, p. 3.

⁷⁶⁴ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 11 June 1964, “Liittotasavallan ulkopolitiikan valtio-oikeudellisista perusteista”, p. 3.

⁷⁶⁵ The *junta* or “the doctor gang” were an informal grouping of a new generation of foreign policymakers that were strict followers of Kekkonen’s foreign policy line. They were not, however, all members of the Agrarian League/Center Party or to be considered as Kekkonen’s “henchmen..” (Hentilä 2003, 79, 80.)

⁷⁶⁶ Risto Hyvärinen was nominated as the Director General of the Political Department on May 1967. Risto Hyvärinen was a doctor in the field of international relations and entered the position out of the normal diplomatic career route. Keijo Korhonen was a doctor of philosophy and a historian who worked as a secretary of division in Political Department. He became Hyvärinen’s most important partner in the ministry during the period of 1967 - 1971. Hentilä 2003, 79, 80. For more detailed description of the *junta*, see Soikkanen 2003a, 183, 184.

⁷⁶⁷ Hyvärinen 1958, 34. In the dissertation Hyvärinen also considered the training of foreign office officials in most countries as inadequate, as it seemed to concentrate merely on the praxis of the inter-state diplomatic intercourse (Hyvärinen 1958, 136).

its problems and that the planning of the foreign policy was difficult due to the constantly changing situations in international politics. In his view, the methodological approach could simply mean a better understanding of the situations and the lessons learned from history.⁷⁶⁸ In the light of this kind of thinking, even the so-called idealistic period in the Finnish foreign policy that started from the latter part of the 1960s could be understood as a partly real-political approach to international politics. In his dissertation, Hyvärinen subscribed to the idea that international organizations, the prime example of the idealistic aspect of the international politics, could be also used as methods of obtaining a nation's own foreign policy goals.⁷⁶⁹ He saw neutrality as a part of the functionality of the international system, not as an individual policy that served only a nation's own interest.⁷⁷⁰ These aspects of his thinking explain partly why Hyvärinen's has been later categorized as an academic who brought the realist school of thinking of international relations to Finland. His dissertation (written partly under the guidance of Harold Sprout and Richard Snyder in Princeton) was also, for a long time, the only one focusing on the theoretical aspects of international politics.⁷⁷¹ Keijo Korhonen, educated at Turku University, was a doctor in the field of political history and represented a more historical approach to international relations.⁷⁷² This approach was shared with the academics Osmo Apunen and Jaakko Ilvesalo at Helsinki University.⁷⁷³ He was assigned as a secretary of division on 4 April 1967, and he would later serve also as a foreign minister in the government of Miettunen from 1976–1977.⁷⁷⁴ He became Hyvärinen's most important partner in the ministry during the period of 1967–1971.⁷⁷⁵

In fact, one of the most important reasons for the actualization of the grouping between the members of the junta was the German question in the context of the activation of the Finnish foreign policy during the latter half of the 1960s. The group took resistance against the rejuvenation the German Democratic Republic's campaign for its recognition was beginning to receive from the large segments of Finnish society, such as academic students, trade unions, and SDP in the latter half of the 1960s.⁷⁷⁶

⁷⁶⁸ Hyvärinen 1958, 135.

⁷⁶⁹ Hyvärinen 1958, 134.

⁷⁷⁰ Hyvärinen 1966, 17.

⁷⁷¹ Antola 1983, 246.

⁷⁷² Korhonen's dissertation discussed the functioning of The Committee for Finnish Affairs (Finnish: Suomen asiain komitea) in the Grand Duchy of Finland (Seppinen 2005, "Korhonen, Keijo (1934 -)", *Kansallisbiografia*, <https://kansallisbiografia.fi/kansallisbiografia/henkilo/4024> [accessed 16 April 2018]) The committee assisted Minister-Secretary of State for Finland that represented Finland in the Imperial Russia.

⁷⁷³ Antola 1983, 254.

⁷⁷⁴ Ulkoasiainhallinnon matrikkeli 1993, osa 1, 333.

⁷⁷⁵ Hentilä 2003, 79, 80. Together, these men formed part of the pact in the foreign ministry that was called as "the Junta of colonels" or "the doctor gang". They were considered as a new generation of foreign policy makers that were strict followers of Kekkonen's foreign policy line. They were not, however, all members of the Agrarian League/Center Party or to be considered as Kekkonen's "henchmen".

⁷⁷⁶ Soikkanen 2003a, 183, 184.

Mäkelä's theoretical approach in the report actually appropriated a concept that was later used by the Finnish Foreign Ministry in its justification of the German policy: the reference to the lack of a German peace treaty. This was, in a sense, paradoxical, as it is customary for the foreign policy argumentation to be based on existing treaties and, if necessary (such as in the case of Finland's), a creative interpretation of them since no treaty is written in a manner that would be totally unequivocal.⁷⁷⁷ However, in Finland's case, this approach was inverted, and the lack of the treaty was used as the basis of the policy.

In general, the increasing tendency for Finland to resort to international jurisprudential thinking was probably stimulated by general tendencies in the international relations (especially the renewed *détente* spirit of the sixties that was creating international treaties at an unprecedented pace) that could have sparked hope for the more just international system. There was also, in Finland, a tradition of legalism: from the battle for autonomy when Finland was still part of Russia (as the Grand Duchy of Finland) and later as the basis of the foreign policy of independent Finland during the 1920s and 1930s as a member of the League of Nations.⁷⁷⁸ However, as it is well known, the trust of supra-national organizations and international law perished during the 1940s. Also, during the Cold War, international law (which in the early Cold War had appeared to be more effective than ever before by its application in the Nuremberg trials) was regarded somewhat void due to the tensions of superpowers and their self-interests. It was thought that these real-political calculations rendered the organizations, such as the United Nations, ineffective and allowed no hope for the functionality of the jurisprudential international forum.⁷⁷⁹ Still, this era of the second *détente* brought minor advancements in international law; the pinnacle of this development was the Declaration on Friendly Relations in the United Nations general assembly of 1970. It comprised the principles of post-1945 international law.⁷⁸⁰

All in all, Mäkelä's report could be seen as an implicit critique of the Hallstein Doctrine. In it, Mäkelä explicated that he was not seeing clear justification from the viewpoint of international law for the Federal Republic's demand for sole representation. However, he still found, in some regards, a solid basis for the Doctrine by referring to the lacking peace accords and the final settlement by the four powers. In this omission of the juridical validity regarding the question of Germany, he was perhaps exhorting the validation of Finland's Germany policy

⁷⁷⁷ See Greig 2006, 163. In fact, in the German case, the history went far back when it came to the interpretation of the treaties and territorial issues with Poland. In 1740 Frederick the Great had marched his troops to conquer Habsburg ruled former territory of Poland, Silesia, after its ruler Charles VI had died. The conquest was justified by referring to the vague treaty signed in the 16th century, which his lawyers had revived from some forgotten file of diplomacy. (Taylor 2008, 37.)

⁷⁷⁸ Jonkari 2008, 385.

⁷⁷⁹ Neff 2014, 396.

⁷⁸⁰ Neff 2014, 412. Some of the most important stipulations were the sovereign equality of states, the prohibition against the use of force, the principle of nonintervention, the duty of peaceful settlement of disputes, and the right of self-determination of peoples.

honestly by its political roots. After all, the policy's main motivation, the Hallstein Doctrine, based on the analysis of Mäkelä, was similarly constructed through the political.

4.2.2 Doctrine's execution is not automatic

As the previous chapter showed, it was clear that the Finnish representative, Kaarlo Mäkelä, was appropriating a somewhat critical attitude towards the Hallstein Doctrine and its tenability in the mid-1960s. However, the Doctrine still managed to survive even the government change in December 1966 when Kiesinger's Grand Coalition of the CDU/CSU and SPD government was inaugurated. This did not, however, avert Mäkelä from his previous stance towards the Doctrine and, during the latter half of the 1960s, he started actually questioning the Doctrine altogether. This was because, at that time, there was increasing activity in the Eastern relations of the Federal Republic and they seemed to put in question the Hallstein Doctrine's viability in increasing amounts.

During this period, the Federal Republic strengthened its economic and political relations with its Eastern neighbors – despite the fact that they already had recognized the German Democratic Republic. It was in these events' context that Mäkelä started questioning the Doctrine. The unfolding of events related to the relations between Romania and the Federal Republic especially bolstered his critical stance.⁷⁸¹ It was natural, since Romania became, on 31 January 1967, the first country after the Soviet Union that would establish diplomatic relations with Bonn while already holding the same with East Germany.⁷⁸² It was an act that received harsh criticism from the Ulbricht regime and led to a situation where Bucharest declined the invitation of the Warsaw Pact countries foreign minister meeting scheduled for February in East Berlin (ultimately shifted to Warsaw), which was organized to strengthen the opposition towards West Germany in the Eastern bloc (which cohesiveness Romania's ties with Bonn deeply questioned).⁷⁸³

What was interesting was that while the diplomats were beginning to question the West German demands for sole representation (the discourse that was perhaps one of the factors to motivate Kekkonen to execute his first attempt to East German recognition during this period) the frustration was tangible in the East German Foreign Ministry regarding the Finnish stance in the German question. The East German Foreign Ministry evaluated that West Germany was using Finland to prevent the recognition of the East German state. The conclusion of the East Germans was that the recognition of their state was not probable from Finland's part.⁷⁸⁴

Before the actual establishment of diplomatic relations between Romania and Bonn on 27 January 1967, Mäkelä stated that Romania's foreign minister,

⁷⁸¹ UM 5 C 5 A secret telegram from Cologne 27 January 1967, p. 1.

⁷⁸² McAdams 1985, 72.

⁷⁸³ New York Times, 4 February 1967 " Rumania Assailed by East Germans: They Score Establishment of Ties With Bonn and Warn Other Allies Against It".

⁷⁸⁴ MFAA L43 C1174/76, memo of GDR Foreign Ministry circa 1967.

Corneliu Manescu, was coming to visit the Federal Republic and that there were expectations the diplomatic relations would be established on the next week by unilateral declarations from both parties. He predicted adherence to a pattern that had already manifested a recurrence of a habituality in the Federal Republic with its Eastern relations; a pattern that allowed circumventing unpleasant and open political questions between the two countries – which meant, in practice, the question of *de jure* existence of the East German state.⁷⁸⁵ This led Mäkelä to suspect that these aforementioned declarations would – based on previous experiences – probably state that the parties admitted their disagreement on the fundamental foreign political issues but that it did not prevent them to agree on the issues that were currently negotiated.⁷⁸⁶

Mäkelä had also noticed that there seemed to be signs that relations with Bulgaria were developing as well. According to him, there had been positive news arriving from the negotiations in Budapest. They gave basis for the most enthusiastic proponents of the development of Eastern relations to speculate that the relations could be established in the coming spring. These hopes, according to Mäkelä, were based on the fact that Hungary's foreign minister had authorized Lahr to announce that on the principle Hungary was ready to establish diplomatic relations. The issue was to be discussed in the Hungarian government by the next month. Once again, Mäkelä interpreted the policy of the Federal Republic to bear resemblance to the disposition towards other Eastern European countries: both parties were not even striving to resolve the major foreign policy issues, but were satisfied to focus on the main issue, the establishment of relations. The logic was that consequently, the soon-to-be established representative offices would also facilitate the handling of the currently unsolved issues in the future.⁷⁸⁷

In the light of the later Warsaw pact meeting in February 1967 called for by Ulbricht, and which was to establish cohesion of the bloc against West Germany, Mäkelä astutely analyzed that the speedy development of relations with the Eastern countries resulted from the fear of countermeasures from the German Democratic Republic.⁷⁸⁸ According to him, Romania's hurrying in its establishment of relations was caused by the wish to have them established before the German Democratic Republic, whose uncertainty was striking, could initiate countermeasures even more severe than the present ones. They were expected as the

⁷⁸⁵ A division of the spheres of *de jure* and *de facto* recognition were used by the East German's too. In the case of Finland, Finland was counted as a *de facto* recognizer of the East German state and holding not only commercial, but consular relations. (memo of DRG Foreign Ministry circa 1967, MFAA, L43, C1174/76.)

⁷⁸⁶ UM 5 C 5 A secret telegram from Cologne 27 January 1967, p. 1.

⁷⁸⁷ UM 5 C 5 A secret telegram from Cologne 27 January 1967, p. 1.

⁷⁸⁸ News of the meeting broke only few days after the reporting, see See New York Times 3 February 1967 "Red Bloc to Meet on Ties to Bonn: Seeks to Head off any Move to Bolster West Germany". The meeting was especially agitated by the Romania's establishment of relations with West Germany New York Times, 14 February 1967 "Failure at Warsaw"; UM secret report Cologne 5 April 1967 "Länsi-Saksan ja Itä-Saksan suhteista", p 3. See also discussion on Ulbricht and the iron-triangle in section 4.1.3.

possible side effects of the development of Bonn's Eastern relations were worrying East Berlin. However, Mäkelä did not explicate what these side effects might be, but it is probable that he was referring to the political isolation of East Germany from its socialist neighbours.⁷⁸⁹

Mäkelä followed with a statement that implied he saw the Soviet Union as possessing the ultimate verdict in the Eastern countries' relations with the Federal Republic, and that it was probably propagating this development. He wrote, "Complications could appear if the Soviet Union, that has urged the socialist countries to co-ordinate their foreign policies in this question, regards the harms to out-weight the benefits, especially with regards to DDR. In here, it is expected the Soviet Union to keep its former positive stand regarding the Federal Republic establishing diplomatic relations with socialist countries." The quote also shows that Mäkelä regarded that the crux of the question was in the possible collision course of interests between the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union and not so much in the actual establishment of the relations between the Eastern socialist states and the Federal Republic.⁷⁹⁰

This latter part of the analysis showed that Mäkelä discerned there was no direct correlation between the benefits of the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union. In this, Mäkelä was taking a surprisingly independent stance on the bloc cohesion issue when considering that, in some Western evaluations, the Soviet Union was seen as unquestionably backing the East German stance.⁷⁹¹ This appeared, at least ostensibly, to be the case, for example, in the form of a memorandum that Moscow directed for Non--Aligned Movement leaders. It claimed that the Federal Republic was bent on destroying socialism in East Germany and begged for sympathy of these nations by appealing to their determination towards the goals of national liberation, progress, and socialism⁷⁹². However, in the beginning of the decade, even the United States foreign policy theorists such as Zbigniew Brzezinski were noting that the Soviet bloc had evolved into a less uniform "communist bloc", as implied by the declaration of communist parties from the December 1960 party meeting in Moscow.⁷⁹³ Mäkelä was perhaps implying that the Finnish foreign policy leadership might serve itself better by lessening its clear bias in favor of the Soviet Union in the German question. This might be possible since it was only a few weeks before that Kekkonen was, once again, overtly taking this stance.

⁷⁸⁹ UM 5 C 5 A secret telegram from Cologne 27 January 1967, p. 2.

⁷⁹⁰ UM 5 C 5 A secret telegram from Cologne 27 January 1967, p. 2. "Komplikatioita voi kuitenkin syntyä, jos Neuvostoliitto, joka jo kehottanut sosialistisia valtioita koordinoimaan ulkopoliittikkansa tässä kysymyksessä, katsoo haittojen olevan suurempia kuin saavutetun hyödyn erittäinkin DDR:ään nähden. Täällä odotetaan Neuvostoliiton pysyvän entisellä positiivisella linjallaan Länsi-Saksan uusiin diplomaattisuhteisiin."

⁷⁹¹ E.g. See New York Times, 3 February 1967, "Red Bloc to Meet on Ties to Bonn: Seeks to Head off any Move to Bolster West Germany".

⁷⁹² Gray 2003, 201.

⁷⁹³ Foreign Affairs April 1961 issue "The Challenge of Change in the Soviet Bloc" by Zbigniew Brzezinski.

In his foreign policy speech at Vaasa Ecclesiastical Day on 6 January 1967, Kekkonen expressed his previous critical stance regarding the nuclear armament of West Germany and its constant threat to European peace. The speech irritated the West Germans, and the head of the mission of the Federal Republic in Helsinki visited the Finnish Foreign Ministry multiple times to express his government's resistance towards Kekkonen's interpretation.⁷⁹⁴ During these visits, he wanted to assure the Finns of the new orientation of Bonn's leaders, a stance concerted by Mäkelä, as the above discussed analysis showed. In this respect, the report must have increased the credibility of the assurances of Bonn's Foreign Office. Mäkelä was also forced to explain Kekkonen's speech in the Foreign Office to State Secretary Schulz and reassure him that the speech did not mean a change in the Finnish stance towards Germany or the inimical attitude towards Bonn's Eastern policy.⁷⁹⁵

This threatening period of once again looming low in the relations between Finland and the Federal Republic since the beginning of the decade was ultimately resolved by the intervention of the Bonn's Foreign Office. It did not, perhaps, sufficiently trust the prestige of the trade mission to send a strong enough message to Kekkonen and offered a visit of All German Affairs Minister Herbert Wehner to Finland. Kekkonen accepted the offer, and Wehner arrived on 15 February 1967. The personality of Wehner managed to impress Kekkonen who deemed his guest polite and diplomatic.⁷⁹⁶ It was an astonishing change in the attitude towards a representative of a government whose foreign minister he had, just a while ago, described as reminiscent of an SS soldier.⁷⁹⁷

It has to be also noted that the fact that the Federal Republic was willing to send one of its ministers to visit Kekkonen implied a change in the Federal Republic's attitude towards Finland. The trust was clearly increased – especially considering that only a few years ago, the Finnish representative in Cologne, Torsten Tikanvaara, had reported how the Foreign Office had stated directly that even the visits by the members of the West German administration (more precisely, the Foreign Office) were politically impossible.⁷⁹⁸ One of the reason could have also been that East Germany's propagandistic actions in Finland were worrying West Germans. Their rationale might have been that without improvement of relations with Kekkonen, the political stage in Finland would have been left solely to the German Democratic Republic.⁷⁹⁹

⁷⁹⁴ Suomi 1994, 436, 437.

⁷⁹⁵ UM 12 K 1955-1964, secret telegram by K. Mäkelä from Cologne 27 January 1967.

⁷⁹⁶ Suomi 1994, 437.

⁷⁹⁷ See section 4.1.3, Discussion of Kekkonen with Norwegian Prime Minister Per Borten.

⁷⁹⁸ See section 4.1.1. UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 25 January 1964, "Länsi-Saksan ja Puolan nykysuhteista", p. 5.

⁷⁹⁹ UKK vuosikirjat 1958-, 1967 memo 2 February 1967 concerning the visit of West German representative Hergt to Martti Salomies, deputy director general of the Political Department of FFM. Memo of Jaakko Hallama 3 February 1967, director general of the Political Department of FFM.

During his visit, Wehner also indirectly confirmed another point the reporting of Finnish diplomats had already noted: that much of the West German foreign policy was, in actuality, suited to the needs of the domestic policy as well. Wehner had admitted that this was the reason why the government program was written in the politically vague and cautious form.⁸⁰⁰ Yet, Wehner admitted that there was still genuine drive, at least among Social Democrats, to improve the image of the West German foreign policy.⁸⁰¹

It has to be considered that perhaps Kekkonen's willingness to be assured by the views of his guest regarding the West German foreign policy were facilitated by the Finnish diplomats' reporting of the advancing Eastern policy. After all, it showed that Bonn was actually executing a new Eastern policy, which could be interpreted by the increased countermeasures of East Germany. Mäkelä's aforementioned reporting one month before the visit certainly gave views that made it easier for Kekkonen to accept his guest's assurances. Mäkelä was implicitly confirming that the words of Wehner (which attested for the genuine nature of the government policy program) might have been valid; in other words, it might have downplayed the government's willingness to reform its foreign policy. This can be considered the most important foreign policy tenet of Bonn. The Hallstein Doctrine entered Mäkelä's discussion in the form of a worn-out threat: he saw upcoming credibility problems for Bonn when it came to their previous hard-line foreign policy towards the German Democratic Republic and its international recognition. He wrote that despite the fear Bonn initially had that the neutral states would possibly be encouraged to recognize the German Democratic Republic by the recent events, this fear had now appeared to diminish, yet it was still going to be a concern of the West German government because, he concluded, "the Hallstein Doctrine has now de facto lost its credibility". This direct statement echoed the same tones as the views from the Finnish representatives that had been posted in Cologne during the 1950s (in the reporting of Olavi Munkki in 1955, and later concerted by Heikki Brotherus in 1957, who had already at that time questioned the Doctrine's longevity.)⁸⁰² In fact, Mäkelä had already also speculated on the possible future "gradation" (*porrastus*) of the Doctrine almost two years earlier in his telegram to Finnish Foreign Ministry's Head of the Political Department, Max Jakobson. By gradation he referred to the new application of the Doctrine by considering each case *in casu*.⁸⁰³

Mäkelä continued by clarifying the stand of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office regarding these events. According to him, the Foreign Office had explained that the Hallstein Doctrine was not preventing the establishment of diplomatic relations with East European countries because the Soviet Union had forced (Mäkelä had underlined the word "forced") these "satellites" to acknowledge East Germany. Also, a mitigating factor was seen in the fact that

⁸⁰⁰ Suomi 1994, 437.

⁸⁰¹ UKK, 21/ 97 memo concerning the discussions with Herbert Wehner 15 February 1967.

⁸⁰² UM 5 C 5 A secret telegram from Cologne 27 January 1967 p. 2.

⁸⁰³ UM 7 D II 307, report Cologne 27 February 1965, "Hallstein-oppi nykyoloissa".

these nations had not previously held diplomatic relations with Germany. This interpretation was, in Mäkelä's opinion, not valid from the viewpoint of international jurisprudence and not tenable if it was going to be used seriously to hinder nations already holding diplomatic relations with West Germany to recognize East Germany.⁸⁰⁴

The fact that Mäkelä had underlined the word "forced" could have two implications. First of all, it could be an intertextual reference to his previous report, in which he had presented information that Finland could be, in the public discussion of the Federal Republic, counted as a country that was not in complete control of its own foreign policy. Consequently, Finland, even though it was not regarded in this public discussion as a satellite, could be forced to recognize East Germany as well. It was clear by the context of this earlier report that Mäkelä considered this statement as mitigating, if not a totally liberating factor, when it came to Finland's German policy. It followed that he could conclude his report and claim that "the Hallstein Doctrine no longer applied to Finland". Yet he included a reservation, and explicated it by noting that Finland was actually considered as a special case in order to prevent its immediate recognition of East Germany.⁸⁰⁵

The conclusion of Mäkelä could be interpreted as containing a tacit assumption that Finland had brought its special status for itself because it had not acknowledged either of the two German states. This caution was being exploited by the Federal Republic's Foreign Office. It did not wish to give Finland the possibility for immediate recognition by giving an impression that Finland was a different case. However, Mäkelä's wording "immediate recognition", implies that he saw recognition as inevitable. He was, in other words, claiming that Finland's stance on the German question was clinging to obsolete principles that no longer applied. It appeared, when it was seen from outside of Finland and its political symbolic order, as an anomaly and a result of a policy that was based on the necessities of the past, not to the pragmatism of the present day.⁸⁰⁶

Mäkelä's analysis was most probably, at this point, read carefully by Kekkonen, who had become the unquestioned bellwether of the Finnish foreign policy at this point.⁸⁰⁷ In his archives, there are found multiple newspaper clips concerning Kiesinger cabinet's foreign policy towards the East.⁸⁰⁸ It is known that Kekkonen was a keen collector of everything concerning foreign policy, but the quantitative extensiveness concerning Kiesinger can also be clearly discerned. The scrutiny of the reporting coming from Germany is also implied by his handwritten remarks on the report that came from Cologne.⁸⁰⁹ It is possible that this was an implication of his (questioning) contemplation of the tenacity of the Finnish German policy in the changing international configuration. However, he was

⁸⁰⁴ UM 5 C 5 A secret telegram from Cologne 27 January 1967, p. 2.

⁸⁰⁵ UM 5 C 5 A secret telegram from Cologne 27 January 1967, p. 2.

⁸⁰⁶ UM 5 C 5 A secret telegram from Cologne 27 January 1967, p. 2.

⁸⁰⁷ Vihavainen 1991, 100, 101.

⁸⁰⁸ See the file UKK 21 / 133 Saksojen kysymys 1967-1971.

⁸⁰⁹ UKK 21 / 133, Saksojen kysymys 1967-1971, report from Cologne 13 December 1967 "Ulkoministeri Brandt ajankohtaisista poliittisista kysymyksistä".

still ostensibly holding on to the previous policy, as he was irritated by an article in the periodical *Päivän Sanomat*, published by Finnish leftist fraction of Social Democratic Party.⁸¹⁰ He considered the article to be affected by their overt promotion of the recognition of German Democratic Republic.⁸¹¹

Mäkelä continued on the reassuring line of analysis regarding the Federal Republic's foreign policy less than a week later; this time he could rely on his analysis on the newly issued government program of Kiesinger's cabinet which the new chancellor seemed to rely heavily upon. The report also contained information regarding the Hallstein Doctrine from the Federal Republic's Foreign Office, and it revealed that Mäkelä saw the change in the Federal Republic's foreign policy looming. He wrote, "Kiesinger's government has, after the release of its government program, began to work in accordance with it surprisingly fast. The effects of the actions that the government has taken should not be underestimated." Mäkelä regarded that Kiesinger himself had taken very seriously the government program that had gained wide attention. It was even claimed that he consulted the program frequently and kept it with him before his speeches and public appearances.⁸¹²

Mäkelä seemed to interpret that it was actually the Soviet Union that was exploiting the Eastern policy to crumble the bulwark of the Hallstein Doctrine. The previously discussed establishment of relations with Romania was an especially important part of this. Mäkelä interpreted that Romania had calculated to gain the favor of the Soviet Union by this move. The reasoning was that as it established relations with the Federal Republic, it strengthened the position of the German Democratic Republic and weakened the Hallstein Doctrine, and possibly led to a benign view from Moscow.⁸¹³

Yet, if Mäkelä's analysis had, in fact, discerned some of the rationale behind the Romanian policy, it is clear by the light of the latter research that the ultimate subject of the Romanian policy, East Germany, was not satisfied with the strategy. After the announcement of the development of further relations between Romania and the Federal Republic, Ulbricht hurried to Moscow with the declaration that he had quickly forged in the impromptu meeting of the SED. Among other things that were unrealistic for Bonn to agree on, it demanded the acknowledgment of the existence of two German states by Bonn.⁸¹⁴ However, Ulbricht managed to validate his paper in the beginning of the following month (February

⁸¹⁰ They formed the Social Democratic Union of Workers and Smallholders (*Työväen ja Pienviljelijäin Sosialidemokraattinen Liitto*, TPSL) party 1959-1973.

⁸¹¹ UKK vuosikirjat 1958-, 1967, Letter of Kekkonen to the Master of Law, trained at the bench (varatuomari), Päiviö Hetemäki, dated 20.1.1967, but probably wrong since the letter refers in the past tense to a visit of Wehner in February, therefore 20 February 1967 probably correct.

⁸¹² UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 2 February 1967, "Länsi-Saksan ja Romanian diplomaattiset suhteet", p. 1.

⁸¹³ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 2 February 1967, "Länsi-Saksan ja Romanian diplomaattiset suhteet", p. 2.

⁸¹⁴ Other demands for Bonn to acquiesce to were: the permanence of the borders between Poland, the Federal Republic, and the German Democratic Republic that had

1967) in the meeting of the foreign ministers of the Warsaw Pact countries in Warsaw.⁸¹⁵ This was to a surprise to some Western observers of communist nations; their views had still been, in January, that Moscow would not back East Germany in its effort to block the establishing of ties between Bonn and East European countries.⁸¹⁶

It seems by these multiple interpretations and reactions of Bonn's policy that at this point the Federal Republic, as Seppo Hentilä has interpreted, had difficulties executing a clear foreign policy line.⁸¹⁷ On the other hand, the policy was causing aggravation for the German Democratic Republic, as Ulbricht feared it was striving to isolate East Germany from the other Warsaw Pact countries, but the policy had its perils for Bonn as well with regards to the domestic acceptability of it and by the actual reactions of Moscow to the policy.

This was the vantage point that Mäkelä was emphasizing as well. In his view, Bonn's new foreign policy course was compromising the Hallstein Doctrine. In this compromise he also found the explanation for Bonn's sudden need to secure its "back" in the direction of neutral states. This was to be achieved by sending diplomatic requests to neutral states to abide by the Federal Republic's claim to sole representation of the German people. It recapitulated the over decade long policy line that the recognition of the German Democratic Republic would be considered as an unfriendly act.⁸¹⁸

Continuing this problematization of the basis of Finland's German policy, Mäkelä added that there was new criterion appropriated with regards to the execution of the Doctrine. He repeated his earlier interpretation and regarded, however, that the new framework of the diplomatic threat of Hallstein was not on a solid base if one considered it from the vantage point of international law. According to this new criterion, the Federal Republic considered it possible to establish diplomatic relations with such nations that had already recognized East Germany. However, this was only if they had recognized East Germany before the founding of the Federal Republic. In addition to this, Mäkelä repeated his previous point that the Federal Republic now considered essential if the recognition of the East Germany was made "under the compulsion of a third power". This was, as previously noted, referring to the Soviet Union.⁸¹⁹

been established after the war; Bonn's acknowledgment of two German states; its renouncement of the demand for the sole representation and the strive to gain nuclear weapons; the acknowledgment that Berlin was not part of the Federal Republic; and the voiding of the Munich Agreement of 1937, by virtue of which Hitler had annexed the parts of the Czechoslovakia. (Hentilä 2003, 62.)

⁸¹⁵ Hentilä 2003, 62.

⁸¹⁶ New York Times, 26 January 1967, "Soviet Said to Refuse to Back East Germany on Bonn's Ties".

⁸¹⁷ Hentilä 2003, 62.

⁸¹⁸ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 2 February 1967, "Länsi-Saksan ja Romanian diplomaattiset suhteet", p. 3.

⁸¹⁹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 2 February 1967, "Länsi-Saksan ja Romanian diplomaattiset suhteet", p. 3.

All this ultimately led Mäkelä to doubt the universality of the Hallstein Doctrine. In this regard he had some very interesting information that he had managed to obtain once again from inside the Federal Republic's Foreign Office. A high ranking official in the Foreign Office had revealed for Mäkelä some important factors regarding the Hallstein Doctrine's appropriation in the case of Yugoslavia. The official in question had explained to Mäkelä that the State Secretary Hallstein had considered Yugoslavia an especially fitting target for the Doctrine and becoming a cautionary example as it had been "politically isolated". By this, he had referred to the fact that Yugoslavia had been expelled from the Soviet bloc as a result of Tito–Stalin split.⁸²⁰ This information, of course, drastically changes the framework in which the Doctrine has to be interpreted – and probably how it was interpreted after the report by the Finnish foreign policymakers. It showed that Finland's case was not comparable to Yugoslavia. Finland was not, as Yugoslavia was, politically isolated but was integrated by its culture and economic system (especially after the EFTA) to the West, albeit while keeping up appearances with the East. The latter aspect, however, was dominant in the Finnish political culture through the self-inflicted subservience to the Soviet Union's (presumed) interests in the domestic politics of Finland.⁸²¹

As a conclusion, Mäkelä saw that the Federal Republic's establishment of diplomatic relations with Romania now opened a new pathway for European relations in general. In his view, it did not matter if the aforementioned shift was considered either the Soviet Union's or the Federal Republic's victory. Its effects were felt in the Soviet bloc, among the non-aligned states, and also in the Federal Republic. According to the memo of the later meeting between Kekkonen and Soviet Premier Kosygin, the conclusion was correct in relation to the repercussions of Romania's actions: two years later, Kosygin would admit to Kekkonen that Romania had, in fact, stirred the established configuration of the Soviet foreign relations, from the Soviet perspective. In Kosygin's view, it had caused problems with its independent policy for the Soviet Union.⁸²²

Yet, Mäkelä did not see any hurry for modifying the Finnish foreign policy according to this new configuration of international relations. Mäkelä recapitulated the official line of Finnish foreign policy, which linked the German policy with the symbolism of neutrality and stated, "this case has no immediate effect on Finland's position because the basis of our stance is our own neutrality policy and, from the international law's viewpoint, it is an impeccable position".⁸²³

Mäkelä's formulation, which emphasized the unique nature of the Finnish neutrality by using the possessive expression "our own neutrality policy", was echoing the ideas of President Kekkonen when it came to neutrality. Kekkonen believed in the prerogative for each country to formulate its own neutrality. He

⁸²⁰ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 2 February 1967, "Länsi-Saksan ja Romanian diplomaattiset suhteet", p. 4.

⁸²¹ See Finlandization.

⁸²² UKK 21 / 97, memo from the discussions of Kosygin and Kekkonen 19-21 May 1969.

⁸²³ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 2 February 1967, "Länsi-Saksan ja Romanian diplomaattiset suhteet", p. 4.

therefore was not keen to think of the neutral countries as a coherent group. He was aware that there were lots of different formulations of neutrality in the foreign ministries of neutral states. He himself strived for some kind of, in his own definition, absolute neutrality; in his mind Finland had to proceed on its own path despite the pressures of superpowers and not be allowed to be side-tracked in any case.⁸²⁴ Of course, in the light of Finland's extensive sensitivity towards the Soviet wishes, the non-gradable adjective seemed to be a technique of rejecting the obvious accusation (neutrality subjected to Soviet interests) with the most unobvious defend (impeccable neutrality). Later, he would use this tactic against the accusations of Finlandization, as he would claim that the phenomenon was something desirable and positive.

Despite the fact that Mäkelä was giving this implicit validation of Kekkonen's line from the viewpoint of international law, he was, however, implying that the status quo was no longer the *modus operandi* in Europe anymore. Mäkelä wrote that the alterations in the previously very static relations of European nations "were causing reconsideration in many cabinets". Mäkelä attributed this quite ambiguously to the result of the fear of isolation in many nations. In this he was probably meaning that also other states, especially in the socialist bloc, did not want to miss the opportunity to start building inter-bloc relations. Possibly with this in mind, Mäkelä thought that it was also a time for the Soviet Union to formulate a new guidelines for the relations of the socialist states and East Germany. So far, East Germany had jealously guarded and wished to prevent other socialist states to establish relations with West Germany.⁸²⁵

And, after Mäkelä reported in the style that was predicted funeral for the Doctrine, Kekkonen made a first serious initiative in the Foreign Ministry to for the consideration of policy change while, at the same time, making changes to the ranks of ministry's Political Department. In May 1967, Kekkonen nominated Risto Hyvärinen as the director general of the Political Department. The first task of Kekkonen for Hyvärinen was to prepare a plan for the recognition of both German states. Hyvärinen was surprised at this sudden challenging of this basic tenet of Finnish neutrality. One reason for Kekkonen's apparent "whim" could have been, as Seppo Hentilä has suggested, the Soviet ambassador's (A. E. Kovalev) recent visit to Tamminiemi during which he had suggested for Kekkonen the recognition of the East Germany. In Kovalev's thinking, Finland was perceived as the barrier that would open the floodgates for the wider recognition of the German Democratic Republic.⁸²⁶ Yet, it is known that Kekkonen did not seriously consider, at least the East German, initiatives concerning East Germany's diplomatic recognition. However, he might have put more value in the Soviet ambassador's request. In the light of this reporting from the Finnish diplomats, it also seems possible that the critical reports coming from Germany regarding

⁸²⁴ Suomi 2001, 22.

⁸²⁵ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 2 February 1967, "Länsi-Saksan ja Romanian diplomaattiset suhteet", p. 4.

⁸²⁶ Hentilä 2003, 79.

the Hallstein Doctrine's tenability perhaps partly contributed to Kekkonen's push towards a solution of the German question in Finnish foreign policy.

Hyvärinen himself later speculated three possible scenarios that could explain the president's actions, however, he does not mention the Hallstein Doctrine's weakening as one. On the other hand, Hyvärinen might have taken the weakening for granted. Consequently, he has speculated more on the issue of why Kekkonen chose that particular moment (the beginning of Hyvärinen's office) as a starting point for the new German policy. Hyvärinen has suggested that Kekkonen perhaps wanted to test him as a rookie official. Another possibility Hyvärinen has seen in the possible strive of Kekkonen to find someone else to share and prop his new ideas; he needed an ally for his ideas in a form of a high-ranking official in the Foreign Ministry. The third possibility was that Kekkonen had already decided to push for a solution in the German question, but simply changed his mind.

The change of the president's heart in the matter could have been, at least partly, caused by the reporting concerning the recognition's possibilities. Even though the reporting, boded the funeral of the Doctrine, it still did not see it as an excuse to move forward in the East German recognition. Considering this option, there would be a way of integrating the two ostensibly contradicting views on the reporting: critique towards the Hallstein Doctrine, but caution in the East German matter. Perhaps the critique for Kekkonen gave a certainty that the German question was coming close to a solution. In this regard he wished to be prepared by making preliminary treaty drafts. However, as noted in the reporting and given the international context of the situation, he cautioned it to be too early for any nation to take their own initiative in the matter, so he opted to wait.

The latter option seemed especially necessary considering the even larger international context; that is, the Six Day War between Israel and Arab states that took place in June, almost immediately after Kekkonen and Hyvärinen's discussion concerning the German question. The war tensed superpower relations, as the Soviet Union aligned strongly with the Arab states against Israel and the United States. Ultimately, the battle between superpowers was fought only in the conventions of the United Nations. However, it was possible that in this international situation Kekkonen decided that Finnish foreign policy should remain more cautious than demonstrative.⁸²⁷

This stance would have been probably advised also by the visit in the same June by Federal Republic's Foreign Minister Willy Brandt to Finland. Kekkonen was not as taken with Brandt as he was with Wehner, according to his critical comments regarding the minister in his diaries. However, he might have taken heed from Brandt's claim that Bonn still regarded the recognition of the German Democratic Republic as an unfriendly act.⁸²⁸

If it had been the case that Kekkonen was honestly pushing for a solution to the German question already at this point, it can be claimed that he was ready

⁸²⁷ Hyvärinen 2000, 109, 110.

⁸²⁸ Suomi 1994, 443.

to initiate what was later known as Finland's active neutrality policy. A recognition of both German states would have been, by any measurement, a major initiative on the international arena. Kekkonen could have been through it striving to play a large role in the relations between the East and West in the looming *détente*. Juhani Suomi regarded that Brandt's visit was, in reality, a continuity of the earlier visit by Wehner, in other words, an attempt to use Kekkonen as an intermediary in the Eastern policy of the Federal Republic and convey the reform readiness of the Federal Republic to Moscow. However, Soviet leadership told Kekkonen that they did not want him to act as a middle man, and that Germans should speak directly to them.⁸²⁹

It is clear, however, that Mäkelä from Cologne was already making bold statements and challenging the Hallstein Doctrine profusely at this point. Yet, the ending of the same year saw him go as far as to debunk the Doctrine as a viable option in the Federal Republic's foreign policy altogether. He had reached this conclusion by observing the development of the looming establishment of diplomatic relations between Yugoslavia and the Federal Republic. With regards to analyzing the foreign policy of the Federal Republic towards Yugoslavia, Mäkelä could contextualize the matter with his first-hand information from the Foreign Office regarding the termination of the diplomatic relations between these countries in the first place. As discussed above, he had already informed the Finnish Foreign Ministry in his previous report, the relations between these nations had been terminated relying upon the politically isolated position Yugoslavia at that time. Consequently, Yugoslavia had become the first example of the Hallstein Doctrine's application.⁸³⁰

Due to this, Mäkelä evaluated that "the relations with Yugoslavia hold a special place in the foreign policy of the Federal Republic because in 1957 the relations were terminated following the dictates of the Hallstein Doctrine". Now, while the inversion of the policy was taking place, Mäkelä stated that there was a mending of these severed relations going on as a part of the Federal Republic's new Eastern policy. Yugoslavia itself had also been active in the issue. Mäkelä saw that the hindrance for the development of the relations had, so far, been a fear of a domino effect. It was especially worried in Bonn that there would be a wave of East Germany's recognition. And – according to Mäkelä – it was Finland that was feared to be the first to step on this path and initiate the momentum. Another reason for the previous holding back of Yugoslavian relations had been the fear of it giving a final blow to the credibility of the Hallstein Doctrine. It was actually, according to Mäkelä, "already dead, but the establishment of relations with Yugoslavia would render it unviable and powerless altogether".⁸³¹

In the Finnish Foreign Ministry's Political Department, Director General of the Political Department Risto Hyvärinen, was possibly alarmed by these reported views that were showing that the Doctrine was no longer a credible threat

⁸²⁹ Suomi 1994, 442.

⁸³⁰ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 18 October 1967, "Länsi-Saksan ja Jugoslavian diplomaattiset suhteet", p. 1.

⁸³¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 18 October 1967, "Länsi-Saksan ja Jugoslavian diplomaattiset suhteet", p. 1.

and was striving to deattach the German policy from it. He circumscribed Finland's German policy – in his view – to its proper boundaries in a memo which referred to the case of Yugoslavia that was discussed in Mäkelä's report. He noted that due to the establishment of diplomatic relations between Yugoslavia and the Federal Republic, the trade mission of the German Democratic Republic had once again become active in probing possibilities for Finland to establish relations with both German states. He pointed out that the basis for Finland's non-recognition policy was firstly in the Paris Peace Treaties of 1947, which stipulated that Finland was obligated to acknowledge the validity of the treaties and organization of matters that were related to the restoration of peace in Germany. However, as the peace treaty with Germany had not been realized, Finland could not take any stance in the German policy as doing so would require predicting the orders or stipulations that the Allied Powers would end up with in their German policy. The upshot from this, for Hyvärinen, was that, in his view, the Hallstein Doctrine's longevity, or the lack of it, had no impact on Finland's German policy because the Hallstein Doctrine had nothing to do with the Finnish German policy. In his words, "... the Hallstein Doctrine has no pertinence to Finland's basis for its German policy, consequently, the fact that Yugoslavia, the Federal Republic of Germany, or Romania have established diplomatic relations, will have no effect to the basis of the Finland's German policy".⁸³²

Hyvärinen's views were, in essence, concerted by another new signing to the official ranks of the Finnish Foreign Ministry during the same period: Keijo Korhonen, who was assigned as a secretary of division 4 April 1967. He became Hyvärinen's most important partner in the ministry during the period of 1967–1971.⁸³³ Korhonen's actions at this time show that the Finnish left (which was rushing ahead in the recognition issue) needed to understand the stance and its basis. Korhonen gave a speech at the seminar of the communist Finnish People's Democratic League's youth division in September 1967. His message was that Finland (in this case, more precisely, the Finnish left) should not hurry in the recognition of the German Democratic Republic. He regarded that the current line in the German question served best the Finnish neutrality. By keeping this line, Finland could also act more in favor of the solution of the German question when the general situation in Europe allowed it. The speech gained a lot of attention in the West, especially in the United States and West Germany.⁸³⁴

Mäkelä actually referred to the speech in his report and considered it to strengthen the general line of Finnish formulations with regards to the German question during this period. By this, he meant that Finland viewed the recognition of German states from the perspective of the international law and not as a political foreign policy decision (in this he seemed to be in some respects contradicting his own formulation discussed in the previous chapter which pointed to the problems of considering the German question purely as an issue inside the

⁸³² UM 7 D II 307 memo from Risto Hyvärinen 29 April 1968.

⁸³³ Hentilä 2003, 79, 80. See also the "Junta", p. 218.

⁸³⁴ Hentilä 2003, 79, 80. UM 7 D II 307, "Esitelmä 23.9.1967 Suomen Demokraattisen Nuorisoliiton seiminaarissa Oulussa".

sphere of international law). With this, Mäkelä was, of course, also solidifying Hyvärinen's guidelines that were to emerge in his memo later. Mäkelä's conclusion was that the promise of Finland keeping its status quo in the German question was beneficial for Bonn, not only by itself, but also through its ramifications. It gave Bonn a chance to move forward in their establishment of relations with Yugoslavia. This interpretation was, in his view, buttressed by the statement of Brandt, which had assured satisfaction to the current level of relations between Finland and the Federal Republic.⁸³⁵ The policy line discussed above was also concerted, and possibly partly initiated, by Mäkelä's colleague in East Berlin as well. The Finnish Foreign Ministry had circulated a secret memo in which Martti Salomies recapitulated multiple reasons why Finland should not follow the lead of Yugoslavia.⁸³⁶

The drastic change Mäkelä saw looming in the near future of the Federal Republic's foreign policy did not have to be waited long. In the following month, Mäkelä already stated by a secret telegram that he had spoken with the head of the Federal Republic's Foreign Ministry's Eastern Department, who had told Mäkelä that the Hallstein Doctrine had been abandoned. The Federal Republic was ready for diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia. The establishment of relations was now only pending Chancellor Kiesinger's planned probing of possible reactions in Southern Asia with regards to the re-establishment of relations with Yugoslavia. Another obstacle to pass was the opposition from the CSU and Franz-Joseph Strauss, which left the solution in the hands of Kiesinger.⁸³⁷

As a conclusion, it can be noted that the case Yugoslavia and the other aspects discussed in these reports from Cologne showed that the Hallstein Doctrine was becoming increasingly difficult for Bonn to keep as a basic tenet in its foreign policy. Furthermore, as the Doctrine's dilution became more and more evident, Finnish foreign policymakers seemed to be detaching the German policy from the captivity of the Doctrine. All this was a result of the new Eastern policy that was, in the reporting, seen as a progressive force that was part of the general breakage of the status quo in Europe in the inter-bloc relations. However, the reporting still advised caution, a stance that Kekkonen took in the question, perhaps partly because of the influence of these views from the reporting. In this respect, the following chapter discussing the reporting concerning the Third World recognizers shows that according to reporting, Finland might have been better served by not drifting further towards the bold policy course that the aforementioned nations were taking.

4.2.3 The number of challengers rise and Finland gets into strange company

As the end of the previous chapter already hinted, during the Erhard and Grand Coalition era of the Federal Republic, it was not only the development of the Eastern relations and the growing criticism towards the Hallstein Doctrine that

⁸³⁵ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 18 October 1967 "Länsi-Saksan ja Jugoslavian diplomaattiset suhteet", p. 2.

⁸³⁶ UKK arkisto, 21 / 133 Saksojen kysymys, FFM secret memo 25 January 1968.

⁸³⁷ UM 5 C 5 A secret telegram from Cologne 24 November 1967, p. 1.

ungrounded the demand of Bonn for sole representation. Bonn was also forced to consider, as Mäkelä noted in the reporting, the reactions of the so-called Third World states. Especially as in the 1960s they were emerging in increasing amounts with their newly won independencies. They often forced Bonn to reconsider its foreign policy. This was because these young nations were in search of – and in the bargaining of – their alignment in the Cold War bi-polar system. Some of them, as in the case of Guinea (as already exemplified⁸³⁸) were expedient in exploiting the predilection in both sides of the Cold War to establish new alliances with these nations, no matter how minuscule their size and political significance were. However, most of these nations would eventually join the Non-Alignment Movement that was emerging more formally from the late 1950s and beginning of the 1960s, an important milestone in this regard being the 1956 Bandung Conference.⁸³⁹ Despite the Non-Alignment Movement officially siding with the Kremlin in the German question (through the influence of Yugoslavia), none of the Movement's countries (except for Yugoslavia) officially recognized the German Democratic Republic until the end of the 1960s.⁸⁴⁰

Finland joined the other Western as well as Eastern nations in establishing relations with emerging independent states in the Third World. However, contrary to the Yugoslavians, who had earlier taken their pointers from Finland but were moving towards non-alignment, the Finnish foreign ministry did not wish to get closer to the Non-Aligned Movement and chose to emphasize its neutrality through the official Paasikivi-Kekkonen line.⁸⁴¹ For example, the Beograd conference was not officially attended as it was feared that the conference would discuss divisive issues that would entangle Finland between the blocs; the anathema for the Finnish neutrality.⁸⁴²

Kekkonen's personal attitude towards these nations was also reserved; for example, as he visited Tunisia in the mid-1960s, he was worried that President Habib Bourguiba might exploit the visit against their former colonial master, France, with whom they still had disputes.⁸⁴³ It was probably not only on the level of international relations that Kekkonen felt this worry; his admiration of de Gaulle could have weighted as much in this extensive concern for France.

During the visit, Kekkonen officially announced, for the first time, Finland's support for the African nations that had been liberated or were fighting for self-determination. The positive message of the speech was mostly formulated in the Finnish Foreign Ministry, and Kekkonen himself had already noted the darker side of the leaders of the newly independent Third World states; that is, their propensity for lavishness and exploitation of power for their own benefit.⁸⁴⁴

⁸³⁸ See section 3.3.3

⁸³⁹ Kullaa 2012, 177.

⁸⁴⁰ Kullaa 2012, 178.

⁸⁴¹ Kullaa 2012, 178.

⁸⁴² Document of Finnish Foreign Ministry circa 1961, seen by the author (more precise reference lacking due to the fact that the document was not photographed or noted along with other primary sources).

⁸⁴³ Suomi 1994, 230.

⁸⁴⁴ Suomi 1994, 230.

And, as Kekkonen's reservations in the case of Tunisia already exemplified, in Cold War international politics there was often more at stake than just the particular relations of a certain Third World state. An insignificant appearing ally could be seen in the top echelons of Western or Eastern foreign policymakers as a gateway to closer relations with a cluster of countries that identified with this particular state, e.g. through common cultural heritage or a religion, or through both, such as in the case of the Arab states.

When it came to the two German states, this search for allies was especially evident, and both were more than willing to be among the first nations to recognize a newly emerging country that was trying to achieve its independence. These nations were, of course, more than willing to get recognition for their sovereignty, which was often self-proclaimed and still precarious. However, in the Federal Republic, the approach towards the newly independent nations of the Third World differed from the approach towards the East European states. In the developing world, Bonn's actions were guided more by practical considerations than by doctrinal purity.⁸⁴⁵

The Finnish Foreign Ministry followed, with interest, the formulations of Third World states when it came to the German question. The interest of the director general of the Political Department, Max Jakobson, was stirred when there began to loom a possibility of a first recognizer of East Germany that did not belong to the Eastern bloc: the case in question was Iraq.⁸⁴⁶ In fact, Iraq had been one of the nations that Veli Helenius had listed in his report discussing the case of Guinea, almost two years earlier, as a possible future recognizer of East Germany.⁸⁴⁷

The Guinean case had already shown, through Helenius' reporting, how much confusion could ensue from the tactics of East Germany with these nations. The method often utilized the vagueness of the actual level of relations and the ensuing titles, for example, in Egypt, the representative of East Germany to Cairo, Ernst Scholz, was titled as the "Plenipotentiary of the Government of the German Democratic Republic to Arab States".⁸⁴⁸ According to Helenius, after a month long avoidance of clear-cut answers concerning titles, including rumors that Guinea's ambassador to Moscow had been accredited to East Berlin, Bonn had finally managed to receive affirmation from Guinean President Sekou Toure that the relations would not advance to the diplomatic level. Helenius had also implicitly warned of the fickle nature and company of these nations in the international forum: he had noted that, at under 40 years of age, Sekou Toure was not only president, but also foreign minister as well as prime minister of Guinea,

⁸⁴⁵ Gray 2003, 70.

⁸⁴⁶ See the following documents (It is probable that Secretary of Section Pekuri had sent the letters asking for further information by the order of Director General of the Political Department Jakobson): UM 7 D II 307, letter from Joel Pekuri to Leo Tauren 28 June 1962; letter from Joel Pekuri to trade missions in Cologne and Berlin 28 January 1962; UM 7 D II 307, letter of Leo Tauren from Baghdad to Joel Pekuri 7 July 1962; UM 7 D II 307, letter from Cologne 6 July 1962.

⁸⁴⁷ See UM report Cologne 9 March 1960 "Tapaus Guinea".

⁸⁴⁸ Gray 2003, 88.

while acting in addition as leader of his own party and the Chairman of the African Union.⁸⁴⁹

Iraq's case, however, caused more action in the Finnish Foreign Ministry, and started an exchange of letters between the Ministry and the Finnish diplomats in Baghdad, East Berlin, and Bonn. The chain of letter exchange was initiated by a report of Leo Tauren, Finland's representative to Baghdad. He wrote concerning the exchange of consul generals between the German Democratic Republic and Iraq. According to Tauren, the situation had stirred the interest of the Federal Republic's ambassador to Baghdad, who had demanded written declaration from Iraq's government that the exchange of consul generals did not mean the recognition of the German Democratic Republic. After the refusal of the Iraq foreign minister to abide with the request, the Federal Republic bolstered its request by sending a two-man delegation to Baghdad. However, the Iraq Foreign Ministry continued to evade the meetings with them. The Ministry had, according to Tauren, rebutted all requests and demands by Bonn's official with a statement of the State Secretary, who had declared that Iraq was in no way obliged to explain its actions to any third nation, including the Federal Republic of Germany.⁸⁵⁰

The Finnish Foreign Ministry took immediate interest to Tauren's report and regarded that the situation deserved further enquiry. In this regard, Secretary of Section Joel Pekuri asked for further clarification by a letter. He forwarded the letter to the Finnish missions in Cologne and East Berlin – clearly implying a wish for possible comments on Tauren's report.⁸⁵¹

Tauren himself clarified that the East German representative had stated he was not holding *exequatur* and was functioning in the framework of the treaty signed by the two states. Surprisingly enough, Tauren had also been consulted by Bonn's officials: he had been invited to the house of Bonn's first secretary of the embassy along with the charge de affaires of the United States' embassy. The meeting had been organized because Bonn's Foreign Office's Middle East expert, Dr. Schirmer, and an expert of international law, Dr. Schenck, had wished to hear the opinion of the Finnish and American diplomats concerning the possible reactions in the diplomatic community in the case that Bonn was to close its embassy in Baghdad.⁸⁵² For Finland, this perhaps signaled that Bonn did not wish to equate it with the Third World countries, but that it, in a sense, equaled Finnish representative with his American colleague (who was undoubtedly epitomizing symbolically the West in this context). This was possibly also a part of Bonn's evident – and already discussed – general long line campaign of trying to keep Finland, in the German question as well as in general, integrated with the West. On the other hand, or simultaneously, it could have been also an implicit warning in Finland's direction that the tampering with the level of relations with East Berlin was still taken seriously in Bonn.

⁸⁴⁹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 9 March 1960, "Tapaus Guinea"; Gray 2003, 113.

⁸⁵⁰ UM 7 D II 307, report from Baghdad 20 June 1962, "Irakin suhteet Länsi- ja Itä-Saksaan".

⁸⁵¹ UM 7 D II 307, letter from Joel Pekuri to Leo Tauren 28 June 1962; letter from Joel Pekuri to trade missions in Cologne and Berlin 28 January 1962.

⁸⁵² UM 7 D II 307, letter of Leo Tauren from Baghdad to Joel Pekuri 7 July 1962.

From Cologne, Veli Helenius responded to the Finnish Foreign Ministry that, according to his information, Bonn's Head of the Eastern Department, Franz Krapf, had been discussing with Iraq's charge de affaires in Bonn and expressed his astonishment over the possibility that Iraq might wish to become the first recognizer of East Germany outside the Eastern bloc. All in all, Helenius report's concerning the events painted a clear picture of a vague situation: there were rumors and discussion between East German, West German, and Iraqi officials and politicians, and the gist of the matter seemed to lie in the question if the establishment of the consular relations now taking place was to be a prelude for the further advancement of relations. Iraq had referred to the earlier precedent set by Egypt and wondered that if Egypt could exchange consular representatives with the German Democratic Republic, why couldn't Iraq. Helenius had also received information that Bonn's aggravation seemed to be only increasing, because the government of Laos had also declared its intention to recognize East Germany. Bonn had, according to Helenius, retorted by declaring that it will consider the acknowledgment of the East German government as an unfriendly act and would consider termination of diplomatic relations with Laos if it would go through with its plans.⁸⁵³

Curiously enough, in relation to the newly independent states that were, at this point, emerging in extensive amounts, Finland drifted diplomatically into their company regarding the German question: East Berlin had consular relations by the middle of 1963 with Egypt, Syria, Yemen, Iraq, Burma, Cambodia, and Indonesia. The closest companions when it came to relations with East Berlin Finland found in the Third World countries that had official government-level trade missions: Guinea, Ghana, Mali, Morocco, Algeria, Lebanon, Sudan, India, and Ceylon. East Berlin had informal relations with seventeen other states, located mainly in Latin America and Europe, and their relations were handled through East German Chamber of Commerce.⁸⁵⁴ The Finnish representative in Berlin, Holger Sumelius, noticed the somewhat odd company of Finland as he was discussing the establishment of Ghana's government-level trade mission in the German Democratic Republic in September 1963. According to him, Finland was the only country outside the socialist bloc represented in East Germany along with Egypt and Ghana.⁸⁵⁵

However, Sumelius's evaluation that juxtaposed Finland with nations such as Egypt and Ghana could actually be seen, in some respects, as an understatement. In the evaluation of the East German trade mission in Helsinki two years earlier, Finland had been counted as a country that was not only at the same level with the Third World states in its relations with the German Democratic Republic, but according to the evaluation, even "somewhat further".⁸⁵⁶ Therefore, it could

⁸⁵³ UM 7 D II 307, letter from Cologne 6 July 1962.

⁸⁵⁴ Gray 2003, 148.

⁸⁵⁵ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 27 September 1963, "Uusin kaupallinen edustusto", p. 1. This was perhaps, however, a slight exaggeration, as also Morocco, Lebanon, and Sudan, which had government level missions could not be counted as socialist countries *per se*.

⁸⁵⁶ PAAA Mfaa L43 A14116, Aktenvermerk 3 March 1961.

have been also interpreted at this point that Finland was not only in the non-Western group of nations regarding the German question, but that it had even spearheaded the movement of nations that were diplomatically elevating the status of the German Democratic Republic.

Despite the fact that Finland, with its German policy, was in this peculiar – or somewhat unflattering – company, the West German Foreign Office received information which emphasized that Finland was not interested to procure further affiliation with them. Heinrich Böx noted that Finland's increasing co-operation with these nations should be seen in the context of its increased activity in the United Nations, which also created pressure for increased contacts and attention outside of Europe.⁸⁵⁷ Most probably he was referring to the fact that from the early 1960s, Finland began to send volunteers to the peacekeeping forces of the UN, and the role of Finland in UN was officially defined in 1961 by Kekkonen. At his speech, he noted that Finland's mission was to function in the UN as a "doctor", not a "judge".⁸⁵⁸

What is certain, however, is that Finland drifted not only in the German question, but on the international arena as well, to this dubious company of often erratically led Third World states. In the United Nations voting, Finland's behavior resembled, in the first half of the 1960s, Third World states such as Ghana or Egypt, who often abstained on the bloc dividing resolutions. This behavior was highlighted by the fact that neutrals other than Finland, on the other hand, usually voted with the Western states.⁸⁵⁹ The Finnish representative in the United Nations, Ralp Enckell, on the other hand, wrote to the ministry in 1962 that Finland's United Nations activity were seen as even more neutral than Sweden's and Austria's. Only Ireland was, according to him, regarded as being on a neutral level. With this he actually meant that Sweden and Austria were voting along the Western bloc lines, whereas Ireland was more independent in this regard. His clear promotion of Finland's neutrality in the case of voting, that was differentiating East and West, seemed to downplay the inconvenient company of underdeveloped nations led by capricious leaders. It was a company that once again was highlighted as Liberia's representative in the organization had lauded Finland's UN policy. Even Enckell, however, admitted in the beginning of his letter that Finland had often voted similarly to the Afro-Asian group.⁸⁶⁰

Finland also increasingly expanded its trade interest in the Third World in the beginning of the 1960s and the German question had to be considered even

⁸⁵⁷ PAAA B26 bd. 249 report from GDR trade mission 16 July 1964, "Reform des finnischen Auswärtigen Dienstes".

⁸⁵⁸ Suomi ja YK, 60-luvulla, Yhdistyneet Kansakunnat, <https://yk.fi/node/457> [received 16 July 2018].

⁸⁵⁹ For example, see United Nations resolutions from 1960-1963 concerning thermo-nuclear prohibition, the question of Tibet, Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, and the question of Hungary (resolutions A/RES/1964(XVIII); A/RES/1857(XVII); A/RES/1784(XVII); A/RES/1762(XVII); A/RES/1741(XVI); A/RES/1740(XVI); A/RES/1723(XVI); A/RES/1649(XVI), requested data from the United Nations, received by email on 1.2.2018).

⁸⁶⁰ UM 12 K, letter from Ralp Enckell, from the permanent representation of Finland in UN, New York, 16 November 1962.

on this level. The case with Ghana exemplified this: Finland agreed to establish trade missions with consular rights in Ghana in the beginning of 1960, and, at the same time, it was planned that there would be sent commercial delegations to the nations around the Gulf of Guinea, such as Ghana, Guinea, and Nigeria.⁸⁶¹ At that point, Finland's Commercial Secretary Heimovaara from Accra could inform the Foreign Ministry that Ghana did not hold diplomatic relations with East Germany, but that it had exchanged commercial agents with it.⁸⁶² The Foreign Ministry's pacification was comparatively short lived. Three years later, in 1963, Sumelius from East Berlin wrote of the possible establishment of relations between Ghana and Ulbricht's regime. He wrote that, for a significant period of time, there had been rumors circulating in East Berlin that some African state, either Ghana or Guinea, would establish a diplomatic mission in the German Democratic Republic. The rumors seemed to have been substantiated when a delegation from Ghana visited the Leipzig Fair.⁸⁶³ Ghana's leader Kwame Nkrumah had already earlier positioned himself in the East bloc's line in the German question. In the Belgrad conference in 1961, he had stated that the West Berlin was an island in the East German state.⁸⁶⁴ However, after Sumelius' report from September 1963, in April 1964, President Nkrumah and Ghanaian Foreign Minister Botsio assured West German State Secretary Lahr that Ghana would not recognize the East Germany. President Nkrumah was also expressing his wish for the re-unification of Germany.⁸⁶⁵

The Ghanaian "connection" brought about a moment that must have struck Sumelius with a loss for words: the newly independent Africans were approaching the German question through Finland's precedent in representation. Sumelius had received a visit in his office in East Berlin from J. Mensa Bonsu, who had informed Sumelius that he was the head of the newly founded trade mission of Ghana. Bonsu had explained to Sumelius that he had previously served in the ministry of trade and emphasized to Sumelius the commercial nature of his latest assignment. He had also expressed great interest with regards to the relations of EFTA and Finland and stated that his country was interested in West European markets. The awkwardness of the situation must have increased for Sumelius, as the Western press had, on the same day reported, that Bonn had called its representative in Ghana home for consultations.⁸⁶⁶

What seemed to be happening, in its essence, was that Ghana appropriated the modus operandi of Finland by emphasizing the commercial aspect of the relations, while the diplomatic side of relations was to be executed under the guise of this "diplomatic umbrella". Yet it was clear that Bonsu's post, in fact, had political implications as much as an officially diplomatic assignment would have had. Had

⁸⁶¹ UM 5 G 71 Accra, Director General of the Administrative Department T. Tikanvaara to kaupallinen sihteeri M.K. Heimovaara 24 March 1960.

⁸⁶² UM 5 G 71 Accra, letter to ministry by kaupallinen sihteeri M.K. Heimovaara 15 March 1960.

⁸⁶³ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 27 September 1963, "Uusin kaupallinen edustusto", p. 1.

⁸⁶⁴ Kilian 2001, 68.

⁸⁶⁵ AAPD, 30 April 1964, State Secretary Lahr's telegram for Foreign Minister Schröder, concerning his talks with Nkrumah and Botsio.

⁸⁶⁶ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 27 September 1963, "Uusin kaupallinen edustusto", p. 1.

his assignment been strictly delineated in the sphere of commercial interests, it would not have initiated the West German Foreign Office to call its representative home for consultations (this time there was no ambiguity such as in the Guinean case regarding the status: it was a trade mission). It seemed that Finland's strange position between the East and West was offering an example for this African nation. This was implied also by the fact that Bonsu had referred to Finland's EFTA solution and to Western markets. The Finnish EFTA solution (negotiated by Olavi Munkki, the former representative of Finland to the Federal Republic) could be seen as a solution for holding privileged access in both Eastern and Western markets. It was a prime example of the Cold War balancing, and this was of course often – as mentioned in the beginning of the chapter – the option that many Third World states sought to exploit. The interest towards the Finnish form of representation was, as the previous discussion of the reporting in the 1950s showed, not limited to only Ghana. Earlier it had been the Syrians that had been intrigued by the Finnish solution and its nuances of the representation's form.⁸⁶⁷

The diplomatic dimension of the relations was, according to Sumelius, unavoidable in this case, he wrote:

The leading circles of the German Democratic Republic have full reason for being satisfied, independently of what kind of official status the new representative office or its chief has, this means, after all, that a third country outside the Eastern bloc is now officially represented here, and yours truly evaluates that for Bonn it is hard to target this case with the Hallstein Doctrine. One of the most prominent goals of German Democratic Republic's policy is to, partly by invented, partly by actually existing "realities", to force the Federal Republic of Germany to recognize the existence of the two German states.⁸⁶⁸

Sumelius' view could be considered as having a strong basis, as in the early 1950s, East German officials, especially in the Ministry for Intra-German and Foreign Trade, had evaluated targeted trade deals as a springboard for the political goals of the SED.⁸⁶⁹ However, Sumelius seemed to wish to calm the Finnish Foreign Ministry by evaluating that Ghana had tried to maintain the utmost discreetness in the matter of its representation in the German Democratic Republic. East Berlin seemed to have been willing to respect their wishes as Sumelius noted that, so far, the Foreign Ministry of the German Democratic Republic had not even announced the founding of the new representative office. He also interpreted that Bonsu did not possess diplomatic or consular rights; this was manifested, according to Sumelius, by the farewell ceremony organized for the German Democratic

⁸⁶⁷ See section 3.1.2, Syrian case.

⁸⁶⁸ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 27 September 1963, "Uusin kaupallinen edustusto", p. 1. "SDT:n johtavilla piireillä on täysi syy tyytyväisyyteen, aivan riippumatta siitä, min-käläinen virallinen status uudella edustustolla tai sen päälliköllä on, merkitsee tämä kuitenkin sitä, että kolmas itäblokin ulkopuolella oleva maa on täällä virallisesti edustettuna ja allekirjoittaneen mielestä Bonnin on vaikeata tähän tapaukseen soveltaa Hallstein-oppia. Eräs SDT:n politiikan tärkeimmistä tavoitteista on, osaksi keksityillä, mutta mieluummin todellisilla "realiteeteilla" pakottaa Saksan Liittotasavaltaa tunnustamaan kahden saksalaisen valtion olemassaolo."

⁸⁶⁹ Gray 2003, 28.

Republic's government delegation to Warsaw. In the occasion held in airport Ghana's representative had been standing last in the line after the charge de affairs of the United Arab Republic (Egypt).⁸⁷⁰

Despite his observations that could, to a certain extent, assuage the Foreign Ministry, what Sumelius was in its essence saying here was that not only did Finland offer an example for Ghana but had actually even gone further than it regarding the diplomatic relations. As Sumelius noted, the Ghanaians did not hold consular rights, which was the case in Finland's mission that was, in practice, also holding the diplomatic status. This interpretation is also supported by the inner information exchange of the West German Foreign Office. The memo did not only categorize Finland with Ghana and Egypt, but it also noted that the Finnish relations were further than Ghana's (and Egypt's). A hauntingly similar analysis that the East Germans had made earlier as was shown by previous discussion. The memo posited that the Finnish diplomatic representative, Sumelius, was in fact enjoying full diplomatic status and privileges in East Berlin: something that the memo did not attribute for Mr. Bonsa who had visited the Finnish trade mission.⁸⁷¹

As the previous quotation proved, Sumelius himself seemed to be ready to acknowledge the political implications of Ghana's representation. All in all, Sumelius' take on the status of representation seemed to emphasize the symbolic aspect of the representation's status, not its official title. In Sumelius' viewpoint, the representation, whatever its official title, was still a diplomatic act. Yet, he still admitted that its ambivalent form made it harder for the Federal Republic to counter these diplomatic maneuvers.

Among these cases that tested the Doctrine could include, from December 1963, the island nation of Zanzibar. Despite that it was to form quite a peculiar case for the German states – as can be soon seen in the following discussion of its reporting on its path to independence – on its path to independence Zanzibar had manifested all the general features of African nationalism. It shared the wholesale importation of Western cultural and political norms with other sub-Saharan African revolutions, which often induced into the population the overt, but not actual, quest for liberal values, as their inception often came with little or no knowledge of their actual implications. In any case, concepts such as national freedom, self-government, civil liberties, and political and social freedom enticed the people's appetite for political change. In Zanzibar, the ideas of Marxism-Leninism were also increasingly superimposed over these values. However, in the initial phase of independence at late 1963, their proponents were not in such a position politically that it would have repelled West Germany from striving to establish diplomatic relations with it.⁸⁷²

⁸⁷⁰ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 27 September 1963, "Uusin kaupallinen edustusto", p. 1.

⁸⁷¹ PAAA B26 bd. 354, memo from FRG Foreign Office's Berlin information service 19 February 1965 "Vertretungen nichtkommunistischer Länder in der SBZ".

⁸⁷² Lofchie 1963, 187.

In the case of Zanzibar, however, the struggle of the Federal Republic to overtake its rival in the establishment of relations with the island state led to a humiliating series of events for the foreign minister of the Federal Republic.⁸⁷³ Both Mäkelä in Bonn and Sumelius in East Berlin informed the Finnish Foreign Ministry how Zanzibar's foreign relations with the German states had developed. The reporting of these cases seemed to point out that Bonn could, in certain cases, formulate its foreign relations independently of its Western allies, most importantly the United States. This maneuvering room seemed to also reach the sphere of the Hallstein Doctrine and diplomatic relations.⁸⁷⁴

The events relating to the establishment of diplomatic relations had begun to unfold on 10 December, 1963, when Zanzibar had gained its independence, yet retained its membership in the British Commonwealth.⁸⁷⁵ Most countries had recognized Zanzibar soon after, including West Germany.⁸⁷⁶ However, quite soon after, the island saw more tumultuous political upheavals, and, ultimately, a revolution. In the end, the leadership on the island had been assumed by, in Mäkelä's description, the "extreme-leftist War-Marshall [John] Okello", hailing from the ranks of the Afro-Shirazi Party (ASP). Consequently, on 19 January, Zanzibar had been declared as the People's Republic of Zanzibar. The new government was quickly recognized by the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, and Ghana.⁸⁷⁷ A diplomatic debacle had followed which had included – once again as so often is the case in newly independent nations with regards to the German states – an extensive amount of rumors, false information, unsuccessful contact attempts to the Zanzibar government by the West German delegation, an assurance by Zanzibar President Abeid Amani Karume that the country would not establish diplomatic relations with East Berlin, and, ultimately, an establishment of diplomatic relations between Zanzibar and the German Democratic Republic on 20 February 1964.⁸⁷⁸

Sumelius concluded by expressing that it seemed evident that this awkward and even humiliating series of events for Bonn had not been caused only by the tumultuous events of the young nation. He seemed to imply that the diplomatic race had been organized politically, as he brought up the recent interpretation of the *Die Welt* newspaper, which had claimed that the whole maneuver had been executed following the directions from the East. The purpose had been to lead astray the Federal Republic and, at the same time, achieve its recognition for Zanzibar – which would have, consequently, alleviated achieving the recognition of other Western states.⁸⁷⁹ Of course, *Die Welt's* political orientation towards the

⁸⁷³ See UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 29 February 1964, "Saksan Liittotasavallan ja Sansibarın nykysuhteista".

⁸⁷⁴ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 29 February 1964, "Saksan Liittotasavallan ja Sansibarın nykysuhteista", p. 3; UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 25 February 1964, "Sansibarın tapaus".

⁸⁷⁵ Lofchie 1963, 190.

⁸⁷⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 29 February 1964, "Saksan Liittotasavallan ja Sansibarın nykysuhteista", p. 1.

⁸⁷⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 29 February 1964, "Saksan Liittotasavallan ja Sansibarın nykysuhteista", p. 2.

⁸⁷⁸ UM report Cologne 29 February 1964, "Saksan Liittotasavallan ja Sansibarın nykysuhteista", p. 3; UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 25 February 1964, "Sansibarın tapaus", p. 2.

⁸⁷⁹ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 25 February 1964, "Sansibarın tapaus", p. 2.

right could partly explain its propensity to see the socialist scheming behind the occasion. Yet, Sumelius' choice to quote it at least indicated that he thought there could have been something of the aforementioned involved in the case.

Only a few days later, Sumelius' colleague in Bonn, Mäkelä, presented information that showed that the Hallstein Doctrine and the diplomatic relations of West Germany in general did not seem to be connected to the West German allies or to the disposition of the West at all. He reported that Zanzibar had managed to achieve the recognition of some of the Western states who were also the Federal Republic's allies. Most important for the Federal Republic of these nations was, in Mäkelä's view, its strongest ally, the United States. Also, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand had decided to recognize Zanzibar's new government. Mäkelä had, however, received confirmation that the Federal Republic was not going to establish relations with Zanzibar. Mäkelä's report seemed to point out that the Hallstein Doctrine was seen in the West as part of the domestic policy of the Federal Republic. It could be interpreted, in other words, that it was not the part of the West's constructed symbolic order of general Cold War policy. Mäkelä, on the other hand, saw real political reasons behind this rupture in the West's and West German's outlook: his interpretation was that Zanzibar was more significant for great powers than for the Federal Republic. Therefore, for the Federal Republic, it was not reason enough to give up the Hallstein Doctrine.⁸⁸⁰

Zanzibar, in fact, was exemplifying well the strategy of the Bonn's Foreign Office regarding the Third World newly independent nations at this point, and it also showed where Bonn drew the line in its tolerance concerning the flexibility of the Doctrine. Bonn regarded its bilateral relations in the larger framework and feared that certain cases might be the precedent for others. And, as Amit Das Gupta has argued, Bonn concentrated in its Third World policy most on the certain states or figures that they regarded being in the key position among the states that were positioned outside the blocs.⁸⁸¹

The uncompromising stance of Bonn in the case of Zanzibar was most likely bolstered by the sharpened focus in the foreign office in the diplomatic battle against East Berlin. In order to better its isolation campaign of the German Democratic Republic, the foreign office was re-organized in the spring of 1963 by Foreign Minister Schröder and State Secretary Karl Carstens. They had assembled the whole staff working on the matters of the Third World in a single department, which was put under the direction of the Josef Jansen. According to William Glenn Gray, Jansen, a devout catholic, viewed the fight against communism even from a religious perspective.⁸⁸² In its rejection of relations with Zanzibar, Bonn wished once again to set a cautionary example. However, even Bonn most likely did not believe that Zanzibar would act as one, since the Federal Republic had

⁸⁸⁰ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 29 February 1964, "Saksan Liittotasavallan ja Sansibarin nykysuhteista", p. 3.

⁸⁸¹ Gupta 2004, 13.

⁸⁸² Gray 2003, 155.

no economic or political commitments towards the island. Therefore, the non-existent diplomatic relations were not any real showcase of Bonn's seriousness regarding the Doctrine, as it incurred no political or economic losses.⁸⁸³

According to Finnish diplomats on both sides of Germany, the more difficult problems than Ghana or Zanzibar for Bonn was in the relations with Ceylon.⁸⁸⁴ This was because of the previous overt economic commitments of the Federal Republic: Ceylon was one of the major receivers of the Federal Republic's development aid. Mäkelä detailed, in his report in February 1964, the substantial loans to Ceylon by the Federal Republic and the capital donation treaty signed in October 1963, which stipulated that Ceylon was to receive six million West German marks (*Deutsche Mark*) through the development aid bank in Colombo.⁸⁸⁵

However, according to the same report, it seemed that there was impending turbulence for the relations. Mäkelä noted the official bulletin of the Federal Republic's government which stated that the Federal Republic's government had received unpleasant information regarding the commercial consulate of the German Democratic Republic in Colombo. The information in question was Bonn's interpretation of the Ceylon government bulletin. According to Bonn, it implied that the German Democratic Republic's commercial consulate in Colombo was to be transformed to a head consular office. And, according to other Ceylonese sources, the German Democratic Republic's Deputy Prime Minister Leuschner, who had recently visited Ceylon, had promised 67 million German marks as a loan for Ceylon, and the German Democratic Republic had, on the same occasion, promised to start purchasing Ceylonese products. It was claimed by Bonn that at this occasion the prime minister of Ceylon, Miss Sirinawa Bandaranaike, had restated the same stance that she had already declared in 1963: that the German question should be solved according to the will of the communists.⁸⁸⁶

The Federal Republic had also stated that the granting of the right to establish a consulate-general, and the aforementioned statements of the Prime Minister Bandaranaike, were against the benefit of the German people. The statement posited that as it was responsible for German people, the government of the Federal Republic therefore considered it impossible to continue distributing development aid for Ceylon.⁸⁸⁷

Mäkelä once again reported the often witnessed rivalry that would initiate between Bonn and East Berlin in these vague cases of Third World states playing the two German states against each other. These cases exemplified the often undiplomatic and crude approach the Third World states adopted in their approach to play East and West Germany (and, through them, the Cold War blocs) against each other in order to receive benefits from both. Their actions in these cases contrasted extensively with Finland's extremely cautious and diplomatic approach to the German question. It was therefore also most likely a huge frustration for

⁸⁸³ Gray 2003, 157.

⁸⁸⁴ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 29 February 1964, "Liittotasavalta-Ceylon-DDR", p. 1.

⁸⁸⁵ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 29 February 1964, "Liittotasavalta-Ceylon-DDR", p. 1.

⁸⁸⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 29 February 1964, "Liittotasavalta-Ceylon-DDR", p. 1.

⁸⁸⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 29 February 1964, "Liittotasavalta-Ceylon-DDR", p. 2.

the Finnish diplomats to realize, at this period, that the nation they were representing was increasingly resembling these states in the German question. In other words, Finland was less and less a special case, and increasingly an unwilling trailblazer in the German question, being even further (in favor of East Germany) in the German question than the Third World states exploiting the rivalry of the two German states

Mäkelä, however, pointed out that it seemed Ceylon had actually crossed the tolerance line of Bonn, and, possibly realizing the damage ensued by losing the relations with West Germany, had starting to back off from its challenging of the German states. According to Mäkelä, the aggravation from the part of the Federal Republic regarding the events had been expressed in such a clear manner that Ceylon had now pled to the fact that the representative of the German Democratic Republic did not receive *exequatur* and that there had been no discussion regarding the diplomatic acknowledgment of the German Democratic Republic. These conditions were, according to Ceylon, also approved by the German Democratic Republic.⁸⁸⁸

Yet it seemed, as Mäkelä stated in the next passages of the report, that the pleas of Ceylon were futile. The Federal Republic had continued to dismiss them by explaining why certain other cases of the German Democratic Republic's consular offices were not comparable precedents. Namely, they were the German Democratic Republic's offices in Cairo and Damascus. The interpretation of the Federal Republic why Colombo differed from Cairo and Damascus was based on the capital treaty signed between Ceylon and the Federal Republic in 1963. The treaty included a clause stipulating that both countries were to hold friendly relations with each other. The fact that Ceylon now allowed the German Democratic Republic to establish a head consular office was, by Bonn's interpretation, violating this clause.⁸⁸⁹ Of course, to anyone's ears, this explanation would have sounded like somewhat of an *ad hoc* improvisation. It was quite evident that even without this kind of clause the establishment of relations between two nations included the will to hold friendly relations. Therefore, Cairo and Damascus would not have differed from Ceylon in their relation to the Federal Republic considering this argument. For the Finnish Foreign Ministry, it must have been a relief that Mäkelä reported that in comparing the other consular-level relations, Bonn had not mentioned Finland. Of course, it was also to Bonn's advantage: after all, as earlier discussed, their own inner communication proved that the relations with Finland were even more developed than the basic consular level.

Mäkelä also seemed to imply that the direction that Ceylon took was no different than other – already multiple – Third World states that were initiating relations with Ulbricht's regime had taken; Mäkelä doubted if Bonn was actually going to go through with their decision to cut financial aid to Ceylon. He regarded that the crux of the question was if Ceylon was actually going to grant *exequatur* to the East German representative. If not, the office would only be a

⁸⁸⁸ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 29 February 1964, "Liittotasavalta-Ceylon-DDR", p. 2.

⁸⁸⁹ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 29 February 1964, "Liittotasavalta-Ceylon-DDR", p. 2.

“title office”, as Mäkelä put it, making a difference – as had other Finnish representatives in Bonn – with the official title and the actual actions of the mission. Mäkelä was also quite sure that the Federal Republic’s foreign minister was not going to suggest cutting off diplomatic relations if the Ceylon government declared that the establishment of a consular office was not going to mean the recognition of the Pankow government. Mäkelä’s interpretation was that the representation would be similar to what the German Democratic Republic had in Syria.⁸⁹⁰ In Syria’s case, which had unfurled in 1956, there had been extensive vested interests by West German trade circles. This led to the involvement of the Federal Republic’s Economics Ministry in the matter as the ministry’s State Secretary Westrick had conveyed a message for Bonn foreign policymakers, pointing out that the harsh treatment of Syria might alienate oil-producing Arab states and endanger West German’s access to the area’s abundant oil markets.⁸⁹¹

It was perhaps these aspects that led Mäkelä to the conclusion that Ceylon could not be regarded as a true test for the Hallstein Doctrine. Mäkelä based this on the interpretation that trade was the decisive factor with regards to the Hallstein Doctrine – implying that it actually superseded the political level. His conclusion seemed to be the Doctrine could be bypassed in cases where there were substantial trade relations at stake. And, in this respect, he noted that the commercial interaction between the Federal Republic and Ceylon was so minuscule that Ceylon could not be regarded as a test for the Hallstein Doctrine. The severance of relations would not cause a noticeable damage to the trade of the Federal Republic. Also, after all these events, it was, according to Mäkelä, a common conception in the diplomatic circles of Bonn that it was unlikely that Bandaranaike would visit Bonn in May during her European visit, as had been originally planned.⁸⁹²

In East Berlin, Sumelius used the Ceylon case as a case study that could reveal some general aspects he had discerned in the German Democratic Republic’s foreign policy towards Third World states. Sumelius contextualized the German Democratic Republic’s Ceylon negotiations as a part of larger foreign policy initiative that East Berlin had undertaken. Around the middle of January, the German Democratic Republic had sent a delegation on a South Asian tour which lasted for over a month. The delegation had visited Indonesia, Burma, Cambodia, India, and Ceylon. The purpose of the trip had been to construct and bolster East Germany on the conceptual level of international politics, as well as in bilateral relations with these nations; that is, to strengthen the political and commercial relations with the aforementioned nations by minutes or by joint communiques. Sumelius evaluated that the secondary objective had been to influence the coming conference of Non-Aligned Movement nations, as Ceylon and Indonesia were actively participating in the movement.⁸⁹³

⁸⁹⁰ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 29 February 1964, “Liittotasavalta–Ceylon–DDR”, p. 3.

⁸⁹¹ Gray 2003, 66.

⁸⁹² UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 29 February 1964, “Liittotasavalta–Ceylon–DDR”, p. 3.

⁸⁹³ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 26 February 1964, “SDT:n valtuuskunnan matka Etelä-Aasiaan”, p. 1.

Curiously enough, if Sumelius had already tied Finland implicitly in the category of the Third World states, there was now another link also discussed by him: the oncoming non-aligned conference in Cairo⁸⁹⁴. The Finnish Foreign Ministry decided to send an observer to the conference, which, without a doubt, linked Finland indirectly to the participating nations. It is possible that Sumelius was once again implicitly emphasizing the odd company of Finland in the German question, and even possibly warning of Finland's role as a trailblazer for the Third World "breakers" of the Hallstein Doctrine

The upcoming second conference of non-aligned nations was also an event for which the Federal Republic's foreign office dedicated much of its work in 1964. It started a lobbying campaign to ensure a favorable outcome from the conference with regards to the German question. This led to a strange logic in the foreign policy; the Foreign Office's strategy in the campaign was to offer generous financial benefits for those countries that were closest to the recognition of the German Democratic Republic and were possibly inciting others in the non-aligned group to take a similar stance. In practice, Bonn was giving rewards to nations that had defied its isolation campaign of East Germany. The first one to achieve the new rounds of benefits was Yugoslavia, followed by Algeria. In Algeria's case, the initial good relations during 1962 and 1963 had begun to sour by the middle of 1964, when President Ahmed Ben Bella was increasingly allured to socialism and drifted towards the East in the Cold War international relations, which was then manifested by his trip to Moscow.⁸⁹⁵

It was in this context of the upcoming non-aligned conference that the sudden burst of activity of both German states regarding the Third World could be explained. And, as Sumelius already mentioned, the East German delegation's tour in South Asia could be seen as a countermeasure to Bonn's overtures towards the non-aligned nations. According to Sumelius, it was especially the Ceylon leg of the tour that had been successful: the delegation had achieved a direct negotiation contact with Prime Minister Bandaranaike. As a result, there had been an exchange of notes which agreed on the elevation of the German Democratic Republic's commercial consulate to a status of consulate general. The German Democratic Republic had, on the same occasion, promised a substantial loan of 64 million East German marks (named *Deutsche Mark* similarly to the West German currency during the years 1951–1964⁸⁹⁶) and to initiate a cultural exchange with Ceylon in the future.⁸⁹⁷

Sumelius saw that these results were unpleasant for the Federal Republic, as it had strived to achieve the support of Ceylon by generous loans. Proportionally, Ceylon also received the largest amount of the Federal Republic's development aid. The Western nations, as well as the Federal Republic, had already performed *démarches* due to the elevation of the German Democratic Republic's

⁸⁹⁴ PAAA B26 bd. 354, FRG trade mission in Helsinki, Jahresbericht 1964.

⁸⁹⁵ Gray 2003, 165, 166.

⁸⁹⁶ Later Mark der Deutschen Notenbank, MDN, 1964–1967, Mark der DDR, M, 1968–1990.

⁸⁹⁷ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 26 February 1964, "SDT:n valtuuskunnan matka Etelä-Aasiaan", p. 3.

trade mission's status. From the part of Ceylon there had been an explanation given that the founding of the consulate general did not mean diplomatic recognition and that these kinds of consular offices already existed in the capitals of other South Asian states. It was also pointed out that the new consul would not receive *exequatur*. However, Sumelius saw this as a trivial detail when it was known that most of the German Democratic Republic's trade missions also handled normal consular matters.⁸⁹⁸ This was a view that had showed up previously in the reporting, and Finnish diplomats did not seem to find very much value in the diplomatic complication of the official title and the actions of the missions. All in all, this was an especially interesting interpretation from Sumelius because it seemed to imply that, in many respects, Finland could be considered among the recognizers of the German Democratic Republic. The Finnish trade mission in East Berlin and the East German trade mission in Helsinki were – as had been already mentioned in the reporting – functioning as *de facto* normal consular or diplomatic offices.

Sumelius concluded by noting that, so far, Bonn had reacted only by announcing that its role as Ceylon's creditor was, for the moment, suspended. Yet, the old credit agreements were not to be nullified. For Sumelius, all this proved "that the Hallstein Doctrine is in dire condition as Bonn has not managed to hold on to it in a consistent manner". As if to bolster his earlier implication regarding the masquerade of trade missions handling diplomatic matters, he regarded that it seemed only a matter of time before the Doctrine had to be altered to also include the representative offices that functioned as *de facto* diplomatic missions. The situation from Bonn's point of view was worsening since the German Democratic Republic had managed to present the treaty with Bonn concerning the visiting permits, especially for the developing countries, as Bonn's *de facto* acceptance of two-state theory.⁸⁹⁹ The cases such as Tanzania, Ghana, and Ceylon, and, in the wake of them, in 1965, the case of Egypt, that had shown similar features of diplomatic tug-of-war caused the Federal Republic's government to receive strong criticism from the press – as well as other areas of society – from both ends of the political spectrum. It attacked its foreign policy and the increasingly infamous Hallstein Doctrine. *Der Spiegel* and *Die Welt* had demanded the "fixing of the Doctrine", and also *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* had written on the issue. The basic message of the press was that if the Doctrine had lost most of its effectiveness, then the possible future applications of it and the benefits gained from it should be balanced against the possible negative implications of the Doctrine's applicability. In this respect, Mäkelä evaluated that from now on the benefits should be much higher than before, in order for the Doctrine's use to be justified. Mäkelä's opinion was that *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* resulted in "an interesting conclusion" and only demanded the abolishment of the automatic

⁸⁹⁸ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 26 February 1964, "SDT:n valtuuskunnan matka Etelä-Aasiaan", pp. 3, 4.

⁸⁹⁹ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 26 February 1964, "SDT:n valtuuskunnan matka Etelä-Aasiaan", p. 4.

adoption of the Hallstein Doctrine in the form of renouncing development aid for countries that established relations with the German Democratic Republic.⁹⁰⁰

Sumelius evaluated that East Berlin's search for allies in the developing nations had borne positive results politically. Still, most of the visited countries had only conceded to East German wishes to such an extent that their balancing between the East and the West was kept intact – perhaps excluding only Ceylon. It was to be noted that during the visits there had been no public announcement of the plans to establish representative offices of the visited countries to Berlin. "This was probably the next goal of the German Democratic Republic's policy", Sumelius noted.⁹⁰¹

As this reporting from Sumelius showed, it could be interpreted in the Finnish Foreign Ministry that, in 1964, East Berlin managed to corrode the sole representation demand of Bonn through the Third World. A similar view was discernible in Mäkelä's reports as well. In his own conclusion he noted that the "borderline in the execution of Hallstein Doctrine had been reached". According to Mäkelä, when it came to the Federal Republic's exclusive right to speak for the whole of the German people, the West did not yet challenge it, but the acknowledgement of the German Democratic Republic was increasingly supported in the cabinets of the developing nations. As a consequence, the Federal Republic no longer considered it expedient to raise its development aid. In Mäkelä's view, all this led to a situation where the Federal Republic had only two options with regards to a third nation that was building foreign relations with East Berlin: it could either cut off its diplomatic relations with any such nation, or try to make those particular nations establish some sort of semi-diplomatic relations with East Berlin.⁹⁰² This showed that there was some sort of limit reached in Bonn's multiple modifications of its Doctrine and in its relations to development aid. Of course, these reports also showed that the company of the Third World states for Finland was a company that was an equivalent only on its overt surface level. In actuality, Finland had already ventured further than them, and, consequently, the Doctrine, in the case of Finland, had bended substantially.

4.3 Conclusions: 1960s, constructing and defending the policy's neutrality

Regarding the Finnish German policy, the beginning of the 1960s did not bode well for Finland. The official Finno-German relations seemed to be in low tide; inner communications of the West German Foreign Office revealed that, in their view, there was a clear bias discerned in the Finnish foreign policy towards the East. However, for them, Finland appeared to be a case that had to be fought for

⁹⁰⁰ UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 27 February 1965, "Hallstein-oppi nykyoloissa", p. 2.

⁹⁰¹ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 26 February 1964, "SDT:n valtuuskunnan matka Etelä-Aasiaan", pp. 4, 5.

⁹⁰² UM 5 C 5 A report Cologne 27 February 1965, "Hallstein-oppi nykyoloissa", p. 3.

politically – it was considered necessary to keep Finland integrated to the West – and that West Germany would do its part in this battle. Curiously enough, it seems that, at this point, it was the Finnish diplomats that functioned as a sort of a counterbalance to Kekkonen. During the 1960s he was attacking West Germany with rhetoric that was nearing the socialist bloc's in its alarmistic nature concerning the threat of West Germany to European peace. Kekkonen's rhetoric was almost explicitly challenged in the reporting, as it was noted that its basic premise (West Germany as a threat to European peace) was untenable. The Finnish diplomats contrary to Kekkonen's (at least overt stance), were clearly West-oriented. They were also coming from Finnish age cohort that was culturally in the Germanophilic atmosphere raised and permeated. This was clearly noted with great satisfaction in the inner exchange of information by the West German Foreign Office. One could even guess that the diplomats were chosen to their post partly in this regard – with the tacit acknowledgment of Kekkonen, who was well aware of his controversiality in the West.

For the Federal Republic – as well as for most other nations – the early 1960s meant an increased international co-operation. Against this framework could also be understood the continued and constant interest in the Federal Republic to better the relations with the neighboring socialist states. It was the geopolitical and geographical reality that could not be denied – even though when it came to Bonn's relations with East Germany this denial still managed to linger. The proof of this was that the term "Soviet occupation zone" was still often used in the official political discourse concerning the subject. Therefore, in this respect, the discursive level of policymaking was not yet ready to converge with the underlying necessities and will that existed for better relations in West Germany. This was noted by Finnish representative Torsten Tikanvaara. According to him, the interest in West Germany to better its Eastern relations was, in fact, a tangible phenomenon driven particularly by the trade circles of the country.

The Eastern policy, especially after the change of Chancellorship from Adenaur to Ludwig Erhard, was looked at by Finnish diplomats with a slight hint of optimism when it came to the long, stagnant German question. However, in this regard, the diplomats were not indicating that German politics were distressed in this respect, especially by the general postwar problems in Europe: entanglement of the domestic policy with the foreign policy through contested borders. The German case was also imbued with the expellee issues that were arising from disputed territories with Poland and Czechoslovakia. Regarding the political life of West Germany, the reporting showed how there was discrepancy in what was strived for in its foreign policy (the better Eastern relations, and perhaps ultimately acknowledgment of the loss of former German territories such as Oder-Neisse and Sudeten ares), but what was difficult to advocate officially without possible consequences in the domestic voter base due to the strong influence of the expellee lobby that could not be left without calculation especially in the foreign policy of CDU/CSU. In this regard, the reporting implied that if some third nation, such as Finland, would make decisions concerning the recog-

nition of East Germany; it was not only foreign policy act, but in the Federal Republic it was also very much intruding the sphere of domestic politics. This was of course, also the basic reason why the German question in general was so difficult: it was not only the East and West that were competing for proper solution, it was also the political parties of the Federal Republic that were competing as much in the issue.

This intricateness of the German–German relations – an innate part of the Eastern policy – ultimately forced the Finnish diplomats to jettison their former optimism regarding Erhard’s possibilities in the Eastern policy. It was not clear, according to the reporting, whether the new Eastern policy could become a political mend for the ruptured relations of the two German states. Mäkelä noted that the Eastern policy and its acceptance in the Eastern bloc was in no way uniform. This was not least brought about by the fact that Walter Ulbricht had managed to build a countercoalition with Czechoslovakia and Poland against Erhard’s Eastern policy. In this respect, Sumelius had already informed the Foreign Ministry of the possible inimical reactions towards the overtures of Erhard’s cabinet towards the East. It was a feat that the East German leadership easily interpreted as striving to isolate it from its socialist partner countries. Even the successes of the Erhard government in the openings of a diplomatic frontier in the East did not cause Finnish diplomats to radically reconsider their views on the implications of the policy. It was not clear at all that the Eastern policy would prove to be driving force in the general relaxation of tensions in the relations of Bonn with the socialist countries.

When this is regarded in the context of the reporting concerning the Eastern policy, it might have messaged to Finnish foreign policymakers that even though the Eastern policy gave some hope for the advancement of the German question, it was too early to make far-reaching conclusions of its ultimateness. In the context of some of the Bonn’s already established Eastern relations, he seemed to implicitly also point out to the Finnish foreign policymakers that, despite Finland’s attempts to integrate with the West, for example, through EFTA, it was no excuse to dismiss the integrity in the relations with the East. Perhaps this reminder was elicited by the previous crises in the Finnish foreign policy that had questioned the independency of the Finnish policymaking – along with some alarming tendencies in the domestic policy where communists seemed to gain increased foothold in Finnish politics.

If one is to be inevitably a captive to one’s own time, then in this respect can also be understood in the reporting the analysis of the Hallstein Doctrine during the 1960s in a brand new context, that is, in the framework of international law. The reporting reflected not only the increasing international discourse towards the judicial aspect of the international relations, but also the professionalization and theorization of the Finnish foreign policymaking (and a return to the foreign policy discourse of the 1920s and 1930s which relied on a similar leaning on international idealism). In fact, the reporting was a couple of years ahead of the nomination of theoretically oriented minds in the lead positions of the ministry, such as Risto Hyvärinen and Keijo Korhonen from 1967 on. Kaarlo Mäkelä had

noted in 1964 that, from the standpoint of the international law, the demand by West Germany for sole representation was not valid. His view was that status of the Federal Republic of Germany as an heir of the Reich was not, from a theoretical perspective, explicitly justified. Mäkelä's upshot was that, therefore, West Germany could not claim the status of the former and only true Germany. Consequently, it seems that he, in this report, ostensibly noted that Finland's German policy should not be argued from the international law's vantage point, as the interpretations from that standpoint were bound for endless theoretical arguments. Even West Germany's own demands of sole representation of the German people were not necessarily valid from that standpoint, then why should another nations' German policy be justified on this precarious base?

The Doctrine was not only challenged by this theoretical standpoint but through the empirical reality of international relations where it was increasingly tested by the new phenomenon: the spawning of new independent ex-colonial states in Asia and Africa. In the Federal Republic's foreign policy, as well as the German Democratic Republic's, this led to the vehement fight for the sympathies of these states who were, at this point, in a very precarious situation by their administrative and economic system. The reporting concerning these nations showed that they were apt to use the Cold War confrontation to their own benefit. In fact, the reporting seemed to contrast the delicate maneuvering of Finland in its position between the two blocs with the exploitation of the similar situation by these countries. They were extorting substantial loans and other benefits from both German states as a token for – depending on which of the German states was in question – their abstinence or advocacy of their governments attitude towards the diplomatic recognition of the East Berlin regime. Finland was also cast in awkward position by these states: Sumelius in East Berlin received a visit from the head of the newly-founded Ghanaian trade mission. It seems that the example of Finland holding representation in both German states but not actually officially recognizing either one of them had commanded the attention at least one of these newly formed nations. Even Finland's EFTA solution of accessing Western markets but also giving the same market access for the Soviet Union was perused with interest by Ghanaians.

The reporting also seemed to challenge the Finnish non-recognition policy's basis vicariously through Bonn's reactions when it came to the actions of Nasser in Cairo. West Germany was, according to Kaarlo Mäkelä, willing to relinquish the hard-line stance of the Hallstein Doctrine for the political expedience of gaining a foothold in the Arab world. There was also another dimension that pointed towards the validity of the interpretation that Finland's policy might have, in fact, been self-flagellation by the threat of the Hallstein Doctrine; the reporting informed the Finnish foreign policymakers that Finland, in fact, could be evaluated, in West Germany, as a nation which existed inside the Eastern sphere of influence, and therefore was not necessarily judged harshly even if it was to take some drastic steps in the German policy (in favor of East Germany). This revealed that, in Finland, there was actually a distorted self-image of Finland's constructed image

on the international arena, and that its official neutrality and its symbolism was not so functional as it seemed from the Finnish perspective.

In other words, the West, and West Germans, had already noted that it was not only the self-inflicted obsequiousness and subservience that hid behind the face of neutrality and were exploited by Kekkonen, but it was also real-political needs that were a motive of Finland's lenient policy towards the socialist camp. This shows that the historiographical portrayal of Finland, made from the standpoint of the West, being led towards the maelstrom of the Soviet sphere of influence with Kekkonen in the helm laughing sinisterly is simply not correct. The real transnational picture, at least as far as the West German sources show, was far more nuanced. This was, of course, predicated on the assumption that West Germany did not perceive the Finnish position inside the sphere of influence as being totally voluntary. This does not seem plausible, as hardly anyone would have estimated that there was much voluntary positioning inside the Eastern bloc in general. It was clear who the hegemon was.

An especially drastic possibility was offered by Mäkelä's report. It pointed out that the Hallstein Doctrine had not only lost its credibility, but it also implied that in the cases where other nations were forced to recognize the German Democratic Republic it was clear that the Doctrine would not apply. By this he might have offered redemption for the Finnish foreign policy leaders should the situation advance to a state in which Finland would have to execute the recognition. However, he also seemed to note that the Federal Republic's foreign office – at least ostensibly – still gave the impression that Finland was actually a special case and that the recognition of East Germany by it would not be taken lightly by Bonn.

5 1969–1971: THE OVERTURE FOR THE CONFERENCE FOR SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE: SEEING THE GERMAN QUESTION TO ITS SOLUTION

Even if the 1960s had been a generally stable era for Finnish German policy and foreign policy in general, the end of the decade, however, saw Finland take on unprecedented activity in its foreign policy. Finland acted, from 1969–1971, as a member in the United Nations Security Council. In the fall of 1969 the negotiations to limit the strategic arms of the Soviet Union and the United States began in Helsinki (Strategic Arms Limitations Talks, SALT). The pinnacle of this activity was Finland's proposal in May 1969 to act as a host of the Conference for Security and Co-operation in Europe.⁹⁰³ The European security conference idea originated in 1954 when the Soviet Union proposed for the organization of a security convention. After that, the proposal was renewed many times, but objections from the West had stymied it. However, in March 1969 there was finally a breakthrough when the Warsaw Pact appealed in Budapest for the convention once again, and this time there was a reciprocal interest from NATO countries as well.⁹⁰⁴

According to Hentilä, the reason for Finland's activity during the period of 1968–1972 was the need to achieve affirmation from both sides (the East and West) for its neutrality policy. There was increased restlessness in the Finnish Foreign-Ministry regarding the construction of Finnish neutrality as its survival as a symbolic order seemed to be jeopardized: the Soviet Union had refused to include the declaration of Finnish neutrality to the communiqués released after the Czechoslovakian crisis of 1968. The active foreign policy and role on the international stage was seen by Finnish foreign policymakers as a means to bolster the profile of Finland as a neutral country as well as seen as a way to distance Finland from the Eastern sphere of influence.⁹⁰⁵

⁹⁰³ Hentilä 2003, 107.

⁹⁰⁴ Soikkanen 2008, 336.

⁹⁰⁵ Hentilä 2003, 108.

The idea of the conference for the European security was all about the question of Germany; it was the problem of the divided Germany that invariably had threatened the peace of Europe, or to put it more precisely, the territorial and political status quo between the two blocs. The questions regarding the status of Berlin had especially irked the Western as well as Eastern leaders. In Finland, the initiative to host the possible conference meant a possibility to solve the predicament of the (constantly in the background haunting) German question in the Finnish foreign policy; the rationale was that the conference required the participation of both German states, and, therefore, gave a concrete basis for driving the solution of policy by recognizing both German states.

This was the "bait" that the Soviet Union's leadership presented for Finnish foreign policy leadership when they suggested for Finland to act as a promoter of the conference.⁹⁰⁶ According to Keijo Korhonen, the conference initiative was adopted in the Foreign Ministry initially only to help Kekkonen and Foreign Minister Ahti Karjalainen to withstand the domestic pressures for the recognition of East Germany and hold on to one of the symbolic aspects of the Finnish neutrality, the equal German policy.⁹⁰⁷

Korhonen explains that the conference was used as an excuse to defend the non-recognition: it was expounded that if Finland would advance the recognition issue, the conference would be jeopardized.⁹⁰⁸ Also Yrjö Väänänen, Finnish Foreign Ministry's deputy director general of the Political Department, who was posted as a Finnish representative in Bonn in 1970, has emphasized this aspect. According to these interpretations, the conference was ultimately a "happy accident" that followed from its utilization as an excuse in the German policy.⁹⁰⁹

This view is buttressed by the fact that the suitability of Finland to host the conference was actually justified in the initiative by the interpretation that Finland's non-recognition policy was a testimony of Finland's neutrality from all parties that were to be involved in the conference.⁹¹⁰ However, this was a manipulation of an aspect of weakness in the Finnish foreign policy to a strength. In reality, Kekkonen had already, the previous year, revived his old speculations with the possibility of trading the recognition of East Germany for the retrieval of Karelian territory to Finland. It was the territory that Finland lost to the Soviet

⁹⁰⁶ Suomi 1996, 202, 203.

⁹⁰⁷ Korhonen 1991, 564; Reimaa 2008, 27. E.g. see statement of Finnish Social Democratic Party 4 April 1968 proposing the recognition of German Democratic Republic (Etelä-Suomen Sanomat, 4 april 1968, n:o 94 "Sosialidemokraateilta kannanotto kummankin Saksan tunnustamiseksi". The conference initiative also had motives of promoting visibility of Finland internationally and strengthening Finland's neutrality (Reimaa 2008, 41).

⁹⁰⁸ Korhonen 1991, 564.

⁹⁰⁹ Korhonen 1991, 564. Ministry's archives seem to speak for the importance of the German aspect as well, there is a 28 page memo from the same year as Finnish CSCE-initiative by Director General Gustafsson concerning the relations with non-recognized states, especially German Democratic Republic (UM 12 K 1968-1970, "Sopimussuhteista tunnustamattomien valtioiden kanssa, erityisesti Saksan Demokraattisen Tasavallan asemaa silmälläpitäen").

⁹¹⁰ Hentilä 2003, 109.

Union in the Winter War and Continuation War leading to the evacuation of 450,000 Karelians to other parts of Finland. The scenario of Karelian territories in exchange for recognition was planned to be discussed in Kekkonen's scheduled meeting with Brezhnev on 24 June 1968.⁹¹¹ Brezhnev had already mentioned the East German recognition in the initial negotiations on 13 June 1968. Finnish historian Esa Seppänen has interpreted this as being connected, at least partly to, the Karelian exchange scenario.⁹¹² However, it is also possible that Brezhnev was simply stating the necessity that Finland would have to recognize both German states for the security conference process to move forward. Even Seppänen himself later admits that it seems Brezhnev did not connect the Karelian question with the East German recognition.⁹¹³ Also, the earlier forays of Kekkonen into the dubious territory of border question discussions in exchange for the recognition had ended with no results. However, they showed that, in reality, with Kekkonen as the ultimate leader of Finland's foreign policy, the Finnish neutrality in the German question had always been precarious—or even non-existent. It also showed that the foreign policy could be subjugated to domestic policy.

In Bonn, the Finnish initiative was accepted with a positive attitude, according to reporting from Bonn by Martti Salomies, who took the post as head of mission in Cologne in the beginning of 1968 (the mission was moved during that year to Bonn, therefore his reporting was later from Bonn). Salomies entered the ministry in 1949 and had been through the important capitals of Europe in his career posts. His first foreign assignment had been as an attaché in London, after that he had functioned as a second secretary in Rome, first secretary in Moscow, and as chargé d'affaires and later ambassador in Bucharest from 1963 on.⁹¹⁴ The fact that he was posted to work as a Consul General in Cologne after holding a title of ambassador in his previous post implied that the trade mission in Cologne was evaluated as being equivalent to an official diplomatic mission with full diplomatic privilege. Immediately before his post as head of mission in Cologne, he worked as the deputy director general of the ministry's Political Department.⁹¹⁵ This implies that Salomies was well aware of the intrigue and multiple political threads that were present in the Finnish conference initiative that the ministry's important figure at this period, Keijo Korhonen, has later reminisced about, i.e. that the initiative was in fact a way to repel domestic pressures in Finland for the recognition of East Germany.⁹¹⁶

Salomies had discussed this with State Secretary Georg Duckwitz right after the publishing of the initiative. Duckwitz had confirmed to Salomies that the Fed-

⁹¹¹ These were the infamous negotiations, abhorred also by President Mauno Koivisto in his memoirs (Koivisto 1997), where Kekkonen had speculated for the Soviet Union's leadership the possibility of dismantling of the Finnish elected government in exchange for an international treaty guaranteeing Finland's sovereignty and neutrality.

⁹¹² Seppänen 2007, 202.

⁹¹³ Seppänen 2007, 204.

⁹¹⁴ Ulkoasiainhallinnon matrikkeli 1996, osa 2, 166

⁹¹⁵ Ulkoasiainhallinnon matrikkeli 1996, osa 2, 166.

⁹¹⁶ Korhonen 1991, 564.

eral Republic regarded the Finnish memo regarding the European security conference as a “well-balanced” document. He had promised that the official answer regarding the memo was pending. However, according to Duckwitz, the matter had not been yet discussed in the government. It also seemed that the acceptance was, at least in some respect, contingent on the Finnish German policy, as Duckwitz had also on the same occasion inquired Salomies whether there was any change to be expected in the Finnish German policy, to which Salomies had assured that, to his knowledge, there was no alteration to be expected.⁹¹⁷

In these discussions, Duckwitz’s seemed to be willing to concert the official façade of the Finnish initiative, i.e. the neutrality policy. This was, of course, quite a stretch of the imagination as the foreign office had, at least since the late 1950s, regarded Finland in many respects as a most prominent threat for the tenacity of the Hallstein Doctrine. Yet, as the discussion showed, Duckwitz was willing to play along with the diplomatic inversion that was taking place. In his opinion, Helsinki was an appropriate city for the security conference because of Finland’s equal neutrality policy. However, his next lines for Salomies seemed to reveal the real calculation behind Bonn’s newly found complacency regarding Finland’s neutrality: Duckwitz had noted that Finland as a host would eliminate the possibility of other (in Bonn’s view, more unpleasant) countries to offer their capitals to host the conference.⁹¹⁸ By this, he was obviously referring to socialist states in Europe, or perhaps also to officially non-aligned but socialist camp sympathizing states such as Yugoslavia.

Behind the push for more stable Cold War Europe from the Federal Republic’s side was the inauguration of Willy Brandt’s government in October 1969. The reformist Brandt was expected to strive, with vigor, for the normalization of relations between the two German states, and this was expected to positively affect the negotiations between the Western powers and the Soviet Union to secure European peace and settle the question of Germany. After the inauguration of the Brandt government, Finnish Foreign Ministry’s State Secretary Jorma Vanamo noted a discursive change in the West German government rhetoric. He noted that the memo he had received from the head of the the Federal Republic’s trade mission in Helsinki, Detlev Scheel, concerning the new government’s disposition in the German question did not contain the words, *Wiedervereinigung*, *Alleinvertretungsanspruch*, or, the Hallstein Doctrine.⁹¹⁹ Scheel’s behavior in the Finnish Foreign Ministry was similar to State Secretary Duckwitz’s, as the representative had lauded the Finnish foreign policy of neutrality in the German question. This suggests that there was a clear policy line in the Foreign Office regarding Finland and the security conference.⁹²⁰ Vanamo, probably very pleased with what he had heard, assured the West German emissary that Finland would not

⁹¹⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 3 June 1969, “Poliittinen keskustelu valtiosihteeri Duckwitzin kanssa”, p. 3.

⁹¹⁸ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 3 June 1969, “Poliittinen keskustelu valtiosihteeri Duckwitzin kanssa”, p. 3.

⁹¹⁹ UM 7 D II 307, memo from Jorma Vanamo 4 November 1969.

⁹²⁰ UM 7 D II 307, memo from Jorma Vanamo 4 November 1969.

attempt to alter its stance or meddle in the solution of German question in the future, and that Finland would leave its solution to the Germans and to be confirmed by the Four Powers.⁹²¹ This promise of Vanamo was, however, premature, as it can be interpreted that Finland had, in fact, meddled in the German question by the initiative to recognize both German states before the German-German negotiations were through.

In general, the possibility for the realization of the European security conference in Helsinki was unquestionably connected to this continuation of the East-West détente in Europe. In this regard, the key factor was Willy Brandt's Eastern policy, its success, and its possible consequences. This was noted by the Finnish diplomats: on 3 June, Salomies in Bonn wrote that the Federal Republic's State Secretary Duckwitz had emphasized that it was also necessary for the German Democratic Republic to attend the conference. This had also been the stance of the other informants Salomies had spoken with. Yet, before the conference, the relations between the two German states would have to be organized. According to Duckwitz, Bonn had already attempted this by various initiatives aiming for "practical interaction". So far, the reaction from East Berlin had always been a rebuttal of the initiatives. In Duckwitz's opinion, some kind of progress in these matters had to be achieved first, and only then could the two Germanies sit over the same table at the conference. The state secretary stated that the Federal Republic's Foreign Office was somewhat pessimistic in its estimations of the speed the Conference could be realized.⁹²²

As Duckwitz's answer to Salomies revealed, Bonn was connecting the eastern policy innately with the European security conference. However, at this point, it was not clear at all if the policy would succeed. There had also been negative results so far; as the Finnish diplomats had reported earlier, the overtures of Bonn towards the East had caused a counterreaction and the forming of the "iron-triangle" of the East Berlin-Prague-Warsaw axis. After all this, Duckwitz informed Salomies that the dialogue with Moscow had progressed at a lax pace. Whenever there had been some progress, something happened to halt it. He added that the relations towards the East had not bettered with such nations as Bulgaria and Hungary. However, the relations with Romania were good, even though some caution had been shown by Romania after the events in Czechoslovakia.⁹²³ Yet, despite these setbacks, Duckwitz emphasized for Salomies that the intention of Bonn was still to continue on the line of "*Entstpannung*", the releasing of tensions.

Despite the security conference link to the German question and the general détente spirit in Europe, the director general of the Political Department in the Finnish Foreign Ministry, Risto Hyvärinen, held strictly to the previous course of the German policy. This was increasingly hard, as there were citizen organizations and the governmental parties that were already willing to initiate the recognition of East Germany. In December 1969, Hyvärinen emphasized in his memo

⁹²¹ UM 7 D II 307, memo from Jorma Vanamo 4 November 1969.

⁹²² UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 3 June 1969, "Poliittinen keskustelu valtiosihteeri Duckwitzin kanssa", pp. 3, 4.

⁹²³ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 3 June 1969, "Poliittinen keskustelu valtiosihteeri Duckwitzin kanssa", p. 4.

that the ministry should not become entangled in the matters of socialist countries by hurrying in the German question. However, it seemed that Hyvärinen also saw the possibility of impending change, as he had requested the Head of the Judicial Department, Paul Gustafsson to draft a treaty that would stipulate renunciation of the use of force in the relations of Finland and Germany.⁹²⁴

However, in international politics, the status quo of the German question became evermore challenged as the Federal Republic began negotiations in December 1969 with the Soviet Union. The next step was that in March 1970, the Four Occupying Powers began the negotiations concerning the status of West Berlin, and both German states finally initiated bilateral discussion as well.⁹²⁵

In Finland, the negotiations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic caused a questioning of a crucial aspect of the Finnish neutrality, the FCMA Treaty. After all, the treaty was directed against the threat of Germany, and, in the case of agreement between the Soviet Union and West Germany, the German threat would have been rendered void – in principle. In the session of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Finnish Parliament, MP Erkki Tuomioja had inquired about the effects to the treaty of the possible agreement between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic. Foreign Minister Väinö Leskinen had stated that everything would remain as before. However, he later nearly contradicted himself in a radio interview, as he admitted that the significance of the Soviet-German animosity would be reduced.⁹²⁶ In fact, later on, this same aspect was noted also by the representatives of the East German and the Soviet Union foreign ministries.⁹²⁷

Ultimately, the adamant line in the Finnish Foreign Ministry with regards to divided Germany was increasingly against the “new” ideas of the main architect of the Finnish neutrality, President Kekkonen. This was manifested when the Foreign Ministry drafted a reply, during the summer of 1970, for Walter Ulbricht’s letter to Kekkonen. In the letter, Ulbricht had asked for the establishment of diplomatic relations based on the negotiations that had started between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic. The reply draft of the Finnish Foreign Ministry had emphasized an unconditional neutrality policy. Yet, Kekkonen had redrafted the answer and wrote that Finland would re-evaluate its European policy in the case that an agreement would be achieved between the Soviet Union and West Germany.⁹²⁸

All in all, considering this discussion, it is evident that the Finnish German initiative formed an important re-definition of Finland’s German policy, and was

⁹²⁴ Soikkanen 2008, 312.

⁹²⁵ Soikkanen 2008, 311.

⁹²⁶ Soikkanen 2008, 313.

⁹²⁷ Hentilä 2008, 188, 189. East German delegation led by Deputy Foreign Secretary Paul Scholz flew to Moscow for consultation with the Soviet Union’s Foreign Ministry. The meeting was hosted by Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Nikolai Rodionov. Soviet Union’s representatives were especially worried recognizing through the Germany package the Finnish neutrality. At this period Soviets strive to withhold officially acknowledging Finnish neutrality.

⁹²⁸ Soikkanen 2008, 313.

an integral part its symbolism of neutrality. Even the relevance of the most important tenets of the Finnish foreign policy and the Cold War political culture, the FCMA Treaty, was questioned in the discourse concerning the new aspects that were opening in the German question. This was a suspenseful moment of the political cat-and-mouse game that the German question had, in many senses, formed the Finnish foreign policy. The period from the publishing of the Finnish CSCE initiative on 5 May 1969 until the Finnish initiative to recognize both German states in September 1971 formed the most important period regarding the Finnish German policy. Different aspects seemed to become connected during this period: the Security Conference, the German question, Finnish neutrality, FCMA Treaty, and superpower détente. It might not be a large exaggeration to say, that Finland's ability, on its part, to steer successfully to the realization of the Security Conference had ramifications for the international configuration of the Cold War Europe. Failure in the conference could lead to continued Cold War tensions, and at the worst case, to the escalation of them in Europe. The Conference could ward off this threat. Yet, later it would receive criticism for this very reason; according to critics, the conference sealed the status quo and gave Eastern bloc the ability to rule Eastern Europe without challenge.

From the standpoint of Finland and the Finnish diplomats in Germany, the observance of the nuances of the West German Eastern policy was of utmost importance for the Finnish Foreign Ministry, as the Eastern policy seemed to become the key that would unlock the German gridlock. In this regard, the reporting of the Finnish diplomats during the 1969–1971 regarding the Eastern policy can be considered as a constant probing in respect to the possibilities to realize the conference. The first chapter of the following section will concentrate on this subject. The second chapter, on the other hand, continues the discussion of the reporting that was concentrating on the new recognizers of East Germany and the consequences of them on the Hallstein Doctrine. These recognizers was increasing in such amounts that it made it even more evident that the threat of the Doctrine was at this point, by and large, ignored altogether.

5.1 Ostpolitik in full motion and the increasing amounts of the Doctrine's challengers

5.1.1 The Brandt government might succeed where Erhard failed

As the new West German government of Willy Brandt took office in late 1969, there were expectations amassing regarding the new foreign policy approach towards the East. At this point, both German states became active in Finland expounding their stance in their East–West relations as well as German–German relations. The first one to do this was the head of the East German mission in Helsinki, Heinz Oelzner, who had spoken in the foreign policy related Paasikivi Society. The West German mission evaluated that, due to the articulateness of the

text, the speech had probably been prepared by the higher echelons of the East German policymakers.⁹²⁹ Oelzner appeared to be an East German diplomat that was not afraid to compromise his position. A little over year later he irritated not only West German but also the Finnish Foreign Ministry as he had given a speech in the meeting of the Finnish leftist party, the Social Democratic Union of Workers and Smallholders, which comprised the leftist section of Finnish Social Democratic Party and led by Emil Skog.⁹³⁰

Concerning the speech of Oelzner to the Paasikivi Society, the head of the West German mission, Detlev Scheel, countered the East German “offensive” by preparing his own speech for the Paasikivi Society a little later. Scheel had asked the Foreign Office to help draft the speech according to the lines of the new federal government’s program. In this respect, Scheel’s speech could be regarded as an official statement of the West German government.⁹³¹ In his speech Scheel had emphasized the continuity in the foreign policy of Bonn. He mentioned this to clearly downplay the expectations of drastic change: he had added a remark that there might be dramatic expectations in the public regarding the new line, as the Brandt government was the first coalition government in the Federal Republic led by social democrats. The aspect of continuity and the implicit negation present in the previous remark concerning the expectations towards the policy was revealed as Scheel noted that the recognition of the German Democratic Republic could not come into consideration. Yet, he pointed out that there were also new dimensions in the government’s policy: the new government recognized the existence of the two German states. However, this was done with the provision that the two states did not represent foreign nations to each other.⁹³²

After the speech, Scheel regarded it strange that the West German news agency DPA had interpreted it as a warning for Finland to not disturb Bonn by foreign policy actions such as the recognition of the German Democratic Republic. However, Scheel interpreted the opposite of this; he had emphasized that the Federal Republic’s government respected Finland’s neutrality policy and did not consider his speech in any way to constitute an implicit threat.⁹³³

Of course, in a sense, Scheel could easily propose that West Germans were supporting Finnish neutrality as it, at this point, relied on Korhonen’s paper from 1967, which articulated the stability of Finnish German policy. The status quo of

⁹²⁹ PAAA B31 bd. 364, report Detlev Scheel 14 October 1969 “Vortrag des Leiters der “DDR”-Handelsvertretung vor der Paasikivi Gesellschaft”.

⁹³⁰ UM 6 O 5 SDT a-b, memo by osastopäällikkö Risto Hyvärinen 4 June 1971. Oelzner’s characterization as a vehement communist seems to be buttressed by his personal history, he was accolated twice for communist activity (Verdienter Aktivist, Verdienst Medaille der DDR) UM 6 O 5 SDT, Kurzbiographie Oelzner, Heinz.

⁹³¹ PAAA B31 bd. 364, letter from FRG Foreign Office to D. Scheel 3 November 1969.

⁹³² PAAA B31 bd. 364 speech of Detlev Scheel in der Paasikivi-Gesellschaft 17 November 1969 “Deutsche Friedens- und Entspannungspolitik”.

⁹³³ PAAA B31 bd. 364 report from Detlev Scheel 2 December 1969, “Mein Vortrag vor der Paasikivi-Gesellschaft am 17.11.1969”.

the policy had been, just a few weeks before Scheel's speech, solidified by Kekkonen who stated that Finland would not change its previous position in the German question.⁹³⁴

However, West Germans had noted the pressure that was built by the political left in Finland, even though the social democratic press was still somewhat moderate and regarded that any advancement in the recognition might jeopardize the security conference.⁹³⁵ It seemed that the party was speaking with two voices: one was the government's (led by Social Democrats) and one was party's own, as just the previous year the official statement of the SDP had spoken for the necessity of the recognition of the German states.⁹³⁶ On the background was the increased contacts of Finnish societal groupings with East Germany, for example, the student exchange programs, the political parties, trade unions, officials of different fields and citizen organizations had established ties to the East German state completely disregarding its totalitarian nature.⁹³⁷ In fact, the Finnish social democratic press' statement had led the West German Foreign Office worried to such an extent that they had expressed their reservations to the Finnish government.⁹³⁸ In the background – as an aggravating factor – was probably the increased connections of the Finnish social democrats with Moscow. SDP had, in 1968, established, with the lead of the party Chairman, Rafael Paasio, party-level relations with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union⁹³⁹. In addition, the radical Finnish left had not considered any prudence necessary in the German policy: during the jubilation of the celebration of the DDR's twenty-year existence, the Finnish communists had evaluated Finland as playing a "key role" in the German question and the search for a solution to it.⁹⁴⁰

In the reporting, the possible changes in the configuration of Bonn's Eastern policy were noted at the end of 1969 by Martti Salomies. He wrote a comprehensive analysis on the Eastern policy of Brandt's government; his focus was especially on the reasons why Brandt's Eastern policy might be more successful than the failed Eastern policy of Kiesinger's grand coalition. Salomies began, however, by noting that the discursive change concerning the policy had already taken place when the coalition government of CDU and SPD was formed in late 1966;

⁹³⁴ PAAA B31 bd 364, Detlev Schlee's telegram from Helsinki 10 November 1969 "presereaktion auf kekkonens aeusserung zur deutschlandfrage".

⁹³⁵ PAAA B31 bd. 364, report from the FRG trade mission in Helsinki 22 July 1969 "Diskussion der finnischen Deutschlandpolitik in der hiesigen Presse". See e.g. speech of the Secretary General of SKP, Ville Pessi, in Labour's Day 1968 ("Ääriivasemmiston mielestä kehitys Tshekkoslovakiassa meille tärkeää" Helsingin Sanomat, 3 May 1968)

⁹³⁶ E.g. see UM 7 D II 307, newspaper clip, *Sosiaalidemokraatti*, 5 April 1968, "SDP:n kanta: Kahden Saksan valtion olemassaolon ja rajojen tunnustaminen vastaa tosiasioita". Hentilä 2004, 14.

⁹³⁷ Putensen 2000, 216. During 1968 also Foreign Minister Willy Brandt issued warning that Bonn would consider the suggestion by Finland to establish relations with Germanies as bilateral, and that Federal Republic would on its part refuse such suggestion. UKK 21/133 Saksojen kysymys, secret telegram from Cologne by Martti Salomies 20 May 1968.

⁹³⁹ Sorsa 1998, 43.

⁹⁴⁰ PAAA B31 bd. 364, report from the FRG trade mission in Helsinki 22 July 1969, "Diskussion der finnischen Deutschlandpolitik in der hiesigen Presse".

the new slogan “Bonn’s new Eastern policy” had been coined at that point. In regards to Brandt government he evaluated that if there, was some change in the Eastern policy, the distinction between it and the policy of the previous government was the attitude towards the German question. During the Adenauer era, the primary goal had been the re-unification of Germany, which (in that era’s German foreign policy thinking) would have made the general rapprochement between East and West possible. Contrary to this, in the new Eastern policy the betterment of East–West relations was seen as a precondition for the re-unification sometime in the future.⁹⁴¹

Salomies admitted that some relatively small successes could be attributed to the previous Eastern policy, including the relations with Romania and Yugoslavia. The approach towards these countries had been, however, ultimately blocked by the already reported “wall of suspicion” from the Kremlin, and, as a possible consequence, this attitude had been adapted in East Berlin too.⁹⁴²

It seems that Salomies was also not sure of the ultimate motives of the initial Eastern policy of the Federal Republic. He regarded that “it should be seriously discussed to what extent the New Eastern policy included in the government program was an honest attempt, and to what extent the adamant doubts the Soviets expressed were right”. His view was bolstered by the fact that after the grand coalition had broken down, the CDU/CSU politicians, finding themselves in the opposition, had shown much less enthusiasm towards certain aspects of the Eastern policy. On the other hand, Salomies regarded that he himself would not question the grand coalition’s Foreign Minister Willy Brandt’s intentions. In Salomies’ view, he had been, in some respects, forced to hold back on his policy because of the coalition partnership with CDU/CSU.⁹⁴³

It seems that, in this regard, Salomies had managed to correctly capture the aspect that had already become evident in the reporting earlier: the West German foreign policy was often taken hostage by domestic politics. Brandt had actually hinted at his limited moving space in the foreign policy of the coalition to President Kekkonen in their meeting a couple of years earlier.⁹⁴⁴ During the grand coalition period, Brandt had appointed Egon Bahr as head of the policy planning staff in the Federal Republic’s Foreign Office in 1967. Bahr’s policy ideas were based on the premise that the Eastern relations could not be bettered without recognizing the existence of the East German state. However, Bahr’s progressive views had already, before the breakdown of the Grand Coalition, provoked resistance from coalition partners and the head of the government, Kiesinger.

⁹⁴¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 16 December 1969, “Brandtin hallituksen idän-avaus”, pp. 1, 2.

⁹⁴² UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 16 December 1969, “Brandtin hallituksen idän-avaus”, p. 2. This was probably a reference to the beginning of the grand coalition when the relations with Romania had developed in January 1967, but further progress was stopped by Ulbricht’s success in his demands for the hindrance of Bonn’s overtures in the foreign minister meeting of foreign ministers of Warsaw pact countries in February 1967.

⁹⁴³ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 16 December 1969, “Brandtin hallituksen idän-avaus”, pp 2, 3.

⁹⁴⁴ UKK vuosikirjat 1958-, 1967 memo concerning the discussions of U. Kekkonen with Willy Brandt 21 June 1967.

Chancellor Kiesinger had been alerted by the new policy suggestions coming from Bahr's office, and had even described Bahr as a "dangerous man", but only confidentially.⁹⁴⁵ Kiesinger's distrust of Bahr was based on the conflict of Bahr's nationalistic orientation against Kiesinger's internationalism.⁹⁴⁶

All in all, however, it seemed that Salomies was not totally discrediting the possible move of the Eastern policy from the sphere of rhetoric to actual executions. In this respect, Salomies was not actually discrediting the voicings in Finland that considered the moment as decisive in the German question and in the general détente movement. In fact, according to him, the factor of time was now in favor of Brandt. He also – in some respects – reduced the setback of the Prague Spring to the role of a domestic matter of the Soviet Union, as he noted that the effects of it would be only temporary and would not have a crucial effect on the East bloc's inter-state relations. It had however, in his view, paralyzed the Kiesinger government. But, since some time had already passed after the Kiesinger government, he now saw new hope looming on the horizon.

He was more confident especially with regards to the personnel of the new government when it came to building bridges in the Eastern relations. Perhaps this was an allusion to the previous report by his colleague Sumelius from East Berlin, who had reported the behind-the-scene contacts being made between Brandt and the Soviet ambassador, Abrasimow. Also, the new government program included some new aspects that were considered relevant in the East. However, the most important aspect with regards to the possibilities of the new government was, in his opinion, the perception of it in Moscow. Salomies regarded that without Moscow's approval and willingness there was no solution for the German question.

In this respect, he indicated positive signs for Brandt's policy as he informed that, with regards to Moscow's reactions, there had been positive signals, and the recent meeting of the Warsaw pact countries had shown a green light for Brandt. The opinion of Salomies was that after the meeting the new drafts for the renunciation of the force declaration between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic was produced surprisingly fast. However, the results were yet to be seen. The recent public statement of the Moscow meeting still held the old bundle of demands for the West.⁹⁴⁷

In this analysis Salomies was – at least implicitly – taking a stance against the one segment of the Finnish political sphere concerning the German policy: the new generation of Social Democrats in Finland. They believed that the way to overtake the Agrarian Union in the Moscow relations (and as a consequential

⁹⁴⁵ Bark & Gress 1989 (2).; Dannenberg 2008, 78.

⁹⁴⁶ Dannenberg 2008, 78.

⁹⁴⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 16 December 1969, "Brandtin hallituksen idän-avaus", p. 3. According to Mary Elise Sarotte, it seems that Brezhnev was in the meeting demanding a harder line regarding West Germany than Ulbricht. For example, Ulbricht settled for demanding normal (*gleichberechtigter*) relations whereas Brezhnev called for the legal recognition of German Democratic Republic as a sovereign state, a demand which became later known by the concept of *völkerrechtliche Anerkennung* (Sarotte 2001, 32).

challenge of the Kekkonen's domestic policy hegemony) could be achieved via good relations with East Berlin.⁹⁴⁸ However, Salomies turned the situation around in his interpretation. He seemed to be pointing towards the larger context of international relations and suggesting that the solution to the German question was to be initiated from Moscow, not from East Berlin. The recognition of East Germany by Finland would have, in this framework of interpretation, gone towards the wrong direction and intervened in the process of German negotiations by giving Ulbricht's regime an international victory. This, of course, was something that Scheell had indirectly, in his previously discussed speech, warned against.

Still, according to Salomies, in the Federal Republic there had been a focus on the fact that things were at least in motion, and not just with Moscow, but also with Poland. In addition, there had been contacts made with Czechoslovakia and Hungary. It was also noted that the usual derogatory statements directed against the Federal Republic had been omitted from the communiqués of the Warsaw pact summit that had been held in Moscow.⁹⁴⁹ The aforementioned were (in addition to the fact that there was a willingness to initiate negotiations in the socialist camp), in Mäkelä's view, interpreted in Bonn to prove that the East was now truly willing to better relations with the Federal Republic.⁹⁵⁰

The biggest problem at the time of Salomies' reporting seemed to be the relations between Bonn and East Berlin. The German Democratic Republic was still using quite harsh expressions when discussing Brandt's government. Other socialist countries were somewhat "wholeheartedly" still backing East German claims, Salomies wrote. However, in Salomies' view, most difficulties were found in the fact that the German Democratic Republic was still demanding the *de jure* acknowledgment of it. In these lines he was perhaps condemning this as an excess, as he especially regarded it as a problematic aspect that East German side "still" clung to.

He seemed to, however, emphasize that, on the practical level, things were moving on between the two German states, but the limit of progress was in Bonn's unwillingness to bend to the East German desire to shift matters to the judicial state level. This was manifested in his opinion in Bonn's dilution of the East German demands regarding the treaty of transportation between East and West Germany. The German Democratic Republic initially had expected it to be ratified by the parliaments and by the heads of the states so that it would achieve the form of a state treaty. However, this idea received adamant opposition in the

⁹⁴⁸ Putensen 2000, 203.

⁹⁴⁹ The summit took place in Moscow on 3 And 4 December 1969 (Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik. VI. Reihe/Band 1 21. Oktober 1969 bis 31. Dezember 1970, 100. Nr. 35. Treffen der Führer der kommunistischen und Arbeiterparteien der Teinehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages (Auszug) Moskau, 3./4, Dezember 1969).

⁹⁵⁰ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 16 December 1969, "Brandtin hallituksen idän-avaus", p. 4.

Federal Republic despite the reformist program of Brandt's government. Therefore, Ulbricht had diluted the demands and started to talk only of the better "practical interaction" between the two German states, Salomies stated.⁹⁵¹

And even with the hardest issue, the question of Berlin's status, there seemed to be some hope looming, according to Salomies. He had derived this interpretation from the rhetoric of the East, as lately it had abandoned using the ominous term "independent political unit" of West Berlin. Now, a little bit more neutral term "special political unit" was adopted. Despite this, there was still an air of worry in the Federal Republic. Salomies saw this as the reason for the pursuit in the Federal Republic to achieve support from NATO for the Republic's pursuits – which also had been granted once again.⁹⁵² The Western Allied Powers had also generally shown a "green light" for the Federal Republic's Eastern campaign. Yet, Salomies evaluated that this support was not completely unconditional, as certain influential statements in the Western press implied.

It seemed that history still cast a shadow on the Federal Republic's pursuits to a conciliatory Eastern policy. Salomies dubbed this phenomenon as a "Rapallo complex" or as a "Molotov-Ribbentrop complex". It was feared that the West German interests in its Eastern policy might override the interests of the West in general. This was considered dangerous as Germany still held a critical position in Europe. Its deviation from the current path could have led to a disruption in the stabilized foreign policy constellation of Europe. The sensitivity regarding this was especially strong on the American side. The United States relations with the Soviet Union were in a tender state due to the SALT negotiations and the Vietnam War.⁹⁵³ The view of the historical "unfitness" of Germany independently forging relations with the East was later expressed to Salomies by former secretary of state in the Press and Information Office for the previous

⁹⁵¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 16 December 1969, "Brandtin hallituksen idän-avaus", p. 4. According to him, the list of demands from the German Democratic Republic was still the following: 1. The commitment to not procure nuclear weapons. A demand which according to Salomies could be regarded as a fulfilled condition since Bonn government had signed the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of the Nuclear Weapons. 2. The Oder-Neisse line issue which according to Salomies seemed also to be possible to handle since Poland and the Federal Republic, according to Brandt's statements, seemed to be able to find formula to suit both parties. 3. The demand for sole representation. This part Salomies regarded also as diminishing in the future policy of the Federal Republic as it was no longer mentioned in the government program. 4. The abolishment of the original Munich Agreement. This was also an aspect that both parties seemed to be agreeing on after the negotiations with Czechoslovakia were initiated, Salomies informed. The Federal Republic government had already declared that it did not consider the Agreement valid: it regarded it faulty and therefore there should be no area demands made in reference to that Treaty. Yet, the Czechoslovakian standpoint, which claimed that the Agreement had never even become valid, could not be accepted by Bonn. This was mostly to guarantee certain rights of the Sudeten Germans living in Czechoslovakia. 5. Fifth, and the final issue, was the future of West Berlin. It Salomies interpreted to be one of the hardest issues of the negotiations. Yet, all in all, the list Salomies annexed in his reports and its commentary were messaging very optimistic view. From this perspective, the German question seemed possible to be solved swiftly.

⁹⁵² UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 16 December 1969, "Brandtin hallituksen idän-avaus", p. 6.

⁹⁵³ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 16 December 1969, "Brandtin hallituksen idän-avaus", p. 6.

CDU/CSU government, Günter Diehl, who had been the official “voice”, *Regierungssprecher*, of the government.⁹⁵⁴ In this analysis, Salomies could have found strong backing: a similar opinion was held in the British Foreign Office at that period. In their view, the German question was, at this point, dependent on the East–West relations and even improved détente with the Soviet Union. In general, Britain was backing the Ostpolitik, however, it had its national reasons as well: the support of the Germans was needed for Britain’s attempt to join the EEC.⁹⁵⁵

However, the British Foreign Office was far from being carefree concerning the West German détente activities. It was constantly aware of the possible danger in the détente proceeded by the Germans alone, i.e. in addition to the concerns of German’s renouncing British rights in Berlin and Germany, there was a fear that Germans would disregard the NATO and European integration process in favor of Eastern relations.⁹⁵⁶ The British view was also explained by history: even before the First World War the Foreign Office had regarded the growing German influence in the East as a geopolitical threat. This was the reason why the Foreign Office had worked so keenly for the independence of the Baltic states. The underlying idea was to form a buffer zone against German expansionism.⁹⁵⁷

At the time of Salomies’s reporting, the old fear could surface as, in the thinking of British Foreign Office (as well as in the Washington and Paris), the Soviet Union was still perceived as working for the goal of breaking up Europe and NATO, also through the German policy, while also holding a goal of banishing American troops from European soil.⁹⁵⁸

According to analyses, Salomies had garnered from the public discussion of the Federal Republic the Soviet Union was now overtly willing to discuss the German question in direct negotiations with Bonn for a few discernable reasons. One explanation was seen as the growing threat of China for the Soviet Union and the consequent need to secure the Western front. Also, there were the economic interests of the Soviet Union as well as the smaller socialist countries that drew them towards the Federal Republic. Salomies regarded that these claims could be true. Especially the last one was supported by the fact that the large Ruhr area company, Mannesmann, had made a deal regarding a major gas line project and there were also substantial loans from the Federal Republic’s part in it. In addition, the trade negotiations with Poland had just initiated and involved a Polish wish of a two million German marks loan which, however, was deemed unrealistic in Bonn.⁹⁵⁹

⁹⁵⁴ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 10 February 1970, “Brandtin hallituksen idän-avaus”, p. 2.

⁹⁵⁵ Macintyre 2007, 174, 175.

⁹⁵⁶ Ratti 2011, 69. British view was also explained by the history, already before the First World War the Foreign Office had regarded the growing German influence in the East as geopolitical threat. This was the reason why Foreign Office had worked so keenly for the independence of the Baltic states. The underlying idea was to form from them a buffer zone against the German expansionism. (Roiko-Jokela 1995, 53.) Ratti 2011, 69.

⁹⁵⁷ Roiko-Jokela 1995, 53.

⁹⁵⁸ Macintyre 2007, 176; Haftendorn 2008, 110; Dannenberg 2008, 2.

⁹⁵⁹ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 16 December 1969, “Brandtin hallituksen idän-avaus”, pp. 6, 7.

As a conclusion, Salomies wanted to point out the general tendency which he had discerned in the Soviet Union's German policy after the war. This was the wish to solve the German question in bilateral negotiations directly with the Germans. Salomies regarded that this tendency was apparent from 1958 on. Khrushchev had, on many occasions, stated that for people such as the Germans, there was no point, in the light of historical experiences, to force a solution.⁹⁶⁰ They would only try to abolish it after receiving enough strength again. Therefore, the durable solution could only be found in direct negotiations with Germans. Yet, Khrushchev's view had been constantly rejected by Adenauer and also the Federal Republic's Foreign Office. The current series of events showed that Khrushchev's followers were also holding this same position Salomies concluded in the last line of the report.⁹⁶¹

The evaluations of Salomies regarding Moscow's attitude seemed to be quite discerning. This can be deduced as the research has shown that the Soviet leadership had been, as Salomies noted, initially suspicious but later more complacent regarding the détente. The contradictory changes were explained by the inner dynamics of the Soviet leadership. Brezhnev – who was no dove but preferred stability of peaceful foreign relations and abhorred the warmongering show-off style of Khrushchev⁹⁶² – was initially, during this period, surrounded by colleagues with more hawkish attitudes. He had, in fact, not been involved in the early détente period foreign policy and had allowed the Stalin era technocrat Dmirty Ustinov to take the leadership of the military complex from 1965-1968. He had also provided his full support behind the construction and deployment of the strategic triad of intercontinental ballistic missiles in hardened silos, nuclear submarines with ballistic missiles, and strategic bombers.⁹⁶³ However, in 1967 he began to gradually remove his rivals. With the important removal of Shelepin, he ultimately gained control of the party apparatus in 1968 and started to lead the foreign policy with a few trusted experts.⁹⁶⁴ The events in Chzechoslovakia had been a setback for his foreign policy goals. Brezhnev had been reluctant to intervene in Chzechoslovakia, but its important role given its strategic location, advanced armament industries, and uranium mines made it an indispensable part of the Warsaw Pact.⁹⁶⁵ This can explain the ostensible contradiction in the Brezhnevian foreign policy: intervention in Chzechoslovakia, the onset of the so-called "Brezhnev-Doctrine", and the ostensibly contradictory détente orientation.

It appears that, at this point, the Soviet Union was willing to truly progress with the conciliatory policy in Europe. The Soviet leadership of 1969 – that is, the extensive control of Brezhnev – was coming to the realities of their limits in waging the Cold War on multiple fronts. Brezhnev trusted the Soviet foreign policy

⁹⁶⁰ In the report Salomies had included in parenthesis a reference to Versailles.

⁹⁶¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 16 December 1969, "Brandtin hallituksen idän-avaus", p. 7.

⁹⁶² Zubok 2007, 203.

⁹⁶³ Zubok 2007, 205.

⁹⁶⁴ Zubok 2007, 204; Savranskaya & Taubman 2010, 134.

⁹⁶⁵ Zubok 2007, 207.

towards the hands of trusted experts.⁹⁶⁶ The Soviet's had had a bad streak since 1967 in their foreign policy: they had lost Indonesia with the power change from the left-oriented Suharto to Sukarno, which resulted in the massacre of hundreds of thousands of communists. In the Middle East, the Six Day War had shown the weakness of its allies in the region, it led to a loss of a Soviet prestige, and was an enormous geopolitical setback for the Kremlin.⁹⁶⁷

Just few weeks later, Salomies could enlarge his analysis of Brandt's eastern policy's effectiveness by the virtue of having received information regarding Bonn's new Eastern policy's reception in socialist countries. Salomies wrote that he had gone to see the Yugoslavian ambassador – who was “well informed” on the Eastern bloc matters – as he had “wished to learn his and Yugoslavia's leadership's views regarding the attitude in Warsaw Pact countries towards Brandt's strivings”. He had also wanted to put the East German views in better context by learning how much different the perception of Brandt's policy was in different East European countries, especially taking in consideration the customarily more rigid stance from the part of East Germany.⁹⁶⁸

In particular, the possibility of having a discussion with a diplomatic member of Eastern bloc had appealed to Salomies, as there were varied theories circulating in Bonn with regards to the inner dynamics of the Warsaw Pact. One was, according to Salomies, emphasizing that Moscow had, in a sovereign manner, actually relegated a different role to each East European country. Another theory posited that Ubricht was actually “playing his own game”. By laying impossible demands for Bonn, he was possibly striving to show other socialist countries that there was nothing to achieve in bilateral negotiations with Bonn.⁹⁶⁹

The Yugoslavian ambassador had confirmed to Salomies that certain common lines had actually been decided in the meeting of the Warsaw Pact countries in the previous December. However, because the meeting had not been unanimous, there would be nuances in the actions of different countries. Some were, for example, only interested in establishing relations with Bonn because of commercial prospects. These nations included Romania and Hungary, which were not having any substantial political problems with West Germany. Still, they also had adapted the general line of requiring the recognition of East Germany. They were, however, not willing to support the recognition demand of East Germany at the cost of worsening their relations with the Federal Republic. To prove his point, the ambassador had referenced Ceausescu's recent speech which had been in favor of developing relations with Bonn. The speech had also mentioned the demand for the recognition of East Germany, but it had not specified the form in which it should be executed. This ambassador had interpreted this as a sign that

⁹⁶⁶ Zubok 2007, 207.

⁹⁶⁷ Daigle 2012, 14; Zubok 2007, 200.

⁹⁶⁸ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 6 January 1970, “Jugoslavalainen arviointi Bonnin idän-politiikan menestymisen mahdollisuudesta”, p. 2.

⁹⁶⁹ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 6 January 1970, “Jugoslavalainen arviointi Bonnin idän-politiikan menestymisen mahdollisuudesta”, p. 2.

the relations with Bonn were taking precedence, to a certain extent, over the East German interests.⁹⁷⁰

This information clearly indicated to the Finnish Foreign Ministry that even the countries of the Eastern bloc were distancing themselves from the negative stance of the German Democratic Republic towards Bonn. In fact, Salomies' quotation seems to point out that he had chosen to implicitly challenge the unity of the Eastern bloc. It can be interpreted – in a sense – as a suggestion that whatever policy decisions were to be made in Finland, they should not be based on the projections or presumptions of some common will existing in the Eastern bloc. In other words, the decision of East Germany's recognition should not be based on the positive expectations concerning such an act's political expediency. This he also implied in another report a month later where he quoted a view of Günter Diehl, former secretary of state for the previous CDU/CSU government.⁹⁷¹ Diehl's view had been that there was weakness in the Eastern bloc's cohesion, and that there was differing maneuvering space for different Eastern bloc countries.

The Finnish advancement towards the recognition would have been especially unwelcomed, as Finland's position as a neutral country seemed to be once again questioned. Salomies himself had been forced to defend it a little over a year earlier, as he had to assure the West German Foreign Office that the interpretation one of their officials had made concerning Finland's geopolitical position was incorrect. The official had claimed (to a reporter of Finnish periodical *Helsingin Sanomat*) that in the communique of a NATO meeting in Brussels, Finland had been described as being in a "grey zone" concerning its position between the blocs. However, the inconvenient part of the situation had culminated later when Salomies had, after the case, met West German Foreign Office's director general of the Political Department, Ruete. Ruete had, with a hint of a smirk, told Salomies that, according to what he had heard, Finnish Foreign Minister Ahti Karjalainen had actually been satisfied with the interpretation of Finland as a grey zone. By this, he had implicitly accused Karjalainen, the foreign minister of Finland, of Finlandization as he had claimed that Karjalainen was satisfied with the evaluation. The underlying idea was that Karjalainen's satisfaction was based on the expectation of positive effect of such an interpretation in the disposition of the Soviet Union towards Finland. Little over year later the derogatory accusation would rise into the West German press discussion in such extent that Finnish Foreign Minister Ahti Karjalainen would be forced to take stance against the accusations.⁹⁷² Salomies wrote to Finnish Foreign Ministry's Director General of the Political Department Risto Hyvärinen concerning these events, but surprisingly, he did not express that he had claimed to Ruete that the statement was

⁹⁷⁰ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 6 January 1970, "Jugoslavalainen arviointi Bonnin idän-politiikan menestymisen mahdollisuudesta", p. 2.

⁹⁷¹ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 10 February 1970, "Hallituksen ulkopoliitiikan menettelytapa-ja koskevaa kritiikkiä", p. 2.

⁹⁷² See, PAAA B31 bd. 364, 4 March 1970 telegram from FRG trade mission in Helsinki "finnischer ausenminister [sic] zur "finnlandisierung" und zur deutschlandpolitik".

false but that he had expressed his wish that Ruete would not spread his “conception” of Karjalainen’s statement. Salomies speculated to Hyvärinen that Karjalainen’s statement had been presented in the company of *Helsingin Sanomat* reporter Kontio and certain other persons, and that some of them had spread it further. According to Salomies’ knowledge, Karjalainen had not explicitly demanded any public withholding of his statement from the persons present.⁹⁷³

It is surprising that Salomies did not claim that Karjalainen’s statement was false. It could therefore also be interpreted also as a criticism towards the political leadership. By his refusal to even debunk such a statement he had resigned the wish to maintain the façade of neutrality at the expense of his own credibility in Bonn. His withholding, in other words, admitted the possibility that the Finnish foreign policy leadership was, at this point, often catering quite directly to the (at least supposed) wishes of the Soviet Union. However, Salomies had later hand written at the end of the report a sort of disclaimer that he did not wish this information to be used to harm Karjalainen. Perhaps he had had a second thought concerning how bold he could make his implicit critique in order to retain his professionalism (and possibly his career in the ministry).

Salomies’ reporting continued with information from the inner-Eastern bloc standpoint concerning the Soviet Union’s current stance in the German question. The Yugoslavian ambassador had pointed to the direction already earlier reported by Salomies, i.e., the new détente direction of the Soviet foreign policy leadership. The ambassador believed that the Soviet Union strived for the loosening of tensions in Europe. In this regard, he claimed that it could be expected that Moscow would continue to support the contacts already made in the direction of Bonn. After all, Bonn’s current government had initiated a period of seeking new direction—a period which might not come again.⁹⁷⁴ His wish was that the Soviet Union leadership “would not execute the stupidity of appropriating an uncompromising attitude that might cause the failure of Brandt’s government”. In this regard, he seemed to be implicitly pointing, in addition to the East Germany’s easily alarmed leadership, to the more hawkish personnel that had earlier prevailed in the Soviet leadership as a hazard factor. In his view, failure was still a possibility, as in Moscow and in East Berlin there were “conservative factions” which wished to see Brandt’s policy fail.

When it came to the crux of the whole Eastern relations—the German question—the ambassador regarded that the demands of East Germany were actually as much as they were able to demand, not the least. He evaluated that it was a wise tactical move from Ulbricht to declare his demands before Bonn’s demands. This way, Ulbricht’s demands formed the basis of the negotiations, despite Bonn’s more limited proposals for the negotiations.⁹⁷⁵

⁹⁷³ UM 12 K 1968-1970, Croney letter from Salomies to Director General of Finnish Foreign Ministry’s Political Department Risto Hyvärinen 16 December 1968.

⁹⁷⁴ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 6 January 1970, “Jugoslavialainen arviointi Bonnin idän-politiikan menestymisen mahdollisuudesta”, p. 3.

⁹⁷⁵ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 6 January 1970, “Jugoslavialainen arviointi Bonnin idän-politiikan menestymisen mahdollisuudesta”, p. 4.

The ambassador believed that negotiations could be established despite the differences in demands, provided that the leadership of the German Democratic Republic actually wanted the releasing of tensions. The release of tension was, at least economically, alluring for East Germany as it would allow for a toll-free access to EEC markets. He believed that East Germans' could actually back off from the demand of the recognition of the German Democratic Republic by the international law – a demand which was deemed impossible by the Federal Republic government. Yet, it was not absolutely necessary for East Germany because the polls showed that general opinion in the Federal Republic was slowly but steadily shifting towards the official recognition of East Germany. This progress was to be sped up if there was some kind of *modus vivendi* reached between the two German states.⁹⁷⁶

The ambassador did not see that the current contact being made between two German states would, however, lead to the establishment of diplomatic relations. But, he regarded that Bonn would now “demolish even the last remains of the Hallstein Doctrine”. Therefore, in the future, any nation would be able to establish diplomatic relations with the German Democratic Republic without harm from the side of the Federal Republic. The status of West Berlin, according to the ambassador, would not be touched upon by the negotiations between two German states. It would more likely remain pending and waiting for results from the negotiations between the Western powers and the Soviet Union. The role of the Germans would then be to execute the already decided actions the ambassador had concluded in his analysis.⁹⁷⁷

These different aspects and forebodings concerning the development in the German question that Salomies reported were all pointing to one common factor: the inevitability of the *détente* momentum. In the analysis, the time was on the side of the solution, and there seemed to be surprisingly few obstacles ahead. It actually appeared that all the parties concerned had something to gain: for Brandt, it was the victory of his policy. For East Germany and other Eastern bloc countries, it was the economic benefits that were latent in the possible opening of the EEC toll barrier. In this regard, the analysis was actually capturing much of the real dynamism and impetus behind the official façade of the ideological *détente* policy taking place on all fronts. The reality was, that most of the players had real-political interest vested in it as well. For Britain, as already mentioned, there was the allure of the German support for Britain's EEC entrance. For the superpowers there was the motivation of being able to release their focus from Europe to the more acute problems they both were facing in Asia. The Soviet Union felt increasingly challenged and irked by the growth of China, a rivalry which had its origins in the days of Khrushchev. For United States, the problem was the war in Vietnam that was increasingly difficult in foreign and domestic policy.⁹⁷⁸ This

⁹⁷⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 6 January 1970, “Jugoslavalainen arviointi Bonnin idän-politiikan menestymisen mahdollisuudesta”, p. 4.

⁹⁷⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 6 January 1970, “Jugoslavalainen arviointi Bonnin idän-politiikan menestymisen mahdollisuudesta”, p. 4.

⁹⁷⁸ Sarotte 2001, 24.

was, at least partly, the reason why Richard Nixon, who made his inaugural address on 20 January 1969, was ready to proclaim that the United States was willing to enter an era of negotiations with the Soviet Union.⁹⁷⁹ It seemed that of the important European powers, only France had, at the moment, nothing to gain from the new political momentum that was taking over. Paris' earlier role as a Western bridge to Moscow was being diminished by the general tendency of mediation and negotiations between the blocs. The Gaullist vision of an international system free of blocs was challenged by the *détente*, which, from the perspective of Gaullist diplomacy, threatened to retain the bi-polar system's status quo.⁹⁸⁰ However, during the office of President Georges Pompidou (1969–1974), the prevailing system was seen as increasingly beneficial to France as well.⁹⁸¹

All in all, it was evident that in his reporting after the inauguration of Brandt's government, Salomies was clearly discerning a difference in this cabinet in comparison with the earlier Bonn government. He pointed out that the initial Eastern policy was wrought with different outlooks between the government partners, the SPD and the CDU/CSU. Contrary to this, the Brandt government had, in its essence, the benefit of the momentum of general *détente* spirit, and a unified voice to speak with, especially as the coalition partner FDP (whose Walter Scheel was the foreign minister in Brandt government) had been moving sharply left already during the Grand Coalition era. The party also had toyed with the idea of being SPD's coalition partner almost a decade before the realization of this idea.⁹⁸² As already mentioned, from the more real-political perspective, it seemed that all the parties involved in the *détente* – with the possible exclusion of France – had something to gain from the success of the Eastern policy. However, it appears that, from Salomies perspective, the hierarchy in the new political momentum had to be discerned on both sides, that is, the prevalence of super-powers at the spearhead of *détente*. The way towards the releasing of tensions was, in his view, not via East Berlin, or through West Germany; in his view, the German question appeared to hinge on the success of general warming of East-West relations.

Over all, the discussion analyzed in this section relating to the reception of Brandt's government's foreign policy showed that the reception might vary in some measures in different socialist countries. However, it also indicated that Moscow was striving for concerted actions with regards the policy in the Socialist bloc. Yet, this pursuit of uniformity also revealed the difficulties of harmonizing the general wishes of the Soviet Union as well as the other socialist countries, including East Germany. This theme of discord between East Germany and rest of the Eastern countries also began to emerge in the reporting from the end of the 1960s on, as the following chapter will show.

⁹⁷⁹ It led to the series of agreements concerning the arms control (for example, SALT-negotiations held in Helsinki), commercial relations, and political cooperation that alleviated the *détente* (Schulzinger 2010, 373).

⁹⁸⁰ Bozo 2010, 174.

⁹⁸¹ Bozo 2010, 175.

⁹⁸² Bark & Gress 1989 (2), 152.

5.1.2 The eastern policy causing a widening rift between the Soviet Union and East Germany

The first time the subject diverting interest inside the Eastern bloc was touched upon in the discussion of Finnish representative Martti Salomies with the head of the political department of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office, Frank.

Salomies evaluated that Frank had interesting views to reveal; he had questioned the whole notion of Moscow wanting the German Democratic Republic to achieve international recognition and membership in the United Nations. His rationale behind the doubt was that the strengthening position of Ulbricht would in fact cause more harm than benefits for Moscow. Therefore, according to Frank, a hypothetical question could be posited if it was in Moscow's interest that Ulbricht's position would continue to be reified by the international recognition of the German Democratic Republic as he would be consequently harder to keep under control. Frank had made an interesting comparison of Moscow's attitude with regards to the membership of the German Democratic Republic and China in the United Nations: according to him, Moscow demanded the membership of China every year in the general assembly, but that it did not, in reality, wish for it.⁹⁸³

There was a strong grasp of the gist of things inside the Eastern bloc, in Frank's words, that Salomies chose to relay. The China-Soviet rivalry was, of course, a well-known phenomenon at that point. However, less known was the rivalry between Ulbricht and Brezhnev, as well as the rivalry inside the Soviet leadership between Premier Alexei Kosygin, head of the KGB Yuri Andropov, and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko.⁹⁸⁴ Hope Harrison has shown through the documents of former communist archives that Ulbricht's tendency to go against the Soviet directives began already in the 1950s.⁹⁸⁵ At the time of Salomies' reporting, East German leader, Ulbricht, possibly seeing a chance of exploiting the divisiveness of the Soviet leadership, was emboldened to go against Brezhnev, who actually was losing his power in relation to figures such as Gromyko, Andropov, and Kosygin.⁹⁸⁶ Consequently, Ulbricht became increasingly difficult for the Soviet leadership especially since he not only ventured in the praxis level of his foreign policy independently, but he also began to assert individual interpretation of socialism on the ideological level. His personal and bloc-independent interpretations of socialism threatened the Soviet leadership as it indirectly challenged the supremacy of the Soviet model: Ulbricht's notions implied that East Germany might not follow the path of the Soviet Union, but, in fact, was on the path of its own when it came to socialism.⁹⁸⁷

The implications of this report once again contradicted the tendencies of the Finnish left, which had taken the stance of setting themselves in a favorable light

⁹⁸³ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 27 March 1969, "Duckwitzin lausun ja muutakin Liittotasavallan idänsuhteista", p. 3.

⁹⁸⁴ Sarotte 2004, 29.

⁹⁸⁵ Harrison 2005, 224.

⁹⁸⁶ Sarotte 2004, 29.

⁹⁸⁷ Sarotte 2004, 17.

in Moscow's view by acting towards the goal of the East German recognition. The message that Salomies was sending was that this kind of action was actually against Moscow's wishes. However, on the other hand, the views that Salomies presented originated from the government official of the Federal Republic, and, in this respect, could represent also—at least partly—wishful thinking, or a speech act, that was furthering the goals of his government. In this regard, one explaining factor was that during this period the Federal Republic's government began to worry that Finland might actually vote for the inclusion of the German Democratic Republic as a member state in the United Nations.⁹⁸⁸

However, it seems that in many respects Kekkonen was concurring with the views effusing from the reporting. He noted that the less commotion around the security conference initiative from the part of Eastern bloc, the better it was. His rationale was that too much Eastern activity would scare of Western nations and cause them to pull their support. He had also trusted the handling of the CSCE initiative for the foreign ministry which seemed to imply that he wished to “de-politicize” it as much as possible.⁹⁸⁹ In this regard, Salomies seemed to be suggesting that the chosen line was right, especially when one took in consideration that the political activity (in this case of the Finnish left) might actually be going against not only Finnish interest, but the Soviet Union's as well.

Salomies' interpretation that there was a rupture opening between the views of Ulbricht and the Soviet leadership was receiving support from the reporting of Esko Vaartela in East Berlin.⁹⁹⁰ Vaartela, who took his post in East Berlin earlier the same year (1969) was, by education, a political scientist, but also a hunter, fisher, and a diletant of history. He had become a trainee in the ministry in 1953. His assignments abroad had been in Bern, Copenhagen, and Paris.⁹⁹¹

He presented information that was boding ill for the future of Ulbricht as the leader of the German Democratic Republic.⁹⁹² Vaartela wrote in August 1969 that the Moscow convention of communist and worker parties, the governmental level convention of joint economic commission of the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union, and the visit of the German Democratic Republic's party and government delegation to the Soviet Union during the past month could all be regarded as indicative of the relations between the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union.⁹⁹³ Vaartela noted that as a general observation of these events, one could discern the propagation of total unanimousness between the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union. This had been manifested in the official documents released in conjunction with these events and in the processes of their formulation. And, despite the fact that this phenomenon was itself no novelty, Vaartela saw that the “frequency of its appearance”

⁹⁸⁸ PAAA B31 bd. 364, telegram of Detlev Scheel 4 November 1969.

⁹⁸⁹ Suomi 1996, 647.

⁹⁹⁰ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 6 August 1969, “SDT:n ja Neuvostoliiton suhteista”, p. 1.

⁹⁹¹ Ulkoasiainhallinnon matrikkeli 1996, osa 2., 275.

⁹⁹² UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 6 August 1969, “SDT:n ja Neuvostoliiton suhteista”, p. 1.

⁹⁹³ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 6 August 1969, “SDT:n ja Neuvostoliiton suhteista” p. 1.

seemed to have increased.⁹⁹⁴ His following information, however, seemed to contradict all this and show that the opposite might be taking place behind the scenes.⁹⁹⁵

He wrote that it was known that the German Democratic Republic's delegation in the Moscow party convention was planned to be led by Ulbricht. At that convention it was also decided that the coming governmental level visit to the Soviet Union would also be headed by Ulbricht. However, the planned visit would not ultimately be realized. On 21 June, the public had received the announcement by the secretary of central committee Professor Norden during the World Peace Conference in East Berlin that Walter Ulbricht had fallen ill with the flu. Western observers had also noted that when Ulbricht had turned 76 earlier in June, there had been no sign of a customary congratulations ceremony. Also, the important promotional event of East Germany, "Baltic Sea Weeks" (*Ostsee-woche, Itämeren viikot*) had started without his presence.⁹⁹⁶ All this led to the speculations concerning the real reasons for Ulbricht's absence, Vaartela stated. The speculations had emphasized the fact that after Ulbricht had returned from his earlier visit to Moscow, there had been another invitation to Moscow for government and party level delegations of the German Democratic Republic, despite the knowledge of Ulbricht's sickness and his inability to attend this next visit. Vaartela brought up two points that were, in his view, especially of importance when interpreting this episode. In them, his ultimate deduction appeared to be that Ulbricht's teetering position was related to the détente taking place. Vaartela could have also meant that it was the alleviation of its realization by diminishing Ulbricht's position (which was often inimical to the Soviet Union and détente due to his capricious policies and pungent attacks against the West Germany).⁹⁹⁷

In his interpretation consisting of two points, Vaartela noted firstly that the importance of the visit had been deemed so high that it could not be postponed. Second, Moscow also wanted to receive the delegation sans Ulbricht, which gave reasons for an interpretation that the visit to Moscow had not been executed so much despite the absence of Ulbricht, but especially because of it. All this had been linked in the Western evaluations to the perceived peace offensive of the Soviet Union in Europe. It had been interpreted to require the displacement of the "rigid and conservative" Ulbricht from the DDR leadership in favor of someone new, possibly Honecker or Stoph. In this respect, it had been noted that during the delegation's visit Gromyko had indicated, towards Western nations, of

⁹⁹⁴ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 6 August 1969, "SDT:n ja Neuvostoliiton suhteista", p. 2. In the beginning of the Moscow conference few months later in December Brezhnev also noted this dimension in the beginning of his speech. According to him, the conference continued in the fine tradition of unifying the approach of Warsaw Pact countries to international issues (Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik. VI. Reihe/Band 1 21. Oktober 1969 bis 31. Dezember 1970, 100. Nr. 35. Treffen der Führer der kommunistischen und Arbeiterparteien der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages (Auszug) Moskau, 3./4, Dezember 1969).

⁹⁹⁵ See Sarotte 2004, 29.

⁹⁹⁶ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 6 August 1969, "SDT:n ja Neuvostoliiton suhteista", p. 2.

⁹⁹⁷ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 6 August 1969, "SDT:n ja Neuvostoliiton suhteista", p. 2.

the Soviet Union's wish for the negotiations over West Berlin in his speech at the supreme council of the Federation of the Soviet Republics in July.⁹⁹⁸

Ultimately, it had been Stoph that had acted as head of the delegation to Moscow. Honecker, on the other hand, had functioned as an important party level representative in the delegation. Vaartela brought up the speculations from the Western side and noted that in these evaluations Honecker had been predicted to be the most probable follower of Ulbricht. This would have been if the current leader were to resign due to health-related reasons, or at least would give up the chair of party leader and act only as a protocolary chairman of the state council.⁹⁹⁹

In his following lines, Vaartela seemed to implicate that perhaps Ulbricht's recent scolding was part of the disciplining of the Kremlin. In other words, it seemed that the bloc's leader was, in order to prepare for the momentum taking place, unifying the states inside its sphere of influence. All this was, once again, messaging for the Finnish Foreign Ministry that the order of the hierarchy, despite the inner bloc contradictions reported earlier, was clear: the Soviet Union was controlling the pace of the détente process.

However, Vaartela also acknowledged the problematic nature of interpreting the events of the extremely controlled society and wrote, "It is daring to venture with such weak evidence to far-fetched conclusions as in the Western writings has been done. It is, however, natural to resort to the aforementioned when observing the occurrences in the closed society from the small signs in the manner of Roman augur".¹⁰⁰⁰ Still, the recent meetings between the Soviet leadership and East Germans had given Vaartela a reason to believe that their meaning was an increasing demand for the German Democratic Republic to acquiescence in the will of Moscow and integrate its policy with the Soviet Union. He noted that despite the fact that delegation visits were common among the Comecon countries, there should be a special meaning attributed to the meeting of the joint economic commissions of the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic in East Berlin that took place the previous July, especially as the resolutions of this meeting were, in a way, confirmed by the government-level delegation visit of the German Democratic Republic to Moscow afterwards. Vaartela argued that the interpretation of these events as a sign of ever-increasing co-operation and integration between these states was supported by the fact that in the SED central committee meeting at the end of July that was discussing the visit to Moscow, Ulbricht had stated that German-Soviet friendship had grown qualitatively to a new higher level. The common declaration of the both parties stated that "the

⁹⁹⁸ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 6 August 1969, "SDT:n ja Neuvostoliiton suhteista", p. 2.

⁹⁹⁹ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 6 August 1969, "SDT:n ja Neuvostoliiton suhteista", p. 3.

¹⁰⁰⁰ "On uskallettua lähteä näin heikoin perustein vetämään niinkin pitkälle meneviä johtopäätöksiä kuten läntisessä kirjoittelussa on tehty, mihin luonnollisesti sorrutaan soljetun yhteisön tapahtumia varsinaisten faktojen puutteessa auguurimaisesti pienistä ennusmerkeistä tarkkaillen" (UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 6 August 1969, "SDT:n ja Neuvostoliiton suhteista", p. 3).

friendship between the peoples of German Democratic Republic's and the Soviet Union is manifested in the unification of their material and spiritual resources for the happiness of people and for the triumph of socialism and communism. The brotherly co-operation between the German Democratic Republic and Soviet Union has politically, economically, ideologically and culturally essentially evolved".¹⁰⁰¹

All this, Vaartela evaluated, had to be seen as a consequence from the political decision that was made already a good while ago. The agreements made now were only confirming the official line in the integration process that seemed to tie the German Democratic Republic more to the Soviet Union. For the German Democratic Republic this meant, in practice, the strengthening of its foreign trade with the Soviet Union which was already 45 percent of its total foreign trade. In Vaartela's view, this meant, in the future, even less room for maneuvering for the German Democratic Republic in its trade policy.¹⁰⁰²

His office had also, Vaartela pointed out, received from high-level East German official information that it was, in fact, political reasons that had forced the German Democratic Republic to direct its trade more and more towards the Soviet Union. According to this informant, it also caused tragi-comical situations as the political appropriateness prevailed over the practicality. The German Democratic Republic had, for example, bought from the Soviet Union caterpillar track equipped forest tractors that were useless in the German Democratic Republic's environment. Consequently, East Berlin had already made a deal with Finnish company Valmet to provide suitable tractors for East German needs.¹⁰⁰³

Vaartela regarded that there was an operation taking place that was, for the time being, striving to stifle the rumors circling around the possibilities of Ulbricht to retain his position¹⁰⁰⁴ There had also been some high-level meetings Ulbricht had recently had which Vaartela regarded as a probable continuum of the implicit messages referring to the status of Ulbricht. First, the sickness-ridden leader had met the ambassador of the Soviet Union, and there had been a rumor that the ambassador had relayed the greetings of the Soviet Union's leading politicians to Ulbricht. These persons had, according to rumors, included at least Brezhnev, Kosygin, and Podgorny. A couple of days later, Ulbricht received the member of the Soviet Union's politburo, Andrej Kirilenko, and the leader of the International Olympic Committee, Avery Brundage.¹⁰⁰⁵

It appears that Vaartela was perhaps expecting a more obsequious stance from Ulbricht and less possibilities for him than there actually proved to be. A few months later he seemed to be surprised that Ulbricht had, against all odds, managed to drive through independent moves in his foreign policy despite that earlier (discussed in the previous report) he had seemed bound to the control of

¹⁰⁰¹ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 6 August 1969, "SDT:n ja Neuvostoliiton suhteista", p. 4.

¹⁰⁰² UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 6 August 1969, "SDT:n ja Neuvostoliiton suhteista", p. 4.

¹⁰⁰³ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 6 August 1969, "SDT:n ja Neuvostoliiton suhteista", p. 4.

¹⁰⁰⁴ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 6 August 1969, "SDT:n ja Neuvostoliiton suhteista", p. 3.

¹⁰⁰⁵ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 6 August 1969, "SDT:n ja Neuvostoliiton suhteista", p. 3.

Moscow.¹⁰⁰⁶ According to Vaartela, he had also managed to ally with the other socialist countries against Brandt's policy. The main impetus behind Ulbricht's independent foreign policy moves had been the fear of drifting in the isolated position caused by the latest bilateral negotiation between East and West: that is, between Bonn and Moscow as well as between Bonn and Warsaw. The fear of Ulbricht had been aggravated by the knowledge that, in addition to Poland, there existed a similar willingness to negotiate in other Eastern bloc countries as well, countries such as Hungary and Czechoslovakia.¹⁰⁰⁷

This analysis was referring to the overt phenomenon taking place from the SED or East German leadership's side: they were, on the one hand, willing to start negotiations, but, on the other hand, they did not wish to make things too easy for Brandt. In this regard, the SED was relying on the CDU/CSU's continued opposition to Brandt's Eastern policy which would prevent it from progressing too much on Brandt's terms.¹⁰⁰⁸

In this regard, a few months after Vaartela's report when the East German and West Germans headed to negotiations in Erfurt, there was a scrupulous preparing by East German secret police, officially titled as State Security Service (*Staatssicherheitsdienst, SSD*), but commonly known as the Stasi, to make sure that Brandt would not get the benefit of prestige by the support of crowds of cheering East Germans.¹⁰⁰⁹ In their view, it would have rendered the domestic opposition by the CDU/CSU to Brandt's Eastern policy devoid of power and given him almost absolute freedom regarding it. Of course, publicly and officially, as manifest in Ulbricht's speech in Moscow at the meeting of the Warsaw Pact countries on 3 December 1969, Ulbricht condemned the CDU/CSU as the "conservative and reactionary" hindrance for German-German relations.¹⁰¹⁰ However, ultimately, in Erfurt, Stasi did not manage to organize enough forces on the ground to prevent the crowds from breaking through one of the blockades at the train station where Brandt's train arrived.¹⁰¹¹

All this showed that, for East Berlin as well as for the Eastern bloc in general, important was the "keeping up of appearances" in the dealings with the Western states.¹⁰¹² The difference between a totalitarian regime based on ideology and one based on pure tyranny is that the ideological one, such as East Germany, cannot suppress too overtly the crowds supporting the visit of a hostile head of the state.¹⁰¹³ It would show distinctively that the regime is not, in fact, supported by its own people and consequently would devoid its legitimacy vested in the ideology.

¹⁰⁰⁶ According to Hermann Wentker, especially during the Soviet ambassador Abrasimow's term in office in the period of 1962-1971, the East German leadership was influenced by extensively by Abrasimow (Wentker 2007, 369).

¹⁰⁰⁷ UM 5 C 5 telegram from Berlin 13 January 1970, p. 1.

¹⁰⁰⁸ Sarotte 2001, 44.

¹⁰⁰⁹ Sarotte 2001 (2), 95, 96.

¹⁰¹⁰ Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik. VI. Reihe/Band 1 21. Oktober 1969 bis 31. Dezember 1970. p. 100. Nr. 35. Treffen der Führer der kommunistischen und Arbeiterparteien der Teilnehmerstaaten des Warschauer Vertrages (Auszug) Moskau, 3./4. Dezember 1969.

¹⁰¹¹ Sarotte 2001 (2), 95.

¹⁰¹² Schoenborn & Niedhart 2016, 3; Sarotte 2001 (2), 99, 100.

¹⁰¹³ Sarotte 2001 (2), 99, 100.

The domestic opposition for Brandt's policy was, in fact, what Vaartela was pointing at in his report as a political weapon for the East Germans. Vaartela informed the Foreign Ministry of the analyses that had evaluated that, from the Western viewpoint, "maximum" demands – that East Berlin regarded as minimum – might push the Brandt government in the uncomfortable position in respect to domestic opposition as well as socialist countries. This was because the demands East Germany had pronounced were impossible for "any kind of West German government" to accept. Behind all this was East Berlin's attempt to drive a wedge between the socialist countries and Bonn. It would be achieved by driving the German question to a dead end with extreme demands and using it as a propaganda weapon to prevent initiation of new bilateral negotiations with socialist countries.¹⁰¹⁴ The evaluations emphasized the factor that, so far, the German Democratic Republic had enjoyed political advantage from its monopoly status among the socialist countries with regards to the entrance to the markets of the European Economic Community countries. The odd situation resulted from the fact that there was no toll barrier between East and West Germany.¹⁰¹⁵

However, Vaartela himself evaluated that it was unlikely that the treaty Ulbricht had presented for Bonn was drafted without the approval of the Soviet Union. He noted in this conjunction that the tactics and interactions of socialist countries with regards to West Germany were decided at the summit that took place the previous December in Moscow. But, it seemed that Ulbricht had had some leeway with regards to West Germany. In Vaartela's view, he had adroitly utilized this.¹⁰¹⁶

Concerning the influence of Moscow, Vaartela was discerning the actual dynamics of the on-going détente process by the Kremlin and East Berlin, in which the latter was relegated to a subservient role. Moscow had stipulated for East Berlin that no results of rapprochement should be reached in the German-German negotiations.¹⁰¹⁷ This was also the cause behind the minimum demands that Vaartela previously referred to as impossible for "any kind of West German government" to accept. In the Moscow meeting that Vaartela also referred to, it had actually been Ulbricht who had proposed more lenient wording for the draft of the German-German treaty. Brezhnev had demanded multiple corrections, and more harsh line. He was not yet willing to trust that the Brandt government would actually mean a new approach in West Germany towards its Eastern counterpart, but that it still wished to "devour the DDR".¹⁰¹⁸

It appears that at this point the tables had turned: previously, Ulbricht had been the one that was hindering the détente process in the form of West Germany bettering its relations with the East. As already noted in the reporting from 1967, against that threat, Ulbricht had improvised the so-called iron triangle (Ukraine,

¹⁰¹⁴ UM 5 C 5 telegram from Berlin 13 January 1970, p. 1.

¹⁰¹⁵ UM 5 C 5 telegram from Berlin 13 January 1970, pp. 1, 2.

¹⁰¹⁶ UM 5 C 5 telegram from Berlin 13 January 1970, p. 2.

¹⁰¹⁷ Schoenborn & Niedhart 2016, 3.

¹⁰¹⁸ Sarotte 2001, 32.

Hungary and East Germany) to prevent the isolation of East Germany in the Eastern bloc.¹⁰¹⁹ Now, however, it was Ulbricht that was willing to exploit Brandt's Ostpolitik. Of course, for Moscow, Germany was one aspect of the larger framework of détente negotiations, this is why the idea of progress from the East German view was not necessarily in line with Moscow. Ulbricht's fast progress in German-German negotiations threatened to make Brezhnev lose one of his most important assets in the negotiations with the West: Berlin, and, along with it, East Germany. Markus Wolf, head of the Stasi espionage abroad, also has pointed in his memoirs to the direction that Moscow was intriguing in its détente and German policy. According to him, Brezhnev was "playing both hands" and wanted to promote better Soviet-West German relations while for the SED, he told to take the opposite course, that is, to brake the process of warming relations with West Germany. Documents from the Stasi archives have supported Wolf's assertions: KGB chief Andropov in fact advised Stasi chief Erich Mielke and Wolf to hold back in their dealings with West Germany.¹⁰²⁰

From the perspective of later research, Vaartela had already, in his previous report, managed to get to the gist of the issue in East Berlin–Moscow dynamics. His pointing towards the political steering of East Germany was close to what was happening and, in some sense, foretold the approaching ousting of Ulbricht and his consequent replacement by Honecker. Later research has shown that the reason for the change in personnel was the conformity to Moscow's policy, not the already mentioned independent socialism and anti-West German rhetoric that Ulbricht had been cultivating. In fact, Honecker, prior to his elevation at the top of the SED, was a harsh critic of the lenient line towards West Germany.¹⁰²¹ After his appointment to the head of the SED he subjugated, however, to Moscow's line, unlike Ulbricht who, in many respects, had taken—his already stable—anti-West German rhetoric beyond its symbolic level and to actual policy implementations. In short, the true reason for Ulbricht's replacement was Ulbricht's capricious and independent stance in the ongoing negotiations between East and West, as Vaartela implied in his analysis before Ulbricht's ousting. Vaartela had at that point concluded that the very existence of the German Democratic Republic relied on the Soviet Union on such a scale that it had no other option but to keep lauding Soviet-East German co-operation.¹⁰²²

On the other hand, even though he had reported these evaluations that were implying the subjugation of East Germany to Soviet interest by the change of its leadership, in his more recent report discussed above he was not yet ready to proclaim it. He brought up information that seemed to posit that Ulbricht's banishment out of the political limelight had been temporary—perhaps just a part of the Kremlin's measures to bring East Germany back in line. However, it is possible that Vaartela's analysis was infused, in some regards, with the view propagated with the holistic nature of the totalitarian state machinery, as his colleague

¹⁰¹⁹ See section 4.1.3.

¹⁰²⁰ Sarotte 2001, 31, 30.

¹⁰²¹ Sarotte 2001, 109, 110.

¹⁰²² UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 6 August 1969, "SDT:n ja Neuvostoliiton suhteista", p.4.

in Cologne, Martti Salomies, was less prone to see that Ulbricht's resistance could continue. The latter standpoint seemed to be valid in the context that the negotiations were quadrilateral between West Germany, East Germany, Poland (due to the Oder-Neisse question), and the Soviet Union, and that the negotiation initiative from West Germany did not even preclude the recognition of East Germany.¹⁰²³

Salomies' informant had been a Western correspondent he regarded as one of the most astute political analysts in Bonn and who, according to Salomies, "possessed a multi-faceted view" on how Brandt's Eastern policy was progressing. Salomies believed that his opinions should be brought to the Finnish Foreign Ministry's knowledge, as they delved deeper and were more discerning than the usual analyses heard in Bonn.¹⁰²⁴ The first point of the correspondent's analysis had been that Brandt's government had decided to progress with the initiated negotiation contacts as far as possible; it was going to achieve at least some results from them and failure was not an option. This was because failure in the negotiations would have most probably brought the CDU/CSU coalition back in power in the next elections.¹⁰²⁵

Salomies wrote that, according to his interlocutor, the most crucial aspect in the negotiations was to assure Moscow. The much attention received interview of Herbert Wehner in *Der Spiegel*, in which he had declared that Bonn's stance with regards to the international recognition of the German Democratic Republic might change, had most likely been addressed to Moscow. It was something that might ease the position of Brandt's trusted man, Secretary of State Egon Bahr, who was leading the German delegation in the Moscow negotiations. Especially since the government's Information Chief Ahlers had confirmed that the stand Wehner had expressed in the interview also represented the government's official stand. If the negotiations in Moscow ended with results, the results would also be achieved in Warsaw and East Berlin. Ulbricht had already referred to this scenario in his recent press interview. Salomies also noted that the informant did not share the earlier reported stand¹⁰²⁶ of the state secretary Dahrendorf, which had posited that the German Democratic Republic had substantial independence with regards to Moscow.¹⁰²⁷

The views Salomies next brought up were not only challenging East Germany's independent role, but its earlier rhetoric in the German question and its possible consequences for European peace. In this he was also indirectly challenging President Kekkonen and his rhetoric that had concerted the East German foreign policy discourse (and the Soviet Union's) in the claims of the West Ger-

¹⁰²³ UM 5 C 5 A classified report Bonn 29 January 1970, "Bonn-Moskova-Itä-Berliini".

¹⁰²⁴ UM 5 C 5 A classified report Bonn 29 January 1970, "Bonn-Moskova-Itä-Berliini", p. 1.

¹⁰²⁵ UM 5 C 5 A classified report Bonn 29 January 1970, "Bonn-Moskova-Itä-Berliini", p. 1.

¹⁰²⁶ Dahdendorff's stance, see report Bonn 24 January 1970 "Keskustelut liittokanslarin ja ulkoministeriön parlamentaarisen valtiosihteerin kanssa".

¹⁰²⁷ UM 5 C 5 A classified report Bonn 29 January 1970 "Bonn-Moskova-Itä-Berliini", pp. 2, 3.

man threat to European peace, especially earlier in the 1960s. Yet, Salomies presented in his report a stance that portrayed the whole idea as absurd.¹⁰²⁸ However, the critique was vicariously communicated through his correspondent (whose views he regarded as astute, as the beginning of the report informed). Vaartela noted that, in the correspondent's opinion, the whole reference to mutual renunciation of the use of force from the part of the Federal Republic and the Soviet Union in the negotiations was merely a "rubric under which the real problems could be resolved".¹⁰²⁹ He had considered the idea of the use of force from the part of the Federal Republic ridiculous and stated that "as if the Federal Republic was going to attack the Soviet Union".¹⁰³⁰ He had also regarded the opposite scenario of Moscow seriously threatening Bonn as absurd. Salomies' reported views were not the only cold-shower towards Kekkonen at this period. The president was hit hard by an article in West German conservative newspaper *Die Welt* the previous year. It had described Kekkonen as an anticharismatic leader that had no connection with the people of Finland. The article also reminded of the Note Crisis in 1961 that had, in its essence, solidified Kekkonen's leadership with Soviet relations. Kekkonen had written a letter to one of the interviewed and enquired of articles origins, the reply implied that some of the other interviewed had been officials from the Finnish Foreign Ministry.¹⁰³¹ This showed that even inside the Finnish political or administrative machinery there existed critique of Kekkonen's methods of ruling. However, contrary to the implicit and discreet critique of the reporting, the anonymity cathartically unleashed a full spectrum of repressed critique concerning it.

In an interesting contradictory juxtaposition, Salomies' information was not only debunking the idea of the West German aggression, it was also containing hints of an assault against the Finnish political discussion where the FCMA Treaty was lifted to a untouchable position. The treaty was, after all, directed against German aggression. However, in the Finnish parliament the sanctity and relevance of the treaty would be reified once again later the same year by Foreign Minister Väinö Leskinen: in his words, the treaty was not, in any way, lessened in importance by the recent developments in the German-Soviet relations. Interestingly, he was a new convert to Kekkonen's foreign policy tenets; in the early 1960s he was still regarded as one of its sternest opponents. However, to advance his and his party's political career, he had renounced his previous attitude. Now he was speaking a different language and willing to limit his discourse inside the

¹⁰²⁸ UM 5 C 5 A classified report Bonn 29 January 1970 "Bonn-Moskova-Itä-Berliini", p. 3.

¹⁰²⁹ "...väkivallasta luopuminen (Gewaltverzicht) on vain sopivaksi katsottu rubriikki, jonka avulla päästään neuvottelemaan "todellisista probleemoista"..." (UM classified report Bonn 29 January 1970 "Bonn-Moskova-Itä-Berliini", p. 3).

¹⁰³⁰ "...Eihän kukaan tosissaan kuvittele, että esim. Liittotasavalta hyökkäisi Neuvostoliiton kimppuun tai Puola Liittotasavallan kimppuun." (UM 5 C 5 A classified report Bonn 29 January 1970, "Bonn-Moskova-Itä-Berliini", p. 3).

¹⁰³¹ UKK vuosikirjat 1958-, 1969 lehdistikatsaus Bonn 31 March 1969. Memo by Matti Tuovinen 29 March 1969 concerning the *Die Welt* article. Letter to Kekkonen, unrecognizable signature, undated.

conceptual boundaries of the FCMA Treaty and Kekkonen's friendship policy towards the Kremlin.

The opposition towards Leskinen's claim in the parliament came only from Kekkonen's starkest opposition: charismatic leader of the populist protest party, the Small Holder's Agrarian Party's (SMP) Veikko Vennamo and from the National Coalition party's strong willed political dissident, Tuure Junnila. Both men, in their attacks against Kekkonen's foreign policy, similarly to *Die Welt*, harkened back to the period of the Night Frost and Note Crisis, and thus reminded people how the Finnish foreign policy was being used in the domestic politics.¹⁰³²

As already implied, Leskinen, in fact, functioned as a general exponent of the slowly evolving symbolic homogenization in the field of Finnish politics. The opposition towards the foreign policy concepts and discourse defined by Kekkonen was increasingly diminishing, as even the previously critical Social Democrats (especially under the leadership of Väinö Tanner) were coming to embrace Kekkonen's friendship policy and the FCMA Treaty as its culmination point. In fact, Leskinen even gone as far as to imply in his speech later the same year to the Finnish parliament that the Security Conference could possibly be realized even with only the attendance of such nations that agreed with the Finnish initiative's terms. His statement was problematic as the initiative was, at least partly, the continuation of the earlier proposal of such a conference by the Kremlin. Therefore, he was in fact opening up a possibility of excluding Western countries from the conference, as it was unlikely that the Eastern bloc (from which the initiative originated) would refuse it. This overtaking of Kekkonen from the left forced Kekkonen to do damage control; he messaged to the representatives of the Western nations that what Leskinen was proposing did not originate from Moscow.¹⁰³³

Salomies' ended his report with the view that his informant had presented regarding the attitudes towards Brandt's policy in Moscow and East Berlin. He had noted that the leadership of the Soviet Union had presumed a disposition which regarded Brandt's Eastern policy as a positive phenomenon. Their view posited that the policy bettered the relations of the Soviet Union with West Germany and opened up the possibility to find a *modus vivendi* with it. On the contrary, Ulbricht's opinion was that the goals of Brandt's Eastern policy were still as they were before: harmful for the socialist camp. This was despite the fact that Brandt's government had adopted a subtler approach in the policy.¹⁰³⁴

Despite the astute observations in the report, what Salomies and his informant did not consider, however, was the possibility of the negotiation tactic where Moscow used East Germany as a bargaining tool. As already noted, Soviet leadership had advised its East German counterpart to pull the brake in the negotiations. However, it seems unclear if this tactic was known outside the SED and Stasi's elite, as just a couple of months earlier, the report from the East German

¹⁰³² PAAA B31 bd.364 report of Detlev Scheel 16 November 1970, "Aussenpolitische Debatte des Finnischen Reichstages am 5. November 1970", P. 6.

¹⁰³³ Suomi 1996, 657.

¹⁰³⁴ UM 5 C 5 A classified report Bonn 29 January 1970, "Bonn-Moskova-Itä-Berliini", p. 3.

Foreign Ministry's Division for Northern Europe seemed to be seriously concerned about détente and evaluated that European security served the interest of the Finnish ruling class bourgeoisie. According to memo:

The Finnish bourgeoisie is interested in the European security, alleviation of tensions, and the following co-operation between capitalist and socialist states in Europe because Finnish position as the neutral state would be thus be solidified. The Finnish bourgeoisie has conceived that the peace is indivisible and the tension and crisis-state in Central Europe will hinder Finland's security and the relative stability of its class hegemony. It has understood that in the case of conflict Finland's existence, due to its position as borderland between two systems, is threatened.¹⁰³⁵

The critique of détente seems to indicate that in the East German Foreign Ministry, Moscow's true intentions were concealed from East German diplomats – or that even the Ministry was unaware of this dimension. The duality of approaches in East Berlin and Moscow was also implied in the latter part of Salomies' report as being related to the question of how the four victor powers were to execute their influence in the German area. According to Salomies' report, East Germany regarded that the development had reached a point where the four powers were no longer responsible for the whole area of Germany. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, regarded that the responsibility had not ended. This was implied by the appointment of the new commander-in-chief of the Soviet troops in Germany: the Soviet Union's communique had referred to the troops as the Soviet Union troops in Germany, whereas, the East German communique had referred to them as the Soviet Union troops in the German Democratic Republic. Salomies' informant had regarded that the Soviet Union had most likely demanded a correction to the East German communique. He deduced it from the fact that Marshall Gretsno had recently visited East Germany and both sides had referred in their communiques to the Soviet Union troops in Germany.¹⁰³⁶

This analysis of the division in certain aspects of the German question and the détente process was something that was generally observed in the reporting at this point. The variety of interpretations regarding the situation from diplomats utilizing transnational information from their informants showed that the phenomenon of détente was a complex entanglement of multiple issues. The unity that was propagated by the socialist bloc in the meetings (such as the Moscow meeting in December 1969) was, in actuality, possibly an indication that the opposite was taking place. Most importantly was noted that the approaches of Ulbricht and the Kremlin seemed to contradict, even to the point where Ulbricht

¹⁰³⁵ MfAA L43 C452,74. memo from GDR Foreign Ministry, 18 November 1969, "Die finnische Bourgeoisie ist an der europäischen Sicherheit, an einer Entspannung und an einer zunehmenden Zusammenarbeit zwischen den kapitalistischen Staaten und den sozialistischen Staaten Europas interessiert, weil die Position Finnlands als neutraler Staat dadurch gefestigt würde. Die finnische Bourgeoisie hat begriffen, dass der Friede unteilbar ist und dass Spannungen und Krisenzustände in Mitteleuropa sofortige Rückwirkungen auf die Sicherheit Finnlands und die relative Stabilität ihrer Klassenherrschaft hätten. Sie ist sich bewusst, dass Finnland im Falle eines Konflikts als Grenzstaat der beiden Systeme in seiner Existenz bedroht ist." MfAA L43 C452,74, memo from GDR Foreign Ministry, 18 November 1969.

¹⁰³⁶ UM 5 C 5 A classified report Bonn 29 January 1970, "Bonn-Moskova-Itä-Berliini", p. 4.

was treated in such a manner that gave impetus for the speculations on the tenability of his position as the leader of the East German state as it approached, perhaps, its most important point in history. What this implied, and what was more precisely stated in other contexts of the reporting, was that East Germany was not the direction from where the progress of détente would originate and proceed. Neither would the possible recognition of it serve the interests of Moscow, as an increasing part of the political elite Finnish society was thinking. From a more international standpoint, East Germany's recognition was not the issue at all, but the further normalization, or increased trust in the relations between Moscow and West Germany (which also represented the West and NATO, in this case) and, consequently, European security and stability.

These reports held valuable interpretations for the Finnish foreign policy-makers as they provided guidance in the extremely narrow maneuvering space in which the promotion of the security conference had to take place. In a sense, this was the time period when the Cold War was at a tipping point, the superpowers could still go either way with regards the Conference. Finland had to keep its foreign policy on a course that emanated a message that Helsinki offered a neutral place that both east and west could accept. A Wrong kind of meddling and hurrying in the German question could have jeopardized the process

5.1.3 Flood of the challengers; Finland not comparable

From Finland's view, the most crucial obstacle for the successive conclusion of the Conference was the threat that was hanging above the possible swerve from the previous policy line: The Hallstein Doctrine. At this moment, if ever, the successful interpretation of the doctrine's state was imperative. The previous reporting showed that Finnish diplomats already regarded the Doctrine diluted, and even nearly abolished. However, it still was an existant factor in the West German foreign policy. At this point, the Doctrine appeared to be challenged also by the increasing amount of Third World states that were more than willing to recognize the German Democratic Republic. This pressure from international politics combined with the increasing amount of political pressure in Finland for the recognition of East Germany caused Walter Kempff, head of the Federal Republic's trade mission in Helsinki, to worry of Finland slipping in the vein of these nations from its previous course. The context was Syria's relations with East Germany. Syria was a nation that had emerged in reporting, in the context of Finland's non-recognition policy, in the 1950s, as the discussion in that section of the study showed. However, this time Syria was not speculated to follow Finland's example in its relations with East Berlin, as had been the case earlier when its trade mission's functionality and diplomatic rights were in question, but the inverse was taking place. Now, the Syrians had decided to proceed further and recognize the German Democratic Republic; the fear for West Germans was that Finland might follow Syria.

Kempff had questioned Finnish Foreign Ministry's deputy director general of the Political Department, Yrjö Väänänen, "what effect did those opinions held

that were presented in Finland on behalf of the recognition of DDR and that perhaps have received more impetus after the Syria had decided to recognize DDR". Väänänen calmed the representative by referring to the interview Foreign Minister Ahti Karjalainen had given the previous day to the *Stuttgarter Zeitung*. Väänänen had explained that it had included a statement in which Karjalainen assured that Finland did not have any intention of changing its equal treatment of the German states—the policy that was in concord with Finland's neutrality policy.¹⁰³⁷

Despite the pressures toward the Finnish German policy, it seems that the West Germans were, at this point, still somewhat assured that Finland was keeping a steady course on its policy. The trade mission in Helsinki reported a few months earlier that the Finnish German policy was in the process of altering and that it was still based on the so-called "Korhonen paper". This referred to the speech that Finnish Foreign Ministry's Political Department's Secretary of Section Keijo Korhonen had given in a seminar of the Finnish People's Democratic League's youth division in September 1967. In it, Korhonen had assured that Finland had no reason to change its German policy.¹⁰³⁸

For representative Kempf, it was enough to prove that the status quo of the Finnish German policy was guaranteed by the "highest level", *höchste Stelle*, of Finnish politics. However, Kempf noted that one notable change could be discerned: the Finnish German policy was taking a more multilateral stance.¹⁰³⁹

What Kempf was referring to here was the new orientation in Finnish foreign policy from the late 1960s: that is, that Finland was executing its foreign policy increasingly in the context of international organizations such as the United Nations or OECD, especially through the representative offices in Geneva, New York, Paris, Brussels, Vienna, and Rome that were observing the functioning of these international organizations.¹⁰⁴⁰

A few months later, the West German Foreign Office was reassured as Kempf's successor, Detlev Scheel, concerted the stance of his predecessor that Finland was not changing the German policy. It was, according to him, confirmed by Kekkonen's recent speech. In his view, Kekkonen had—in its essence—expressed that Finland was not changing its German policy.¹⁰⁴¹

At this point Syria was not the only case that drew was the diplomatic interest in regards to the sole representation demand of West Germany. Vaartela reported that especially relevant was the recognition of East Germany by Iraq.

¹⁰³⁷ UM 7 D II 307, memo from Yrjö Väänänen 6 June 1969, "...mikä vaikutus on niillä mielipiteillä, joita Suomessa on esitetty DDR:n tunnustamisen puolesta ja jotka ovat saaneet ehkä uutta tuulta purjeisiinsa mm. Syyrian päätettyä viimeksi tunnustaa DDR:n."

¹⁰³⁸ UM 7 D II 307, "Esitelmä 23 September 1967 Suomen Demokraattisen Nuorisoliiton seminaarissa Oulussa".

¹⁰³⁹ PAAA B 31 bd. 364, report of Günther Kempf 4 February 1969 "Erklärungen der Regierung und führender Persönlichkeiten des Gastlandes zur Deutschland- und Berlin-Frage".

¹⁰⁴⁰ Soikkanen 2003a, 310.

¹⁰⁴¹ PAAA B 31 bd. 364, telegram from Detlev Scheel 10 October 1969 "pressereaktion auf kekkonens aeusserung zu deutschlandfrage".

According to Vaartela, it was the first non-socialist recognizer of the German Democratic Republic and a result of years of propagation by East Germany in Iraq for the benefit of recognition. Iraq was in this respect an easy target as it had actually severed diplomatic relations with West Germany already in 1965.¹⁰⁴² Speculations considering the promotion of the status of Iraq's mission had started after East German Foreign Minister Winzer's visit to Cairo in March and the consequential promotion of the representative offices of Egypt and the German Democratic Republic of Germany to the status of a mission. However, the promotion of Iraq's representation had not taken place at that time nor during the visit of Iraq's Foreign Minister, Al Sheiklyn, to the German Democratic Republic in April – during which, however, in Vaartela's evaluation the timing of the now-executed recognition had been decided.¹⁰⁴³

Ultimately, the recognition had taken place on the eve of Labor Day on 30 April 1969 when Baghdad's radio had announced the decision of Iraq's Revolutionary Command Council. After this, the SED's Central Committee member Gruneberg had expressed in his speech, on 1 May, that the populace of the German Democratic Republic saluted the recognition, which, in Vaartela's view, was quite a "laconic reaction". The next day, there had been published East Germany's Foreign Minister Winzer's telegram to Al Sheikly, after which there was substantial attention paid in the German Democratic Republic media to the foreign statements and press comments with regards to the recognition. They were fused in the German Democratic Republic's media with the attacks towards the Federal Republic and its policy of the Hallstein Doctrine.¹⁰⁴⁴

Despite the muted official reaction, Vaartela seemed to discern that the modest reaction was planned to be such. This is implicated, he reported, by the fact that the event was considered in East Berlin as "extremely significant" and it was interpreted as a sort of a breakthrough on the Arab front. It was the result of 10 years of bilateral relations work. However, he also noted that the outcome was much influenced by the escalation of the situation in the Middle East (the Six Day War) and the clear positioning of the German Democratic Republic for the pro-Arab line and its consequent critical stance towards Israel and Zionism. Whether this policy was also backed by financial support for the Arab states – which was implied by the Western newspapers – was not known.

Yet, Vaartela had acquired information that revealed that Winzer had, during his visit to Iraq, promoted a possibility of a financial support for states that would follow the example of Iraq in East Germany's recognition. Vaartela noted that as a concrete symbol of the newly established diplomatic relations between the German Democratic Republic and Iraq, a passenger plane of Iraq Airways had landed on Schönefeld airport: a manifestation of the fact that it had added East Germany to its roster of routes. The German Democratic Republic's own aviation line, Interflug, had been flying to Baghdad for two years already.¹⁰⁴⁵

¹⁰⁴² Gray 2003, 209.

¹⁰⁴³ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 17 May 1969, "Irakin suorittama SDT:n tunnustaminen", p. 1.

¹⁰⁴⁴ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 17 May 1969, "Irakin suorittama SDT:n tunnustaminen", pp. 1, 2.

¹⁰⁴⁵ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 17 May 1969, "Irakin suorittama SDT:n tunnustaminen", p. 2.

After the recognition, the East German foreign minister visited Baghdad between 6 and 11 of May. The communique published in German Democratic Republic after the visit had noted that during the visit an official treaty confirming the establishment of the diplomatic relations and the alteration of the current head consular offices to embassies had been signed. The treaty also called for co-operation in the areas of economy, culture, science, and technology. This was to be executed by founding of an economic commission, scientific counsel, and cultural commission; the co-operation was to be also strengthened in the area of information. On the party level there had been a decision of co-operation between the SED and Iraq's ruling Baath party, part of the larger pan-arab Baath party that promoted its own brand of socialism that infused leftist ideology with nationalism.¹⁰⁴⁶

By this reporting of a somewhat extensive political show that was put forth by the German Democratic Republic, Vaartela was perhaps informing the Finnish Foreign Ministry of the multiple ramifications that the the whole political sum of recognition of the German Democratic Republic could entail. It was not to be reduced to a recognition of an existence of a state entity; it intensified relations in multiple fields on a bilateral level and also formed a political statement in the international arena. In this respect, Vaartela noted in his report the inimical element of the recognition's aftermath: that is, the angry socialist rhetoric. All this was, of course, something that would not concord with Finland's neutrality policy. This was perhaps partly behind Vaartelas' clarification of the communique's contents the two states had produced. In order to further his point, Vaartela quoted verbatim some of the crass, communist-tilted rhetoric the document had been imbued with. The citation was quite an excessively detailed recapitulation of the socialist rhetoric that was usually a hyperbole exceeding in drama and lacking in eloquence. According to him

The communique holds pungent attacks against Israel, the United States, and the Federal Republic of Germany, and it can be said generally in this light that neither of the parties have bargained in the political price they withdrew; both parties have received what they wanted. Therefore, both ministers condemn Israel's continued aggressive military provocations against the Arab states and Israel's constant violation of the international convention of human rights and its terror and war campaign against the Arab people and its forced evacuation. "Israel is racist, imperialist, reactionary and aggressive. It spearheads imperialism in the Arab world and threatens worldpeace and the international security. Against this situation, the German Demoractic Republic and the Iraq people are fighting on a common front"¹⁰⁴⁷

¹⁰⁴⁶ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 17 May 1969, "Irakin suorittama SDT:n tunnustaminen", p. 2.

¹⁰⁴⁷ "Kommunikkea sisältää kiivaita hyökkäyksiä Israelia, Yhdysvaltoja ja Saksan liittotasavaltaa vastaan, ja voidaan yleisesti ottaen sanoa, ettei sen valossa kummaltakaan taholta ole ilmeisestikään tingitty poliittisessa hinnanmaksussa; molemmat osapuolet ovat saaneet sen, mitä ovat halunneet. Niinpä molemmat ministerit tuomitsevat Israelin jatkuvat agressiiviset sotilaalliset provokaatiot arabivaltioita vastaan ja Israelin jatkuvan kansainvälisen ihmisoikeuksia koskevan konvention loukkaamisen sekä sen terrori- ja sortosotaretken arabiväestöä vastaan väestön pakkoevakuoimisineen. "Israel on rasistinen, imperialistinen, taantumuksellinen ja agressiivinen. Se on imperialismiin keihäänkärki arabimaailmassa ja uhkaa rauhaa sekä kansainvälistä

When all this was included in the report that was going to a ministry of a democratic Western state (contrary to a communist state bodies that expected certain liturgies to be included in the evaluation of politics) it adds to the effect that the report was practically a warning to the ministry of the ramifications latent in the recognition of the German Democratic Republic. Of course, this could have been once again a notification that Finland already was, in a sense, in the German question with a dubious company of Third World states—an observation already presented by Vaartela's predecessor, Holger Sumelius. He had noted this in 1963, as he pointed at Finland's unique position as a Western state that held *de facto* representation in East Berlin.¹⁰⁴⁸

According to Vaartela, in the press there was not an imminent flood of German Democratic Republic's recognition by the other Arab states expected. Only Syria was considered as a potential recognizer. It was speculated that Iraq had done its recognition without consulting the other Arab governments beforehand. In the German Democratic Republic, according to Vaartela, there was, on the other hand, a certainty that the example of Iraq would be followed.

Vaartela also could highlight the underlying strategy of the East German regime behind all this: according to him, the East German deputy foreign minister had told him that Bonn was to be cornered by the recognitions. The minister had claimed to Vaartela that if Bonn continued to follow the Hallstein Doctrine, it would, in the long run, be depleted of any financial or economical countermeasures to stop the current development. This interpretation was based on the view that the interests of West German industry and the West German government were totally opposite to the Doctrine's execution and could diminish the scope of West German export markets.¹⁰⁴⁹

Iraq was not to hold long its position *extraordinaire* as Cambodia and Sudan followed suit and established diplomatic relations with Ublricht's regime during the same month. This addition to the number of recognizers increased the push towards the journey of East Germany into full "statehood" to such a degree that in Finland members of the government were inquired by the East German magazine *Horizont*, which focused on international politics, of their stance regarding the German question. As mentioned before, communists in Finland had already evaluated Finland as being in a key role in the matter. At this point, even the ministerial position in the government that officially took a cautious stance in the German question was no restraint in the enthusiasm of the left for the trailblazing in the German question. Communist Social Minister Anna-Liisa Tiekso (member of the Finnish People's Democratic League) expressed that Finland should recognize the German Democratic Republic and noted that recognition by a European nation would advance the international status of East Germany more than the

turvallisuutta . Tätä tilannetta vastaan taistelevat SDT:n ja Irakin kansat lujina yhteisrintamassa." (UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 17 May 1969, "Irakin suorittama SDT:n tunnustaminen", p. 3.)

¹⁰⁴⁸ See section 4.3.1, UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 27 September 1963, "Uusin kaupallinen edustusto".

¹⁰⁴⁹ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 17 May 1969, "Irakin suorittama SDT:n tunnustaminen", p. 4.

recognitions executed by Third World states. More restraint, however, was shown on the moderate left, as Industrial Minister Väinö Leskinen (Social Democratic Party of Finland) noted that the recognition of East Germany was related to European security. He emphasized that the question should be peacefully resolved by using the propitious time at hand before it was too late.¹⁰⁵⁰

In Bonn, Salomies seemed to implicitly suggest that he could present valuable and realistic information from inside the West German political system of how the latest events were to be interpreted in the German question. This could be interpreted because he noted that he had gathered the following views from a “leading official” of the Federal Republic’s Foreign Office. According to the informant, the recognition of the German Democratic Republic by Sudan caused worry in the Foreign Office. However, there was no belief that Sudan’s actions would initiate a wave of recognitions, but there did exist the speculation of the possibility that Syria and South Yemen might follow the example. However, the Federal Republic’s Foreign Office held certain that Egypt would not step on the path of recognition. While the informant from the ministry had discussed the Arab nations, he seemed to give Salomies and the Finnish government an implicit warning – as had Vaartela in East Berlin. This could be interpreted from the statement that the general view of the Foreign Office was that the non-communist nations which had already recognized the German Democratic Republic, and the ones which may soon recognize it, were countries that the “nations more significant for West Germany” would most likely not want to be associated with them.¹⁰⁵¹

This statement pointed out that the Foreign Office was striving to formulate a sort of categorization of nations into two casts: significant and insignificant. This method could work as flattery as well as a repellent: by including (in this case quite clearly) Finland into a category of “significant” nation, it could give credence while at the same time noting inimical implications of the German Democratic Republic’s recognition that could tarnish the image of it.¹⁰⁵²

The informant’s revelations indicated that the first category, along with Finland, included West European states, and the latter, the socialist states and Third World states, with a few exceptions to which the official had included, for example, India, Pakistan, and Egypt.¹⁰⁵³ For Finland, this latter category was, however, unpleasantly familiar due to Finland’s voting behaviour in the United Nations (noted by West German Foreign Office), and Finland’s relations with East Germany, which, in the evaluation of East German mission in Helsinki were regarded to be even further in the relations that the Third World states it was compared to.¹⁰⁵⁴

¹⁰⁵⁰ PAAA B31 bd. 364, coded telegram 3 June 1969 from FRG trade mission in Helsinki.

¹⁰⁵¹ UM 5 C 5 A classified telegram from Bonn 28 May 1969, p. 1

¹⁰⁵² Other research seems to support this deduction too, see Kilian 2001, 48.

¹⁰⁵³ UM 5 C 5 A classified telegram from Bonn 28 May 1969, p. 1.

¹⁰⁵⁴ See section 4.2.3 for East German mission’s evaluation and section 4.1.3 for Finland’s United Nations voting behaviour and West German Foreign Office’s negative evaluation.

The taxonomy of nations was originating from, or at least resonating with, the right wing of the West German cabinet. The next month, the Minister of Treasury, Franz Josef Strauss, wrote an article where he expounded the notion that the recognition of the German Democratic Republic by some other than a Third World state would carry more diplomatic weight. In addition, the piece branded Finland as a surrogate for Eastern bloc's policies, which it claimed pressured Finland to promote the Security Conference initiative.¹⁰⁵⁵

The observation of Salomies from the Foreign Office was relevant also in other aspects; it included the explication that Finland might not wish to be associated with certain nations (including the Eastern bloc nations). This was the period when in Germany there spawned a new term into political discussion, the concept of Finlandization. A term that denoted subjugation of national interest to the Soviet Union's wishes. The West German right especially used the concept as a political weapon to criticize Brandt's *ostpolitik*. They claimed that it would lead to a similar dependency from the Soviet Union as was in the case of Finland.¹⁰⁵⁶

Perhaps Salomies had already sensed this critique amassing at this point and brought forward the possibility of the affiliation with certain nations in the German question. As already discussed in the previous chapter, the previous year, Salomies had to debunk to the West German Foreign Office that the Finnish foreign minister would have been satisfied with Finland's inclusion in the grey zone in NATO's strategic thinking.¹⁰⁵⁷

However, it was only in the next year that the concept of Finlandization rose more prominently in the political discussion of West Germany and Finland. The concept's genesis begun a discursive battle for the representatives (also for some journalists and scientists) of Finland against the spreading of the denotation.¹⁰⁵⁸ It seemed to undermine deeply on a symbolic level the creation of the idea of Finland as a neutral country, and therefore also the neutrality of Finland's German policy. At this point, the term was, in fact, surfacing at the most uncongenial of times as this was exactly the period when the Finnish neutrality was necessary to upkeep. In fact, on a deeper semantic level, it could be argued, as Timo Vihavainen has done, that the accusation could not be directed, actually, so much against Finland; in a sense, Finland could not become Finlandized, it was a tautology.¹⁰⁵⁹ In this regard, the notion was a transnational political weapon, it was directed against the Western Europe in general as a warning and a safeguard of West German right against (in their view) of too conciliatory politics of Brandt.

In Finland, Foreign Minister Karjalainen debunked the accusations by referring exactly to the party-political dimension of the concept: he branded the

¹⁰⁵⁵ UKK vuosikirjat 1958-, 1969 telegram of Finnish representation in Bonn 6 June 1969.

¹⁰⁵⁶ Klinge 2001, 35, 36. Bäckman 2001, 12.

¹⁰⁵⁷ UM 12 K 1968-1970, croney letter from Salomies to Director General of Finnish Foreign Ministry's Political Department 16 December 1968.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Klinge 2001, 36.

¹⁰⁵⁹ Vihavainen 1991, 9.

pejorative term to be the frustrated rhetoric of the West German (right wing) opposition.¹⁰⁶⁰ In Germany, the party-political aspect was also seen as Brandt's government stepped in to the defense of Finland, as Foreign Minister Scheel stated in reference to the accusations that the government appreciated nations who had chosen neutrality in the world political conflicts. Yet, he somewhat unflatteringly, from Finland's perspective, had juxtaposed Finland and Yugoslavia. In his view, both were states that sought the middle road between blocs, Finland politically, and Yugoslavia by its social system.¹⁰⁶¹

However, even if Salomies' information could previously be regarded as a disguised suggestion of the benefits of remaining on the non-recognition line in the German question, he also noted that the main countermeasure by Bonn against the recognition of East Germany, the Hallstein Doctrine, was perhaps devoid of its power. He reported that there had not yet been termination of diplomatic relations. The anonymous official had explained to Salomies that the delay had been caused by Brandt's resistance towards termination of diplomatic relations. His interest towards "peripheral" countries was minimal because his focus had been totally absorbed by European security and the Eastern policy. He feared backlashes in the Eastern policy if the Federal Republic would take a hard line in the Cambodian case. Yet, the informant of Salomies regarded that the termination of relations was inevitable. There was also the prestige of the Federal Republic in question: the Federal Republic's representative in Cambodia had already become a target of several "humiliations". The official had ended the discussion with the statement that once again signaled the wishes of Bonn towards the Finnish government as well as other Western nations. According to him, the Federal Republic trusted that the nations closer to Bonn understood that the recognition of the German Democratic Republic did not further the solution of the German question or the other European questions.¹⁰⁶²

This discussion that Salomies reported continued the cautious advisory in the recognition issue that the Finnish diplomats in the East, as well as West Germany, had so far adopted. The security conference would not be furthered by the premature recognition of the German Democratic Republic, and Finland should not step towards the direction of the Third World states any further.

A few days later, Salomies met State Secretary Duckwitz in the Federal Republic's Foreign Office and managed to get a briefing and analysis of the current state of Bonn's Eastern policy. This was, of course, ever more valuable in the light of the recognitions of the German Democratic Republic. The rising amount of the recognizers naturally led to a situation where there was a constant need for the observers of Bonn's foreign policy to update their information of the policy's changing configuration. Each recognition also added to the pressure domestically, as well as internationally, towards the recognition of East Germany. After

¹⁰⁶⁰ PAAA B31 bd. 364, 4 March 1970 telegram from FRG trade mission in Helsinki "Finnischer Außenminister zur "Finlandisierung" und zur Deutschlandspolitik".

¹⁰⁶¹ PAAA B31 bd. 364, telegram from FRG trade mission in Helsinki 1 June 1970.

¹⁰⁶² UM 5 C 5 A classified telegram from Bonn 28 May 1969, p. 1.

all, one of the ministers of the Finnish government was already publicly expounding the recognition line.¹⁰⁶³

According to Salomies, Duckwitz had himself earlier proposed for Salomies to ask for these kinds of audiences every now and then. This was implying that the Federal Republic considered Finland now as an important aspect with regards to the Eastern relations, since Finland was striving for the European Security Conference. Consequently, the subjects of Salomies' and Duckwitz's discussion were the issues related to the third state recognitions of the German Democratic Republic and the security conference.

Duckwitz had revealed that, in the government, there were now differing views with regards to the proper attitude towards the third state recognition of the German Democratic Republic. Part of the government held on to the original hardline of the Hallstein Doctrine and required that the Federal Republic should sever its relations with any such nation that recognized East Germany. And in the case that there were no diplomatic relations, all the commercial and cultural relations, as well as possible development aid, should be immediately abolished. The rationale behind this was that these cases would function as cautionary examples for others. The other faction regarded that even though the recognition of the German Democratic Republic was to be regarded as an unfriendly act, every case should be evaluated uniquely, "in casu". In other words, there should be an evaluation of what countermeasures were appropriate when accounting for the commercial and political interests of the Federal Republic. Duckwitz had admitted openly that he supported this line of thinking.¹⁰⁶⁴

In this evaluation, Salomies revealed the political commotion inside the Grand Coalition government in its later phases before the final dissolution a few months later. The political fault lines inside the West German government were forming mostly between the dynamism of the SPD and the more static approach of the CDU/CSU. As mentioned, it boded ill for the future of the cabinet and was the beginning of the end of the Grand Coalition. Willy Brandt had been stunned after the negotiations that had taken place between cabinet members concerning the proper approach towards the Third World recognizer's after the case of Cambodia. He had been against the Hallstein Doctrine for a substantial period of time and was shocked to discover that it was still considered as a viable option among the CDU/CSU members despite the fact that Kiesinger was not known as a "doctrinaire".¹⁰⁶⁵

It was perhaps this meeting that Salomies was referring in his report, as he continued paraphrasing State Secretary Duckwitz's remarks. Duckwitz had informed him that there had recently been a government meeting negotiating the proper attitude with regards to the recognition of the German Democratic Republic. The meeting had also revealed that the Foreign Office of the Federal

¹⁰⁶³ See the interview of Social Minister Anna-Liisa Tiekso by East German periodical *Horizont*.

¹⁰⁶⁴ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 3 June 1969, "poliittinen keskustelu valtiosihteeri Duckwitzin kanssa", pp. 1, 2.

¹⁰⁶⁵ Gray 2003, 210.

Republic was tilting towards the flexible line of Brant. This was revealed as Duckwitz noted that the ministry had used the more flexible line of Hallstein Doctrine as a basis for their paper which served as a framework of negotiations, but that it was modified in some respects to make the other faction more easily to approve it. The flexible line had, in the end, achieved an approval in the negotiations, which, according to Duckwitz, had taken a dramatic tone and lasted seven hours. However, there still had been no final resolution concerning the proper actions in the cases of the recognition of the German Democratic Republic, for example, in the Cambodian case.¹⁰⁶⁶

Salomies, however, brought up a differing view. According to him, the results of the meeting were regarded by the political observers in Bonn as a disengagement from the Hallstein Doctrine; these interpretations were based on the closing line of the meeting's record. It posited that the attitude towards nations recognizing the German Democratic Republic would be, in the future, dependent on the interests of the German people and the prevailing circumstances.¹⁰⁶⁷ According to Salomies' report, the Cambodian recognition of the German Democratic Republic seemed to be an example of this kind of case which hinged on the prevailing circumstances. In Bonn, the recognition was seen in the geopolitical context. The conjectures were based on the interpretation that Cambodia's ultimate motivations lay further in the general Cold War bloc configuration. These interpretations posited that Cambodia was, in reality, fearing the United States' egress from its entanglement in Southeast Asia and the consequent growth of China's influence – which was the traditional hegemonic power in the area. To counter this, the Cambodian government was seen, by its East German gesture, to be striving to buy support from the Soviet Union by executing its presumed wishes in the German question and recognizing the German Democratic Republic.¹⁰⁶⁸

The analysis seemed to capture the dynamics of the ongoing Cambodian maneuvering. Cambodian strongman Sihanouk was playing both hands in his strive to keep the power: he warmed the American relations in the late 1960s as he feared the growing communist party in the country, Khmer Rouge, which was supported by the North Vietnamese government, Viet Cong, and Pathet Lao. Later research has speculated that Sihanouk might have hinted the Americans that should their troops enter the country to fight Viet Cong, he could turn the blind eye. However, in the fear of communists he also, paradoxically, a few days after Salomies' report, recognized the revolutionary provisional communist government in South Vietnam which was formed in 8 June 1969. Sihanouk did this

¹⁰⁶⁶ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 3 June 1969, "poliittinen keskustelu valtiosihteeri Duckwitzin kanssa", p. 2.

¹⁰⁶⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 3 June 1969, "poliittinen keskustelu valtiosihteeri Duckwitzin kanssa", p. 2.

¹⁰⁶⁸ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 3 June 1969, "poliittinen keskustelu valtiosihteeri Duckwitzin kanssa", pp. 2, 3.

to prepare for the outcome that communists might win the Vietnam war; he believed that by doing these actions he could persuade the communists to leave their troops from Cambodia.¹⁰⁶⁹

Less than a month later, Vaartela in East Berlin was, in some respects, contradicting the Salomies' views in regards to the example (or more precisely the lack of it) that these recognitions might set. In fact, Vaartela went as far as to present a prognosis that the new recognitions had set a precedent that might be unstoppable and may lead to a wave of new recognitions. In his view, Iraq's example had already initiated a chain reaction.¹⁰⁷⁰ He recapitulated the history of the relations and pointed out their gradualness. According to him, the representative office of the German Democratic Republic had been founded in Pnom Penh already in 1962 when the countries had signed an economic treaty. Initially, the office had been nominated as a head consular office, but, in 1967, it had been transformed into a "representative" office. This had been, according to Vaartela, only an intermediary step towards the full diplomatic relations that had been now realized.¹⁰⁷¹

The evaluations regarding the underlying motives of Cambodia's newly established diplomatic relations with East Berlin varied according to the evaluator, Vaartela noted. Eastern statements seemed to emphasize the history of the relations that Vaartela had previously noted: the event was seen as a logical consequence from the policy of peace and friendship that both countries had followed. They had also emphasized that the GDR had been the first nation to recognize Cambodia's integrity with its current disputed borders, which, according to Vaartela, was a more concrete reason. In Vaartela's view, it could be interpreted as a "political down-payment" which was supposed to pave the way for the recognition of East Germany by Cambodia. Yet, it might not have been the sole explanation, as the Federal Republic had also recognized Cambodia's borders in 1967, Vaartela remarked.¹⁰⁷²

Vaartela recapitulated the same view from Western observers that Salomies had done (which he noted in the report by referring to the reporting of the trade mission in Bonn), that the motive for Cambodia's actions was Cambodia's curious position with regards to North Vietnam and China. Cambodia was turning towards the Soviet Union in its search for a strong enough ally to withstand the "pressure" originating from North Vietnam and China.¹⁰⁷³

The origins of these moves by Cambodia, seen in the geopolitical context, were a plausible explanation. As discussed in the previous chapter, the détente process actually was a symptom of the real political interest of the Soviet Union's rivalry with China and the consequent interest in finding allies in the Third

¹⁰⁶⁹ Wikipedia, "Norodom Sihanouk" [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Norodom_Sihanouk#Continued_leadership_as_Head_of_State_\(1966-70\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Norodom_Sihanouk#Continued_leadership_as_Head_of_State_(1966-70)).

¹⁰⁷⁰ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 25 July 1969, "SDT:n tunnustamisen ketjureaktio", p. 1.

¹⁰⁷¹ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 25 July 1969, "SDT:n tunnustamisen ketjureaktio", p. 1.

¹⁰⁷² UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 25 July 1969, "SDT:n tunnustamisen ketjureaktio", p. 2.

¹⁰⁷³ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 25 July 1969, "SDT:n tunnustamisen ketjureaktio", p. 2.

World states such as Cambodia.¹⁰⁷⁴ The idea that Cambodia had seized the momentum for its own benefit and exploited the situation in Europe was not far-fetched at all.

With regards to the other recognizers, Vaartela again quoted again the Western evaluations. They posited that Sudan, Syria, and South Yemen had recognized the German Democratic Republic because their governments had been strongly infused by the people advocating Arab leftist ideas. Also, the escalating conflict with Israel and the Arab states had significantly affected the current development.¹⁰⁷⁵ Vaartela, in this regard, shed more light on the already earlier discussed decision of Syria to establish diplomatic relations with East Germany.

However, the victory on this front that Vaartela referred to had not come for free. As the Arab states had probably sensed the desperation of East Germany (especially towards the end of the 1960s) to receive victories in the international arena, they were asking a high price in exchange for recognition¹⁰⁷⁶. In fact, the case of Cambodia had exemplified the same: Sihanouk's decision to progress with relations had come as a surprise. In the first round of negotiations with Sihanouk in February 1968, the East German foreign minister, Otto Winzer, had not received more than a promise from the Cambodians to elevate the current status of the mission to a *representation*. Consequently, Sihanouk's announcement in May 8 1969, had come as a surprise to the East Germans. The East Germans, doubting if Sihanouk would actually follow through with his bold surprise, were willing to pay for it. They offered Cambodians an embassy building and the ambassador's residence free of charge, a loan of 11 million dollars, and a technical training school at no cost.¹⁰⁷⁷

The Arab front had incurred similar payments: Syria demanded a 50 million dollar loan with 0.5 percent interest (SED politburo was, however, unwilling to drop below 1.75 percent).¹⁰⁷⁸ Vaartela noted this dimension in the relations and wrote that Syria had been a long time target for constant diplomatic wooing of East Berlin. Therefore, when the delegation led by the GDR's Foreign Minister Winzer had arrived in Damascus, it was reasonably expected that the issue of recognition had moved to its next stage. And, as suspected, Winzer was not disappointed in his wish that the negotiations, which began in February, would lead to results. The establishment of relations was published on 5 July 1969, which was the second anniversary of the beginning of the Six Day War. Syria's Foreign Minister Al Sayed had stated that the date was not a coincidence but intentionally chosen to emphasize the common battle of both countries. The strong pro-Arab line of East Berlin had once again borne fruit, Vaartela noted.¹⁰⁷⁹

¹⁰⁷⁴ Savranskaya & Taubman 2010, 134, 147.

¹⁰⁷⁵ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 25 July 1969, "SDT:n tunnustamisen ketjureaktio", p. 2.

¹⁰⁷⁶ Gray 2003, 213. One of the reasons for the need of international prestige for GDR was its coming celebration of 20th year of its statehood on 7 October 1969.

¹⁰⁷⁷ Gray 2003, 212, 213.

¹⁰⁷⁸ Gray 2003, 214.

¹⁰⁷⁹ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 25 July 1969, "SDT:n tunnustamisen ketjureaktio", p. 2.

Iraq, similar to Syria, had inflicted costs for East Berlin; it disdained project-oriented aid programs offered by East Berlin and demanded 96 million dollars in cash in addition to gestures of solidarity in the form of small arms and uniform deliveries.¹⁰⁸⁰ East Germany's efforts were, according to rumors, also hindered by the counterbidding by Bonn's agents, some of which can be verified: in Egypt, Bonn, through its agent, offered to finance Egypt's wheat imports with a commercial credit of 25 million dollars.¹⁰⁸¹

After Iraq, and Damascus, the East Germans had headed to Egypt. Vaartela noted that "Winzer had rushed" to Cairo, according to some sources, by his own request. The visit to Cairo had given a reason to expect the possible establishment of relations between the German Democratic Republic and Egypt, however, it was not, at that time, realized. Only one month later that there was a sign of a turn in the course of Egypt in the issue. The semi-official *Al-Ahram* paper had, on 9 June, released news that Egypt was soon to recognize the German Democratic Republic and that the East German Foreign Minister Winzer was coming to Cairo on 11 June to negotiate actions that were needed in order to establish diplomatic relations. This time the waiting had not been long: the next day there were similar announcements from both parties of the promotion of the diplomatic relations to an ambassador level. Vaartela noted that the progress of events had been probably hastier than expected as he had met the representative of Egypt a few days earlier, and the representative had himself been somewhat surprised of what had taken place.¹⁰⁸²

The evaluation of the unpredictability of East German's Egypt breakthrough by Vaartela pointed at the reality of the events: Egypt was no certainty for the German Democratic Republic. It was the most sought-after prize in the Middle East, and, as already mentioned, it was also one of the instances in which West Germans were doing the counterbidding. In fact, the recognition of the German Democratic Republic by Iraq had actually hindered the progress on the Arab front, such as in Egypt, as the Egyptians (as well as the Syrians) had been unwilling to appear as timid followers of the example of Iraq. Nasser had regarded that, in the Arab world, he would have been the first to establish diplomatic relations with East Berlin; him being the most high-profile leader in the region.¹⁰⁸³

The role of Nasser as a prepotent figure was what Vaartela considered as the eminent factor of the recent events. He regarded that it could have been too difficult for Nasser to avoid recognition as the amount of Arab nations recognizing East Germany increased. The leading role Nasser had taken in the Arab world necessitated the chosen line of action, and it had been also increasingly difficult to remain impassive with regards to the pro-Arab policy East Germany executed – despite the fact that it had clearly been somewhat calculated, Vaartela added. The Western evaluations claimed that the recognition of Egypt actually had more political repercussions than the other recognitions by the Arab states

¹⁰⁸⁰ Gray 2001, 213.

¹⁰⁸¹ Gray 2003, 214.

¹⁰⁸² UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 25 July 1969, "SDT:n tunnustamisen ketjureaktio", p. 3.

¹⁰⁸³ Gray 2003, 214.

or by the states of the Non-Alignment Movement. Vaartela did not note, however, that the Non-Aligned Movement had been quite reserved towards the East Germany. For example, in the vote for the inclusion of East Germany to the World Health Organization (WHO) in May 1968 only Burma, Mali, Cambodia, and several Arab states had voted in favor.¹⁰⁸⁴

In general, Vaartela stated that Egypt's recognition was seen, similarly to the case of Syria, as being connected to the situation in the Middle East. It was also regarded that the Soviet Union had possibly exerted some pressure by exploiting its arms deliveries to Egypt as a political wager. The Soviet Union's involvement in the matter was a correct evaluation from Vaartela. The exertion of pressure as an attribute of the relationship did, in fact, articulate the situation. Yet the strain was reciprocal in its quality: Brezhnev and Ulbricht – even if they seemed, at this point, at odds with each other – were agreeing on one issue: the prize the Arab nations were positing in exchange of accommodating the wishes of the socialist leaders. Ulbricht shared the analysis with Brezhnev that the Arab nations were using the military aid from the German Democratic Republic, the Soviet Union, and Eastern bloc states in general (in the Syrian and Egyptian case, most ostensibly in the form of fighter jets) as *Faustpfand*, a ransom, for the recognition.¹⁰⁸⁵

Vaartela's evaluation was that the eyes were next directed towards Algeria and India when it came to next possible recognizer of the German Democratic Republic. With regards to India, Vaartela had some exclusive views to share as he had discussed with the Yugoslavian diplomat stationed in India previously. The Yugoslavian had regarded that if the faction led by Indira Gandhi prevailed inside the India's Congress Party, it was only a matter of time before India would recognize the German Democratic Republic.¹⁰⁸⁶ However, in the end, the number of recognizer's from outside the socialist bloc did not increase from six (which included the final recognizer, Egypt). India restrained itself to only open a state trading office, and Guinea raised the level of the East German office in Conakry from trade mission to consulate.¹⁰⁸⁷

When 1969, a year of multiple recognitions, was finally over, Salomies, in Bonn, summarized its events from the Federal Republic's viewpoint and noted that the year could have been one of the most active in the Federal Republic's foreign policy. Salomies interpreted that the recognitions were actually testing Bonn's adamancy in its foreign policy, and therefore showing in the end that it could shift from its hard line when needed. In his wording, it led to a "puzzlement in Bonn and once again to a new interpretation of the Hallstein Doctrine". This time the explanation had been that the Doctrine never meant that it would automatically lead to a termination of relations with any such third nation that had recognized the German Democratic Republic. Even though the recognition

¹⁰⁸⁴ Gray 2003, 205.

¹⁰⁸⁵ Gray 2003, 202.

¹⁰⁸⁶ UM 5 C 5 report Berlin 25 July 1969, "SDT:n tunnustamisen ketjureaktio", p. 3.

¹⁰⁸⁷ Gray 2003, 215.

itself was interpreted as an unfriendly act, the repercussions would be considered *in casu*. According to Salomies, the aforementioned limited wave of recognitions had meant an even more flexible interpretation of the Hallstein Doctrine. Salomies did not seem to regard the chosen policy as credible, and, in his evaluation, it basically meant the “total wrecking” of the Hallstein Doctrine.¹⁰⁸⁸

Salomies’ information seemed to, however, strive to distance Finland from this wave of recognition that had taken place. It implied that Finland was no longer counted in this group of, in a sense, rogue recognizers from the Third World. The states, as the previous discussion has already shown, were keenly exploiting the competing Cold War blocs in the German question. Finland’s position seemed to be redeemed, especially with the CSCE initiative, as a peer among developed Western democracies and seen as striving for diplomacy, not bargaining. This was previously also intimated in the categorization of possible recognizers in the different categories by State Secretary Duckwitz in his discussions with Vaartela in East Berlin.¹⁰⁸⁹ Salomies noted that, despite the new recognitions having caused speculation among the officials and the media regarding Finland’s stance in the German question, the speculations of Finland’s possible change in its foreign policy disposition in the German question had been substantially milder this time than previously. More exactly, Salomies referred to the previous spring when Finnish social democrats had declared their statement demanding the recognition of the German Democratic Republic. However, even the latest celebrations concerning the issue had differed: Finland had not alone been the target of estimations concerning which non-communist European countries might recognize the German Democratic Republic. Sweden and some other European states had also been mentioned as being in Finland’s company.¹⁰⁹⁰

As noted, Salomies did not link the initiative directly to a new, more, trusting stance in West Germany to Finland’s policy. According to Salomies, the reactions had been varied in West Germany, similarly to other Western, and especially NATO states. The press had reacted mostly based on the particular stand of each paper with regards to Brandt’s Eastern policy. Some parties had presented views that Finland might be functioning as the courier of the Soviet Union. This was no surprise considering that the Soviet Union was also cultivating this sort of image by its strive to define the conference as sort of mutual operation of Finland and the Soviet Union.¹⁰⁹¹ However, the general reception seemed to be positive and empathetic towards the goals of the Finnish government.¹⁰⁹²

This reporting showed that Finland’s German policy was, in the West German views tied to the Security Conference initiative. Salomies’ information was

¹⁰⁸⁸ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 5 January 1970, “Suomen ja liittotasavallan väliset suhteet v.1969”, pp. 1, 2.

¹⁰⁸⁹ See UM secret telegram from Bonn 28 May 1969, p. 1.

¹⁰⁹⁰ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 5 January 1970, “Suomen ja liittotasavallan väliset suhteet v.1969”, p. 2.

¹⁰⁹¹ Suomi 1996, 647. The conference was in danger of becoming the dispute between East and West as the Soviet had openly admonished the stipulations that West had posited for the conference (Suomi 1996, 646).

¹⁰⁹² UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 5 January 1970, “Suomen ja liittotasavallan väliset suhteet v.1969”, p. 2.

guiding the Finnish Foreign Ministry towards the status quo in this regard. His reporting was constantly pointing out that West Germans were cautious of Finland's possible alteration in its German policy. In this respect, Salomies seemed to indirectly critique one of the enemies of Finland's foreign policy's stability, the political culture that was favoring socialism. This critique is possible to discern as Salomies pointed out that latent suspicions concerning the tenability of Finnish stance had surfaced as he had relayed, to the Federal Republic's Foreign Office the information that members of the Finnish government were going to take part in the twentieth anniversary committee of the German Democratic Republic. Salomies wrote that, to the inquiries concerning the aforementioned, he had replied according to his directions: this meant that Salomies had clarified that Finnish members were taking part as private persons, not as representatives of the Finnish government. He had tried to assure the Germans that the Finnish politicians partaking in the East German jubilation should not be taken as a sign or prediction of future Finnish German policy.¹⁰⁹³

The interpretation of this passage as a critique is forced by the somewhat estranged and laconic statement of Salomies concerning the need to explain the aforementioned behaviour. He seemed to distance himself from the phenomenon and emphasized his compulsory role as a peregrine civil servant interpreting Finnish political culture to Germans by the ministry's "directions". Salomies' answer had been, at least ostensibly, honest. The fact that members of the Finnish government were taking part in a particular event did not necessarily imply a change in the official stance of the government. Suspicion from the German part was understandable against the background of differing political cultures. In Germany, a cabinet member could not distinguish his role between a public and private person in similar occasions.

As if to emphasize the contingency of the initiative from the support of West Germans, Salomies noted the already gained victories in this respect. He stated that, from the onset, Willy Brandt had been very much in favor of the Finnish initiative during his period as a foreign minister in the Grand Coalition as well as now during his chancellorship. Salomies interpreted, based on his discussions, that the same attitude seemed to prevail also among the officials of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office. The Finnish initiative especially gained respect as a diplomatic document due to its balance and equality towards all parties concerned. It had been discerned to be clearly distinct and differing from the Budapest declaration (by the Budapest declaration Salomies referred to the first proposal of the initiative drafted in the meeting of Warsaw Pact in Budapest, March 1969). The response to the initiative had already been positive during the great coalition, most likely because of Brandt, Salomies evaluated, which was, in his

¹⁰⁹³ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 5 January 1970, "Suomen ja liittotasavallan väliset suhteet v.1969", p. 2.

view, indicated by the fact that it was later evident that, especially among CDU/CSU members, there had been doubt towards the initiative.¹⁰⁹⁴

Salomies concluded with positive implications of the new Social Democratic government for bilateral relations. In his words, "not probably the least important factor" affecting the relations between Finland and the Federal Republic was Brandt's new government.¹⁰⁹⁵ Even though the previous government, led by Kiesinger, could not be interpreted as having a negative attitude towards Finland, it was still clear that in its ranks, especially among the CDU members, there was a more reserved attitude towards the "peculiar" foreign policy of Finland.¹⁰⁹⁶ Some of the new stance, however, could be, according to him, attributed to the personality of Brandt as well. It could be presumed, Salomies predicted, that Brandt, "well-familiar with the special problems" of Northern Europe, would be more understanding towards Finland's foreign policy and Finland's position in the political field of Europe.¹⁰⁹⁷

As evidenced by this reporting from the latter part of 1969 and the beginning of 1970, Finnish diplomats were once again holding on to the cautious line already evident in their previous reporting. The wave of new recognitions by the Third World states did not alter this stance, but in fact brought more reasons to remain on the status quo line. This was despite the fact that the Hallstein Doctrine appeared in a more flexible form of the so-called Scheel Doctrine, referring to Brandt's foreign minister and vice chancellor, Walter Scheel. This approach favored the judgement of each recognition individually and considered possible West German counter-measures through it. Diplomats pointed out that the new recognitions were done almost invariably in the context of the Cold War bloc bargaining, that is, that these particular nations wished to achieve favors of the certain bloc or German state, most often in the form of financial and military aid. The reporting seemed to emphasize that Finland could be now satisfied as its company in the German question was not among these countries, judging by the statement of West German Foreign Office officials.

5.2 Conclusions: advice of caution inside the convulsions of the détente

In general, the discussion of the reports from the period of 1969-1971 showed that, in the views of the diplomats, the time appeared to be fruitful for the new advances of German politics. This was caused not only by the unfoldings in the

¹⁰⁹⁴ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 5 January 1970, "Suomen ja liittotasavallan väliset suhteet v.1969", p. 2.

¹⁰⁹⁵ "...muttei ehkä suinkaan vähiten tärkeänä suomalais-länsisaksalaisiin suhteisiin vaikuttavana tekijänä..." (UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 5 January 1970, "Suomen ja liittotasavallan väliset suhteet v.1969", p. 2).

¹⁰⁹⁶ "omaleimaiseen" (UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 5 January 1970 "Suomen ja liittotasavallan väliset suhteet v.1969" p. 2).

¹⁰⁹⁷ UM 5 C 5 A report Bonn 5 January 1970, "Suomen ja liittotasavallan väliset suhteet v.1969", p. 4.

international arena, but also by the domestic political events in West Germany. Willy Brandt formed the first left-liberal coalition cabinet in the history of the Federal Republic and managed to put the pan-european social democratic thinking that acknowledged the existence of the socialist East German state to the forefront of the West German foreign policy. It stipulated that the East German state should not be demarcated only by fences and the riparian natural borders along Schnackenburg, Werra, and Saale, but also by the status of sovereign international entity as defined by international law.¹⁰⁹⁸

The Brandt government appeared to be source of slight hints of optimism in the reporting. The diplomats saw that the Brandt government could, in fact, move further than the previous cabinets of West Germany in the German question. Salomies saw, for example, that the strength of Willy Brandt's government lay in the personnel of the government—an implication which perhaps was based partly on the previous report from his colleague, Sumelius, in East Berlin who had witnessed the contacts made with Foreign Minister Willy Brandt and the Soviet ambassador, Abrassimov. The occasion proved there had been personal contact established between Brandt and the representative of the Soviet Union, which was the unsurpassable actor in the solution of the German question.

In the reporting it was pointed out, however, for the Finnish foreign policymakers that there was a repeated pattern in the history of the Federal Republic's politics, which showed that the domestic political issues could override even the starkest will in the foreign policy matters. Another reason for the cautious stance of the diplomats could be found in the quite easily discernible aspect that the Ostpolitik was not a clear-cut phenomenon and that even inside the Western bloc there was division, according to their information. For example, it was noted that the Rapallo complex still cast a shadow on the Eastern policy of the Federal republic, that is, the real-political behind-the-scenes diplomacy between Germany and Russia in relation to both their interests in the earlier history. In this sense, the diplomats challenged the bloc monolith thinking—even more so in case of the Eastern bloc. In this respect, the gist of the matter was especially the independent inclination of Ulbricht in his foreign policy. According to information Salomies managed to achieve from the Eastern diplomats, Ulbricht was, in a sense, playing his own game inside the Eastern bloc.

In this regard, the new backdrop of hopeful expectations that the late 1960s brought did not undress the Finnish diplomats from the reservations regarding the détente possibilities and German–German relations, at least initially, after the inauguration of Willy Brandt government. Veli Salomies from Bonn reported that the intentions of Willy Brandt were, in his evaluations, honest, but it was whole other matter if this perception was the one that dominated in the Soviet Union

¹⁰⁹⁸ Definition of state by international law has been regarded traditionally by four factors: a state has to have population, region, and government that wields sovereign state power. However, there are differing theories as to when a state is acknowledged in relation to other states, for example, constitutive theory presumes that a state can only be subject of international law after other states have recognized it. (Hakapää 2010, 75, 80.)

leadership. All this was, of course, contradicting the often espoused view that the détente and Eastern policy process was a clear-cut process all the way to its end – a view with a share of teleology in it. This standpoint was confirmed also by Esko Vaartela in East Berlin who seemed to message to the Foreign Ministry that the recent failings of Ulbricht to make it to the meetings of the East Germans in the Soviet Union implied that the unattendance was not caused so much by the illness of the potential visitor, but perhaps more by the political message wished to be sent by the host: in this case, it being that Ulbricht had driven his own policy with blinkers on while not being receptive enough to the political necessities of the bloc. The main message that was implied for the Foreign Ministry by the reporting was perhaps (later confirmed) evaluation that East Berlin was not an independent player. Consequently, considering the political momentum, especially in the Finnish left towards the recognition of East Germany, the reporting was stating that the possible recognition should be seen in the larger context of détente dynamics between East and West, and was in no manner to be an isolated act. Another aspect was that the recognition, at this point, might have been Ulbricht's wish, but by no means necessarily Moscow's.

In this regard, they also pointed out that despite the impetus of Brandt's policy, there should be no hurrying in the question of the East German recognition. Indirectly, they were defending the position of the Foreign Ministry in its German policy line and criticizing the political pressures in the form of heated discussions in Finland positing that the recognition of the German Democratic Republic should come sooner rather than later. In the diplomats' views, the hierarchy was clear: the German question should be seen in the context of the international relations and the détente process. In his regard, there should be no interference in the process by individual policy moves from individual states. The navigation to the solution in the German question was not going via East Berlin but through Moscow.

However, according to diplomats, the most important (previous) basis for the Finnish German policy was gone. In their views, the Hallstein Doctrine had been stretched and flexed – on a metaphorical level, in elastic and muscular connotations respectively – as far as was possible. It was no longer necessarily applied even to the states that possessed the most menial role in international politics. The general détente process was not the only factor challenging the most important foreign policy tenet of Bonn. At this point, the recognition wave that had initiated from the Third World by the newly independent nations was gaining its high water mark. The Arab world seemed to go behind Ulbricht, and even in Asia some victories were gained: mildly in the case of Ceylon, more clearly in Cambodia's case where the full diplomatic relations were achieved. When it came to Finland, Bonn seemed to put together a strong final attempt at averting Finland's following of the Third World by the re-categorization of Finland in the taxonomy of nations in the international arena. An informant from Bonn's foreign office had notified Salomies that nations "more significant for the Federal Republic" might not wish to venture on this path.

Most importantly, the reporting brought up that implicitly the Foreign Office was tying the recognition of East Germany together with the European security process. In this regard, the view of the West German foreign office was relayed to Finnish foreign policymakers. The recognition of East Germany did not further the solution of the German question or other European questions.

If the security conference was initiated to support the German policy status quo, as the Finnish Foreign Ministry's high-profile official Keijo Korhonen (secretary of section 1967–1969, head of the section 1970) has reminisced¹⁰⁹⁹, then the West Germans were perfectly playing their role in this regard: they gave the Foreign Ministry a good excuse to hold back on the recognition issue.

In general, it is hard to debunk the arguments of historians William Gray and Wilfried Loth who have pointed out that from early 1970 onwards it was clear that Finland would have to recognize the German states: the realization of the European security conference demanded the participation by both German states.¹¹⁰⁰ However, the contemporary view gives a more complex picture of the matter; in fact, everything was still open at this point, and nothing was certain. It could be argued that, according to reporting from Germany, more precise description would be that at this point Finland's German policy, and to it inevitably linked Conference initiative, were contingent of the détente process. This was also implied for the Finnish Foreign Ministry on 18 January 1971, when the Political Department's Head of the Section, Keijo Korhonen, had lunch with the Federal Republic's Head of the Mission in Helsinki, Otto Hauber. Hauber had told Korhonen that Finland had not come up in the negotiations. Hauber's information was, according to Hauber, coming directly from the Federal Republic's main negotiator in Moscow, Egon Bahr, whom he knew personally.¹¹⁰¹

It was only in 1970, as the détente negotiations on various fronts – most importantly between Germany and the Soviet Union – were progressing, that it was clear in the Finnish Foreign Ministry that the recognition of the German states was ahead. This was put down in the memo of Risto Hyvärinen in November 1970. However, in it he still noted that the recognition should not be done in a hasty manner but in a way that would bolster the credibility of the neutrality policy.¹¹⁰² Despite this, the Finnish initiative to recognize both German states was published hastily (also in the light of the reporting) in September 1971. The ministry was forced to publish the initiative earlier than it had planned, as Foreign Minister Väinö Leskinen had leaked the idea in the Nordic conference (rumors had it that he did this due to reduced inhibitions of the intoxicated state).

The official publishing was done by a bulletin of the government and the speech of the president on radio and television. The basis of the initiative was, in the official declarations, the release of tensions between the superpowers. The declarations also claimed that the initiative was a coherent continuity of Finland's

¹⁰⁹⁹ See Korhonen 1991; Korhonen 1999, 231.

¹¹⁰⁰ Gray 2003, 217; Loth 2008, 155.

¹¹⁰¹ UM 7 D II 307, memo from Keijo Korhonen 18 January 1971.

¹¹⁰² Soikkanen 2008, 314.

German policy; the equal treatment of both German states was emphasized and the link to neutrality was also underlined, as Kekkonen declared that Finland's neutrality policy was altered according to an ever-shifting world political situation.¹¹⁰³ This marked, in any case, the end of the non-recognition policy, despite the fact that the recognition of both German states was ultimately achieved only as late as 7 January 1973 after multiple rounds of difficult negotiations between the recognition date and the publishing of the initiative. The initiative received a lukewarm response from West Germany, especially problematic in the talks became the war reparations, which were related to the Finnish property destroyed by the German troops during the Lapland War.¹¹⁰⁴ The West German foreign minister, Scheel, also made it known to Finland that Finland's recognition of the German states could only come after a German-German agreement. On East German's part, the difficulty was in the formulation of Finland's neutrality in the draft of the treaty. Objections came all the way from Moscow. For example, Vice Foreign Minister Rodionov had advised the East Germans to decline the proclamation of Finland's neutrality.¹¹⁰⁵ Kekkonen trusted the process to the Foreign Ministry and did not get actively involved in it.¹¹⁰⁶ He evaluated the final phrasings and contents of the treaty as satisfactory.¹¹⁰⁷ The West German press, however, evaluated the treaty as a failure, as it had started with too precise demands that had ultimately not been realized, and even with regards the neutrality it only included the statement that the German Democratic Republic "respected" Finland's neutrality, which was not an explicit declaration of Finland's neutrality.¹¹⁰⁸

¹¹⁰³ Soikkanen 2008, 318.

¹¹⁰⁴ Soikkanen 2008, 323, 320. During the Continuation War between Finland and the Soviet Union, June 1941 - September 1944, Finland fought as an ally of Germany. The armistice signed between Finland and the Soviet Union in 19 September 1944 demanded the expulsion or disarming of the German soldiers in Finland.

¹¹⁰⁵ Soikkanen 2008, 328, 319.

¹¹⁰⁶ Soikkanen 2008, 320.

¹¹⁰⁷ Soikkanen 2008, 327.

¹¹⁰⁸ Soikkanen 2008, 332.

6 CONCLUSION: SYMBOLISM TESTED, ATTESTED, AND RELINQUISHED

This study has discussed the reporting from the divided Germany by the Finnish diplomats, especially from the standpoint of the Finnish Foreign policy of neutrality and its symbolism in the German question. It has subjected to analysis how the policy was, on the one hand, conceptualized and discussed by the diplomats, and on the other hand, executed by them. They were, after all, functioning in both roles: as interpreters of the policy's functionality, and as its carriers or messengers. The study has used the theoretical framework of the constructivist approach to international relations, through which the policy's construction by Finnish foreign policymakers has been interpreted as a discursive process of re-defining and constituting meanings. This demonstrated the symbolic function of the foreign policymaking and thus helped to better understand the policy's different aspects. It confirmed the study's basic hypothesis and showed how Finland's foreign policy in the German question became increasingly entangled as part of the larger symbolic realm of Finland's Cold War neutrality policy in the Cold War international arena. However, the transnational conceptualization of the policy from the multiple perspectives emerging from the political reporting shows that Finland's policy was not holding such strong credibility that have been previously attributed to it. The policy was often seen as vague solution and, for example, even the Soviet representation in divided Germany did not seem to be aware of policy's intricacies in its early stages. However, in the praxis of the policy's execution in the diplomatic realm the diplomats managed to convey the message that was actively tried to attached already to the mere discursive construction of the policy's neutrality. They were actively attesting for the aim of Finland to remain neutral on the international arena. The results of the study will be discussed in this section in an intertwined conjunction on two levels: empirical and theoretical. That means that the reporting will be discussed in relation to the research questions, the temporal contexts defined by the three sections of the study, and in conjunction with the theoretical framework.

The level of symbolic function in Finland's German policy was not prominent inherently in the policy as it was a pragmatic response to the undefined immediate postwar international configuration with the emerging superpowers in East and West. When the policy began, in the background lay the not yet configured Cold War geopolitical framework, a framework that was not constructed in a coherent and planned way but improvised in the bargaining done by the winners of the war – most importantly between the United States and the Soviet Union. The undefined parameters of the postwar international system were reflected in the reporting of the Finnish diplomats as well. One of the diplomats, Olavi Munkki, was even suggesting a 180 degree turn in Finland's German policy during the era of first *détente* and the Austrian State Treaty. This was probably partly encouraged by the discussions with Austrian foreign policy figures that were promoting their own style of neutrality for Finland, that is, the neutrality that was guaranteed by both superpowers and the consequent recognition of the Federal Republic by Austrians. In this respect, the tables had turned: earlier, it was Austrians that had, in some aspects, searched for pointers from the Finnish foreign policy of neutrality, especially in their relations with the Soviet Union. The similarity in the situation of the two nations was that Kremlin wielded indirect and direct power in the Austrian as well as the Finnish state system after the war.

What was then the functionality of Finland's German policy at this stage? It is clear, according to the reporting, that the practical level of handling the relations had stabilized by the latter part of the 1950s. In the early 1950s, there still existed, albeit very limited, pressure by East German officials and politicians towards Finland to elevate its level of relations. By 1957, the Finnish representative in East Berlin, Olavi Wanne, could report that the relations were functioning without hindrances. However, the symbolic value of Finland's German policy as the indicator of its neutrality was – at best – vague. In a sense, nothing more could be expected; after all, the policy, on the conceptual level, was not yet directly linked to neutrality. It was mostly still carried on as a legacy of President Paasikivi, who had based the policy on the pragmatic desire to not take a stance on the issue of which one of the two German sides was the actual inheritor of the German nation.

After this initial basis of the policy, it became hostage to Bonn's new foreign policy dictate, the so-called Hallstein Doctrine. The speech of Adenauer in Bundestag in 1955 indirectly posited that the Federal Republic's government would regard the recognition of the East German state, in their parlance, the Soviet Occupation Zone, as an unfriendly act towards the Federal Republic. Finland was no longer capable of altering its policy without (at least supposedly) severely irritating either one of the Cold War sides, East or West.¹¹⁰⁹

¹¹⁰⁹ In Finland's case, both options could have had their dire consequences. The disowning of Finland by West could have pushed it towards the Soviet Union. On the other hand, the recognition of West Germany could have meant trouble from the Eastern side of the border.

It is in this context that the pragmatism of the policy of the 1950s was altered towards the active attestation of the policy's rationale. Yet, in the diplomatic reporting, the Hallstein Doctrine's viability in the case of Finland was already challenged. Heikki Brotherus regarded the Doctrine as non-constructive and therefore the probability of its execution as low. Surprisingly, Tito's (the Yugoslavian leader) idiosyncratic foreign policy behavior cast the evaluations of Brotherus in a dubious light quite soon after his analysis. Beograd moved abruptly to announce the recognition of the East German state on 15 October 1957, only to be equaled in swiftness by Bonn's retaliation: the severing of the diplomatic relations with Beograd. Yet, later reporting would reveal that Brotherus was, in fact, not so misguided in his evaluation of the reality of the Doctrine's threat after all. An official of the West German Foreign Office later admitted to the Finnish representative in Cologne, Kaarlo Mäkelä, that the Doctrine was executed against Yugoslavia due to its vulnerable position outside of both Cold War blocs. It was, according to Mäkelä's source, evaluated in the Foreign Office as being "politically isolated".

In fact, according to reporting from Germany, it seems that Finland too was increasingly outside both blocs in its German policy—however, with a pronounced difference in that it was not politically isolated as Yugoslavia and seeking the partnership of both. Finland's new stance in the German question seemed to approach the Third World newly independent states, states that were increasingly affiliated with the Non-Alignment Movement from the 1960s onwards, a Cold War grouping that the Finnish Foreign Ministry was not keen on entering even unofficially. This image was not helped by the voting behavior of Finland in the UN that started to resemble these nations as well. In the context of this involuntary affiliation, there transpired an uncomfortable moment for the Finnish representation in Germany as the representative of Ghana approached the Finnish mission in East Germany with an intention of consulting the representation on how to, in effect, have representation in both German states without irritating either one of the blocs. In the same context, the Finnish EFTA solution was inquired about with a keen interest by Ghanaian representative. After all, the EFTA solution was a prime example of having exclusive trading benefits with both sides of the Cold War.

However, the reporting showed also, indirectly, when it discussed the Third World states and their actions in the German question, the eloquence of Finland's approach in the Cold War in its between-the-blocs position. It was diplomatic and not striving to blackmail benefits from the competing blocs. Neither did it possess this quality in the case of the German states, as often, by contrast, happened in their relations with the Arab world in particular. In the Arab world, East Germany and its ultimate guarantor, the Soviet Union, were faced with excessive demands in exchange for their allocation of support for the international status of the German Democratic Republic.

The results of this research indicate that at least from the early 1960s on, Finland's German policy was argued increasingly on the level of non-rational,

that is, the symbolic. As was discussed in the theoretical chapter, this level operates more in areas such as the metaphoric, illustrative, emblematic, allegorical, non-literal etc. On this level, the uncomfortable fact that Finland was the only neutral country that had not recognized either one of the German states could be argued for. The equal treatment was part of the symbolic order of Finland's "absolute neutrality". It was elevated, in a sense, to a metapolitical level apart from the, ironically, increasingly politicized foreign policy of Kekkonen. Especially in this regard, the definition "absolute" seems to be cast in a strange light, when it is remembered that it was coined in the period when Kekkonen also posited that Finland's neutrality was, in fact, provisional. That is, that Finland could remain neutral only if peace prevailed.

These statements of Kekkonen, according to the documents, caused large concern in the West German Foreign Office, and in the West in general. It appeared that the Finnish president, with increasing powers beyond his official mandate (due to his increased support by the Soviet Union), was shifting Finland's foreign policy discourse (if not the policy itself), towards the ideas ostensibly propagated by the Eastern bloc. Kekkonen was borrowing and quoting the slogans of the socialist camp.

It seems that the worst decline of the Finnish foreign policy's image in this respect was, however, not caused by Kekkonen's rhetoric, but by his personal involvement in the two consequent crises between Finland and the Soviet Union (the Night Frost Crisis of 1958, and the Note Crisis of 1961). The first crisis was solved by the dissolution of a cabinet that the Soviet Union regarded as unfriendly, and the second was solved by the dropping out of Kekkonen's competitor, Olavi Honka, from the 1962 presidential elections. This gave the image that the composition of the Finnish government and the results of the presidential election were decided in the Kremlin, not in Helsinki.

This could be interpreted from the reporting coming from Germany: the Soviet Union, as a guarantor of Kekkonen's electoral success and sovereignty, not only in foreign policy (the handling of which was already by and large granted to the president by the Finnish constitution) but in domestic politics as well, did not look good to West Germans. The tarnished image of Finnish foreign policy was explicitly noted by the diplomat Veli Helenius as he reported to the Finnish Foreign Ministry that the West German politicians and foreign policymakers were even avoiding visits to Finland. In this regard, the President of the Federal Republic, Heinrich Lübke, took the most critical stance, albeit indirectly against President Kekkonen's way of executing his politics, and denounced Finland as a country in such a tight grip of the Soviet Union that it was unvisitable ("one could not breathe in there", was the exact quotation). In the context of the recent crises and Kekkonen's actions in them, this could not be taken as anything else but an indirect critique of Kekkonen.

It can be argued that, from this point on, the Finnish Foreign Ministry had to double its effort to steer the Finnish foreign policy in the vein of Paasikivi, and not be sunk by Kekkonen's politics. In other words, Kekkonen's actions, from the

perspective of diplomats, were directly harming the functionality of Finnish foreign policy. This could have been partly (even unconsciously) the impetus towards symbolism in the German policy, and at the same time in Finnish neutrality policy. In its essence, the diplomats and the Ministry were clearing up the havoc left behind by Kekkonen's maverick behavior.

The 1960s brought also, in more general terms, new challenges to Finland's German policy, especially due to the fact that inside the Federal Republic the German-German policy appeared to be in the process of morphing from the rigid hold-the-line policy of the Adenauer era in the direction of the more organic and responsive approach of the Kiesinger cabinet (with Willy Brandt as foreign minister) towards East Germany, and the East in general. Finnish diplomats, however, saw some progress in the relations happening but were still advising discreetly towards caution; in their view, the Eastern policy was not a clear-cut phenomenon. It was an advice that Finland's own policy decisions should not be based on a rushed rationale, even despite the fact that the Finnish left, with the Social Democrats, was jumping the gun more and more and demanding the acknowledgment of the existence of the East German state.

However, at the same time, Finnish diplomats were noting the increased dysfunctionality of the Hallstein Doctrine, the hidden basis of the Finland's "equal treatment" policy. In 1967, the reporting noted that the Doctrine was, in practice, dead. This was manifested more and more by the increased diplomacy of the Third World's newly independent states with East Germany. Diplomats still seemed to advise caution; the reporting implicitly pointed out that the solution to the Germany question went through Moscow, not through East Germany or Finland (as the Finnish left had suggested). However, this equation did not mean that the goals, or even the benefit, of East Berlin and Moscow were the same. In fact, they could differ for strategic and tactical reasons. This was implied not least by the sudden inability of Ulbricht to attend certain important meetings in the Soviet Union (officially explained by his ill health, but the true reasons were considered by the Finnish diplomats to lie in the realm of intra-bloc politics).

In the latter part of the 1960s, the push towards the conceptualization of the Finnish foreign policy on the level of symbolic testimony of neutrality continued and gained momentum. This was made possible by the new assignments to important positions in the Foreign Ministry. The director general of the Political Department became Risto Hyvärinen, a theoretically oriented, Princeton educated foreign policy theoretician. His aide became Keijo Korhonen, who took the post of secretary of section at the same period. Korhonen, a doctor of political history, was not any less capable in the abstraction of Finland's foreign policy tenets. The Ministry's fight for neutrality was attested more on the level of symbolic action, as both these men gave speeches which, for the first time in the post-war era Finland, could argue and clarify Finland's neutrality on the conceptual level. In some respects, Kaarlo Mäkelä's report in 1964 had already shown that foreign policy matters could be argued on the theoretical level, especially quoting the international law and the quite large maneuvering room that it gave for interpretations. However, his report could have been as well an implicit critique of

the Finnish tendency to find a theoretical basis for the policy (as had happened earlier in the memorandum of State Secretary R.R. Seppälä who had referred to article 10 of the Paris Peace Treaty as a basis for the Finland's non-recognition policy). Mäkelä was, after all, approaching the question of two German states and demands of West Germany as a state entity from the theoretical perspective similar to Carl Schmitt's ideas of a state as a politically constructed concept. Therefore, it could not be taken as an unquestioned premise in the juridical discussion inside the framework of international law – which is, in many senses, an interpretative subject itself.

As discussed earlier, Kekkonen's first task for his new trusted man in the ministry, Keijo Korhonen, was to draft documents for the recognition of both German states. It is possible to argue that Kekkonen's assignment to Korhonen could have been partly encouraged by the reporting at that time. It posited – as already mentioned – that the Hallstein Doctrine was dead. Therefore, on that part, the Finnish equal treatment policy was free from one its most important motivators. Yet, the reporting also shows that the interpretation of the inevitability of the progress of the German–German relations and some kind of Four Power treaty at the end of the 1960s was not that clear from a contemporary viewpoint. Against the backdrop of aspects brought forward in the reporting, this interpretation would be teleological. Therefore, it is possible that Kekkonen was not seriously pushing towards the recognition of both German states at that point (1967) but was merely preparing for the more distant future.

In this regard, it has to be noted that too many conclusions should not be drawn from the appearances of this period, the nominations of officials supporting Kekkonen, and the consequent drafting of a recognition of the German states on paper. This was not, by any means, Kekkonen's attempt to turn the ministry around to uncritically support his line of appeasement policy towards the East. Quite the opposite is the case: although Korhonen and Hyvärinen could be counted as supporters of Kekkonen's – albeit East leaning but yet neutral – foreign policy, they were also adamant supporters of Finland's national independence, democracy, capitalism, and values of Western civilization. This was also attested later by the fact that Korhonen became a *persona non grata* in the eyes of the Soviet Union's leadership. Korhonen himself evaluated this to be caused by his strict adherence to neutrality.¹¹¹⁰ A similar reaction was manifested towards Risto Hyvärinen. For example, in 1970, his visit to the Soviet Union was postponed three times by the host with no clear reason, which implied that these actions were a demonstration against him.¹¹¹¹

It has to be also noted that these nominations to important posts in the ministry coincided with the period when Kekkonen intensified his rhetoric against West Germany as a threat to peace, as well as with the period when the Social Democratic Party was politically overtaking Kekkonen from the left to advance

¹¹¹⁰ Seppinen 2005, "Korhonen, Keijo (1934-)", *Kansallisbiografia*, <https://kansallisbiografia.fi/kansallisbiografia/henkilo/4024> [accessed 16-4-2018].

¹¹¹¹ Seppinen, 2004. "Hyvärinen, Risto (1926-)", *Kansallisbiografia*, <https://kansallisbiografia.fi/kansallisbiografia/henkilo/8022> [accessed 16-4-2018].

its political appropriateness in the eyes of the Kremlin. It seems that Kekkonen was, perhaps, in fact, searching for a stronger defense line for neutrality in the foreign ministry when he himself compromised the neutrality in his rhetoric that was catering for the Soviet Union's interest. When it came to German policy, Kekkonen probably knew – by virtue of the reporting from Finnish diplomats – that Finland's German policy should not be executed through motives that might be ostensibly pleasing for the Kremlin; it might turn out that such an act may have been against the wishes of Moscow in the end. This was insinuated, for example, through the reporting of the views of head of the political department of the Federal Republic's Foreign Office, who noted that the Moscow might not in reality even wish for a fast international breakthrough for East Germany as a sovereign state. The teetering position of Ulbricht was also speculated in the reporting through his increasingly invariable failure to attend to important political events organized in the Soviet Union.

If all this is taken as a premise, then it is reasonable to ask whether Kekkonen's foreign policy was partly afforded by his knowledge of the counterbalance that was offered to his Eastern-oriented policy by the more conservative ranks of the foreign ministry. It is known that Kekkonen was very fond of the Machiavelian approach to politics and cognizant of the benefits of playing with a card up in his sleeve.

Kekkonen's critique towards the foreign ministry seems, in many respects, forced; he downplayed the competence of the majority of diplomats, yet he did not make initiatives for further professionalization of the ministry's functioning. The ministry that was, after all, in many senses, as Timo Soikkanen has suggested, his personal tool in the creation of Finnish foreign policy. He regarded the ministry as his foreign policy opponent yet did nothing but superficial strikes against the Ministry¹¹¹², for example. His tolerance was most clearly manifested in the case of Olavi Munkki, a sworn conservative, anti-communist, and pro-West old school diplomat (whom Kekkonen disliked personally). Kekkonen's evaluation of the officials in the Finnish Foreign Service appeared to be done on the basis of a professional competence. For example, in the case of Munkki, he would later be in the extremely important role of leading Finland's EFTA negotiations.

The documents of the West German Foreign Office reveal that the personalities of diplomats other than the overtly West-oriented Olavi Munkki seemed to offer Bonn's foreign policymakers a guarantee of a West-integrated Finland. This was helped by the fact that the diplomats were largely coming from the generation that was infused, in Finland, by the influence of German bourgeois culture. They were often already fluent in the language before their assignment to Germany and, by their disposition, did not seem to hide the fact that their politico-economic orientation was in favor of the capitalist system. It is only possible to guess that if this much West German sympathy evident from the Finnish diplomats made its way in the documents of the foreign office, how much of it was

¹¹¹² In 1958 Kekkonen appointed permanent secretary of president's Office outside of the ranks of the Foreign Ministry that they usually had been picked from (Soikkanen 2003, 46).

emanating from the Finnish diplomats in private occasions, for example, through a close personal friendship to their interlocutors that permitted them to speak freely of their home country's foreign policy. It is very probable that at these occasions the curtain was dropped, so to speak, and the symbolic façade of Finland's equal treatment policy of the German states as well as the foreign policy of neutrality in general was disposed of altogether.

It can be argued then that in Finland's Cold War foreign policy, a silent request for the West to abide by the capricious outer stance of Kekkonen was sent through the diplomatic representatives of the state. Perhaps it was even part of the strategic thinking of Kekkonen himself, as it afforded him to go further in his rhetoric and political level of foreign policy as he was aware of the counter-balance to his policy present in the ranks of the Finnish Foreign Service handling and executing the foreign policy abroad. In other words, Kekkonen's rhetoric and politics were, more often than not, merely cannon fodder in service of either his domestic political power (the threat of the Soviet Union or of a third world war), or in service of his foreign policy (paying lip-service to socialist rhetoric).

It seems that this policy functioned, as evidenced by the discussion in this research, despite all the worrying, especially around the early- and mid-1960s, in the West German foreign office concerning the direction of Finland. The foreign office stuck by the side of Finland, for example, in the case concerning Khrushchev's proposition for a separate peace treaty with East Germany. In the speculations concerning the Soviet leader's proposal and Finland's possible adherence to it, the head of the West German mission in Helsinki, Heinrich Böx, met with Secretary of State Karl Carstens in the foreign office and pondered the counter-measures. Carstens and Böx invalidated harsh actions in this regard on the basis that they would have pushed Finland towards the East. Their conjecture was, by all probability, reached by their view of Kekkonen's foreign policy leaning already dangerously in that direction. Maybe they speculated that one more push would have tipped the policy over too far. In this case, Kekkonen's policy brought about Western support for Finland on the basis of the real-political fear of losing the most Eastern (in the definition's geographical as well as political connotation) Western ally. Into this equation, however, had to be counted the more idealistic level that emanated earnest sympathy towards Finland by the fact that the diplomats were a testimony of the strong undercurrent of the pro-Western line in Finland behind the overt political façade that was favoring the Eastern bloc. Böx and Carsten also noted an odd feature of the Finnish non-recognition policy that in fact made the West German threats towards Finland void. Their conjecture was that even if diplomatically there had been countermeasures towards Finland, in the end the relations between the two countries would have remained due to the amount of trade between them. This, of course, would not have changed the prevailing situation on a theoretical level, since Finland only held a trade mission that, in principle, only handled trade matters.

All in all, the reporting brought up the international as well as transnational view to the German question. It showed, in contrast to the views in Finland that were emphasizing the importance of Finland for the Soviet foreign policy, that

this self-aggrandizing tendency might have distorted the Finnish left's perception concerning their role on the international stage in relation to Moscow.¹¹¹³ In the end, the reporting seemed to imply that Finland was partaking in the process of international relations and their construction. However, it was not defining it. This role was posited by the diplomats as they reported to Finland that the West German foreign office trusted that Finland knew better than certain states, that is, the Third World states, on how to act on the international stage. This warning probably emerged as a result of Finland's position that had earlier in the decade seemed dubiously to approach the non-aligned Third World grouping, especially in the United Nations votings.

Similar warnings were given concerning the European Security Conference process: Finland's hurrying in the German question could have jeopardized the Conference. Ironically, it seems that the whole Security Conference was adopted to the Finnish active neutrality policy as a way of fighting against the domestic pressure towards the recognition of the German Democratic Republic. This did not seem to be informed to Finnish diplomats, at least according to sources available for this study, and therefore they could not convey the message to West Germans.

In relation to one of the largest motivations behind Finland's German policy, the friendly relations with both superpowers (but especially with the Soviet Union), the solution was, by all indications, satisfactory. Finland's policy should also be contextualized in the larger Cold War framework: decision of Finland concerning the recognition of either one of the German states was, by all probability, quite low in the hierarchy of the Kremlin's foreign policy. In fact, it seems that Moscow was also satisfied in many respects with Finland's solution. They were not overtly pushing, or allowing, East Germans to demand recognition from Finland – a decision which shifted the focus of the East German attempts for recognition by a Western country towards Sweden.

It seems inevitable that one more estimation concerning Finland's German policy needs to be made: that is, did the policy suffer from Finlandization? Compared to other neutral states, Finland's policy was clearly more in favor of the East bloc's interpretation of the German question: that there, in fact, existed two different German states. This was, of course, not seriously questioned by the Western powers either; it was clear from quite early on that the German re-unification was merely a pipedream as long as communism prevailed in Eastern Europe and Russia. Yet, Finland did not recognize the West German state, which was, after all, recognized, in addition to the Western states, even by the Soviet Union. In this regard, Finland's policy compared to the general stance in the West was distorted; it did not follow the pattern of the peer group of nations to which Finland belonged. The distortion of the policy was exacerbated by Kekkonen's anti-West German rhetoric. But it is also evident that Finland, in theory, was

¹¹¹³ However, in a certain sense, the Finnish left was correct in their evaluation of Finland holding a key position: the West German Foreign Office also warned that the recognition of East Germany by Finland might cause a snowball effect and that certain other nations would follow suit.

treating both German states equally by not recognizing either one of them. But whether this was a policy deserving a congratulatory assessment can be questioned. From this standpoint, the Soviet Union had a similar equal treatment policy: it recognized both German states. In this regard, Finland's policy was making an inverted mimicry of the Kremlin's.

The difference then was obviously the dimension that Finland tied its policy as part of its symbolic order of neutrality. As already, for small nations, such policy offers possibilities on the international arena. When real-political power is lacking, the power of construction of an image of foreign policy offers a solution. It can affect and function in the realm of international relations yet retain certain ambiguity and offer a leeway in the situations when the policy has to be reinterpreted for the benefit of its executor. The documents in the archives of the Finnish Foreign Ministry stand as a testament to this policy, a dossier system that offers file after file of speeches, memos, invitations, declarations, communiques, and other items that constructed this policy. It speaks clearly to one thing: the construction of the policy required constant hard work and an intense thought process; it was, in its essence, a battle of wills executed between nations by the officials and politicians. However, one could ask if a lot of the ministry's energy would have been saved later if Olavi Munkki's suggestion had been heeded in the mid-1950s and Finland had pushed for a recognition of West Germany following the example of Austria, as well as other neutrals. If this was possible for Austria and other neutrals, but not for Finland, it, in its essence, means that either Finland was not neutral, or the other neutrals were not. Of course, the contexts and situations of the two nations differed, but one would be hard pressed ever to find two nations in exactly the same position. Therefore, in the analysis of a policy of principle, the argumentation can only be done on the basis of principle, not on the level of contingent and pragmatic. In fact, the whole story of Finland's German policy was the metamorphosis of the policy from its clumsy awkwardness, inherited from the precarious immediate postwar period and Paasikivi's timid *Realpolitik* towards the Soviet Union to the conceptualization of the policy on the level of symbolic. It became part of the more complex neutrality of Kekkonen's era, a neutrality that reached its theoretical and constructive pinnacle in the late 1960s and seemed to receive its official acceptance in the European Security Conference's closing meeting in Helsinki in 1975. In this regard, the resolve of Finland's German policy was also an important part of the political work of Kekkonen, who was unquestionably one of the most important politicians and leaders of independent Finland.

The international comparison of Finland's German policy to other neutrals then either makes or breaks the case of Finlandization in the policy. It seems plausible to argue that on the *de facto* level Finland was leaning East in its German policy; however, on the theoretical level Finland, in fact, was neutral in the German question. In this case, it seems that the Finlandization of Finland's German policy was not inherent in the policy, but it started when the Finnish non-recognition policy became a domestic policy issue for the Finnish left during the latter

part of the 1960s. This is an apt conjecture when it is noted that the Social Democratic Party's enthusiasm for the recognition was, by and large, motivated by the need for the Kremlin's acceptance of them as a trusted political power in Finland. There lay then, in effect, the core of Finlandization in Finland's German policy. In other words, the policy was at stake in the Finnish political discursive construction of foreign policy at that point. In this regard, the discursive input of the Finnish diplomats was contributing to the effort to hinder the appropriation of the foreign policy inside the sphere of domestic policy phenomenon. It was striving to keep the policy in the context of the international arena, and to put it in its proper framework in this regard. It had done similarly earlier as the previous discussion has shown, for example, when it put the policy's symbolic value in its proper perspective in the transnational context. It had also done similarly when it had showed that the policy's initial basis, the Hallstein Doctrine was already eroding during the latter part of the 1960s.

YHTEENVETO (SUMMARY)

Toisen maailmansodan jälkeen, 6. huhtikuuta 1948, Suomi joutui allekirjoittamaan sopimuksen ystävyydestä, yhteistoiminnasta ja keskinäisestä avunannosta (YYA-sopimus) Neuvostoliiton kanssa. Sopimuksen ensimmäinen artikla määräsi, että mikäli Saksa, Suomen liittolainen jatkosodassa, hyökkäisi Neuvostoliittoon, Suomi sitoutuisi puolustamaan omaa aluettaan joko yksin tai yhteistyössä Neuvostoliiton kanssa Saksa vastaan. Tämä aloitti niin sanotun pakotetun ystävyyden Suomen ja Neuvostoliiton välillä, joka jatkui aina Neuvostoliiton romahkamiseen ja kylmän sodan päättymiseen saakka. YYA-sopimus muodostui tärkeäksi osaksi maiden välistä ystävyyttä: sen uusimisesta ja siihen viittaamisesta muodostui eräänlainen rituaalinen suhteiden uusintamisen keino. Sen lisäksi, että sopimus konstruoi paitsi vertauskuvallisesti maiden välistä yhteyttä, se toimi myös reaalipoliittisena sidoksena ja rajoitti esimerkiksi sitä, millaisia aseita Suomen puolustusvoimat saivat hankkia.

YYA-sopimus satoi Suomen Neuvostoliiton ja itäblokin piiriin, vaikka Suomi ajoi ulkopoliitikassa virallisesti puolueettomuuspolitiikkaa. Itse asiassa presidentti Kekkonen käänsi tulkinnan niin, että YYA-sopimus oli olennainen osa Suomen puolueettomuuspolitiikkaa, jonka päätavoitteeksi muotoutui tavoite olla sekaantumatta suurvaltojen välisiin ristiriitoihin. Tämän sodanjälkeisen ulkopoliitikan uusi suunta kulminoitui Suomen Saksan-politiikkaan: Suomi ei tunnustanut kumpaakaan jaetun Saksan valtioista, jotka perustettiin vuonna 1949. Suomi edustautui sekä kommunistisessa Itä-Saksassa (Saksan Demokraattinen Tasavalta) että kapitalistisessa ja demokraattisessa Länsi-Saksassa (Saksan Liittotasavalta) ainoastaan kaupallisilla edustustoilla. Tämä ulkopoliittinen linjaus oli täydellinen muutos sotaa edeltävään aikaan, jolloin Suomi oli sitoutunut Saksaan, jonka perillinen Länsi-Saksa monessa suhteessa oli, niin taloudellisesti, kulttuurillisesti kuin poliittisestikin. Nyt se sen sijaan kohteli kommunistista, kulttuurillisesti ja yhteiskuntajärjestelmällisesti täysin uudenlaista Saksa rakentavaa Itä-Saksa tasa-arvoisesti Länsi-Saksan rinnalla.

Jaetun Saksan kohdalla Suomen vaihtoehdoksi ei näyttänyt ainakaan pinnallisesti jäävän muuta vaihtoehtoa kuin olla tunnustamatta valtioita, joiden virallinen tunnustus vuonna 1955 seuraili suurvaltopoliittisten liittoutumien linjoja idän tunnustaessa Saksan Demokraattisen Tasavallan ja lännen tunnustaessa Saksan Liittotasavallan. Pelättiin, että jos Suomi tunnustaisi vain Länsi-Saksan, kuten muut länsimaat, se suututtaisi Neuvostoliiton. Toisaalta myöskään molempien tunnustus vaikutti mahdottomalta, koska pelättiin niin sanottua Hallsteinin oppia eli Länsi-Saksan esittämää yksinedustusvaatimusta Saksan valtion ja kansan osalta. Hallsteinin oppi oli liittokansleri Konrad Adenauerin valtiosihtööri Walter Hallsteinin laatima linjaus, jonka mukaan Länsi-Saksa katsoisi Itä-Saksan tunnustuksen jonkun toisen valtion taholta Länsi-Saksalle epäystävälliseksi teoksi. Pahimmillaan tämän pelättiin johtavan diplomaattisuhteiden katkaisemiseen.

Tässä työssä tutkitaan jaetussa Saksassa toimineiden suomalaisdiplomaattien näkemyksiä Suomen Saksan-politiikasta vuosina 1955–1971. Huomio kiinnittyy erityisesti niihin oleellisiin ulkopoliittisiin ulottuvuuksiin, jotka liittyivät Saksan-politiikkaan: puolueettomuuteen ja Länsi-Saksan yksinedustusvaatimukseen. Työ jäsentyy näiden pääteemojen alla sellaisten aiheiden kautta, joita diplomaatit käsitelivät raportoinnissaan ja jotka liittyivät näihin pääteemoihin. Diplomaattien poliittisessa raportoinnissa ei useinkaan suoraan käsitelty teemoja kuten Suomen puolueettomuus tai edes Saksojen tunnustamattomuuspolitiikka. Näin ollen näitä teemoja käydään läpi sellaisen raportoinnista löytyvien aiheiden kautta, jotka antavat mahdollisuuden tulkita diplomaattien näkemyksiä itse pääteemojen osalta.

Suomen virallinen ulkopoliittikka oli hyvin rajoitettua tutkimusperiodin aikaan, ja sitä tukahdutti lisää ns. suomettumisen ilmiö, joka esti kriittisen keskustelun ulkopoliitikasta. Diplomaatit olivat Suomen valtiollisen instituution, ulkoministeriön, kautta luonnollisesti sidottuja Suomen viralliseen ulkopoliittikkaan, joka muuntui välillä jopa liturgiseksi Neuvostoliiton mielistelyksi. Näin ollen lähdekriittisesti on huomioitava heidän painottelunsa toisaalta omien näkemysten ja toisaalta instituution sekä Suomen poliittisen kulttuurin asettamien paineiden ristiaallokossa. Tästä johtuen heidän mahdollisia näkemyksiään joudutaan lukemaan usein rivien välistä. On kuitenkin toisaalta muistettava, että heidän tehtävänä oli tuottaa todellista sekä kriittistä tietoa ja näkemyksiä Suomen ulkopoliittikan tekijöille, ylimpänä presidentti Kekkonen, joka monessa suhteessa piti ulkoministeriötä omana työkalunaan, kuten ulkoministeriön historian kirjoittanut Timo Soikkanen on todennut. Näin ollen heidän raportointinsa tarjoavat aiemmin hyödyntämättömän mahdollisuuden peilata heidän näkemyksiään Suomen viralliseen ulkopoliittisen linjaan ja suhteuttaa siten Suomen toteutettua ulkopoliittikkaa siihen ns. mahdollisuushorisonttiin, jonka diplomaatit näkivät raportoinnissaan.

Diplomaattien raportointi tarjoaa tutkimusaiheeseen ylijärjestyksen (*transnational*) näkökulman, joka myös osaltaan auttaa näkemään Suomen poliittista historiaa sellaisista näkökulmista, jotka aiemmin ovat saattaneet jäädä huomiotta. Diplomaatit nähdään eräänlaisina ylijärjestyksinä toimijoina: he välittivät suomalaisen ulkopoliittiseen keskusteluun huomioita ja tulkintoja, jotka pystyivät ylittämään Suomen sisällä yleisesti, esimerkiksi median kautta, levinneet tulkinnat. Usein diplomaatit toivat esiin ei ainoastaan lännessä vaikuttaneiden poliittikkojen ja länsitarkkailijoiden näkökulmia vaan myös itäblokin puolelta tulevia tulkintoja. Ylijärjestyksen näkökulma auttaa suhteuttamaan Suomen poliittista historiaa ja sen olennaista osaa, Saksan kysymystä, laajemmassa kylmän sodan kontekstissa. Näin voidaan välttää myös ongelmia, joita on tuonut mukanaan Kekkonen ajan ja kylmän sodan ajan Suomen poliittisen historian tutkimuksen politisoituminen erityisesti suomettumiskysymyksen kautta. Kekkonen ajan ulkopoliittikan historiallinen tulkinta on aiemmin helposti ajautunut asemasodaksi, jossa Kekkonen ajama politiikka nähdään joko machiavellilaisena oman edun tavoitteluna Neuvostoliiton uhkaa hyödyntäen tai sitten ainoana mahdollisena politiik-

kana, jota voitiin ajaa. Jälkimmäisessä viitekehyksessä Kekkonen on nähty sanakarillisena luovijana, joka onnistui välttämään vaaralliset ulkopoliittiset karikat sisäpoliittisen vallan keskittymisen hinnalla.

Työ tuo samalla esiin aiemmin vähälle huomiolle jääneet toimijat Kekkonen ajan ulkopoliittikan muotoilussa: Suomen ulkoasiainministeriön virkamiehet. Heidän osaltaan on usein keskitytty lähinnä erityisen profiloituneisiin hahmoihin kuten Max Jakobsoniin. Sen sijaan ns. rivimiehistön ääni on aiemmin jäänyt valtaosin sellaisen lähdeaineiston rooliin, jonka tehtävä on ollut rakentaa kokonaisnarratiivia. Diplomaattien näkemykset, erityisesti laajalla aikavälillä systemaattisen analyysin muodossa tarkasteltuna, ovat jääneet tutkimatta. Heidän raportointiaan on sivuttu lähinnä anekdoottimaisesti, esimerkiksi lyhyissä biografisissa lähettiläiden historioissa.

Työn metodologia on siis osaltaan jo selitettynä edeltävissä huomioissa: keskiössä on lähdekriittinen raporttien luenta, niiden suhteuttaminen aikalaiskeskusteluun sekä ajallisen taustan sekä muutoksen huomioiminen. Ikään kuin lisätyökaluna työ soveltaa konstruktionistista lähestymistapaa lähdeaineistoonsa ja tutkimuksen kohteeseen. Tämä tarkoittaa, että kansainvälinen politiikka tulkitaan tämän teorian kautta sosiaalisesti rakennettuna maailmana, joka ei aina korreloi todellisuuden tai edes todellisesti vallitsevien käsitysten kanssa. Näin ollen esimerkiksi Suomi pystyi rakentamaan kuvaa puolueettomuudesta samaan aikaan kun se oli allekirjoittanut YYA-sopimuksen, jolla se sitoutui toimimaan Neuvostoliiton apuna mahdollista itänaapuriiin suunnattua aggressiota vastaan. Työssä hyödynnetään erityisesti niin sanotun Cambridgen koulukunnan historiinantutkimuksen lähestymistapaa, jossa pyritään erottamaan keskustelun näennäinen ja todellinen intentio. Tätä menetelmää voidaan käyttää niin raporttien luenassa kuin Suomen virallisen ulkopoliittisen linjan diskursiivisen muotoilun tulkinnassa tutkimuksen ajanjaksolla. Tällöin jopa sellaisesta aineistosta, joka ei suoraan problematisoi tai haasta vallitsevia virallisia linjauksia, voidaan lukea myös vaihtoehtoisia tulkintoja ja viestejä. Työn perushypoteesi, oletus, että Suomen ulkopoliittikan tekijät pyrkivät sitomaan Saksan-politiikan osaksi puolueettomuuspolitiikan symbolista järjestelmää, sen sijaan rakentuu sille konstruktionistiselle näkemykselle, että kansainvälisen politiikan rakentamisessa symbolinen ulottuvuus on erityisen tärkeä.

Edellä mainitun huomion pohjalta olen jakanut Suomen ulkopoliittikan tarkasteluajanjaksolla erilaisiin ajallisiin vaiheisiin. Ensimmäinen vaihe käsittää vuodet 1955–1962. Tänä aikana Suomen edustus Saksoissa vakiintui ja molemmat Saksat alkoivat hyväksyä vallitsevan tilanteen, eli Suomen ratkaisun edustautua ainoastaan kaupallisilla edustustoilla. Suomen diplomaattista tunnustamattomuuslinjaa alettiin sitoa tuolloin myös osaksi Suomen puolueettomuuspolitiikkaa. Selvin esimerkki tästä oli valtiosihteeri R.R. Seppälän muistio vuodelta 1955. Siinä mietittiin tunnustamattomuuspolitiikan perustelemista Pariisin rauhansopimuksen artiklalla, jossa vaadittiin Suomea olemaan puolueeton kaikkia sodan voittajavaltoja kohtaan.

Työn toinen osa käsittelee vuosia 1963-1968, joka oli vakiintumisen aikaa Suomen Saksan-politiikan osalta. Tällöin toisaalta Saksan kysymyksen symbolinen merkitys vahvistui, koska Suomen sisäinen ilmapiiri suhteessa Neuvostoliittoon alkoi muuttua yliherkäksi, erityisesti 1950-luvun lopulla ja 1960-luvun alussa koettujen yöpakkas- ja noottikriisien myötä. Näin ollen myös Saksan-politiikka, joka oli luonnollisesti osa Suomen idänpolitiikkaa, muuttui osa-alueeksi, jossa muutokset olivat epätoivottavia, eritoten mikäli ne eivät olisi olleet Neuvostoliiton edun mukaisia.

Tutkimuksen kolmas ja viimeinen osa käsittelee vuosia 1969-1971, jolloin Saksan-politiikasta tuli osa Suomen ja erityisesti presidentti Kekkonen ajamaa aktiivista puolueettomuutta. Ajanjaksolla Suomi muun muassa toimi YK-turvallisuusneuvoston jäsenenä, isännöi strategisten aseiden rajoittamisneuvotteluja (Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, SALT) sekä alkoi ajaa Euroopan turvallisuuskonferenssia tarjoutumalla sen isännäksi. Tämä ajanjakso muodostaa kulminaatipisteen Saksan-politiikalle, sillä turvallisuuskonferenssialoitteen myötä oli selvää, että onnistuneen konferenssin vaatimuksena oli Suomen Saksojen tunnustus. Tällöin diplomaattien osalta oli erityisen tärkeää tarkastella Saksan kysymyksen yleistä kehitystä, varsinkin neljän voittajavallan neuvotteluja Saksan kysymyksestä sekä saksalais-neuvostoliittolaisia bilateraalinneuvotteluja.

Työn tutkimustuloksena suomalaisdiplomaattien poliittinen raportointi sekä Saksojen ulkoasiainhallinnon diplomaattinen materiaali osoittavat, että Suomen ulkopuolelta katsottuna asiat näyttäytyivät useimmiten huomattavasti moniulotteisimmilta kuin Suomen sisältä. Esimerkiksi vuoden 1956 tammi-kuussa Olavi Munkki, Suomen Länsi-Saksan Kölnissä toimineen kaupallisen edustuston päällikkö, ehdotti Itävallan solmiman valtiosopimuksen jälkeen mahdollisuutta, että Suomi voisi seurata Itävallan mallia. Itävallan neutraliteetti tuli valtiosopimuksen myötä tunnustetuksi molempien, sekä idän että lännen puolelta. Tämän jälkeen Itävalta toimi vastoin aiempaa tunnustamattomuuslinjaa jaetun Saksan kahden valtion suhteen ja tunnusti Länsi-Saksan eli Saksan Liittotasavallan diplomaattisesti. Suomen linja, Munkin kehoituksesta huolimatta, jatkui varovaisena: Suomi jatkoi edustautumistaan ainoastaan kaupallisten edustustojen kautta. Matalan profiilin pito edustautumisessa lienee osaltaan ollut alkuvaiheessa syynä siihen, että tärkein syy edustautumattomuuden takana, Neuvostoliitto, ei tuntunut olevan selvillä tästä diplomaattisesta pidättäytymisestä. Sen edustaja vieraili Suomen Länsi-Saksan edustustossa ja tiedusteli Suomen edustautumisen tasoa Saksoissa. Jo edellä käsitelty raportointi osoittaa, että Suomen ulkopoliittista toimintaa voitiin myös arvioida ilman ennakkoehtoa, että se olisi ollut tärkein osa myös Neuvostoliiton ulkopoliitiikkaa. Näissä näkemyksissä, eritoten Olavi Munkin raportoinnissa, Suomi pystyi määrittelemään linjaansa myös oman itsenäisen toimintansa kautta, ja tätä pidettiin jopa suotavana. Raportointi toi myös esiin, että välillä Länsi-Saksan ulkoasiainhallinto käytti Suomen epäselvää edustautumisen tasoa esimerkkinä tulkiten edustautumisen tason itselleen edullisena. Tällöin ei koettu tarpeelliseksi mainita, että Suomen edustajat olivat käytännön tasolla täysivaltaisia diplomaattisia edustajia.

Saksan kysymyksessä noudatetusta äärimmäisen varovaisesta linjasta muodostui lopulta tärkeä osa eritoten Urho Kekkosen pitkälti ajamaa mutta myös ulkoministeriön virkamiesten määrittelemää Suomen puolueettomuuspolitiikkaa. Tässä tapauksessa heikkoudesta tehtiin vahvuus. Vaikkakin politiikkaa pyrittiin sitomaan enenevissä määrin osaksi Suomen puolueettomuuspolitiikan symbolista järjestelmää, antoi raportointi Suomen edustoista ymmärtää, että usein Suomi ajautui, erityisesti YK-äänestyskäyttäytymisensä myötä, yhä enemmän ns. kolmannen maailman linjoille pyrkimyksessään tasapainoilla idän ja lännen välissä niin Saksan kysymyksessä kuin puolueettomuuspyrkimyksissään yleisestikin. Tässä suhteessa enenevissä määrin syntyi myös mielenkiintoinen vastakkainasettelu: samaan aikaan kun Saksan-politiikka symbolisoitui, Kekkonen siirtyi retoriikassaan yhä kompromissittomaan suuntaan ja erityisesti 1960-luvun puolivälin jälkeen hyökkäsi yhä enenevässä määrin Länsi-Saksaa vastaan. Kekkosen ulkopoliittiset puheet alkoivat muistuttaa itäblokin standardisoitua ulkopoliittista liturgiaa, jossa Länsi-Saksaa syytettiin sodan lietsomisesta ja pidettiin mahdollisena kolmannen maailmansodan aloittajana.

Diplomaattien raportointi osoittaa, että Kekkosen toiminta näytti äärimmäisen huonolta länsisaksalaisten näkökulmasta eritoten ulkopoliittisten kriisien, kuten noottikriisi ja yöpakkaset, valossa. Nämä olivat jo valmiiksi vieneet Kekkosen uskottavuutta. Länsisaksalaisissa tulkinnoissa kriisit nähtiin pitkälti Neuvostoliiton sekaantumisenä Suomen sisäpolitiikkaan ja pyrkimyksenä vahvistaa ja varmistaa Kekkosen vallan jatkuminen. Itse asiassa kriisien jälkimainingeissa suomalaisdiplomaatti Veli Helenius joutui äärimmäisen kiusallisen tehtävän eteen: Saksan liittopresidentti Heinrich Lübke nimittäin tunnusti hänelle, että hän olisi kovasti kiinnostunut vierailemaan Suomessa, muttei voinut tätä tehdä, koska Suomi ei ollut vapaa maa eikä siellä pystynyt edes hengittämään. Aiemmin myös Suomen edustaja Torsten Tikanvaara sai selvän viestin Länsi-Saksan ulkoministeriön virkamiehiltä: huolimatta siitä, että he tunsivat kiinnostusta peirehtyä Suomeen ja sen hallintojärjestelmään, he eivät voineet tätä tehdä Kekkosen ristiriitaisen persoonan vuoksi, eritoten kriisien jälkeen.

Huomiota herättävää on, että tänä aikana ulkoministeriön riveihin palkattiin Keijo Korhonen ja Risto Hyvärinen, jotka olivat korkealla teoreettisella tasolla koulutettuja ulkopoliittikan muotoilijoita. He alkoivat formuloida yhä teoreettisemmin Saksan-politiikkaa käsitteellisellä tasolla sidotuksi puolueettomuuteen. Voi esittää myös kysymyksen, että käyttikö Kekkonen Saksan-politiikassa ns. kahden kärjen taktiikkaa. Samaa aikaan kun hän yhä vahvemmin kävi ulkopoliittisessa retoriikassa idän linjoille, hän vahvisti ulkoministeriön henkilöstöä vahvasti länsisuuntautuneilla ja kyvykkäillä puolueettomuuspolitiikan muotoilijoilla. Tämä vahvisti viestiä, jonka Länsi-Saksassa toimineet suomalaisdiplomaatit osaltaan kuljettivat. Heidän esittämät näkemyksensä ja keskustelunsa Länsi-Saksan virkamiesten sekä poliitikkojen kanssa osoittavat, että Suomen ulkoasiainhallinnossa, ja tätä kautta ulkopoliitiikassa, ei suinkaan oltu menossa idänsuhteiden osalta Kekkosen retoriikan näennäisesti viljelemille linjoille. Länsi-Saksan ulkoasiainhallinnon dokumentit paljastavat kuinka Länsi-Saksan

ulkoministeriössä pantiin tyytyväisinä merkille, että Suomen ulkoasiainhallinnossa ja poliittisen järjestelmän sisällä oli yhä olemassa länsimielinen suuntaus. Positiivisen arvioinnin saivat suoraan nimeltä mainiten valtiosihteeri T.O. Vahervaara ja kaupalliset edustajat Alexander Thesleff ja Torsten Tikanvaara. Thesleff oli keskusteluissa länsisaksalaisten virkamiesten kanssa ilmaissut suoraan anti-kommunistisen asenteensa. Tikanvaara oli puolestaan pahoitellut länsisaksalaisille 1960-luvun alkupuolella epäonnistunutta yritystä kohottaa Suomen Länsi-Saksassa toimineen edustuston virallista nimitystä. Samoin on selvää, että konservatiiviseksi tiedetyllä ja viipurilaisesta kauppasuvusta lähtöisin olleella Olavi Munkilla tuskin lienee ollut positiivista sanottavaa Suomen poliittisesta ilmapii-ristä sekä Neuvostoliittoon suuntautuneesta YYA-liturgiasta. Hänenkin kohdallaan ilmeni Kekkonen selvä halu pitää ulkoministeriön toiminta pohjautuneena osaamiseen eikä poliittiseen sopivuuteen. Kekkonen, huolimatta siitä, että Munkin ja hänen henkilökemiat eivät käyneet yksiin, ei yrittänyt vaikeuttaa Munkin uraa ministeriössä: päinvastoin, tärkeissä Suomen liittymisneuvotteluissa Euroopan vapaakauppajärjestö Eftaan Munkki oli johtavassa roolissa. Myös muiden diplomaattien raportointi ei missään vaiheessa ottanut selkeää itäblokkimyönteistä kantaa itä ja länsi -vastakkainasettelun suhteen niin Saksan kysymyksessä kuin yleisemminkään. Myös Itä-Saksan ulkoasiainhallinto piti Suomen ulkoministeriötä lähdeaineistona toimineiden dokumenttien perusteella taantumuksellisenä, mikä tukee edellä tehtyä tulkintaa.

Kun ulkoministeriössä muotoiltiin yhä vahvemmin puolueettomuuteen liitettyä Saksan-politiikkaa ja toisaalta Kekkonen hyökkäsi retoriikassaan Länsi-Saksaa vastaan, Suomessa kasvoi myös sisäpoliittinen paine Itä-Saksan tunnustamiseen, osatekijänä suomettuminen ja Neuvostoliittoa kohtaan positiivinen julkinen keskustelu. Nämä seikat johtivat lopulta siihen, että maltillisella linjalla edennyt Suomen Sosialidemokraattinen Puoluekin kirjoitti julkilausuman vaatien Itä-Saksan tunnustamista. Suomen poliittinen kenttä oli alkanut kääntyä vahvasti itämyönteiselle linjalle, jota vastaan ulkoministeriössä alkoi kamppailu. Tällöin muodostui ministeriöön Kekkonen palkkaamista uusista virkamiehistä Korhosesta ja Hyvärisestä sekä eräistä muista ulkoministeriön virkamiehistä, joista tärkeimpänä ryhmittymän eräänlaisesti johtohahmoksi tullut Max Jakobson, ns. kenraalijunta tai tohtorikopla. Tämän epävirallisen yhteenliittymän päämotivoijana oli pyrkimys taistella kasvavaa sisäpoliittista painetta Suomen Saksan-politiikan muuttamista vastaan. Tätä linjaa tuki myös suomalaisdiplomaattien raportointi osoittamalla ettei Suomi voinut haastaa Saksan-politiikallaan enenaikaisesti neljän vallan välistä, Saksojen välistä, sekä Länsi-Saksan ja Neuvostoliiton välistä ns. détenteprosessia, jonka toivottiin johtavan Euroopan turvallisuuskonferenssiin ja Saksoja koskevan sopimuksen syntyyn. Vaarana oli, että Suomen Saksan-politiikka olisi juuri sen kriittisimmällä hetkellä, 1960-luvun loppua lähestyttäessä, ajautunut karille eritoten sosiaalidemokraattien lähinnä ulkopoliittisesti motivoituneen tunnustamisinnostuksen myötä. Tiukan linjan pito Saksan-politiikassa oli tärkeää, sillä Suomi alkoi tässä vaiheessa ajaa isännöityä Euroopan turvallisuuskonferenssille. Tämä aloite olisi voinut hajota hätköityyn Saksojen tunnustamisyrittäykseen. On kuitenkin huomioitava, että jo aiemmin

1960-luvun puolenvälin jälkeen diplomaatit olivat toisaalta haastaneet Hallsteinin opin uhan Suomen Saksan-politiikan osalta. Heidän mukaansa oppi oli menettänyt uskottavuutensa. Lisäksi Länsi-Saksan ulkoasianhallinnon virkamies paljasti Suomen edustajalle Kaarlo Mäkelälle, että oppia oli voitu soveltaa Jugoslavian kohdalla aiemmin, koska se oli ollut poliittisesti eristetty. Jugoslavia oli ajautunut ulos itäblokista muttei voinut toisaalta poliittisen järjestelmänsä vuoksi myöskään identifioitua länteen. Se oli siis erilaisessa asemassa kuin Suomi, jolla oli hyvät suhteet kumpaankin kylmän sodan leiriin.

Diplomaattien raportointi korosti turvallisuuskonferenssialoitteen jälkeisessä vaiheessa – huolimatta Suomen sisäpoliittisesta Itä-Saksa-myönteisyydestä – etteivät Itä-Saksan ja Neuvostoliiton edut välttämättä käyneet ollenkaan yksiin. Neuvostoliitolle Itä-Saksa oli pelinappula suuremmassa geopoliittisessa pelissä Euroopan osalta. Itse asiassa raportoinnista suodattuu lukijalle kuva, että liian itsenäinen ja vahvistunut Itä-Saksa tulkittiin jo tuossa vaiheessa haittana Neuvostoliitolle. Myöhemmin tämä alkoi käydä vielä ilmeisemmäksi, kun Itä-Saksan itsepäinen johtaja Walter Ulbricht ei enää osallistunut Neuvostoliiton ja Itä-Saksan välisiin tärkeisiin tapaamisiin vaan joutui jäämään pois ainakin näennäisesti terveydellisten seikkojen vuoksi. Raportoinnissa huomautettiinkin, että Ulbrichtin sairastuminen ei estänyt Neuvostoliittoa järjestämästä tapaamisista. Itse asiassa huomiona esitettiin, että tapaamiset saattoivat järjestyä juuri Ulbrichtin sairaudesta johtuen eikä siitä huolimatta.

Ennen kuin Suomen Saksan-politiikka lopulta ajettiin päätökseen Suomen aloitteella tunnustaa molemmat Saksat syyskuussa 1971, piti raportointi siis osaltaan Suomen Saksan-politiikan jatkuvasti yllirajaisessa ja kansainvälisessä mittakaavassa. Se osoitti, että huolimatta siitä roolista, joka Suomelle oli näyttänyt syntyvän kansainvälisen politiikan areenalla 1960-luvun lopulta alkaen, Saksan kysymys oli lopulta niin tärkeä suurvaltojen välinen kysymys, ettei Suomi voinut olla kovin aloitteellinen asian suhteen. Suomen Saksan-politiikan oli toisin sanoen pysyttävä alisteisena suurvaltojen välisten neuvottelujen etenemiselle ja laajemmalle liennytyshitykselle. Huomionarvoista on myös, että Suomen aloite julkistettiin jo syyskuussa 1971 sen vuoksi, että ulkoministeri Väinö Leskinen oli vuotanut tiedon siitä. Ei siksi, että ajankohta olisi koettu vielä tuolloinkaan oikeaksi.

Millaisiin päätelmiin nämä huomiot Suomen Saksan-politiikan toteutuksen sekä diplomaattien poliittisen raportoinnin osalta siis johtavat? Huomionarvoista on se, että tällainen, ns. monipaikkainen poliittinen keskustelu tai dialogi, joka muodostui toisaalta Suomen poliittisen järjestelmän sisältä ja toisaalta ikään kuin sen ulkopuolelta katsottuna, auttoi suhteuttamaan asioita sekä kyseenalaistamaan itsestäänselvyksiä. Poliittisesti otollinen ajan henki sai vastapainon vähemmän poliittisen ja enemmän asiakeskeisen virkamiestyön kautta sekä Suomen ulkopuolisten näkökulmien kautta, jotka välittyivät raportoinnista. Diplomaattien raportointi toi Suomen Saksan-politiikkaan jatkuvasti yllirajaisen näkökulman, tasapainotti näin Suomen sisäisen poliittisen ilmapiirin painottamaa näkökulmaa, joka ei voinut olla vaikuttamatta Suomen ulkopoliittikan tekijöihin. Eritoten siinä poliittisessa ilmapiirissä, jonka suomettuminen loi, moniulotteinen

ja vertaileva raportointi auttoi suhteuttamaan Suomen roolia ja asemaa kansainvälisen politiikan kentällä. Työn perushypoteesin näkökulmasta – Saksan-politiikan tarkastelu sen symbolisesta näkökulmasta – voidaan sanoa, että tällä tasolla politiikan uskottavuus oli kovin kyseenalainen erityisesti sen konstruoidulla teoreettisella tasolla. Sen sijaan suomalaisten diplomaattien toiminta sekä heidän näkemystensä ja persoonien kautta välittyneen viestin voidaan katsoa pitäneen Suomen ulkopoliittista uskottavuutta myös Saksan kysymyksessä koossa.

REFERENCES

Original sources:

Eduskunnan kirjasto (*Library of Finnish Parliament*)

Ulkoasiainvaliokunnan pöytäkirjat

Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes, Bonn (PAAA) (*The Archives of the foreign office of the Federal Republic of Germany*)

2. Akten, Bundesrepublik Deutschland Zentrale
2.3.2. Politische Abteilung

B 23 – Nordische Staaten, Österreich, Schweiz

Bd. 93

Bd. 228

Bd. 13

Bd. 227

Bd. 205

B 26 – Länderreferate Mittelmeer und Nordische Staaten, Bulgarien, Rumänien

Bd. 249

Bd. 354

B 31 – Länderreferate Großbritannien, Commonwealth, Nordeuropa, Ostseerat

Bd. 364

Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes, Aussenstelle Berlin (PAAA, Bestand Mfaa) (*The Archives of the Foreign Ministry of the German Democratic Republic*)

L 43 – Finnland

100 Umfassende fragen der Aussenpolitik

A14116

A14080

C1174/76

C452/74

Suojelupoliisin arkisto, Archives of the Finnish Security Police (Supo), Helsinki

Kortti 15 January 1946.

hs XXVIIA-226

Ulkoministeriön arkisto (UM) (*Archives of Finnish Foreign Ministry*), Helsinki

5. Ulkoasiainministeriö ja Suomen diplomaattinen edustus ulkomailla

5 C 5 Kaupallinen edustusto Berliinissä

5 C 5 A Kaupallinen edustusto Köln/Bonnissa

5 G 71 Accrassa

5 C 25 Viennassa

6. Vieraiden valtioiden ulkoministeriöt ja lähetystöt Suomessa

6 O Ulkovaltain diplomaattinen edustus Suomessa

6 O 5 Saksan (myöh. Itä-Saksan)

6 O 5 A Saksan (myöh. Länsi-Saksan)

7. Maailmanpolitiikka

7 D 2 Saksan kysymys

12. Suomen ulkopoliitiikka ja poliittiset suhteet muihin maihin

12 K Suomen ulkopoliitiikka ja ulkopoliittinen asema yleensä

13. Puolueettomuus

Urho Kekkosen arkisto (UKK) (*Archives of President Urho Kekkonen*), Orimattila

21. Poliitiikka

21/91 Suurlähettiläskokouksia 1959, 1965-1967

21 / 133 Saksojen kysymys

21 / 97 Selostuksia valtio- ym. vierailujen aikana käydyistä neuvotteluista, tiedonantoja 1963-1969.

Vuosikirjat 1958-

Online:

Finlex

<https://www.finlex.fi/fi/>

"Asetus Suomen ja Sosialististen Neuvostotasavaltain Liiton välillä ystävydestä, yhteistoiminnasta ja keskinäisestä avunannosta Moskovassa 6 päivänä huhtikuuta 1948 allekirjoitetun sopimuksen voimaansaattamisesta"
<https://www.finlex.fi/fi/sopimukset/sopsteksti/1948/19480017/> [accessed 19 April 2018]

International Court of Justice

<http://www.icj-cij.org/en>

Statute of the International Court of Justice
<http://www.icj-cij.org/en/statute> [accessed 16 April 2018]

Kansallisbiografia

<https://kansallisbiografia.fi/>

Hallberg, P. 2005. Merikoski, Veli (1905 - 1982), <https://kansallisbiografia.fi/kansallisbiografia/henkilo/2043> [accessed 24 January 2018]

Klinge, M. 2005. Mäkinen, Jussi (1929 - 1978), <http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kansallisbiografia/henkilo/1714> [accessed 29 June 2017]

Seppinen, 2004. Hyvärinen, Risto (1926-), <https://kansallisbiografia.fi/kansallisbiografia/henkilo/8022/> [accessed 16 April 2018]

Seppinen, J. 2005. Korhonen, Keijo (1934-), <https://kansallisbiografia.fi/kansallisbiografia/henkilo/4024> [accessed 16 April 2018]

Soikkanen, T. 2002. Ruutu, Yrjö. (1887-1956), <https://www.kansallisbiografia.fi/kansallisbiografia/henkilo/5253/> [Accessed 12 September 2017]

Lemo, Lebendiges Museum Online

Karl Carstens 1914-1992. <https://www.hdg.de/lemo/biografie/karl-carstens#jpto-1950/> [Accessed 9 October 2017].

Kurt Georg Kiesinger 1904 - 1988. <https://www.hdg.de/lemo/biografie/kurt-georg-kiesinger.html> [accessed 9 July 2018]

Lillian Goldman Law Library

<http://avalon.law.yale.edu/default.asp/>

The Franco-Russian Alliance Military Convention - August 18, 1892.
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/frumil.asp [accessed 16 April 2018]

The United States government, Central Intelligence Agency

<https://www.cia.gov/index.html>

Intelligence Memorandum: 24 February 1967 Strains in Soviet-East German relations
1962 - 1967.
https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/docs/DOC_0000969854.pdf [accessed 19 September 2017]

The United States Department of State, Office of the Historian

<https://history.state.gov/>

The Berlin Crisis, 1958–1961

<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1953-1960/berlin-crises> [accessed 16 April 2018]

United Nations

<http://www.un.org/en/index.html>

E-mail to the author from Dag Hammarskjöld Library concerning Finland's UN votes during 1960–1969 [received 5 February 2018]

Urho Kekkonen julkaistu tuotanto

<https://www.doria.fi/ukk>

Kekkonen's columns under alias Liimatainen

14 October 1967 "Hakaristin varjo" (Shadow of the Swastika)

<http://www.doria.fi/handle/10024/11215> [accessed 23 October 2017]

1967 "Ratkaisuna kolmas maailmansota?" (Third World War, a solution?)

<http://www.doria.fi/handle/10024/9435> [accessed 23 October 2017]

Speech at the dinner of the Soviet Union's embassy in Helsinki 24 February 1965 "Suomen suhtautuminen monenkeskisten ydinvoimien luomiseen" (Finland's position on the creation of multilateral nuclear force) <http://www.doria.fi/handle/10024/8473> [accessed 23 October 2017]

Speech in Vaasa 6.1.1967 "Suomen tie jännitysten maailmassa" (Finland's path in the world of tensions). <http://www.doria.fi/handle/10024/11632> [accessed 23 October 2017]

UW-Madison Libraries <https://uwdc.library.wisc.edu/collections/History/>

Documents on Germany, 1944-1959 : background documents on Germany, 1944-1959, and a chronology of political developments affecting Berlin, 1945-1956 (1959)

Note from the foreign minister of the Federal Republic of Germany (von Brentano) to the Soviet Ambassador (Smirnov), regarding nuclear weapons in Germany, May 23, 1957 [extracts], pp. 205-206.

<http://images.library.wisc.edu/History/EFacs/GerRecon/BackgrndDocs/reference/history.backgrnddocs.i0091.pdf> [Accessed 19 September 2017]

Valtioneuvosto

Urho Kekkonen V hallituksen ohjelma

http://valtioneuvosto.fi/hallitusohjelmat/-/asset_publisher/39-paaministeri-urho-kekkosen-v-hallituksen-ohjelma [accessed 16 April 2018]

Wilson Center, Digital Archive

<http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/123891>

Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance Between the People's Republic of Albania, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Czechoslovak Republic, May 14, 1955.

<http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/123891> [accessed 13 June 2018]

Yhdistyneet Kansakunnat <https://yk.fi>

Suomi ja YK, 60-luvulla <https://yk.fi/node/457> [accessed 16 July 2018]

Printed original sources:

Hölscher, W. & Kosthorst, D. (Eds.). (2013). *Akten zur Auswärtigen Politik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (AAPD)*: Wissenschaftliche Leiterin: Ilse Dorothee Pautsch. 1964. Berlin, Germany: Oldenbourg.

Bührer, W. (Ed.). (1993). *Die Adenauer-Ära: Die Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1949-1963*. Munich, Germany: Piper.

Deuerlein, E. & Schierbaum, H. (Eds.). (1961). *Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik*. III.Reihe / Band 1. 5.Mai bis 31. Dezember 1955. Frankfurt am Main, Germany:

Hofmann, D., Hildebrand, K. & Schwarz, H.-P. (Eds.). (2002). *Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik*. VI. Reihe/ Band 1. 21. Oktober bis 31. Dezember 1970. Munich, Germany: R. Oldenbourg Verlag.

Dauerlein, E., Bracher, K. D., Jacobsen H.-A. & Oberlander, G. (Eds.). (1984). *Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik*. V. Reihe / Band 1. 1. Dezember 1966 bis 31. Dezember 1967. Munich, Germany: Oldenbourg Verlag.

Great Britain, Foreign Office. (1961) *Selected Documents on Germany and the Question of Berlin 1944-1961*. London, England: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

Valtiopäivät 1961. (1963). Pöytäkirjat III. Istunnot 82 – 105. Joukuun 13. Päivästä 1961 valtiopäivien loppuun 1962. Helsinki, Finland: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino.

Newspapers and periodicals:

Helsingin Sanomat

New York Times

Ulkopolitiikka 1 / 1962.

Viikkosanomat

Etelä-Suomen Sanomat

Books and articles

- Adler, E. (2002). Constructivism and international relations. In W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse, & B. Simmons (Eds.), *Handbook of international relations*. London, England: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Ahonen, P. (2003). *After the expulsion. West Germany and Eastern Europe 1945-1990*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Ahonen, P. (2011). *Death at the Berlin Wall*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Alholm, B. (1996). Suomettuminen ulkoasiainhallinnossa. *Kanava* 1996, 24(9) 516-520.
- Androsova, T. (1996). Neuvostoliiton ja Suomen suhteet Urho Kekkosen ensimmäisellä presidenttikaudella. *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* 94(1), 3-16.
- Androsova, T. (2009). Vuoden 1948 YYA-sopimus Suomessa Neuvostoliiton politiikan yhtenä päävälineenä. In V. Vares, (Ed.), *Poliittista ystävyyttä: YYA-sopimus 60 vuotta; Henkivakuutusta, reaali politiikkaa, ystävyyttä?* Turku, Finland: Turun yliopiston Poliittisen historian laitoksen julkaisuja.
- Antola, E. (1983). Kansainvälinen politiikka suomalaisessa valtio-opissa. In J. Nousiainen & D. Anckar (Eds.), *Valtio ja yhteiskunta: Tutkielmia suomalaisen valtiollisen ajattelun ja valtio-opin historiasta*. Porvoo, Finland: WSOY.
- Apunen, O. (1977). *Paasikiven-Kekkosen linja*. Ulkopoliittisen instituutin julkaisuja. Helsinki, Finland: KK kirjapaino.
- Apunen, O. (2004). *Murrosaikojen maailmanpolitiikka: Ulkopoliittikan, kansainvälisen politiikan ja kansainvälisten suhteiden kehityslinjat ja rakenteet*. Studia Politica Tampere No. 3. Tampere, Finland: Tampereen yliopisto, Poliittikan tutkimuksen laitos.
- Barracough, G. (1964). *An Introduction to Contemporary History*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bark, D. & Gress, D. (1989), (1). *A history of West Germany. Volume 1, From shadow to substance 1945-1963*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Bark, D. & Gress, D. (1989), (2). *History of West Germany 2. Democracy and its discontents*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Berger, P. L. & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York, NY: Doubleday. Doubleday Anchor books.
- Berger, S. (2000). *Social Democracy and the working class in nineteenth and twentieth century Germany*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Pearson Education Limited.
- Biefang, A. & Schulz, A. (2016). From monarchical constitutionalism to a parliamentary republic: Concepts of parliamentarism in Germany since 1818. In P. Ihalainen, C. Ilie & K. Palonen (Eds.), *Parliament and parliamentarism: A comparative history of a European concept*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
- Blitz, H-M. (2000). *Aus Liebe zum Vaterland. Die Deutsche Nation im 18. Jahrhundert*. Hamburger edition. Retrieved from Google Books.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Berkeley, CA: University of California. Repr. 1986, 1998.
- Bott, S., Hanhimäki, J. M., Schaufelbuehl, J. & Wyss, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Neutrality and neutrality in the global Cold War: Between or within the blocs?* London, England: Routledge.

- Bozo, F. (2010). France, "Gaullism", and the Cold War. In M. P. Leffler & A. O. Westad, (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of the Cold War. Vol. 2, Crises and détente*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Bracher, K. D. & Hildebrand, K. (1984). *Von Erhard zur Grossen Koalition 1963-1969. Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: in fünf Bänden..4*. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.
- Brandt, W. (1989). *Erinnerungen*. Frankfurt Am Main, Germany: Propyläen.
- Brzezinski, Z. (1961). The challenge of change in the Soviet bloc. *Foreign Affairs*, April 1961. Retrieved from <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/russian-federation/1961-04-01/challenge-change-soviet-bloc>
- Brotherus, H. (1985). *Ritarikadun salaisuudet*. Espoo, Finland: Weilin-Göös.
- Bull, H. (1977). *The anarchical society: A study of order in world politics*. London. Retrieved from Googlebooks.
- Burkhardt, A. (2016). German parliamentary discourse since 1948 from a linguistic point of view. In P. Ihalainen, C. Ilie & K. Palonen (Eds.), *Parliament and parliamentarism: A comparative history of a European concept*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
- Böök, M. (1979). Johdanto. In Gramsci, A. (Ed. Böök, M.). *Vankilavihkot: valikoima*. Helsinki, Finland: Kansankulttuuri OY.
- Carr, E. H. (1961). *What is history?* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, A. (1976). *Two-dimensional man: An essay on the anthropology of power and symbolism in complex society*. University of California Press. Retrieved from Google Books.
- Cohen, D. & O'Connor, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Comparison and history: Europe in cross-national perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Costigliola, F. (1997). "Unceasing pressure for penetration": Gender, pathology, and emotion in George Kennan's formation of the Cold War. *The Journal of American History*, 83(4) 1309-1339.
- Daigle, C. (2012). *The Limits of détente: The United States, the Soviet Union, and the Arab-Israeli conflict, 1969-1973*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Retrieved from Ebscohost.
- Dale, G. (2006). *Popular protest in East Germany*. London: Routledge. Retrieved from ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Dannenberg, J. (2008). *The Foundations of Ostpolitik: The making of the Moscow Treaty between West Germany and the USSR*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from Ebook Central.
- Dinkel, J. (2016). "Third world begins to flex its muscles": The Non-Alignment movement and the North-South conflict during the 1970s. In S. Bott, J. M. Hanhimäki, J. Schaufelbuehl, J. & M. Wyss (Eds.), *Neutralism and neutrality in the global Cold War: Between or within the blocs?* London, England: Routledge.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. London, England: Athlone press.
- Espagne, M. (2017). Comparison and transfer: A question of method. In M. Middell & L. Roura (Eds.), *Transnational challenges to national history writing*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Feldman, L. G. (2014). *Germany's foreign policy of reconciliation: From enmity to amity*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. Retrieved from Ebscohost.
- Fischer, T. (2009). "A mustard seed grew into a bushy tree": The Finnish CSCE initiative of 5 May 1969. *Cold War History*, 9(2), 177-201.
- Freeden, M. (1996). *Ideologies and political theory: A conceptual approach*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
- Frye, N. (1957/1973). *Anatomy of criticism: Four essays*. New Jersey, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fullbrook, M. (2005). *The People's state: East German society from Hitler to Honecker*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Garcia-Zamor, J-C. (2014). *Bureaucratic, societal, and ethical transformation of the former East Germany*. University Press of America. Retrieved from Google Books.
- Genscher, H-D. (1976). Adenauer und die Ost- und Deutschlandpolitik der Freien Demokraten. In D. Blumentwitz, K. Gotto, H. Maier, K. Repgen & H.-P. Schwartz (Eds.), *Konrad Adenauer und Seine Zeit. Politik und Persönlichkeit des ersten Bundeskanzlers*. Band 1. Beiträge von Weg- und Zeitgenossen. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.
- Gilcher-Holtey, I. (2001). *Die 68er Bewegung: Deutschland-Westeuropa-USA*. Munich, Germany: Verlag C.H. Beck.
- Gildea, R. & Simonin, A. (Eds.). (2008). *Writing contemporary history*. London, England: Hodder Education cop.
- Gordon, P.H. (1993). *Certain idea of France: French security policy and the Gaullist legacy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Retrieved from Ebscohost.
- Gray, W. G. (2003). *Germany's Cold War: The global campaign to isolate East Germany, 1949-1969*. Chapel Hill, NC, USA: University of North Carolina Press.
- Görtemaker, M. (1999). *Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck.
- Greig, D. (2006). The Time of conclusion and the time of application of treaties as points of reference in the interpretative process. In M. Craven, M. Fitzmaurice, & M. Vogiatzi (Eds.), *Time, history and international Law*. Developments in international law. Brill. Retrieved from Brill.
- Greiffenhagen, M. & S. (1993). *Ein schwieriges Vaterland: Zur politischen Kultur im vereinigten Deutschland*. Munich, Leipzig: List Verlag.
- Guilhot, N. (2011). Introduction: One discipline, many histories. In N. Guilhot (Ed.), *The Invention of the IR theory: Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the 1954 Conference on theory*. Columbia University Press. New York.
- Gupta, A. D. (2014). *Handel, Hilfe, Hallstein-Doktrin: Die deutsche Südasienspolitik unter Adenauer und Erhard 1949-1966*. Husum: Matthiesen Verlag.
- Haataja, L. (1995). Vanha sortuu, aika muuttuu, uusi elämä kukoistaa raunioilla. Historiankirjoituksen paluu nollapisteseen. In T. Soikkanen (Ed.), *Lähihistoria: Teoriaan, metodologiaan ja lähteisiin liittyviä ongelmia*. Turku: Turun yliopiston poliittisen historian tutkimuksia.
- Haftendorn, H. (2006). *Coming of age: German foreign policy since 1945*. Oxford: Rowman & littlefield. Dawsonera.

- Haftendorn, H. (2008). The Harmel Report and its impact on German Ostpolitik. In W. Loth & G.-H. Soutou (Eds.), *The Making of Détente: Eastern and Western Europe in the Cold War, 1965-1975*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hakapää, K. (2010). *Uusi kansainvälinen oikeus*. Helsinki: Talentum.
- Halmesvirta, A. (1999). Nietzsche, historia ja degeneraatio. In F. Nietzsche (1999/1874), *Historian hyödyistä ja haitasta elämälle* [A. Halmesvirta, trans.]. Jyväskylä: Julpu.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Victoria: Deakin University.
- Halonen, M.; Ihalainen, P. & Saarinen, T. (2015). Diverse discourses in time and space: Historical, discourse analytical and ethnographic approaches to multi-sited language policy discourse". In M. Halonen, P. Ihalainen & T. Saarinen (Eds.), *Language policies in Finland and Sweden: Interdisciplinary and multi-sited comparisons*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Hamilton, K. & Langhorne, R. (2010). *The Practice of diplomacy: Its evolution, theory and administration*. London, England: Routledge.
- Hanhimäki, J. (1997). *Containing coexistence: America, Russia and the "Finnish solution"*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Harrison, H. (2005). *Driving the Soviets up the wall: Soviet-East German relations, 1953-1961*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Retrieved from Ebscohost.
- Haupt, H-G. & Kocka, J. (2009). *Comparative and transnational history: Central European approaches and new perspectives*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
- Hecker-Stampehl, J. (2007). Vorwort. In Hecker-Stampehl, J. (Ed.), *Nordeuropa und die beiden deutschen Staaten 1949-1989: Aspekte einer Beziehungsgeschichte im Zeichen des Kalten Krieges*. Leipzig, Germany: Kirchof & Franke.
- Hecker-Stampehl, J. (Ed.). (2007). *Nordeuropa und die beiden deutschen Staaten 1949-1989: Aspekte einer Beziehungsgeschichte im Zeichen des Kalten Krieges*. Leipzig, Germany: Kirchof & Franke.
- Heikkilä, T. (1965). *Paasikivi peräsimessä. Pääministerin sihteerin muistelmat 1944-1948*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Heikkinen, V., Hiidenmaa, P. & Tiililä, U. (2000): *Teksti työnä, virka kielenä*. Helsinki, Finland: Gaudeamus.
- Heinlein, F. (2002). *British government policy and decolonisation, 1945-1963: scrutinising the official mind*. Routledge. Retrieved from Ebook Central.
- Hentilä, S. (2004). *Harppi-Saksan haarukassa: DDR:n poliittinen vaikutus Suomessa*. Helsinki, Finland: SKS.
- Hentilä, S. (1994). *Jaettu Saksa, jaettu historia. Kylmä historiasota 1945-1990*. Helsinki, Finland: Suomen historiallinen Seura.
- Hentilä, S. (2003). *Kaksi Saksaa ja Suomi : Saksan-kysymys Suomen puolueettomuuspolitiikan haasteena*. Helsinki, Finland: SKS.
- Hentilä, M. & Hentilä, S. (2016). *Saksalainen Suomi 1918*. Helsinki, Finland: Kustannusosakeyhtiö Siltala.
- Heuer, R. J. (1999.) *Psychology of intelligence analysis*. Center for the Study of Intelligence. Central Intelligence Agency. Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/books-and-monographs/psychology-of-intelligence-analysis/PsychofIntelNew.pdf>

- Hildebrandt, K. (1984). *Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Von Erhard zur Grossen coalition 1963-1969*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt. Wiesbaden: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Flores, I. B., Himma, K. E. (Eds.). (2013). *Law, liberty, and the rule of law. Ius Gentium: Comparative perspectives on law and justice*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. Retrieved from SpringerLink Ebooks.
- Hofhansel, C. (2005). *Multilateralism, German foreign policy and Central Europe*. London, England: Routledge. Retrieved from Ebscohost.
- Holsti, K. J. & Heiskanen, R. (1963). *Suomen ulkopoliittikka suuntaansa etsimässä vuosina 1918-1922: Rudolf Holstin osuus*. Helsinki, Finland: Tammi.
- Hooper, A. (1995). A politics adequate to the age: the New Left and the long sixties. In G. Andrews (Ed.), *New Left, New Right and beyond: Taking the sixties seriously*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave. Retrieved from Ebook Central.
- Horn, G-R. (2007). *Spirit of '68: Rebellion in Western Europe and North America, 1956-1976*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from Ebscohost.
- Hyvärinen, R. (1958). *Monistic and pluralistic interpretations in the study of international politics*. Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum XXIV. 1. Helsinki, Finland: Helsingin yliopisto.
- Hyvärinen, R. (1966). *Kansainvälisen politiikan tutkimus valtion ulkopoliittikan kannalta*. Helsinki, Finland: Helsingin yliopiston valtio-opin laitoksen tutkimuksia. N 8 / 1966.
- Hyvärinen, R. (2000). *Virkamiehiä, viekkautta ja vakoilua*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Häkkinen, T. (2014). *The Royal Prerogative redefined: parliamentary debate on the role of the British Parliament in large-scale military deployments, 1982-2003*. Jyväskylä, Finland. Jyväskylä University. Retrieved from Jyx digital archive.
- Ihalainen, P. (2005). *Protestant nations redefined: Changing perceptions of national identity in the rhetoric of the English, Dutch and Swedish public churches 1685-1772*. Leiden, Germany: Brill.
- Ihalainen, P. (2016a). European parliamentary experiences from a conceptual historical perspective. In P. Ihalainen, C. Ilie & K. Palonen (Eds.), *Parliament and parliamentarism: A comparative history of a European concept*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
- Ihalainen, P. (2016b). "Läntinen demokratia" Euroopan sisäisenä jakolinjana ensimmäisen maailmansodan lopulla. In Jouhki, J. & Pennanen, H-R. (Eds.), *Länsi: käsite, kertomus ja maailmankuva*. Helsinki, Finland: SKS.
- Ihalainen, P. & Matikainen, S. (Eds.). (2016). The British parliament and foreign policy in the 20th century. *Parliamentary History*(35), pt. 1, 1-14.
- Ihalainen, P. (2017). *The springs of democracy: National and transnational debates on constitutional reform in the British, German, Swedish and Finnish parliaments, 1917-1919*. Helsinki, Finland: SKS.
- Iriye, A. (2013). *Global and Transnational History: The Past, Present, and Future*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jakobson, M. (1980). *Veteen piirretty viiva: havaintoja ja merkintöjä vuosilta 1953-1965*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.

- Janhunen, M. (1997). *“Sonderfall Finland” – DDR:n pyrkimykset tunnustuksen saamiseksi Suomelta 1967–1972 sekä diplomaattisten suhteiden solmimiseen johtaneet neuvottelut*. Helsinki, Finland: Helsingin Yliopisto: Pro gradu -tutkielma.
- Jeismann, M. (1992). *Das Vaterland der Feinde: Studien zum nationalen Feindbegriff und Selbstverständnis in Deutschland und Frankreich 1792-1918*. Stuttgart, Germany: Klett-Cotta.
- Jelavich, B. (1987). *Modern Austria: Empire and eepublic 1815-1986*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, R.A. (1983). *The British Diplomatic Service, 1815-1914*. Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press. Retrieved from Ebscohost.
- Jonkari, L. (2008). *Kansainliitto Suomen turvallisuuspolitiikassa ja kansainvälisissä suhteissa: vastaanotto ja vaikutus julkisessa sanassa ja yhteiskunnassa vuosina 1919-1936*. Turku, Finland: Turun yliopisto.
- Junnila, T. (1962). *Noottikriisi tuoreeltaan tulkittuna*. Porvoo, Finland: WSOY.
- Junnila, T. (1980). *Toisinajatteleva Kekkonen tasavallassa*. Porvoo, Finland: WSOY.
- Kaarkoski, M. 2016. 'Energimix' versus 'Energiewende' : competing conceptualisations of nuclear energy policy in the German parliamentary debates of 1991-2001. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. Jyx Digital Archive.
- Karjalainen, A. & Tarkka, J. (1989). *Presidentin ministeri: Ahti Karjalaisen ura Urho Kekkonen Suomessa*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Kempe, F. 2011. Berlin (1961). *Kennedy, Khrushchev, and the most dangerous place on earth*. New York, NY: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Kennedy-Pipe, C. (2000). International history and international relations theory: A dialogue beyond the Cold War. *International Affairs* 76(4), 741-754.
- Keränen, S. (1990). *Moskovan tiellä: Urho Kekkonen ja Neuvostoliitto 1945-1990*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Keski-Rauska, R. (2015). *Yksinäinen Ehrnrooth: Georg. C. Ehrnrooth YYA-Suomen puristuksessa*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Kesselring, A. (2009). Eine “Nordisierung” Finlands? Die Nordatlantische Allianz und Finland im Kalten Krieg 1949-1961. In B. Wegner, O. V. Wrochem & D. Schummer (Eds.), *Finnland und Deutschland: Studien zur Geschichte im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Hamburg, Germany: Kovac. Hamburger Beiträge zur Geschichte des östlichen Europa.
- Kilian, W. (2001). *Die Hallstein-Doktrin: Der diplomatische Krieg zwischen der BRD und der DDR 1955-1973*. Berlin, Germany: Duncker & Humblot.
- Klinge, M. (2001). Ecce Finnia tridentem! – Tässä Suomi valtikkasi! In J. Bäckman (Ed.), *Entäs kun tulee se yhdestoista? Suomettumisen uusi historia*. Helsinki, Finland: Wsoy.
- Koivisto, M. (1997). *Liikkeen Suunta*. Helsinki, Finland: Kirjayhtymä.
- Kolbe, L. (2001). Pelko, torjunta, toveruus: kohtauksia suomalaisesta ylioppilaselämästä. In J. Bäckman (Ed.), *Entäs kun tulee se yhdestoista? Suomettumisen uusi historia*. Helsinki, Finland: Wsoy.
- Korhonen, K. (1991). ”Siihen aikaan kun Suomi Saksat tunnusti”. *Kanava* 19(9) 563, 564.
- Korhonen, K. (1999). *Sattumakorpraali. Korhonen Kekkonen komennossa*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Koselleck, R. (2004). *Futures past: on the semantics of historical time*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

- König, D. (2012). *Patriotismus in Deutschland*. Springer-Verlag. Retrieved from Google Books.
- Kujala, A. (2013). *Neukkujen taskussa? Kekkonen, suomalaiset puolueet ja Neuvostoliitto 1956-1971*. Helsinki, Finland: Tammi.
- Kullaa, R. (2012). *Non-Alignment and its origins in the Cold War Europe: Yugoslavia, Finland, and the Soviet challenge*. New York, NY: I.B.Tauris.
- Kullaa, R. (2016). Roots of the Non-Aligned Movement in neutralism: Yugoslavia, Finland and the Soviet political border with Europe 1948-61. In S. Bott, J. M. Hanhimäki, J. Schaufelbuehl & M. Wyss (Eds.), *Neutrality and neutrality in the global Cold War: Between or within the blocs?* London, England: Routledge.
- Kunttu, T. (1995). *Anglofiilisyttä, demokratiaa ja kansainliittoidealismia: nuorten holstilaisten diplomaattien Eurooppa-kuva 1920-luvun alussa*. Turku, Finland: Turun Yliopisto.
- Lackman, M. (2009). "Ensimmäisen tasavallan" turvallisuuspoliisi 1918-1944. In M. Simola (Ed.), *Ratakatu 12: Suojelupoliisi 1949-2009*. Helsinki, Finland: WSOY.
- Laine, J. (1996). "Sietämättömästi Rähmällään". *Kanava* 24(9). 574-576.
- Lane, B. (2000). *National romanticism and modern architecture in Germany and the Scandinavian countries*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Laukkanen, L. & Parry, C. (2014). *Austausch und Anregung: Zu den Kulturbeziehungen zwischen Finnland und dem deutschsprachigen Raum im 20. Jahrhundert*. Munich, Germany: Iudicium.
- Laurila, J. (1995). *Finnish-Soviet Clearing Trade and Payment System: History and Lessons*. Bank of Finland studies A: 94. Helsinki: Suomen Pankki. Retrieved from Suomen pankin julkaisuarkisto.
- Lehmann, G.L. (1979). *Der Oder-Neisse Konflikt*. Munich, Germany: C.H. Beck.
- Lehtonen, J.U.E. (1998). Die deutsch-finnischen Kulturbeziehungen aus der Sicht der Volkskunde von der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis heute. In A. Jäntti & M. Holtkamp (Eds.), *Finnisch-deutsche Kulturbeziehungen seit dem Mittelalter*. Berlin, Germany: Berlin Verlag Arno Spitz.
- Leonhard, J. (2008). *Bellizismus und Nation: Kriegsdeutung und Nationsbestimmung in Europa und den Vereinigten Staaten 1750-1914*. Munich, Germany: Oldenbourg.
- Leonhard, W. (1990). *Das Kurze Leben der DDR*. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.
- Lewin, D. (1966). The decline of tradition in the German foreign service. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 19(4), 653-662.
- Linderöth, A. (2002). *Kampen för erkännande: DDR:s utrikespolitik gentemot Sverige 1949-1972*. Lund, Sweden: Univ.
- Lofchie, M.F. (1963). Party conflict in Zanzibar. *The journal of modern African studies*, 1(2) 185-207.
- Loth, W. (2008). The road to Vienna: West German and European security from 1969 to 1973. In W. Loth & G. H. Soutou (Eds.) 2008. *The making of Détente: Eastern and Western Europe in the Cold War, 1965-1975*. London, England: Routledge.
- Lofchie, M. (1967). Was Okello's revolution a conspiracy? *Transition*, 7(33), 36-42. Retrieved from Jstor.

- Ludlow, N. P. (2010). European integration and the Cold War. In M. P. Leffler & O. A. Westad (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of the Cold War. Vol. 2, Crises and détente*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Lüthi, L. M. (2016). Non-alignment, 1961-74. In S. Bott, J. M. Hanhimäki, J. Schaufelbuehl & M. Wyss (Eds.), *Neutrality and neutrality in the global Cold War: Between or within the Blocs?* London, England: Routledge.
- Macintyre, T. (2007). *Anglo-German relations during the labour governments, 1964-70: NATO Strategy, Detente and European integration*. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press. Retrieved from Ebscohost.
- Mahan, E.R. (2003). *Kennedy, de Gaulle, and Western Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan. Retrieved from Google Books.
- Mankoff, J. (2012). *Russian Foreign Policy: The return of great Power politics*. Rowman & Littlefield. Retrieved from Google Books.
- Mansala, A. & Suomi, J. (Eds.). (2003) *Suomalainen diplomaatti: muotokuvia muistista ja arkistojen kätköistä*. Helsinki, Finland: SKS.
- Marjanen, J. (2017). Transnational conceptual history, methodological nationalism and Europe. In W. Steinmetz, M. Freeden & J. Fernández Sebastián (Eds.), *Conceptual history in the European space*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
- McAdams, A. J. (1985). *East Germany and Détente: Building authority after the wall*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from Google Books.
- Middell, M., Roura, L. & Roura i Aulinas, Lluís (Eds.). (2013). *Transnational challenges to national history writing*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Middell, M. & Roura, L. (2013). The Various Forms of Transcending the Horizon of National History Writing. In M. Middell, L. Roura & L. Roura i Aulinas (Eds.), *Transnational Challenges to National History Writing*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mikkonen, S. (2011). Neuvostoliiton kulttuurivaihto-ohjelmat – kulttuurista kylmää sotaa vai diplomatiaa?. *Historiallinen aikakauskirja*, 109(4), 393-412.
- Mikkonen, S. (2015). The Finnish-Soviet Society: From political to cultural connections. In V. Ingimundarson, & R. Magnúsdóttir (Eds.), *Nordic Cold War cultures. ideological promotion, public reception and East-West interactions*. Aleksanteri Cold War Series (2:2015). Helsinki, Finland: Kikimora Publications. Retrieved from Jyx digital archive.
- Mikkonen, S. & Koivunen, P. (2015). Introduction: Beyond the divide. In Mikkonen, S. & Koivunen, P. (Eds.), *Beyond the divide: Entangled histories of Cold War Europe*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
- Mockli, D. (2008). *European foreign policy during the Cold War: Heath, Brandt, Pompidou and the dream of political unity*. London, England: I.B. Tauris. Retrieved from Google Books.
- Morgenthau, H. 2006. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle For Power And Peace*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Mueller, W. (2011). A good example of peaceful coexistence? the Soviet Union, Austria, and neutrality, 1955-1991. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. OAW. Retrieved from Jstor.

- Muschik, A. (2005). *Die beiden deutschen Staaten und das neutral Schweden. Eine Dreiecksbeziehung im Schatten der offenen Deutschlandsfrage 1949-1972*. Munich, Germany: LIT verlag.
- Muschik, A. (2006). Headed towards the West: Swedish neutrality and the German question. *Contemporary European History*, 15(Special issue 04), 519-538.
- Möttölä, K. (1976) Kansainvälisen järjestelmän pääpiirteet. In V. Niitemaa & K. Immonen (Eds.), *Poliittisen kulttuurin historialliset juuret*. Turku, Finland: Turun Yliopiston yleisen historian laitos.
- Möttölä, K. (1993). Puolueettomuudesta sitoutumiseen: Turvallisuuspoliittisen perusratkaisun muutos kylmästä sodasta Euroopan murrokseen. In F. Forsberg & T. Vaahtoranta (Eds.), *Johdatus Suomen ulkopoliittikkaan. Kylmästä sodasta uuteen maailmanjärjestykseen*. Helsinki, Finland: Gaudeamus.
- Mäki-Kulmala, H. (2004). *Taistolaisuuden harmaa kirja*. Tampere, Finland: Pilot-kustannus Oy.
- Neff, S. C. (2014). *Justice among nations: History of international law*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nevakivi, J. (1988). *Ulkoasiainhallinnon historia 1, 1918-1956*. Helsinki, Finland: Ulkoasiainministeriö.
- Nevakivi, J., Hentilä, S. & Haataja, L. (1993). *Poliittinen historia: Johdatus tutkimukseen*. Helsinki, Finland: Finn Lectura.
- Newman, K. (2007). *Macmillan, Khrushchev, and the Berlin Crisis, 1958-1960*. Routledge. Retrieved from Google Books.
- Nietzsche, F. (1999/1874) Historian hyödystä ja haitasta elämälle (*Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Historie für das Leben*) [A. Halmesvirta, transl.]. Jyväskylä, Finland: Julpu.
- Nilsson, B. (1994). Undens tredje väg: Sverige i det kalla kriget 1950–1952. *Scandia*, 60(1), 67–97.
- Nixon, R. 1982. Johtajuuden profiileja (Leaders) [E. Pirinen, Transl. Pirinen]. Helsinki, Finland: Rastor-julkaisut.
- Nousiainen, J. (1983). Valtio-opillisen tutkimuksen behavioraalinen murros. In J. Nousiainen & D. Anckar (Eds.), *Valtio ja yhteiskunta: Tutkielmia suomalaisen valtiollisen ajattelun ja valtio-opin historiasta*. Porvoo, Finland: WSOY.
- O'connon, M. (1998). *The Romance of Italy and the English political imagination*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- O'connor, M. (2004). Cross-national travelers: Rethinking comparisons and representations. In D. Cohen & M. O'Connor (Eds.). *Comparison and history. Europe in Cross-national perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ouimet, M. J. (2003). *Rise and fall of the Brezhnev doctrine in Soviet Foreign Policy*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press
- Paakkunainen, K. (1985). *Demokratia, tiede, kansanvalistus: Valtiotieteellisen yhdistyksen intellektuaalihistoria 1935 – 1985*. Jyväskylä, Finland: Gummerus.
- Paastela, J. (1991). *The Finnish communist party in the Finnish political system 1963-1982*. Tampere, Finland: University of Tampere.
- Painter, D. S. (1999). *Cold war: An interdisciplinary history*. London, England: Routledge.
- Palmowski, J. (2011). The Europeanization of the nation-state. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 46(3), 485-505.

- Palmowski, J. & Spohr Readman, K. (2011). Speaking truth to power: Contemporary history in the twenty-first century. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 46(3) 485-505.
- Palonen, K. (1980). *Politiikan ja valtion käsitteiden kriiseistä suomalaisen valtio-opin historiassa: Tieteenalan perusteiden ja itseymmärryksen muuntumisen tulkintaa erityisesti suhteessa Allgemeine Staatslehre-traditioon*. Jyväskylä, Finland: Jyväskylän yliopisto, Valtio-opin laitos julkaisuja No 39 – 1980.
- Palonen, K. (1983). Yleisen valtio-opin perustaminen Helsingin yliopistoon. In J. Nousiainen & D. Anckar (Eds.), *Valtio ja yhteiskunta: Tutkielmia suomalaisen valtiollisen ajattelun ja valtio-opin historiasta*. Porvoo, Finland: WSOY.
- Piana, D. (2009): Beyond judicial independence: Rule of law and judicial accountabilities in assessing democratic quality. *Comparative Sociology* 9, 40–64.
- Pekkarinen, J. (2012). *Maailmanluokan tarkkailupaikka: Suomen Lontoon suurlähetystön historia*. Helsinki, Finland: SKS.
- Pekkarinen, J. (2015). *Kohtu 4. Suomen Tallinnan-lähetystön historia*. Helsinki, Finland: SKS.
- Pekonen, O. (2014). *Debating “the ABCs of parliamentary life”: the learning of parliamentary rules and practices in the late nineteenth century Finnish Diet and the early Eduskunta*. Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä. Retrieved from Jyx digital archive.
- Petrusewicz, M. (2004). The Modernization of the European periphery; Ireland, Poland, and the two Sicilies, 1820 – 1870: Parallel and connected, distinct and comparable. In D. Cohen & M. O’Connor (Eds.), *Comparison and history. Europe in cross-national perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pocock, J.G.A. (1989). *Politics, language & time: essays on political thought and history*. Chicago, IL: Yale University Press; University of Chicago Press 1989.
- Polvinen, T. (2003). *J.K.Paasikivi: Valtiomiehen elämäntyö 1948-1956*. Helsinki, Finland: WSOY.
- Pulkkinen, K. (2016). Kavakun synty. In K. Pulkkinen, H. Mäntyvaara & R. Veltheim, (Eds.), *Isänmaan airuet: Suomalaista diplomatiaa viidellä vuosikymmenellä*. Helsinki, Finland: Edita.
- Putensen, D. (2000). *Im Konfliktfeld zwischen Ost und West : Finnland, der kalte Krieg und die deutsche Frage (1947-1973)*. Berlin, Germany: Berlin-Verl. Spitz. Schriftenreihe der Deutsch-Finnischen Gesellschaft.
- Rainio-Niemi, J. (2008). *Small state cultures of consensus: state traditions and consensus-seeking in the neo-corporatist and neutrality policies in post-1945 Austria and Finland*. Helsinki, Finland: University of Helsinki.
- Rainio-Niemi, J. (2014): *The Ideological Cold War: The politics of neutrality in Austria and Finland*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ratti, L. (2011). *Britain, Ost- and Deutschlandpolitik, and the CSCE (1955-1975)*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang AG, International Academic Publishers.
- Raunio, T. & Wiberg, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Eduskunta: Kansanvaltaa puolueiden ja hallituksen ehdoilla*. Helsinki, Finland: Gaudeamus.
- Rautkallio, H. (2010). *Alistumisen vuodet 1954-1961: suomettuminen vai lännettyminen?* Kirkkonummi, Finland: Paasilinna.
- Rautkallio, H. (1993). *Neuvostovallan asialla: NKP:n vaikutus Suomessa 1960-luvulla*. Helsinki, Finland: Tammi.

- Rehbain, K. (2006). *Die westdeutsche Oder/Neisse-Debatte: Hintergründe, Prozess und Ende des Bonner Tabus*. Münster, Germany: LIT Verlag.
- Reichenbach, H. (1966). *Elements of symbolic logic*. Toronto, Canada: Collier-Macmillan Canada, Ltd.
- Reimaa, M. (2008). *Kekkosen katiska: Suomi Etykissä 1968-1989*. Helsinki, Finland: Edita.
- Reimaa, M. (2013). *Diplomatian taikuri Ralph Enckell*. Helsinki, Finland: Edita.
- Rentola, K. (2009). Punainen Valpo. In M. Simola (Ed.), *Ratakatu 12: Suojelupoliisi 1949-2009*. Helsinki, Finland: WSOY.
- Rentola, K. (2009). Suojelupoliisi kylmässä sodassa 1949-1991. Teoksessa Simola, M. *Ratakatu 12: Suojelupoliisi 1949-2009*. Helsinki, Finland: WSOY.
- Reus-Smit, C. (2008). Reading history through constructivist eyes. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 37(2) 395-414.
- Robinson, R. E., Gallagher, J. & Denny, A. (1961). *Africa and the Victorians: the official mind of imperialism*. Palgrave Macmillan. Retrieved from Google Books.
- Roberts, G. K. (1998). *Soviet Union in world politics: Coexistence, revolution, and Cold War, 1945-1991*. Florence, KY: Routledge.
- Roiko-Jokela, H. (1995). *Ihanteita ja reaalityttöä: Rudolf Holstin toiminta Baltian maiden kansainvälisen de jure -tunnustamisen ja reunavaltioyhteistyön puolesta 1918-1922*. Jyväskylä, Finland: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Ruddy, T. M. (1998). *Charting an independent course: Finland's place in the Cold War and in U.S. foreign policy*. Claremont, CA: Regina.
- Rusi, A. (2014). *Etupiirin ote: Suomen valtapeli Euroopan rajalla 1700-2014*. Helsinki, Finland: Gummerus.
- Paloposki, J. (2001). Suomen edustustot Berliinissä. In H. Saarinen (Ed.), *Suomi Berliinissä*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Sakwa, R. (1998). *Soviet Politics: In perspective*. London, England: Routledge. Retrieved from Ebook Central.
- Salminen, E. (1979). *Aselevosta kaappaushankkeeseen: Sensuuri ja itsesensuuri Suomen lehdistössä 1944-1948*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Salminen, P. (1995). *Puolueettomuuden nimeen: sotilasjohto Kekkosen linjalla ja sen sivussa 1961-1966*. Helsinki: Suomen mies. Suomen sotatieteellisen seuran julkaisuja; no 18. Helsingin yliopisto.
- Sarotte, M.E. (2001). *Dealing with the devil: East Germany, Détente, and Ostpolitik, 1969-1973*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. Retrieved from Ebook Central.
- Sarotte, M.R. (2001). A Small Town in (East) Germany: The Erfurt Meeting of 1970 and the Dynamics of Cold War Détente. *Diplomatic History*, 25(1) 85-104.
- Savranskaya, S. & Taubman, W. (2010). Soviet foreign policy, 1962 - 1975. In M. P. Leffler & O. A. Westad (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of the Cold War. Vol. 2, Crises and détente*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Schlesinger, R. (1953). Recognition and enforcement of Soviet Zone criminal judgments. *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 2(3) 392-399.
- Scholz, M.F. (2009). Die Ostdeutsche Nordeuropapolitik bis zur internationalen Anerkennung der DDR (1972/1973). In J. Hecker-Stampehl (Ed.), *Nordeuropa und die beiden Deutschen Staaten 1949-1989: Aspekte einer Beziehungsgeschichte im Zeichen des Kalten Krieges*. Leipzig, Germany: Kirchhof & Franke.

- Schulzinger, R.D. (2010) Detente in the Nixon - Ford years, 1969–1976. In M. P. Leffler & O.A. Westad (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of the Cold War. Vol. 2, Crises and détente*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Schulzinger, R.D. (2002). *U.S. diplomacy since 1900*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from Ebscohost.
- Schwarz, H. P. (1981). *Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Ära Adenauer: Gründerjahre der Republik 1949-1957*. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt. Wiesbaden: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Seppinen, J. (1997). *Suomen Efta-ratkaisu yöpakkasten ja noottikriisin välissä*. Helsinki: Suomen historiallinen seura. Bibliotheca historica, 21. Helsinki, Finland: Helsingin yliopisto.
- Seppinen, J. (2004). *Urho Kekkonen - Suomen johtaja: poliittinen elämäkerta*. Helsinki, Finland: Gummerus.
- Seppinen, J. (2006). *Neuvostotiedustelu Suomessa 1917 - 1991: Strategia ja toiminta*. Helsinki, Finland: Ajatus kirjat.
- Seppinen, J. (2008). *Vaaran vuodet? Suomen selviytymisstrategia 1944 - 1950*. Helsinki, Finland: Minerva.
- Seppänen, E. (2007). *Itäsuhteiden Kolmiodraama: Kekkonen-Breznev-Kosygin*. Helsinki, Finland: Ajatus Kirjat
- Skinner, Q. (2002). *Visions of politics: Vol. 1, regarding the method*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Sluga, G. (2004). The Nation and the Comparative Imagination. In D. Cohen & M. O'Connor (Eds.), *Comparison and History. Europe in Cross-National Perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Smith, A. D. (1998). *Nationalism and modernism: a critical survey of recent theories of nations and nationalism*. London, England: Routledge. Retrieved from Ebook Central.
- Soikkanen, T. (1985). *Rudolf Holstin ulkoministerikaudet 1936-38*. Tampere, Finland: Rauhan- ja Konfliktintutkimuslaitos.
- Soikkanen, T. (1995). Historiankirjoituksen "etulinja" reaaliaikaan!. In T. Soikkanen (Ed.), *Lähihistoria: Teoriaan, metodologiaan ja lähteisiin liittyviä ongelmia*. Turku, Finland: Turun yliopiston poliittisen historian tutkimuksia I.
- Soikkanen, T. (1999). Aus einer Zwangslage zum außenpolitischen Lehrstück. Finnlands Deutschlandpolitik 1947–1972. In E. Hösch, J. Kalela & H. Beyer-Thoma (Eds.), *Deutschland und Finnland im 20. Jahrhundert*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Harassowitz Verlag.
- Soikkanen, T. (2003a). *Presidentin ministeriö: ulkoasiainhallinto ja ulkopoliitiikan hoito Kekkosen kaudella [osa 1]. Kansainvälistymisen ja muutosvaatimusten paineessa 1956-69*. Helsinki, Finland: Ulkoasiainministeriö.
- Soikkanen, T. (2008). *Presidentin ministeriö: ulkoasiainhallinto ja ulkopoliitiikan hoito Kekkosen kaudella [osa 2]. Uudistumisen, ristiriitojen ja menestyksen vuodet 1970-81*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Soikkanen, T. (2003b). Olavi Munkki. In A. Mansala & J. Suomi (Eds.). *Suomalainen diplomaatti: Muotokuvia muistista ja arkistojen kätköistä*. Helsinki, Finland: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

- SOL:n taisteluohjelma Suomen opiskelijoille, 1973. *Opiskelijoiden etujen puolesta – demokratian ja tieteen puolesta imperialismia vastaan! Opiskelijoiden joukkovoimalla – Työväenluokan rinnalla suurpääomaa ja oikeistoa vastaan!* Helsinki, Finland: Kursiivi.
- Sorsa, K. (1998). *Sisäänajo: politiikan kuvioita 1969-72*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Suomalainen, K. (1964). *Kari: Nyyttikestit*. Tampere, Finland: Sanoma Osakeyhtiö.
- Suomi, J. Undated. *Raportointi*. Suomen Ulkoministeriön Arkisto.
- Suomi, J. (1986). *Urho Kekkonen. 1936-1944, Myrrysmies*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Suomi, J. (1988). *Urho Kekkonen. 1944-1950, Vonkamies*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Suomi, J. (1990). *Urho Kekkonen .1950-1956, Kuningastie*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Suomi, J. (1992). *Urho Kekkonen .1956-1962, Kriisien aika*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Suomi, J. (1994). *Urho Kekkonen 1962-1968, Presidentti*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Suomi, J. (1996). *Urho Kekkonen 1968-1972, Taistelu puolueettomuudesta*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Suomi, J. (1998). *Urho Kekkonen 1972-1976, Liennytyksen akanvirrassa*. Helsinki: Otava
- Suomi, J. (2000). *Urho Kekkonen 1976-1981, Umpeutuva latu*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Suomi, J. (2001). *Ulkopolitiikka ja ulkoasiainhallinto: Kolikon kaksi puolta*. Jyväskylä, Finland: Ulkoasiainministeriö.
- Suomi, J. & Majander, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Urho Kekkosen päiväkirjat. 1, 1958-62*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Suomi, J. & Majander, M. (Eds.). 2002. *Urho Kekkosen päiväkirjat. 2, 1963-68*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava
- Suomi, J. & Majander, M. (Eds.). 2003. *Urho Kekkosen päiväkirjat. 3, 1969-74*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava
- Suomi, J. & Majander, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Urho Kekkosen päiväkirjat. 4, 1975-81*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava
- Suomi, J. (2010). *Lohen sukua: Urho Kekkonen*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Spengler, O. (2016/1931). *Ihminen & tekniikka (Der Mensch und die Technik)* [Transl. M. Simola]. EU: Kiuas kustannus.
- Sperber, D. (1975). *Rethinking symbolism*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <http://dan.sperber.fr/wp-content/uploads/Rethinking-Symbolism.pdf>
- Spoh-Readman, K. (2011). Contemporary history in Europe: From mastering national pasts to the future of writing the world. *Journal of Contemporary History* 46(3) 506-530.
- Steinmetz, W. & Freeden, M. (2017). Introduction. Conceptual history: challenges, conundrums, complexities. In W. Steinmetz, M. Freeden & J. Fernández-Sebastián (Eds.), *Conceptual history in the European space*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books. MLA (Modern Language Assoc.).
- Talvitie, H. (2009). Ajatuksia puolueettomuudesta ja YYA-sopimuksesta. In V. Vares (Ed.), *Poliittista ystävyyttä: YYA-sopimus 60 vuotta; Henkioakuutusta, reaali-politiikkaa, ystävyyttä?* Turku, Finland: Turun yliopiston Poliittisen historian laitoksen julkaisuja.
- Tarkka, J. (1987). Kekkosen loistokausi 1962 – 1978. In J. Tarkka & A. Tiitta (Eds.), *Itsenäinen Suomi: Seitsemän vuosikymmentä kansakunnan elämästä*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Tarkka, J. (2010). *Max Jakobson: kylmän sodan diplomaatti*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.

- Tarkka, J. (1992). *Suomen kylmä sota: miten viattomuudesta tuli voima*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Taylor, F. (2008). *Berliinin Muuri: 13. Elokuuta 1961–9. Marraskuuta 1989 (The Berlin wall: 13 August 1961 - 9 November 1989)* [Transl. M. Kinnunen]. Helsinki: Wsoy.
- Tervo, J. (2001). Toimittajaliitto, taistolaisten käsikassara. In J. Bäckman (Ed.) *Entäs kun tulee se yhdestoista? Suomettumisen uusi historia*. Helsinki, Finland: Wsoy.
- Teräväinen, E. (1999) Finland droht Isolierung: Westdeutsche Ansichten über die EFTA-Entscheidung Finnlands. In E. Hösch, J. Kalela & E. Beyer-Thoma (Eds.), *Deutschland und Finnland im 20. Jahrhundert*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Teräväinen, E. (2003). *Lavastettu rinnakkaiselo: Suomen ulkopolitiikka johtavassa länsisaksalaislehdissä 1955-1962*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. *Bibliotheca historica*, 76. Helsinki, Finland: Helsingin yliopisto.
- Tiusanen, T. (2011). *Narutettu sukupolvi: Suomettumisen ilot ja murheet*. Helsinki, Finland: Edita.
- Törmikoski, J. (2009). *Luotsi ja lääkäri: Ison-Britannian ja Suomen ulkopoliittiset roolit ja asenteet parlamentaaristen ulkoasiainvaliokuntion näkökulmasta 1970- ja 1980-luvun taitteessa*. Yleisen historian pro gradu -tutkielma. Jyväskylä, Finland: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Törnudd, K. (2003). Ralph Enckell. In A. Mansala & J. Suomi (Eds.), *Suomalainen diplomaatti: Muotokuvia muistista ja arkistojen kätköistä*. Helsinki, Finland: SKS.
- Ulkoministeriö (1993). *Ulkoasianhallinnon matrikkeli, osa 1*. Helsinki, Finland: Ulkoasianministeriö.
- Ulkoministeriö (1996). *Ulkoasiainhallinnon matrikkeli, osa 2*. Helsinki, Finland: Ulkoasiainministeriö.
- Uola, M. (2006). *Itsesensuurin Kritiikkiä: Tekstejä Suomettumisen vuosista Neuvostoliiton hajoamiseen*. Turku, Finland: Turun yliopiston digipaino.
- Uola, M. (2013). *Unelma kommunistisesta Suomesta 1944 - 1953*. Helsinki, Finland: Minerva.
- Valtasaari, J. & Valtasaari, E. (2013). *Suurlähettiläänä suurvallassa: Suomen diplomatiaa Washingtonissa*. Jyväskylä, Finland: Docendo.
- Vares, V. (1994). *Lontoon tie: Iso-Britannian diplomaattien rooli Suomen sisäpolitiikassa 1919-1924*. Turku, Finland: Turun yliopisto, poliittinen historia.
- Vares, V. (1998). *Kuninkaan tekijät: Suomalainen monarkia 1917-1919; Myytti ja todellisuus*. Porvoo, Finland: WSOY.
- Vares, V. F (2002). Foes who grew better with time: The image of Janos Kadar and Urho Kekkonen in the West from 1956 to the end of the 1960s. In A. Halmesvirta (Ed.), *Kadar's Hungary - Kekkonen's Finland*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä, Hungarian Studies.
- Vares, V. (Ed.). (2009). *Poliittista ystävyyttä: YVA-sopimus 60 vuotta; Henkivakuutusta, reaaliolitiikkaa, ystävyyttä?* Turku, Finland: Turun yliopiston Poliittisen historian laitoksen julkaisuja.
- Vartiainen, P. (2010). *Barokki, klassismi, valistus ja romantiikka länsimaisen kirjallisuuden historiassa*. Helsinki, Finland: Avain.

- Vesa, U. (1998). Esipuhe. Yy- on tutkimuksen aika. In U. Vesa (Ed.), *YYA: Aika ja Sopimus*. Rauhan ja Konfliktin Tutkimuskeskus. Tutkimuksia No. 81, 1998. Tampere, Finland: Tampereen yliopisto.
- Viereck, P. (2007). *Metapolitics: From Wagner and the German Romantics to Hitler*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Vihavainen, T. (1991). *Kansakunta rähmällään: suomettumisen lyhyt historia*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Vilkuna, K. (2013). *Kapina Kampuksella*. Nykykulttuurin tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja 113. Jyväskylä, Finland: Jyväskylän Yliopisto.
- Virrankoski, P. (2009). *Suomen Historia 1 & 2*. Helsinki, Finland: SKS.
- Visuri, P. & Forsberg, T. (1992). *Saksa ja Suomi: pohjoismainen näkökulma Saksan kysymykseen*. Porvoo, Finland: Wsoy.
- Visuri, P. (2006). *Suomi Kylmässä sodassa*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Vladimirov, V. & Hiltunen, A. (1993). *Näin se oli: muistelmia ja havaintoja kulussientakaisesta diplomaattitoiminnasta Suomessa 1954-84*. Helsinki, Finland: Otava.
- Walsh, W.H. (1960). *Philosophy of history: An introduction*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.
- Weber, H. (1985). *Geschichte der DDR*. Munich, Germany: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH & Co.
- Weber, M. (1977/1919). *Politik als Beruf*. Berlin, Germany: Duncker & Humblot.
- Weber, M. (1980/1922). *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*. Tübingen, Germany: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it: The social construction of power politics. *International Organization*, 46(2), 391-425.
- Wentker, H. (2007). *Außenpolitik in engen Grenzen. Die DDR im internationalen System 1949-1989*. Munich, Germany: R. Oldenbourg Verlag.
- Werner, M. & Zimmermann, B. (2006): Beyond comparison: Histoire croisée and the challenge of reflexivity. *History and Theory* 45(1) 2006, 30-50.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1985). *Symbolism, its meaning and effect: Barbour-Page lectures*, University of Virginia, 1927. New York, NY: Fordham University Press.
- Workman, S. (2015). *The Dynamics of bureaucracy in the U.S. government: How Congress and federal agencies process information and solve problems*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Väyrynen, P. (2016). Ulkopoliittista linjanvetoa 1970-2015. In K. Pulkkinen, H. Mäntyvaara & R. Veltheim, R. (Eds.), *Isänmaan airuet: Suomalaista diplomatiaa viidellä vuosikymmenellä*. Helsinki, Finland: Edita.
- Ylönen, M. (2001). *Pilahistoria: Suomi poliittisissa pilapiirroksissa 1800-luvulta 2000-luvulle*. Helsinki, Finland. SKS.
- Zubok, V.M. (2007). *Failed empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press. Retrieved from Ebook Central.