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Abstract

This thesis is a study of neutrality, as a foreign policy, as practiced by Finland and Ireland, and of the constraints that limit the scope of neutrality as a foreign policy. Ireland's neutrality is affected by its close relationship with the Western powers. Finland's neutrality is modified by its position next to the Soviet Union. The simple distribution of power does not allow either Ireland or Finland to practice a classical neutrality, as does Switzerland. Furthermore, the forces of domestic political competition and maintenance of sovereignty, also color the formulation of these states' foreign policies. By analyzing these three forces, distribution of power, domestic political competition, and maintenance of sovereignty, while historically comparing Irish and Finnish foreign policy, we can describe and understand neutrality better.
A Historical Comparison of Irish and Finnish Neutrality
Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to compare and explain the neutralities of Finland and the Republic of Ireland, hereafter referred to simply as Ireland. The method of explanation will set the neutrality of these two countries in the context of constraints. That is, neutrality is the chosen foreign policy of Ireland and Finland because it has been the most efficacious course to follow in light of the constraints which bind them. Because of concerns for state integrity, the distribution of power, and the high political value assigned to staying out of great power conflicts, neutrality is used by the two states to accommodate the constraints which limit their options in foreign policy.

The method used to compare the forms of neutrality practiced by Ireland and Finland is a chronological one, introduced by a general overview of each country as it stands presently. Then, the development of Irish and Finnish neutrality will be examined from the emergence of each as a sovereign state to the present. At intervals which signal a change in the importance of the constraining elements, an analysis of the two neutralities to that point will be given, and then the comparison will recommence.

Neutrality in a modern sense is a difficult concept to define, let alone practice. A neutral state must not start wars or belong to a military alliance. A neutral state must provide for a credible military deterrent, to prevent the transgression
of its territory by belligerents. A neutral must follow the current guidelines of international law as it applies to neutrals. A neutral must profess to be neutral and practice a foreign policy which will not allow it to be drawn into conflict. Finally, a neutral must not aid militarily, economically, politically, or otherwise, belligerent states, though economic and political intercourse may continue.¹

Unfortunately, in the modern world the distinction between war and peace has become increasingly difficult to determine. For example, the complexities of international trade are such that the origins of some strategic materials are hard to determine, which complicates the verification of aid to belligerent states by neutrals. Furthermore, what does and does not constitute a neutral foreign policy is not universally agreed.

Today Ireland and Finland profess to be neutral and are considered neutral by much of the rest of the world. However, neither country is as purely neutral as Switzerland, which established its neutrality in an 1815 treaty. Austria, in 1955, also achieved international treaty recognition of its neutrality. But in both cases, the Austrian and the Swiss, foreign policy prerogatives were sacrificed to obtain international recognition of their neutrality.

Ireland and Finland have retained most of their foreign policy prerogatives and this adds to the uncertainty about the

degrees of their neutrality. The Austrians and Swiss are bound by international law to remain neutral, which is not the case with either Ireland or Finland, and it remains in the hands of the Irish and Finnish policymakers to establish versions of neutrality which enable the two countries to stay out of great power conflict without sacrificing their sovereignty or independence in foreign policy.

Presently, in Finland and Ireland, neutrality enjoys a great deal of support among the electorate and the political elites. An example of public support in Finland for neutrality occurred in 1980 when former President Kekkonen attracted multi-party support from approximately 80% of the electoral college in his bid for reelection, which was conducted on the basis of Finland's successful neutrality vis a vis the Soviet Union. Neutrality enjoys multi-party support in Ireland and Finland because it safeguards the sovereignty of the two states.

Neutrality has also afforded a framework within which to establish the identity of the two states. The Irish and the Finnish manifest themselves, to some degree, in the international arena by their neutral stances. Helsinki, the Finnish capital, has become an international conference center. For example, it

---

3 Faloon, p. 11.
4 Faloon, p. 12.
was the site of the Council on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), and the Finns and the Irish were signatories of the resulting CSCE document known as the Helsinki Final Act.5

In the United Nations, the Finns and Irish have shared a similar mediatory role, both having contributed heavily to United Nations peacekeeping ventures. In fact since 1956, the Finns have sent 15,000 troops and the Irish 9,000 to man United Nations peacekeeping ventures in Africa, the Mediterranean, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia.6 Both Ireland and Finland have exhibited a sympathy for Third World concerns in General Assembly voting, as one would expect of states which have only recently achieved sovereignty after centuries of great power control.7 Neutrality allows them the latitude to express their sympathy for the Third World. Were either bound by a military alliance to one of the great powers, it would temper its stance on Third World issues in the General Assembly and elsewhere rather than injure its relationship with the great power.

Nonetheless, the distribution of power does effect Ireland and Finland, and their attachment to neutrality, with varying degrees of similarity. Both of these countries lie within the scope of great power influence. Ireland, which is a neighbor to Great Britain, is also within the area of the United States'

5 Faloon, p. 13.
6 Keatinge, p. 50.
7 Keatinge, pp. 52-53.
(US) power projection. With 3.3 million inhabitants, it is 1/3 as big and 1/20 as populated as Great Britain. It is dependent upon Great Britain for 50% of its export trade and fully 80% of its export trade is with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) signatories.

Ireland spends less per capita than any neutral in Europe on defense, apparently indebting it to the West, and more specifically to NATO and the US, for its military security.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Ireland, while not always a practitioner of solidarity with the West in the United Nations, is clearly tied by the distribution of power to a pro-West neutrality.

Its great neighbor, the Soviet Union, exerts a similar influence over Finland, albeit with more of an emphasis place on defense considerations. The Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance (FCMA) signed in 1948 by the Soviets and the Finns binds the survival of Finnish sovereignty, and correspondingly the success of Finnish neutrality, to Soviet security from advances from the West, most specifically Germany. In its preamble, the FCMA acknowledges, "Finlands

---

8 Keatinge, p. 77
9 Keatinge, p. 47.
10 Keatinge, p. 42.
11 Keatinge, p. 38.
12 Falloon, p. 9.
desire to remain out of the conflicting interests of the Great
Powers."13 However, the FCMA requires consultations between the
parties if an aggression directed at the Soviet Union has the
potential of using Finland as a route into Soviet territory.
Moreover, if a belligerent act aimed at both the Soviets and the
Finns seems imminent, the Soviets have the right to transport
troops through Finland in order to assist the Finns in the
maintenance of their territorial integrity and neutrality.14

The FCMA is both a hindrance and a support to Finnish neu-
trality. It certainly reflects the awesome military power of the
Soviet Union and highlights what the Soviets can do to Finnish
territorial integrity if they see fit. If taken literally, it
would destroy any claim the Finns have to neutrality. It is
clearly a military alliance in time of war because it commits the
Finns to allowing Soviet troop transport through their territory,
and to a co-belligerency with the Red Army. But the FCMA is the
lesser of two evils if one considers the fate of the Baltic
states, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Their fate, total ab-
sorption into the Soviet empire, would have befallen Finland had
the FCMA not acknowledged Soviet power and guaranteed the Soviets

13 The Preamble of the Agreement of Friendship, Co-operation
and Mutual Assistance Between the Republic of Finland and the
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Signed on April 6, 1948, in
Anatole Mazour, Finland Between East and West (Westport,

14 Articles 1 & 2 of the Agreement of Friendship, Co-
operation and Mutual Assistance, in Mazour, pp. 280-281.
a benevolent Finnish neutrality.15

The strength of Finnish neutrality has been demonstrated by the fact that the FCMA has not been activated. In order to protect their sovereignty the Finns opted to not join the Warsaw Pact, despite Soviet Invitation. But with a bow to Soviet power, the Finns also elected not to join NATO, for this would have initiated the FCMA by the Soviets. Both Finnish nonparticipation in the Warsaw Pact, and nonparticipation in NATO were tolerated because of the FCMA.16

Forced by geographical realities to serve as a buffer state between East and West, but forced by diplomatic realities to stay out of power blocs, the Finns have moved to assert their neutrality by arming themselves handily, thus making the transgression of Finnish territory a potentially unpleasant experience. In contrast to Ireland, which can mobilize 1.1% of its population in time of war, the Finns can muster 15.3%.17 The Finns have a viable army, air force and navy which are equipped with modern weapons purchased from the East and West.18 But with only 4.7 million inhabitants and the 5th largest land area in Europe, they

15 Faloon, p. 5.
17 Keatinge, p. 42.
have a big job of defense. Finland is bigger than Great Britain and Ireland combined. However, the Finns are well equipped and have a strong military history, and it is due, in part, to their military history that the Soviets have respected Finland's claim to neutrality, though the smaller country possesses only 2% of the population and 1/2% of the land mass of its larger neighbor.  

Finally, the domestic political frameworks of Finland and Ireland predispose them to neutrality. They are both modern, industrialised, northern European states, but each was dominated by its larger neighbor for centuries and only achieved independence in the years following World War I. Both countries were inclined to neutrality at their births, due to Ireland's reluctance to fight British wars and Finland's tradition of partial foreign policy autonomy during its period as a Russian Grand Duchy.

Ireland shares with Great Britain the Westminster form of government, a common literary heritage and language, and a larger, more general, cultural bond. It also has close ties to the US. Fully 40 million Americans claim whole or partial Irish


ancestry. Why, then, is it not a member of the Western Alliance. The answer lies in the separation of the six northern counties in Ireland from the southern twenty-six. At this time, a military alliance with Great Britain is heresy in Irish politics due to the presence of British troops and the British government in the six counties of Northern Ireland. However, the Irish, like the Finns, have strayed close to compromising their neutrality. As the FCMA would destroy Finnish neutrality if enacted, Irish membership in the European Community could damage Irish neutrality, due to the economic and political responsibilities it entails for its signatories, such as joint economic sanctions during hostilities.

Currently, neutrality is parroted without opposition in the Irish Parliament, though it may be true that the neutrality of a member of the Labour Party is quite different from that of Dr. Fitzgerald of Fine Gael or Mr. Haughey of Fianna Fail. However, neutrality is likely to remain a cornerstone of Irish foreign policy as long as it continues to keep Ireland out of a military alliance while affording it the flexibility to derive the economic benefits of European Community membership.

Finland also had a border dispute with its larger neighbor, but unlike the Irish, who use the separation of the north and the south as a pretext for remaining out of NATO, the Finns make no

---

23 Keatinge, p. 95.
24 Keatinge, pp. 84-85.
25 Keatinge, pp. 116-117.
such logical leap. Control of the territory of Karelia, the mythological birthplace of the first Finns and the home of a large Finnish ethnic minority until the end of World War II, was disputed by the Finnish and Soviet governments and was a justification for hostilities with the Soviet Union in World War II.\textsuperscript{26} But the border dispute was resolved at the end of World War II with the extrication of the Finnish minority from the USSR and their resettlement in Finland. This would be comparable to solving the Northern Ireland problem by resettling of the northern Irish Catholics in the south, if Ireland's leadership were to abandon hopes of reclaiming the northern six counties. However, unlike the Irish, the Finns could not exist with a border dispute with their infinitely more powerful, and more aggressive, neighbor. While the nonsettlement of the border dispute symbolizes Irish dreams of reunification, and necessitates Irish independence from Great Britain in foreign policy, the resolution of the Karelian issue is an example of the awareness by Finns that neutrality and sovereignty cannot coexist with confrontation with the Soviets.

Unlike Ireland, Finland is not a relative geopolitical backwater and, as a consequence, Finnish Lapland separates the NATO forces from the Warsaw Pact, and to the south, whoever controls the Aaland Islands, as Napoleon remarked, holds a pistol aimed at the heart of Sweden.\textsuperscript{27} It was because of Finland's strategic

\textsuperscript{26} Mazour, p. 179.

\textsuperscript{27} Jakobson, p. 9.
importance that the Germans passed through its territory in 1918 and 1941 to engage the Soviets.\textsuperscript{28} International relations therefore assumes a high profile in the Finnish political arena.

The Finnish presidential-prime minister system of government is similar to the current French arrangement in the 5th Republic. As in France, it is the president who is paramount in foreign policy. It is he who must construct or protect a neutrality which both mollifies the Soviet Union and enables the Finns to hold onto their thoroughly Western, or more accurately, Scandinavian ideological preferences and socio-economic organizations.\textsuperscript{29} The so-called Paasikivi-Kekkonen line, named for Finland's first two post World War II presidents, has become the basis of Finnish foreign policy and it is the rock upon which Soviet trust in Finland is placed.\textsuperscript{30} As such, if one is to be taken seriously within the Finnish political spectrum, one must support and adhere to this policy.\textsuperscript{31}

As is evident from this introduction, neither Finland nor Ireland is wholly neutral, nor is neutrality an end in itself. Rather, neutrality bends and folds to the demands placed on it by the European Community, the FCMA, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, respectively.

\textsuperscript{28} Jakobson, p. 54.
\textsuperscript{29} Faloon, p. 11.
\textsuperscript{30} Faloon, p. 11.
Chapter 1
"The Struggle to Establish a Neutral Foreign Policy
After Independence"

Irish neutrality evolved as a means for the Irish to maintain their independence from Great Britain. The Irish separatist and home rule movements of the late 19th century were not enamoured with the prospect of fighting any more wars on behalf of the British empire. As a result, Irish nonparticipation in, and opposition to, the Boer War was an early form of Irish neutrality, and of its symbolic importance to Irish independence from Great Britain.32

Irish opposition to conscription in World War I was headed by separatists, including, Roger Casement and James Connolly, and the British did not attempt to impose conscription in Ireland until 1918, when the idea was met with massive resistance and abandoned.33 The Irish war of independence, from 1919 to 1921, added to the likelihood that the Irish would opt for a separate identity in international relations because many who opposed Irish participation in World War I also fought for Irish independence.

But however much the Irish would have wanted to cut their ties with their powerful neighbor, complete separation from Great Britain was still a distant possibility.

32 Ward, pp. 43-45.
Britain was an economic and cultural impossibility. The bonds of common language, political systems, and for centuries, the same head of state and head of government, had firmly cemented the link between the two countries. Moreover, British trade sustained the Irish economy.

Before Ireland was formally recognized as an independent state, the Irish Free State, in 1922, the Anglo-Irish Treaty of December 1921 had granted the British naval port facilities at the Irish ports of Cobh, Berehaven and Lough Swilly. At the time, Britain considered these facilities important to protect convoy travel between the US and Britain, and provide security for Britain's western flank in time of war.

During the 1920's it became evident that although the centuries old attachment of Ireland to Great Britain would not end, it would be diminished by Irish independence. Ireland was, after all, still a part of the Commonwealth, if in a diminished capacity. In 1927, the Minister for External Affairs, Desmond FitzGerald, noted that if Great Britain was ever the target of belligerency, the Irish would come to its aid. And when the election of 1932 brought Fianna Fail to power, Taoiseach Eamon de Valera asserted that Great Britain and Ireland had a unique relationship, and in time of conflict Ireland would show special

---

34 Keatinge, p. 16.

It was during the 1930's that de Valera, watching League of Nation sanctions against Italy fail, turned away from the notion of collective security embodied by the League and decided upon a more isolationist and neutral policy to protect Irish interests. In 1936 he told Dail Eirann that Ireland wished to be neutral. The 1938 Anglo-Irish Treaty therefore removed British claims to Irish ports. Britain had decided that the ports were no longer vital to British security, and were becoming an unnecessary luxury because of the ill will provoked by maintaining a British presence in Ireland.

As the storm gathered which would become World War II, with the German annexation of the Sudetenland and the Wehrmacht's rapid mobilization, Europe became restive. It was clear there would be no "peace for our time." In 1939, the First Lord of the Admiralty, Winston Churchill, inquired if Ireland would regrant Britain rights to the Irish Defense Ports. This was refuted by the Irish. De Valera determined that the best path for Ireland was to steer clear of the battle on the Continent, and he was able to assert Irish independence in doing so. Irish neutrality

36 Keatinge, A Place Among Nations, p. 86.
39 Keatinge, A Singular Stance, p. 16.
40 Keatinge, A Place Among Nations, p. 89.
in World War II was de Valera's successful attempt to keep Ireland out of the conflict while promoting a sense of Irish nationalism through the exercise of an independent foreign policy.

De Valera was also to find a policy of neutrality expedient for his party, Fianna Fail, which had opposed the partition of Ireland in 1921 and had fought a civil war over the issue. He claimed that Ireland could not take part in a war as Britain's ally so long as the northern six counties were occupied by British forces.\(^{41}\) Partition gave de Valera the political issue necessary to unite the Dail under his leadership, for no party was willing to sanction partition by actively and overtly abandoning neutrality, which would be the consequence of siding with Great Britain.

Moreover de Valera felt he had no choice but to remain above the conflict. He felt that civil war was possible if the government were to conscript Irishmen to fight in Britain's war.\(^{42}\) Simply stated, neutrality was the one policy de Valera could adopt which would unite the nation under his leadership, and force Britain to accept Ireland's sovereignty.\(^{43}\) This last point was evidenced by the British decision to accept the Irish refusal

\(^{41}\) Fisk, p. 382.

\(^{42}\) Fisk, p. 250.

\(^{43}\) Fisk, p. 250.
on the defense ports and its nonparticipation in the war.44

When British inquiries were later made to the Minister of Defense, Frank Aiken, to determine if Ireland would commit itself to the Allies in return for a deferred reunification of the Island, they were turned down.45 Britain had once deferred Irish home rule, during World War I, and the Irish leadership was not willing to be taken advantage of a second time, especially since it was doubtful that the northern Protestants would agree to any such deal involving their separation from British rule. When it was noted, somewhat bitterly, that British lives were lost as a result of his policy toward the defense ports, de Valera replied that many Irish lives were spared by the same act.46

This is not at all to intimate that the Irish had reneged on their promise to show the British a special consideration if it were the object of hostilities. From the Spring of 1941 to the end of World War II, there was an effective Irish combat force within the British army. A full 60,000 troops and 100,000 civilians volunteered to serve the British war effort.47 The Irish did not let themselves fall easy prey to the Germans either. The Irish army during the War grew to 40,000 regulars

45 Keatinge, A Singular Stance, p. 16.
46 Fisk, p. 256.
47 Keatinge, A Place Among Nations, p. 91.
and 100,000 reservists to meet the challenge.\textsuperscript{48}

In several ways, the Irish were not wholly neutral during the conflict. Besides the Irish volunteers in the British army, Ireland supplied coastal reconnaissance and weather reports to the US and Great Britain in order to aid convoy movements. The Pentagon even contemplated decorating Irish military leaders after the war for services rendered to the Allied cause.\textsuperscript{49} So Irish neutrality was not, in the strict sense, complete. But de Valera had avoided sending Irish troops to battle the Nazis under Irish colors. He also managed to avoid a declaration of war on Ireland by the Axis powers. Irish neutrality during World War II was peculiar, given the assistance rendered to the Allies by the Irish military, but symbolically it was wholly successful, because Ireland had demonstrated to its citizenry that it could opt for a policy differing from that of Great Britain.

The result of neutrality on the citizenry during the war was one of increased introspection, as Ireland sealed itself off from most of the conflict on the Continent. The war forced it to become more self-sufficient, economically and politically, which heightened the feeling among Irishmen that theirs was indeed a viable state. Support for neutrality became a nationalist cause and de Valera noted during the war that straying from neutrality would be political suicide. By the end of the war, de Valera's "successful neutrality" had become so accepted that it had taken

\textsuperscript{48} Keatinge, \textit{A Singular Stance}, p. 19.

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., p. 17.
on a dogmatic quality.\textsuperscript{50}

In examining the constraints placed on Irish foreign policy before and during the war, it becomes evident how de Valera was able to develop neutrality and use it to pursue Irish claims on sovereignty. We have noted that de Valera, as head of Fianna Fail, could not have survived politically if Ireland allied itself with Great Britain while the northern six counties remained beyond Dublin's domain, but Ireland's culture was intertwined with Great Britain's and adverse to Nazism.\textsuperscript{51} The Irish could be nothing but partial to the allied cause, which explains, partly, the phenomenon of Irish volunteers in the British army and the general benevolence shown to the Allies. Simply, Irishmen were closer to the British and Americans in their political history, belief, and values, than to the Nazis. And if the Irish policy of neutrality left them out of the fray, they would still assist the Allies in a way which would not compromise their neutrality.

The distribution of power was another factor which directed the Irish to aid the Allies. Ireland was situated geographically in a British and American sea. Had the Irish, for some insane reason, decided to exhibit a benevolent neutrality toward, or openly ally themselves with, the Axis powers, either the British or the Americans would have brought this, and Ireland's sovereign existence, to a hasty end.

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., p. 20.

\textsuperscript{51} Fisk, p. 370.
Likewise, the Irish need to preserve, and perhaps prove, that their sovereignty directed them to neutrality as the only feasible policy. For while coming in on the Axis side would have put this sovereignty in jeopardy, so would have openly siding with the British. De Valera felt that massive civil unrest would result if he chose the latter, and this was something a young state could ill afford, after the civil war of less than twenty years before.

Benevolent neutrality toward the Allies gave de Valera the means to unite the population, and aid those to whom the Irish felt bound, without sacrificing political capital or internal stability. British acceptance of Irish neutrality was the payoff for de Valera. It proved to an international audience that Ireland was an independent nation and that her larger neighbor accepted this independence in a time of great consequence, when overt Irish aid was most needed.

* * * *

The origins of Finnish neutrality are remarkably similar to those of Irish neutrality. The Finns, until the final days of World War I, had been a nation within a larger state. Sweden and Russia fought off and on for centuries to control what is now Finland. Under their rule, Finland existed as a semi-autonomous entity known as a Grand Duchy. And as a Grand Duchy, Finland was able at times to conduct a foreign policy separate from its imperial master. For example, the Finns were given special

---

52 Mazour, pp. 24-25.
consideration with regard to the amount of the population conscripted for armed service. Like the British in Ireland, the Russians ruling Finland from 1809-1917 were careful, at times, not to excite a population on which they did not have a firm grip.

Finland achieved independence on 6 December 1917 in an atmosphere of unrest and disorganization during the disintegration of the Russian empire. Nonetheless, the new Soviet state, which arose out of the ashes of the fallen Russia of Nicholas, was the first to recognize Finland's claim to sovereignty, on 1 January 1918. This is not surprising considering the early Bolshevik support for self-determination for peoples formally under the rule of the czar.

Finland's initial inclination was to avoid great power conflicts and adopt the foreign policy common to the nations of Scandinavia, which were neutral in varying degrees. However, a civil war and a territorial dispute with the USSR did much to unravel initial Finnish efforts at neutrality. On 28 January 1918 a civil war commenced, with considerable great power interference. The Bolsheviks aided the Finnish reds and the Germans aided the Finnish whites. By the Summer of 1918 the whites, under the command of Baron Mannerheim, had succeeded in their encirclement of red resistance in the major southern Finnish

54 Jakobson, p. 6.
55 Jakobson, p. 7.
The next step for the army under Mannerheim was to expel the remnants of German influence, which was already on the wane as a result of Germany's weakening position in World War I. This was accomplished by 1919, and on 17 June 1919 Finland convened its parliament and became a republic.  

Any hope the newly incorporated Finland had of survival depended on the Soviet Union. It naturally wished to keep out of great power conflicts, the results of which had kept her under Swedish and Russian domination for hundreds of years. A credible neutrality policy was therefore sought; but credibility takes time to achieve, and the declaration of neutrality made by the new republic in 1919 was regarded with skepticism in the Kremlin.

Not only had the victorious forces under Baron Mannerheim received assistance from the Germans, but the Finns had not renounced their claims to Soviet Karelia, the mythological birthplace of the earliest Finns. The Soviets had valid security reasons for retaining Karelia, because it formed Leningrad's suburbs. The impasse over Soviet Karelia, and the German influence in Finland from 1918-9, slowed Finnish rapprochement with the USSR during the 1920's.

The 1930's brought a change in Finno-Soviet relations as the
Soviets watched with concern the rise of facism in Germany and took steps to secure their borders. In 1932, the Finns signed a Non-Aggression Pact with the Soviets, and in 1935 reiterated their desire not to be included in great power conflict, a signal to the Germans and the Soviets that this time the nonviolability of Finnish soil should be respected.60

On 2 September 1939 the Finns issued another statement of neutrality after the Germans rolled into Poland, following their consolidation of Austria and Czechoslovakia.61 The Baltic states, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, quickly capitulated to Soviet security demands and the Finns were confronted with a similar demand on 5 October 1939.62 They rejected the Soviet offer of "protection" from Germany on the grounds that it violated Finnish neutrality and most assuredly would result in future Soviet domination. As a consequence, the Soviets claimed, on 26 November 1939, that the Finnish army had fired an artillery salvo into the USSR. On 28 November 1939, the Finnish leadership decided to hold fast to their previous rejection, which brought about further Soviet recriminations, some of which mentioned the possibility of voiding the 1932 Non-Aggression Pact. The next step brought a Soviet offensive, and on 30 November 1939 the Winter War was on.63

60 Jakobson, p. 7.
61 Mazour, p. 96.
62 Mazour, p. 98.
63 Mazour, pp. 109-110.
The Soviet rationale for the attack on Finland was the need to defend itself from the Germans. The Soviet demand for a defensive alliance, already accepted by the Baltic states, was rejected by Finland. Stalin countered with a scaled down offer that assured Leningrad's safety by the annexation of parts of eastern Finland. It also gave the Soviets military bases in Hanko, on the Gulf of Finland, and in the Arctic.64 Finnish envoy Juho Paasikivi, a member of the moderate Agrarian party, turned down the Soviet offer because it violated Finnish territorial integrity, and correspondingly neutrality. The Finnish Prime Minister, Risto Ryti, a Social Democrat, then directed the now Marshall Mannerheim to prepare Finland's defenses.

The Winter War lasted 100 days and ended in a cold and hard fought stalemate. Though the Finnish forces managed a draw, Ryti approached the Soviets for a cessation of hostilities. The Finns had not been supported by the rest of Scandinavia or the Allies, and as a result remained desperately short of war material and foodstuffs. Again, Paasikivi was called upon to do the negotiating, and on 7 March 1940 Ryti signed the peace treaty which leased the Hanko peninsula, and ceded part of eastern Finland around Leningrad, to the Soviet Union.65

The Winter War ended Finland's hopes of remaining out of World War II. Short of supplies and stinging from the concessions made to the Soviets in March, the Finnish government,

64 Jakobson, pp. 10-11.
now controlled almost wholly by the Social Democrats, responded positively to German overtures promising aid. On 12 September 1940, the Finnish leadership, headed by President Ryti and Social Democratic party chief Vaino Tanner, initialed a troop transport agreement with the Nazis.66

When the German offensive against the USSR began in earnest, the resupplied Finnish army, under the direction of Mannerheim, broke through the Soviet lines and regained all that they had lost. Mannerheim pressed further and managed to occupy most of Soviet Karelia, on Finland's eastern border. But Mannerheim and Ryti were not in league with the Nazis. The Finns were too suspicious of the German leadership to integrate Finnish forces into the Wehrmacht, and Ryti refused offers to join the Axis powers. The Finns described their collaboration with Germany as "co-belligerency," implying that the connection between the two was tenuous. The distinction made between co-belligerency and allying with the Nazis was not appreciated by the Kremlin, and Stalin was furious with the Finnish leadership.67

Nonetheless, Mannerheim refused to participate in the German siege of Leningrad or its attack on Murmansk.68 This benevolent gesture toward Allied convoy movements, and the Finnish contention that their war was one only of Finnish liberation, was undermined by their signature on the Nazi sponsored Anti-Comintern

66 Mazour, p. 136.
68 Jakobson, p. 18.
Pact of 25 November 1941.  

As World War II progressed and the German army began to disintegrate on the eastern front, the Finns still held onto a large chunk of territory which had not been considered Finnish before the war. However, realizing the futility of remaining at war with the Red Army for very much longer, President Mannerheim, the new Conservative Party leader of the republic, who had succeeded Ryti to the presidency in 1944, initiated peace talks with the Soviets through his new head of government, Prime Minister Paasikivi.

The Peace Treaty of 1944 between the USSR and Finland was facilitated to a large measure by Paasikivi's integrity. Paasikivi, the Finnish envoy in Moscow between hostilities, succeeded in establishing a personal working relationship with Stalin. When Paasikivi resigned in protest at his government's co-belligerency with the Nazis, his character was most dramatically exhibited to the Soviet leadership.

Paasikivi accepted Stalin's insistence that the Soviets had to protect Leningrad through a benevolent Finland. He took tangible action to dispel Soviet doubts about Finnish intentions and, using Finnish troops, drove the remaining 200,000 German troops from Finland into Norway.

---
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The 1944 Peace Treaty was not the end point of the Finno-Soviet conflict and another round of talks was started after the war. The 1946 Paris Peace Treaty between the USSR and Finland was negotiated without the input of the Allies, excepting a small show of leniency by the British, for none but the Soviets and the British had ever declared war on Finland, and only the Soviets had fired a shot. As a result, the Soviets negotiated a peace highly favorable to themselves which left Porkalla as a Soviet military base on Finnish soil in Soviet hands. In addition to the reduction in territory suffered by Finland, the Soviets exacted $300 million in reparations.

The end of the Second World War marked the first, and largely unsuccessful, attempt by Finland at neutrality. For a number of geo-political reasons, it is simple to understand why Finland's attempt to stay out of great power conflict, without sacrificing territorial integrity, was futile. Simply, its corner of Europe was claimed by both Germany and the Soviet Union, countries which had exhibited expansionist aims and a willingness to use their armies to achieve those aims. The distribution of power therefore adversely affected Finland. It was a corridor for German aggression in 1918 and again in 1941. The Soviets, renowned students of German military history, attempted to forestall the second German push through Finland during the
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20th century by initiating the Winter War, but surprisingly failed.

Finnish co-belligerency with the Germans was not dictated by the distribution of power but by Finnish concerns for the maintenance of their sovereignty. While the Finns did refuse Soviet expansion on their corner of the Baltic, they also refused German offers to integrate their army into the Wehrmacht. The German army and German supplies were a means to regain lost territory, but under no circumstances was Mannerheim willing to pay for this by accepting German domination. Finish belligerency in World War II was not expansionist but rather an attempt to regain ground lost as a result of the Winter War, and to liberate parts of the outlying Finnish speaking areas. Taken as a whole, Finland fought in WWII to re-establish state integrity.

Unlike the Irish, whose domestic political framework was solid in its support of neutrality, the Finns lacked coherent domestic support. The Finnish Social Democrats, under the direction of Ryti and Tanner, became scapegoats after the war for initiating co-belligerency with the Germans and thereby increasing Soviet suspicions that Finland could not be counted on as a benevolent neighbor. The Conservatives, or National Coalition, led by Mannerheim were a right of center party also willing to forego neutrality if it meant waging a war to liberate Finnish speaking people from Soviet domination. After the resolution of the conflict in 1946, the Soviets were suspicious of Tannerite Social Democrats and the Conservatives, due to their support
of the war against the USSR.

However, the Agrarian, or Central Party, came out of World War II with their integrity intact in Soviet eyes, and this was to be critically important in the re-establishment of credible Finnish claims to neutrality. The personality of Paasikivi, and the refusal of the rest of the Agrarian leadership to participate in the co-belligerency government rewarded them with a great deal of foreign policy influence. They were the only nationalist party in Finland with whom the Soviets wished to deal.

Both the Irish and the Finns wished to stay out of World War II and only the Irish were successful. One is inclined to ascribe this solely to Finland having been a buffer state between the Soviet Union and Germany. However, the Finns also lacked a coherent domestic political leadership committed to neutrality. By the end of the war, the Finns had found this political leadership in the Agrarian party, through its leader, President Paasikivi. While the acceptance of Irish neutrality by the British was a factor in establishing the credibility of Irish neutrality in international eyes, Paasikivi's integrity and Finnish fighting valour served the same purpose by gaining Soviet recognition of Finnish sovereignty and neutrality after the war.
Formally, hostilities between Finland and the USSR were brought to a close by the Paris Peace Treaty, negotiated in 1946 and signed in 1947. As is the case in most treaties ending open warfare, the winner was able to extract some harsh concessions from the vanquished. But although the Finns were saddled with a Soviet military presence in Porkalla, a loss of 12% in territory, and $300 million in reparations, the Treaty also contained a provision which prohibited the Finns from joining alliances. This attempt to neutralize Finland gave President Paasikivi a badly needed bulkhead to staunch the onrushing East-West conflict over the reformation of Eastern and Central Europe.

Paasikivi took positive steps to realize Finland's aspiration for neutrality by mollifying the Soviets at every turn, for it was they who presented Finland with its greatest threat. Paasikivi directed Finnish courts to sentence Social Democratic collaborators, such as Tanner and Ryti, to confinement in Finnish prisons, which convinced the Soviet leadership that the Finns were serious about rapprochement with their great
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neighbor.\textsuperscript{77} In addition, the cleansing of Tannerite influence, or "war criminals," from the Social Democratic party removed the possibility of Nazi collaborators participating in the immediate post-war Finnish government.

The Finns also took care not to provoke Soviet anxiety by not moving to integrate themselves with the reconstruction of much of Western Europe. In 1947 Paasikivi was invited to take part in the Marshall Aid program, initiated by George Marshall to ensure the economic remobilization of Europe. Much to Soviet delight, and at the cost of economic hardship to the Finnish population, Paasikivi rejected Marshall Aid in order to stay out of great power conflict.\textsuperscript{78}

Paasikivi also refused to let the Soviet base in Porkalla, the reduction in territory, and the reparation payments become a point of contention in Finland's relations with the Soviets. There existed little internal dissatisfaction with Soviet behavior in Porkalla, and the reparation cheques arrived in Moscow on schedule.\textsuperscript{79} By accepting the terms of the Treaty, while refusing Marshall Aid and punishing the Finnish Nazi collaborators, Paasikivi was able, in a remarkably short time, to evoke trust among the Kremlin leadership.

Paasikivi was able to make these tangible gestures towards the Soviet Union immediately after the war by maintaining a
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consensus in his government on achieving good relations with the Soviets. The governments from 1945-8 were coalitions formed between the Agrarian, or Central Party, the SKDL, or Communist Party, and those Social Democrats not tainted by German collaboration.\textsuperscript{80} Both the Agrarians and the Communists were committed to Soviet accommodation. The Social Democrats and the Agrarians were committed to maintaining Finland's free market economic organization and a liberal democratic political structure. Thus, the Soviet Union's security needs were accommodated without changing Finland's political or economic organization; an anomaly in Eastern and Central Europe that the USSR accepted.

Demonstrating, rhetorically, his concern for Soviet security interests, Paasikivi stated in 1947, "If anyone tries to attack the Soviet Union through our territory we shall together with the Soviet Union fight against the aggressor as hard and for as long as we can."\textsuperscript{81} The Soviets wanted an assurance in writing, however, as they had already obtained from Hungary and Romania. On 23 February 1948, therefore the day of the Communist takeover in Prague, Paasikivi was informed by the Soviet envoy that he should come to Moscow to negotiate a mutual defense treaty.\textsuperscript{82}

With this request, the Soviets tested the resolve of the Finns to maintain their sovereignty within a liberal democratic system while nations to the south of Finland were capitulating to
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Soviet demands. Paasikivi asked for enough time to meet with the Finnish parliamentary leadership, and he attempted to include the widest possible spectrum of political beliefs on his negotiating team. He was, of course, under pressure to negotiate a treaty with the Soviets that would prove satisfactory to the USSR while retaining Finnish prerogatives in foreign policy. He also had to sell the treaty to the Finnish parliament, which was not entirely predisposed to meet Soviet demands, which called for the security of Leningrad and the Northwestern USSR.83

The result of the negotiating process was the 1948 Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance (FCMA), which was ratified by the Finnish parliament on 28 April 1948. It was to last for ten years.84 The Treaty, as outlined in the introduction of this paper, provided the Soviet Union with security from aggression through Finnish territory. It provided for consultations if a threat of aggression was perceived, and acknowledged the Finnish claim to neutrality. It made no reference to the reorganization, on Soviet lines, of the political or economic structures of Finland. The FCMA set down on paper what Paasikivi was already committed to in relations with the Soviets. It came to be known as the Paasikivi, or Paasikivi-Kekkonen line.85 Kekkonen was to succeed Paasikivi as President.

The Paasikivi-Kekkonen line was tested that very year, 1948.

---
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Distaste for the Finnish Communist Party was growing in the electorate, fomented by Social Democratic accusations that the Minister of Interior, the Communist Yrjo Leino, had deported Finnish Social Democrats to the Soviet Union in 1948 to serve the remainder of their prison terms for Nazi collaboration. In addition to this charge, it was widely rumored that the Communists, who favored extremely close links with the Soviets, were planning a coup d'etat to effect this end. While none of the accusations could be substantiated, they were sufficient to cast doubts on the patriotic resolve of the Communist Party and brought the Social Democrats, under the leadership of Karl Fagerholm, to victory in the parliamentary elections.

The 1948 Fagerholm government proved to be shortlived, mainly because of Agrarian distrust and Soviet displeasure. However, the 1948 political gambit by the Social Democrats did accomplish two things of relatively long-lasting duration. They and the Communists remained enemies until the mid 1960's, and the Soviets were convinced of the complete unreliability of Social Democratic led governments in Finland.

The 1950's brought into focus the impending retirement of Paasikivi, who announced he would not seek reelection in 1956. As the Social Democratic collaborators, Ryti and Tanner, were released, having done their penance, it was speculated that
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Tanner, in particular, might head the Social Democratic campaign for the presidency. The Soviet Union watched these events unfold, and some particularly livid articles in Izvestia warned Tanner and Ryti to stay out of the race.\(^8^9\) It was becoming clear that a corollary of the Paasikivi-Kekkonen line was that, in order to satisfy Soviet security needs, the Soviets had to be able to trust the Finnish leadership. Therefore, Tanner and Ryti had to be excluded from Finnish politics if relations with the Soviets were to remain cordial, a price the Social Democrats were not yet ready to pay.

As the 1955 presidential election drew near, Paasikivi and the Agrarian presidential candidate, Prime Minister Urho Kekkonen, were invited to Moscow two years ahead of schedule to renegotiate the FCMA.\(^9^0\) Soviet Premier Nickolai Bulganin informed the Finns that, although the base in Porkalla was leased to the Soviet Union for fifty years under the terms of the Paris Peace Treaty, and contributed to the defense of Leningrad by securing the Gulf of Finland, the Soviets would return it to Finnish control by 1956.\(^9^1\)

The Soviets were evincing their trust in Finnish intentions. They were aware that the Finns knew that Leningrad's defense and Finland's integrity were inexorably intertwined. But the Soviets might also have had an ulterior motive for pulling out of
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Porkalla early. The 1956 Finnish presidential election was apparently going to be decided at the eleventh hour, and the Soviets were willing to convert the return of Porkalla into political capital for the Agrarian candidate, Kekkonen.

Partly because of his participation in the negotiations which removed the last territorial barrier to Finnish neutrality, Kekkonen was inaugurated President in 1956. His victory was an important event in retaining good relations with the USSR. The election had been extremely close and was decided by only one vote out of three hundred in the Finnish electoral college.

Kekkonen's opponent, Social Democrat Karl Fagerholm, was clearly distrusted by the Soviets, but by espousing the foreign policy line of his predecessor and emphasizing his own role in the return of Porkalla, Kekkonen won both the trust of the Kremlin and the election. However, the opposition of the largest party, the Social Democrats, evident in the closeness of the electoral college results, suggested that a working consensus for the Paasikivi-Kekkonen line was precarious. This raised the possibility of future confrontations with the USSR which could bring Finnish sovereignty into question.

The credibility of Finnish neutrality had to be established in the West as well as in the East. It was thought by some in the West that Finland was little more than a Soviet puppet. Although the Paasikivi-Kekkonen line gave a preponderant role to gestures designed to curry Soviet favor, the Finns did stop short
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of being drawn behind the Iron Curtain. In 1955, they refused to
join the Warsaw Pact, discouraging Soviet consolidation
attempts.\textsuperscript{93} They felt able to say no to the Soviet invitation
because they had attempted to demilitarize Scandinavia. In 1952,
Prime Minister Kekkonen advanced the idea of a pan-Scandinavian
neutrality. It failed because NATO members Iceland, Norway, and
Denmark refused to participate.\textsuperscript{94} However, in a gesture to the
Finns, German forces were kept out of NATO exercises in
Scandinavia to avoid fueling the Soviet paranoia.\textsuperscript{95}

1955 was the year Finland joined the United Nations where it
proceeded to pursue an activist course in promoting the United
Nations' mediatory role in hostilities.\textsuperscript{96} The Finns were also
careful not to let their activism in the United Nations bring
them into conflict with Soviet imperialism. For instance, al­
though the Finns participated in the 1956 Sinai Peacekeeping
Force, and condemned Britain, France, and Israel, for their role
in the 1956 Middle East War, they did not protest the Soviet
Union's violent repression of Hungarian nationalists, which coin­
cided with the Suez crisis.\textsuperscript{97}

By 1957 the Soviets, having vacated Porkalla a year earlier,
proclaimed a new interpretation of the FCMA. They now considered
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the agreement foremost as a guarantee of Finnish neutrality, and
only secondarily as a representation of Soviet Security
interests.98 Unfortunately, 1957 also marked the comeback of
Vaino Tanner as he resumed his post as chairman of the Social
Democratic Party. Again, relations between the two nations
cooled because Tanner's political reemergence was coupled with a
Social Democratic victory in the parliamentary elections, which
once again gave the premiership to Karl Fagerholm.99

The Fagerholm government provoked a crisis in Finland known
as the "Nightfrost."100 Soviet displeasure with the reascendent
Social Democrats was not lost on President Kekkonen, who under­
stood that the Paasikivi-Kekkonen line depended in large part on
who occupied the major cabinet posts.

In order to maintain his credibility with the Soviet Union,
which rested largely on his own relationship with Moscow's
leadership, Kekkonen could not allow the Agrarians to remain in a
coalition headed by Tannerite Social Democrats which included the
Conservatives.101 This provoked a loss of confidence in the
Finnish parliament and the fall of the Fagerholm government,
which brought in a Center-Left coalition. The new government
included the Social Democrats, minus Fagerholm and the
Tannerites, and gave the premiership back to the Agrarians.
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This arrangement was not threatened until 1961.

1961 signalled the start of another campaign for the presidency. Olavi Honka, a former jurist, was supported by the Social Democrats and the Conservatives in a run against Kekkonen. However, his campaign was unsuccessful because a complex series of events, perhaps orchestrated by the Soviets, gave Kekkonen an outstanding foreign policy victory, and enough political clout to win reelection.

The Berlin Wall crisis of August 1961, and the end of disarmament talks between the Americans and the Soviets, had renewed East-West tensions. With Superpower relations clearly on the wane, Kekkonen was again requested to journey eastward for consultations on the FCMA. The invitation was delivered on 30 October 1961, the day the Soviet Union exploded a fifty megaton weapon, an ominous coincidence.

Kekkonen was not in Helsinki to receive Kruschev's request. Instead, he was in Hawaii, relaxing after a summit with President Kennedy at which he had received assurances from the president that Finland's special neutrality was understood in Washington. Kekkonen did not immediately respond to the Soviet threat. He sent his foreign minister to the Kremlin in order to buy himself some time and prevent any rash actions by the USSR.
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Facing a tight race for reelection, Kekkonen could not simultaneously enter negotiations with the Soviet Union and hope to allay Soviet fear about Finnish credibility. To the Soviet Union, credibility in Finland rested upon Kekkonen's shoulders. Unless Kekkonen could convince the Soviets that he would remain president, his negotiating position would weaken correspondingly. He therefore dissolved parliament and called for early elections. This move forced the Conservatives and the Social Democrats to break with solidarity in order to win seats in the parliament. It also meant that the Social Democratic and Conservative alliance in support of Olavi Honka, known as the Honka Front, was thrown into disarray, for the Social Democrats and Conservatives could hardly contest each other over parliamentary seats and hope to reconcile their differences for a common presidential candidate. As a result, the Honka Front split apart and Honka withdrew from the campaign, assuring Kekkonen's reelection. 105

Only then, on 18 November 1961, did Kekkonen present himself to Kruschev in Novosibirsk, Siberia, where he convinced the General Secretary that the USSR had nothing to gain by invoking the defense clause of the FCMA. Kekkonen argued that the crisis in East-West relations was past. By militarizing Finland with the Red Army, Kekkonen argued, Kruschev would provoke counter measures by the NATO countries in Scandinavia and considerable anti-Soviet propaganda would result. Instead, Kekkonen suggested, with his reelection assured and Finno-Soviet relations
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put on firm ground for six more years, the General Secretary should rescind his proposal, and reaffirm his trust in the Kekkonen leadership and Finland's desire to remain out of great power competition.106

Kekkonen's trip to Siberia established an important precedent in the interpretation of the FCMA. For it to be invoked, both parties had to recognize aggression. In this case, the Finns clearly had not. The Finns established the right to say no if perceived aggression was simply a Soviet fabrication because in 1961 NATO was not about to roll through Finland en route to Leningrad. Kekkonen's victory at Novosibirsk also sealed his reelection for it established, without a doubt, his personal importance to Finland's international credibility. As Kruschev bluntly put it, "Whoever is for Kekkonen is for friendship with the Soviet Union and whoever is against Kekkonen is against friendship with the Soviet Union."107

In 1952 Kekkonen advocated a nuclear free and neutral Scandinavia while concurrently applying for membership in the Nordic Council, which he achieved in 1955.108 Again, in 1963, Kekkonen called for Scandinavia to become nuclear free and for its NATO members to opt for neutrality. Its aim was to reduce the strategic importance of the North, and this was partly accomplished in 1964 with the removal of nuclear weapons from
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Scandinavian soil by the NATO countries. In 1965 he attempted to demilitarize Lapland, where the Warsaw Pact forces stand toe to toe with NATO on the Norwegian-Soviet border. In the United Nations the Finns advocated an active mediatory role but stayed clear of criticism of the USSR whenever possible. They participated heavily in peacekeeping ventures in order to establish their role as mediators and promoters of stability. In all, over 15,000 Finnish troops have served in such widely divergent locals as the Congo, Cyprus, Laos, the Golan Heights, and the Sinai.

Complimenting Finland's high profile abroad as an active mediator, acceptable to both East and West, was a gradual change in the leadership profile of the Social Democrats. Fagerholm, Tanner, and Ryti had retired, and by 1965 the Soviets announced to Kekkonen that a Social Democrat led government was no longer threatening to them. The 1966 Social Democratic victory was even applauded by Premier Kosygin, and he communicated to the Social Democrats that the government of Social Democrat Paasio had his complete trust. This, of course, was due to the support given the Social Democrats by the Agrarians and the Communists, as well as the absence of Tannerites in the rejuvenated Social
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Democratic leadership.\footnote{113}{Vloyantes, p. 136.}

By the late 1960's detente was starting to accelerate, and the Finns played an active part, hosting the opening round of Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) in 1969.\footnote{114}{Vloyantes, p. 152.} In 1972 the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) opened in Helsinki, with the Finns taking part as one of the neutral and nonaligned (NNA) countries, further solidifying recognition of the Finnish neutral role. The Helsinki Final Act, signed at the conclusion of the CSCE, was a highwater mark in detente, with the host Finns actively involved throughout.\footnote{115}{Faloon, p. 8.}

Coinciding with the emergence of Finnish neutrality was Finland's attempt to integrate itself into the Western European economic prosperity without sacrificing its trade relationship with the USSR. On 27 March 1961, President Kekkonen negotiated an agreement with the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) that offered Finland the opportunity to enjoy the economic benefits of the free trade area without actually joining the organization. In addition, the Finns could continue their Most Favoured Nation treaty with the Soviets without endangering their new found EFTA affiliation.\footnote{116}{Jakobson, p. 61.}

In December 1967 the Finns joined the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the successor of the
Organization for European Economic Cooperation, and was a signatory of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) as well.\textsuperscript{117} To balance Finland's growing involvement with Western economic organizations, Kekkonen reassured the Soviets by signing a twenty year extension of the FCMA in 1970, and in 1971 initiating a bilateral trade agreement with the Soviet sponsored Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.\textsuperscript{118} After Kekkonen strengthened his formal economic ties with the East, he was ready to attempt a separate agreement with the European Economic Community. This move was especially important to Finland because of Britain's recent entry. Within the EFTA, Great Britain had been one of Finland's largest trading partners, due to British use of Finnish timber products. Finland's negotiations with the Community took place at the end of another presidential term, and the combination of Kekkonen possibly leaving the presidency and further Finnish integration with the West worried the Soviets. Once again, the unique relationship between Kekkonen and the Kremlin proved to be the deciding factor. Kekkonen was reelected with almost complete unanimity and Finland was able to conclude an external association agreement with the Community in 1974.\textsuperscript{119} Though Finland was not a member of the Community, its products would not be barred from the Community's free trade area, and its relationship with the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance
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would not jeopardize its Western European contacts.

    By the end of this time period, it had become highly advan-
    tageous, politically, for Finland to support a policy of neu-
    trality which accommodated the security interests of the Soviet
    Union through the consistent application of the Paasikivi-
    Kekkonen line. Finland's mainstream politicians all advocated
    neutrality, but as Fagerholm found out twice, it was possible to
    subscribe to an interpretation of neutrality which failed to give
    sufficient notice of the interest of the Soviet Union in the
    Finnish election results. If a man won an election in Finland,
    who had previously supported a cause detrimental to the Soviet
    Union, like Nazi collaboration, his chances of staying in office
    were nil. And it was only after the Social Democratic Party
    jettisoned the remnants of Tannerite influence that it had the
    chance to form a stable government.

    The premium placed on holding onto governmental power
    eventually convinced three of the four major political parties,
    the Agrarians, Communists, and Social Democrats, that a benevo-
    lent neutrality, supported by the force of Kekkonen's person-
    ality, could both satisfy the Soviet Union and put them into
    office. Only the Conservatives failed to come to this realiza-
    tion, and as a result, were largely ostracized in the process of
    coalition negotiations.

    The domestic political framework of Finland, as in most of
    Scandinavia, favored a preponderant role for the Social
Democrats. Although the Social Democrats, were for much of the the post-War era, the largest political party, they were kept from fully exercising their numerical advantage because they did not reconcile the Paasikivi-Kekkonen line with the Tannerite leadership. As a result, neutrality did not always provide stability for Finland, which went through the crises of two aborted Fagerholm governments, in 1948 and 1958, and the Honka Front-FCMA note crisis of 1961.

The need to maintain the integrity of Finland from assimilation by the Soviet Union was another factor in the development of Finnish neutrality. One of the hallmarks of the Paasikivi-Kekkonen line was the importance of personal relationships between the Soviet and Finnish leadership. Thus, in 1961 Finnish sovereignty was certainly enhanced, if not saved, by Kruschev's trust in Kekkonen. Neutrality, as exercised by Paasikivi and Kekkonen, was not a drab policy, and they understood that the Soviets wanted more than bureaucratic inertia committed to a course of perpetual neutrality. The Soviets wanted to see neutrality personalized and, as long as Paasikivi and Kekkonen held the presidency, the Soviets had their wish. The credibility of Finnish neutrality was used to preserve Finnish sovereignty, but the credibility of Finnish neutrality was preserved by Kekkonen and Paasikivi.

Finally, and quite obviously, the distribution of power in post-War Europe placed Finland within the USSR's sphere of influence. So if the Finns wished to maintain their chosen
political and economic structures, both inimicable to Soviet communism, they had to allay Soviet security concerns. Neutrality became a tool with which to demilitarize their part of the North, and Finland convinced its fellow Scandinavians to tread with care. German soldiers were therefore kept out of maneuvers in Scandinavia, and both Denmark and Norway became nuclear free NATO states. Finnish neutrality was aimed at removing Finland as a strategic point of contention. If this could be accomplished, the USSR would have no need to exert its power, or to absorb Finland as it had Poland, Romania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. However, though distribution of power constrained the Finns to accommodate Soviet security interests, the maintenance of Finnish integration with the West, in the Nordic Council, with the Community, with the EFTA, and in the United Nations, allowed the Finns a chance to present their neutrality to the realities of the distribution of power. It was illustrated in the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, a culmination of negotiations synonymous with the promotion of dialogue between the great power blocs.

* * * * *

Having demonstrated its sovereignty in the successful neutrality by de Valera and Fianna Fail, Ireland changed governments in 1948 and Taoiseach John A. Costello, with a Fine Gael coalition which included Labour and Clann na Poblachta members, assumed control. It was under Costello that the remaining ties to Great Britain were undone, and Ireland became a republic in
1949, after having repealed the External Relations Act in 1948, formally disassociating Ireland from the Commonwealth.\textsuperscript{120}

Though Ireland was now unfettered by any formal links to the Commonwealth, it did not shy away from the foreign policy precedent set by de Valera. Neutrality had acquired enormous popularity as a symbol under which the Irish in the south had united and proved their sovereignty.\textsuperscript{121}

In 1949 Ireland was invited to join NATO and refused in order to reassert its predilection for military neutrality. Neither Costello nor his coalition partners felt they had the political capital necessary for the abdication of neutrality. The Minister for External Affairs, Sean MacBride, personally supported joining the Atlantic Alliance but felt he could not bring his party along with him.\textsuperscript{122} MacBride was a member of Clann na Poblachta, a party committed to the republican cause of reunification. It also had a domestic political agenda which would be harmed if money was diverted to the defense spending made necessary by the obligations of a defensive alliance.\textsuperscript{123} Therefore, MacBride publicly said, "Any military alliance with or commitment involving a military alliance with the state that is responsible for the unnatural division of Ireland would be
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entirely repugnant and unacceptable to the Irish people."\textsuperscript{124}

Privately, the Irish leadership appeared ready to initiate some form of defense cooperation with the West, though this would mean a corresponding loss of autonomy in the conduct of Irish foreign policy. Noting that NATO membership was politically untouchable, MacBride suggested to President Truman that the US and Ireland should consummate a bilateral defense agreement. But the Americans had lost interest in Irish defense cooperation and MacBride's proposal was ignored.\textsuperscript{125}

In 1955, Liam Cosgrave, the Minister for External Affairs in another Fine Gael coalition, suggested that the Irish were committed to fighting the spread of communism, though not formally a part of NATO.\textsuperscript{126} This suggestion, along with MacBride's private attitude toward NATO and de Valera's assertion of a special consideration to be shown for Britain's security, seemed to validate a US National Security Council report issued in 1955. This claimed that Ireland could be expected to show the West considerable sympathy in an East-West conflict, notwithstanding the Irish claim to neutrality.\textsuperscript{127}

1955 also marked Irish entry into the United Nations. The Soviet Union dropped its objection to Irish membership, as a Western vote, when a package deal between the Soviets and the
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West was worked out. Most importantly for the Irish was their chance to demonstrate to an international audience what was meant by their neutrality. The Irish policy of voting on General Assembly resolutions on their merits, divorcing considerations of East vs. West from the decision process, was initiated by Cosgrave and developed more thoroughly by his successor, Frank Aiken.128

Frank Aiken succeeded Cosgrave as Minister for External Affairs in 1957, when Fianna Fail once again was able to form the government. Aiken advocated a middle power role for Ireland. For example, the Irish supported the right of self-determination in developing countries, a goal the Irish themselves had not long since attained. The Irish also believed in regional rather than East-West solutions to conflicts in developing areas like the Congo, the Middle East and Indochina. By fulfilling a mediatery role as peacekeeper within United Nations contingents, and using the United Nations as a forum to promote general disarmament, the Irish were able to promote stability while establishing their neutral credentials to a larger audience.

The Irish support for the Peoples Republic of China as the legitimate representative of China in the United Nations was balanced by the fact that the Irish voted with the US 75% of the

The Irish were committed to judging issues on their merits, for example Chinese representation and disarmament, and this separated them from their Western neighbor's views which were more polarized in an East vs West fashion due to the Cold War. The Irish castigated the Soviet repression of Hungary in 1956 and the concurrent Suez Canal intervention by Britain, France and Israel. By taking the moral high ground, deploping the use of violence, and promoting a vision of international justice based on self-determination and stability, the Irish carved out a niche in the United Nations which promoted their own interest, as a small neutral state, in staying out of conflict. An example of this was Aiken's sponsorship of a nuclear non-proliferation treaty in the United Nations during 1958.130

The next watershed in the formulation and practice of Irish neutrality was the 1961 decision by Taoiseach Sean Lemass to seek European Economic Community membership.131 Lemass was convinced that, economically, Ireland had to remain integrated with the West. At one time, he had been prepared to compromise Irish neutrality for that end, as he argued in a 1959 Oxford Union


Lemass said affiliation with NATO would be an acceptable prerequisite to Community membership if it could be secured in no other way.133

At this point, in the early 1960's, Lemass seemed to regard Ireland's economic future as more important than Irish neutrality, unlike Aiken and de Valera, men from his own party. Furthermore, Lemass also appeared to be moving away from the United Nations as Ireland's primary forum.

Lemass oriented Irish neutrality toward possible Community membership and put more emphasis on European cooperation. Neither de Valera's hope for a neutralized Ireland nor Aiken's quest for a more fundamental and complete neutrality based on the Swedish model, would be reconciled with Lemass' pragmatic outlook for the economic health of the state.134

Throughout the 1960's, the Irish government continued to press for Community membership, while using as bait the prospect of some movement away from neutrality. But for all their rhetoric, the behavior of the Irish in the United Nations changed very little. Their voting record still suggested concern for self-determination and they continued to contribute heavily to United Nations peacekeeping ventures.
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In 1972 a referendum in Ireland on Community membership was won, but although the new Irish Taoiseach, Jack Lynch, and his Foreign Minister, Patrick Hillery, had hinted at the possibility of trading a change in defense policy for admission to the Community, this did not happen and neutrality escaped unscathed.\textsuperscript{135} The Hague Summit of 1973 paved the way for Irish admission into the Community. In that year the new Foreign Minister, Garret FitzGerald, stressed the continued likelihood of an independent Irish foreign policy; its affiliation with the Community notwithstanding. Due to Ireland's historical experience and the Irish predilection for avoiding great power conflicts, its foreign policy would not be altered by Community membership, and Irish neutrality would continue.\textsuperscript{136}

FitzGerald expressed a personal distaste for the politics of NATO and publicly emphasized the advantageous role Ireland could play by differentiating Community policy from that of NATO. In his view, Ireland could lend the Community a civilian image.\textsuperscript{137} He noted that neither the Treaty of Rome nor Paris, the main Community covenants, required a military commitment, and he fought those who argued within the Community for further defense commitments.\textsuperscript{138} The Irish asserted that defense obligations concomitant to Community membership were inappropriate. And if
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defense obligations were to be accepted in the future, it would be as a consequence of political cooperation between member states, not as a prerequisite to further integration.\textsuperscript{139}

Ireland did much to alleviate Community concern over its non-participation in NATO when it participated in the CSCE as a Community member and not as one of the Neutral and Non-Aligned states. It joined the other eight Community members at the time in their support of detente and stability within the CSCE structure.\textsuperscript{140} One byproduct of the CSCE which served to further Irish interests was the artificial distinction made between security and defense. By security was meant the maintenance of economic survival, internal freedom, and the lowering of tensions and management of conflicts. By defense was meant dimensions of military defense such as the coordination of strategic and tactical planning, arms manufacture and sale, and the command and movement of troops.\textsuperscript{141} This distinction, though some have argued security is a seamless whole which includes military dimensions, gave the Irish enough room to participate in common measures adopted by the Community which furthered the interests of security but could not be classified as purely defense issues which might degenerate into the East vs. West competition the Irish had spent thirty years trying to avoid. An example of Irish cooperation on security rather than defense within the
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community was their acceptance of Community funded ships to patrol boundaries, ostensibly a non-defense initiative meant to protect Ireland's fisheries.

In 1975 Garret FitzGerald assumed the Presidency of the European Council of Ministers and was given a chance to put into practice his earlier assertions concerning Ireland's natural sympathy for developing peoples, a product of its historical experience, and the dimension which Irish membership gave to the Community in its projection of a civilian entity apart from NATO.142

Ireland had not altered its United Nations voting pattern as a result of Community membership, and combined with the Belgians, Dutch and Danes, it presented a progressive voice in both the United Nations and the Community. They had refused to participate in an earlier Community sponsored force in the Sinai on the grounds the United Nations was the proper organization to act as a mediator because it was not controlled by any one power bloc consistently, and had established a solid peacekeeping record in Africa, Asia, Europe, and the Middle East. Ireland's neutrality also enabled it to supply peacekeeping forces in both Cyprus and the Sinai, conflicts which had provoked considerable disunity among NATO members.143 In fact, the Irish supplied so many peacekeeping troops to the Sinai that some had to be called home after a rash of bombings in Monaghan and Dublin required their

presence in Ireland.\textsuperscript{144}

FitzGerald, during his term as the President of the European Council of Ministers, from January to June of 1975, successfully negotiated the Euro-African dialogue at Lome, the talks being facilitated, according to some, by Ireland's neutrality, its advocacy of development in the Third World, and its history as part of the British empire. It was also FitzGerald who was called upon to negotiate with the post-revolutionary leaders of Portugal in that same year, again because of Ireland's neutral stance.\textsuperscript{145}

Ireland also took tentative steps in the early 1970's to improve its relationships with communist Europe, which had been distant due, in large part, to the Irish Catholic antipathy to communism in general.\textsuperscript{146} There were no diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union until 1973. Since 1946, when the Soviets vetoed Ireland's admission to the United Nations, relations between the Soviet Union and Ireland were rudimentary at best. They did not interact culturally, politically, economically, militarily, or otherwise to any great degree, if at all. With the gradual reorientation of Irish policy toward the European theatre and Community membership, the Irish interest in contact with the East also began to grow.
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In the early seventies, Patrick Hillery, the Foreign Minister, demonstrated an ability to separate such issues as trade and commerce from Ireland's natural concern for freedom and self-determination in Eastern Europe, and the general antics of Soviet imperialism which had strained relations between the countries.\textsuperscript{147} In 1973, Garret FitzGerald completed Hillery's initiative and opened full diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Ireland. The carrot of potentially vast markets for Irish goods gave him the strength to overcome domestic opposition to establishing relations with the USSR. He successfully extended the policy of Lemass and Lynch, which gave economic benefits an equal weight with moral considerations in Irish foreign policy.\textsuperscript{148}

Unlike the Finnish party spectrum, which had only belatedly come to accept the Paasikivi-Kekkonen line of neutrality, there was a relative consensus among Irish politicians, that personal feelings aside, military neutrality had to be maintained. As such, governments were not made or unmade on the issue of neutrality. The policy had enormous symbolic value as a unifying force and a manifestation of Irish independence.

Only by the 1960s, with the advent of an economic, and therefore European, orientation in Irish foreign policy, did neutrality seem threatened by Community membership, which
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demanded some political solidarity on the part of member states. But, as the Finns would not abandon their commitment to free enterprise and an open form of government because of the FCMA, neither would Ireland sacrifice its concern for distributive justice and self-determination, which was a manifestation of Ireland's sovereignty and was made practical by neutrality, because of Community membership.

Irish peacekeeping contributions in the United Nations, like the Finnish response, were attempts to assert their state sovereignty and gain wider acceptance for their neutrality. Also, the Irish were able to assert their independence through their voting record, which was labeled "progressive" and not clearly aligned to either of the major power blocs. This contrasted with the Finnish voting pattern in the United Nations in which the Finns quite glaringly refrained from criticising the USSR's forays into Hungary and Czechoslovakia. The Finns could assert their independence through United Nations mediatory efforts, but would endanger their autonomy by criticising Soviet repression.

The distribution of power mattered less in constraining Irish foreign policy in the post-War period than it did during the conflict. Great Britain fell in political and military stature and was no longer a Superpower as it had been. Though British military power was not likely to be exercised as a threat to Ireland, the British economy was the lifeblood of the Irish economy and, if they so chose, the British could exert
considerable economic power upon the Irish. Thus it was essential for the Irish to follow the British into the Community, lest they be economically crippled. Just the opposite occurred in Finland. Their economy could have been integrated wholly into the West, but a move in that direction would have brought a Soviet response. The Soviets, unlike the British, had shown a willingness to use force in repressing neighboring countries during the post-War era and the Finns did not want to be in that number. The decision by the Finnish government to seek concurrent agreement with the communist states when they sought Community affiliation was purely obeisance to Soviet power.

The distribution of power constrained the Irish economically. Unlike Sweden they could not practice both an economic neutrality and a military neutrality. The Finns simply had no choice but to develop their economy to the point that economic parity in their relations with East and West was observed. While the activism of the Irish was not constrained by concerns of Western power, the Finns were constrained by the presence of Soviet power and they tempered their neutral stance to this fact.
Chapter 3
"The Current Challenge"

In 1976 Leo Tindemans, the Belgian foreign minister, issued a report which suggested that steps toward the formation of an eventual European Union ought to include issues of defense.\textsuperscript{149} This was one of the first papers within a Community context which seemed to threaten Irish neutrality, if only theoretically at the moment, because European Union remains a pipedream. The Irish response to Tindeman's proposal was negative. Ireland's stance was that further European integration must precede defense cooperation, and part of the integration process must be the lessening of the disparity in wealth among Community members. Even were rough economic parity to occur among Community members, an Irish commitment on defense would still be judged on its merits, with no guarantee of a positive response.\textsuperscript{150}

Of course, Ireland would not seem strategically important to Community defense. NATO has bases to the north of Ireland in Greenland and Norway, and to the south in the Portuguese Azores, which would render Ireland redundant as a link to the US.\textsuperscript{151} Though the airports of Shannon and Dublin could prove useful, the Continent has bigger and better facilities that would be more proximate to a conflict, should one occur.

In 1981 the spectre of defense commitments within the Community was again raised by the Genscher-Colombo report, the
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product of the German and Italian foreign ministers.\textsuperscript{152} Genscher-Colombo was regarded with suspicion in Ireland because it suggested that future European integration ought to include defense cooperation. This raised the question of a neutral's place in a future Community modified by Genscher-Colombo.

A response to Genscher-Colombo was produced on 13 May 1981 during a meeting of the Council of Ministers. The President of the Council, British Foreign Secretary Carrington, in a personal statement, stressed that neither the London Report nor the Genscher-Colombo proposal were meant to embarrass the Irish. Instead, the two reports were meant to emphasize a flexible and pragmatic approach to common security issues confronting Community members.\textsuperscript{153}

Beyond the theoretical consequences the two proposals might have to Ireland and the practice of its foreign policy, it was evident that the Irish were not constrained in their positions on contentious international issues by the need for a European consensus, nor were they being pressured to conform. They criticized the Camp David Accord, for example, which was widely applauded in the rest of the Community, because it failed to resolve the Palestinian homeland question or include the rest of the Arab world.\textsuperscript{154} They called for an end to apartheid before the rest of the Community, and pressed for sanctions against
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South Africa and Namibia. This initiative was vetoed by both Britain and France in the UN Security Council.\textsuperscript{155}

European integration or no, the Irish still adhered to their policy of judging each case on its merits, which might or might not bring it into line with the more powerful members of the Community. For example, they condemned the Soviet Union for its actions in Afghanistan in 1980, and condemned the criminal action of hostage-taking in the US Embassy in Tehran. In all these cases, the overriding Irish concern was for self-determination and justice.\textsuperscript{156} Irish neutrality certainly did not seem threatened by Ireland's membership in the Community, judging from its response to current issues. And talk of further European integration did not interfere with Irish neutrality, if one can judge by the practice of Irish foreign policy.

Ireland's performance in international relations did not raise doubts about its commitment to neutrality and it was clear that, in the domestic political arena, neutrality was again a prized mantle. In 1980, Taoiseach Haughey raised the possibility of changes in Irish defense policy as a \textit{quid pro quo} for British concessions on the border question, and in 1981, the Dail debated the question of whether neutrality should or should not be the basis of Irish foreign policy.\textsuperscript{157} The Irish declined to embrace neutrality formally, but reaffirmed the policies which had guided
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Irish policymakers in the past.158

The 1981 change of government in Ireland from Fianna Fail to Fine Gael also provoked a debate on neutrality. The former minister, Brian Lenihan, accused the incoming Minister for Foreign Affairs, Dr. James Dooge, of being ready to sacrifice neutrality for the sake of European integration. Dooge exchanged recriminations, with the help of his Taoiseach, Garret FitzGerald, who noted that Lenihan had done an admirable job of confusing the distinction between security and defense during an EEC meeting at Venlo.159 Ironically, the uproar at the mere suggestion that either party, Fianna Fail or Fine Gael, might be on the path to abandoning neutrality, underlined the political importance of the concept. Both parties wanted to assume the title of neutrality's protector.

Dooge, in an effort to dispel doubts over his steadfastness to neutrality, reminded the Community that political cooperation within the Community would have to be delineated from NATO policy. He also directed his aides not to participate in Community meetings which raised defense questions, and forbade Irish signatures on Community communiques which concerned defense issues.160

Still, separating valid Community security issues from defense issues was a difficult task. The Irish had been part of a

---
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solid Community front at the CSCE in Helsinki and its subsequent review meetings. Moreover, the Irish had participated as a Community member not as a neutral or non-aligned nation, as did the other Continental neutrals who are not members of the Community.\textsuperscript{161} The Irish also accepted Community funding of helicopters, frigates and corvettes to patrol their coastal waters.\textsuperscript{162} Patrolling the coastal waters of Ireland with Community funded vessels was viewed as security, rather than defense, cooperation on the grounds that Ireland was attempting to protect the economic integrity of her waters and the vessels had few offensive capabilities.

While the argument over security vs. defense issues prompted both Fianna Fail and Fine Gael to reassert their commitments to military neutrality, the Irish Labour party went even further. Labour's support of neutrality may be said to have historical roots older than those of either Fianna Fail or Fine Gael. James Connelly's opposition to Irish participation in World War I, and the 1919 International Labour Conference espousal of neutrality, demonstrate these roots.\textsuperscript{163} Subsequently, the party adopted a fundamental, or ordinary neutrality, as observed by the Continental neutrals, as part of its manifesto in March 1981, and it pledged to work neutrality into the Irish Constitution if the
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chance presented itself.164 A small chance did occur with Labour's participation in the Fine Gael coalition formed in 1981, but the new Minister of Defense, Paddy Cooney considered fundamental neutrality one of Labour's "loonier shrines" and declined to embrace the idea.165

However, the Irish continued to practice the same type of neutral, mediatory role in the United Nations as they had before their membership in the Community. From 1979-83, they participated in United Nations peacekeeping efforts in Lebanon, while declining participation in efforts by Community member states to duplicate such action. Just as the Irish had earlier demonstrated in their opposition to Community forces in the Sinai, they were committed to the United Nations as the proper agency to undertake security measures because the United Nations was not tainted with the stigma of a specific power bloc.

The Irish found themselves in the unaccustomed place of a seat on the UN Security Council from 1981-82. By coincidence, it was in this period that the Falklands crisis erupted. However, the Falklands crisis, lasting from April to June 1982, proved how valuable neutrality was as a state value, and how muddled neutrality could be as a state policy.166

The initial Irish response to the seizure of the Falklands by Argentina was to back UN resolution 502 condemning Argentine
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aggression. However, Ireland's UN Ambassador, Dorr, felt there still existed some ambiguity as to the legal title to the Falklands.\textsuperscript{167} Argentina was wrong to use force but its legal argument might have some validity.

The British response to the seizure of the islands was military, represented by an armada. After a naval confrontation resulted in the sinking of the Argentine battleship, General Belgrano, Ireland was placed in a difficult situation. During the conflict, the Irish had participated in the British sponsored Community boycott of Argentina, but the sinking of the Belgrano prompted the Haughey government to change direction and declare that they would not be bound to observe Community sanctions, because of Ireland's traditional policy of neutrality.\textsuperscript{168}

While Haughey did repudiate Defense Minister Paddy Power's assertion that the British were the aggressors, his action was aimed at putting pressure on Britain by breaking Community ranks. The Italians followed the Irish in protest, and on 4 May 1982, these two countries supported a motion to end Community economic sanctions against Argentina.\textsuperscript{169} Though this gambit failed, the British could hardly have been pleased by this show of Community non-solidarity.

Haughey continued to defend his position from attacks by
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opposition leader FitzGerald, who claimed that Haughey's embrace of neutrality in the crisis was belated, and by the British, who stressed the obligations of Community membership and the importance of solidarity.\textsuperscript{170}

Both Taoiseach Haughey and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Gerry Collins, began stressing the importance of the U.N. in resolving issues of this sort. Of course, any U.N. role in the crisis would guarantee a large measure of Irish participation by dint of their seat on the Security Council.\textsuperscript{171} Haughey asserted in the Irish \textit{Times} on 7 May 1982, "Our options are much more limited than anyone elses (in the EEC). As a neutral nation that has always refrained from military alliances of any kind, we have to take a very clear view of any action, economic or otherwise, that would appear supportive of military action. Sanctions complementing military action are not acceptable to us as a neutral country."\textsuperscript{172} However, as FitzGerald pointed out, Haughey had participated fully in the Community sanctions for a time and was now using his noncompliance with sanctions to spur British movement on agricultural subsidies within the Community which would benefit Ireland.\textsuperscript{173} If this was true, Haughey's remark in the Irish \textit{Times} was not very accurate.

Nonetheless, the Irish and Italians continued to support
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anti-renewal measures within the Community until 17 May 1982. The Irish then ceased participating in the Community debates and focused solely on efforts in the U.N. On 21 May 1982, the day the British forces landed on San Carlos to regain possession of the Falklands, UN Ambassador Dorr called for the cessation of hostilities and the deployment of a UN observer force to prevent the possibility of the conflict becoming much larger. Predictably, this idea was vetoed by both Britain and France in the UN Security Council.174

Irish behavior in the crisis did not provoke the Haughey government into leaving the Community. The economic advantages of membership outweighed any other considerations, but the Irish had shown that their independence in foreign policy was not encumbered by Community membership. Thus, while Ireland's neutrality might prove nettlesome to, it would not be threatened by, the Community.

Therefore, in Ireland neutrality declined as a political issue, although the structure of Irish neutrality was debated. For example, a neutral must be able to defend itself and should have an adequate defense force for this purpose. Recently, the Irish had been spending less on defense, on a per capita basis, than any other neutral or NATO country in Europe, including such minimal spenders as Portugal, Greece and Switzerland.175
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In 1982, UN Ambassador Dorr called for a worldwide reduction in conventional forces, arguing that Ireland's defense forces were already at a level acceptable to a disarmed world, but in 1983, Fine Gael Minister of Defense, Paddy Cooney, suggested that Ireland could confidently rely on NATO if it were attacked by forces hostile to the West.\footnote{Keatinge.  \textit{A Singular Stance}, p. 119.} \footnote{Keatinge, \textit{A Singular Stance}, p. 73.}

A firm commitment to military neutrality was consistent with a weak army, because of Ireland's relatively unimportant strategic position. In an age of intercontinental ballistic missiles, Great Britain was no longer a bulwark of the West and this reduced the likelihood that Ireland would be used as a base of attack. Furthermore, missile technology has made conventional perceptions of territorial transgression of a neutral's integrity somewhat obsolete.

Ireland's current defense forces can best be classified as a gendarme.\footnote{Keatinge.  \textit{A Singular Stance}, p. 69.} \footnote{Keatinge, \textit{A Singular Stance}, p. 68.} It has almost no offensive capability. Its main roles are serving in UN peacekeeping operations and controlling domestic political terrorism, for example, by patrolling the border with Northern Ireland. It has no jet fighters or bombers and its air force is largely restricted to prop driven reconnaissance and ground support planes.\footnote{Keatinge, \textit{A Singular Stance}, p. 68.} The helicopters, frigates and corvettes of the navy are used for patrolling Ireland's
200 mile coastal waters. There is little armour or anti-aircraft capability. Thus Ireland is constrained by its peculiar armed forces to a military neutrality in which its fate is left up to Western benevolence and its own strategic insignificance.

Though Ireland may not possess the capability to repel an aggressor, inroads or weaknesses in the political attractiveness of neutrality have not been apparent. The New Ireland Forum of 30 May 1983 brought agreement between Dick Spring of Labour, Charles Haughey of Fianna Fail, and Garret FitzGerald of Fine Gael, that a united Ireland would remain neutral.180

In 1987, the Single European Act, a modification of Genscher-Colombo which omitted references to NATO or military security, was confirmed in a referendum by the Irish electorate.181 Thus, Ireland became the last of the twelve European Economic Community member states to accept a package of political and economic measures which give concreteness to the "Solemn Declaration on European Union" referred to by the Act. Though this strengthens the possibilities for further political and economic coordination within the Community, the doubts of 1981 about the viability of neutrality were largely absent in Ireland. The Irish now presented a united front on the non-negotiability of Ireland's neutrality. The policy was no longer merely a useful expedient, subject to future review. It was firmly established policy.
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In the analysis of the factors of constraint on Irish neutrality from the mid-1970's to the present, the most important factor has been the popularity of neutrality in Irish domestic politics. The Dail debates on Professor Dooge's appointment as foreign minister, and the debates dealing with Haughey's handling of the Falkland's crisis, demonstrated how powerful a force neutrality had become politically. Neither Fianna Fail nor Fine Gael was willing to be characterized as less than rock solid in its support of a militarily neutral Ireland. The exact practice or consistency of Irish neutrality could be questioned. The Fine Gael Minister of Defense, Paddy Power, and Fianna Fail Taoiseach, Charles Haughey, both made statements which seemed to waver on this point, but when pressed, neither of the two largest parties would lessen its hold on neutrality as a state symbol. It had become too important politically.

The domestic political framework was solidifying in support of some type of non-negotiable neutrality. No longer did politicians make remarks like Lemass did in the 1960's, hinting at joining NATO in return for entrance into the Community, or as a quid pro quo for the reunification of the island. The Irish were now in the Community and their neutrality was not seriously questioned by other Community members. The New Ireland Forum also brought agreement among the leaders of the South that an eventually united Ireland would, and should, remain neutral.

If anything, the most contentious force in the domestic
political debate was the Irish Labour Party's attachment to a more rigorous neutrality than that embraced by Fianna Fail or Fine Gael. While this may cause some difficulty for future Fine Gael-Labour coalitions, it certainly will do nothing but strengthen the tendency of the Irish political leadership to identify with neutrality. The population, in fact, seemed not at all threatened by suggestions that the Single European Act might put Ireland's neutrality at risk. They endorsed the referendum and brought Ireland into line with the rest of the Community. Only a populace solidly attached to neutrality would have taken this step, one that theoretically limits the scope of Irish neutrality by providing for further European coordination.

The need to assert Irish sovereignty is linked to the prospects of further European integration. The Irish could join the Community and vote for further European integration because neither of these steps immediately threatened the use of neutrality as a symbol of Irish independence. Indeed, Ireland has broken with the Community ranks in the boycott of Argentina, has supported the right of the Palestinians to a homeland, has supported sanctions against Namibia and South Africa, and has generally voted a progressive line in the UN with regard to self-determination and economic development in the Third World. The Irish continue to formulate answers to questions based on the merits of each case, as they see them. By remaining neutral, they do not have to temper their views to one power bloc or the other.
The distribution of power, the last factor to consider, had not radically changed during the previous twenty five years. The Irish were still situated in a British and American lake and are still heavily integrated into the British economy. They have felt so integrated into the Western zone of influence that they have largely abandoned the thought of a credible military defense. Likewise, they are firmly indebted to the West in matters of trade and economic survival. If not for Great Britain and the rest of the Community, the Irish economy would be even weaker than it is today. As a result, Ireland's neutrality is benevolent to the West, and practically speaking, it is constrained by the balance of power to this benevolence. Domestic politics and maintenance of sovereignty have constrained the Irish to a neutral course, but the distribution of power directs this neutrality toward the West.

Ireland has used this orientation to facilitate dialogue between the Western powers and parts of the world not normally receptive to the West. Thus, when the Community needed a negotiator with the post-revolutionary Portuguese leadership, or the Arab countries, it was Ireland which served this function. So, while the distribution of power suggests that the Irish should join the Western alliance, this need not occur as long as Irish neutrality is directed toward fulfilling needs seen as non-threatening and beneficial to the West.

* * * * *
During the 1970s, Finland's use of neutrality to promote an image of accommodating both East and West had reached its maximum effort. The CSCE included the US and Canada only because the Finns convinced the USSR that a conference without the two North American nations would lessen the chances that the CSCE would be viewed as contributing to détente. The Soviet-Finnish Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance (FCMA) was renewed, but the Finns refrained from criticizing the US for its actions in Vietnam. In 1973 the two Germanies were simultaneously recognized by Finland, promoting diplomatic links among the three states, other than trade missions, for the first time since World War II. In exchange for recognition, both East and West Germany promised to respect Finnish neutrality and gave the Finns pledges of nonaggression.

While Kekkonen occupied the presidency, the government was composed of varying Center-Left coalitions which largely left foreign policy in the president's hands. Kekkonen continued to commit forces to UN efforts, with Finns in Cyprus until 1977 and in Lebanon starting in 1979. He also continued to use the UN as a forum for advocating the abolition of nuclear weapons, an issue he raised extensively in 1978.
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The late 1970s and early 1980s ended the period of detente between the Superpowers, but Kekkonen continued to refrain from committing himself to either side in East-West conflict. Communist aggression in Kampuchea in 1979, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1980, and the declaration of martial law in Poland did not illicit a Finnish response. However, the invasion of the US embassy in Tehran and the subsequent hostage taking, not East-West issues, did provoke condemnation by Kekkonen.\textsuperscript{186} The Finns also took no sides by participating in both the 1980 Olympics in Moscow and the 1984 Olympics in Los Angeles.

In 1981-2 a power struggle took place in Finland to determine the successor to President Kekkonen. The electoral college was a reflection of party strength and it was assumed that, as the largest part, the Social Democrats could virtually pick the next president at a party caucus. But they could not unify for this event and one faction, allied with the Agrarians and the Communists, received the important endorsement of President Kekkonen. The Social Democrat candidate favoured by Kekkonen, and subsequently elected by the electoral college, was Mauno Koivisto, one of the Social Democrats opposed to the Tannerites and the Honka front in 1961. In 1966 he was in the cabinet of the first, Soviet endorsed, Social Democratic government of Finland. In 1968 he became Prime Minister, and his experience

also included a term on the board of governors of the Bank of Finland.187

Koivisto would finally enable a representative of the largest party to serve in the highest office. He was the choice of Kekkonen and was known and trusted by Moscow. He was well prepared, having played a number of roles in different Finnish coalitions, and was a vocal supporter of the Paasikivi-Kekkonen line that had facilitated Finland's continued existence as a sovereign state.

Early in Koivisto's tenure, however, it became apparent that the Paasikivi-Kekkonen line was undergoing some modification. In 1984, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Paavo Vayrynen, asserted that the line was no longer to be interpreted as treating both the East and the West in a symmetrical fashion. Vayrynen was aware that Finland's propinquity to the Soviet Union meant that, if the Soviets wished, Finland's sovereignty could be endangered. He was also aware that the new Social Democratic leadership had not accumulated the trust that the Kremlin had for Kekkonen. Because of strategic reality and the infancy of their tenure, therefore, Vayrynen believed the Social Democratic government would have to give the Soviet Union more sympathetic consideration, than had their predecessor.188
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Some examples of criticism aimed at the West by Finland demonstrate this point. Israel was severely rebuked by Finland for its invasion of Lebanon and the idea of a Palestinian homeland was supported. The US intervention in Grenada during the collapse of the Bishop regime and the NEW JEWEL movement also brought Finnish condemnation. Finally, Reagan's aggressive tactics against the Sandinistas have brought Finnish displeasure. 189

In 1983, the same year that the US intervention in Grenada was condemned in Helsinki, the Finns extended the term of the FCMA, echoing the process of 1955 and 1970. 190 While the FCMA reduced tensions to Finland's east, an attempt by Koivisto and Vayrynen to line up support for a Nordic Nuclear Free Weapons Zone (NFWZ) failed. Finland's accommodation of the Soviet Union's security interests was not shared by the rest of Scandinavia. For example, the deployment of cruise missiles and Pershing IIs to counter the Soviet INF buildup was not criticized in Scandinavia, except by Finland. 191 The Swedes had been vexed by the outstanding matter of Soviet submarines, in all likelihood carrying nuclear weapons, stranding themselves in Swedish waters. Norway and Denmark, as signatories of NATO, simply could not

189 Blomberg, p. 3.


formalize their adherence to the NFWZ, and there existed in the two countries a great deal more scepticism regarding Soviet motives than there was in Finland. Nonetheless, Foreign Minister Vayrynen continued to press the idea. As recently as 1985, at the review meeting of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in Geneva, he continued to assert the practicality and usefulness of nuclear free regions in the promotion of non-proliferation and disarmament. He also used this forum to call for more progress in the US-USSR INF negotiations.

1985 was also the year during which the Finns had a hostage crisis of their own in the Middle East. They had previously condemned the Israeli bombardment of PLO headquarters in Tunis, as well as the Israeli presence in Lebanon generally and now found themselves at the mercy of Israeli proxies. The South Lebanese Army took hostage twenty four Finnish soldiers serving with the UN. The soldiers were eventually returned, with Israeli assistance, and the Finnish government kept lines open in Jerusalem throughout the matter. These communication links with the Israeli leadership would again prove valuable in 1987, during

----


a Soviet visit to Jerusalem. The Soviet Union, which had broken ties with Israel, was forced to use the good offices of Finland. In effect, the Soviets operated out of the Finnish embassy.

During Koivisto's presidency there has also been an increased attempt to further integrate Soviet and Finnish economic needs. The level of Finnish-Soviet trade had decreased somewhat late in Kekkonen's final term. The Finns had actively participated in EFTA-EEC agreements in 1977 at Vienna, and in 1984 in Luxembourg. The levels of Finnish trade directed toward the East and the West were not symmetrical. The bulk of Finnish trade was, and still is, with Western nations. However, at the start of a new five year agreement in 1986 with the Soviet Union, which was intended to increase Finnish-Soviet trade, the Finnish leadership noted that bilateral trade between the Soviet Union and Finland was expanding. From 1976-80, the Soviet Union accounted for 18.6% of Finnish trade. That figure rose to 23.4% in the years of 1981-5. But Finnish trade with NATO signatories still accounted for over 50% of Finland's trade income. The attempt to develop parity in trade with both East and West
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is clearly not practical, but Finland aims to have a healthy trade with both power blocs so that the prosperity of its Western oriented economy is realized without provoking Soviet anxieties.

Trade has been used, therefore, to muffle Soviet concerns about Finland becoming too deeply integrated with the West. The Finns and the Soviets worked together, for example, to develop nuclear power plants in Finland. In 1985 the Finns signed a gas supply agreement with the Soviet Union which calls for joint development of the pipeline to the Soviet source and will supply Finland's energy needs through 2008. The Finns also continued to buy the main Soviet battle tank for their armed forces, the T-72. Developing trade in sensitive items such as nuclear power and the procurement of weapons ensures that trade links are assured in the future. Furthermore, the Joint Finnish-Soviet Commission for Economic cooperation acts as an offshoot of the FCMA to forestall Soviet fears of a Western economic takeover in Finland by promoting economic links and joint projects between Finland and the USSR. Finnish cooperation with the Soviets in the procurement of supplies for its army, development of nuclear power, and the pipeline project were coordinated by this commission. A recent project of the commission foresees the


development of a $350 million dollar coal plant in Phillipines.201 Such ventures garner dividends for both parties. The Soviets acquire much needed Western currency and the Finns strengthen their credibility in the Kremlin.

The emphasis placed on trade between the Soviet Union and Finland appears to have been strengthened during the Koivisto presidency, and this would seem to be a corrolary of the Vayrynen assertion that Finland's neutrality is nonsymmetrical.

To review the factors influencing Finnish neutrality during this time period, the starting point will be the tug and pull of domestic politics. For the first time since 1956, Finland had a new man in the presidency. Koivisto was selected because he was a Social Democrat who appealed to both the Communists and the Agrarians. This was due to his pledge to continue the Paasikivi-Kekkonen line and his non-Tannerite past. But with mainly Social Democratic advisors, the emphasis on detachment from East-West competition that Kekkonen initiated was dropped. And it was perhaps the need the Social Democrats felt to develop Soviet trust in the Koivisto presidency that led to the more accommodating pose sculpted by Koivisto and Vayrynen.

The loss of Kekkonen meant that the forces of domestic politics would have less power to constrain Finnish neutrality. The last years of Kekkonen's presidency were not politically

contentious, as his 80% reelection figure in 1980 would indicate, but his seat above the political fray also enabled him to formulate a foreign policy which was less accommodating to the Soviet Union. He had developed the personal trust of the Kremlin, and as a result, his initiatives did not become political issues in Finland. The election of Koivisto merely signalled a return to the days of the earlier Paasikivi and Kekkonen presidencies that were more accommodating toward Soviet interests than was the later portion of Kekkonen's tenure.

The need to maintain sovereignty and state integrity constrained Finland's brand of neutrality less than in earlier periods. The long stay in office by Kekkonen had dispelled Soviet doubts over Finnish intentions, and Soviet absorption of Finland was now out of the question. The main force of state sovereignty, and the assertion of that sovereignty, was expressed in Finland's role as a mediator. By developing Helsinki's image as a neutral site in which East-West conferences could be held, dialogue promoted and treaties signed, Finland's neutral image gained credibility and the state found a secure outlet for the expression of its sovereignty.

Finally, the distribution of power continued to be the dominant consideration in the practice of Finnish neutrality. The Finns could not integrate too closely into the West for fear of provoking Soviet paranoia. Instead the Finns found that, even in foreign trade, they would have to adapt economic priorities to fit their attempt to stay out of great power competition. The
natural orientation of Finland's economic system favoured trade with the West. The proximity of the USSR and the Soviet need for Western technology, which was obtainable through Finland, promoted trade to the East. By exchanging manufactured goods for Soviet raw materials such as gas and oil, the Finns achieved the most balanced East-West trade portfolio in Europe.

Likewise the Soviet military presence promoted a certain blindness in Finnish neutrality. The Finns simply did not act as if they saw Soviet power being exerted in Afghanistan, or indirectly in Poland, and their silence on these matters was the result. On the otherhand, the silence which had greeted Western imperialism in Kekkonen's last years was also over. The West, specifically the US, was chastised for its involvement in the Caribbean, and Central America, and for its intransigence in the US-USSR INF talks.
Conclusions

The historical review of Finnish and Irish neutrality is now complete and it is necessary to compare the forces of constraint which moulded Irish and Finnish neutrality, bringing out the similarities and explaining the contrasts. For as the constraints differed in intensity, so did the development of the two neutralities.

Presently, in both Ireland and Finland, there is a consensus among the political parties that, for political purposes, neutrality is too valuable a policy to neglect. But in both countries, there exists disagreement over the type of neutrality that should be practiced, making the formulation of neutrality a somewhat contentious issue at election time.

In Ireland, the Labour Party is the strongest proponent of a complete or fundamental neutrality. This is, Labour proposes to institutionalize neutrality by introducing an amendment to the constitution which stipulates that Ireland be a neutral country, politically, militarily and in all other forms of international intercourse. While this type of arrangement has proved feasible on the Continent, for example the Swiss are constitutionally bound to neutrality, it has not moved much beyond the circle of Labour proponents in Ireland. But Labour is the third largest party in Ireland and its importance as a possible coalition partner makes it difficult to imagine any government advancing a policy which would lead to a reduction in scope of the military neutrality already in place.

The Fianna Fail and Fine Gael parties espouse a military
neutrality, the principles of which were developed by Eamon de Valera in World War II. Though officials in Fine Gael and Fianna Fail have alluded to Ireland's natural affinity for the West, and Ireland's concomitant responsibility to the Western powers if they are attacked by the Soviet bloc, neither party has seriously considered joining NATO. There is a recognition that military neutrality is too valuable a political weapon not to be used, and as shown during the Falkland's crisis, each major party will, if pushed, claim to be more neutral than the other.

In Finland there is also a recognition that neutrality is immensely popular with the public, and is therefore not to be abandoned by any party which wishes to remain in office. The Agrarian party, whose members have included Kekkonen and Paasikivi, is the original architect of what is known as the Paasikivi-Kekkonen line. This is the policy of declaring Finland neutral, accommodating Soviet security interests, attempting to de-militarize Scandinavia, and developing Finland's role as a mediator.

The second largest party, the Communists, favor a stronger link to the Soviet Union than is represented by the Paasikivi-Kekkonen line, but have been willing to compromise party principle to serve in Center-Left coalitions. However, willingness to compromise party principles has come late to the largest party, the Social Democrats. For much of the post-War period, this party was not politically successful. It had trouble, for example, forming stable governments in the Finnish parliament
because of its non-acceptance of a corollary to the Paasikivi-Kekkonen line. Because Soviet security interests must be taken into account in formulating Finnish foreign policy, it is essential that the leaders of Finland have some credibility in the Kremlin. This was recognized by Paasikivi and Kekkonen, but the Tannerite leadership of the Social Democrats lacked this credibility, and as a result Social Democratic governments led by Fagerholm in 1948 and 1958, and the 1961 Honka front, were ultimately failures. Only after the Social Democrats embraced the "personal corollary" of the Paasikivi-Kekkonen line was stability introduced into Finnish neutrality, the product of Soviet trust, and was political success granted to the Social Democrats.

The need to maintain and assert state sovereignty as a cause of neutrality is evident in both Ireland and Finland. In Ireland, neutrality was practiced by de Valera in World War II for just such a purpose. He need to provide a working policy behind which the population would unite, and at the same time distance himself from Great Britain. Neutrality was, and is, a means to delineate Irish independence from the United Kingdom.

Unlike Ireland, Finland was unable to assert complete state sovereignty through neutrality until the Soviet evacuation of Porkalla in 1956. Though Finland's assertion of state sovereignty has been of a shorter tenure than Ireland's neutrality has played just as big a role in its independence from the Soviet Union. Finland resisted attempts by the Soviets to be
drawn into the communist orbit and was the only country to say no when asked to join the Warsaw Pact.

In both Finland and Ireland, the declaration and practice of neutrality has facilitated independence, but the same policy has also facilitated mediatory actions which are embraced by the political framework, and are used to establish an international identity and gain credibility for neutrality with a wider audience. The progressive voting behavior of Ireland in the Community and the United Nations and its participation in UN peacekeeping efforts, have carved out an independent Ireland, separate from Great Britain. Likewise, because of Finnish participation in the NNA and their hosting of the CSCE, the Finns are recognized as a separate, neutral country, and not a Soviet pawn.

The distribution of power has been more of a force in Finland than in Ireland, with regard to constraining the policy choices available to the leadership. Given the proximity of the Soviet Union, Finland must not be a threat to the USSR if it wishes to remain an independent Western oriented state. The solution worked out by Paasikivi and Kekkonen was the FCMA. This document guarantees both Soviet security and Finnish neutrality by recognizing that as soon as one is compromised so is the other. For example, as long as the West acts nonaggressively towards Finnish territory, the Soviet Union will be content to respect Finnish neutrality. If the West were to roll through the North and threaten Finland's territory, Finnish neutrality would
be finished as a policy able to reconcile Finnish interests in the current distribution of power. The Finns are cognizant of this and work for the demilitarization of the North with such proposals as the NFWZ and a Scandinavian neutrality.

The Irish, because they lie in an American and British zone of interest are, for reasons other than a common political and cultural heritage, constrained to a benevolence towards the West. But the West would not be likely to threaten Irish territory if Ireland were to end this benevolence. The distribution of economic power also constrains Ireland to something less than an economic and military matters in the same light in its practice of neutrality. However, the Irish are not actually threatened by NATO power and, in large part, depend upon it for protection.

The Irish are clearly neither economically nor politically neutral, as are the Finns. As a member of the Community, Ireland is constrained to remain a member of that political and economic alliance even in time of war, and to take part in Community sanctions aimed against a common aggressor. However, the distribution of economic power has had a far greater effect in modifying Ireland's neutrality than it has had on the Finns. Finland, unlike Ireland, has been able to achieve a balanced trade portfolio with both East and West. The Finns are not members of any overtly political economic organization. Instead, they cooperate with the Community, EFTA, and CMEA in a manner that demarcates Finnish participation from Finnish membership. This type of evenhandedness, and awareness of the effect of
economic policy on the credibility of neutrality, is not a recent occurrence in Finland. By accepting German war material in World War II, the Finns were punished by the Soviet Union when they sued for peace. The next time a decision involved aid from a bloc opposed to the Soviets, the Marshall Aid package, the Finns elected to turn it down. A precedent dictating neutrality in the economic sphere was set and has been adhered to since.

Both Finland and Ireland illustrate the impracticality of sustaining a rigid neutrality. In Ireland there is not a political consensus among the parties to adhere to a complete neutrality shorn of consideration for Western interests. Certainly Ireland's heritage and its political and economic organization, define it as Western. Its need to remain economically viable dictates that it participate in the Community, and this, accordingly, colors its neutrality. The geographic situation of Ireland and its woeful defense forces also obligate it to the West. But Ireland, if it wishes to fulfill its yearning for an identity separate from Great Britain, cannot take the final step of joining the Western Alliance and fully integrate itself into those states which form the Western power bloc. Neutrality affords Ireland an identity, though it is incomplete. But given the factors which support it, which include culture, its domestic political efficacy, and its need to assert sovereignty, Irish neutrality will only be colored by the need to accommodate the distribution of power, not be abandoned.

The Finns are also predisposed, because of the domestic
political balance, and the need to assert sovereignty, to continue their neutral policy. The distribution of power is accommodated in Finland's case by the FCMA. This treaty colors Finnish neutrality, as Community membership does Irish neutrality, because of its ramifications in time of war. But it does allow for a neutrality that has lasted since the end of World War II because it calls for modifications in Finnish neutrality and the accommodation of Soviet security interests, and adjusts to the strategic balance Finland occupies.

Finnish and Irish neutrality are both imperfect. While one pays obeisance to the East, the other takes full advantage of the economic wealth of the West, while declining a defense role. In both countries there is wide public support for continuing the present foreign policy. Neutrality is popular in both Ireland and Finland because it is modified to fulfill the needs of their political leaders and populace, and guarantees the sovereignty of each state. As a state value and state policy, neutrality has flourished in Ireland and Finland, but the incompleteness or imperfections of each states' neutrality policy, its willingness to compromise to accommodate domestic and foreign interests, has benefited rather than hindered its survival.
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