UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

https://helda.helsinki.fi

Dismantling the Soviet Security System : Soviet–Finnish Negotiations on Ending Their Friendship Agreement, 1989–91

Kansikas, Suvi Helena

2019
Taylor and Francis Ltd.
http://hdl.handle.net/10138/300260
Kansikas, S H 2019, 'Dismantling the Soviet Security System : Soviet–Finnish Negotiations on Ending Their Friendship Agreement, 1989–91', The International History Review, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 83-104. https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.2017.1398177

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository. https://helda.helsinki.fi
This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.
Please cite the original version.



The International History Review

ISSN: 0707-5332 (Print) 1949-6540 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rinh20

Dismantling the Soviet Security System. Soviet–Finnish Negotiations on Ending Their Friendship Agreement, 1989–91.

Suvi Kansikas

To cite this article: Suvi Kansikas (2019) Dismantling the Soviet Security System. Soviet–Finnish Negotiations on Ending Their Friendship Agreement, 1989–91., The International History Review, 41:1, 83-104, DOI: 10.1080/07075332.2017.1398177

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.2017.1398177

© 2017 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

Published online: 24 Nov 2017.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 626

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=rinh20

THE INTERNATIONAL HISTORY REVIEW
2019, VOL. 41, NO. 1, 83–104
https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.2017.1398177

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

OPEN ACCESS Check for updates

Dismantling the Soviet Security System. Soviet–Finnish Negotiations on Ending Their Friendship Agreement, 1989–91

Suvi Kansikas

ABSTRACT

The Soviet Union had tied Finland to its security system through the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance (FCMA) signed between the two in 1948. As the Soviet Union began to disintegrate at the end of the 1980s, Finland exited the Soviet sphere of influence – the region controlled through a system of bilateral and multilateral agreements. This article analyses the Soviet–Finnish negotiations to discard the FCMA treaty as a case study of the changing Soviet European neighbourhood policy. It gives important insights into the disintegration of the Soviet foreign policy mechanism during the Gorbachev era as it elaborates on both the intra-bureaucracy conflicts between the Kremlin and the Soviet foreign ministry, MID, and later between the Soviet central government and the Russian republic. As Finland was part of the Soviet security system, analysing Finland's exit from it sheds light onto the crucial change that took place in the Soviet foreign policy doctrine during the perestroika years. The Gorbachev leadership's decision not to defend its sphere of influence with force paved way for the upheavals of 1989 which led to the Cold War's end.

KEYWORDS

USSR; Finland; sphere of influence; friendship agreement

Introduction

Profound changes in the Soviet foreign policy doctrine after the ascendancy of Mikhail Gorbachev as the Soviet communist party (CPSU) leader in 1985 paved way for ending the Cold War. The Soviet decision to discard the use of force to keep its bloc together diluted its power over its neighbours. The Warsaw Pact allies were quick to assess their enlarged room to manoeuvre, and they began deep-seated transformations after the revolutions of 1989. The process eventually led to the dissolution of the Soviet bloc and its multilateral organisations, the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) and Warsaw Pact in the summer of 1991.[1] Finland did not belong to the Soviet bloc, but as the small neighbour of a superpower, it was part of Soviet security considerations. The Soviet Union had tied Finland into its security system through the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance (FCMA) signed between the two in 1948, thus gaining a guarantee that Finland would not switch to the other side of the Cold War bloc division.

This article analyses how Finland – in the context of the Soviet foreign policy change, and the consecutive weakening of its power – was first able to gain more sovereignty vis-à-vis the Soviet Union in the autumn of 1990, and then to negotiate itself out of the FCMA treaty, and the Soviet sphere of influence, in the autumn of 1991. 'Sphere of influence' is

CONTACT Suvi Kansikas suvi.kansikas@helsinki.fi

© 2017 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

not used here as a pejorative term, but rather as a concept that denotes the Soviet leadership's interest in attempting, if possible, to influence the policies of those neighbours that it considered crucial for its security interests.[2] In this article, the term refers particularly to the region controlled through a system of bilateral and multilateral arrangements and agreements that the Soviet Union established in the aftermath of the Second World War – the Soviet–Finnish FCMA being the focal point here.

The collapse of the Soviet security system is studied by analysing this process through the Finnish foreign policy leadership's eyes. This article shows how the changes and later the disorder in the Soviet Union and its foreign policy apparatus gave cause for the Finnish leadership to re-interpret its leeway and to distance itself from the Soviet Union. This process is captured in the Soviet–Finnish talks on the fate of the FCMA treaty during the years 1989–91. As Finland was part of the Soviet security system, analysing Finland's exit from it sheds light onto the crucial change that took place in the Soviet foreign policy doctrine during the perestroika years. The Gorbachev leadership's decision not to defend its sphere of influence with force paved way for the upheavals of 1989, which led to the Cold War's end.

The FCMA was discarded in two phases: first, Finland unilaterally re-interpreted the two international treaties that defined its post-war international position, the Paris Peace Treaty and the FCMA, thereby regaining some of its sovereignty. This took place in September 1990 – just one week after the signing of the Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany – and the improvement in the Soviet policy towards the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) was an important motive for the Finnish move.[3] As a wartime German co-belligerent, Finland had been required to accept significant restrictions to its sovereignty, such as limits to its arms acquisitions from Germany, as well as military cooperation with it. The re-interpretation of the treaties, Operation PAX, as it was later labelled, was the first Finnish reaction to weakening Soviet control over Finland.

The second phase towards discarding the FCMA took place only after the August 1991 putsch, at a time when the Warsaw Pact had already been disbanded and its members were negotiating the withdrawal of Soviet troops stationed on their soil. The August coup had been an effort by conservative forces to put a stop to the new union treaty promoted by the Soviet government, which would have granted the republics some authority in the field of foreign policy and trade.[4] The putsch, and the change in the balance of power in Moscow after it, changed Finland's allegiances. Finland, sharing a 1300-km border with the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR[5]), had followed closely the negotiations over jurisdiction between the centre and the republics. For Finland, Gorbachev's Kremlin possessed an important source of influence even after the putsch: The Soviet government was the signatory to the FCMA, which required Finland to continue upholding relations with it. However, in the context of Boris Yeltsin's Russia contending for power in Moscow, Finland, in September 1991, initiated negotiations to replace the FCMA treaty altogether.

A new treaty between the Soviet Union and Finland was negotiated in October and November 1991. In these talks, Finnish negotiators witnessed the disintegration of Soviet foreign policy mechanism. The new Soviet–Finnish agreement was ready to be signed in December 1991; however, there was no longer a Soviet government in Moscow to sign it. To its discontent, Finland was stuck to the FCMA treaty even after the Soviet Union itself

had collapsed. Its termination was left to be settled with the Russian Federation in January 1992, which Finland had recognised as the Soviet successor state on December 30, 1991.

An analysis on the negotiations to discard the FCMA gives important insights into the disintegration of the Soviet foreign policy mechanism. The new Soviet foreign policy doctrine, which emphasised cooperation instead of conflict, no longer necessitated the kind of security system built during the Stalin era. But as perestroika created more and more turbulence, even within the Soviet Union itself, Gorbachev's foreign policy line had come under attack by the conservative forces. There were considerable frictions within the foreign policy apparatus on Soviet neighbourhood policy. Gorbachev was heavily criticised for letting Eastern Europe go,[6] and along the same line, the Finland specialists in the CPSU central committee and the Soviet foreign ministry, MID, were – as this article shows – also trying to undermine the new Soviet foreign policy doctrine.

The Kremlin did not at any time criticise Finland for amending the FCMA in 1990, nor for the initiative to discard it altogether a year later. As it happened, Gorbachev was open to talks on changing the contractual basis of its entire neighbourhood policy. In fact, during his state visit to Helsinki in October 1989, Gorbachev indicated that the Soviet Union would not continue the kind of political control over Finnish foreign policy decisions as it had during the Cold War era.[7] The Soviet Finland specialists, on the other hand, tried to hold onto their foreign policy tools, such as the FCMA, even in the changed circumstances. In the end, the Kremlin no longer had the need for the FCMA, whereas until late-1991 the Soviet MID tried to guard the security aspect of the relationship, ultimately losing out to the Russian MID.

This article fills a gap in the literature on the end of the Soviet sphere of influence. The ability of the Soviet Union to influence Finnish politics has been recorded in previous literature, starting with contemporary political analyses[8], and later archival-material based historiography on Finnish–Soviet relations.[9] Research on Soviet policy towards Finland is scarce,[10] and there is a particularly noteworthy gap in the literature on Gorbachev's foreign policy goals vis-à-vis Finland. Gorbachev or his foreign policy aide do not talk about the final episodes of the Finnish–Soviet special relationship in their memoirs and published diaries,[11] although several Finland specialists in the CPSU central committee and the foreign ministry have published their accounts of the relationship.[12] This shows that the Kremlin leadership did not pay much attention to the bilateral relationship during late-1980s.[13] On the other hand, the MID representatives' and other Finland specialists' memoirs underscore that the lower levels of foreign policy mechanism had an interest in preserving a say in Finnish affairs. This corresponds with the archival sources analysed for this article. Recently, Finnish historiography has turned to analyse the last phase of the Cold War as the archives for those crucial years have started to open,[14] yet the focus has remained primarily on the domestic policymaking level.

Research on Soviet policy in Eastern Europe during the final years of the socialist alliance is equally not very extensive. Much of the literature focuses on negotiations over German unification[15], with little attention to Soviet–East European relations during the years 1990–91. The works by Charles Gati, Jacques Levesque and Mark Kramer are the important exceptions.[16] The gap in the literature has been to some extent covered by publications of Soviet and Eastern European archival sources.[17] By contrast, the collapse of the Soviet Union has generated a vast amount of research from many different angles. There are several studies that bring light into the disintegration of the Soviet foreign

policy mechanism in its final years. Also, the independence movements of Soviet republics have been the focus of many studies.[18]

The materials analysed for this article are from two Finnish archives: The National Archives, which houses the personal collection of former president of Finland Mauno Koivisto (1982–94) and the Archives of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, in which documents pertaining to, among other, the crucial years 1991–92 have been recently declassified. The source base consists also of memoirs of several key participants, both Russian and Finnish.[19] Unfortunately, the documents on Soviet foreign policy making found in published document collections do not give much insight into the bilateral Soviet–Finnish relations.[20] Where Soviet documents are inaccessible, the author has referred to articles published in the CPSU party organ *Pravda* and the government paper *Izvestiya*, which reveal the frictions between the Kremlin and the Soviet MID mentioned earlier.

Finland in the Soviet security system

After the Second World War, the victors and the defeated set to negotiate a settlement for post-war Europe, which was descending fast into a Cold War. The Paris Peace Treaty was signed on 10 February 1947 between Finland and the Allied and Associated Powers, with the United Kingdom (UK) and the USSR as the main signatories.[21] The USSR received an agreement on its new border with Finland. Finland was also required to accept all conditions on any future settlement over Germany.[22] The peace treaty was the multilateral settlement on Germany and its co-belligerents, but the Soviet leadership needed bilateral security guarantees as well. After 1947, it began to seal the gaps in its security system in Eastern Europe. Its central aims concerning Finland were to safeguard its security interests with a long-term agreement that would preserve a status quo in the bilateral relationship. Proposals on similar treaties were sent simultaneously to the countries the Soviet leadership considered its sphere of influence: Poland, Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary. According to Stalin's foreign minister, Viacheslav Molotov, the treaty with Finland was to cover 'the northern flank of the Soviet security system'.[23] Stalin had hopes for getting Finland to initiate the treaty negotiations, but as this did not happen, on 22 February 1948, he sent the Finnish leadership an official proposal for negotiations on a bilateral security agreement.[24]

The Soviet Union initially took the recently negotiated Soviet–Hungarian treaty as a model for the Finnish–Soviet one. This proved unacceptable to the Finns. After brief negotiations, which were assisted by a leak from the Finnish side indicating the maximum demands Finland could accept, the FCMA was signed on 6 April 1948. It was a compromise solution for both; the Soviet Union had begun with the idea of a military alliance, which it discarded as it became clear that Finland would not agree.[25] Significantly, a reference to Finland's endeavour to stay neutral was added to the preamble of the treaty – it was also the seed of contentions in the Soviet–Finnish relations throughout the Cold War.[26]

The Soviet–Finnish treaty differed from the Soviet–East European ones in two significant aspects; first, Finland was not obliged to give military assistance to the Soviet Union. Second, if there was a perceived threat of an attack on Finland, or on the Soviet Union through Finnish territory, military consultations would precede any Soviet military assistance to Finland. The consultations were not automatic; both signatories needed to agree

on their necessity and consent to their start. Military assistance, according to Soviet military doctrine, would be given on Finnish territory; and consenting to the Red Army entering Finland was generally seen as a possible first step towards the annexation of Finland. This is why the Finnish leadership's main goal throughout the Cold War decades was to reduce the possibilities for any need to consider bilateral military consultations.[27]

In Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union continued to tie the socialist regimes into a web of bilateral and later also multilateral links. This included bilateral security treaties. It also meant establishing the so-called embassy-system: Soviet advisers and military officials, stationed in Soviet embassies in the region were tasked with forcing the regimes to follow Moscow's rules.[28] During the first decade of Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe, the socialist bloc had also cemented mutually-binding links on the multilateral level, as organisations in the economic, military and political fields were established; the CMEA in 1949 and the Warsaw Pact in 1955. Although neither of the organisations provided the Soviet leadership a total control of the alliance,[29] and even though the USSR required also bilateral security treaties with its allies, Soviet hegemony over its allies was at the beginning so unquestioned that it has left the East European socialist countries with a label of Soviet 'satellites'.

Finland was of course not a member of either one of these organisations, and was not part of the Soviet alliance. Even with the FCMA treaty limiting its room to manoeuvre in the Cold War conflict, its degree of sovereignty was significant when compared to the Warsaw Pact members. Yet, being a neighbouring country, with a long common border, it was a definite part of the Soviet security *system*, and had a significant place in the Soviet neighbourhood policy. One foreign policy tool in this regard was the FCMA treaty, which gave the Soviet leadership an assurance that Finland would not switch to the other side of the Cold War bloc division, but would remain in a 'grey zone'.[30] 'Finland achieved a unique status somewhere between a military ally and a benevolent neutral, preserving its independence and traditional system, but accepting important limitations on its foreign policy,' as the Russian scholar, Maxim Korobochkin, defined Finland's Cold War era position in 1995.[31]

The Soviet Union tied Finland to its sphere of influence with the FCMA treaty, and concomitantly one of the hot potatoes of the Cold War, Soviet policy towards the FRG.[32] Article One of the FCMA treaty set Finland to fight any 'aggression from the side of Germany or any of its allies' on its own, or if so agreed, with the help of Soviet forces. Article Four prohibited Finland from 'establishing or joining any alliances that are targeted against the other high party'.[33] The fate of divided Germany, as well as fluctuations in Soviet policy towards the FRG, had direct consequences for Finland's position in Soviet foreign politics because the FCMA treaty contained a clause in which Finland had accepted (West) Germany as a threat.

During the Cold War, the Soviet leadership started using the FCMA treaty for political purposes: it preferred the interpretation that Finland ought to consult the Soviet leadership on its approaches towards western organisations if they were considered a threat to Soviet security.[34] Finland's membership in NATO was out of the question, but gradually, also organisations deemed 'against Soviet interests' were prohibited as well, and Finland's rapprochement with them required bilateral Finnish–Soviet political consultations. For instance, during Finnish president Urho Kekkonen's visit to Moscow in August 1972, when the two leaderships discussed Finland's free trade agreement with the European

Community, the Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev, referred to the FCMA treaty as a warning when he asked Finland to postpone the signing of the agreement – which Finland in fact ended up doing until the summer of 1973:

> It [FCMA] has several important articles, one of which is that Finland follows a policy of neutrality. Is there a threat that certain forces in Finland could take advantage of the EEC agreement and try to revise the agreement of 1948.[35]

1989: New thinking in Soviet foreign policy

After Brezhnev's two short-lived successors, a young, energetic and reformist leader rose to the top. Mikhail Gorbachev started with economic reforms, perestroika, soon after his accession in 1985. Then he moved to Soviet international relations. He soon realised that the triumph of perestroika was related to the successful ending of the bipolar confrontation, and ending the Cold War became his central foreign policy goal. The Soviet Union redesigned a new foreign policy doctrine, the New Thinking, which included an understanding that the direct use of force would erode Soviet legitimacy and bring an end to perestroika. These ideas extended also into a revision of the relationships within the Soviet bloc. In intra-bloc relations the culmination was the denouncement of the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine, which was created to justify the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968.[36]

One of the main surprises to observers of the Soviet foreign policy change was that the Gorbachev leadership did not do anything to prevent the waning of its influence in Eastern Europe during and after 1989. The People's Democracies began their transformation to a democratic, multiparty system and market economy mechanisms; and the Soviet Union could, and would, do nothing but watch. One important reason is the crucial change in Soviet foreign policy doctrine that forbade the use of force to keep the alliance in control.[37] The other reason was that internal developments in the USSR were taking an increasing share of the Soviet leadership's time and energy.

Soviet policy towards Finland was also in flux. In October 1989, just before the Berlin Wall fell, but after the Polish and Hungarian roundtables had already begun the turmoil in the Soviet bloc, the Soviet leader had time to make his first state visit to Finland. The main outcome for Finland of Gorbachev's visit was that the CPSU leader unequivocally endorsed Finland's neutrality. In the words of the final communique of the trip, Finland was a 'Nordic, neutral country'.[38] Later, in his reply to reporters at a press conference, Gorbachev also underscored the fact that Finland was free to decide independently key foreign policy issues, such as its integration policy. In his words, 'it is the right of that country to deal with a certain organization as it sees fit.'[39] This answer, as well as Gorbachev's entire statement, did not have an echo of the Brezhnev era references to the need to check with Moscow first, nor between-the-lines threats of military consultations.

The declaration adopted by the Soviet Union and Finland during the visit, entitled 'New Thinking in Action', referred to the FCMA treaty not as a core item defining the relationship, but only after a reference to both the United Nations Charter and the Helsinki Final Act. The countries were described to be 'proceeding on decades-long experience of good neighbourliness and interaction, gained during the validity of the 1948 Treaty on Friendship, Co-Operation and Mutual Assistance'.[40] Thus, the FCMA was still considered relevant: for instance, in his speech the Finnish president Koivisto underlined that there was no

need to change even a single word in the FCMA treaty; which was duly quoted by the Soviet government newspaper *Izvestiya*.[41] Seemingly, the new interpretation of the FCMA positioned Finland exactly where it wanted to be.

The Soviet–Finnish declaration was in line with the New Thinking that the Soviet Union was proclaiming, and it had relevance for the Soviet Union as well. On the day of the Gorbachev–Koivisto meeting, Pravda carried a headline asserting that the declaration strengthened the foundations of the 'Common European Home'[42] – another one of Gorbachev's foreign policy slogans.[43] This side of the visit did not go unnoticed by the Finns though: the head of political department at the foreign ministry, Jaakko Blomberg, realised that Finland might have been used as a showcase for promoting a new view of the Soviet Union.[44] Neutrality had in fact been advertised to the Eastern Europeans by the Soviet leadership, which had started to fear that its allies were interested in alignment with West European institutions, NATO in particular. A policy of supporting '*Finlandisation*' of Eastern Europe, argued a report prepared for the CPSU central committee in early-1989, would help to propagate a 'more benevolent image' of the Soviet Union in the public opinion around the world. Furthermore, this active engagement with the allies would force the United States to 'correct' its foreign policy towards the region.[45]

For Finland, of course, the main point was that the Soviet leaders considered it a 'neutral Nordic country'. Gorbachev's statements in Helsinki finally put the controversy between the requirements posed to Finland in the FCMA treaty and Finland's self-proclaimed policy of neutrality onto the backburner. As the Soviet leader himself stated, the two were not controversial. Significantly also, the Soviet acknowledgement of Finland's neutrality reduced the Soviet ability to invoke the consultation and mutual assistance mechanisms attached to the FCMA treaty.[46]

The Finnish leadership had for years yearned for the Soviet Union to accept and acknowledge the country's neutrality.[47] Finally – as a result of the Soviet foreign policy change – this was reached without any Soviet counter-demands. In October 1989, therefore, Finland finally had a more satisfactory position as a Soviet neighbour, as the FCMA treaty's value as a Soviet tool to control Finland was disappearing. Soon, however, Finnish gains seemed outdated for the fast-evolving post-Cold War world. The countries in Eastern Europe underwent regime change during 1989 and 1990. They initiated multiparty elections and an overhaul of central planning in economy. After the domestic changes were introduced, they began to renegotiate their multilateral and bilateral ties to both the Soviet Union and the two international organisations, the CMEA and the Warsaw Pact. Realising that Moscow's control over them was diluting, they seized the opportunity to free themselves of both communist ideology and Soviet hegemony. During a short span of time, many of the countries turned towards the EC and NATO. East Germany's fate and path of development was the clearest: in late-1989, the West German chancellor, Helmut Kohl, proposed to begin a process that would eventually lead to the long-term goal of German unification. In a few months, achieving this goal became very tangible, and by February 1990, it became certain.[48]

Moscow's relations with the FRG had improved to the point that a reference to German aggression no longer seemed probable and no longer had any resonance in Soviet neighbourhood politics. Also, Moscow's neighbourhood policy underwent a drastic change, giving the former allies a choice of integrating towards the West. The Kremlin had given up the best weapon of its Finland policy – the ability to control Finnish politics thought the

threat of military consultations in accordance with the FCMA treaty. Finland's position became more relaxed, and it realised there was more leeway in its international affairs than before.

1990: Finland's first step out of the Soviet orbit

The unification of Germany became the focal point of the Cold War agenda after the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989. The Soviet position changed gradually to accept German unification, and consecutively, the former GDR's entry into NATO structures. The 2+4 negotiations on German unification included the two Germanies and the four powers that held rights over Germany as a result of the Second World War.[49] In Finland, the German unification process sparked a domestic debate during the spring of 1990. Many Finnish observers began to understand that Germany most likely was going to regain its sovereignty in the process, and Finland was about to be left as the last country whose sovereignty was still restricted with agreements dating to the post-war settlement.[50] At the same time as the speculations over Germany's future began, the Finnish leadership reacted to that process with a foreign policy manoeuvre, which came to be known as Operation PAX. It ended in September 1990 with Finland unilaterally reinterpreting one part of the two agreements that restricted the country's sovereignty: the reference of Germany as a threat in the Paris Peace Treaty from 1947, and as a last-minute addition to PAX, also in the FCMA Treaty of 1948.[51]

In its Soviet relations, Finland was playing with its cards close to the chest. As late as early-September 1990, foreign minister Pertti Paasio stated that the unification of Germany did not necessitate changes in the FCMA treaty. While considering the reference to Germany outdated, he noted that it was obvious to everyone that Germany could not become a threat.[52] Also many officials and politicians were unwilling to re-evaluate the treaty, for instance Finnish ambassador at Moscow Heikki Talvitie thought that in the precarious international situation, Finland was better off with the current agreement than without any agreement at all.[53]

The Finnish foreign policy-makers talked with their Soviet counterparts about the advisability of continuing the FCMA treaty. The Finns were told by several Soviet high-level representatives that the unification of Germany did not change the basic Soviet policy line, which was that there was no need to touch the FCMA treaty.[54] On the official level, both sides declared their support for its continuity. At the same time, a close circle of key Finnish foreign ministry officials began to analyse Finland's room to manoeuvre in the situation.

In the spring of 1990, the Finnish foreign ministry conducted an analysis of the latest developments in Soviet neighbourhood policy and the status of other similar treaties the Soviet Union had with its neighbours. The embassies in East European capitals were asked to report back to Helsinki about their residence countries' bilateral treaties with the Soviet Union.[55] The replies revealed that the Soviet Union and its allies had renewed their friendship treaties during the 1960s and 1970s, to update them to match the contemporary circumstances. The reference to the FRG as a possible aggressor had been removed from all new treaties except the Soviet–Polish one. Significantly, the survey revealed that the Soviet Union seemed even willing to renegotiate its network of bilateral agreements.[56] This was consistent with the Soviet aim for the post-Cold War era to dismantle the military

blocs and to create an all-European security system. With improving East–West relations, the Soviet leadership did not see a need for the security system build in the Stalin-era.[57]

The decision on the timetable of Operation PAX was decided during summer 1990, after the German Chancellor Helmut Kohl had received confirmation from Gorbachev to the German unification: The Finnish government would convene on 21 September. The foreign policy leaders, while preparing to reinterpret Chapter Three of the Paris Peace Treaty as a unilateral act, rather than through multilateral negotiations,[58] did not want to put the USSR and the UK in a fait accompli situation. The foreign ministry's chosen way of conduct was to inform both the British and the Soviet governments a few days in advance of the government's meeting, on 17 September.[59]

Unbeknownst to his own foreign ministry, two weeks before, president Koivisto had nevertheless already notified Gorbachev on Finland's coming move concerning the peace treaty. Koivisto had inherited a back-channel with the Kremlin from his predecessor Urho Kekkonen; namely the KGB resident in Helsinki. He used the direct contact after finding out that he would meet Gorbachev when the latter was coming to Helsinki for a summit with US president George Bush. Koivisto's message to Gorbachev via his back-channel at the Soviet embassy Felix Karasov was that while Finland did not want to disturb the process towards German unification and the Paris CSCE conference, Koivisto was willing to discuss the Finnish decision with Gorbachev. The peace treaty, nonetheless, was never taken up in Koivisto's talks with Gorbachev; the two talked primarily about the Soviet domestic situation.[60] Gorbachev had bigger issues to consider, and did not have much interest or time to devote to the particularities of Finnish–Soviet relations;[61] Chernyaev also did not think PAX was worth a mention in his political diary.[62]

The Finnish government meeting in which Operation PAX would be decided was scheduled to take place on 21 September. The re-interpretation of the FCMA treaty was a last-minute addition to PAX. It was only after the signing of the Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany on 12 September in Moscow that the Finnish foreign ministry leadership realised that if the FCMA treaty was left untouched, the manoeuvre would be incomplete.[63]

On 19 September, the president consented to the inclusion of the FCMA into the plan.[64] This was communicated to the MID the next day. According to the reply ambassador Talvitie received from head of MID's Second European department, Yuri Fokin, the MID's unauthorised stance was that the Finnish president naturally had the right to interpret the FCMA if he so chose. The ambassador reported to Helsinki that the discussion was held in 'a very friendly atmosphere' and that 'Fokin seemed to understand our conduct'.[65]

Since Gorbachev had not reacted negatively to Koivisto's message – Gorbachev's aide Anatoly Chernayev in fact confirmed to Koivisto's chief of staff, Jaakko Kalela that Gorbachev viewed the move positively[66] – the Finnish president continued on the basis of his assessment of the policy change in Moscow, which had been clarified during Gorbachev's state visit the previous year; the era of Soviet interference in Finnish foreign policy decisions was over.

Thus, on 21 September 1990, the government of Finland decided that the references to Germany in Chapter Three of the Paris Peace Treaty had lost their validity. At the same time, the president gave a statement to the government meeting's protocol that the references made to Germany in the FCMA treaty were outdated.[67]

The timing of Operation PAX was not trivial: the Finnish foreign ministry drafted the first memorandum about policy alternatives at the same time as the 2+4 negotiations – which aimed at the unification of Germany and ending the four-power control that posed restrictions on its sovereignty – began. Once these negotiations would be accomplished, Finland would be the only country in Europe whose sovereignty would still be limited based on the post-war settlement. The Finnish decision in September 1990 to discard these limitations was also timed with the German unification process: the operation was executed just one week after the signing of the Moscow treaty.

At first, there were no protests from either the Soviet or the British side. The CPSU paper *Pravda* even ran a non-critical piece on PAX, pointing to the fact that the FCMA had been restricting Finland's sovereignty, thereby suggesting that this was a welcome move.[68] The Finnish political leadership contemplated that they had been able to pull the operation through successfully. The FCO showed its displeasure that the Soviets had received the information earlier than they did, which was revealed in Soviet–British consultations on the issue. Britain was nonetheless willing to let the issue drop.[69]

The Finland specialists in the Soviet foreign ministry, MID, had most likely been sidelined in the process, and they interpreted this as a Finnish fait accompli, criticising Finland for not checking with Moscow first.[70] It seems nonetheless probable that the news of Gorbachev accepting the Finnish plan had been sent to the high-levels of the MID. When the Finnish ambassador Talvitie, had gone to the MID headquarters to inform it about PAX, to his surprise, deputy minister Yuli Kvitsinsky seemed to already know the reason for his request to meet: Kvitsinsky had had a copy of the Paris Peace Treaty on his table.[71] Therefore, it seems likely that some officials in the MID did not know about Gorbachev's position and that those who knew, were displeased about the procedure anyways, and wanted compensation for having been made to let go of its means of control over Finland.

Yet, MID representatives complained only about the new interpretation of the Paris Peace Treaty. Two issues proved contentious: The Soviet foreign ministry was worried about the strength of Finnish armed forces and the possibility of Finland retaining a choice of acquiring nuclear weapons.[72] On the other hand, none of the materials consulted for this article provide any evidence that the Soviet officials would have considered Finland's reinterpretation of the reference to Germany in the FCMA treaty as a problem. This was the conclusion of one of the PAX initiators in the Finnish foreign ministry, Rene Nyberg as well[73] – and it was a view echoed in the memoirs of the MID officials.[74]

There is, in fact, plenty of evidence to support the argument that the Soviet Union did not have a problem with Finland giving the FCMA a new interpretation. Soviet diplomats were irritated by the way the operation was executed, not so much about its contents. This was even admitted by the Soviet diplomat Vadim Andreev at the end of October: 'The problem lies not with the solution – of which there is no difference of opinion – but with the way it was accomplished, bypassing the Soviet Union.'[75]

It seemed that there were contradictions within the Moscow foreign policy-makers on the policy towards Finland. As Soviet president, Mikhail Gorbachev no longer saw the need to restrict Finland's policies, and as much was also publicly stated. The MID, on the other hand, still considered that it had, or that at least it *should* have, some say in how Finland approached its foreign relations. The MID's Finland specialists apparently continued to uphold the line that the role that the FCMA treaty had had in monitoring Finnish affairs should not be squandered. In several consecutive meetings with Finnish diplomats in

Moscow and in Helsinki, they let their disapproval be known. The government paper *Izvestiya* also criticised Finland for the unilateral move, referring to statements from Gorbachev's visit the year before when the Finnish president had underscored that there was no need to change even one word of the treaty.[76] The MID was more invested in the Finnish–Soviet relationship, and it had more interest to safeguard the special status of Finland in Soviet foreign policy. For instance, in late-September 1990, Vadim Andreev from the Soviet embassy in Helsinki met head of political department Blomberg to criticise Finland for its actions. During the meeting, he was nevertheless forced to admit that he was acting on his own initiative without any instructions from the Kremlin.[77]

The MID refused to give up, and the Finnish ambassador at Moscow was told that the Soviet Union needed more guarantees that Finland's foreign policy line, and particularly its armaments policy, would not change. The MID remained adamant even after several Finnish attempts to soothe the Soviet concerns. In early-November, the MID even sent Finland an official note asking the government to give the Soviet Union the required security guarantees. Ultimately, foreign ministers Eduard Shevardnadze and Pertti Paasio decided that after Finland replies to the note, the issue is settled.[78]

Later, Karasov from the Soviet embassy admitted that the MID probably never asked for Gorbachev's opinion in sending the note but considered this to fall within its own jurisdiction. He also confirmed that he considered the issue so minor that there had been no need to take it to the highest level.[79] As was considered by Blomberg already at the time, much of the MID's actions had to do with their endeavour to strengthen their positions in the changing power constellation that the perestroika had brought into Soviet politics. This final episode also had to do with Soviet security concerns, and particularly, the strength of Finnish defence in the future, and not the FCMA treaty.[80]

To put Operation PAX into an international perspective, it needs to be analysed in the context of the changing Soviet neighbourhood policy. As stated above, the unification of Germany, according to Finnish analyses, would have left Finland as the only European country whose sovereignty was limited by settlements from the 1940s. This was the main motivation for the reinterpretation of the FCMA and the Paris Peace Treaty. The Finnish foreign ministry also noted that Finland was already the only defeated country that was still abiding to the peace treaty restrictions on its armaments and armed forces. Italy, Hungary and Romania had joined military pacts, which made the Paris settlement redundant; and Japan had unilaterally withdrawn from those limitations.[81]

The press release of Operation PAX given by the Finnish leadership referred to changes in the Soviet alliance policy. The foreign ministry itself also analysed the status of other friendship treaties the Soviet Union had signed with its neighbours. Not surprisingly, Austria, as well as all members of the Soviet alliance were also reconsidering their arrangements with Moscow.[82]

Simultaneously, the Soviet alliance was losing its legitimacy, raison d'être as well as its members. The first country to initiate talks on the bilateral friendship agreement with the Soviet Union was Czechoslovakia, whose newly-elected president Vaclav Havel took the issue up in negotiations with Gorbachev in January 1990. By the summer of 1990, nonetheless, the Czechoslovak government had not initiated either the old one's termination, or even its discontinuation after it would expire. Hungary had been able to agree with Moscow to redraw a new pact. In his talks with Gorbachev, prime minister József Antall had also expressed his hope to start a discussion about the future of the Warsaw Pact

with other member states. Romania and Soviet Union had recently set up a working group to update the bilateral agreements,[83] while Bulgaria was not interested to take up the issue.[84] The German Democratic Republic (GDR) was under the impression that its agreement with the Soviet Union would not impede its progression towards the unification with West Germany.[85] Out of the Eastern Europeans, only Poland, under the rule of Wojciech Jaruzelski seemed to be taking a different position; due to security considerations, the German unification pushed it closer to the Soviet Union. Jaruzelski visited Moscow in April 1990, and underscored his country's hesitancy to change the friendship, or any other pact, which guaranteed its borders.[86] Yet, Poland had already started to negotiate the withdrawal of Soviet troops stationed on its soil.[87]

For the most part, the Finns were also content with the FCMA treaty. At the end of 1990, the majority of the foreign policy leadership considered that there was no need to get rid of the treaty. Operation PAX had been a swift move that was in stark contrast with the caution with which Finnish Eastern policy had been conducted for decades. However, in the context of the East Europeans' rapid departure from the Soviet bloc, Finland could weigh its options with less haste. For instance, by the end of 1990, Hungary had already begun to negotiate an association agreement, the so-called Europe Agreement, with the EC. The agreement contained a clear indication of its ambition to ultimately join the Community, granted its economic restructuring was advanced to an appropriate state.[88] Moreover, the Hungarian foreign minister Guyla Horn had as early as February 1990 – on an academic note, and not as a state representative – contemplated on some kind of integration into NATO.[89]

1991: Transition from Soviet to Russian power

As the Finnish foreign policy leadership was soon to notice, Moscow's power continued to dilute and its ability to remain the centre was next challenged by its constituent parts – several of the socialist federative republics started their quest for independence and sovereignty. The Baltic States' declarations and pursuit of independence were a small foreign policy predicament for Finland,[90] but Russia, as the most important of the Soviet republics, and Finland's neighbour, posed a diplomatic dilemma for Finland. Finland needed to make a choice between the old and the new leaders in Moscow. As long as there was uncertainty as to which of the two would grab power, Finland could not change its allegiances. Also, Finland's president Koivisto was on a personal level connected to Gorbachev, and supported him staying in power.

Dealing with the repercussions of Operation PAX, the Finnish leadership had observed the problems within Soviet foreign policy mechanism: The Kremlin and the MID seemed to be fighting over the foreign policy line. Finland had tried to fit its own foreign policy into this constellation, but it was not easy, as developments in Moscow escalated further. During the year 1991, which became the final one for the Soviet regime, the Finnish leadership watched as Soviet power and its foreign policy mechanism disintegrated: Gorbachev was losing his power and support base, and the national republics began their march to independence.

The year 1991 began with disturbing news on clashes between the Soviet central government and the national republics, particularly in the Caucasus and in the Baltics. The violent suppression of the independence movement in Vilnius in 11–13 January 1991 was in

fact the final straw for the Soviet military alliance: on 15 January, the leaders of three Warsaw Pact countries, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary met in Visegrád to discuss their trilateral cooperation in the event of more sinister news from the Soviet Union. The three countries had been promoting changing the Warsaw Pact into a political organisation and dissolving its military structures. However, after the Soviet interference in Lithuania, they turned towards withdrawing completely from the organisation's activities by June and called for a meeting to disband the organisation.[91]

Gorbachev's attempt to maintain Soviet power and his own government's legitimacy was the introduction of a new union treaty, which would have granted the republics some jurisdiction over their national affairs. During the summer of 1991, Gorbachev was backed by Russia's newly elected president Boris Yeltsin, although the latter was also seen pushing more for room to manoeuvre for Russia.

President Koivisto travelled to Moscow to meet Gorbachev in June 1991. During his visit, he also held discussions with the president of Russia, Boris Yeltsin, who wanted to use the opening of relations with foreign representatives to gain international authority for himself.[92] Yeltsin urged that the two governments start negotiations on arranging their relations. He grounded his proposal on the upcoming new federal treaty that Gorbachev was striving to achieve: According to him, in the new situation, Russia would gain jurisdiction over foreign affairs and foreign trade, and with Finland bordering Russia, and its eastern trade mainly conducted with Russia, it would need start dealing with Yeltsin's government on issues of trade and foreign policy. Yeltsin was invited to send a delegation to Finland in the autumn, to start negotiations on the basis of the new relationship. Koivisto would not consent to any further action, also not giving any support to Russia against the Soviet central government.[93]

Initially the Finns had held their distance to Yeltsin, but the failed *putsch* in August changed the situation. The Finnish government's first conclusion in the new situation was to recognise the three Baltic States,[94] a move that Yeltsin had already done in his effort to downplay Gorbachev.[95] A meeting of the foreign ministry leadership in Helsinki on 2 September outlined the next few steps: with the FCMA treaty, the foreign ministry leadership decided to wait. There was no knowing what the result of the upheaval would be, so there was no point in acting yet. Contacts with Russia, on the other hand, would be begun immediately: according to the memorandum of the meeting, 'we should not wait to see how the relations between Russia and the former (sic) Soviet Union will develop'.[96]

In early September 1991, nonetheless, Koivisto came to consider that the FCMA treaty needed to be replaced with a new one, more fitting to the contemporary situation. In his view, the new agreement should be like the one between the Soviet Union and the FRG signed in September 1990. He made his decision without consulting the Finnish foreign ministry; yet discussed the issue with prime minister Esko Aho.[97] A message carrying this position was sent through KGB's Karasov to Gorbachev on 12 September.[98]

From there, the situation developed fast. Soviet foreign minister Boris Pankin, in a speech in Stockholm on 18 September, stated that the Soviet Union was ready to discuss the FCMA treaty with Finland. It seems very possible that Koivisto's message reached Gorbachev, who then had formulated the new Soviet stance to Pankin. Yet, Koivisto's chief of staff Jaakko Kalela doubted already at the time whether the information channels in Moscow were working so efficiently that in a few days Koivisto's message would have

travelled from Karasov to Chernyaev to Gorbachev, and after his decision, back to Chernayev and then Pankin, who then would also have had time to change his speech to include the passage on the FCMA.[99] What is certain is that the information on Koivisto's overture did not reach the Finnish foreign ministry, so its officials were left wondering whether Pankin had in fact spoken more than had been decided in the Kremlin.[100]

The Soviet ambassador at Helsinki, Boris Aristov, most likely unaware that Gorbachev had given his consent to his foreign minister, was quite opposed to starting negotiations to annul the FCMA. Meeting with the Finnish foreign minister Paavo Väyrynen after Pankin's press conference, Aristov explained that the Soviet Union was not ready to start discussing the FCMA treaty. Väyrynen referred to the same reasoning that Yeltsin had used: after Gorbachev's new federal agreement, the republics would gain some authority in foreign affairs and therefore Finland needed to start negotiating with Russia. For this reason, also the Finnish agreement with the federal government had to be re-evaluated.[101] It is not clear from the available sources whether Väyrynen knew that Pankin had already been informed by Gorbachev that Finland wanted to open negotiations on a new treaty. It is also likely that Aristov had not received an update, and was acting on the line pursued by the MID.

This would concur with the knowledge we have of how bad the information flow was in the autumn months between Gorbachev and his foreign ministry. According to one of the PAX initiators, the communication between the Kremlin and the MID was 'careless and uncontrolled'.[102] Also, this account matches with the memoirs of Finland experts in the MID as well as the CPSU central committee that point to a continued interest on their part to continue monitoring Finland.[103]

On 22 September 1991, during a meeting with his Soviet counterpart Pankin, foreign minister Väyrynen voiced the Finnish wish to discard the FCMA treaty altogether. They needed an entirely new agreement.[104] Pankin concurred that the Soviet Union was ready to start discussions: it had been content with the agreement and the role it had played, but now it would be fitting to draft a new basis for the mutual relationship between the two countries. 'The FCMA and the first two articles are in many ways outdated', said Pankin, referring to the articles on Germany. President Koivisto's position was that the new agreement should be like those that the Soviet Union had recently signed with Germany and others. Pankin again concurred, and referred to the agreement signed with France. In the end, the foreign ministers agreed that the negotiations would start during head of political department, Jaakko Blomberg's forthcoming visit to Moscow.[105]

Finland and the Soviet Union had two rounds of negotiations on a new agreement, which came to be called 'Agreement on Good-neighbourly Relations and Cooperation'. The Finns had also stated their willingness to open negotiations with Russia. Those negotiations were set to begin in late-November, as the three planned agreements – a general agreement, trade agreement and an agreement on cooperation in the border area – were contingent on the agreement between Finland and the Soviet Union.[106]

The first round of Soviet–Finnish negotiations to replace the FCMA took place in October. One major issue that the Soviet side had was the question of borders. Finland reclaiming Karelia, which it lost in the Paris Peace Treaty, was dreaded in the Soviet Union, and its fears were aggravated by a public discussion which broke out in Finland in the autumn. Finland would have wanted to add only a reference to the Helsinki Final Act, which left open the possibility of 'a peaceful change of borders', whereas the Soviet negotiators

demanded a clause in which Finland would relinquish all territorial claims. This clause had been included in the agreements with Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Germany already.[107]

The negotiations were continued in early-November. Here again the Soviet negotiators, led by Yuri Deryabin, put up a tough fight. They were insistent that the Soviet Union receive security guarantees from Finland. Even though the Soviet side pushed hard in the negotiations, the border issue was settled as a compromise. Also, it was settled that the FCMA treaty would be annulled once the new agreement was signed; the agreed date for that was 18 December.[108]

The Finnish concerns, rather, were how the negotiations would be finished. If the year before the Finns had observed a rivalry between the Soviet president and the MID, now the power struggle was between the centre and the republics. This corresponds to other accounts on the final phases of the Soviet regime. One of Gorbachev's aides, Andrei Grachev, in his memoirs elaborates the way in which the Soviet foreign policy making fell apart due to intra-office rivalries.[109] For instance, in November, the Finnish foreign ministry received news that Yeltsin had decided that Russia would soon stop paying for its share of the Soviet MID expenses.[110] Would Finland have time to finish the negotiations that would replace the notorious FCMA treaty before Soviet authority collapsed?

The Finnish–Soviet negotiations continued throughout the autumn of 1991, although news of the Kremlin's weakening position were more frequent. Negotiations with the Soviet government ended in early November, and the agreement to replace the FCMA treaty was initialled on December 9. The agreed date for its signing was 18 December. However, one day before foreign minister Väyrynen was to set off to Moscow, the Finnish ambassador sent news that Yeltsin had forbidden the Soviet foreign minister Eduard Shevardnadze to sign. Ambassador Talvitie had had talks at both the Russian and Soviet MID, and he ended up delivering information on the Russian stance to the Soviet MID, which was that Finland should not sign anything with the USSR. As the director of the European department, Kabanov stated, the Russian view was that the FCMA would be replaced by the new Russian-Finnish agreement. Kabanov also expressed Russian foreign minister Andrei Kozyrev's astonishment that Finland even considered signing the agreement with the USSR, which was 'about to cease to exist any day now'. The Soviet MID drew its conclusions from this, and foreign minister Shevarnadzhe told the Finnish ambassador that they would not sign. Deputy foreign minister Yuri Deryabin asked that the Russian veto would not be publicised.[111]

Thus, the FCMA treaty continued to exist and its replacement would be negotiated with the Soviet successor state, the Russian Federation.[112] There was a general understanding that the latter would nonetheless not become a formal party to the Finnish–Soviet FCMA. The way out of the FCMA was that, acknowledging that the Soviet Union no longer existed, Finland would either unilaterally state that the FMCA has lost its validity. This could be done in a diplomatic note. The other option would have been to give a joint statement at the signing of the new treaty on the foundations of relations between Finland and the Russian Federation.[113] Finland chose the latter.

Finally, on 20 January 1992, during the visit of the Russian deputy prime minister Gennady Burbulis, the FCMA treaty between the Soviet Union and Finland finally expired. At the same time, the two countries signed their new agreement, the Basic Treaty, which for its section on security and political relations, contained the same elements that the Soviet MID had negotiated in the autumn months. After the ceremonies, a phone call was placed

on Yeltsin to inform him that the ceremony was over. The cordial discussion between Yeltsin and Koivisto was held in Russian.[114] The next week, Koivisto informed through his chief of staff that the back-channel with a KGB resident in Helsinki would be discontinued.[115]

Conclusions

It seems that in the final years of Soviet power, the Gorbachev leadership did not have the need nor the time to immerse itself in the Finnish–Soviet bilateral relationship. It was preoccupied with other problems, both external but to a growing extent, internal, which in the end proved to be detrimental to the Soviet Union itself. Also, with a new foreign policy doctrine, which aimed at ending the Cold War and the dissolution of the military blocs, it did not even want to use the FCMA treaty as a tool to control Finland.

For the Soviet Union, the FCMA played a crucial role in its security considerations until the major foreign policy doctrine change in late-1980s. Even after the Gorbachev leadership had abandoned the idea of world revolution as a Soviet foreign policy goal, some elements of the Soviet foreign policy machinery insisted on continuing the old policy line. Namely, Finland specialists in the CPSU central committee and the Soviet MID fought to keep the FCMA intact as long as possible; and after it was clear that a new agreement would replace it, their positions in those talks in October and November 1991 were tough. Therefore, the view expressed in the literature on the demise of the Soviet Union that its sphere of influence dissolved at the same time as the Cold War ended, is simplistic. Moreover, as the case of Finland shows, the Russian Federation in fact inherited some aspects of the Soviet security structure.

An important milestone in the Soviet–Finnish bilateral relationship was the joint declaration of Gorbachev's state visit to Finland in October 1989, in which the Soviet leadership acknowledged Finland's neutrality without restrictions. The bilateral relationship was at that moment, just before the walls came tumbling down, in a good position for the Finns. The process that took off in Eastern Europe just weeks later changed also Finland's position in international politics. The end of the Cold War did not result in dismantling all bloc structures – which had been Gorbachev's dream – but just the eastern ones. It also reduced the significance of neutrality, which meant that the situation reached in the Soviet–Finnish relationship in October 1989 during Gorbachev's state visit, was soon outdated. It furthermore made the Finnish unique position in the Cold War, Finlandisation as it has been labelled, redundant as a model, which the Soviet Union could promote to the countries of Eastern Europe as an alternative to integrating into the west.

Finland's ability to negotiate itself away from the Soviet orbit was enabled by the dilution of Soviet power rather than Finland's own resolution. Finland exited the Finnish–Soviet friendship pact later than the People's Democracies in Eastern Europe, which left the Soviet-led bloc after the revolutions of 1989. Paradoxically, even though Finland did not want to be included into this reference group, it was the only possible option in the process of annulling the FCMA treaty: As a prelude to Operation PAX, the Finnish foreign ministry examined how countries with similar references to Germany as an aggressor in their friendship agreements were interpreting this clause. The only comparisons the ministry had were the countries of Eastern Europe. It found out that even the Soviet allies no longer considered Germany as a threat. The ministry used this to justify its decision to include a reinterpretation of the FCMA into PAX as well. In this light, the demonstration of

René Nyberg in February 1990, when the operation was just about to be launched, seems to have a lot more to do with identity politics than realpolitik:

> Why should Finland seek company where it doesn't belong? Why should it join the Eastern European and Baltic states that now are striving to open the negotiations of the 1940s in Moscow? Finland is content with its position and content with its relations with the Soviet Union.[116]

Therefore, through the FCMA treaty Finland was tied to Soviet security considerations, and thus there was a link to the position of the Eastern Europeans – just as there had been since the first post-war years. It would be interesting to analyse further first, how much the Eastern European regimes' transition away from Moscow, and then later the Baltic States' independence movements helped Finnish policy-makers to interpret the dilution of Soviet power. This is not easy to analyse, however, because Finnish Soviet policy is depicted in both prior literature as well as the policy documents analysed for this study as a bilateral matter, which thus prudently demarcates Finland's distinction from Eastern Europe – both politically and mentally. In the case analysed here, the materials remain silent on any influence that the Eastern European regimes' transition away from Moscow might have had on Finnish decision-makers.

For Finland, discarding the FCMA treaty meant it had regained full sovereignty. In the autumn of 1991, at the same time that Finland initiated negotiations to terminate the FCMA, it voiced its interest in joining the European Community. And just two months after the annulment of the FCMA, in March 1992, it filed for EC membership. Ridding itself of the post-war restrictions to its sovereignty, Finland entered the post-Cold War world with a new interpretation of its neutrality, leading to EU membership in 1995. Yet, a valued part of the country's self-image is still military non-alliance, which has left Finland outside NATO.[117]

A crucial element in Finland's self-image during the Cold War was its status as a neutral, Nordic and western country.[118] This meant that it needed to actively hide the fact that it had a military agreement with the Soviet Union. This makes it difficult to study Finland as part of Soviet security considerations. The study of the Soviet security system has its own challenges as well. Its security system consisted of multilateral and bilateral agreements, as well as informal institutions such as the Brezhnev Doctrine, which were not included in the formal structure of the Soviet neighbourhood policy. This kind of study requires multi-archival research in several countries of the former Warsaw Pact, as well as other neighbours of the Soviet Union such as Finland. This case study on Finland's position in the collapsing Soviet security structure opens important questions for future research, such as that of the way Soviet power was transferred to the Russian Federation, and the interplay of the formal and informal institutions, or the roles of different parts of Moscow's foreign policy apparatus.

Notes

1. Jacques Lévesque, *The Enigma of 1989: The USSR and the Liberation of Eastern Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997). There is a wealth of studies on the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union, yet they focus either on east–west relations or internal Soviet developments. The dissolution of the Soviet bloc, however, remains an under-researched topic.

2. Susanna Hast, *Spheres of Influence in International Relations. History, Theory and Politics* (London: Routledge, 2014), 1–4.
3. J-M Ritvanen, 'Komissarov olisi kääntynyt haudassaan'. Neuvostoliitto, Iso-Britannia ja Suomen Operaatio Pax 1989–1990', *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, cxv (2017), 74–86.
4. Archie Brown, *Seven Years that Changed the World. Perestroika in Perspective* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 294–8; Robert Service, *The End of the Cold War: 1985–1991* (New York: Public Affairs, 2015), 489–90.
5. For brevity and clarity, this article refers to the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic as Russia; and to the post-1992 Russia as the Russian Federation.
6. For instance, after the unification of Germany in fall 1990 conservative forces gained more power and influence over Gorbachev, which led to the resignation of foreign minister Eduard Shevardnadze, Levesque, Enigma of 1989, 249.
7. Gorbachev's interview on 26 Oct. 1989. F[innish] F[oreign] M[inistry] A[rchives, Helsinki], 18.60: N[euvosto]L[iitt]O, 1989.
8. Walter Laqueur, *The Political Psychology of Appeasement: Finlandization and Other Unpopular Essays* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1980), 7.
9. A comprehensive account is the eight-volume biography of President Urho Kekkonen by Juhani Suomi, published during 1986-2000, as well as the edited diaries by the same author, published during 2001–2004.
10. Aappo Kähönen, *The Soviet Union, Finland and the Cold War: The Finnish Card in Soviet Foreign Policy*, 1956–1959 (Helsinki: SKS, 2006), 15–9; Tatiana Androsova, 'Economic Interest in Soviet Post-War Policy on Finland' in Sari Autio-Sarasmo, Katalin Miklossy (eds), *Reassessing Cold War History* (London: Routledge, 2011) 33–48.
11. Mikhail Gorbachev, *Memoirs* (New York: Doubleday, 1996); *The Diary of Anatoly S. Chernyaev (1985 to 1991)*. Svetlana Savranskaya (ed.), The National Security Archive, 2006–2011, (http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB192/). All internet sources were accessed on 6 July, 2017.
12. Juri Derjabin, *Omalla nimellä. Reunamerkintöjä Juri Komissarovin kirjoihin ja omaan elämään* (Helsinki: Otava, 1997); Felix Karasev, *Naapurinpojan muistelmat* (Helsinki: Otava, 1998); Vladimir Flodorov, *NKP:n Suomen osastolla 1954–1989* (Otava: Helsinki, 2001).
13. This is also posited in Fjororov, Suomen osastolla, 237.
14. Kimmo Rentola, 'When to Move? Finland and the Disintegration of the Soviet Union' in Poul Villaume et al (eds), *Northern Europe in the Cold War, 1965–1990. East-West Interactions of Trade, Culture and Security* (Helsinki: Aleksanteri Institute, 2016), 268–286; V. Mitzner, 'Almost in Europe? How Finland's Embarrassing Entry into Eureka Captured Policy Change', *Contemporary European History*, xxv (2016), 481–504; Ritvanen, Operaatio Pax; J. Aunesluoma, J. Rainio-Niemi, 'Neutrality as Identity?: Finland's Quest for Security in the Cold War', *Journal of Cold War Studies*, xviii (2016), 51–78; Juhana Aunesluoma, Marjo Uutela, 'In Germany's Footsteps. German Reunification and Finland, 1987–1994' in Michael Gehler, Maximilian Graf (eds.), *Europa und die deutsche Einheit. Beobachtungen, Entscheidungen und Folgen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2017), 415–438.
15. Mary Sarotte, *1989: The Struggle to Create Post-Cold War Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009); Service, End of the Cold War.
16. Charles Gati and Mark Kramer wrote on the events as they unravelled: Charles Gati, *The Bloc that Failed. Soviet-East European Relations in Transition* (London: Tauris, 1990); M. Kramer, 'Beyond the Brezhnev Doctrine: A New Era in Soviet-East European Relations?', *International Security* xiv (1989–1990), 25–67. Jacques Levesque's book, from the early post-Soviet years, which is based on participants' interviews as well as non-published policy documents, is still one of the most insightful accounts of the demise of Soviet-East European relations; Lévesque, Enigma of 1989; Mark Kramer's later, ground-breaking archival work in the region has unearthed important sources on the theme. M. Kramer, 'The Collapse of East European Communism and the Repercussions within the Soviet Union' (Parts 1–3), *Journal of Cold War Studies* v (2003); vi (2004); vii (2005); M. Kramer, 'The Demise of the Soviet Bloc', *The Journal of Modern History*, lxxxiii (2011), 788–854.

17. *Der Kreml und die 'Wende' 1989. Interne Analysen der sowjetischen Führung zum Fall der kommunistischen Regime. Dokumente*. Stefan Karner et al. (eds) (Innsbruck: StudienVerlag 2014); *Masterpieces of History. The Peaceful End of the Cold War in Europe, 1989*, Vladislav Zubok et al (eds) (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2010).
18. Andrei Grachev, *Gorbachev's Gamble. Soviet Foreign Policy and the End of the Cold War* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008); Plokhy, Last Empire; Service, End of Cold War; K. Spohr Readman, 'Between Political Rhetoric and Realpolitik Calculations: Western Diplomacy and the Baltic Independence Struggle in the Cold War Endgame', *Cold War History*, vi (2006), 1–42.
19. Mauno Koivisto, *Historian tekijät. Kaksi kautta II* (Helsinki: Kirja-yhtymä 1995); Derjabin, Omalla nimellä; Karasev, Muistelmat. A seminal work on the period is the eyewitness account by the head of the political department of the Finnish foreign ministry during 1988–92, Jaakko Blomberg, *Vakauden kaipuu. Kylmän sodan loppu ja Suomi* (Helsinki, WSOY, 2011).
20. Kreml und die 'Wende'; Masterpieces of History.
21. Other parties to the treaty were Australia, Belarus, Canada, Czechoslovakia, India, New Zealand, the Ukrainian SFSR and South Africa.
22. The Peace Treaty of Paris, http://www.finlex.fi/fi/sopimukset/sopsteksti/1947/19470020/19470020_2; Chapters 1–2.
23. M. Korobochkin, 'Soviet policy toward Finland and Norway, 1947–1949', *Scandinavian Journal of History*, xx (1995), 192.
24. Ibid, 195.
25. Ibid, 197.
26. Johanna Rainio-Niemi, '*Cold War Neutrality in Europe. Lessons to be learned?*' *in Heinz Gärtner (ed), Engaged Neutrality. An Evolved Approach to the Cold War* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2017), 21–2.
27. Ibid, 23–5.
28. A. Noskova, 'Sovetskie sovetniki v stranakh Tsentral'noi i Vostochnoi Evropy, 1945–53 gg.', Voprosy *istorii* (1998), 104–113.
29. L. Crump-Gabreëls, S. Godard, 'Reassessing Communist International Organisations: A Comparative Analysis of COMECON and the Warsaw Pact in Relation to their Cold War Competitors', *European Review of History*, forthcoming.
30. The view of Finland not as a neutral country between the blocs, but in the fuzzy grey zone was echoed by Russian policy-makers even after the Cold War. Derjabin, Omalla nimellä.
31. Korobochkin, Soviet policy toward Finland, 206.
32. Aunesluoma, Uutela, In Germany's Footsteps.
33. Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance, http://www.finlex.fi/fi/sopimukset/sopsteksti/1948/19480017/19480017_2. A similar article was in the Austrian State Treaty from 1955, and its interpretation was also the same. M. Schultz, 'Austria in the International Arena: Neutrality, European Integration and Consociationalism', *West European Politics*, xv (1992), 175.
34. Suvi Kansikas, 'Balancing between Moscow and Brussels: Finland's integration policy towards the EC and its political constraints' in Northern Europe in the Cold War, 81–103.
35. Memo Urho Kekkonen, 19 Aug. 1972. Archives of Urho Kekkonen, Yearbook 1972. The yearbooks were folders in which President Kekkonen compiled in his view the most important documents of each year.
36. D. Welch Larson, A. Shevchenko, 'Shortcut to Greatness: The New Thinking and the Revolution in Soviet Foreign Policy', *International Organization*, lvii (2003), 77–109; Kramer, Soviet Bloc.
37. Christopher Jones, 'Protection from one's own friends: the disintegration of the Warsaw Pact', *in Derek Leebart and Timothy Dickinson (eds), Soviet strategy and new military thinking* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 100–126; Levesque, Enigma of 1989.
38. 'Sovetsko-Finlyandskaya deklaratsiya: Novoe myshlenie v deistvii', Izvestiya, 27 Oct. 1989, 1.
39. Gorbachev's interview on 26 Oct. 1989.
40. Deklaratsiya 27 Oct. 1989.
41. 'Rech' M. Koivisto', Izvestiya, 26 Oct. 1989, 2.
42. 'Ukreplenie fundament obshcheevropeiskogo doma', Pravda, 26 Oct. 1989, 1.

43. M-P. Rey, '"Europe is our Common Home": A study of Gorbachev's diplomatic concept'. *Cold War History*, iv (2004), 33–65.
44. P[olitical] D[epartment] memo 884, 23 Oct. 1989, Jaakko Blomberg, FFMA, NLO 18.60, 1989.
45. Memorandum from the Bogomolov Institute, 'Changes in Eastern Europe and their Impact on the USSR', Feb. 1989. In: Masterpieces of History, 377.
46. Blomberg, Vakauden kaipuu, 133–6.
47. Rainio-Niemi, Neutrality, 23–5.
48. Levesque, Enigma of 1989, chapter 8.
49. Ibid.
50. This was the mentality in Finland. Even though Finland had never accepted the Baltic countries annexation into the USSR de jure (just de facto), the three Baltics were not considered in this category.
51. Ritvanen, Operaatio Pax, 74.
52. Blomberg, Vakauden kaipuu, 256.
53. Talvitie to Helsinki, 16 Jan. 1990, FFMA, 18.41: NLO 1990.
54. Blomberg, Vakauden kaipuu, 133.
55. Secret cable CCCB190 to Berlin Bucharest, Rome, Sofia, Budapest, 5 Apr. 1990. The answers were received between 19 and 26 April FFMA, 18.41: NLO 1990.
56. PD memo 481, 1 June 1990, Lars Backström, FFMA, 18.41: NLO 1990.
57. Sarotte, 1989.
58. The proper way of conduct would have been either to negotiate with the UN Security Council or alternatively all contracting parties to the Paris Peace Treaty, which the Finns considered too 'strange a bunch' to deal with.
59. Ritvanen, Operaatio Pax, 79.
60. Ritvanen, Operaatio Pax, 78–9; Memo, Jaakko Kalela 4 Sept. 1990; Memo, Jaakko Kalela, 25 Sept. 1990, [Helsinki, The National Archives of Finland], M[auno] K[oivisto] R[ecords, foreign policy,] box 42.
61. Jaakko Kalela, the president's chief of staff, in an Oral history seminar on Operation PAX on 10 Mar. 2016 in Helsinki.
62. *The Diary of Anatoly S. Chernyaev. 1990*. Svetlana Savranskaya (ed), The National Security Archive, 2010, (http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB317/index.htm).
63. PD top secret unnumbered memo, 17 Sept. 1990, Jaakko Blomberg, Rene Nyberg, MKR, box 42; Ritvanen, Operaatio Pax, 80–1.
64. Koivisto's consent on a handwritten memo dated 19.9.1990 on a meeting with Jaakko Blomberg. MKR, box 41.
65. Talvitie to Helsinki, 20 Sept. 1990. MKR, box 43.
66. R. Nyberg, 'Olette kajonneet yya-sopimukseen', *Kanava* (2008), 8.
67. Ritvanen, Operaatio Pax, 74.
68. 'O sovetsko-finlyandskoye dogovore', Pravda, 27 Sept. 1990, 4.
69. Ritvanen, Operaatio Pax, 79.
70. PD memo 1195, Rene Nyberg, 12 Dec. 1990, FFMA, 18.40: NLO, 1990.
71. Ritvanen, Operaatio Pax, 79–80.
72. Nyberg memo 12 Dec. 1990, FFMA, 18.40: NLO, 1990.
73. Nyberg, Kajonneet yya-sopimukseen, 9.
74. Derjabin, Omalla nimellä, 113.
75. PD memo 978, 25 Oct. 1990, Jaakko Blomberg, MKR, box 42.
76. Odnostoronnyaya aktziya Helsinki. Sud'ba dogovorov, Izvestiya 25 Sept. 1990, 7.
77. PD top secret, unnumbered memo, Jaakko Blomberg, 20 Sept. 1990, MKR, box 42.
78. Ritvanen, Operaatio Pax, 84.
79. Memo, Jaakko Kalela, 2 Nov. 1990, MKR, box 42.
80. PD top secret, unnumbered memo, Jaakko Blomberg, 17 Oct. 1990, MKR, box 42.
81. Backström, 1 June 1990. FFMA, 18.41: NLO, 1990.
82. Blomberg, Vakauden kaipuu, 256–7.
83. Backström, 1 June 1990, FFMA, 18.41: NLO 1990.

84. Cable SOFB009 from Sofia 20 Apr. 1990, FFMA, 18.41: NLO 1990.
85. Cable BRLB018 from Berlin 19 Apr. 1990, FFMA, 18.41: NLO 1990.
86. Cable VARB045 from Warsaw 20 Apr. 1990, FFMA, 18.41: NLO 1990; Cable VARB067 from Warsaw 26 April 1990, FFMA Varsova R-sarja 1990.
87. Record of Conversation between Mikhail Gorbachev and Wojciech Jaruzelski. 13 Apr. 1990, In: Masterpieces of History, 695.
88. Finnish embassy to the EC memo, 11 Jan. 1991, FFMA 35.10: EY-Unkari 1988–1991.
89. Cable BUD0117 from Budapest 2 Mar. 1990, FFMA, Budapest R-kirjeet 1990; Sarotte, 1989, 224.
90. Spohr Readman, Baltic Independence; I. Metsalo, 'Vallanvaihto suomalaissilmin. Suomen ulkoasiainministeriön analyysit Baltian itsenäistymiskehityksestä 1986–1991' (MA thesis, Helsinki, 2016).
91. Levesque, Enigma of 1989, 249–50.
92. This is visible also in Russian-Baltic relations. Spohr Readman, Baltic Independence.
93. PD memo 714, 2 July 1991, Jaakko Blomberg, FFMA, 18.41: NLO 1991.
94. Metsalo, Vallanvaihto.
95. Service, End of the Cold War, 492.
96. PD memo 896, 3 Sept. 1990, Alpo Rusi, FFMA, 18.41: NLO 1991.
97. Koivisto, Historian tekijät, 442.
98. Koivisto, 1995. The memorandum on the Koivisto-Kalela-Karasov meeting is not found at Koivisto's archive. The date of the president's use of the backchannel to the Kremlin, 12 Sept., is given in a later memorandum on a meeting between Kalela and Karasov. Memo, Jaakko Kalela, 26. Sept. 1991, MKR, box 48.
99. Ibid.
100. President Koivisto discusses in his memoirs the possibility that his message did not reach Moscow on time. He also tells that he informed his Prime Minister Esko Aho. The reason why Aho did not convey the information over to the foreign ministry is unknown. Koivisto, 1995, 442–3. Yuri Deryabin, a Soviet diplomat working on Finnish affairs on the other hand is convinced that Pankin had received instructions from Gorbachev. Derjabin, Omalla nimellä, 194. Blomberg for his part states that, because there was no information on Koivisto's move, for a long time the Finnish foreign ministry thought that the initiative to discard the FCMA had originated in the Soviet Union. Blomberg, Vakauden kaipuu, 418.
101. PD memo 968, 18 Sept. 1991, Laura Reinilä, FFMA, 18.41: NLO 1991.
102. Grachev, Gorbachev's Gamble, 184–91; Nyberg, Olette kajonneet, 8.
103. The role of deputy foreign minister, and later the first ambassador of the Russian Federation to Finland, Yuri Deryabin needs to be stressed here. He was leading the Soviet delegation in the FCMA negotiations, and had as recently as Sept.1990 in an article in the Finnish foreign policy journal Ulkopolitiikka, underlined the importance of the FCMA. His memoirs show some remorse for the harsh Soviet control of Finnish politics, but there's nothing apologetic about his interest in maintaining the FCMA intact. Derjabin, Omalla nimellä.
104. Koivisto uses the word 'renew' in his memoirs, which does not indicate whether he in fact was ready to discard the FCMA treaty altogether. In a foreign ministry memorandum for the Väyrynen-Pankin meeting on 22 September, one question on the table still had been, whether the FCMA should be renewed or replaced with an altogether new one. The decision that Finland would seek to get rid of the FCMA was apparently made during the few days before the aforementioned meeting. PD memo 978, 19 Sept. 1991, Jaakko Blomberg, FFMA, 18.41: NLO 1991.
105. Finnish embassy to the UN memo YKE1431, 22 Sept. 1991, Elina Kalkku, FFMA, 18.41: NLO 1991.
106. Blomberg, Vapauden kaipuu, 432–4.
107. PD memo 1053, 7 OCt. 1991, Jaakko Blomberg, FFMA, 18.41: NLO 1991; Blomberg, Vakauden kaipuu, 421–33.
108. Blomberg, Vakauden kaipuu, 427–30.
109. Grachev, Gorbachev's Gamble, 1984–191. Also Rene Nyberg, analysing the process from the Finnish side, concurs with this view. Nyberg, Kajonneet yya-sopimukseen.

110. Memo Jaakko Kalela, 4 Nov. 1991, MKR, box 48.
111. Talvitie cable MOSB346 (very urgent) to Helsinki, 17 Dec. 1991, FFMA, 18.41: NLO 1991.
112. Blomberg, 2011, 421–4.
113. Memo MOSB179 to Moscow, 19 Dec. 1991, Harry Helenius, FFMA, 18.41: NLO 1991.
114. Tasavallan Presidentin ja Venäjän Federaation valtiosihteerin ja ensimmäisen varapääministerin G.E. Burbuliksen puhelinkeskustelu Venäjän Presidentin Boris Jeltsinin kanssa 20.1.1992 Presidentinlinnasta. MKR, box 49.
115. Memo, Jaakko Kalela, 28 Jan. 1992, MKR, box 49.
116. PD meetings with foreign representatives 90, (lieutenant G. Hand, UK), 6 Feb. 1990. René Nyberg, FFMA, 18.41: NLO 1991.
117. Aunesluoma, Rainio-Niemi, Neutrality as identity?
118. C. Browning, 'Coming Home or Moving Home? 'Westernizing' Narratives in Finnish Foreign Policy and the Reinterpretation of Past Identities', *Cooperation and Conflict,* xxxvii (2002), 47–72; Rainio-Niemi, Neutrality.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their comments on the manuscript. The author also acknowledges her gratitude to the members of the Reimagining Futures in the European North at the End of the Cold War research consortium at the Universities of Helsinki, Tampere and Turku for their valuable support for this article.

Funding

This work was supported by the Academy of Finland [grant number 268635], [grant number 295567].

ORCID

Suvi Kansikas http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2180-2139