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Abstract

Perceptions of Finland and Finns held by Canadian government decision-makers underscore the relations between the two countries. The individuals involved had definite views of what Finland and Finns were like and these images were at times openly expressed or inferred from the archived government departmental files. Using an analysis of images, the evolving bilateral relations between Canada and Finland from the recognition of Finnish independence in 1919 until the early Cold War in 1948 can be understood from the Canadian perspective. The images are analyzed on a scale in terms of their positive or negative connotations. Positive images regarded Finland as a friendly, Northern, country, a borderland, cultured, Western, modern, progressive, liberal, and democratic. When these images were applied to Finns they were seen as honest, hardworking, reliable and the payers of debts. On the opposite end of the spectrum, Finland was an enemy and a trade competitor. The Finnish people could also be seen with negative images as dangerous and radical.

These images existed before the establishment of diplomatic relations and carried over to interactions involving immigration, the League of Nations, trade, and scientific exchanges. They are also evident in relations between the two countries during the Winter War, in the decision to declare war against Finland during the Continuation War, during the armistice period, the peace process, and the during the early Cold War when normalized relations were established. The findings suggest that relations between Canada and Finland were most often impacted by events in Europe. The images of Finland and Finns did not directly impact relations as such, since the policies and actions taken were based on what decision-makers considered realistic assessments of the situation, as well as Canada’s national interests and capabilities. However, the images appear frequently as a means to narrow the range of acceptable options, rationalizations for specific polices, and justification for particular actions.
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Tiivistelmä


Nämä näkökuvat olivat läsnä ennen maailman diplomaattisuuhteiden perustamista, ja jatkuivat vuorovaikutuksissa koskien siirtolaisuutta, Kansojen liittoa, kauppaan ja tieteellistä vaihtoa. Ne olivat myös nähtävissä suhteissa talvisodan aikana, päätoksessa julistaa sota Suomea vastaan ja sen jälkeen aikana, aserauhan aikana, rauhanteon aikana sekä paluussa normaaleihin suhteisiin kylmän sodan alussa. Euroopan tapahtumilla näytti olevan myös suuri vaikutus Suomen ja Kanadan suhteisiin. Näkökuvat Suomesta ja suomalaisista eivät suuranaisesti vaikuttaa niitä maitten suhteisiin, koska käytäntöjen ja toiminnan perustuivat päältäjien mielestä realistiseen arvioon tilanteista sekä Kanadan kansallisuutta edusta ja kyvyistä. Tästä huolimatta näitä näkökuvia käytettiin usein rajoittamaan hyväksyttävien vaihtoehtojen valikoimaa, järkeistämään tietystä käytäntöjä sekä oikeuttamaan joitakin toimintoja.

Asiakumat: kahdenvälisten suhteiden historia, Kanada, Kanadan ja Suomen väliset ulkosuhteet, kuvat, Suomi
Finland, Finland, Finland, Finland has it all (from Monty Python’s Contractual Obligation Album, 1980).
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David Ratz
Preface

When the first contacts between Canada and Finland began in the latter part of the nineteenth century, few Canadians knew much about Finland. A fact still evident even today as for many Finland remains an “unknown” country.¹ There are of course numerous Finns playing in the NHL and hockey is a popular sport in Canada. Others might have taken note when the Finnish entry in the Eurovision music contest does well or understand they can blame Finland for the video game Angry Birds.² Yet Finland only occasionally enters the Canadian consciousness, such as in 2012 when a popular magazine did a report on the high quality and innovative nature of the Finnish education system. In Canada, Finland is portrayed as a progressive and egalitarian country, with a unique system of education that ensures a high literacy, numeracy, and graduation rate.³ As the article concludes, “At the end of the day, Finland is intriguing just for being Finland.”⁴ The oddness of the Finnish language can also be a source of perceptions of Finland as unusual and amusing. For example, one Canadian in a subsequent issue of the same magazine suggested that the longest palindrome of any language was “saippuakauppias” which he defined as a “soap salesperson.”⁵ Even in Thunder Bay, where there are plenty of “Finns,” and residents think they know a lot about Finnish culture, what they actually know about is Finnish-Canadian culture. Many in Thunder Bay think the mojakka they are served at the Hoito restaurant is traditional, with its beef, vegetables, and clear broth. I have experienced first hand in Finland that it is not. There it has fish and a cream sauce, or what Finns in Thunder Bay call kalamojakka. What is served as plain mojakka is in fact lihamojakka (or lihakeitto). Finnish-Canadian/Finnish-American culture it seems has adapted to the circumstances.⁶

Why study images of Finland? Canadians and Finns share a fascination with images, often unspoken, expressed in the sort of questions when people are asked what they think of Canada or Finland. Both Finnish and Canadian foreign policies also have as a subsidiary role the promotion of a positive image of their country.⁷

¹ All of the Nordic area seems to remain unknown to most of the rest of the world. See Booth 2014.
³ The article was highlighted in the Canadian edition of Reader’s Digest, as the editors’ choice and was a précis of the book by Zander Sherman. Sherman 2012a and 2012b. For the admiration expressed by Canadian readers see the letters to the editors. Readers Write 2012.
⁴ Sherman 2012b, 108.
⁵ Question of the Month 2012.
⁶ See the cookbook Kaitila and Saarinen 2004, vii–viii.
Shortly after I began my studies an interesting article appeared in the science magazine *Discover* about research done concerning Finnish genetics by Leena Peltonen at the University of California. Author Jeff Wheelwright’s observation that, “it seems to be human nature to assign types to our fellow humans and then make judgments based on those types” seemed to fit what I wanted to examine in my dissertation.\(^8\) He also presented some Finnish images, likely unintentionally, with what I thought was with some ironic humour. My apology in what follows, if you do not share my sense of humour. Peltonen was genetically comparing blondes in California and Finland. She talked about how the small gene pool created in “The setting of a limited number of ancestors and hundreds of years of isolation make Finns good study subjects.”\(^9\) There is of course in English an insult that questions a person’s intelligence by referring to a family ancestry which swam in the shallow end of the gene pool, implying inbreeding, which Peltonen may not have been aware of. She found the chromosomes of blondes in California were quite different, but those representing unrelated Finnish people were quite similar. “These guys are the boring Finns,” she said and then went on to compare the human genome to a deck of cards and “The number of cards in the Finnish deck is fewer than the California deck.”\(^10\) There is also an insult that questions a person’s sanity and compares it to not playing with a full deck of cards. I was amused. Boring and crazy Finns, such wild images, but of course I find Finns interesting and do not think they are crazy.

Before my first visit to Finland in 2004, I read British author Deborah Swallow’s travel guide, *Culture Shock! Finland*, where she observes that Finns are very dour and solemn yet enjoy a good laugh and have a sense of humour. She related a Finnish ethnic joke:

An American, a German, and a Finn are looking at an elephant. The American wonders if the elephant would be good in a circus, the German what price he would get if he sold it, and the Finn asks himself, ‘I wonder what the elephant thinks of me?’\(^11\)

The joke refers to much older story, the “Hindoo Fable,” also called “The Blind Men and the Elephant,” retold as a poem and made popular by John Saxe. The parable has various versions, some with blind men, others with men in the dark, some with varying numbers of men and variations from different parts of India.

---

\(^8\) Wheelwright 2005, 54.
\(^9\) Ibid.
\(^10\) Ibid.
The story acts as a metaphor or analogy to expose ideas about the relative nature of truth and fallacy. In Saxe’s version there are six men who in turn think the elephant is a wall, a spear, a snake, a tree, a fan, and a rope. The “moral” given in the final stanza is “So oft in theologic wars, The disputants, I ween, Rail on in utter ignorance Of what each other mean, And prate about an Elephant Not one of them has seen!”12 Perhaps, that is what I intended to do in this study of Canadian images of Finland: find out how the elephant looked from across the Atlantic.
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12 Saxe 1882, 111–112.
positive and negative experiences and I have developed my own images of Finns and Finland. Like those images which exist in the wider Canadian society about Finns and Finland, my own images need to be set aside, in order to examine the images held by Canadian officials during the first four decades of the twentieth century.
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Section One: First Contacts
1 Introduction

The proposition that people behave based on their perceptions of the world, as much as any rational decision-making process, has gained considerable acceptance in social-psychology. As Walter Lippmann summarized the concept, “For the most part we do not first see, and then define, we define and then see.”13 Perceptions transform into images and condition the individual responses when encountering people from different groups. When members of a group perceive things from their particular perspective, they act based on that point of view. Manfred Beller notes that images of foreign countries, peoples, and cultures are formed from selective value judgements, using selective observations.14 When considering the official and unofficial contacts between Canada and Finland these propositions are supported by the existence of historic mental images of Finland.

It is an example of a cross cultural encounter the way Olavi Fält and others have described bilateral relations.15 The focus of “The Canadian Image of Finland, 1919–1948: Canadian Government Perceptions and Foreign Policy” is on the Canadian side of that encounter. Using these premises, an examination of images of Finland can shed new light on how foreign policy decision makers viewed Canadian-Finnish relations. More specifically, the perceptions of Finland held by those Canadian political leaders and government officials shows evidence of how and why they responded the way they did to situations involving Finland. The historical development of the Canadian images of Finland will be presented within the backdrop of Canadian-Finnish foreign relations to provide context and help make sense of those images. The time frame under consideration starts with recognition of Finland’s independence in May 1919 and runs until normal relations are restored after the Second World War. Examining the images held by Canadian foreign policy makers can show how Finland went from being considered a friendly nation to being considered an enemy nation and provide a fresh perspective from which to assess the Canadian-Finnish relationship.

15 Fält 1997.
1.1 Historical Background

While clearly different, Finland and Canada also have much in common. Geographically they are both classified as Northern countries, part of the Circumpolar North, with comparatively long, cold winters. Forest covers large parts of Canada as well as Finland and the species of trees, other plants, and animals are very similar. Two Finnish geographical expeditions in the 1930s went to Canada with the goal of learning more about the physical and human geography, climate, geology, plants and animals because “It has been known that the natural conditions in Fennoscandia agree in some particulars with those of Laurentia.” In explaining Finnish emigration to Canada a decade earlier, the first Finnish Consul General Akseli Rauanheimo remarked about the area around Sudbury and Thunder Bay: “The scenery here reminds [one] strongly of Finland.” In sociological terms, both countries have had to adjust to having two official languages, English and French in Canada and Finnish and Swedish in Finland. Politically Canada and Finland are liberal democracies, which place value on the rule of law and individual rights. Economically they both have capitalist economies, with varying degrees of government involvement through state enterprises and social welfare programs.

In geopolitical terms the two countries border larger, more powerful states, with which the maintenance of good relations has been an important aspect of foreign policy. In Finland, it has been Russia or the Soviet Union often seen as the traditional enemy or neighbour to the east, which Finnish leaders have had to convince their country had friendly intentions. An anti-Russian/Soviet attitude was therefore part of Finland’s cultural baggage. The same applies to Canada where anti-Americanism is a cultural perspective which presents itself occasionally. The

16 A similar conceptualization was used for Germany by Trautsch 2013, 143–169.
17 The expeditions were led by geographer Väinö Tanner in 1937 and 1939. Tanner was a professor of geography from the “University of Helsingfors.” “Laurentia” was the remnant of an older Tectonic plate which forms the Canadian Shield. Labrador was part of Newfoundland which was technically still a British colony and would join Canada in 1949. Tanner 1944, 32, 77.
18 Akseli Rauanheimo, Consul General for Finland (CGF), “Finnish Emigration to Canada General Survey” to F.C. Blair, DImm, 21 November 1928, Library and Archives Canada, (LAC), Record Group (RG) 76 IA1, Vol. 26, File 651 Part 5, Reel C4683. Akseli Kustaa Rauanheimo changed his name from Axel Gustaf Leonard Järnefelt in 1906. He wrote several books on Finns in North America under both names. As Ovia Saarinen has noted Finns settled near these two urban areas because land was available, and it was also close to employment in forestry and mining. Saarinen 1999, 21.
19 On Canada’s liberal-democratic heritage see for example Ajzenstat 2003, 280–284; Waite 2006. For Finland see Nousiainen 1971, 145ff.
21 Canada in fact shares a frontier with the US and over the polar region borders the Soviet Union/Russia.
22 Singleton 1982, 90.
traditional Canadian enemy had been the United States (US) to the south. However, by the end of the nineteenth century many Canadian leaders generally accepted that the national interest depended on fostering a friendly relationship with the Americans.\footnote{Hillmer and Granatstein 2007, 38, 117–136. This is seen generally in Muirhead 1992.} Something similar was recognized in Finnish foreign policy towards the Soviet Union after the Second World War with the “Paasikivi-Kekkonen line.”

Until the post Second World War era, Canada diplomatically tended to focus its foreign policy efforts at Britain and the United States, and to a lesser extent France, and the other countries of British Empire/Commonwealth. Britain and the US loomed large in the Canadian world view because of shared cultural heritages and interlocking political and economic interests. Likewise, Finland tended to focus its foreign policy activity towards Sweden and Russia, the two countries to which it had historic ties. Other important Finnish foreign policy targets mainly due to trade included the Scandinavian countries, the Baltic States, and Britain. Comparatively the Canadian-Finnish relationship was of minor importance to both countries. Finland which saw itself on the borderland of Western civilization, considered it important to have ties to the West. Canada in terms of domestic policies was a self-governing Dominion within the British Empire, but it was legally still a British colony in terms of foreign policy until after the First World War. Once Canada obtained the right to its own foreign policy in 1926, the Canadian-Finnish relationship took on new meaning, but not greater importance.\footnote{This occurred in 1926 with the Balfour Declaration and was codified in 1931 with the Statute of Westminster. Glazebrook 1966b, 90–92.} Relations with Finland simply became another way to begin to develop and express an international personality or identity separate from Britain. To a degree this benefit was diminished by the fact that although Finland opened a consulate in Canada a few years after independence, Canada did not accredit a minister to Finland until the late 1940s.

Until representation was established in Finland, Canadian foreign policy decision-makers had to rely on outside sources for their information about the situation in Finland. The images this information conjured up in turn played a role in the discussions about how to respond to various situations of mutual interest to Canada and Finland. For the most part these sources were newspapers and British diplomats, but on occasion information was obtained from American or other diplomatic sources.\footnote{Pickersgill 1994, 140, 142; Eayrs 1961, 130–141.} In terms of the Canadian images of Finland this is an important consideration because images of foreign countries are often derived, not
by direct experience, but filtered through the written observations of others.  

Indeed as L.C. Tombs, a Canadian employed by the Finnish minister to Canada in 1950 to promote Finland as a tourist destination observed, Northern Europe, let alone Finland, “has seldom been visited by Canadians.”

With few Canadian officials having any firsthand knowledge of Finland, the images of Finns are also relevant to the Canadian image of Finland, because for many Canadians the only contact with anything Finnish was indirectly through the Finns they found in their midst as immigrants. Images of Finns and images of Finland are interrelated. Value and character judgements about the people of Finland conversely imply certain meanings about the state of Finland.

Notwithstanding the migration of Finns to Canada, part of the reason there was little official contact between Canada and Finland lay in the fact that as Canadian trade officials noted in the post Second World War era, “Canada’s trade with Finland has traditionally been small and of an inconsistent pattern.”

Trade with Finland in the 1930s and 1940s was valued only in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, while trade with Sweden and Norway for example totalled in the millions of dollars. From the early nineteenth century Finland was seen as a competitor for Canadian forest products, especially in the British market, where the lower shipping costs made “Baltic timber” more attractive. There was therefore comparatively little in the way of commercial or business contacts between Canada and Finland. What importance trade with Finland had was based largely on ideology or as a symbolic gesture towards the achievement of a broader foreign policy objective, such as the liberalization of international trade in general.

---

28 “Canada’s Trade with Finland,” 5 July 1956, 1, LAC, Ibid. This report was produced by the International Trade Relations Branch of the Department of Trade and Commerce in the aftermath of the fourth round of talks in Geneva for the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), to which both Canada and Finland were signatories. In the press release it was stated “Canada did not negotiate directly with Finland,” but through agreements with other countries received and gave tariff and duty concessions. Press Release, DEA, 7 June 1956.
30 Albion 1965, 139–199, 354–357, 401–402; Lower 1973, 15, 17, 48–49, 124; Lower 1938, 80, 188. Baltic timber was a term used in Britain, loosely applied to wood products received from Russia, Finland, Sweden, German Poland, and later Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.
Few Canadians visited Finland and even fewer Canadian officials were familiar with the country. Perhaps it is because of the secondary nature of the Canadian-Finnish relationship that very little has been written about it. An examination of the images of Finland held by Canadian foreign policy makers from the period of Finnish independence to the return of normal relations after the ratification of the peace treaty in 1947 serves to broaden the understanding of Canadian-Finnish relationship.

1.2 Research Situation-Historiography

The historiography or research situation regarding Canadian images of Finland and Canadian-Finnish relations is relatively small. The literature can be divided into those sources which cover some aspect of Canadian-Finnish relations and those which look at images of Finland in the English-speaking world. In examining the research situation there are more sources used in the completion of this study than can be covered in the space provided here. What follows only serves to highlight the types of sources that have proven useful.

There are a few short surveys by Finnish-Canadian historian Varpu Lindström, on behalf of the Finnish Embassy in Canada, and some official summaries by the Canadian Department of External Affairs (DEA) and its Finnish counterpart, however, to date there have been no detailed studies of the foreign relations between Canada and Finland.\(^{31}\) In her book *From Heroes to Enemies: Finns in Canada, 1937–1947*, Lindström uses Canadian-Finnish relations as a backdrop for the experience of Finnish-Canadians around the time of the Second World War.\(^{32}\) A more recent publication about Finnish war veterans in Canada contains a very brief synopsis of Canada-Finland relations.\(^{33}\) To mark the 150th anniversary of Canada’s existence as a nation and Finland’s centenary, the Finnish-Canadian Society and the Embassy of Canada in Finland produced a commemorative book. Among the numerous articles on migration, culture, sports, and other subjects are two articles on Canadian-Finnish bilateral relations: one by David Ratz and the other by Veli-
Pekka Kaivola and Tuulikki Olander from the Finnish Embassy in Canada.\textsuperscript{34} In general it can be said Canadian-Finnish relations are rarely mentioned in studies exploring Canadian foreign policy.\textsuperscript{35}

Several Finnish government publications have outlined the history of Canadian-Finnish relations. For example, an information booklet from the 1970s by the Embassy of Finland has a brief section on relations with Canada explained that:

For many Canadians Finland is no longer merely the country who pays her debts and who fought for her independence. Nor is her image limited only to the sauna bath, sisu, the composer Sibelius, and the ‘flying Finn’ Paavo Nurmi...Instead Finland has begun to be recognized as a modern democracy with old social, cultural, and educational tradition.\textsuperscript{36}

With a few sentences the booklet captured the main iconic images of Finland and added to that formula internationally recognized architects, designers, engineers, a high standard of living, and a foreign policy of neutrality. A 2011 Finnish government publication called \textit{Finland and Canada Northern Partners: Finland’s Canada Action Plan}, focuses on current bilateral relations. In a brief historical section, it claims, “Finland is fairly well known in Canada and Canadian society’s affiliation with Finland is strong.”\textsuperscript{37} The evidence found during the research for this thesis shows this to be not entirely accurate. Most Canadians have likely heard of Finland; however, except for the perhaps 130,000 people of Finnish ancestry, a few experts in academia or government, and some hockey enthusiasts, Finland is not well known. During the period under consideration, except when widely reported events like the Winter War occurred, few Canadians would have known anything at all about Finland.\textsuperscript{38}

One specialized area where Canadian-Finnish relations have been studied is what was sometimes called the “Petsamo question.” What this question refers to is the diplomatic moves by various countries to secure access to the nickel deposits in northern Finland. The mines were developed in 1934 by the Petsamon Nikkeli

\textsuperscript{34} Interestingly Kaivola and Olander do not mention the state of war which existed between the two countries from 1941–1947, only mentioning the Treaty of Paris which established normal relations. Ratz 2017, 54–58; Kaivola and Olander 2017, 65–66.

\textsuperscript{35} For example, Finland is mentioned in the parts about the peace conference and later during the signing of the Finnish-Soviet Agreement of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance in 1948, as a partial justification for the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Mackay 1971, 23, 189.

\textsuperscript{36} Finland 1974, 3.

\textsuperscript{37} Finland 2011a, 8.

\textsuperscript{38} For the Finland-United States relationship see Sorsa 1976; United States 1989; United States 1999; Finland 2011b, 18–19.
OY for its British parent company Mond Nickel, which since 1929, was a subsidiary of the International Nickel Company of Canada (INCO). Studies tend to examine the diplomatic and strategic situation surrounding the mines which drew the attention of Germany, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain. Historian Peter Krosby determined, the desire to secure Petsamo nickel was one little known motivation behind the Allied offers of aid to Finland during the Winter War. During the Continuation War, Britain was willing to let INCO continue to operate the mines and export ore, with the idea that the company could disrupt production and inform the Allies of shipments to Germany which could be sunk. As Matt Bray determined, the Canadian government was not prepared to consider such a possibility. It was too risky and could prove an embarrassment. With the adjustment of Finland’s borders after 1944, the area was ceded to the Soviet Union. It is at this point the dispute is typically mentioned in the Canadian literature. However, the inter-government talks over the amount of compensation the company would receive did not involve Finland and were exclusively between Canada, Britain, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR).

Finland during the Second World War is a topic, which does occasionally appear in the Canadian literature. Several memoirs by officials at the DEA make note of the Soviet attack on Finland in December 1939. Discussion about possible Canadian aid to Finland and Allied plans for military intervention is covered in the second volume of C.P. Stacey’s *Canada and the Age of Conflict*. In English, there is a vast literature on various topics regarding the diplomacy and foreign relations during the Second World War between Britain, the United States, the Soviet Union, and Finland. These sources are useful in terms of the context they provide for events in which Canada played a background role, but nonetheless play a part in the

39 The corporate structure of International Nickel Company was perhaps unfamiliar. INCO had been founded by a consortium of US and Canadian mining interests as a subsidiary of an American company in 1902, but by 1916 the Canadian subsidiary became the parent company. In 1929 the British based Mond Nickel Company was merged with INCO and continued to operate as a subsidiary. Mond Nickel was used as agent to acquire funds to develop the Petsamo mines. This is likely why for a brief time US State Department Officials thought compensation should be paid for the loss of “American” and not Canadian interests in Petsamo. Berry 1998, 70–73; Main 1972.
41 Krosby 1968, 8–10.
44 For example, Pearson 1973, 162–163. Charles Ritchie working for the department in London recalled that “Everyone was stunned at the Finnish surrender.” Ritchie 1974, 50.
development of Canadian images of Finland. Among them, the Winter War stands out in terms of the sheer number of studies. In particular, the question of Allied military assistance to Finland and the efforts to prevent German access to Swedish iron ore have received attention.

Another subject sometimes mentioned in the Canadian literature is the declaration of war against Finland by Canada in December 1941. John Hilliker’s history of the DEA only comments that the declaration of war on 7 December 1941 added Finland, Hungary, and Romania “to the roster of enemies.” On the other hand, military and diplomatic historian C.P. Stacey, provides a bit more detail about the discussions surrounding the Canadian decision. The state of war between Canada and Finland was a result of Finnish participation in the German attack on the Soviet Union. To Finland this was the Continuation War and English readers were perhaps first introduced to the war from the Finnish perspective in Finland and World War II, 1939–1944 published in 1948. This book attempts to show that Finland was dragged into the Continuation War as a “co-belligerent” of Germany, but fighting a separate war. However, scholars disagree over the degree of agency exercised by the Finnish government and the status and role of the country in that war remains contested. Canada’s perspective was clear, Finland was fighting beside Germany against the Soviet Union, which was an important Canadian ally.

Logically flowing from Finland’s part in the war are studies, which look at the period of the armistice in 1944, the peace conference in 1946 and the start of the
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48 Heeney 1972, 66; Pearson 1973, 199.
49 Although the current accepted spelling is Romania and Romanian, Canadian documents at the time used Roumania and Roumanian. The modern spelling will be used unless the older spelling appears in a quote. Hilliker 1990, 249.
51 Wuorinen 1948. It was later determined this was the work of historian Arvi Korhonen, politicians Risto Ryti, Väinö Tanner, and others. See Aunesluoma 2013, 208. Overshadowed by the Winter War, the Continuation War has fewer studies in English. See Lundin 1957; Ziemiak 1959; Upton 1963; Erfurth 1979; Vehviläinen 2002; Lunde 2011.
52 A version of this interpretation of co-belligerency is sometimes called the “driftwood thesis,” which argues that Finland was dragged along by the tides of international events and that the country was as much a victim of the war as any other country. See the historiographical discussion in Meinander 2011.
53 See the historiographical discussion in Silvennoinen 2013; Aunesluoma 2013; Forster 1979. A more recent examination of the war is the collection of articles which provide access to the historiography and debates published in Finnish and other languages is Kinnunen and Kivimäki 2012.
Cold War. Canada played a minor role in the various peace overtures, which occurred during 1943 and 1944, but was nonetheless consulted by Britain about the form and content of the armistice. Canada did not play a direct role in the drafting of the peace treaty, but Canadian officials had the opportunity to comment on it as the details were worked out between Britain and the Soviet Union. The Paris Peace Conference and ratification of the treaty is usually only briefly covered in Canadian sources. Unlike New Zealand, the Canadian government never published an official report of the conference proceedings. Except for some muted support for modification of the political clauses and a reduction of the amount of reparations Finland had to pay, Canada contributed little to the talks about the Finnish treaty.

Soon this was replaced by Cold War concerns over Soviet penetration of Finland and the possible loss of independence. As a self-proclaimed “Middle Power” and a committed member of the Western alliance, Canada was not in a position to influence these events to any significant degree. By offering moral support, maintaining diplomatic ties, and trade relations, Canada could however, assist Finland in maintaining a window on the West.

When conducting relations with Finland, the Canadian government often considered the positions of the United Kingdom (UK) and the United States when choosing a course of action. Therefore, from a contextual perspective studies about US or UK relations with Finland are useful for comparison. Studies concerning Britain and Finland are varied. Some look at Finland in the early
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54 For example, Nevakivi 1994; Hentilä 1994; Kertesz 1992; Evans 2011; Tallgren 2013.
56 New Zealand 1947. The chair of the Canadian delegation did present a report to parliament and this was printed in the official records, however, not until 1977 were papers from the conference included in the Documents on Canadian External Relations series. The selected Canadian records briefly mention Finland. Page 1977, 67–151.
59 A useful collection of essays on British-Finnish relations is Aunesluoma 2005. The most useful articles were Salmon 2005; Evans 2005; Manninen 2005; Nevakivi 2005; Upton 2005; Visuri 2005. A similar collection of essays about the Finnish-American relationship is Ruddy 1998a. The most useful papers were Berry 1998; Maude 1998; Olson 1998. Perhaps one of the earliest scholars to look at the American policy towards Finland were two studies of isolationism, which contain sections on the Winter War and Continuation War. Langer and Gleason 1952, 318–342, 376–385; Langer and Gleason 1953, 547–551, 826–835. Some of the works on Finland include Sobel 1960; Schwartz 1960; Rhodes 1972; Jacobs 1981.
60 For example, Paasivirta 1965; Maude 1973; Sundbäck 1991a; Sundbäck 2001; Hovi 1980; Lyytinen 1980.
period of independence as a possible buffer state, as part of some broader Scandinavian or Baltic policy or as a diplomatic sideshow during the Second World War. American historian Michael Ruddy notes that throughout most of the Cold War historians did not pay much attention to Finland, the “small and relatively insignificant country” overshadowed by the USSR. He found that American perceptions of Finland contained the usual images of honest, debt paying, brave Finns resisting invasion. Even when Finland supported the Axis attack against the Soviet Union, these impressions remained. Only during the Cold War was a negative image formed in the minds of Americans, as they began to regard Finland as a penetrated and dominated country in the Soviet sphere. This image existed from the start, but only later was it popularized with the problematic term “Finlandization.”

One scholar who looks at American images of Finland and their relation to US foreign policy is Michael Berry. He argues in *Frontiers of American Political Experience*, that American foreign policy images of Finland were an extension of the “frontier thesis” or the “frontier myth.” Berry’s approach links American prosperity to economic and political liberalism within the concept of the relationship between “core” and “periphery.” In this model the economic and political centre seeks new sources of raw materials and markets in the hinterland or periphery. Ultimately, this led to an ideological preference for an informal world order, based on economic and political liberalism, where the American centre could seek new sources of material and markets. Until the 1930s the US saw itself located on the periphery of the Europe centred capitalist system. Finland was also on the European periphery acting as an interface with the Eastern geopolitical and economic area. Finland’s debt payments served to reinforce this positive image of a liberal economic world where countries were good world citizens, who honoured their commitments and, in the process, contributed to the building of the world community the US desired.

As a liberal democratic country, the image of “brave Finland” during the Winter War fit this ideology. Here was a self-reliant country, defending its independence against a country whose ideology was the antithesis of the American worldview. Finland fit the American world view and in part this explains why instead of declaring war on Finland in 1941, the US tried to convince Finland to
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62 Ruddy 1999b, 1.
63 The term was made popular by Laqueur 1977, 37–41. More nuanced is Lukacs 1992, 50–63.
leave the war. American policy makers by 1943–1944 were hoping for Allied co-operation to continue after the war through the United Nations (UN) and that the Soviet Union would allow “friendly democratic” nations on its borders. The best policy for continued Finnish independence was the adoption of a “good neighbour policy.” In the American liberal world view, Finland could then be an interface periphery by being in the Soviet sphere, with a democratic government and an economy open to the West. With the Cold War, it was realized there were limits to the American frontier and limits to the American ability to influence events in Eastern Europe. Finland clearly fell into the Soviet sphere but was also an exception since through a careful balancing act it was able to retain its democratic and capitalist system. As such, it was still on the periphery between East and West and could play a role in the containment of Soviet expansion and later act as a bridge during the era of detente. Reading American relations with Finland in this light according to Berry, explains the behaviour of the US government at various times.

To a degree Berry’s application of the frontier thesis fits the Canadian-Finnish situation as well. Such schools of thought like the “staples thesis” and the “Laurentian Thesis” were gaining popularity in the period Canada was developing relations with Finland. The economic expansion of the Canadian frontier was seen to be centred on key natural resources like fur, fish, timber, minerals, and wheat, controlled from a metropolitan centre such as London or Paris and later Canadian cities along the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River water way, like Montreal and Toronto. Where this essentially differs from the frontier thesis is there was more controlled expansion directed from the metropoles. These interpretations have been criticized as too simplistic and ignoring contrary evidence showing a more diversified and differentiated development of the economy. Still, the idea of a core-periphery or heartland-hinterland relationship retains some explanatory power. Although like Finland, the Canadian economy had become relatively diversified in relation to the British and American cores, Canada was on the periphery and dependant on world trade. What remains important was the preference for liberal political and economic institutions. Historian Ian McKay has
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64 Berry 1987.
66 See Allardt 1985; Alapuro 1980.
68 The Laurentian Thesis was sometimes described along with the related but not identical “Metropolitan Thesis.” See Innis 1972; Creighton 1937; Lower 1936.
described this as the “liberal order framework.” Canadian leaders like W.L.M. King and his officials in the Department of External Affairs and the Department of Trade and Commerce also desired a liberal world order based on their own ideological predispositions and the fact Canada was trading nation. Finnish democracy would put that country in a positive light, trade agreements would be seen as positive steps towards liberalised trade, but Finnish staples would make the country a competitor.

Some recent Finnish scholarship on international relations and Finland during the period of the Second World War into the early Cold War is also pertinent. In particular Kimmo Rentola’s study of Stalin’s view of Finland during three critical periods. Rentola utilizes recent scholarship and newly available Russian archival material and determined Stalin miscalculated how difficult Finland would be to defeat in 1939–40. He had only visited the country twice and otherwise showed little interest. The supreme leader was led to believe Finland would fall with little resistance like the Baltic States. When the Finnish army proved more difficult to defeat and managed to hold off the numerically and materially superior Red Army for months, Stalin chose not to occupy the country. Rentola reasons that this was likely because the Finns would continue to resist and become a festering wound. He also places importance on the threatened Allied intervention. This was not so much concern over the arrival of British and French troops, since they would not arrive in the numbers needed to turn the tide, but the threat of an attack on the Caucasus and Central Asia. In 1943–44 Stalin likewise insisted on a hardline which protracted armistice talks in the hope the Red Army could defeat Finland. When the massive Soviet offensive in the summer of 1944 failed to break the Finns, Stalin waited until the last moment to reveal his “bottom line.” Although the terms were only slightly more reasonable than from the start, they were still not as punitive as expected. Rentola found three reasons for this leniency. Finland was a marginal country and its territory was not needed for the more important invasion of Germany. The timing of the armistice talks over the summer of 1944 coincided with the landings in Normandy and Stalin did not want to devote resources to conquer Finland that were needed for the Soviet drive into Poland. Lastly the Soviet leader remembering
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70 McKay 2000.  
71 Rentola 2016; Lever 2018.
the Winter War concluded the Finns would resist to the last and require large numbers of troops to pacify the country.\textsuperscript{72}

Then in 1948 they had another opportunity to take Finland in a way similar to what occurred in Czechoslovakia. The country in many ways was ripe for take over. There was a communist prime minister and security minister, the communists still had a high level of voter support and were planning an insurrection and coup d’
état. The tipping point could have been the negotiation of a mutual assistance pact. However, the reasoned but firm stand taken by the Finns, in particular J.K. Paasikivi, reminded Stalin of Finnish determination. The Finns would resist a communist seizure of power. Instead the insurrection was stood down and Stalin accepted a treaty that was not a military alliance and left Finland to be a country influenced, but not controlled.\textsuperscript{73}

Both Kimmo Rentola and Juhana Aunesluoma have done research into recently available British archival material from the Continuation War into the early Cold War.\textsuperscript{74} In his article “A Nordic Country With East European Problems,” Aunesluoma notes the standard interpretation of British policy towards Finland in this period is based on a memorandum by Anthony Eden in August 1944 which essentially writes off Finland as part of the Soviet sphere. The conventional interpretation is that Britain sticks to this position through the rest of the Cold War.\textsuperscript{75} Or as Helena Evans concludes, sold off Finland through a series of errors.\textsuperscript{76} In 1944–1945, it was essential to the Allies to retain the alliance with the Soviets, therefore Britain was relatively passive during armistice talks and the operation of the Armistice Control Commission. The British government under Eden was optimistic that good relations could be maintained among the wartime allies and that the Soviets would not be expansionist. Except for access to forest products, there was no British interests in Finland. It was a view not shared by all British experts and officials. The newly available British documents show a more nuanced and evolving policy.\textsuperscript{77}

British policy towards the end of the war had been aimed at steering Finland away from Germany and anti-Soviet sentiments. In this the British thought the

\textsuperscript{72} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{73} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{74} The research was done using the latest volume of *Documents on British Policy Overseas*. Install and Salmon 2011.  
\textsuperscript{75} See Polvinen 1986, 14; Upton 2005, 63. The memorandum is summarized in Woodward 1971, 123–131.  
\textsuperscript{76} Evans 2005.  
Finns were “slow learners.” From the British perspective in the period 1944–48 it was thought obvious Finland would be either be annexed completely or at least drawn tightly into the Soviet orbit as a satellite. The March 1945 election with the strong showing of the communists, seemed to reinforce the image of Finland as Eastern and part of the Soviet sphere. By 1946 it was clear the relationship between the Soviets and the West had deteriorated, which explains the British behaviour at the peace talks in Paris. Finland’s military needed to be limited because in any future war the Finnish military would be at the disposal of the Soviets. Providing the option of future Finnish membership in the United Nations was a way of offering a way to move out of the Soviet orbit, even if only a little, by permitting Finland to enter the community of nations. Britain also remained passive at the peace talks, because they did not want Finland to become another “Balkan question” and was less concerned about Finland’s survival than over stability in the Baltic. In this way Aunesluoma sees Britain influencing the Paasikivi Line through such subtle messages implying no help would be forthcoming from the West and the best policy was one which did not antagonize the Soviets.

Aunesluoma notes an evident shift in British thinking by 1947, when they were more willing to look for ways to support Finland, without provoking the USSR. The only real tools available are what in a later period would be called “soft power.” Economic and cultural contacts, along with information campaigns and public diplomacy would be used to encourage friendly relations between Britain and Finland. This would be a slow process. Unfortunately for Foreign Office officials working the Finland desk, trade interests came first, and the British government took a harder line at times than they would have preferred. Things like the Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Co-operation in 1948 revived pessimism about Finland’s future, but by the end of the year it was clear country would survive. Finland would remain a Nordic country and occupy a unique place between East and West.

Rentola examines the same documents in his article “Great Britain and the Soviet Threat, 1944–1951” and finds many of the same patterns noted by Aunesluoma. He also noted a distinct change the attitude of the British government from 1944 to the late 1940s when it was determined to counter Soviet efforts in Finland despite the fact in naked military terms Finland was “lost.” The British did object to the peace terms in March 1944, not just over the amount of the reparations.
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78 See Koskimies 2011; Visuri 2005.
80 See Jensen-Eriksen 2006.
81 Aunesluoma 2012, 238–240.
but because the Soviets planned to take most of Finland’s forest products as payment. It was out of self-interest because the UK wanted to buy wood and paper like before the war. By the summer Stalin was no longer eager to occupy Finland and relented, instead proposing a new indemnity list which consisted mainly of metal goods, ships, machinery and so on. To this the Finns reacted negatively, since they wanted to pay with products traditionally traded to Russia. Being able to sell forest products to Britain and other Western countries offered a thin lifeline to prevent the Finnish economy from becoming totally dominated by the Soviet Union. The 1945 British timber delegation while it served Britain’s reconstruction needs was also intended to help Finland in this way. The foreign exchange earned from wood purchases could then be used to acquire the metals, rubber, and other raw materials needed to fulfil reparations deliveries.82

Expanding on the discussion about Finland’s place in the early Cold War is Marek Fields who looks at British and American propaganda, often in the form of public diplomacy, but also cultural diplomacy, directed towards the Finnish people. A lot of this was handled by embassies, but also by sponsoring or encouraging private groups and individuals to participate in educational, artistic, scientific, and sporting exchanges. As Anthony Pratkanis notes, today this is sometimes called “soft-power,” which is aims to promote the national interest of the sending power, by influencing the population of other nations. The examples presented here are relatively benign, but he notes it can also have a hard edge consisting of propaganda which plays on emotions and prejudice.83 Although, there were no direct armed confrontations between the Super Powers, there was indirectly through proxies or satellite belligerents, and covert espionage activities, the Cold War was mainly ideological and fought with rhetoric. It was a war of ideas as much as it was anything, using words, images, and perceptions, laden with motives and expectations. It was a “war of the mind” or to use a cliché phrase from the era, it was a war for “hearts and minds,” to change attitudes and perceptions in favour of one side or the other.84 Propaganda therefore becomes what some described as the fourth element of international relations after the political, economic, and military components. The goal was to influence international public opinion or the public opinion in a targeted country, in a way favourable to the nation sending the message.

83 Pratkanis 2009, 111, 113.
In this war of images, everything becomes a tool to disseminate, control, and manipulate information about the Self and the opponent Other. Things such as sport, ballet, music, popular entertainment, comic books, space travel and many others are given political significance when it came to shaping opinions at home to counter the opponent’s propaganda or in subverting a target country. Finland was a target for both the UK and US. Despite recurrent suspicions or doubts about Finland’s true position in the Cold War, there remained a strong desire to do everything possible to reinforce the country’s attachment to the West. Given the precarious military position Finland was in, propaganda and cultural diplomacy were the only viable options. For that reason, Fields argues that propaganda activities directed at Finland took on a greater importance than they did for other zones of contact. Here the UK during the early Cold War was in the lead, though their efforts did overlap with the Americans. Britain produced “copy” for Finnish newspapers and information directed at influential Finnish personalities, along with more “neutral” material designed to simply inform about aspects of British life and generally promote the country to Finns. Complementing this was the BBC Finnish Service programs and the British Council for Cultural Activities which set up educational exchanges and opportunities for language training.85

The American approach utilized the press, the production of a magazine with Finnish contributors, the circulation of films, and the establishment of libraries, educational exchanges, that were complemented by Voice of America broadcasts. Both the British and Americans had concerns over the state of freedom of the press in Finland, especially the cautious self-censorship which existed. It was perplexing that material too blatantly pro-Western and anti-Soviet was not permitted, while groups like the Finnish communists could freely publish anti-Western and pro-Soviet material. American and British propagandists, however, were astute enough, to avoid placing the Finns in an embarrassing position, by refraining from using provocative messages in their anti-Soviet campaign in Finland. Through these avenues of propaganda, public diplomacy, and cultural diplomacy, both the UK and later the US had an influential position in Finland and provided a counter balance to Soviet influence.86

The views of Rentola, Aunesluoma and Fields based on their findings in British and American archives parallel those found in Canadian archives. As such they support and complement the information presented in this dissertation. Canada to

85 Fields 2015, 14–15.
86 Ibid., 14–16.
a large degree adopted similar views about Finland’s fate in the period leading into the Cold War and followed a policy very similar to the US and UK. Regarding Western propaganda directed towards Finland, Canada also played a supporting role, and this is shown in later sections of “The Canadian Image of Finland.”

Aside from studies of foreign relations there are a number of useful works that look at images of Finns and Finland in Canada and the United States. There is a lot of literature relating to subjects about Finns in North America, the communities they established, their experiences, culture, religion, sporting and community groups, and politics.87 For Finnish-Americans and Finnish-Canadians the question of retaining some connection with their ancestral roots or assimilating into the wider culture was an ongoing issue of identity construction. There have been a lot of examinations of Finnish-American identity and culture with an ethnic history, sociological or anthropological focus. These sometimes contain information about perceptions of Finns in Canada.88 My own paper on the early images of Finns and Finland is one of the few studies specifically looking at these Canadian perceptions.89 Varpu Lindström, in her survey of the Finnish-Canadian experience during the Second World War era, covers in passing the range of positive and negative images that dominated Canadian perceptions in that time.90 The only other such study has been done by a student at Laurentian University in Sudbury; one of several locations in Canada which has a large population of Finnish-Canadians. Using secondary sources and newspapers from several Northern Ontario communities Chris Vuorensyrja looked at Canadian perceptions and images of Finns in reaction to the Winter War.91

With few Canadian studies, comparative literature about images of Finland and Finns in the UK and the US is also useful. Canada historically imported large numbers of books and periodicals, mainly from Britain, the United States, and France. For example, in the twentieth century for every Canadian magazine there were 8 American magazines sold. American books ranged anywhere from 50–85% of all books imported, compared to British books which varied from 10–40% of all imported publications.92 In addition to sharing some common history and the same language, there was considerable social and cultural exchange with those two

87 See for example the volumes of the Journal of Finnish Studies from 1997–2015.
88 For example, Lewis 1991; Taramaa 2007a, 15; Taramaa 2007b; Taramaa 2009.
89 Ratz 2008.
90 Lindström 2000a.
91 Vuorensyrja 2008.
countries, because English speaking Canadians had access to British and American newspapers, periodicals, and books. In the process, Canadians would have been exposed to the historic images of Finns and Finland, which developed in the broader English-speaking world. New images would develop, and the common images of Finland and Finns would be given their own unique Canadian variations. The earliest information about Finland was available from various travel writers, encyclopaedists, journalists, anthropologists, geographers and historians from Britain, Western Europe, and the United States.

One of the first scholars to look at the image of Finland in North America was Juhani Paasivirta. His 1962 study, *Suomen kuva Yhdysvalloissa: 1800-luvun lopulta 1960-luvulle; ää rivivioja*, examines perceptions, viewpoints, and prevalent opinions about Finland and Finns. As a backdrop, he pays attention to US government policy towards Finland and the Finnish government information activities in America. The images and events the study uncovers have many similar parallels to the Canadian case and will be well known to those familiar with images of Finland. In earlier periods Finland had images as a primitive, frontier borderland, with a northern location, and there were questions about the racial origin of the Finnish people. Keijo Virtanen found during the nineteenth century American travelers reported similar things others did when visiting Finland, such as witchcraft, mysticism, and a land inhabited by a poor rural people who were erroneously said to be descended from Mongols. On the other hand, there was interest in the United States about Finnish intellectual life seen through academic exchanges and the work of the Finnish Literature Society. Particularly, Finnish art and the literature of Zachris Topelius and Johan Runeberg attracted a lot of attention.

Publication of the *Kalevala* and Alexis Kivi’s *Seven Brothers* in English, contributed to wider knowledge of Finns in America, but Virtanen found it tended to reinforce the primitive image. Literature, international recognition of Jean
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Sibelius as a great composer, the success of the Arabia and Iittala ceramic and glass ware and the work of designer Alvar Aalto added to the perception of Finland as a place of culture and art. Success by the Olympic runners Hannes Kolehmainen (smiling Hannes or the smiling Finn), Paavo Nurmi and others, collectively known as the “flying Finns,” gave the country a higher profile and Finland also came to be associated with athletic achievement.99

From the end of the nineteenth century Finland had a two-faceted image incorporated into the idea of a borderland. The link to the East and Asia added exoticism and a Romanticized attachment to the natural world, while the Western aspect added European qualities like industrial and intellectual progressiveness. Virtanen found that travel writers generally reinforced the image of Finland as a remote, primitive place, but when the urban areas were looked at a new image was emerging of a country with cultural features similar to Western Europe. Paasivirta found that positive images of immigrant Finns as hardworking grew beside images of radical Red Finns. Germany’s aid to the White Finns further contributed to the negative image, but this was eventually supplanted in the decades after independence by the image of Finland as a payer of debts and a modern progressive nation due to the country’s position on women’s rights, prohibition and temperance, and association with the idea of the “Scandinavian middle way.”100

The Winter War revived the image of brave Finland which had grown during Russification. The war was presented as a “David versus Goliath” struggle and Finland was an outpost of Western civilization opposing Soviet barbarism. Although public opinion in the US was generally very sympathetic, isolationist tendencies ensured official support would be limited, despite the appearance of generosity.101 During the early Cold War there was a revitalization of the positive Finnish image as an interface between East and West that of brave Finns resisting Sovietization to retain their way of life.102 While employed at the Embassy of Finland in Washington during the 1970s, Pauli Opas, relayed similar positive images, but downplayed them because writing during the Cold War brave Finland resisting the Soviets was not constant with maintaining a good neighbor policy. Instead he focused on the more neutral images around “Sibelius, sauna, sports, and sisu.”103

100 Ibid.
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One of the more prolific authors to examine Finland has been geographer W.R. Mead.\textsuperscript{104} In between looking at standard geographical topics, Mead also explored the cultural phenomena of perceptions, stereotypes and images of Finland and Finns. A number of articles examined the myths and misconceptions inherent in the many images of Finland found in English fiction and non-fiction. Here he found the Finns often misidentified with the Lapps and the supposed witchcraft they possessed. There were mysterious sailors with sinister reputations, Finns prone to violence and drunkenness, and suborn silent Finns, alongside Finns presented as an honest, hardworking Northern people. They were also reputed to be skilled seamen. Interspersed with these were images of the Northern and Eastern frontier of civilization, a land of snow, woods, lakes, and wild animals. Mead has also looked at perceptions surrounding Finland’s place in the world, such as, is Finland part of the East or West, a periphery or part of the Scandinavian or Nordic community.\textsuperscript{105} As a cross-cultural encounter, he looked at how the British and Finns “discovered” each other as travelers, missionaries, scientists, and traders.\textsuperscript{106}

Mead observed that, “On paper every country is reduced to a bundle of metaphors and myths. They shift and change in time: they are explored and exploited for different reasons.”\textsuperscript{107} It is also an appropriate comment about the Canadian image of Finland, which perceived the country and its people at various times in positive and negative ways and employed them for different reasons in the Canadian-Finnish relationship. No one source has examined those images of Finland within the context Canadian-Finnish relations and that is the research problem which needs to be looked at.

\textsuperscript{104} Mead 2005.
\textsuperscript{105} Mead 1949a; Mead 1958; Mead 1963; Mead 1976; Mead 1979; Mead 1982; Mead 1984. These subjects he expanded on in Mead 1987. It was reprinted in English. Mead 1989. Also, Mead 2008. More recently others have examined how geography, maps, and territorial representations are related to the images found in Finnish identity construction and the creation of perceptions of Finland by outside observers. Here we see the pervasiveness of the borderland, the idea of an interface periphery between Europe and Asia and other similar and related concepts that compose a significant part of the auto and hetro-images of Finland. Karsh 1986a; Paasi 1997; Paasi 1999; Peltonen 2000; Paasi 2008; Häyrynen 2004; Kosonen 2008; Kantola 2010. This has also been extended the examination of images in identity construction to Finnish postage stamps. Raento and Brunn 2005; Raento and Brunn 2008.
\textsuperscript{106} Mead 1949b; Mead 1950. A more recent study is Nyman 2015.
\textsuperscript{107} Mead 1993, 1.
1.3 Research Problem

“The Canadian Image of Finland, 1919–1948: Canadian Government Perceptions and Foreign Policy” looks at the image of Finland held by Canadian foreign policy makers from the period of the establishment of diplomatic recognition to the implementation of the 1947 Peace Treaty and the restoration of normal relations. The problem will be approached by defining the images of Finland held by Canadians and then examine them in the context of Canadian-Finnish relations in the subsequent sections. To do this the images of Finland held by Canadians will be examined in the period up to the 1920s. Next the images that existed during the period of normal relations between the world wars will be explored. The specific issues of diplomatic recognition, trade and commerce and immigration will be looked at. Then the focus will change to the shifting image of Finland during the Second World War and how it was reflected in Canadian foreign policy towards Finland. The last part of the study will look at the image of Finland after the war with the restitution of normal diplomatic relations and trade. A detailed explanation of the chapter organization is included at the end of this introduction.

The various images of Finns and Finland that existed in Canada will not be exhaustively studied in all their variations and contexts; rather it will suffice to establish what images existed. The truth of those images is not as important as examining how they influenced Canadian foreign policy decision-makers when dealing with issues concerning Finland. Interwoven with identifying what images existed and the impact they had on Canadian foreign policy towards Finland is why certain kinds images of Finland and Finns presented themselves at a certain time or in relation to a particular policy issue. Canadian government records do at times differentiate between the people and the state or government of Finland. Images of Finns are included in this study because occasionally the source material makes references to the people, rather than the country or state. Images of the Finnish people are important because they are part of the image of the country as a whole. If the Finnish people are perceived in a certain way, it logically follows that this implies certain images about the place they come from. This applies equally to people who can be described as Finnish-Canadians, which includes those who immigrated to Canada or were born in the country. The main reason this is important is because for many Canadian officials the only knowledge they had of Finland was indirectly through newspapers and other published material and from their encounters with Finnish people in Canada.
It is also important to clarify what “The Canadian Image of Finland” is not. From Political Science, the fields of International Relations (IR) and Foreign Policy Analysis there are numerous theories, paradigms, approaches, and research programs which offer ways to examine inter-state relations and how states make and implement foreign policy decisions. While there is a rich literature in these fields which point to the importance of images and these to varying degrees have influenced the research conducted here, this is not an exercise in IR theory or Foreign Policy Analysis. There is no effort at making a broad explanatory model or predictive theory. Constructivism, the IR approach with its recognition that important aspects of international politics are socially and historically constructed, has informed in some ways the examination of “The Canadian Image of Finland.” In particular images are useful in understanding the construction of identities and interests; however, this is not a study of Canadian identity. Although this study will certainly touch on issues of identity, as Waldemar Zacharasiewicz and others have found in their examination of images of Central Europe, in literature from North America,

The factual and fictional confrontation of North Americans with cisatlantic manners and morals merits our attention also because of the implied evaluation in descriptions of European nations and societies reveals a good deal about the assumptions of the North American authors as to their own national societies.\(^{108}\) Canadian images of Finland are by that reasoning inextricably linked to Canadian self-images. It is also not a history of Canadian foreign policy, though the “The Canadian Image of Finland” contributes to that area. International politics, Canadian foreign policy, the decision-making process, and identity does enter the narrative into which the Canadian images of Finland are placed but are intended to act to help understand those images. At its heart, this study remains essentially a history of the Canadian image of Finland.

1.4 Methodology and Sources

The key subject under consideration here is historical written representations of Finland and Finns, found in Canadian government documents, which for analytical purposes is called an “image.”\(^{109}\) The study of images has occupied scholars in the

\(^{108}\) Zacharasiewicz 1995a, xi, xvi.

disciplines of history, literature studies, geography, social psychology, anthropology, women’s studies, feminist theory, cultural studies, and political science/studies for decades. In Europe, the field of imagology since the 1960s has examined, often in a comparative context, the ideas and attitudes presented in the images circulating in a given society and how the generalizations in the mental pictures authors and readers have in their minds, show they represent ethnic groups and nations. These studies work from the premise that such generalizations are social constructions and use insights from social psychology regarding the dissemination of prejudices. It as process whereby stable ideas about one’s own group reify into self- or auto-images and those of other groups are juxtaposed as hetero-images. The literature these studies have produced is too voluminous to cover here, but recognized leaders in the field Manfred Beller and Joep Leerssen in 2007 produced a comprehensive primer on imagological theory in their Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters, which also contains a critical survey of the vast literature on the subject.

As a concept the image is a problematic term with considerable ambiguity in the ways it is used. In different fields the term “image” has been used with various, occasionally contradictory meanings. Nathan Glazer notes that at times scholars have among other things used image synonymously with perceptions, perspectives, notions, ideas, similes, metaphors, schemas, policy orientations, cognitive maps, and operational codes. Things such as beliefs, opinions, attitudes, and stereotypes are in a sense related to the concept of the image, because they form part of the underlying conceptions of the object viewed. However, images are more enduring, since opinions and attitudes are temporary and more easily changeable, and stereotypes are narrower, reified and more selective images. The image contains the various descriptive and evaluative elements attached to it from generalized beliefs, stereotypes, attitudes, opinions, and recollections about the object. An image can also contain the myths believed by the observer, as well as their hopes and fears and strong emotions like love and hate projected onto the object.

According to image theory, every person or collection of people has an image of the world. As one of the pioneers of image studies Kenneth Boulding described it, the information a person believes to be “true” has a “cognitive structure” which

110 Zacharasiewicz use the terms autostereotype and heterostereotype. Zacharasiewicz 2007, 1, 5.
111 Beller and Leerssen 2007.
113 Fält 1995, 100.
forms their “subjective knowledge” of the world or their image.\textsuperscript{114} The image orders experience and gives it meaning when filtered through the person’s value system. Each individual, group, organization, society, and nation, therefore, has its image or images of the world encompassing everything in it. This is, in turn, composed of countless specific images of people, groups, places, and objects. The “material” the image is made of comes from information inputs.\textsuperscript{115} These come from the senses, in the form of direct experiences of the environment and this gives the information a degree of perceived validity or truth.\textsuperscript{116} They also come through written or verbal communication, photographs, drawings, and so on. Such information can be given verbally or in writing, by the observers or participants of something, but more often is based on “reports of reports” received from others.\textsuperscript{117} In this way, a person gains “knowledge” about something they have had no direct experience of, but can still “picture” or relate to through symbolic communication.\textsuperscript{118} When significant events occur it becomes clear that an assortment of images are formed which fade or focus depending on the circumstances. Regardless of the degree of acquaintance with the object, there is typically sufficient information to form a positive or negative impression.\textsuperscript{119}

As Boulding notes, the majority of the countless “messages” a person receives have no effect on the structure of the image. In other cases, messages confirm the existing image or simply add to it without fundamentally altering it.\textsuperscript{120} Moreover, a person may not be able to handle the vast amount of relevant information about something or miss those messages that indicate the image is wrong. On the other hand, the presence of inconstancies in the image can lead to “psychological discomfort” or “dissonance.” The initial reaction might be to reject or ignore any conflicting message. A message that serves to make the image less clear can be dismissed outright as wrong or an anomaly and it is easier to question the accuracy of the source of the information than to alter the image of something on which a high value is placed. Conversely, messages received repeatedly or forcefully, particularly if they come from credible sources, can at times overcome this resistance.\textsuperscript{121}

\textsuperscript{114} Boulding 1973b, 24.
\textsuperscript{116} Boulding 1959a, 27–28.
\textsuperscript{117} Hayakawa 1941, 15.
\textsuperscript{118} Ichheiser 1940, 290.
\textsuperscript{119} Isaacs 1962, 405–406.
\textsuperscript{120} Buchanan and Cantril 1953, 2–3; Glazer 1975, 204–205; Scott 1965, 70–103.
\textsuperscript{121} Festinger coined the expression “cognitive dissonance.” Festinger 1957, 2–3; Boulding 1956, 8.
Any apparent variations in the image are more likely attributable to the relative weight assigned to an object at different times. The image of a nation, for example, which was previously considered friendly, but is now regarded as an enemy will have a “new” image manifested that reflects the current relationship. Elements of it, however, will have been “latent” in the former image. 122 Many of the images a person has were already in existence in the society in which they live. They have been described as an “intellectual heritage,” handed down as a socially constructed cultural interpretation of reality. Within this heritage are many latent images that remain relatively constant no matter what new bits of information are added to them over time. 123 Robert Jervis in his study of perception and misperception determined that it is not easy to verify the accuracy of perceptions. Images will therefore to a certain degree be at variance with reality due to the “dynamics of social perception.” 124 From the historical actor’s point of view, as Boulding describes it, this variety of alternative images is not just a part of the psychological “environment” in which the actor operates; it is that environment or “subjective reality,” regardless of its accuracy in relation to the “real world.” 125 For historians it is not so important that the images held by people in the past are “true.” The mere fact people held such images and how they affected responses to events is the crucial point. Relative accuracy, or truth does however become a factor when looking at how such images were used.

Images of nations involve identity construction and a process called “othering.” The process of constructing identities involves outlining who is included in the nation or “self,” which by implication also defines who is not included or the “other.” Images of the other form gradually in a society over long periods and change with the social and political conditions of the time. When one group of people looks at another, inevitable questions arise about what is the “national character” of the other. It comes out of the common, but incorrect assumption, that all members of ethnic groups have a definable, distinguishable character. It also assumes others see the world in the same way as the viewer. The image of an individual, nation or culture can be favourable/positive or unfavourable/negative depending on the

123 Lippman used the expression “pictures in our heads.” Lippman 1965, 3, 5, 60–63. See also Carter 1962; Buchanan and Cantril 1953, 1–3; Kelman 1965, 24–25.
124 Jervis 1976, 6–7, 172–173; Ichheiser 1940, 6, 8.
125 Boulding 1973a.
relation of the hopes and fears of the observer to the prevailing “environmental conditions.”  

The process of defining the self is therefore to a degree is based on an imagined contradistinction of the other, sometimes called the experience of “alterity.” The concept of the “image of the other” according to social psychologist Gustav Ichheiser, is the basis of relations between people. The nature and form of these relations depends on the adequacy or inadequacy of the mutual perceptions of the other. Unconsciously, people consider the reactions of others to their actions. He stressed that “the way in which we see ourselves can be adequately described and grasped only by the roundabout method of analysing the way in which we see others and are seen by them.” Images of the other often reify into stereotypes that place value judgements about the character of the foreign peoples, cultures, and nations observed. The experience of alterity means that the starting point for the self-image is judgements about foreign peoples, cultures, and nations, which “may be tacitly or explicitly used to reflect back one’s domestic presuppositions and culture.” Zacharasiewicz notes that it is “well explored by social psychology and the study of prejudices, that foreign countries and peoples are usually judged and described from an ethnocentric position.” Franz Stanzel in his theoretical examination of imagology around national images, found stereotypes to exist in two senses. In a positive sense they are merely descriptive tools, which provide a preliminary generalization about a complex topic, which can be revised and expanded as more information becomes available. Negatively stereotypes exist which are generalizations that reset revision, even when faced with new data. These stereotypes persist over time and show a rigidity of thought.

Literary images or stereotypes were commonly used in various contexts to make some assessment about a people’s “national character.” As Stanzel points out the concept of “national character” is problematic and controversial, since it is not clear if such a thing can be demonstrated to exist. However, imagology and the study of images is indeed about “national character” as it is presented in various forms of literature. Such representations are a fruitful avenue of historical inquiry, because in the past and in the present, despite evidence to the contrary, many people

---

127 Ichheiser 1940, 289. See also Browning 2008, 49.
130 Stanzel 1995, 1.
thought and even today think it a “self-evident” idea that nations and people’s have fixed immutable properties.\textsuperscript{131} The crassest form of a stereotype is the cliché, which reduces the subjective evaluation of national character to a one trait. Typically, this is seen in literature where the foreigner is presented as a “type,” yet the native characters are seen as individuals. Stanzel notes that these are commonly drawn from typologies, such as the “four humours,” “lists of virtues and vices” following the lines of the seven deadly sins or a professional description like soldier, craftsman etc. Similar things occur when the evaluation of national character is done using climatic zones, suggesting there is a formative influence on a people’s temperament and behaviour. Northerners were seen as hardly, but dull; southerners as lively, witty, but lecherous; while those in the temperate zone combined the best of both, without the vices.\textsuperscript{132}

Nonetheless, Zacharasiewicz found that the national images evoked in literature can be quite complex, but more importantly stereotypes are relatively stable over time and in some cases, such as with the Germans, perpetuated over centuries. National stereotypes he concludes are frequently deployed in opposition to known historical facts or in the face of changing political and cultural contacts between countries.\textsuperscript{133} In the case of the Germans, the cliché of drunkenness and gluttony has reappeared repeatedly since Greco-Roman times. As character flaws drunkenness and gluttony, was associated with peoples considered primitive, uncivilized, and barbarian in the original sense of someone who was not Greek or Roman.\textsuperscript{134} Imagologists have used a wide variety of source material to demonstrate where stereotyped ideas and images about other countries and peoples are generated: literature, ethnographic and historical studies, travelogues, plays, and in more recent times films.

According to Stanzel, the literary source of such stereotypes is critical. It has been a common assertion of historians, sociologists, and anthropologists who have studied images, that images of foreigners stem from individual and collective contacts which form the historical political and social relations between two countries. If this were so, he argues there would be more variety in the images. Instead, what is seen is constancy over time, with perhaps changes in word use to articulate the image, but the meaning is the same. When the images are used in

\textsuperscript{131} Zacharasiewicz 2007, 3.
\textsuperscript{132} Stanzel 1995, 2–3.
\textsuperscript{133} Zacharasiewicz 1995a, xii.
\textsuperscript{134} These were just two of the repeating images of Germans over time. Zacharasiewicz 2007, 14. Also, Stanzel 1995, 4–6.
literature they become resilient. Another assumption that has been challenged by more recent work by social psychologists and anthropologists, according to Zacharasiewicz, is the notion that by reducing images found in literature to their common denominator, these images accurately portray the quality of the bilateral political, military, and cultural relationship. This it has been shown is a simplification, since there is also “no doubt that collective experience also shapes the multifaceted image of the culture of another nation.”

Not all representations of other countries and people are exaggerations or “fictions” according to Zacharasiewicz. Such things as travelogues are in many ways “authentic” historical observations by contemporary witnesses. Reports and descriptions which at first seem to be fanciful inventions, were actually based on “facts” or things actually seen. Some work might be required to suss these out, but his point is that not all images of other nations are fictitious. This does not mean that such writers eschewed stereotypes, even if they were consciously attempting to be objective. Noted art historian Ernst Gombrich in his study of art theory and history demonstrated that the “innocent eye” is a myth and so it is with national images. Everyone carries with them preconceptions and prejudices, a sort of mental baggage, with ideas and notions about foreign countries and peoples, which in turn were most likely derived from literary sources. In the case of images of Europeans in North American these migrated along with immigrants and took root in their new home, where often the virtues of the “New World” were contrasted or foregrounded against the perceived vices of the old.

To a degree a number of scholars have studied how images can be deliberately created or cultivated. Within such fields as cultural studies, media studies, and discourse analysis it has been noted that images of a country are often created by the news media. Here representing peoples and countries it is argued involves recontextualization. Reality is transposed into a discourse, formed by the angle of vision of the medium, politics, and economics to become semiotic tools of power and domination. Elena Tarasheva in her study of images of Bulgaria on the BBC news website found her native land to be presented as an oddity, when it was reported on at all, with negative images associated with crime corruption, and concerns over the negative effects of immigration on British society. These images
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were made frequently without any direct contact with the people or country.\textsuperscript{140} States can also try to deliberately cultivate attitudes and images through propaganda as Fields demonstrates in his examination of British diplomacy towards Finland in the early Cold War and Pratkanis shows in his analysis of public diplomacy.\textsuperscript{141}

Just as Britain tried to cultivate certain images in Finland, the Finns have since the exhibits set up at the World Fairs starting in the late nineteenth century, tried to project positive images of themselves to the international community. These early pioneers and later the government Propaganda Union and Finland News Bureau formed in 1937, according to Elina Melgin, thought “their most important task was to safeguard Finland’s national image.”\textsuperscript{142} The methods used, and the specific messages changed over time. In general, the aim was to foster a positive image of Finland using cultural, educational, and sporting exchanges, and the distribution of news about Finland, to create a sense that Finland was a modern, progressive, Western, Nordic, European country.\textsuperscript{143} The success of this program is seen in the fact that many of these were accepted uncritically by the Canadian officials who dealt with foreign policy, as can be seen throughout this study of the “Canadian Image of Finland.” It must however be kept in mind that to a large extent this was more a bolstering of already existing or latent positive images which were part of the Canadian cultural baggage, as opposed to the creation of new images.

Positioning national images in this way means that the holder of the image or the observer is a crucial factor. In this study they are the politicians, government officials, and civil servants who formulated and managed Canadian foreign policy. They were both receivers of images about Finland and creators of images through their verbal statements, written communications, and actions. They are the focal point from which to examine the image of Finland as decisions about Canadian-Finnish foreign relations were made. In some sense a country is as much a “concept” as a geographic locality. The decision makers involved in Canadian-Finnish relations through their status, experiences, interpretation of historical events, and their hopes and fears for the future create a mental structure or image that operates in the world system as “Canada” or “Finland.” Therefore, when we examine an image of a people we must speak of several dimensions or variations of an image,

\textsuperscript{140} She used three methodologies: content analysis, critical discourse analysis, and corpus (key words) assisted discourse analysis. Tarasheva 2014.
\textsuperscript{141} Fields 2015; Pratkanis 2009.
\textsuperscript{142} Melgin 2015, 20.
\textsuperscript{143} Melgin 2014. On strategies to protect and bolster images Ivanov and Parker 2011. For a case study of images of India and Indians at home and in Poland, two countries which had very little contact between them see Klodkowski 2012.
as different aspects are highlighted at different times. In his studies on ethnic and national images, social psychologist Richard Willis demonstrated that people tend to hold different images of a people and the government of a country. There is a common perception that “people are people” and human nature is essentially the same everywhere, but individuals are less likely to give a particular government the benefit of the doubt. This is an important distinction when dealing with historic images Canadian officials had of Finland and Finns, because at times they clearly differentiate between the government and people of Finland.

The image of another country or people will have affectional connotations and have an internal coherence that does not necessarily follow the rules of formal logic and it may be riddled with contradictions and ambiguities. IR theories have typically worked from a “rational” decision-making model. It operates on the premise that relations between states are largely determined by the material considerations of geography, resources, power, money, economics, and national self-interest as determined by the governing elites and are based largely on “hard facts,” seen in the harsh light of “reality.” However, those who make decisions, and determine the policies or actions of governments it has been said, do not simply read the “objective” facts of the situation, but instead respond in terms of their subjective views or their image of the situation. In other words, foreign policy decision makers react to what they “think the world actually is” not how it “actually is.”

Intelligent people whose task it is to handle the problems of foreign relations would claim they are conscientious and separate their personal feelings or reactions to other nations and peoples, from their judgements of the desirability or undesirability of a particular policy. It is however doubtful that any person ever fully escapes their own biases, regardless of how reflective they are. It would also be dubious to assume that a head of state, foreign minister, or other policy making body commands effectively the vast range of information available when making decisions. People in general and in particular foreign policy decision makers operate in what has been termed a “bounded reality” or “bounded rationality,” which is to say within the limits placed by time, intellect, and amount of information available. The quality of a decision or policy is only as good as the
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information available, which can be ambiguous, inaccurate, conflicting, incomplete, or overwhelming.\textsuperscript{149} When looking at foreign policy decisions, the images decision makers have of other peoples and nations are clearly only one of several interrelated elements, that come to bear on the issue being considered. Rarely are these images expressly stated and therefore they must be inferred and reconstructed indirectly from what these individuals said and did.\textsuperscript{150}

The study of images is also compatible with the approach known as Constructivism used in IR theory. The dominant approaches in IR theory tend to treat states as unitary rational actors whose identities and interests are taken as given and essentially the same and relatively invariant over time and space. Given this, all states should respond to the “hard facts” of the international system in similar and predictable ways.\textsuperscript{151} This is seen when a state is described in anthropomorphic terms as a unitary thinking or acting entity, maximizing utility while rationally perusing goals.\textsuperscript{152} It works on the presumption that states are united and rational in the definition of and pursuit of national interests. In contrast Constructivists argue this ignores the possibility that individual states have different cultures and histories, which through the concepts of the self and the other and the images surrounding them, create identities that play a role in foreign policy formulation, decision making, and responses to material conditions in the international system.\textsuperscript{153}

States and the decision-making process are seldom composed of likeminded and unified actors. Most states are in some way internally divided among contending demographic groups, economic interest or classes, ethnicities, and interest groups, with each of these having its own ideas, based on its own interests, of what policies a government should follow at home and internationally. Governments are typically run by competing departmental bureaucracies, each with their own interests, goals, and routines. Politicians in democratic countries, who are given posts with decision making powers, must also face public opinion and legislative bodies split on partisan lines aiming to influence policy. In this way
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saying Finland wanted something or Canada acted in a certain way is a heuristic model representing the final product of the conflicting or contenting forces that play into the decision-making process. What is then presented as the national interests can be the end product of the interplay of these various factors or represent the views of decision makers who are part of the dominant elite.\textsuperscript{154}

Social and political reality Constructivists argue, is not “objective” or “external” and are not measurable and predictable in the way that things in the Natural Sciences like chemistry are. In reality they exist in the realm of human consciousness, and therefore IR should concentrate on the study of the ideational and social interaction aspects of the international system. The international system is a social construct, is not purely material and it is the intersubjective meanings the actors imbue the material features of the system that constitute it. This does not mean that Constructivists think the structure of the system and material power distribution between states is unimportant. States do not have an unlimited freedom of action in this concept of international relations, but rather face a wide variety of external and internal, material, and ideational constraints that serve to limit the range of viable policy options. Material considerations can have some impact outside of ideas. The distribution of resources and capabilities makes some choices and outcomes more likely than others.\textsuperscript{155} The perception of the objective, external, reality of the situation will in turn be influenced by underlying images the individuals and collective decision-making apparatus have of the country or countries involved and their own self-image of their country and its role in world affairs. Socially constructed realities do not directly impact foreign policy in terms of cause and effect, but as foreign policy analyst Christopher Browning notes, they “do frame the context of the ‘perceived’ reality of decision-makers at any given time.”\textsuperscript{156} Foreign policy makers as social creatures whose desires, interests, and identities evolve through “social interaction” conform to roles, intersubjective shared values, expectations about appropriate behaviour, and respond to situations with what is described as the “logic of appropriateness.”\textsuperscript{157}

The process of creating identity, the defining of the self and the other makes future action meaningful. Identities are composed of “narratives” which give a sense of belonging. In his study \textit{Imagined Communities}, Benedict Anderson has shown that ethnic and national identities are constructs and written texts contribute
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to this through the inclusion and exclusion of groups.\textsuperscript{158} While there may be a dominant narrative in a country, there is never just one national narrative. There are always others that are parallel to or contest it and the dominant narrative will either try to co-opt them, exclude, or marginalize the competing discourses.\textsuperscript{159} Browning notes with for Finland there are at various times narratives which define Finland as Finnish, Nordic, European, and Western. This has been the dominant narrative structure regarding Finnish foreign policy that defined Finland’s geopolitical orientation in terms of the structure of the international system and material considerations between East and West. What is perhaps more important, Browning argues, is why particular polices were important to Finns at a given time. He points out that the tendency to use Russia as the foreign other, overlooks other narratives which used the neighbour to the East to differentiate Finland from Sweden or counter the idea that Nordicity was something to aspire to.\textsuperscript{160}

Oliver Turner in his study of United States policies towards China found that national images construct certain subjective “truths” and “realities” about a country and its people.\textsuperscript{161} They express the “imaginative geography” that Edward Said notes in his study of Orientalism, because although the country exists “out there” in the “real world” its existence is discursively constructed in a “fanaticized” form.\textsuperscript{162} A cause and effect relationship between images and policy decisions is difficult to discern, but as Turner discovered with American images of China the power of the image is such that as it circulates, it becomes received truth and enables, justifies, and legitimizes some policies, while at the same time excluding potential alternatives.\textsuperscript{163} The same things can be said to exist for the Canadian-Finnish relationship.

The concept of the image used in this study will be based on that provided by Boulding: “The ‘image,’ then must be thought of as the total cognitive, affective, and evaluative structure of the behaviour unit, or its internal view of itself and its universe.”\textsuperscript{164} Or more simply as defined by Zacharasiewicz, the term image is used “loosely to indicate physical and/or psychological qualities that taken together result in a composite mental picture.”\textsuperscript{165} Boulding went on to add that “The images
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\textsuperscript{164} Boulding 1959b, 120–121.
\textsuperscript{165} Zacharasiewicz 2007, 6.
which are important in international systems are those which a nation has of itself and of those other bodies in the system which constitute its international environment.” 166 The image of a nation defined by Michael Kunczik “constitutes the totality of attributes that a person recognises (or imagines) when he contemplates that nation.” 167 As explained by Elena Tarasheva, it is “the cognitive representation that a person holds of a given country and its people, what a person believes to be true about a nation.” 168 The image then is a “knowledge cluster” that organises information into manageable and meaningful structures, as well as defining the relationship between categories and also a way to perceive new information. Because people tend to be “cognitive misers” they often need “heuristic shortcuts” to process the “information overload” they continually face and still make sense of the world in a “parsimonious fashion.” 169 In many ways the concept of the image is similar to the concept from cognitive psychology of the “schema.” 170 The schema, also called things like “mental map” or a “mental model,” differs from the concept of the image in one important way. A schema is a memory structure which can be used to process information quickly or automatically and make decisions when situations do not require much complex thought. 171 As Richard R. Hermann et al. in their study of how images work found they tend to operate as schemata. The image concept they contend captures the notion of the schema but is more easily defined. To study schemata, you need to reconstruct a lot of the thought process, but to study images you only need to discern parts of the ideas about an object perceived and the rest can be inferred in order to define the image. From there you can see how the logic of the image likely influenced a preference, decision, or action. 172

Lee Beach in his study of “image theory” identifies three broad image types: visual, mental, and cognitive. Visual images are those seen with the eye, through experiences witnessed and through pictures, photographs, art work, etc. Mental images are quasi-pictorial phenomena in the mind which can remain fixed or manipulated. These are images typically experienced when someone tries to recall or picture something in the mind. Cognitive images are a combination of mental images and non-image knowledge. When they are evoked, cognitive images
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166 Ibid., 121.
167 Kunczik 1990, 44.
168 Tarasheva 2014, 6.
169 Hermann 2003, 294.
171 Lau 2003, 29.
contain a visual element, a semantic element, and an affective or emotional element.173 The semantic element causes images to be expressed verbally or in writing, it allows cognitive images to be reduced to their features and amenable to analysis. Canadian cognitive images of Finland therefore form the basis of this study.

Regarding the components of a national image, it is common to see them consisting of three analytically distinguishable parts. The first part is the “cognitive” component which is the representation of what a person believes they know about a country or people. For international relations, the emotional or “affective” component is important because it determines the attitude towards the other nation in terms of things such as like-dislike, approval-disapproval or the benevolence or malevolence the observed nation is supposed to have. In turn this provides the range of appropriate behaviours toward the other nation or the “action” component.174 There does not seem to be any broad agreement among scholars on how to classify national images. Most seem to follow some variation of the positive-negative dichotomy and the four perceptual patterns or ideal types of images, with numerous permutations introduced by political scientist Richard Cottam in 1977.175

When dealing with images of Finland, using the positive-negative continuum allows them to be placed into broad categories and infer their significance in terms of Canadian-Finnish relations. The place an image has on that continuum is based on a perceived strategic relationship which is in turn based on perceptions of relative power, perceived culture, perceived threat, and perceived opportunity.176 In this context positive images could show Finland as a friendly power, a possible trade partner, and a progressive country. Positive images also draw on the apparent cultural similarity of Finland to Canada as a liberal, democratic, capitalist country, that was at different times Nordic, Scandinavian, and Northern. Similarly, Finland could be seen as Western, European, and a borderland or periphery with Asia. The people of Finland could be seen positively as educated, literate, hardworking, honest, reliable, quiet, and good potential settlers for Canada. Under other circumstances negative images of Finland could predominate. Here Finland could be perceived as an enemy country during periods of armed conflict or indirectly

---

174 Scott 1965, 72; Kunczik 1990, 10, 44.
175 Hermann et al. uses enemy, ally, degenerate, and colony; Martha Cottam uses ally, enemy, dependent ally, dependent ally of enemy, and neutral; Turner uses idealized, opportunity, uncivilized, and threatening. Cottam 1977, 62; Hermann, Voss, Schooler, and Ciarrochi 1997, 41; Cottam 1986, 69–70; Turner 2014, 6.
176 Hermann, Voss, Schooler, and Ciarrochi 1997, 403.
through Finns in Canada who could be seen as dangerous because of their support for radical ideas. Finland was also seen at times in negative terms as a trade competitor. When negative perceptions come to the fore, Finland can be seen as culturally different, as influenced by “Asian” culture via Russia, and even as non-European and Eastern. Extending this to Finns in Canada, they could be seen as clannish, not able or unwilling to learn English, and unable or unwilling to assimilate. As a variant on the dangerous image they could be seen as stubborn, violent, prone to alcoholism, and more likely to be afflicted by psychological illness.

Zacharasiewicz in his study of images of Germany in North America has observed that there is a tendency for scholars studying images to limit their source material to that which fits the pre-existing modes of their discipline. Literary scholars often focus only on stereotypes, they consider to be “constant,” in novels, plays, and poems, selected for aesthetic reasons. The claim is these images are independent of facts and do not need to accurately represent any country or the attitudes towards that nation, since they are “cultural baggage” accepted in whole or part without reflection. Historians and political scientists when looking at images preference such things as press reports, public pronouncements, government documents, and other non-literary texts. The premise is that literature tends to use old or outdated stereotypes. However, in his study of images of Germany it was apparent there was a connection be the images that appeared in literary works and everyday texts. Because such images are a part of a social practice, a variety of literary and non-literary sources helps provide insight into the power politics by dominant groups and the interplay of societal forces into a culture and society.177

Following this example, the “Canadian Image of Finland” uses a variety of sources to establish the “cultural baggage” of pre-existing images of Finland and Finns in Canada, to augment those extracted from the archival material containing Canadian government documents relating to foreign policy towards Finland.

To adequately investigate the image of Finland found in Canadian foreign policy, both archival and secondary sources have been consulted. The main archival source is the files of the DEA held by the Library and Archives Canada (LAC). These files were produced by the department on more general topics such as trade agreements and diplomatic representation or specific topics such as the provision of aid during the Winter War, the declaration of war in December 1941, and

177 Zacharasiewicz 2007, 1–2, 11.
preparations for the Paris Peace Conference in 1946.\textsuperscript{178} There are also published annual reports by the department which are helpful in verifying factual data such as names and dates. It is these files which form the largest proportion of the sources and as such they are the most useful in identifying what images of Finland existed and why they were of a certain type at any given time or on any issue. The limitation of these files as a source of images is that they do not give the intellectual heritage of the image in Canadian society. The bureaucrats working at External Affairs were after all Canadians and they lived in a society which had definite images about Finland and Finns. Secondary published sources discussed in the historical research situation/historiography are important in establishing the Canadian social context of the images of Finns and Finland. As will be seen the images which existed in Canadian society are reflected in the files of the DEA.

The DEA seldom advised the government on a foreign policy decision without consulting other departments that might have an interest in a particular aspect of Canada’s relations with Finland. The Department of the Secretary of State was responsible for administering various aspects of government including the national police force - the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and during wartime conducted censorship. Among the files of the Secretary of State are the cabinet decisions and Orders in Council which implemented those decisions, which have information relevant to Canada’s foreign policy towards Finland. Other departments like Justice, Finance, and Trade and Commerce also have subject files relating to aspects of the foreign policy towards Finland. All of these contain dispatches, reports, memoranda, and letters by the civil servants involved in creating Canada’s foreign policy, which express implicit and at times very explicit images of Finland.

For the most part the files at the LAC are easily accessible. However, there are several which until recently were still restricted under Canadian law. These required a formal application under the Access to Information Act. In several cases permission was granted to access files, but the documents that could be seen were redacted, with sections of the text blacked out. In the case of two important files, labelled “Finland-Implementation of the Peace Treaty” and “Diplomatic Relations Canada and Finland” it took repeated requests for access.\textsuperscript{179}

\textsuperscript{178} There are some published document collections. For the most part these collections of documents were produced before the DEA files were sent to the archive and opened to the public. Riddell 1962; Stacey 1972; Hillmer 1993; Mackenzie 1994.

\textsuperscript{179} The files are LAC, RG25 A3b, Vol. 4199, File 4697-G-2-40, “Finland-Implementation of the Peace Treaty”; LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 6238, File 8775-50, “Diplomatic Relations Between Canada and Finland.” This is a common problem, and in fact other scholars have found that files that were once open are now closed. See Bothwell 2007, 442.
At the LAC there are also several collections of private papers that are useful. The personal papers of Prime Ministers Robert Laird Borden, Arthur Meighen, Richard Bedford Bennett, and Louis St. Laurent all contain several files about Finland. The files of Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King are extensive, since he saved every letter, note, and receipt with an eye to posterity and among them are many relating to Finland. Of particular note is his personal diary, which contains references to Finland. It was published in edited form in four volumes, but this has largely been superseded by the full digital version available online. His contacts with Finns were very limited throughout his life. In his diary he regularly wrote about the people he encountered. Prior to the Second World War there were few mentions of Finns. While he was the deputy minister of labour, King visited a “Finn Hall” in May 1903, in the community of Ladysmith, British Columbia where “a colony of Finns” lived. Later when he was prime minister, King socialized with Hjalmar Procopé, the Finnish foreign minister who at the time was the council president at the League of Nations in 1928.

The importance of source material relating to Canada’s prime ministers and the DEA stems from the fact the authority to conduct foreign policy was based the British Westminster model. The Canadian constitution was embodied in the British North America Act of 1867. It made Canada a self-governing Dominion, but not independent, since it was still part of the British Empire and as such there was no clause allowing for a separate foreign policy. Foreign policy was the responsibility of the British government. Nonetheless, Canada did gradually get the right to conduct its own external relations and recognition of this culminated in the Balfour Declaration of 1926, which was formalized in the Statute of Westminster in 1931.

Though the powers of the British sovereign had been eroded over time with the strengthening of parliament, the authority to conduct foreign affairs remains the prerogative of the king or queen and royal authority expressed through the concept of the Crown. Amendments and the evolution of the Canadian constitution retained

180 The archival reference is King Diary, LAC, MG26 J13 and is on 492 microfiche slides. The published volumes are Pickersgill 1960; Pickersgill and Forster 1968; Pickersgill and Forster 1970a; Pickersgill and Forster 1970b. The online version “King Diaries.” http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca (30.7.2012).
181 He was checking to see if the hall was a suitable place to rent for the Royal Commission inquiring into industrial disputes in British Columbia. King Diary, 2 May 1903; LAC, MG26 J13.
182 In 1928 King described Procopé as “a splendid man in appearance, manner and ability.” King Diary, 28 September 1928, LAC, Ibid. In another anticipated encounter with Finns, King was supposed to be the escort for Lady Peggy de Gripenberg, wife of the Finnish minister in London Baron Georg A. de Gripenberg, at the dinner for the Coronation in London in 1937. When the time came she could not be located so he sat with another lady. King Diary, 14 May 1937, LAC, Ibid.
the king or queen of Canada as the head of state, with the functions of the sovereign exercised by the governor general. In practice that means in Britain and Canada it is the advisors to the Crown in the Cabinet which exercised the royal authority to conduct foreign relations and make foreign policy. Practically speaking from 1912–1948 the portfolio of Secretary of State for External Affairs (SSEA) was by convention also the same person who was the prime minister and the head of the cabinet. The cabinet contained all the government ministers, decided government policy, and made decisions by majority rule, at times it also worked by consensus. In the end as the head of government it was the prime minister who ultimately decided.\(^{183}\)

There is no constitutional role for parliament in conducting foreign policy, though that representative body does exert some influence. The prime minister to retain power is required to maintain the confidence of a majority of the members of the House of Commons. The support a prime minister has in parliament could therefore influence the adoption of a popular or rejection of an unpopular policy.\(^{184}\)

The DEA is the Canadian foreign policy bureaucracy. The employees of the department handled most routine decisions regarding Finland. They also gathered information, wrote letters, memorandums, and position papers on aspects of Canadian policy towards Finland. These government officials briefed the SSEA on any topic relating to Finland, brought forward routine and urgent matters for decision, formulated policy options, and made recommendations on which policy was in the national interest. In addition, they represented the Canadian state abroad and helped conduct negotiations with other governments.

Regarding the issue of bureaucratic “control” of foreign policy, it is important to distinguish between the “influence” these officials have versus the “power” they

\(^{183}\) Nossal, Roussel, and Paquin 2015, 183–184.

\(^{184}\) This occurred because the very nature of foreign policy makes legislative decision making unsuitable as a mechanism for decision making. Interstate relations required the ability to respond quickly and decisively to external events, participate in negotiations which require secrecy and flexibility, to develop new policy initiatives, all under the constraint of time. The bicameral Canadian legislature, with hundreds of members divided along partisan party lines simply can not mange this. It also occurred because the political executive did not grant the legislature a decision-making role in foreign policy. Canadian prime ministers have often made comments that on foreign policy matters parliament would decide on important issues. Prime ministers from Laurier to Borden, Meighen, Bennett, King and St. Laurent in fact were not willing to let parliament decide on foreign policy issues. The real decision would be made in cabinet and parliament would in effect simply confirm the policy. For King, the less time spent discussing divisive critical or sensitive matters in the House of Commons, the better. This was evident in 1939 when the amount of time allotted to discuss the war emergency on the floor of the House of Commons was a mere 27 minutes, while eight hours was spent debating the tariff on asparagus. Jackson and Atkinson 1980, 14–29; Eayrs 1961, 131–138.
may have to make their own policy preferences those of the state. Mitchell Sharp, who worked as a civil servant for the Department of Finance in the 1940s, and later was the Minister of External Affairs, thought the relationship was clear, “Civil servants do not make policy, all rumours to the contrary notwithstanding.” While he acknowledged the making of policy was “the prerogative of the elected representatives of the people” he noted “civil servants do have a profound influence upon the making of policy.” They had an influence on policy since they had to “assemble the relevant facts and analyze their significance” because “ministers simply do not have the time to do so.” It also occurred because it was “their job is to throw up for the consideration of ministers well considered plans of action.” This was not limited “to requests for advice,” but included putting forward ideas even before they were called upon. He recalled “occasions when civil servants by fruitful initiatives led the government to adopt lines of policy which would never have occurred to them otherwise.”

Even strong ministers could find themselves relying on their staff. Prime Minister King confessed as much to his diary after the death of his trusted advisor O.D. Skelton in January 1941: “I have been tremendously at fault in not concentrating more on work and perhaps mastering more myself, and trusting too greatly to the outside aides.” A few days later he wrote, “I was glad to have [Skelton] as a guide, but there are times when it was almost too strongly exerted to the extent of unduly influencing Government policy.” There can be little doubt that in bureaucracies there exist a “civil service policy” which political scientist Tony Benn described as “an amalgam of views that have been developed over a long period.” It is expressed in the views held by senior officials regarding problems and best possible solutions to them. While this is a normal aspect of group or institutional behaviour, it does not mean that the ideas of what should be done in terms of foreign policy will always be in accord with the individual or collective views of the elected political leaders and representatives. This is important because during the period from 1918–1948, regardless of who was prime minister the
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Canadian government seldom made any statements about foreign policy or published a foreign policy platform. What typically passed for foreign policy was a general policy orientation, with an ad hoc approach, usually expressed in qualified statements. The general avoidance of explicit statements of foreign policy in part explains why the SSEA, his civil servants, and diplomatic officers are more likely to focus on the lowest level of policy, which deals with day to day matters of diplomacy. It was the duty of the civil servant to advise and inform about possible foreign policy actions, but the final decision rested with the minister.\footnote{Nossal, Roussel, and Paquin 2015, 261–263, 279–281; Sharp 1981.}

Other than the secondary sources mentioned in the section on previous research, there are a large number of biographies and memoirs of prime ministers, diplomats, and civil servants which are useful. Each of the prime ministers has had several biographies written about them.\footnote{For Borden see Thornton 2010. For Meighen see Graham 1963 and 1965. His collection of speeches includes a speech about Finland during the Winter War. Meighen 1949, 355–359. For Bennett see Beaverbrook 1959; Waite 1992 and 2012; Boyko 2010; For St. Laurent see Pickersgill 1981.} W.L.M. King is perhaps the most widely examined Canadian prime minister, in part because of his quirky personal life, but also because he was the longest serving and therefore arguably the most successful.\footnote{He was prime minister for 21 years 157 days, while Sir Robert Walpole had been British prime minister only for 20 years 10 months and 8 days. Carnegie 1950, 66. Also, Dawson 1958; Neatby 1963 and 1976; English and Stubbs 1977; English, Lackenbauer, and McLaughlin 2002; Levine 2011.} Key members of the DEA such as Lester Pearson, Escott Reid, and John Holmes among others, have also written memoirs or had biographies written of them.\footnote{Holmes 1979; Reid 1977; English 1989; Bothwell 1978; Wilgress 1967.} Some of these works provide insight into the workings of the Canadian foreign policy decision-making process and the workings of the DEA, while others give useful context to Canadian foreign policy. Finland is rarely explicitly mentioned in these sources, but they help understand the social, cultural, political, and ideological context in which Canadian foreign policy was made.

The body of information about the image of Finland held by Canadian officials is in the files from the various government departments found at the LAC. Often, they are extremely useful in providing context for any particular image and show how other aspects of government policy related to the formation and nature of the images when dealing with foreign relations with Finland. In this way they help define what image of Finland existed and why it was of a particular character positive or negative. As the Canadian image of Finland evolved, the images held by officials in other departments and agencies at times influence policy, but very
often were already in the foreground or had been latent in the images held by those at External Affairs.

1.5 Outline

“The Canadian Image of Finland” is divided into three parts, organized roughly chronologically, by related themes, and distinct phases in the history of Canadian-Finnish relations. Part 1, “First Contacts” contains five chapters. First it outlines in Chapter 2 the intellectual heritage of Canadian images of Finland and Finns up until roughly the era of Finnish independence. Drawing on the work done by the many scholars who have written about migration to North America and the communities Finns established, the images formed during the last two decades of the nineteenth and first two decades of the twentieth century set the stage for the images at play in Canadian-Finnish relations.

Canadian images of Finland and Finns during the 1920s and 1930s, even though there were continuities from the past, evolved to fit the circumstances. These are covered in the next three chapters. Chapter 3 deals with the recognition of Finnish independence in 1919, the establishment of formal relations with Finland, and interaction at the League of Nations. The subject of immigration to Canada from Finland and the image of Finns in Canada is the focus of Chapter 4. In Chapter 5 normal diplomatic relations between Canada and Finland during the interwar years are outlined. This involved a range of bilateral treaties and agreements, including a trade agreements and various scientific exchanges. Finland as the other had an overriding positive image, which at times competed with latent negative aspects, and coloured the Canadian government’s reaction to events involving the two countries in the Second World War.

Part 2 “Brave Little Finland” looks at the Canadian image of Finland during the Second World War and comprises the next two chapters. The Canadian reaction to the invasion of Finland by the Soviet Union is the topic of Chapter 6. It outlines the sympathy shown by Canadians, the government response, and the mainly positive images that emerge during the Winter War when the questions were considered of what aid Canada could offer and the legality of Canadians and Finnish-Canadians volunteering to fight for Finland. Chapter 7 continues the examination of themes related to the Russo-Finnish war, like an embargo against the Soviet Union, whether Canadian troops would be part of the aid promised to Finland by France and Britain and ends with the Canadian reaction to the Finnish defeat.
Part 3 “Enemy Images” examines Canadian reactions to the Continuation War and its aftermath. Finland’s participation in the German invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941 and the gradual shift towards an enemy image through the fall of 1941 is examined in Chapter 8. The chapter continues with tensions escalating with closing of Finnish consulates in Canada, and the seizing of Finnish merchant ships, until finally in December war was declared. Finland was now an enemy and Chapter 9 examines the legal problems of what to do with Finnish nationals in Canada, including merchant seamen, who were now enemy aliens. The confusion enemy status caused among Finnish-Canadians was evident. In Chapter 10 the war continues and interned Finnish seamen and ships remain issues of concern. During 1943–1944 Canada was kept apprised of the various peace feelers made by Finland and the Soviet Union and the negotiations which led to an armistice in September 1944.

The post-armistice period is the subject of Chapter 11. During the lead up to peace talks and the conduct of the 1946 Paris peace conference, some of the older positive images started return. Concern that Finland might be drawn into the Soviet sphere of influence as a satellite or lose her independence revised previous images of brave Finns. After the peace treaty was concluded in 1947, there were a number of issues which needed to be resolved before normal relations could resume and these are covered in Chapter 12. There were the issues of war claims and enemy property, the removal of the designation of enemy aliens from Finnish nationals, the repatriation of Finnish seamen, the removal of immigration restrictions, and the question of whether Finnish-Canadians could be permitted to send aid to Finland. The final chapter documents the return to normal relations between Canada and Finland through the appointment of a Finnish diplomatic representative to Canada. There was a great deal of concern over the potential loss of Finnish independence to the Soviet Union, which invoked aspects of the borderland image and reinforced the brave Finland idea. Finland desperately needed trade to help make reparations payments, do reconstruction, and supply domestic needs. Before the war trade between the two countries was relatively small, but it gained new significance as the Cold War began. Efforts by Finland to sign a trade agreement were initially rebuffed, but Canadian officials eventually relented because of the symbolic value it offered, as a window on the Western world, which would help the Finns retain some independence from the Soviet Union.

“The Canadian Image of Finland” is primarily focused on the images of Finland and Finns held by Canadian officials who dealt with foreign policy. The positive and negative images documented and examined here in many respects are
familiar, but previously have only been partially explored within the context of migration studies and ethnographic treatments of the Finnish experience in Canada. What is new about “The Canadian Image of Finland” is that this is the first study to look at those images within the framework of Canadian foreign policy towards Finland. Certainly, positive, and negative images of Finland and Finns were at play and influenced policy preferences, but they were seldom, if at all, the deciding factor in what actions Canada took. The scope of the project necessitates that not every instance and nuance of a particular image can be explored and many other interesting issues such as the role of gendered images can not be included. There is in this regard more work which needs to be done by historians, foreign policy analysts, IR specialists, and others.

As a final note, Canadian source material poses certain problems with regard to Finnish words, especially the use of the International Phonetic Alphabet. Canadian government documents often do not include the umlaut on letters or the skandimerkit of the ruotsalainen “Å.” When quoting from documents the words will be shown as they are incorrectly written by the authors. All other times effort will be made to spell them correctly. A similar dilemma exists for place names in Finland. Until the end of the Second World War, Canadian and British officials mainly used the Swedish place names of locations in Finland, only later switching to Finnish names. Unless it is from a quotation, the Finnish place name will be used. There will be some exceptions like the Åland Islands, which Canadians only knew by the Swedish identifier, rather than the Finnish name Ahvenanmaa.
2 The Historical Image of Finland

Images of Finland are a part of the intellectual heritage of the English-speaking world and contain both negative and positive elements. The dominant image many Canadians held of Finns as an industrious, hardworking, literate, reliable, honest, northern, people, who would make good citizens stems from long held perceptions of “Finnishness.” Finland was seen as a borderland, between East and West, which was Scandinavian and Western European, with values Canadians shared such as liberal democracy, rule of law, and capitalism. There were all positive images. For Canadians, the image of Finland and Finns in other contexts could become negative, especially once the number of Finnish immigrants increased. Participation in radical politics, support for the labour movement, atheism, anti-capitalism, and support for all sorts of socialist ideologies gave the impression Finnish-Canadians were disloyal, subversive, and dangerous. Adding to this was the limited number of female Finnish-Canadians, non-traditional modes of marriage, suspicion of prostitution and illegal alcohol sales, creating the sense Finns were a threat to the Canadian social fabric. The insular nature of Finnish-Canadian communities left the impression that, arrogant, psychologically unstable Finns could not or would not assimilate into Canadian life and learn English. When Canadians especially among the social and political elite and the police began to distrust Finns in Canada, the country of Finland was also seen in less complementary ways. The homeland of the Finns when seen negatively as not European, but Asian, uncivilized, primitive, a source of mystery, and danger. This could become an enemy image when conservative White Finns were thought to be getting too close with Germany or if the socialist Red Finns were thought to be under the influence of the Bolsheviks and later the Soviets. The development of these positive and negative images would take time to evolve and different elements would come to the foreground or recede depending on the situation. By looking at the early manifestations of these images, at how they changed over the decades prior to the establishment of diplomatic relations, it is possible to determine the heritage of those images which reappear during the course of Canadian-Finnish relations. Before these images could develop Canadians needed to be exposed to Finnish immigrants and learn more about Finland.
2.1 Finland an Unknown Country

W.R. Mead thought it was ironic that Finland and Finns remained relatively unknown in the English-speaking world as late as the 1950s, despite the fact the British Empire, of which Canada had been a part, spanned the globe. Therefore, it is the written sources, produced by the occasional geographer, linguist, ethnographer, encyclopaedia article writer, and traveller, which formed Canadian impressions about Finland and Finns in the early twentieth century. Finland could be drawn to the public’s attention through the newspapers, because of dramatic events like the policy of Russification in the 1890s. In Canada, the image of Finland and the Finnish people were directly connected since few Canadians had direct knowledge of Finland itself and what they perceived was most commonly expressed in their reaction to Finnish immigrants. By examining perceptions of Finland and Finns in Canada until the 1920s elements of these images can be ascertained and changes over time noted. The images of Finland and Finns prior to Finnish independence set the stage for Canadian images of Finns and Finland into the middle of the twentieth century.

The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were a period of a heightened sense of identity and nationalism in Finland. Finns in their homeland experienced crop failures, followed by the oppression known as “Russification.” Russification was an effort by the Imperial Russian government from 1898 onwards to implement its “nationality policy” and strengthen the unity of the state. This was done by eliminating the degree of political and administrative autonomy enjoyed by Finland within the empire, making Russian the language of education and government, conscripting Finns into the Russian army, and making the Orthodox Church the state church. There followed a number of incidents of increased censorship and the imperial government overriding the Finnish Diet and state administration.

To promote international support for Finland, groups like “Pro-Finlandia” headed by Leo Mechelin and Julio Reuter tried to foster a positive image of Finland as a modern, progressive, Western European nation, that was a distinct part of the Russian Empire. Finnish participation in the World Fairs of 1889, 1899, and
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198 For example, in the early twentieth century Finland exported 20–30 million pounds of butter annually to Britain where it was misidentified as Danish. Nordensköld 1919, 369.
199 Mead 1958, 178.
1900 further raised the positive image of Finland as a European country. Efforts were made to educate politicians and the public about Finland by encouraging journalists to visit the country. Its separate cultural identity, level of industrialization, and economic achievement were emphasized. The Canadian Department of Immigration (DIimm) received copies of the Pro-Finlandia sponsored periodicals, which were translated into English for staff to read. Evidence the campaign was successful was seen when the work of Jean Sibelius began to appear on concert programmes outside Finland.

Attempting to counter Russian policy, Finnish nationalists along with Canadian newspapers and magazines began to inform Canadians about who the Finns were. Canadians were told Russian policies violated the Finnish constitution and liberty, causing these “noble” people to have to flee their native land. Finns were presented in a way, so as to support the idea that though they differed from Canadians, the two peoples had a lot in common and therefore the Finnish people merited respect. Finns were characterized as a people with strong democratic tendencies and Finland was an orderly society. Finland had been an autonomous part of the Russian Empire with its own democratic style of government. Finnish leaders were educated and cultured. Canada should encourage the mass migration of these ideal settlers it was frequently said. Russia by contrast was an autocratic, backward, Eastern, Asian country, filled with ignorant masses. In addition to such factors as over population, rural-urban migration, economic problems, and social changes, now political repression and the avoidance of military conscription were added to the reasons why people left Finland for Canada.

203 Frederiksen 1902; Hourwich 1903.
204 These had articles by Leo Mechelin and Konni Zilliacus among others. Finland an English Journal Devoted to the Cause of the Finnish People 6 December 1899; Konni Zilliacus, “Tanken Att i Kanada Salma Utvandrare Från Finland,” Athenum International 15 December 1899, 292-300 in LAC, RG76 IA1, Vol. 25, File 651 Part 2, Reel C4683. From 1917-1936 the Department of Immigration and Colonization, often abbreviated to Department of immigration, was responsible for immigration then from 1936-1950 it was the purview of the Department of Mines and Resources.
205 Scott 1975, 8.
207 The Daily Whig 21 March 1899 and “Welcome the Finns,” Manitoba Free Press 18 April 1899. There are dozens of clippings in LAC, Ibid.
208 The census statistics before 1900 are not reliable because Finns were often listed as Swedes or Russians by Canadian officials. From 1900–1914 some 21,219 Finns migrated to Canada, with the highest year 1913 seeing 3,508 Finns immigrating. Puumala 2004, 84. The literature on Finnish migration is too extensive to mention here. Lindström-Best 1981c, 3. Swedes from Finland were often identified as simply Swedes. Prior to Finnish independence earlier immigrants tended to use the term
Indeed, some Canadians during this period drew comparisons of the relative positions and the degree of autonomy Finland and Canada had in their respective empires. Pointing out that if Britain treated Canada the way Russia did Finland, Canadians would react much the same. 209 Canadian values were British and therefore Western, and Finns wanted to be seen as Western, not Eastern. Finns it was argued would make good citizens, because Finland aspired to be like Canada. Finns valued the things other Canadians did, like constitutional government, democracy, freedom, and rule of law and therefore would make good Canadians.210

2.2 Mysterious Finland: A Northern Nation, Between East and West

A reoccurring theme in the image of Finland is that of a frontier of Europe, expressed in various ways as a periphery, borderland, marchland, and margin. The very words Finland and Finlander evoked the impression of a group, uncivilized, and living on the fringe of the known world, in a wilderness, in a wet forested fen or swampland. Finland was a European boundary zone, where the map of Europe ended, and over which Sweden and Russia struggled. Finland was a borderland between East and West, between Europe and Asia or between Western civilization and Asiatic despotism. Here East and West made contact in the North. The North implied the nadir or the end of something. The North was a land of dark, of cold, of snow, and seemingly eternal winter.211 Furthermore, Finland was described as a land of forests and lakes, full of wild animals like elk, deer, reindeer, bears, and wolves, which further emphasized the rugged frontier nature of the land.212 Canadians might have recognized some of these features of the Finnish image, as they were once applied in British perceptions of North America and the Canadian self-image.213

Position was the ongoing question: was Finland part of Europe or Asia? If it was European, was it also Scandinavian? The Finno-Ugrian language was interpreted by early linguists and anthropologists to mean that Finns had their origins east of the Ural Mountains and were therefore an Asiatic people, not
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European. Into the twentieth century scholars still classified Finns as “Mongols,” but the Asian influence was said to be “modified” by Scandinavian contacts. This point was reiterated by John Martin Crawford in the preface to his well known English translation of the *Kalevala*. The name Scandinavia had generally positive connotations in association with the North, the Romanticized history of the Vikings, and cultural achievement. It was therefore a positive image when Finland was included in the geographic and cultural area of Scandinavia. The Asian classification nonetheless lingered for some time. For example, United Church of Canada minister, Reverend Arvi Heinonen related an anecdote in the 1930s where his daughter had to write a report about Finns for school. The description in the school textbook described Finns as being related to the peoples of Central Asia and the Magyars, and though “The Finns are short, stout, with slanting eyes and high cheek bones of the Asiatic.”

The miscategorization of Finns as Mongols, but also as Russians or Swedes according to Finnish American historian William Hoglund, can be explained as a result of a general lack of information about Finland. As historian Arthur Lower has noted, Northern Ontario was a “polyglot” and Finns could be found as individual settlers or in “colonies” in every part of the region. The mines at Porcupine Camp, in Northern Ontario began operation in 1912. Two Finnish prospectors had discovered the Porcupine gold deposits and many other Finns came to work in the mines. When the local newspaper the *Porcupine Advance* was launched the same year the mine opened, it extolled the economic potential of the region and its cosmopolitan character, itemizing the peoples living there, which included Jews, Poles, Swedes, Italians, Russians, Americans, English, Irish, Scottish, and French. There was no mention of Finns, presumably because as every Canadian “knew” they were the same as Swedes. A sociologist who examined
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work camp life in the early twentieth century noted that all Scandinavians, the Finns included, were often simply labelled “Swedes.” From an Anglo-Canadian perspective this was a positive label, much like Scandinavian. The Finlander, however, was found to be “assertive of his nationalism” and was “not flattered to be called a Swede even in a bunkhouse” and “his racial pride is supersensitive…in his struggle for recognition.”

Another example of the Finns being mistaken for Swedes was evident in the technological improvements introduced to Canadian logging. In this case it was the misnamed “Swede saw,” which was really a “Finnish saw.” Also known as the bucksaw, it was a variation on the bow saw commonly used as a farm tool to cut firewood. Starting in the 1920s Finns introduced their variation of the tool into the Canadian forest industry. The version introduced by the Finns had a thinner blade which made it more efficient at cutting down the Spruce trees used in making pulp. In fact, it was said to be twice as fast as the standard two-man crosscut saw then in use. It was also more portable, since the thin blade could be rolled, and new handles and cross pieces could be made from wood at the new location. The “new” saw became very popular with Canadian lumberjacks. The likely reason it came to be called a Swede saw, was due to the fact Finnish-Canadians tended to call it that, since the blade was made from Swedish steel. This perception was reinforced later in the 1930s when factory made, tubular steel frame saws were imported from Sweden.

Where to classify Finns was related to the question, was Finland part of European or Asian civilization. One measure of Finland’s place as a civilized, Western European country was thought to be the issue of hygiene. Canadians during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries likely found the Finnish method of getting clean unusual and it contributed to the sense of otherness. To Canadians the sauna was a bizarre concept, especially if it was a savu or smoke sauna, with its heat, steam, and nudity. The custom of families bathing together, with mixed genders would have been even more foreign. Given the often rural and working-class nature of the places Finnish immigrants tended to live, most Canadian homes would not have had running water, even in the early twentieth century.
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century. These were features of middle and upper-class Canadian homes, especially in urban areas. Compared to his working-class counterparts in Canada, the Finnish worker was generally cleaner, because at least they could use the sauna.

When explaining Finns to Canadians, Reverend Heinonen had to remind them, “Cleanliness again is a widely known national trait.” Every Finnish farm had a “bath-house” and every Saturday the family takes a “steam-bath,” “naked,” followed by a plunge into the lake or roll in the snow. Heinonen pointed out that the choice of Saturday was to get clean for church on Sunday and put on “church clothes.” The intended message was cleanliness was next to godliness and in part intended to counter the negative image of Finns as radical, godless socialists. The idea that Finns were “clean” compared to other foreigners was a sign the Finns were a civilized people, Western, and European. Indeed, the sauna came to be seen as a root metaphor for Finnish culture to other Canadians. The eventual acceptance of the sauna meant that in later years many Canadians would embrace the sauna or steam bath as an acceptable activity.

Another measure of a national groups level of “civilization” in the Anglo-Saxon world was thought to be the level of education and literacy. Finns in this respect could appear highly civilized to Canadians. In Finland, the Lutheran Church as a protestant denomination placed a high value on the ability to read scripture. In order to emigrate from Finland a certificate from the police and a church issued birth certificate were required. Another factor contributing to a high literacy rate in Finland was the introduction of state funded formal schooling in the 1860s. Even though many of the adult immigrants, especially in the earlier years, would not have had much formal education, most Finnish immigrants could read and write. The importance of literacy is shown in the Finnish proverb, “Suomalainen uskoo sanan voimaan,” which stresses the power of the word and is sometimes cited as why Finns in Canada went on to develop libraries, establish reading rooms, run education programs, and publish books, periodicals, and newspapers.

Literacy and education were thought to be factors which determined if a particular ethnic group could be compatibility with Canadian society and the
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likelihood they would assimilate. Historian Arthur Lower’s observations during the first three decades of the twentieth century about the people in Northern Ontario reflected this idea. The Scandinavians and Germans it was thought would assimilate easily and even the “marginal” Finns were “said to learn English rapidly, to be anxious to give their children schooling, and in general adapt themselves to Canadian ways.”\footnote{Lower 1936, 104.} The claim they learn English rapidly was unusual, but they were “marginal” Scandinavians, so it was logical to assume they would eventually fit into Canadian society. A positive image would be the end result if Finns were regarded as educated, literate, and similar to Swedes and were therefore part of European civilization and not Asian.

The importance of education to Finnish-Canadians was noted when Lower surveyed school inspectors and agricultural experts. Among the ethnic groups mentioned the Finns appear frequently. Interestingly on the question of the use of French in the region, it was noted in the Sudbury area, “In the case of the Finnish section, the natural language in dealing with English or French people is English” and “the Children are quite proficient in the use of the English language in most cases.”\footnote{Lower 1936, Appendix C, 154.} On attitudes towards the public school system of Ontario, in Cochrane the “Finns are lukewarm,” while elsewhere they were “sympathetic,” and in Rainy River the “Finlanders” were “much interested.”\footnote{Ibid., Appendix C, 155.} Regarding general intelligence, whereas Swedes were sometimes thought to lack mental agility, the Finns compared favourably to the norm. For many Finns in North America, education was one important way to adjust to their new home. Finnish-Canadian societies, social clubs, halls, and other groups often ran education programs, including English language instruction.\footnote{Ollila 1977.}

The tendency to produce stereotyped images of Finns in North America was common, according Hoglund, during the periods when large numbers of immigrants were arriving from Finland in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The parallels between the American and Canadian situation are apparent. The dominant culture tended to define immigrant behaviour according to race or the national characteristics a group were thought to possess. From those leading the wave of immigration from Finland both positive and negative images could result. The list of traits Hoglund found observers credited Finns with could be contradictory. Among those traits Finns were hard working, good agriculturalists,
honest, taciturn, melancholic, sober, clannish, patient, stubborn, sullen, quiet, even-tempered, “more phlegmatic than the Italian,” to be philosophically introspective, prone to drunkenness, fighting, and radicalism. At least some of these could be said to be among the traits present in the self-image of Finns presented by noted nineteenth century Finnish author Zachris Topelius. To nationalist Finns concerned about the negative images, according to Hoglund, it must have appeared if people in North America had “learned about Finns in the saloons.” These negative images undermined efforts of Finns to maintain a good reputation and ensure they were welcome in their new home, since all Finns could be labelled with the stereotypes. The solution in the case of drunkenness and violence was to create temperance societies. To combat the bad reputation caused by radicalism, education in the form of articles in newspapers, periodicals, and books on Finland and Finns, aimed at showcasing the positive contributions Finns was used.

2.3 Honest, Reliable, Hardworking Finns

Despite any negative images which may have surrounded the Finns, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, in Canada there developed a parallel positive image that they were reliable and hardworking. Therefore, they were good, even ideal settlers for the vacant lands of Canada. The strong work ethic of Finns had been one aspect of the images projected by the Pro-Finlandia movement and it was often recognized by Canadians. The work ethic applied to both men and women and it was also a necessity for Finnish immigrants to Canada, since most of them were unskilled workers the only options were to work in often dangerous, low paying jobs, which other Canadians found unattractive. For the men this meant mining, forestry, bridge building, railway construction and maintenance, and factories. For women, the limited options were domestic servants, work camp cooks, and running cafes, restaurants, or boarding houses to service the workers. According to Varpu Lindström, Finnish women who came to Canada to work as domestic servants, were considered skilled at their job, and were apparently sought after by well to do Canadian families. Regardless of where Finns found work,
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they stood out as having a noticeable sense of pride and a desire to see the job well done. There was a perception by some Canadians, that at times there was a degree of arrogance in the Finnish pride in their work ethic, but nonetheless there was a general sense that Finns were “reliable” workers.

Part of the reliable image also carried with it a sense that most Finns kept their promises and were honest. Reverend Heinonen describing his countrymen to Canadians, noted, “The fact that a Finnish farmer never locks his doors and still fears no thieves may show the honest character of the people.”242 John Hawkes who in the 1920s wrote a history of Saskatchewan and included a section on the New Finland settlement. He quoted a merchant from the nearby community of Whitewood who spoke about his business practice of extending credit to customers. He had a particularly positive view of Finns as safe credit risks: “He would not trust an Englishman because he was English or a Canadian because he was a Canadian, or a Methodist because he was a Methodist, but he would trust a Finn because he was a Finn. Surely high praise and practical sense.”243 As noted earlier, in the American context reliability was expressed by claiming Finland paid its debts.

One commonly recited claim by Canadian immigration officials was that Finns were agriculturalists, well suited to farm in the harsh climate of the boreal forest region. It was thought they had ample experience in this type of farming because a large part of Finland resembled this area of Canada.244 This was another variation of the hardworking image. Finland was a country, William Hoglund noted, where most of the agricultural land “yielded grudgingly” and it was in this “hard struggle for survival Finns found consolation and exhortation.”245 “The endurance of a Finn is very characteristic,” Heinonen told Canadians, “Nobody but a Finn would have undertaken to cultivate such a stony and marshy country.”246 Finnish farmers may be slow to adopt new techniques and technology he said since, “it is an enormous task to persuade them to believe in something new,” but once convinced of the merits of the new ideas they stubbornly hold to them.247 By the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century much of the land available for settlement was at best marginal cropland, particularly in Northern Ontario. For many Finns
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farming was in fact only a part-time occupation and many of them only worked their homesteads in between employment in the mines or lumber camps.\textsuperscript{248} It was said the Finnish farmer in these areas produced two crops, one of produce and the other of stones. The irony was not lost on these settlers, who at times referred to themselves as “stump farmers” or “kantofarmi” because they had to plant between the tree stumps.\textsuperscript{249}

In the 1870s when Canada began to more actively seek settlers, immigration was primarily the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture (DoA) and later the Department of the Interior (DoI), which oversaw the settlement of the Canadian frontier. The department hired individual contractors and paid them a fee per person enticed to immigrate to Canada. In most cases immigration officials focused on the Scandinavian countries and Finland was an afterthought or ignored the area altogether. One such individual was Hans Mattson who was an immigration agent from 1873–1875. Earlier he had been an American immigration agent and had recruited Finns for the North Pacific Railroad, in 1872.\textsuperscript{250} Matson convinced Canadian officials that “dissatisfied” Finns might prefer Canada to the Russian scheme to have them colonize the Amur Valley in Asia.\textsuperscript{251} At other times private companies were contracted to do this job. For example, in 1902 a secret contract was issued to the North Atlantic Trading Company to “carry on effective emigration propaganda by advertising, printing, and circulating suitable literature by mail and personal distribution.”\textsuperscript{252} Finland was just one of seventeen countries it was responsible for. Steamship lines needed passengers, so they also employed agents to direct migrants to North America.\textsuperscript{253}

The Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) also did immigration work because it wanted cheap labour, passengers, and settlers to purchase the grants of land it had

\textsuperscript{248} Lower 1936, 22, 84–88, 134; Kent 1966, 120–121; Vasiliadis 1989, 41–42.
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\textsuperscript{250} Finns unknowingly played a part in the “Pacific Scandal,” which helped defeat the Conservative government of John A. Macdonald in 1873. The Conservatives had accepted campaign funds from Americans connected to the Northern Pacific Railroad, on condition their Canadian associates get the contract to build the CPR. Hans Mattson recruited workers for the Northern Pacific and settlers for Minnesota, including Finns. The Finns and other Americans it was hoped would engage in chain migration to the Canadian northwest and precipitate a secessionist movement like had occurred in Texas. Berton 1974, 45–70; Hedges 1926, 323; Jalava 1983a, 6; Ljungmark 1971, 174–175.
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received as part of its charter. There were articles which appeared in Finnish newspapers in 1874 which promoted the CPR interest in attracting Finns as settlers, but no Finnish immigrants are recorded as arriving in Canada as a result.²⁵⁴ It was not until the Conservative Party of John A. Macdonald was returned to power in 1878 that any serious immigration policy was formulated. Macdonald had campaigned on a platform known as the “National Policy.” This nation building policy had three parts: a high protective tariff to encourage the growth of Canadian industry, the completion of the CPR, which had been started several years previous, and the encouragement of immigration to the Canadian West.²⁵⁵

As part of this policy Immigration Agent John Dyke paid a visit to the “Scandinavian kingdoms” and Finland in 1882–1883, and “found that the agents were exceedingly anxious to secure their share of a most important emigration which is now going on in Finland.”²⁵⁶ For over fifteen years American immigration agents had systematically worked through Norway and Sweden and now Finland was targeted. He made observations about the quality of Finnish workers:

The Russian Finns as labourers and farmers are equally as good as the best Swedes or Norwegians. They are first class axemen, charcoal burners, and miners, and as such would I feel confident to be a most valuable class of settlers to encourage to any part of the Dominion, more especially to the Ottawa Valley and the lands traversed by the eastern section of the Canadian Pacific Railway.²⁵⁷

He thought this was a “most valuable field” of operations and hoped that “we shall be able to secure our share of these most valuable settlers.”²⁵⁸ The praise given to Finns in Dyke’s report typified the type of things said by other agents in the years prior to 1914.

The founding of New Finland in 1887–1888, in the Assiniboia Territory, which was later part of Saskatchewan, was the first deliberate attempt to attract groups of Finns as settlers.²⁵⁹ The efforts of Canadian immigration officials in the end produced little results. As immigration agent C.K. Hendrickson wrote in his 1891 report,

²⁵⁴ Uusi Suometar 20 July 1874 and Sanomia Turusta 17 July 1874 in Kero 1976c, 8. Also, Jalava 1983a.
²⁵⁶ John Dyke to John Lowe, Secretary, DoA, 4 December 1882, LAC, RG17, Vol. 357, Docket 38224A.
²⁵⁷ Ibid.
²⁵⁸ Ibid.
²⁵⁹ Schelstraete 1982, 8–9.
New Finland is the first and only place in the North-West where there are any settlers of Finnish nationality...These people are particularly hard working, saving and industrious and therefore they cannot only get along but even make a success of farming, with very limited means, where any English-speaking individual with a good-sized capital would starve. It would take time, but other Finns would follow.

During the late 1890s the CPR continued to try to attract Finnish settlers and placed advertisements in Finnish newspapers to encourage Finns to go “to sunny Canada and become rich.” Finns were regarded by one immigration official along with Swedes and Norwegians as “a sturdy, honest, hardworking, God-fearing folk, used to hardship and toil, obliged to battle in order to live.” Scandinavia and Finland with “large tracts of forests, and huge districts where the pitiless, rugged rocks thrust themselves up on every side” was not unlike “the stern scenery on the north side of Lake Superior.” An agent for the Finnish Steamship Company, Lars Krogius, described his Finnish countrymen as “highly intelligent,” “literate” and “freedom loving” but most importantly accustomed to living in a cold climate and creating farms out of forested wilderness.

There were over the years many proposals by individuals inside and outside the Immigration Department to try to attract Finnish settlers. As a general rule the Canadian government did not set aside areas for particular groups to settle, preferring independent farmers take up homesteads. However, one of the exceptions was the Finns. New Finland was the earliest example and from 1908–1910 the areas around Rock Point and Turtle Lake were set aside for Finns. In general these met with little success, since letters from friends and relatives according to William Hoglund played more of an influencing factor than immigration agents.
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Certainly, a lack of reliable information about Canada played a role in the small numbers of Finnish immigrants who came before 1914. Letters were published in Finnish newspapers by Americans describing Canada as a cold, inhospitable place with poor agricultural land.\(^{269}\) Clergyman Thomas Karppinen and Postmaster Samuel Kivela, from New Finland wrote to the Minister of the Interior in February 1900 to draw attention to the small number of Finnish immigrants who were attracted to Canada:

> For the most part of the Finnish people are the circumstances here completely unknown indeed the principle conditions of life and what to be supposed there on…There has been in action a large operation by way of the Finnish newspapers, purposefully those published in the United States. They publish thoroughly false informations \[sic\] to the Finnish people from this country and the circumstances here.\(^{270}\)

To counter this misinformation, they thought the government should do a better job distributing information about Canada, especially favourable testimonials from Finnish settlers.

It was illegal in the Russian Empire to encourage emigration. The distribution of printed matter, leaflets or travel guides was prohibited and advertisements in periodicals were censored by Tsarist authorities.\(^{271}\) To evade the law Canadian immigration agents had to mail the information in a nondescript envelope or distribute pamphlets by hand to Finns as they arrived in Britain.\(^{272}\) At first the immigration brochures distributed in Finland were in Swedish only. After his visit to Finland in 1883, Dyke took the initiative and produced 10,000 brochures for Finland. However, “as the Finnish language is exceedingly difficult” he found it necessary to have “the translations to be made in Norway.”\(^{273}\) Finnish newspapers reported in 1883 that “maps” of Canada with Finnish language texts were distributed in southern Ostrobothnia, but authorities managed to seize and destroy some of the material.\(^{274}\)


\(^{271}\) Dyke to Lowe, 4 December 1882, LAC, RG17, Vol. 357, Docket 38224A; Dyke, Liverpool to J.G Colmer, 3 April 1886, LAC, RG17, Vol. 483, Docket 52977. On Russian censorship see Rudd 1982.
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\(^{274}\) Kero suspected this was an effort by the CPR, but in fact it was the pamphlets made by Dyke. *Satuakunta* 7 July 1883 in Kero 1976c, 8.
There were problems with the literature produced.\textsuperscript{275} Finnish language brochures produced by the CPR in 1889 and 1891 examined by Rev. H.H. Mclean, were found to be riddled with spelling and grammar errors. McLean was a native of “Uleåborg” (Oulu), lived in Winnipeg and had written about Finnish settlement in Canada.\textsuperscript{276} One thousand copies with errors had already been distributed in the United States to attract Finns away from that country. He felt that the Canadian government should produce a pamphlet to benefit from these “good settlers (like those of Sweden). They are accustomed to agriculture from their childhood and have always through their life worked hard for getting a crop from a loam soil.”\textsuperscript{277} The consequence was that few Finnish people had any knowledge of Canada and those that did, likely had a negative image. Over the next few years thousands of brochures in Finnish were distributed.\textsuperscript{278} By 1899, however, an official with the Department of the Interior responded to a request for pamphlets for Finland with, “I am directed to say in answer to your recent postcard that we have no Finnish pamphlets, but that we have sent you some in the Swedish language which would probably be understood by your correspondent in Finland.”\textsuperscript{279}

Likewise, there were times between 1886 and 1914 when Canadian immigration officials employed interpreters to help immigrants, but this was seldom a person whose first language was Finnish. Typically, this was someone from one of the other Scandinavian countries who was functional in Finnish, but often only a Swedish speaker was available.\textsuperscript{280} Canadian officials did not see a problem with this because “Generally there are in a batch of Finlanders one or two who speak Swedish.”\textsuperscript{281} Because of the negative America propaganda about Canada and these half-hearted efforts by the Canadian government to produce
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brochures and provide interpreters, the Finns “stubbornly” continued to go to the United States in large numbers, instead of Canada, into the twentieth century.

To facilitate the spread of accurate information E. Wickelmann, a Finn employed as the Netherlands vice consul at Oulu and an agent for Lars Krogius, was brought to the North West Territory in 1899 to see things first hand. It was the height of the period of repression in Finland and there had been a series of crop failures, which Canadian immigration officials hoped to take advantage of. Wickelmann explained, that the official literature which described Canada, the Finns “often suspected to be pointed out in too bright colours” and therefore were exaggerated. It was important to get accurate information to Finns because emigration was not entirely welcome among many Finnish politicians, business leaders, and the clergy. For example, the Department of Immigration learned that the diet of the Grand Duchy of Finland had in 1891 presented a petition to the Tsar calling for an investigation into the “disadvantages caused to the country by the increasing emigration to America and Canada.”

Wickelmann was accompanied by Canadian poet and naturalist Charles Mair who took pains to point out the positive qualities of Finns and their successful settlement. The Finns who had settled in New Finland “came to the country with little or no means, and whose condition today is typical of what can be achieved by an industrious people in a region suited to their tastes and requirements” he wrote. The unique architectural features of the Finnish farms were noted, as if to indicate that Finnish ways were welcome in Canada and mainly for the benefit of his superiors, Mair commented on the character of these settlers. Mair added his own opinion that Finns were a very civilized people, who fit in well to Canadian society, and “I have never met with a people more civil and obliging or households better managed...the houses clean, the children orderly. The people resemble our
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own in habits and appearance.”288 To stress the Finnish settlers would become integrated into Canadian society and values, he drew out their knowledge of the British democratic system and sought testimony of their eagerness to integrate and learn English. Winckelmann reported this information to his superiors, in order to get it into the hands of passengers of the Finnish Steamship Company. It was printed in “Finnish, ‘Scandinavian’ and Norse,” though Wickelmann did not want his name mentioned in the pamphlet for fear of legal consequences.289

At the same time Canadians were inundated with information about the political situation in Finland. There was plenty of evidence in the newspapers that among at least some Canadians there was sympathy for the Finnish cause.290 In order to provide context, the reports invariably went on to explain to Canadians the history, national character, and customs, of what was thought to be an unknown people.291 The Ottawa Daily Free Press, wrote: “The Finns are described as of middle stature, fair, muscular, of powerful build, very easily contented, and agreeable to converse with. They have a reputation for cleanliness, sobriety, and obedience second to none who cross the great highway between East and West.”292

While the Fredericton Religious Intelligencer found Finns admirable because: “They are Lutherans in religion and have a zeal for education which characterizes the Swedes. There are said to be no illiterates in the country, and it is further said that in the established [Lutheran] Church illiterates are not admitted to the communion.”293 An Ottawa paper thought compared to other groups: “The Finns would make as good, if not superior, settlers, as the Mennonites and Dukhobors, and the money spent on them would be a first-rate investment.”294 The Manitoba Free Press, was impressed by Finns and indicated they “rival the Dutch in their love of order and cleanliness, and to them is attributed the invention of the vapour bath now extensively used as a medicinal agent.”295

The reference to the Mennonites and Dukhobors, two other minorities persecuted by the Russian state, was timely. During the summer of 1897 the noted
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anarchist, Prince P.A. Kropotkin visited Canada at the urging of Professor James Mavor. Kropotkin found Canada’s tolerance of the Mennonites, offered the Dukhobors a place to find refuge and suggested this to Leo Tolstoy. He also encouraged Mavor to successfully lobby the Canadian government and the relocation of the Dukhobors to Canada occurred during 1898–1899. At that point Kropotkin suggested Canada do the same for any Finns wishing to leave their beleaguered homeland.296 He claimed “Canada could not have a better set of immigrants than from Finland (after the Dukhobors). Hardworking, accustomed to a harsh climate.”297 The Canadian government was receptive and permitted Mavor to go to Europe on a fact-finding mission in May–September 1899. There he made friends with the Reuter family, the Borgström’s and Lars Krogius.

His report was filled with details regarding the history, geography, as well as the current political and economic situation in Finland.298 Mavor’s report had profuse praise for Finns and contained the elements which form many of the common images of Finland. Finland was “distinctly Western” and the culture was “not Russian,” but rather Swedish, which applied to both the Swedish and Finnish parts of the population.299 While he differentiates between the “Scandinavian” and Finnish population, he avoids referring to them as Asian or Mongol. Instead he focused on the Lutheranism of Finns, the high literacy rate and that like “the Icelander the Finn is spontaneously orderly” and law abiding.300 The problem with getting more of these “admirable settlers” was in making them aware of the opportunities in Canada.301 At the “Emigration Offices” in places like Oulu, Mavor found them full of information about the US and only a few “dusty and discoloured pamphlets” about Canada, which had been produced by the CPR years previous.
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Mavor was emphatic Canada should do more, but cautious it needed to be low key to avoid the attention of Russian authorities. Mavor’s visit came on the heels of the tour by Immigration Commissioner W.T.R. Preston who was in Finland in May. It was unjust, he thought, of Russia to put Finns under the same autocratic rule as the other “semi-barbaric and uneducated population in other parts of the empire.” Preston reported “I am simply amazed at the achievement and progress here.” He told the London Times, the Finns use “modern methods” and “In their telephone conveniences they are as far ahead of Ontario as Ontario is ahead of Labrador.”

Taking advantage of the contacts made by Mavor, independence activist Konni Zilliacus led a party of Finns on a tour of various parts of Canada in August 1899. He purportedly told their guides from the Department of Immigration that they were very pleased with what they found. Thinking they had secured their portion of Finnish immigrants, Canadian officials agreed to set aside land. However, the offer was later declined. Zilliacus objected to the Canadian requirement for sections to be reserved for schools, the Hudson’s Bay Company, the CPR, and timber reserves, which meant that close blocks of settlement were not possible. Immigration Agent Emanuel Ohlén later learned from Krogius that the delegates complained “the land which they were shown was not of the best, and the localities were unsuitable for their co-patriots.” Zilliacus also claimed that by now some of the fear and hysteria driving emigration had died down, so the whole program was put on hold. Another member of the committee in Finland effectively killed the plan in July 1901. Contradicting apparently positive reports of their visit, Arthur Borgström told the Canadian government its offer was insufficient and “I am rather of the opinion that it would be a pity to try to persuade the emigrants to go to Canada instead of going to the States, where they as a rule already have friends and relations, unless the Canadian government were to offer much more advantageous terms than
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they seemed to be inclined to give when we were there.”

He also thought Canadian nativism and public opinion would oppose any special treatment of any “favoured ‘lambs’ whether ‘Sifton’s’ or others.”

The attitude among senior department members seemed to suggest they now thought the news reports that 15,000 people were trying to leave Finland were exaggerated. This was confirmed in Mavor’s report where he thought at best Canada could hope for 1,500–2,000, but he noted the committee which was actually headed by Borgström had no mechanism in place to facilitate mass migration.

The efforts of Mavor and a similar plan to convince Finns to move from the US in 1891 and 1901 were not very successful. The only large movement of Finns achieved at this time was the arrival of Matti Kurikka and his utopians on Malcolm Island, British Columbia in 1901. Department officials remained hopeful, but retained a dose of scepticism about Finnish migration when in 1903 Count Carl Mannerheim, J.N. Reuter and N.C. Frederickson asked to send two more “experts” to tour Canada looking for land for Finns.

As settlers and workers, Finns in Canada clearly had a positive image in the country by the early twentieth century. As Professor Arthur P. Coleman noted when he looked at the polyglot makeup of Northern Ontario noted, “A great many Russians come here, the majority of them Finlanders, fine fellows physically.” He went on to say,

I don’t know whether they are going to make good raw material for us or not, but they are going to stay…Whether he has good moral qualities, is hard to say,
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but the Finlander tries to learn English, and in all the schools in these little towns you will see his flaxen haired boys and girls with their blue eyes. They are very good material if we bring them up right, and we must bring them up right. We must see to it they become good Canadians and that they learn; English in the schools…The Finlanders are largely Lutherans, where they are anything at all, religiously.316

Here we begin to see both positive and negative aspects of the latent image of Finns. Coleman was expressing concern over the number of foreign workers used to develop Canada’s resources and if they could be assimilated into Canadian society. Finns would continue to come to Canada but would their contribution to Canadian life be positive or negative was an open question. Those who came to build a new life by contributing to Canada helped to make a positive image of Finland, but those who had been radicalized and continued those attitudes in their new home fed negative perceptions.317

2.4 Dangerous Finns

The evidence suggests that Finns were initially welcomed by Canadian authorities for what was thought to be their positive national character.318 That these character traits were widely perceived was evident in a 1962 when Gilbert Johnson found many positive things to say about the “practical Finns” in his article on the New Finland colony.319 One negative side of the Finnish-Canadian community he noted was alcoholism and the violence often associated with it. Alcohol addiction had been a serious problem in Finland. Coinciding with out migration from Finland was a growing temperance movement, often with a religious connection. Not surprising then, among the first Finnish-Canadian organizations formed in a community was a temperance society. 320 The existence of temperance societies in mainstream Canadian communities was seen as a positive thing and an example of high moral
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standards. In the case of the Finns it could also be seen as proof of a deeper problem, evidence at least some members of that group might not make the best citizens.321

Despite positive images of Finns as the best workers, according to sociologist Edmund Bradwin who studied lumber camp life in the early twentieth century, there were definitely negative aspects to Finns. Their apparently insular nature could be disturbed by the presence of alcohol, which “lead to stolidness, quarrels and brutal personal onslaughts.”322 Finnish “knife culture” with its swaggering “puukko” wielding young men left Canadians with impressions Finns were potentially dangerous.323 The illegal sale of alcohol in Finnish communities and the drunkenness and violence that could result fostered a dangerous, violent, and intoxicated image.324

An example of poor behaviour, thought to be caused by alcohol, occurred when a group of Finns wanted to return home in 1884 after working on the CPR line. They approached immigration officials to arrange transportation home. Controversy occurred because the Finns deemed the interpreter was biased towards the Allan Line over the Dominion Line. Many Finns it seemed preferred the Dominion Line since, “The treatment in the Dominion Line steamers is very good and the Finns can get as many herrings they like[sic].”325 Some of those who claimed to have been pressured to take the Allan Line complained. On examination of the passenger lists by immigration officials, the names of those who complained could not be found. The Allen Line agent in Ottawa stated that they did get tickets from him, since he turned them away because “the Finns called to his office in a state of intoxication.”326 Canadian officials considered the matter settled, because the claims by the intoxicated, trouble making Finns could not be substantiated.

Another case of problem Finns was recounted by Superintendent of Immigration (SoI) W.D. Scott in the fall of 1906. A group of six Finlanders had arrived in October and immediately raised complaints. They had a letter of introduction from E.F. Larsson of Stockholm, a private individual who occasionally did immigration work. The Finns reported having friends in the settlement of New
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Finland and claimed they had been told they could earn $2 a day working as labourers in Canada. Scott proceeded to disillusion them by informing them they might earn at most $1.50, but more likely less as railway navvies. They were now stranded in Ottawa without funds. Concerned that Finnish immigrants were being given false information in Sweden the matter was investigated. According to Larsson he never discussed with them anything about New Finland or the wages offered in Canada. They either learned it from their friends or by rumour in Finland. Larsson had visited Canada and was therefore very familiar with conditions there. His evaluation of the party of Finns was “These persons were very ignorant and very Stubborn. Just like the worst and Most Ignorant Finlanders.” As proof of this he noted they seemed to think New Finland was near the coast, not in Western Canada. He only cautioned them that the limited amount of money they had would only get them as far as Ottawa, where they might be able to find work or contact their friends for money. Larsson’s explanation appears to have been accepted.

There also existed the popular belief that Finns were prone to insanity and suicide. The expression “crazy Finn” was a common epithet. Jacob Jarvis, a Finnish-Canadian lawyer in the Sudbury area, represented many Finns in court. In an interview with Martha Allen he recalled one case that encompassed several negative images of Finns. The case involved a father and stepson who had been drinking heavily and argued about the way the father had mistreated the mother. During the fight which followed the father murdered and mutilated the stepson’s body. In New Finland, David Kautonen who was said to have a violent temper, apparently confessed that he had murdered a Swedish neighbour with an axe. The North West Mounted Police (NWMP) officer, who investigated in 1892 what was effectively a cold case, was unable to prove anything, even with Kautonen’s confession. After a fruitless search for the body, the officer was left with the impression the Finn was suffering from some sort of mental illness.
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Another negative aspect was that Finns were seen as clannish. The concept that ethnic groups were cultural anomalies, the other, to be integrated and then assimilated, was the Canadian government response to immigrants up until the adoption of a policy of official multiculturalism in 1971. The expectation was immigrants would assimilate into the liberal universalism of Canadian culture, which was still essentially Anglo defined.\(^{334}\) If an ethnic group could not easily assimilate it was a possible threat to social cohesion. In this context the perception that Finns were unwilling or unable to integrate themselves into Canadian society existed, despite the fact that in the farm communities, mines, and logging camps, they did interact.\(^{335}\) However, this was mainly on a work or business basis. The insular nature of life in the Finnish communities was evident as one Finnish-Canadian later observed, “We knew very little about what was going on in our town, or the country where we had homes.”\(^{336}\) Like many immigrant groups trying to adjust to life in Canada, the Finns tended to gather in ethnic enclaves for support.\(^{337}\) In Lower’s study of Northern Ontario the Finns did not stand out as being any more “clannish” than the various Scandinavians, Germans, French Canadians, Slovaks, Hungarians, Galicians and Russians.\(^{338}\)

The reluctance or inability of many to learn English also supported the clannish image of Finns held by other Canadians. The close knit nature of the Finnish communities, while it aided adjustment to their new home, also made English unnecessary, since most could get by without.\(^{339}\) Difficulty learning the English language and unfamiliarity with the customs of their new home was a contributing factor in their being “misjudged by their neighbours.”\(^{340}\) One method of adaptation, which though effective could be a source of derision over the poor pronunciation, was to make English words fit Finnish morphology and syntax. For example, “rooma” would be used for room or “haussi” for house. This was in effect an English dialect or patois that has come to be known as “Finglish.”\(^{341}\)

Another perception was that Finns were a danger to the social fabric, laid in the fact that for a long period the proportion of women to men among Finnish-Canadians was low. A high number of Finns who came to Canada were single men,
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either bachelors or men who left their families behind and came in search of employment. In the communities that grew up around the mining and lumber camps the Finnish women that were there, were typically employed as cooks or cleaners. Other women ran boarding houses, offering rooms, and meals to Finnish men. In the eyes of mainstream Canadians and the authorities, the boarding houses were a source of impropriety. These houses were usually run as co-operatives, where a share in the operation bought a bed, meals, and camaraderie. This was also a suitable place to discuss politics or spread propaganda about Marxism, atheism, and syndicalism. Canadian authorities suspected that many of these “boarding houses” were actually “speak-easies” or “blind pigs”; that is covert operations for prostitution and the illegal production and sale of alcohol. Occasionally a Finnish woman would be arrested for performing an abortion, which was illegal and considered socially repulsive. Certainly, the police sought to shut down those suspected of illegal activity and arrest or deport the guilty parties. However, as several scholars have observed these boarding houses were in fact noted for their cleanliness and at least the appearance of moral propriety. The Finnish community tended to accept them at face value and very practically rationalized the women served a need. If any sexual relations occurred between the women and the Finnish men, it was a matter which only concerned those involved.

When Finnish men and women did form couples, many were not legally married. Especially among left-wing Finns the institution of marriage was rejected on ideological grounds. It was thought this was encouraged by exiled socialist leaders from Finland, who Reverend Heinonen felt were left in relative “liberty to advocate atheism, anarchism and free love.” Among other groups, he was likely thinking about the utopian settlement, Sointula, on Harmony Island, British Columbia, that operated from 1901–1904. With its communal lifestyle and controversial “free love” philosophy Sointula was an example of the radical ideas Finns were attracted to. In general, in socialist Finnish-Canadian communities, if a man and woman chose to live together, it was up to them and if the community accepted the union that was all that was required. Viktor Koski, a miner in Timmons, recalled “The Finns in Porcupine had a custom that whenever a couple was allowed

342 Schneider 1986, 48.
to go to the sauna together...they were considered to be married.”

Apparently one way of “solemnizing” such a union was to place an advertisement in one of the socialist papers indicating “Miss X” would now be known as “Mrs. Y.” To Heinonen this was evidence of the disadvantage it placed women in; because sometime later another advertisement would appear indicating the woman was reverting to her maiden name. By implication she was now destitute and a single mother. In Canada this would normally be considered a “common law” marriage. It was not recognized in law until later in the twentieth century and did not necessarily guarantee the same rights as a married couple. The practice of common law or “Communistic marriage” was another reason for mainstream Canadians to look down on Finns.

At times Finns in Canada exhibited a sense of superiority and pride in things Finnish that could come across as arrogance. For example, the ubiquity of saunas on Finnish farms left the perception that Canadians were “dirty” and contributed to the sense many Finns felt they were better. The success of Finnish farmers at New Finland can be attributed to their determination, or as local historian Nancy Schelstraete prefers to summarize it, “through backbreaking effort and Finnish sisu, carved out of the wilderness as close-knit, thriving community...based on concept of co-operation, good will and close social and economic bonds.” Canadian-Finns could be justly proud of these accomplishments. However, these were characteristics that typified the experiences shared by many Canadians, both new and old, during this era of large scale migration and settlement of the frontier. What stood out as much as the hard work was the independent spirit of the Finns. There was a self-consciousness among Finns that they were different than other European Canadians, which could at times be seen as arrogance. Perceived arrogance and anti-social behaviour, coupled with radical ideas, only served to reinforce the Canadian image of Finns as the other.
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2.5 Radical Ideas

According to Hoglund, the Finnish propensity to dwell on a subject and philosophize was related to education. The literal mindedness of Finns was thought by some to have its origins in pre-Christian spiritual magic and later this was transferred to the new religion. As the written foundation of the new religion, the Bible gave reading and learning the “magical nature” of the old religion. From this, Finns it was thought developed an attitude of “legal-mindedness” and passion for “forensic argument” and litigation over ideas. There occurred an “intellectual awakening” among the Finnish “peasantry” in the nineteenth century, where literacy and intellectual aspirations flourished. In part this explains the attraction of socialism to many Finns. The ideas presented by the socialist thinkers in books and lectures, seemed to accurately reflect the daily experience of Finns as workers. This correlation was why so many Finnish-Canadians adhered to socialist doctrines with an almost religious conviction.

Not surprisingly many socialist Finns examined the situation in their new home and expressed their critique of Canadian society through various newspapers and other print materials. They often contained cartoon images lampooning what were thought to be the problems with Canadian society, especially capitalism and religion. As J. Hampden Jackson, later in the twentieth century, pointed out to his readers the Finns love: “songs, proverbs, riddles, exercises of thought,” but also had “a disposition for satire which mercilessly ridicules their own follies and those of others.” When the Finns denounced Canadian society, they were seen as ungrateful aliens, who benefited from the country while rejecting it. Authorities would later seek to suppress those publications which propagated their socialist ideas and criticisms of Canada.

Therefore, an image of Finns as radicals, with dangerous ideas developed over the years. An early example might be one Finnish immigrant, Nils Gustaf von Schoultz, an aristocratic Finland-Swede. He was a particularly colourful
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individual, who had participated in the 1830–1831 Polish revolt against Russian rule. Perhaps presaging later images of Finns as dangerous radicals, Schoultz participated in the Rebellion of 1837–1838 in Upper Canada on the side of the rebels, was captured, and eventually hanged. The origins of the rebellion are complex, but a key aspect was the desire for responsible constitutional government and greater Canadian autonomy within or even independence from the British Empire, something nineteenth century Finns might have related too. However, ignorance of Schoultz’s Finnish origin would have prevented his act of armed resistance from contributing much to the negative image of Finns. Canada’s Prime Minister W.L.M. King was on his mother’s side a descendant of one of leaders of the Canadian rebels. In 1948, when he was being interviewed by a Finnish-Canadian working for MacLean’s Magazine the topic of Schoultz came up and King promised to get her information on the rebel. In this way one of the key Canadian foreign policy decision-makers had a connection with Finland, however remote.

The work ethic of the Finns was seen as a strong point and they had a reasonable sense that work should be properly rewarded with fair wages and decent working conditions. Where this failed to happen, they turned to the only tool at their disposal, the labour movement. Among those who fled the Russian oppression in Finland in the early twentieth century were intellectuals who held various types of socialist, Marxist, syndicalist, and anarchist ideologies. These individuals became a cadre of agitators, activists, radical leaders, and union organizers. Given the insular nature of Finnish communities in Canada, it meant that Finns were considered to be more susceptible to these influences. There was a sense that the Finns thought they were superior and had an anti-Canadian element in their political thinking when they sought to change the character of Canadian politics. Under such circumstances immigrants became synonymous with “aliens” and were perceived as “dangerous foreigners.” They were a threat to the existing liberal, democratic, capitalist order in Canada and were often demonized through the use of medical images of a disease, infecting the body of Canada. The radical element in this way further contributed to negative perceptions of Finnish-Canadians as a
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whole. To a large degree it was a distorted image, which failed to account for the fact it was exploitative labour conditions in Canada that caused the reaction. The misperception credited the radicals with larger numbers and a greater influence than they actually had within the Finnish community, except in a few centres on the resource frontier. The most visible and organizationally active were the socialists according to Lindström, but a precise number is difficult to determine because only about 50% of adult Finnish-Canadians formally joined any political or cultural group and of those did join she estimated before the First World War about 75% of those opted for the Finnish Socialist Organization of Canada (FSOC). Finns in turn received the criticism and harassment of employers, government officials, the police, and the courts.

The First World War created circumstances which offered the possibility for more images of Finns. Military service in Canada was voluntary until 1917 when conscription was introduced. On the positive side from 1914–1918 hundreds of Finnish-Canadians demonstrated their loyalty and joined the Canadian army. Still, in certain segments of Canadian society Finns were seen as disloyal. Finns were among the groups of “foreigners” identified as participating in seditious anti-war demonstrations and disrupting the war effort through labour agitation and strikes. Fear of enemy subversion coincided with the atmosphere of the “Red Scare,” stoked by business leaders, conservative members of ethnic communities, government officials, and the press. Under these circumstances the general Canadian public was prepared to accept extreme restrictions on civil liberties ranging from censorship, to police surveillance, and arrests.

Labour unrest was not only a threat to the social order, but because of its perceived “foreign” origins in wartime it was also a security risk. Lieutenant Colonel R.W. Leonard, a military engineering officer stationed along the Canada-US border at St. Catherine’s, Ontario, can be considered representative of this view. He wrote the Divisional Intelligence Officer, at Camp Borden in October 1917 about his concerns over the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) The IWW was seen as a dangerous movement, whose influence was widespread, and its origin and purpose were “alien.” In Northern Ontario it had some success recruiting not only
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the “foreign element,” but also English-speaking miners. The IWW to Leonard was synonymous with labour agitation and full of foreigners, “Finns, Polacks, Austrians and Hungarians and some Irish, and I believe it to be a thoroughly disloyal organization. This is borne out by some recent reports of labour troubles in Canada which have been fomented by enemy labourers.”

The war split the Finnish-Canadian community even further than before, especially after the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. Finnish independence was achieved at the end of 1917 as a result and in the civil war which followed in 1918, the divisions became “White” versus “Red.” Negative images came to the fore, mainly associated with perceived German influence, through the existence of the German trained 27th Jaeger Battalion, the proposed Finnish monarchy with a German as king, the German-Finnish trade treaty, and German military intervention which aided the White cause. Complicating the issue was the fact that in the West the Bolsheviks at least initially were also associated with German interests and machinations.

From the start of the war periodicals, newspapers, publications, pamphlets, books, and letters were subject to censorship. It was illegal to import or publish anything that could directly or indirectly be useful to the enemy, by spreading false information or work against the war effort of Canada, Britain and her allies, including Russia. Of course socialist organizations were suspect, as were any publications in a language other than English or French. After the position of Chief Press Censor was created in June 1915, Ernest J. Chambers hired Finnish speaking translators to monitor Finnish language publications. The efforts of Chambers were hampered by having to rely on translations and limited knowledge
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369 Lieutenant Colonel R.W. Leonard to Captain Coventry, Divisional Intelligence Officer, Camp Borden, Ontario, 4 October 1917 in Roberts 1988, 75. To one Anglo-Canadian informant the Finns were a personal danger. He told the Dominion Police in 1917 he wanted his information kept confidential because he feared for his safety, “as it would be a perfectly justifiable excuse, according to the Finlander’s way of thinking, for sticking a knife between my ribs on the first dark night.” A. Murray to T.C. Creer, 5 October 1917 in Avery 1979, 73.
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In an effort to promote a positive image many non-socialist Finns demonstrated their loyalty by supporting Canada’s war effort. The *Canadan Uutiset* for example, when it was launched in November 1915, advised the chief press censor that its publishers had pledged to show “the Finnish people the liberty and advantages offered and assured by Canadian laws and institutions” and thereby “bring about a better understanding and beneficial reciprocation between this nationality and the Canadians and educate the Finns to become good, useful and law abiding citizens.” They were cautioned by the censor to keep that attitude, as well as refraining from any criticism of the Russian government.

The infighting of Finns in Canada was an ongoing source of concern and at times confusion for officials. Conservative Finns like the publisher of *Canadan Uutiset* J.A. Mustonen and Reverend Heinonen repeatedly lobbied to have left-wing Finnish publications banned because of their subversive nature. At the same time socialist Finns tried to oppose papers like *Canadan Uutiset* because of the White Finnish affiliation with Germany. Chambers noted to the Deputy Postmaster General R.W. Coulter that “A decidedly peculiar situation exists with reference to these Finnish publications.” For example, Frank Aaltonen, on one hand appeared to Chambers “to be a well-meaning individual who is willing to help in excluding undesirable publications from Canada.” Yet, he was advocating for such potentially subversive socialist Finnish newspapers as *Amerikan Työmies*, which Mustonen, who Chambers also considered trustworthy, wanted prohibited. Chambers felt “It is of course important to avoid stampeding and I am glad to have evidence on the other side.” Coulter agreed and suspected the motives had as much to do with business competition as it did with loyalty to Canada. A similar motive was thought behind the vigorous opposition Mustonen had to the founding
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of a new socialist paper *Vapaus*, in the fall of 1917, to replace the banned papers *Raivaaja* and *Työmies*.

In an effort to persuade Chambers to treat publications such as *Vapaus* more favourably, the operator of the socialist Finnish bookstore in Sudbury, Hugo Paasikivi sent him a copy of Arthur Reade’s book *Finland and the Finns*.\(^{383}\) Chambers read it with great interest, because “like most English speaking people, I always had an idea that Finland was a fine Country and that Finns were a quiet and extremely intelligent people, who had not had fair opportunities to develop their natural resources.”\(^{384}\) Because of his respect for Finns and the belief they will be an asset to Canada, Chambers stressed that it was vital to prevent the “spread of non-satisfactory feeling among the Finns” and therefore justified his censorship activities.\(^{385}\)

Unaware the regulations did not require them to do so; the supporters of *Vapaus* were seeking the approval of Chambers to start publishing. In fact, the censor could only prosecute or proscribe a publication after it had violated the regulations. In the end Chambers was convicted to give official sanction to the paper so long as the publishers agreed to abide by the censorship regulations. Later, Chambers confessed to C.H. Cahan that he was in fact exceeding his authority, but yielded because it was “pointed out to me that so long as Finn [nish] Labour Organizations in Canada had not some kind of organ, they would continue to bring in the highly objectionable and inflammatory Finnish Anarchistic publications printed in the United States.”\(^{386}\) He retained this view despite the occasional questionable article and the fact that documents seized by police in August 1918 exposed that the paper was secretly owned by the politically suspect FSOC. The documents also revealed the FSOC was clearly engaged in anti-war activities and spreading socialist and pro-Bolshevik propaganda.\(^{387}\)

C.H. Cahan, was a lawyer appointed in early 1918, by Prime Minister Robert Borden to investigate and report on the danger of a revolutionary movement
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387 Ahlqvist apparently told Paasikivi they needed to cover their tracks by destroying papers, so the censor did not learn they acted “treacherously.” To the editor he also is supposed to have advised to be cautious and crafty in editing *Vapaus*. The documents were seized at the INCO owned Creighton Mine, near Sudbury. J.W. Ahlqvist to H. Paasikivi, 7 October 1917; Ahlqvist to H. Juntunen, nd., LAC, RG6 E, Vol. 568, File 237-T-3 Part 3, Reel T66.
developing in Canada. Since the war began Cahan reported, there had been “revolutionary groups of Russians, Ukrainians and Finns” in organizations like the Social Democratic Party of Canada and others, “who as aliens, are carrying on a most pernicious propaganda.” These ethnic groups in his view were enemies of the state, since so many of them were “Bolshies.” The Bolsheviks were aiding Germany by disrupting Canada’s contribution to the Allied cause. Both White and Red Finns it seems were caught up in this enemy image. A number of publications from the Socialist Party in Finland, which Canadian officials regarded as a branch of the Russian “Bolsheviki Party,” were intercepted and banned by censors “on account of their pro-German tone.” Cahan’s final report claimed that the problem of enemy aliens was straight forward and if the necessary regulations were put in place they could be registered, watched by police, and if necessary interned. The necessary steps would be taken later in the year.

Money and German influence in Finland further contributed to negative images. Throughout the war many Finns were collecting funds and sending them to Finland and this was regarded with suspicion and hostility. A justice of the peace in British Columbia in early 1918 questioned the legality of sending money to Finland, “because Finns in this district are strongly anti-British, and have refused to apply one cent to any fund for any Red Cross or Patriotic purposes but now they can be busy enough getting funds for their own purposes.” He was advised that for now it was not illegal, “but such remittances would be prohibited under the law as it stands if Finland should pass into the occupation of the enemy.” Another example was evident when regulations were introduced in June 1918 that prohibited money transfers directly to Finland, on the grounds they were being transferred to land controlled by the enemy. In August 1918 Anna Sjoblom drew a money order from the bank at Carbury, Manitoba, to send home. Canadian officials thought she was sending German marks not realizing it was Finnish markka she wanted. All banks were notified that the remittance of money to Finland was
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suspended and any found in the mail were to be intercepted, “owing to the existing
relations between Germany and Finland, and the possibility of remittances to
Finland being retransmitted to Germany.” The bank manager pointed out that the
draft was actually payable in London in sterling and that he had sold it to a
“reputable citizen” and had no knowledge of her nationality or the ultimate
destination of the money. Apparently funds destined for Finland could still be
sent, but had to go via the US or UK, so in the end there was found to be “no
objection” to the money being sent.

As the war dragged on through 1918 the first step designed to prevent the left
from fomenting revolution occurred on 25 September 1918 when various ethnic
groups were added to the classification of “the enemy.” The order prohibited a
wide range of publications in “enemy” languages, with the exception of material
which was of a purely literary, scientific, religious, or artistic nature. Finnish was
among the fourteen alien languages prohibited in this way. Two days later on 27
September 1918, a wide range of organizations such as the IWW and various
ethnically based organizations like the FSOC were made unlawful. Languages
other than English or French at meetings by organizations where business was
conducted in a foreign language were banned. Finns along with Russians and
Ukrainians became enemy aliens and had to register and lists were made in the
hope of keeping track of Bolshevik activists.

The socialist oriented paper Vapaus and even the Canadian Uutiset, which had
aided the government in its censorship activities, was banned. Regarding the
banning of all Finnish language publications Chambers explained, “There are at
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The present forces and organizations at work in Canada, especially among the Finnish people, which seek to corrupt their minds, to undermine the very foundations of our civilization and the law and order, and substitute therefore bolshevism with its attendant evils.\textsuperscript{401} Arguing in favour of \textit{Canadian Uutiset}, the editor of the Port Arthur \textit{News Chronicle}, tried to educate Chambers about the two types of Finns, the “Church Finns” and the mostly socialist “Non-Church Finns.”\textsuperscript{402} The Church Finns he argued supported the government and opposed the anti-Canadian activities of the socialists and therefore needed their newspaper. Chambers replied that “I might say that I was fairly familiar with the differences between the two sections of the Finnish population,” but the ban on enemy language papers “was due entirely to the insistence of the Military and Police Authorities that the only way to deal with this subject was to prevent the circulation of all enemy language publications in Canada.”\textsuperscript{403} Small town police forces like Port Arthur, faced difficulties identifying objectionable material because there was a shortage of reliable translators. The only option was a blanket ban, which continued after the war. The restrictions were relaxed in April 1919, but still required published materials to be submitted to the censors. Finally, in December all orders passed under the War Measures Act were repealed.\textsuperscript{404} Now, like other Canadians, Finnish publications and organizations were simply subject to the sections of the Criminal Code dealing with sedition and offending material could be not be sent by mail.

By 1919 the image of Finns and Finland had become so negative that Canadian officials discouraged as far as possible immigration from Finland. A rationale for these restrictions was that after the war the Canadian economy needed time to adjust to peacetime production and accommodate the large numbers of returned soldiers seeking employment. In an economy where competition for employment was intense, both veteran’s groups and organized labour opposed reopening immigration to pre-war levels. An increasingly nativist attitude prevailed in Canada.\textsuperscript{405} Countering this were business interests, especially in mining and lumbering who faced a labour shortage because Canadians were less interested in employment at these northern locations. Still the Canadian government persisted in not wanting Finns. In response to a request to allow workers from Finland in 1919,\textsuperscript{406}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{401} Chambers to W. Niinimaki, 7 July 1919, LAC, RG6 E, Vol. 565, File 237-C-3, Reel T64.
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F.C. Blair, the secretary for the Department of Immigration and Colonization explained that there were some “excellent Finnish settlers, especially those who take up farming,” but immigration from Finland was discouraged because some “Finnish people seem to be very busy spreading IWW propaganda and occasionally one is found doing something worse.”\textsuperscript{406} Nonetheless, companies managed to circumvent the immigration restrictions and obtained Finnish immigrant workers, on the grounds workers could not be found in Canada.\textsuperscript{407}

2.6 Canadian Image of Finland and Finns Summary

It is evident that by 1919 the Canadian image of Finland and Finns had both positive and negative aspects to it. The newly formed Dominion of Canada, in need of hardy settlers, during the late nineteenth century initially found much that was positive in the image of Finns and Finland. The images conjured positive perceptions for many Canadians whereby Finland appeared as a progressive, modern, Western, Christian, European country, which valued democracy and rule of law. Finland was a borderland, an interface periphery between east and west, and it was also a northern nation, which implied purity, hardiness, and self-reliance. All these things made the Finnish national character one which created people who were hardworking, honest, reliable, literate, and clean. The overall positive image of Finland made Finns ideal settlers in Canadian eyes.

This gradually changed by 1919, as the perceived radicalism and clannishness of many Finns failed to reflect the aspirations Canada had for integrating these immigrants into mainstream society. Competing for dominance was a range of negative images which were in many ways the polar opposites of the positive images. Finland in these cases was perceived as an Eastern or Asian land, which implied it was backward, prone to authoritarian or despotic style societies, which were thought to be a feature of the Oriental world. As such Finland was a source of dangerous ideas, which did not fit the established liberal order, such as socialism, anarchism, communism, and bolshevism. Canadian ideas about the undemocratic nature of Germany and militarism also tainted Finland with an enemy image, when conservative White Finns benefited from military aid from Canada’s enemy during the First World War. The character of the Finnish people made them stubborn,

\textsuperscript{407} Avery 1979, 93; Avery 1995, 85; Kelly and Trebilcock 2010, 190.
superstitious, clannish, slow to learn English, and prone to violence, mental illness, and alcoholism. In sum the negative images associated with Finland made Finnish immigrants undesirable citizens.

The year 1919 was also significant because the negotiations for the Treaty of Versailles were on going. At the Council of Foreign Ministers on 3 May the Allied and Associated Powers, including the United Kingdom recognized the de facto independence of Finland. Britain’s recognition of Finland extended to the self-governing Dominions, including Canada. The images which evolved prior to the independence of Finland, set the stage for the treatment of Finns in Canada into the 1930s and future diplomatic relations as old images remerge in new forms to suit the circumstances.
3 Foreign Policy and the Image of Finland

In the immediate aftermath of the First World War, Canadian officials played a role in the recognition of Finnish independence by the British Empire and the other Allied powers by working to find a solution for the last few members of the Murmansk Legion. The acceptance of the legionnaires as immigrants helped satisfy one of the pre-conditions the Allies had set for extending recognition to Finland. In international relations terms, these later interactions involved “high policy” areas related to war and peace such as territorial disputes, disarmament, and the peaceful resolution of disputes. The two countries interacted at the League of Nations and Canada showed passing interest in the Åland Island and East Karelia disputes. The events surrounding the high policy interactions of Canada and Finland produced a considerable amount of intense, fast paced diplomatic activity, but these things were a small fraction of the total relations between the two. Most Canadian government involvement with issues relating to Finland was more mundane.

Images of Finns and Finland were active in the Canadian government handling of these issues. Finnish independence caused conflicting or contradictory negative images to surface. Coming as it did during the last part of the First World War, conservative, White Finnish sympathy for Germany and German military intervention placed Finland in the camp of the Central Powers. Germany was the main enemy of Britain and the other Allies and therefore Canada’s enemy. Bolshevik support for the Red Finns also brought out long held negative images of Finns. Canadian immigration officials, police, politicians, and capitalists had for some time suspected Finns in Canada of radical politics, labour agitation, and even fomenting revolution. The timing of Finnish independence and the civil war which followed, coincided in Canada with a “red scare” and a xenophobic reaction towards Finnish-Canadians whereby many Canadian officials saw them as dangerous.

Nonetheless the historical image of Finns and Finland in Canada worked to counter such negative perceptions. Images of hardworking, reliable Finns and a shortage of lumberjacks made it easier to accept the members of the Murmansk Legion, who were clearly identified as Red Finns. By the time Canadian-Finnish foreign relations began with the appointment of the first honorary Finnish consul in Canada, positive images were in the ascendency. Negative images of Finns as dangerous radicals were counterpoised with positive images of the country Finland as a Western, modern, democratic, liberal country during interactions internationally.
3.1 Diplomatic Recognition

Finland declared independence from Russia on 6 December 1917. The Council of People’s Commissars of the new Soviet government gave their recognition of Finland’s independence on 31 December. Starting in the New Year several countries extended de jure recognition to the new state. The only Allied country to do so was France on 4 January. Britain and the US wanted to avoid any premature decisions before the future of Russia and its borders were settled. By the end of January 1918 Finland descended into civil war. The White, conservative nationalist Finns opposed the socialist Red Finns who were also supported by the Soviets. Complicating the situation, the Germans intervened to aid the White cause, but with their own strategic interests in mind. With Germany as a de facto ally of the new Finland, recognition by the Allied powers was problematic. France withdrew its earlier recognition and the other Allied powers continued to withhold theirs. This placed the new state of Finland in an awkward position regarding the Allies, the Bolsheviks, and German interests in the Baltic.

A side issue which involved Canada and Canadian soldiers, developed out of the moves towards the diplomatic recognition of Finland. This was what to do with the former members of the Finnish Legion. The unfortunate situation these soldiers found themselves in was a product of the Finnish Civil War and the Allied Intervention into North Russia during 1918–1919. In the process groups of Red Finnish refugees had been drawn into the Allied intervention and formed into a military unit by the British. Canada’s role in this consisted of the provision of military personnel as part of the North Russia Expeditionary Force, some of whom would become involved with the Finnish Legion and countering German influence in the area.

German war aims in the east contained a prominent position for an “independent” Finland as part of a series of satellite states to contain Russia.
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German influence would be further enhanced by the creation of a Finnish monarchy with a German prince as king. In effect Finland would become a client state.\footnote{The development of German policy toward Finland in 1918 came from a compromise between the Foreign Office and the Supreme Command. On the conflicting German war aims in Finland see Kaipio 1976, 100, 310; Herwig 1973; Jackson 1939; Jarausch 1972.}

Though the decision was by no means universally supported, the Finnish Senate in Vaasa requested German aid military to fight the Red Finns. The Baltic Sea Division (Ostsee-division), under Major General Rüdiger von der Goltz landed at Hango on 3 April 1918 and helped hasten the White Finnish victory. At the invitation of the Finnish government the German troops remained as a further guarantee of Finnish independence, to help organize and train the Finnish army, and because the Entente Powers had begun to station troops in northern Russia.\footnote{Ganz 1980. Also, Arimo 1991.}

For the Allies there was the desire to retain the use of Murmansk as a line of communication with Russia and there appeared a danger that either the Germans or the White Finns might seize the area. Exaggerated Allied reports which claimed the forces of von der Goltz numbered 55,000, contributed to the panic, though these forces never exceeded 12,000 and remained mostly within the Finnish frontier.\footnote{The number German troops in Finland varies depending on what source is consulted. Ganz indicates the Baltic Division numbered 9,445; while Luckett cites 15,000 and others use the figure 12,000. Many sources repeat the erroneous number of 55,000, used by Ironside and Maynard. Ganz 1980, 86; Luckett 1971, 198; Nicholson 1962, 510; Maynard 1971, 100; Ironside 1953, 17. For the most recent critical overview Hentilä and Hentilä 2018.}

There was also the issue of safeguarding war materials and supplies the Allies had provided Russia, stockpiled in the ports of Archangel and Murmansk and the need to prevent the Germans using the ports as submarine bases. A subsequent aim was to bolster anti-Bolshevik or White Russian forces. The irony of the situation was this would also have coincided with White Finnish aims insofar as they also opposed the Bolsheviks. The problem for the Finns was the White Russians who the Allies supported were at best vague about agreeing to an independent Finland or adamantly opposed any loss of former Imperial Russian land. Therefore, to many conservative Finns orientation towards Germany was the only real foreign policy option.\footnote{There is a considerable literature on the Allied Intervention for example Coates and Coates 1935; Bradley 1968; Silverlight 1971; Strakovsky 1944; Jackson 1972; Stewart 1970; Thompson 1966; Kettle 1992; Kinvig 2006; Rhodes 1988; Carley 1983; Goldin 2000.}

During this period the Allies tended to regard White Finns as puppets or pawns of the Germans and Finnish interest in northern Russia and Karelia was due to German influence.\footnote{Tokoi 1957, 174; Nevakivi 1970, 67–69; Long 1972, 50–51.}
Early in June 1918 the Supreme War Council authorized sending military expeditions, to Murmansk and Archangel. They would fight an undeclared war against the Russian Bolshevik government. The combined forces were of mixed nationality and included British, French, American, Italian, Serbian, and eventually Canadian and Australian troops. In addition there were locally raised forces which included White Russians, Poles, and Karelians. Total Allied forces including locally raised troops, fluctuated throughout the intervention reaching a maximum of roughly 26,000 in the fall of 1918 and grew to roughly 50,000 by the fall of 1919. Though initially reluctant, the Canadian government agreed to support intervention because it indirectly contributed towards the war with Germany. The troops sent would be volunteers. The Canadian contribution to the North Russia Expeditionary Force consisted of two artillery batteries, a number of personnel to work in headquarters, and with the Royal Air Force. Another part of the contingent included 92 officers and non-commissioned officers who were to act as instructors for the locally raised troops.

The majority of the Canadians operated in the Archangel area, but a small number came to be associated with the Red Finns at Murmansk. Here the British commander, Major General F.C. Poole, found Red Finnish refugees were willing to resist the Germans and White Finns, which were eventually formed into a “British” unit, referred to in English as the “Finnish Legion.” The Red Finns agreed to serve under Finnish officers, in a unit trained, equipped, supplied, and paid by the British. Ultimately about 2,000 Red Finns were in some capacity part of the legion. A number of British and Canadian officer’s and non-commissioned
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418 On the fluctuating numbers of troops see Bullock 2008, 96–100. Of the locally raised troops the Karelian Regiment, sometimes called the Karelian Legion, was organized in July 1918. It eventually numbered around 4,000 men and included Red Finns eager to damage the White Finn efforts at acquiring Karelia. Especially among its leadership there was a desire for an independent Karelia, but its discipline was always in question. Swettenham 1967, 60–61, 66–67. See the diary of one of the British officers who served with the Karelians. Baron 2007.  
419 The name of the force has several variations, with each contingent having its own title. A new force raised in April 1919 to replace the troops already there was called the North Russia Relief Force. Beattie 1957, 62. In total Canada contributed nearly 585 men, including a “Malamute Company” which used dog sleds for transport. Nicholson 1962, 512–513; Wood 1957, 116; Nicholson 1967, 377–387; Donnell 1921, 219–239. For the experience of one of the Canadian soldiers employed as an instructor at Murmansk see Morton 1992. The postal history of the intervention has created some interest; see Burgers 2006; Whiteley 2008a; Whiteley 2000; Whiteley 2001.  
421 A good summary of the formation of the legion can be found in Lyytinen 1980, 158–161.  
422 The strength of the Finnish Legion given in the literature varies because the sources used cite the strength at different times through its existence and the exaggerated reports of Tokoi. For example,
officers were assigned as instructors. However, because the Red Finns lacked the experience to command such a large force, Lieutenant Colonel R.B.S. Burton and the other instructors soon took on leadership and administrative roles within the legion.423

In addition to guarding Petsamo (Pechenga), they garrisoned parts of the Murmansk Railway and helped counter several incursions of White Finnish forces.424 From August–October 1918 the Finnish Legion and the Karelian Legion worked with Allied forces to stymie irredentist incursions by White Finns into Karelia.425 However, problems soon developed because Red Finnish leaders in Petrograd, who now saw the legion as an imperialist tool, branded its members as traitors, produced anti-legion propaganda, and sent agent provocateurs, which would lead to a number of desertions and a few instances of threatened mutiny.426 Furthermore, German forces had been withdrawn from Finland in September 1918 and with the armistice the purpose of the Allied intervention had shifted to support of the anti-Bolshevik movement.

MacLaren uses the number 1,000, Nevakivi around 1,400, while Lylytinen indicates 1,500. Toko 1957, 190–191; MacLaren 1976, 118; Nevakivi 1970, 56; Lylytinen 1970, 159–160. 423 Robert Bruce Stalker Burton was an engineer and from Winnipeg. He enrolled in the 8th Battalion, Canadian Expeditionary Force in 1914 and served in France, where he was wounded twice. He arrived in North Russia with the rank of Major but was promoted to command the Finnish Legion. For his work with the legion he was made an officer of the Military Division of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire and “Brought to Notice,” a form of commendation for “valuable and distinguished services,” by Major General Poole. London Gazette, 5th Supplement, No. 31096, 31 December 1918, 80 and No. 31938, 8 June 1920, 6456; LAC RG150, Accn. 1992-93/166, Box 1327-4, Burton, Robert Bruce Stalker. On Burton see McDougall 1919; Old Boys 1958-1959. Toko 1957, 191–192.

424 The incursions by White Finns were part of the Heimosodat during which Finns helped the Estonians and made official or unofficial efforts to annex territory considered to be “traditionally” part of a “Greater Finland,” such as Karelia, Ingria, and Petsamo. Heimosodat is translated in different ways: “Wars for Kindred Peoples” or “Kinship Wars.” See Niinistö 2005; Roselius 2002; Harjula 2007. On the Karelian insurgency see Salomaa 2002; Lackman 1998; Kangaspuro 2000.

425 Burton was so impressed with the Finns that he requested 1,200 maple leaf badges in the style worn by the Canadian Expeditionary Force. Burton clearly felt it an honour to give “his” Finns the Canadian badge. The request was denied by the headquarters at Murmansk. MacLaren 1976, 88–89. The official report the Department of National Defence (DND) produced in 1941 erroneously states “The Finnish Legion was not employed by the British for any military operations.” “Finnish Legion North Russian Exp. Force 1918-1919,” LAC, RG24, Vol. 1837, File GAQ-10-7B. The only source used for this report was the personal diary of Captain T.P. O’Kelly who was one of the Canadian officers with Syren Force, responsible for the “Malamute Company.” Though an eyewitness, O’Kelly was likely unapprised of the details of the operation of the legion. LAC, RG24 C6a, Vol. 1754, File DHS-9-2, Personal Diaries, Folder 13, “Thomas Patrick O’Kelly.”

426 Toko 1957, 182, 188–189, 202. Maynard had sympathy for the Red Finns, stating later, “that the British public and politicians hear one side only of the conditions that obtained during the revolutionary period, and of the deeds committed by either side. According to them, they are the true patriots who tried to save their country, and they swear that such excesses as may have been committed by irresponsible bands of ‘Reds’ were as nothing compared with those carried out under the direct orders of responsible ‘White’ leaders, of whom Mannerheim was about the worst!” Maynard 1971, 185.
As part of this struggle White Finland now factored into British aims in the Baltic and had in effect become a British ally by the end of 1918.\footnote{Swettenham 1967, 187–188, 200–201; Thompson 1966, 216–217, 331–333. See Anderson 1962; Agar 1963; Ferguson 2008; Sundbäck 1991b; Debo 1977; Ruotsila 2002; Ruotsila 2005, 26–44.}

The Finnish Legion was an embarrassment for the British government given the move to establish relations with the “Finnish bourgeois government.”\footnote{Lyytinen 1970, 158.} British offensive action against the Bolsheviks was further cause for discontent among legion members and there were desertions, acts of insubordination, and the danger they would mutiny and join the Bolsheviks.\footnote{An instigator of the threatened mutiny was Verner Lehtimäki. See the biography of Lehtimäki 2005 and the comic books Markkula and Koivusaari 2006; Markkula and Koivusaari 2009.} There were not enough troops to fight the Bolsheviks and at the same time disarm and guard the Red Finns.\footnote{Maynard 1971, 185; Maynard wrote reports back to London indicating that there was the ongoing danger of both the Finnish Legion and Karelian Legion mutinying. United Kingdom 1920, 26; Strakovsky 1944, 116–123.}

The Finnish Legion had become a liability in the eyes of the British government, which still had a moral obligation towards its restless members. In the meantime, while the British authorities sought a solution, their duties were shifted from military operations to labouring, lumbering, and ditch digging.\footnote{Tokoi 1957, 201–203; Kinvig 2006, 117–118, 168.}

By spring 1919 the intervention had accomplished nothing of significance and it was decided that the Allied troops would be withdrawn that summer. Under the present circumstances the Finnish legionaries could not be repatriated, since most of them faced prison or the firing squad.\footnote{Tokoi 1957, 196; Long 1972, 278–279.} The White Finnish government had been eagerly seeking British recognition as the legitimate government of Finland. Amnesty for the legionaries was one aspect the Foreign Office had to consider.\footnote{Lauterpacht 1947, 362; Graham 1936, 140–142; Screen 2000, 54.}

Amnesty for the legionaries was one aspect the Foreign Office had to consider. At the 3 May 1919 meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers it was agreed that the US and Britain would recognize the independence of Finland and the “Finnish Government be urged to treat the Red Finns who have fought for the Allies in a liberal and generous spirit by the grant of amnesty.”\footnote{“The Commission to Negotiate Peace to the Acting Secretary of State,” 860d.01/21, 5 May 1919, United States 1934, 214; Paasivirta 1965, 117–118. The text of the message added the British Government: “welcome the action of the Finnish Government in agreeing to receive a deputation from the Finnish legion which has been serving with the Allied forces in the North of Russia and of expressing the hope that an early settlement of this question in a liberal spirit will give further proof of the intention of the Finnish people to guide their policy in accordance with the principles of liberty and toleration.” Lord Milner, SSFC to Duke of Devonshire, Governor General, No. 47516 June 1919, LAC, RG76 IA1, Vol. 25, File 651 Part 3, Reel C4683.} Though the implications...
were not apparent at the time the Canadian government received a copy of the message recognizing Finnish independence.

Eventually by mid-July 1919 the terms and conditions under which the legionnaires could return to Finland were agreed upon. Finland was not prepared to deviate from the existing law or grant a special amnesty. Instead an extraordinary repatriation procedure was devised, removing the last diplomatic obstacle. Each legionnaire who wished to return would be brought to Helsinki and investigated to determine their situation under Finnish law. British officials were permitted to observe the proceedings.435 Those who had committed no criminal offence could enter Finland unrestricted, but those who were deemed to have committed an offence would be tried. Those who did not wish to undergo a trial because the punishment might be severe, would remain under British authority. These “black listed” Finnish Legion members would remain at Murmansk, under the supervision of Lieutenant T.C. Wetton until the Allies withdrew. Though he was serving in a British regiment and seconded to Murmansk, he was a Canadian and like Burton was warmly regarded by many in the legion.436

In late August 1919, the men and women of the Finnish Legion, under British protection, moved to an island in Helsinki harbour. During the screening process the British officers thought that the proceedings were biased, and the Finnish Legion members were verbally abused by the prosecutors. Demanding that the legion members be treated with the respect due to soldiers in “His Majesty’s Armed Forces,” the British representatives threatened to halt the process.437 Only 158 of

435 Paasivirta 1963, 118. The agreement took the form of a treaty and is perhaps the one exception where a treaty that granted a foreign state “delegated powers on the territory of Finland” was not submitted to the Eduskunta for approval. For the text of the agreement see Nevakivi 1970, 361–364. Various Finnish scholars have criticized this as unconstitutional. Broms 1969, 97, 111–112 n3.
436 Lieutenant Thomas Charles Wetton had worked for the Manitoba Free Press and as a lecturer for the CPR promoting immigration and tourism. He served during the Boer War, immigrated and became a naturalized Canadian. He returned to Britain and joined the British Army. Most sources describe him as a Canadian officer, however, he was a technically a British officer. In 1919 he joined the North Russian Expeditionary Force as part of the instructional cadre eventually assigned to the legion. There he met his future wife Aini Kauppinen. Once the black listed Finns were safely in Portsmouth, England, they were married. Tokoi was the best man and the legionnaires acted as the guard of honour. Tokoi 1957, 208, 212; Lindström 2003, 20–21. Also his biography: The Personal Side of It 1921.
437 Tokoi indicates it was “Villing Island.” Despite the instance they were to be treated as “British soldiers” the actual legal status of these soldiers was questionable. Seven former legion members applied to the British War Office for war service medals they thought they were entitled to, but no medals were issued to them. In 1941 a former member who was later allowed to immigrate to Canada, Leo Illberg (Illberg), applied to enlist in the Veteran’s Guard of Canada. It was a formation of men too old, too young or medically unfit to serve overseas, but could still do guard duty at prisoner of war camps in Canada. Many of its members were veterans of the First World War. It was determined that, “No information can be found as to the provisions of their enlistment or the status given by the British Authorities to the Finnish Legion.” Yet, various documents did describe them as members of “His
the legionaries had to face a trial and by the end of December 1919, the rest of them had been cleared to go home. Excluded from returning to Finland were 42 black listed men whose charges were of a more serious nature or they were accused of committing some atrocity, for which the punishment was 7 or more years in prison and in some cases the death penalty. For the men in this category self-imposed exile was the only viable option. Once the last of the trials occurred, the remainder left for Britain in March 1920. To this point the Canadian government had not been directly involved. The employment of Burton and Wetton with the Finnish Legion had been a British decision and expense. Now faced with the dilemma of what to do with these “dangerous” Red Finns, the British sought to convince a reluctant Canadian government to accept them as immigrants. Though the idea was to bring them to Canada as immigrant workers, they were in fact the only group of political refugees from Finland who arrived with the assistance of the Canadian government.

The initial request was made by the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (SSFA) in January 1920, asking Canada to consider accepting the men for which “His Majesty’s Government find themselves responsible.” Appealing to the solidarity of the British Empire, it was argued, that they had fought in “British uniforms” as part of the Allied forces against Germany. The dispatch made it clear the legion had been forced to flee Finland by the Mannerheim White Finns and their German allies. They had rendered “invaluable services defending the ice-free ports of Murmansk in the summer of 1918 and formed part of the British forces in the operations against the Bolsheviks.” Burton had been interceding on their Majesty’s Military Forces.” According to Tokoi on demobilization each legionnaire was given a “discharge certificate showing honourable service in the British army.” Their names were spelled wrong on the declined medal cards. “Finnish Legion North Russian Exp. Force 1918-1919,” LAC, RG24 C6e, Vol. 1837, File GAQ-10-7B; Note on Finnish Legion, 31 March 1920, LAC, RG25 A2, Vol. 176, File C14/7; National Archives of the United Kingdom (TNA), Medal Cards, WO 372/11/112222; WO 372/12/60624; WO 372/20/4949; WO 372/20/29984; WO 372/20/14799; WO 372/13/722021.

Even though they had been allowed to return, many still found themselves under suspicion and surveillance by state police and intelligence services. Lackman 1987, 199–219; Jackson 1940. 114–116. See also the reminiscences in Tokoi 1947.

Tokoi 1957, 212–213.

Lindström-Best 1981c, 5.

A few times they are described as “Finnish Revolutionary Refugees.” L.S. Amery for SSFC to Duke of Devonshire, Governor General, No. 40, 16 January 1920; SSFC to Governor General of Canada, 24 February 1920, LAC, RG25 B1b, Vol. 176, File C14/7. The British and Canadians at this time use the spelling “despatch” though today the more widely used spelling is dispatch. L.S. Amery for SSFC to Duke of Devonshire, Governor General, No. 40, 16 January 1920, LAC, Ibid. For another Canadian officer’s account of the legion see Captain O’Brien French, “When the Germans Fought on Side of Finland.” Vancouver Sun 10 February 1940.
behalf, but their skills made it difficult for them to find work in Britain. He was certain “owing to their training as axe-men and lumbermen he would be able to find them employment.” 443 Apparently all Finns, even those from the cities, were thought expert woodsmen.

Despite these favourable representations, Joseph Pope the USSEA, replied it had already been decided the previous fall not to accept them. Wetton it turned out had approached Canadian immigration officials in London back in October 1919, stressing the fact the Finns were deserving of consideration because they opposed the oppressive policies of the Russian imperial government, alluding to the public sympathy Finland had earned during the era of Russification. Likewise, they opposed German imperialist designs on Finland and rebelled against those Finns who supported Germany. As such they might be called “Red,” but Wetton maintained they were not “Bolsheviks.” As Social Democrats they were no different than the Labour Party in Britain, advocating “better conditions of labour, hours, wages, and living for the Finnish working classes. They desire to see established an independent, contented and prosperous Finland with a Constitutional Government based on democracy.” 444 He vouched for their good discipline, obedience to orders, efficient work habits, and that they were well suited to the conditions in Canada, which were similar to Finland. Wetton’s views were contradicted by a London Times article clipped by the department. It noted they did good work under Canadian officers against the Germans, but refused to fight the Bolsheviks, “being wavers of the red flag themselves” and since then “have been a problem ever since.” 445 They were “the very cream of Finnish revolutionism,” with Tokoi and “other prominent wavers of the red flag ranking as mere privates.” 446

Immigration Superintendent J. Obed Smith did not give his views to Wetton, but later wrote, “one feels that these men, who have fought for their independence, are entitled to an asylum somewhere.” 447 It was the view of F.C. Blair,

443 L.S. Amery for SSFC to Duke of Devonshire, Governor General, No. 40. 16 January 1920, LAC, Ibid.
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445 “Remnant of Finnish Foreign Legion is Desirous of Settling in Canada,” London Times, 6 November 1919, LAC, Ibid.
446 Tokoi was in fact an officer in the unit. Ibid.
447 Smith perhaps felt responsible for Wetton’s current dilemma. Wetton had initially joined the Canadian forces, but it was Smith who used his influence to have him join a British regiment. Indirectly then, Smith was responsible for Wetton arriving in North Russia and serving with the legion. The Library and Archives Canada does not appear to have a military service file for Wetton. Given the ad hoc arrangements for Canadian recruiting early in the war, it is possible for him to have served briefly
I think that such highly inflammable material should remain where the climate is not so conducive to an outbreak as it is in some parts of Canada. The great majority of the Finns in this country are radicals of a most pronounced type and leaders in various forms of revolution. I would, therefore, recommend that we do not encourage this movement at the present time.  

Therefore, the Department of Immigration at the beginning of December 1919 sent a telegram to high commissioner in London informing him of Canada’s refusal. However, the British did not seem to acknowledge the Canadian position and a more detailed response was sent which explained, it is somewhat well known that the great majority of the Finns resident in Canada have some pronounced radical views, and many of them are leaders in various forms of revolution. To add to the number by bringing in fifteen or twenty men fresh from the scene of conflict on the other side, would be likely to have an unsettling effect on those now in Canada.

The Minister of Immigration was of the opinion, “we should defer this movement until we know something more about the tendencies of these particular men who desire to come to Canada.”

Smith still tried to convince the high commissioner of the merits of the case. Apparently, some of them had already lived in Canada or the United States and spoke English. He also fell back on the old argument and the positive image that the Finns were ideal experienced “agriculturists.” This complied with general Canadian immigration policy, whereby “so long as a man is capable and willing to work upon the land, his Nationality, not being an Enemy Alien” he was not prevented from emigrating. He went on to say “Personally I see no objection to taking Finnish farmers to Canada than Dutch or Belgian farmers, and we are passing the latter every day.” They would easily fit into the Finnish “colonies” around Port Arthur or on the prairies. Even if they do not take up farming, the Finn was “one of the best workers in the lumber camps and lumber mills that Canada
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ever obtained.” The authorities in Ottawa would view these men differently, Smith thought, if they could hear from Burton and Wetton about their character. This would serve to counter the negative press coverage of the legion and the propaganda spread by the Finnish minister in London about the Red Finn atrocities during the Civil War.

Subsequently, the Immigration Department arranged for the legionaries and their families to be interviewed and inspected on 29 April 1920 by an immigration agent who Smith said was the “most experienced in selecting and judging men suitable for farm work in Canada.” He had been “fortified...with all the information I had officially and otherwise, warning him particularly regarding a possibility of any of these 37 being of a class, political or otherwise, undesirable to Canada.” Each person was questioned “carefully” and “Each man of course, averred that he had never been on strike or had any revolutionary ideas.” Wetton reported that Lieutenant Colonel W.R. Warren, who had been the British officer in charge of the legionaries as they awaited trial, “speaks very highly of their conduct and discipline.”

This whole situation illustrated the confusion and poor internal communications experienced by Canadian officials, since the number of legionaries was never fully clarified. By May the number was 37 plus an unknown number of families. At this time the RCMP expressed concern that these Finns were being considered for entry to Canada, but F.C. Blair assured them none were being admitted. As the RCMP continued to uncover intelligence on the legion, it was learned the Red Finns sought service with the British because they feared the local population was hostile. The only reason these last legion members needed to come to Canada was because they “had committed serious crimes punishable by long terms of imprisonment, and the recent amnesty was not applicable in their
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case” and were trying to evade Finnish legal proceedings.\(^{462}\) The RCMP no doubt gathered this information from conservative Finns in Canada, however, this was news to the Canadian government. Furthermore, the radical Finns in the Fort William region were elated because “they are just the kind of men needed in Canada at the present time by the Finns. They are called ‘experienced leaders’ and their presence here is expected to put new life into the Finnish socialist movement in Canada.”\(^{463}\) Non-socialist Finns were alarmed by this development and clearly it was not in Canada’s interest to accept these men, because it was part of an organized effort to get these radicals out Finland to safety and of course the “Finnish Government is naturally pleased to see these people move out of Finland, and the British Consulate not knowing the records of these people are only doing their duty in Vising their passports.”\(^{464}\)

It appeared to Smith that the British authorities had yet to be apprised of the Canadian refusal and told the Canadian high commissioner confirmation was needed that the proposed immigration of the Finnish legionaries was denied. High Commissioner George Perley replied he was unaware of the refusal, since it was likely handled directly between the Governor General’s Office and Colonial Office, but he had forwarded the new information on the legionaries and thought it might lead to reconsideration of the matter.\(^{465}\) Despite this the Department of Immigration sent a message in early June 1920 that the matter had been given, “Very full and careful consideration” but “regretted that conditions in Canada are such that it is inadvisable to encourage the entry of these men at the present time.”\(^{466}\) The Commissioner of the RCMP had advised “against the entry of these men. A number of incidents have occurred in Canada indicating that many Finns resident here have revolutionary tendencies.”\(^{467}\) Given the comments by Canadian immigration agents, what was not said was, had the members of the legion applied individually, and thereby surreptitiously, and indicated they were able and willing to take up agricultural work, they would have been admitted to Canada without much difficulty. Unfortunately, their case was made officially by the British government,
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with full disclosure of their background. There the matter appeared to rest. Fortunately for the Finnish legionaries the convoluted method of handling Canadian foreign policy at the time, worked to their benefit.

That the British had never been told of the Canadian refusal of the Finns is evident in the British War Office request to the Canadian immigration officials in London in September 1920 that the negotiations needed to be concluded. There were not in fact any negotiations on this issue. The reason for their concern was mainly financial. In addition to the costs associated with paying and accommodating the remaining legionnaires, Lieutenant Wetton had not been demobilized, but kept on active duty to supervise the men. The War Office said it would continue to employ Wetton for several months after the Finns arrived in Canada. This was because he was regarded by the Finns as their “councillor and friend” and his services would be useful in getting them “settled down.”

The British had never been told of the Canadian refusal of the Finns is evident in the British War Office request to the Canadian immigration officials in London in September 1920 that the negotiations needed to be concluded. There were not in fact any negotiations on this issue. The reason for their concern was mainly financial. In addition to the costs associated with paying and accommodating the remaining legionnaires, Lieutenant Wetton had not been demobilized, but kept on active duty to supervise the men. The War Office said it would continue to employ Wetton for several months after the Finns arrived in Canada. This was because he was regarded by the Finns as their “councillor and friend” and his services would be useful in getting them “settled down.” The War Office clearly had not been informed of the official Canadian attitude, since officers looking after the Finns seemed to think the Canadian authorities had shown “much sympathetic interest in the matter.”

Canadian archival records do not show what exactly transpired to bring about a change in the view of the Canadian government. Coincidently soon after the War Office request arrived in Ottawa, inquiries were made by various lumber companies, which had for some time been pressuring the government to re-open Finnish immigration. There was a labour shortage and the legion members were suitable candidates since these employers were under the impression the men were all experienced lumberjacks and farmers. Capitalism had come to the rescue of the Red Finns. F.C. Blair was happy that this offered a resolution to this problem, but it was important to place them in a remote area where they would not fall into the hands of agitators among their fellow countrymen. Having Wetton to assist would make this easier.

The situation now had some urgency, since on 14 October the Immigration Department asked the superintendent for emigration in London how soon the legionnaires could sail for Canada. The British paid their ocean passage and gave
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them a suit of civilian clothing. By mid-November they had arrived in Canada and were working in a lumber camp in Northeastern Ontario. There the employer and Wetton were of the opinion these men, “give promise of fitting in to Canadian conditions and being able to make their way.”

It did not take long before they built a sauna, which Wetton explained “every Sunday the men indulge in what is really a sort of Turkish bath. They are all very keen on these baths which is one of their national traits.” In order to ensure the terms of the agreement were met, Canadian officials wanted Lieutenant Wetton kept on longer, though the War Office and the lumber company resisted this because of the cost and even claiming he was unpopular with the men. British authorities had hoped to close the matter and made it clear Canada had done Britain a favour. The decision to accept the legionaries was not popular in Canada, and immigration officials said “We have run the gauntlet of criticism in bringing these men into Canada and naturally are most solicitous for their welfare. If things go wrong within the next few months we will have considerable trouble righting them and more especially if Lieutenant Wetton is not available.” The matter of the Finnish Legion was essentially closed, aside from dealing with the move to Canada of several of the blacklisted Finnish Legion members who had been taken into Finnish custody. A British bureaucratic error, mistakenly indicated they could return home without any problem. The diplomatic moves to resolve that problem would continue into the spring of 1921.

In fact, during the confusion, F.C. Blair at the Department of Immigration started calling men like Oskari Tokoi “Whites” who could not go home because they fought against the “Reds” in the Finnish civil war. RCMP efforts to correct the factual record were ignored.

It did not take long before the men started causing problems for immigration officials. A few of them quit their jobs and were therefore unemployed and subject to deportation. Tokoi was among them and he went to the US only to be arrested as
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a dangerous radical. Others tried to apply for naturalization, since they had served in the British forces. Immigration officials were no doubt relieved to learn that the Treaty of Dorpat extended an amnesty to those who supported the Red side and they could return without fear of prosecution.

3.2 Canada and the Recognition of Finland

While the fate of the Murmansk Legion was played out, the Allies through the Council of Foreign Ministers had agreed to recognize the independence of Finland. Given Canada’s status as a self-governing Dominion within the British Empire, it meant that Britain had also de facto given recognition to the independence of Finland on behalf of Canada. The Canadian governor general was sent a telegram by the Secretary of State for the Colonies (SSFC) on 28 May formally informing the Canadian government “His Majesty’s Government have accordingly definitely recognized Government of Finland.” Two weeks later by a copy of the text sent to the Finnish prime minister followed.

The text of the message sent by the British government on 6 May maps out the changing negative image of Finland as a country “dominated” by “the enemy” to one of a country joining the ranks of the civilized, democratic nations of the world. A key precondition of British and American recognition had been the establishment of a democratic government. The election held in March 1919, which brought Kaarlo Castrén to office as prime minister, was regarded as “a clear expression of the desire of the Finnish people and of their determination to follow the path of order and of constitutional development” making it worthy of recognition. As a country which was established on the ideals of liberal democratic constitutional order and the rule of law the Finnish government was expected to accept the territorial frontiers drawn up by the peace conference at Versailles and oppose any efforts to pre-empt that decision by force. Finland was a country which had a history of good relations with Britain and by extension Canada.

From the time of “strict independence,” which meant from 6 December 1917, Finland “maintained friendly though, informal relations,” which continued “even through the difficult period when Finland was subjected to the Military domination of Germany, they did not lose faith in the devotion of the Finnish people as a whole to the cause of liberty or in their friendly feelings toward Great Britain.” What was implied was that Finland had never really been a British enemy, but rather a small country made a victim by Germany.

In Canada, a negative image remained. Growing nativism meant that “foreigners” were often discriminated against. In June 1919, the Port Arthur city council was trying to restrict the issuing of licences for restaurants, taverns, and bars, “to our own people and subjects of our allies,” according to a lawyer from that city. It was unclear to these officials where Finns stood in this view of the world, were they still part of Russia and therefore an ally, were they neutral or an enemy? Notwithstanding the fact Bolshevik Russia was not considered an ally, for the Department of Justice W.S. Stewart replied, that the independence of Finland had been recognized by the US and UK and therefore the current government in power was legitimate, in “that the Government of Finland is recognized as a friendly government, but I do not understand it is in any sense one of the Allies.”

That December Finland appointed a consul general in London, who had “jurisdiction throughout His Majesty’s dominions.” To oversee Finnish interests in Canada Erick J. Korte, a Finnish-Canadian business leader, was appointed in the New Year as the Finnish honorary vice consul at Port Arthur, Ontario (now Thunder Bay). One of his first duties was the issuing of new Finnish passports to Finns returning to Finland. Three years later the Finnish consul office was opened in Montreal, with Akseli Rauanheimo as the consul. The post was upgraded to a consulate general in 1925 and the main issue it would deal with would be assisting immigrants from Finland with passports, assisting with legal issues, the handling of mail for migrants, helping arrange transportation, and dealing with inquiries from concerned relatives. A secondary but no less significant activity was
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disseminating information about Finland to Canadians and to report back to Helsinki about the economic and political situation in Canada. In 1924 further honorary consular appointments were made in places with substantial Finnish communities like Vancouver, Toronto, and Quebec, with Winnipeg and Copper Cliff added later in 1926. On the other hand, Canada did not have any pressing interests in Finland and would be represented by the British minister in Helsinki until the late 1940s.

Establishment of diplomatic relations meant that Canada began to receive the periodic political intelligence reports prepared by the British Foreign Office. In the first years after Finnish independence this amounted to only a handful, but by the Second World War the volume increased substantially. For the rare Canadian official who had any interest in Finland these reports offered information to which the Canadian government would not have had easy access. However, the “mere communication of information” MacKay and Rogers wrote in the late 1930s “does not constitute consultation, nor does the failure of the dominion government to comment on information received imply approval of or acquiescence in any proposed policy.” Officials in External Affairs who were slowly leading Canada towards an independent identity in international politics, would have accepted them with a guarded view and provided their own uniquely Canadian interpretation to the information. These dispatches were what Britain was willing to share with Canada and not necessarily the full picture. Unspoken would be the question of what British policy or secret diplomatic maneuver was the imperial centre trying to entangle Canada in by keeping the Dominion informed? Even with these reservations, British sources would still have had an influence on Canadian perceptions of Finland.

From these reports it is evident that Mannerheim is seen as a key force in Finnish politics, even though he was defeated in the July 1919 election. He was not
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a politician, but a “strong man” and if given power, Finland would effectively be a military dictatorship. Any influence he had was a result of the ongoing fear of Bolshevik Russia and the radical left at home. On the other hand, moderate “radicals” like Rudolf Holsti seemed to offer a democratic future for Finland and the hope of national reconciliation. This desire for conciliation and compromise was something Canadian Liberals could identify with, even if they also shared a similar fear of Bolshevism at home. Finland was still a country divided, with acute class differences made worse “as a result of the Red Terror and secondly of the no less violent White Terror.” This could be a source of instability for Finland, coupled with the prominence of those who had served with the Jaegers, meant they were an avenue for German meddling. The former Jaegers were offset by the presence of Mannerheim who was considered the most pro-Allied Finnish leader. The creation of a “Skyddskropps” (Suojeluskunta or Civil Guard), was a bulwark against the Reds, who were now camouflaged as independent or left socialists. The potential of right-wing extremism among this White Guard militia would not be evident until the 1930s.

From the liberal perspective Finland was also a country where disarmament could occur. The new left leaning government was inclined towards reducing the amount Finland spent on armaments and reducing the size of the armed forces. Partly this was due to the cost, since Finland needed the money to focus on other domestic priorities. There was also a sense that the League of Nations would be effective in reducing international tension through the peaceful settlement of disputes, making large military expenditures unnecessary. Conservative elements within Finland would view this with some alarm, because the military was seen as a bulwark against the Reds and because the Soviet Union was regarded as a very real threat to the country’s independence. Canadian officials although they tended to remain aloof from the machinations of European politics, would have seen the instability of Finland as a threat to Canada, if only a minor one. There was always the possibility that once Canada opened itself up to immigrants again, dangerous radicals from Finland might try to use Canada as a refuge, but this was nothing new.

494 The report used the Swedish name. In English they were referred to as either the White Guard or Civil Guard, but other translations exist like Protection Corps, Security Guard, National Guard, White Militia, Defence Corps, Protection Guard, and Protection Militia. Haapala and Tikka 2013.
3.3 Canada and Finland at the League of Nations

Any fear that Finland might prove to be a destabilizing influence in world affairs soon evaporated. Though the issues were only of passing interest to Canadian officials, the settlement of the Åland Islands dispute, Finland’s subsequent membership in the League of Nations, and the decision to bring the East Karelia question before the league for resolution, were signs the country could be a good world citizen. Canadian officials in places like the DEA which viewed the world from a liberal order perspective and especially Canada’s long serving Liberal Prime Minister W.L.M. King, saw the pacific settlement of disputes through negotiation and compromise as virtues. Finland’s handling of these disputes and membership in the league served to reinforce those perceptions which created positive images of Finland as a progressive, liberal, democratic, peaceful country. The Åland Islands were a prime example of Finland as a liberal country.

As part of the discussion surrounding the recognition of Finnish independence by the Allies, Finland agreed to respect the territorial settlements of the peace conference and to settle any disputes through negotiation. Though Canada was not directly involved in the issue it was for Canada a small demonstration of the countries autonomous, yet subordinate place within the British Empire. As part of the effort to fulfil wartime promises of consulting the Dominions on foreign policy and retain something of the concept of the unity of the Empire, Canada was kept informed about the British position. At the same time Canada as a member of the league received correspondence directly from Geneva on the issue.

Finland’s claim rested on the fact the islands had been part of the territory of the Grand Duchy of Finland and they strategically covered the sea approach to Helsinki and Leningrad. Sweden also laid claim to them because the population on the islands had been overwhelmingly Swedish since the Middle Ages. With Swedish support the islanders made a claim to the right of self-determination when Finland declared her independence. In May 1920 to resolve the situation Finland had granted the islands the status of an autonomous province. This did not have the desired effect and tensions between Finland and Sweden were escalating to the point that they might result in war.

496 International relations jargon of the era tended to use pacific as a synonym of peaceful.
497 Various reports and position papers were received through the league on the Finnish and Swedish cases and from the British cabinet. See “Åland Islands,” LAC, RG25 A3A, Vol. 1274, File 1920-101b. On the Finnish case see Bonsdorff 1920.
498 Lloyd 1995, 162.
Canada became a sideline observer of the dispute. The British government chose to use her “friendly right” under Article 11 of the League of Nations Covenant, to refer the matter to a special meeting of the council. To Finland this was unacceptable since it was argued that the matter was of a domestic nature and the league had no jurisdiction, not to mention the fact that Finland was not yet a member. Sweden on the other hand liked the idea and called for a plebiscite to determine the wishes of the islanders. A precedent existed because in some of the areas impacted by the Treaty of Versailles, through a vote the people in the region had been allowed to determine what state they would be a part of.\textsuperscript{499} Finland agreed, somewhat reluctantly. The Finnish government was considering the issue of league membership and did not want a rejection of arbitration to jeopardize a future application.\textsuperscript{500} Experts in international law were consulted and they concluded that the islands should remain part of Finland. While self-determination was considered by many to be a right, the report stated that minorities could not be allowed to secede at will, because it would create instability and undermine the concept of the state unity. They recognized that Finland did try to accommodate this minority, but further steps were needed to allow the islanders to retain their culture and communities. A further recommendation was that the islands be demilitarized and neutralized.\textsuperscript{501}

The council accepted the recommendation in June 1921, despite Swedish protests. Finland had been willing to compromise and the Åland Islanders were given some of the farthest-reaching rights of any minority, exercising full linguistic, political, and religious liberty, all under league protection.\textsuperscript{502} The settlement gave the league its first success and earned it credibility. It was successful because both Sweden and Finland were small, law-abiding nations. There were no major power interests at stake and those who took an interest were keen on seeing the league machinery work.\textsuperscript{503} Notwithstanding this, it reflected well on the image of Finland as a liberal democratic state, where the rule of law was respected, and the pacific settlement of disputes was a part of foreign policy.

What remained to arrange was for the demilitarization and neutralization of the islands. Through the end of 1921 into early 1922 the negotiations, drafting, and

\textsuperscript{499} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{500} Hovi 1980, 174–177; Rotkirch 1986.
\textsuperscript{503} Mazower 1997, 54; Stanbridge 2002.
ratification of a convention to carry this out occurred. The details paralleled a
similar convention worked out with Russia in 1856 as part of the treaty ending the
Crimean War. The 1856 Convention prohibited any fortifications or permanent
military presence, but some defence measures were allowed in time of war.
Neutralization had not been part of the original agreement, but after 1921 it meant
that no power could operate military forces in the area during wartime. The
convention was signed in Geneva, 20 October 1921, where the other states invited
to participate in drafting the convention, Germany, Denmark, Iceland, Estonia,
Finland, France, UK, Italy, Latvia, Poland, and Sweden, also agreed to the
neutralization of the islands. Each signatory then had to ratify the convention.

Britain provided Canada with the details of the convention on 5 December
1921 and asked if the Dominion agreed to the ratification. A few days later the full
text of the convention arrived to allow for full consideration of the matter. It is
unclear or evenly doubtful, if Canada had expressed any reservation or refused to
concur with the ratification, that this would have prevented Britain from doing so.
The process being followed was part of the promise to consult and the principle at
stake was the diplomatic unity of the British Empire. Under the Conservative Party
which tended to have a more pro-British orientation the Canadian government
would have welcomed this, but the newly elected Liberal government, with
William Lyon Mackenzie King as prime minister would have been more
circumspect. While not wishing for Canada to separate from the British Empire,
King wished to avoid external commitments and distrusted British officials, whom
he regarded as trying to entangle Canada in affairs that were not in the national
interest as he saw it. He would have regarded efforts at consultation on Åland in
this light. Canada had no say in the British decision to enter a foreign policy action
over Åland and was now retroactively asked to give its support. However, the
pacific settlement of disputes, arbitration, and conciliation were things dear to the
heart of King, so he was unlikely to raise any serious issue with the British position.
As was his style, King would have given the matter full consideration and
deliberated on the response. More typically he would have regarded the

504 On the discussions held during the drafting of the convention see Rotkirch 1986.
505 Winston S. Churchill to Governor General, No. 210, 23 June 1922, enclosing Parliamentary Paper
Cmd. 1680 No. 6 of Treaty Series 1922, Convention Respecting the Non-Fortification and
File 1920-101b; Castrén 1963, 53.
506 SSFC to Governor General, 5 December 1921; SSFC to Governor General, 12 December 1921
communications for information purposes only and declined to comment.\textsuperscript{507} This likely resulted in some delay in the provision of an answer to the request, since a hastener was sent in January 1922. Britain was the only country not to ratify the convention and Canada was holding up the process, because Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa already indicated they had no objections.\textsuperscript{508} This produced the desired result a few days later. The Canadian Privy Council published a minute indicating “the Canadian Government has no objection to the ratification of the said Convention.”\textsuperscript{509}

Canada because of its participation in the First World War and subsequently as part of the British Empire Delegation at the 1919 Paris Peace Conference secured for herself league membership independent of Britain. Canada was therefore a member of the league from the outset. Finland on the other hand did not join until December 1920 after much internal debate over the merits of doing so.\textsuperscript{510} The decision for membership by both Finland and Canada were similar. Membership was recognition of their status as independent states and legal equality with other nations. For Finland membership in the league also offered the opportunity for collective security, and a venue for the peaceful settlement of disputes. The Canadian claim was more unique. It was a sign of the increased autonomy gained by participation in the First World War. The foreign policy of Britain under these conditions was also the policy of the Empire as a whole, but Canadian autonomy had always meant it was up to the Canadian government to determine the extent of participation in any British policy. After 1921 Canada sought to differentiate itself from Britain internationally. The Balfour Declaration in 1926 and its legal codification in the Statute of Westminster of 1931, recognized that Dominions like Canada, were sovereign nations and in no way, subordinate to the United Kingdom. Though this freed Canada to set her own foreign policy, the sentimental tie to the British Empire, now also called the British Commonwealth, remained. In this context even though Canada tended to keep a low profile in league affairs, it did offer at least a practical and symbolic representation of Canada’s independence.\textsuperscript{511}

\textsuperscript{507} On King’s style see Gibson 1952.
\textsuperscript{508} SSFC to Governor General, 7 January 1921, LAC, RG25 A3A, Vol. 1274, File 1920-101b.
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\textsuperscript{510} On Canada’s membership see Veatch 1975, 3–11. Finland’s membership was approved by a unanimous vote in the League Assembly 18 December 1920. Hudson 1924, 443; Broms 1963, 88–89; Rudzinski 1952, 180.
\textsuperscript{511} Soward 1932, 359–363; Dawson 1958, 402–403.
One area where conflict in Europe could have developed was over Eastern Karelia. Karelia was considered the spiritual homeland of the Finns and the source of the national epic poem the *Kalevala*. There had been White Finnish irredentist incursions during the period 1918–1920 and a separatist Karelisan insurrection during 1921–1922.\footnote{On Karelia see Horváth 2010; Häyrynen 2004.} With the Treaty of Dorpat in 1920, which was the peace treaty between Finland and the Soviet Union, the right of Karelians to self-determination was recognized. However, in practice nothing was done to honour this. Finland attempted to have the League of Nations intercede in 1923 but failed since all that was achieved was recognition of the treaty as an international agreement and a commitment to further study. To fulfil the letter of the treaty the Soviets created the Karelian Autonomous Socialist Soviet Republic in 1923 out of East Karelia and a large area east of Lake Onega, but this was more of a ruse since by adding territory with a large Russian population it made Karelians a minority in their homeland.\footnote{Engman 1995, 226–228.} Like so many other European disputes, Canadian officials were not really interested, however, the attempt at negotiation fit nicely into Canada’s liberal order outlook. It was of course the area where Finland created an international borderland between Europe and Asia, and Canadian officials appear to have looked at the subject only briefly and then filed the information.\footnote{See LAC, RG25 A3b, Vol. 1352, File 1923-763, “Request for An Advisory Opinion Of The Permanent Court Of International Justice Regarding Obligations Involved In The Dorpat Treaty Of Peace Between Finland And Russia-1923.” On the international borderland see Mead 1952.}

Åland and Karelia strictly speaking had nothing to do with Canada. Canada’s first important initiative at Geneva, which involved Finland, had to do with Article X of the Covenant of the League of Nations. During the drafting of the covenant in 1919, Canada expressed strong reservations over the collective security aspects of the document. The various security guarantees could compel all member states to take action against an aggressor, but as the mechanisms by which these came into effect were cumbersome, it was unlikely they would ever operate. Article X on the other hand was clear and binding. The wording which applied to each member, gave the guarantee against external aggression, and protected territorial integrity and political independence. The League Council could indicate the means by which each member would fulfil this obligation.\footnote{The key phrase was: “to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.” In Stacey 1972, 499–507.} Canada wanted this either removed or
amended. It was an unreasonable blanket declaration, which assumed that all existing territorial arrangements were “just and expedient,” that they would remain so, and that it made no allowance for the future aspirations of minorities. Disputes in Central and Eastern Europe could involve Canada in issues where it had no interests. Though Finland was not specifically mentioned, it was included in this broad category.516 Collective security was of course one of the reasons Finland joined and this placed Canada at odds with a friendly northern European country. Britain had assured Canada that collective security would never compel Canada to act without consent. In the end the advantages of league membership for Canada’s status over road any concerns.517

A reoccurring theme of Canadian foreign policy through the 1920s and 1930s, was the efforts to avoid external commitments. At the first meeting of the assembly in 1920 Canada introduced a motion to have Article X “struck out.” The arguments were the same, but Canada added the possibility that this might make membership in the league more acceptable to the US, which had been deterred from membership because of the collective security aspects. The required unanimous approval was extremely unlikely, since all members had recently ratified the covenant and small states, such as Finland needed collective security, because they did not have the benefit of the relative geographic isolation Canada had.518 Instead of voting on the motion it was deferred to committee.519 When the committee met in 1921 it sought an interpretation to determine if the article imposed any additional obligations on members. When the jurists reported, they stated that the article was a basic principle on which the league was founded and that by deleting it would not alter the existing obligations under the covenant. The committee instead unanimously proposed drafting an amendment to clarify the article.520

In the meantime, there was a change of government in Canada. The Liberal government of W.L.M. King realized that having the article stricken was a non-starter. Ernest Lapointe at the meeting in 1922 made Canada appear to do an about

516 Memorandum by Prime Minister on Draft Covenant of the League of Nations, W.C.P. 245, 13 March 1919; Prime Minister to President of the Privy Council, 21 April 1919; Extracts from Minutes of Twenty-Sixth Meeting of British Empire Delegation, 21 April 1919 in MacKay 1969, Documents 74, 78-79, 112–113, 120, 122; Veatch 1975, 8–10 and 72–73.
517 This discussion of the Canadian position on Article X notwithstanding, too much should not be made between the opposing views of Canada and Finland. Frederic Soward, a contemporary Canadian foreign policy expert, in an article about Canada and the league, does not mention Finland, though he does refer to other countries opposing the Canadian proposals. Soward 1932, 363–370; Walters 1952, 122–123.
518 Veatch 1975, 73–74.
519 Ibid., 74–75.
520 Ibid., 75–80.
face and proposed a rewording to make clear participation in actions stemming from the article would be voluntary. Recognizing the league could draw members into a war, there needed to be consideration given to the “the political and geographical circumstances of each state,” but there would be no participation without the consent of that country’s parliament. 521 Most members of the committee opposed any changes and a decision was again deferred. 522 Leading up to the 1923 meeting of the league, the Canadian proposal was sent out to member nations for comment. Of the few replies, only six favoured the Canadian amendment, and more tellingly no replies were received from British Commonwealth countries. Finland was among the countries that sided with France in opposing Canada. 523 In the face of this the Canadian government retreated and indicated it would accept an interpretive resolution by the assembly. 524 Finland again voiced opposition to the Canadian position, arguing to the effect “that it would be well to refrain from amending or interpreting Article X which was the cornerstone of the guarantee provided by the Covenant.” 525 Again Canada retreated, this time indicating a willingness to accept a majority vote, rather than unanimous agreement, since this would serve to indicate how members interpreted the article. More countries were now willing to support the resolution, but Finland was one of the few countries to restate their opposition regardless of the resolution was framed. 526

With the major powers now supporting the Canadian position, the Finnish delegate R.W. Erich recalled that “very insistent attempts were made” to have states either support it or to preserve unanimity by abstaining. 527 Finland and other small states chose to abstain so as not to antagonize the major powers. He noted all but Persia agreed “though unwillingly.” 528 When it came to the vote, 29 countries voted for the resolution, 22 abstained or were absent, with only one vote against. The resolution was defeated because of lack of unanimity. Erich later recorded, “I think that to-day we are all glad to have avoided the fatal act we were then about to
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accomplish.”529 The problem was the Canadians had achieved their aim, with a majority vote and although the motion was not adopted, neither was it rejected.530 The result left the meaning of Article X ambiguous. The legal obligation remained for league members to protect each other from aggression, but it was now evident that each nation could decide for itself the degree to which it was bound by league responses to aggression.531

Despite the failure to achieve unanimity, the DEA approved of the result. O.D. Skelton in preparing a briefing note for the Canadian delegation in 1933 said, “The Canadian policy in respect to sanctions, grantee pacts etc., from the Peace Conference at Paris to the present, has been clear and constructive. That policy has opposed putting a club behind the League of Nations or rigid, advance grantees to come to the assistance of any state, if that state is attacked.”532 Consistent the Canadian policy may have been, but it was not constructive. Canada also opposed, but not as vigorously, the obligation to impose economic sanctions under Article XVI against aggressor states. As Senator W.A. Griesbach noted Canada had been the first to torpedo “the organization, or, to use another metaphor, to have robbed it of any teeth it had.”533 Canada had played a pivotal role in weakening the collective security system Finland had placed a high value on in choosing to become a member. As Walter Riddell observed for Canada the league offered “her first recognition as a national entity” and a chance “to demonstrate her separate status,” but gave the appearance “of a country that was bent on expanding its sovereignty even at the expense of the Security System, a country determined to resist any encroachment on her newly acquired rights and privileges.”534 That Canada should approach its membership to the League of Nations in this way is not surprising. Once Britain acknowledged the right of the Dominions to make their own decisions in international affairs, it was unlikely Canada would surrender this new freedom to Geneva.

Unlike Canada, foreign policy decisions made by Britain impacted world peace. The views of the Dominions did not prevent Britain from choosing a course of action, but they were a constraint that had to be considered, before rushing headlong into another war. Britain therefore typically kept the Dominions informed and at
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times consulted with them on particular issues. The official Canadian stance through the 1920s and 1930s, was that even in a crisis no official Canadian opinion could be given on an issue until after parliament had deliberated on it. Canada would not become an active belligerent in any war without knowing why. The same then applied to the league. Through the interpretive resolution on Article X it removed the ability of the league to commit countries like Canada to come to the aid of countries like Finland in a crisis. By weakening the collective security aspects of the league, it was hoped that it would temper the actions of countries like Finland with the prudence to seek peaceful resolution of disputes, rather than being drawn into the vortex of war.

The League of Nations opened another opportunity for Canada and Finland to work more closely together, when in 1927 both became candidates for election to the League Council. As the executive organ of the league, the council was composed of the five permanent members, Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and Germany, plus nine non-permanent members. It was possible in theory at least that the Dominions could hold council seats, but prior to 1926 their international status made this awkward. The Canadian government now reasoned that the country was detached enough from European complications to be impartial and contribute something of value. Another reason was the Commonwealth countries provided 1/7 of the total revenues of the league and this meant that it was reasonable to have representation from this group on the council. Some countries held the old view that since the Dominions were part of the British Empire they should be represented by Britain and by allowing them membership on the council it gave Britain a greater voice than it was entitled to. This view survived in some degree until after the Second World War. The British Commonwealth consisted of independent states, linked only by bonds of tradition and sentiment. It might mean that on many issues the Dominions and Britain would have similar opinions, it did not follow that they were under British control. For Canada then, participation in the league remained essentially an expression of its international personality, while at the same time trying to avoid any commitments this membership might impose.

Prime Minister King, who was always opposed to Canadian involvement in international controversies, initially resisted the idea of standing for election to the council. When Britain sought Canadian consultation, the usual approach was to
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avoid comment. Election to the council would make this impossible, since Canada would be expected while sitting on that body to express its views. If Canada found itself siding against Britain, council membership had the potential to disrupt national unity between English and French Canadians. Furthermore, there was little public interest in Canada over becoming a candidate. This differed from the situation in Finland where the prospect of candidacy for the council prompted much debate. 538 Senator Raoul Dandurand, who led the Canadian delegation, had apparently received encouragement when one of the Norwegian delegates thought the Scandinavian states and Germany might vote for Canada. This was a surprising revelation, since it might be expected they would vote for Finland.539 In the end Prime Minister King was swayed by the view of his Quebec lieutenant, Ernest Lapointe, who saw it as enhancing Canada’s independent status.540 When it came to a vote the countries selected in order were Cuba, Finland, and Canada.

Finland and Canada now took on greater responsibilities at the league, working together on numerous committees both in the council and the assembly. The three years of Canadian and Finnish tenure was perhaps an ideal time since international relations were relatively stable. There occurred no serious disputes which placed Canada at odds with Britain or jeopardized the general neutrality of Finland. As historian Frederic H. Soward noted several years later, “Canada did useful but not spectacular work.”541 There were however, several other issues on which Canada and Finland interacted, such as modifications to the Permanent Court of International Justice, appeals for the protection by minorities, and the study of alcoholism.542

Though it was not specifically a league initiative, the one big success of the period was the negotiation of the Kellog-Briand Pact in August 1928. The signatories to the pact agreed to renounce war as an instrument of policy and agreed to use peaceful means to settle international disputes.543 As the Canadian delegates to the league meeting in 1928 reported it was a hot topic and the prime minister saw it “as a triumph for the cause of peace.”544 Finland had adhered to the Kellog-
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Briand Pact and Canada also supported it because it omitted the use of sanctions other dispute settlement proposals had included.

Various proposals on disarmament, security and dispute arbitration had been discussed in previous years, in the hope of calling a general disarmament conference. Both Canada and Finland as council members were automatically on the Preparatory Commission of the Disarmament Conference. Before any move towards disarmament could occur an environment of security had to be established to allow states to in good conscience reduce their armed forces. Finland of course was one of several countries which because of their particular circumstances had an interest in the question of disarmament. The need for a mechanism for peaceful dispute resolution resulted in the creation of the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of Disputes in September 1928. It allowed for the creation of a conciliation commission, an arbitration tribunal and if that failed allowed the dispute to be presented to the Permanent Court of International Justice. 545

While discussion on the General Act were ongoing the reduction of armaments was the area covered by the 1927 meeting of the Third Committee of which Canada and Finland were both members. The general discussion was circular, with disarmament leading to security and where security meant there could be disarmament, because disputes would be resolved by arbitration. For the “Scandinavians” the key was arbitration, because it ultimately would prevent situations from reaching the point of war. Finland proposed that states which were the victim of aggression should receive financial guarantees through loans or credits and by cutting economic relations with the aggressor. 546 In general this fell under Article XVI of the covenant, which related to economic and military sanctions. The mechanisms for sanctions the league had at its disposal would make them slow in coming, at a time when the victim was under financial stress. If a measure was in place in advance so that the aid could arrive sooner, it might in fact deter aggressors knowing they would face the resistance of the whole league. 547

It was Britain which proved to be the main obstacle towards the Finnish proposal. The British thought they would have to shoulder most of the burden of assistance and it seemed that many of the states who now supported this proposal, were also the ones who resisted any effort at disarmament. Eventual British support for the plan was won by adding a stipulation that the convention would not come
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into effect until a general disarmament treaty was brought into force. Canada had other reasons for having reservation about the Finnish proposal.

When proposed amendments to Article XVI designed to strengthen the process whereby sanctions were imposed were brought forward in 1921–1922, Canada supported them. The amendments allowed for the gradual and partial application of economic sanctions against aggressor states. However, by 1925 the Canadian attitude shifted, and Prime Minister King found the whole idea objectionable. His instructions to the Canadian delegate Walter Riddell, in 1928 regarding sanctions and any proposal under Article XVI elaborated the new policy. In his view security was best achieved “by creating [the] will and habit and atmosphere of co-operation and by providing machinery for solution of international difficulties...[the] Most effective sanction whether in international or in industrial disputes is force of informed and focused public opinion.” These ideas were taken directly from King’s study and involvement in industrial disputes and a view that would in part colour the Canadian response to the Winter War in 1939. Perhaps the real issue was how neutral countries such as the US would respond to the proposal. The close proximity of Canada to the US and dependence on that country for trade meant the implications of any sanctions put Canada in danger. If the Americans became embroiled in a war with a member of the league such as Japan, it would put Canada in a position of having to break economic relations with the US.

When considering the Finnish proposal, Canada expressed support for measures to deter aggression, however, any financial sanctions would have to be approved by the Canadian parliament. Canada preferred the existing arrangements under Article XVI to deny cash, credit, and war material to aggressor nations. In effect this meant economic and military sanctions and the Canadian government reserved the right to decide the degree of compliance with any imposed sanctions or aid. When the draft Convention on Financial Assistance was reviewed in 1930, Riddell noted there had been a change in government in Canada, but there was nothing to suggest the new Conservative government of R.B. Bennett had changed Canada’s general position on the proposal. In so far as Canada was willing to consider financial assistance it would only do so within the existing league structure and sided with Britain and the Scandinavian countries in insisting that the adoption
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of the convention was tied to disarmament.\footnote{Eastman 1946, 82; Veatch 1975, 55.} When the time came for the vote, Riddell interjected his personal convictions in explaining his decision to abstain rather than vote against the convention. He thought “the Convention has so worthy and important a purpose” that he could not stand in the way of unanimity and indicated he would advise the new government of the merits of the “Finnish proposal” and if his government thought it wise to adhere to the convention he would advise the committee.\footnote{Riddell described it as the “Finnish proposal” in his memoir of his time at the League of Nations. Riddell 1947, 37; Canada 1931, 23.} The draft of the convention was approved with 8 abstentions and eventually adopted by the assembly. France and Britain supported it, along with such small “uneasy nations” as Finland, Poland, and Uruguay, which did not feel as secure as Canada.\footnote{Eastman 1946, 32.} In the end the Convention on Financial Assistance never came into force, since the requirement of a general disarmament treaty was never fulfilled.\footnote{Walters 1952, 382.}

The Finnish proposal and the general convention failed, but it was not from lack of trying, since arms control on a limited scale could occur. An example of this was the Naval Limitation Treaty between Great Britain, Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden, signed in December 1938. In an effort to keep Canada informed about British policies, London sent dispatches outlining the broad discussions and changes this would mean from the London Naval Treaty of 1936.\footnote{See LAC, RG25 G1, Vol. 1876, File 1938-605, “Naval Limitation Treaty Between Great Britain and Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden - 1938–1939.”} Of course the prime minister and his Under Secretary of State for External Affairs (USSEA) did not really welcome such consultation and passage of information, because this would mean Canada had a role, however small, in formulating British policy and from that could follow unwanted commitments. In this case most of the information involved technical details of the types and classes of ships and their armaments and it was of little interest to Canada. What this did for Finland was contribute to the image held by people in External Affairs, that Finland was a peaceful, democratic state. Given the other more disturbing developments in European affairs, it was likely seen as a small, but positive event.
Conclusion

From the time of Finland’s independence Canadian government officials began receiving more information about Finland and Finns from its own sources, as well as from the British. There was no explicit Canadian foreign policy towards Finland expressed by the Canadian government. Responses to issues involving Finland and Finns reflected the general preference to avoid external entanglements and to reduce the threat of radicalism in Canada. Clear negative images regarding Finns as dangerous and an enemy image of Finland permeate the handling of the Finnish Legion refugees. Finns whether White or Red were perceived negatively either because of German or Bolshevik influence. The blacklisted legion members, which included the high profile Oskari Tokoi, raised concerns that their immigration to Canada this was simply adding more potential leaders for the labour movement and the socialists was therefore a bad idea. The police and some officials in the Immigration Department shared this view. Despite this there remained the positive image of Finns as good workers and settlers for the Canadian frontier and this was expressed by some immigration officials working in Britain and the military officers who had served with the Murmansk Legion. It was this positive image and capitalist pressure which finally overcame official Canadian resistance to the British request for Canada to take the remaining legionnaires as immigrants. In the end the Red Finns did prove to be trouble makers and those who had become unemployed were deported.

Nonetheless, despite the initial enemy image the “White” bourgeois government was recognized as the lawful government of Finland. The British and the other Allies were able to rehabilitate the image of Finland by rationalizing German support for the Whites during the civil war. Finland was occupied by Germany and therefore a “victim” rather than complicit in the actions of the enemy. The fact that the presence of the Baltic Sea Division abetted the White cause in the civil war was conveniently ignored. Finland was a liberal democratic country, which had resisted the militarism of Germany and the democratic election in early1919 was proof. However, this was all based on second hand information from the British and Canada could not alter a decision that was fait accompli because at this time such foreign policy actions were a British responsibility. There is no record of Canadian officials making any comment or observation about the recognition of Finland, but the appointment of the first honorary vice consul was accepted as a matter of course.
In the post Finnish independence period the first international relations interactions between Canada and Finland occurred at the League of Nations. Officials at the Department of External Affairs and successive prime ministers, especially W.L.M. King, tended to view the collective security arrangements of the league to be an impingement on the newly achieved independent status of Canada. Therefore, there were repeated attempts by Canadian representatives to have them removed from the league charter or at least reinterpreted to remove any obligation. It was a position diametrically opposed to that of Finland, which counted on the collective security and peaceful settlement of disputes mechanisms of the league for her own security. The Canadian concern was that conflicts in unstable parts of the world could draw the country into a war that was not in the national interest. Though it was never explicitly portrayed in such terms, Finland as an Eastern European country fell into that category. In this way at a very subdued level Finland was a threat to Canada. However, this was clearly outweighed by the signals that Finland was a liberal, democratic, capitalist country. Add to this were the positive perceptions generated by a willingness to peacefully settle disputes, such as Åland and East Karelia, through the League of Nations and active participation in its various bodies.

These events in and outside the League of Nations contributed to a positive image of Finland, especially for the members of the DEA, who for the most part, were philosophically liberal and placed hope for world peace through discussion and negotiation. The image of Finland in Canada was therefore overwhelmingly positive. There were however, still latent negative images at play during this same period and they become evident through Canadian interactions with Finns in Canada and the government policy areas of immigration and national security.
4 Radical Images

Recognition of Finland’s independence and interaction at international conferences and bodies were an important part of Canadian-Finnish relations, however, these were typically remote and likely of little interest to most Canadians. More pressing and closer to home was the issue of Finnish immigration. From the start of Canadian-Finnish relations, the issue of immigration attracted a significant amount of attention from the Canadian officials involved with relations with Finland. The interwar period coincides with what has been described as the second phase of Finnish immigration to Canada. The first period saw the need to find settlers for the large areas of undeveloped agricultural land and to a lesser extent as a source of cheap labour. The start of the war in 1914 effectively ended Finnish immigration for the duration of the conflict. The resumption of large-scale Finnish migration to Canada did not resume immediately after the war. Finns were included on a long list of inadmissible national and ethnic groups. Official interaction with Finland and Finns in this context consisted of routine matters such as the issuing of visas, screening immigrants, and enquiries aimed at the clarification of existing policies to name a few. Officials were also concerned with whether to restrict Finnish immigration to Canada because it was suspected that radical and subversive individuals were fleeing Finland.

Radical, dangerous, enemy images were further amplified by the behaviour of Finnish-Canadians. Participation in and support for socialist causes in Karelia and the Spanish Civil War was a sign of the commitment of Finnish-Canadians to radicalism in the 1930s. The departure of radicals from Canada was welcomed by the police and some immigration officials. With any luck the undesirables would stay in the Soviet Union or Spain, but there remained the possibility they might return. Compounding the negative perceptions was a Canadian connection to a high-profile Finnish spy case in 1933. Finland was indirectly a threat to Canadian national security through Red Finns and the CPC which had links to Soviet intelligence agencies. When it was learned some radical Finns were in fact trying to get back to Canada, the Immigration Department and police toyed with the idea of ideological profiling to screen out Red Finns. However, this amounted to nothing because of procedural difficulties identified by External Affairs.

Negative images of radical, dangerous Finns were mainly evident among immigration and police officials. The spy case did open the eyes of people at

External Affairs, like O.D. Skelton, to the Soviet security threat and Finland as a source of subversives. The impact on the positive image of Finland which existed at External Affairs was minimal. The image that Finland and the Finnish government was like Canada, a liberal, democratic, capitalist government struggling to maintain it values in the face of internal and external threats was positive. To a degree this was bolstered by the efforts the nationalist, conservative, White Finns in Canada. Religious leaders and groups like the Loyal Finns in Canada carried out anti-radical propaganda, which influenced Canadian government views of the Finnish-Canadian community. White Finland was successfully presented as representing all that was commendable about Finland and Finns in Canada. By the late 1930s the fear of Finnish-Canadian radicalism had diminished, as the energies of the “progressive” left-wing segment of the population shifted into more acceptable avenues of social, economic, and political change. There was still a wide spread prejudice that Finns were dangerous radicals which was now part of the Canadian intellectual heritage and images of Finnishness in Canada.

4.1 Immigration

After the First World War the Department of Immigration was continuing to restrict immigration of “aliens” from the “continent.” People from countries on the preferred list which included places like Britain and parts of the British Empire settled by Europeans and the United States, who were “agriculturalists” could still be admitted, but all others were restricted. However, operating at a distance in Britain, immigration official J. Obed Smith needed more specific instructions regarding Finns, because previously they had been among the preferred immigrant groups. F.C. Blair advised him the policy of restricting Finnish immigration was the safe course, since “The number of agitators of a revolutionary type found amongst the Finns in Canada during the war, should make us careful about the encouragement of any general immigration from Finland for the time being.” He was sceptical about Finnish farm labourers, since in his estimation few Finns actually took up farming. More often Finnish immigrants instead sought work in mining and lumbering. Along with the radical ideas of Finns this was enough reason to keep them out.
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One exception was for family members, but he stressed each application for a relative from Finland to be admitted should be carefully scrutinized "as to the record during the war of the applicant." It was noted that occasionally a bona fide Finnish farm labourer applied, who typically had friends or family in Canada. If they obtained the necessary Finnish passport they were usually allowed to come to Canada. Based on the Finnish settlements around Port Arthur and Fort William, it was still thought that those who did farm were "good pioneer farmers who will and do put up with many privations and hardships." Immigration Inspector A.H. Wilson, however, thought this was offset by the fact,

They are determined law breakers in some ways, have no regard for game and fishery laws, or the Ontario Temperance Act, are professional bootleggers. Numbers are now considered wealthy through distilling and peddling whiskey. They are keen on the use of knives mostly their own make. They are a savage and well-made knife made from worn out files highly tempered. They have some bitter quarrels when one or both are sure to be hospital patients for a time.

From his sources, who did not want to be exposed because they feared retribution from Red Finns, he learned that "85% are radical in their views and with numbers in a district would surely cause trouble unless harsh measures were used. It is claimed they are not so in Finland and dare not. It is after coming to this country where they have more freedom that this develops."

When in 1921 a lumber company asked if more could be done to encourage Finnish settlement, they were advised that "The Government has not been actively encouraging the immigration of Finns" because of "the unrest that has been so prevalent in Finland. It is not unknown that a somewhat similar spirit of unrest has shown itself among the Finns in certain parts of Canada." The unspoken motive for a lumber company from Timmins, Ontario, requesting more immigrants was the need for more workers, but the department thought there was no shortage of miners or lumberjacks. The company was no doubt aware that a few months previous some Finns from the Murmansk Legion arrived at nearby New Liskeard and other lumber companies had obtained Finnish immigrant workers despite the
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objections of immigration officials. In 1922 new regulations continued the existing practice and immigration from Scandinavia and Finland was restricted to bona fide farmers, farm workers, female domestic servants, and members of the immediate family. Prospective immigrants had to have at least $250 to sustain themselves until they could get settled, had to have a valid passport, get a visa from a Canadian immigration official, and pass a medical examination. The following year the same conditions were applied to all immigrants from the preferred list. Nonetheless, because of US immigration restrictions, in the period from roughly 1919 to 1939, Canada became the destination of choice for Finns until the outbreak of war again curtailed immigration.

Although Canadian officials considered removing Finland from the preferred list, nothing was done about it and the country remained on the list along with people from Scandinavia, Germany, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, and France. The new immigration regulations, on the surface at least restricted the types of newcomers. Far from reducing immigration it allowed for large numbers of peasant farmers to move to Canada. Prospective farmers also made ideal labourers, which the government turned a blind eye too and there was nothing done to prevent people who came from entering the labour force. One official from the Department of Mines in 1924 at South Porcupine, though he evidently disliked the practice, acknowledged its existence and said, “As a Canadian I desire to see this country go ahead...but not at the expense of bringing in Finns, or any other settler marked for farming when the real intention is to make miners of them, or even lumbermen.” He went on to add, “I do not as a Canadian wish to see any European be he Mongoloid or Nordic put anything over those who are trying to make this a land worth living in.” Once again the Finns were made to seem more alien because they were thought to be Mongols. Finns who came during this post war immigration
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boom, were attracted in the same ways as in the past. In fact, travel agents were
directing immigrants to the mining and lumbering regions with increased
regularity. This was a concern for immigration officials.

Earlier in 1923, Consul General Akseli Rauanheimo enthusiastically requested
brochures so his government could establish an office to assist immigrants. Blair
stated Canada was not really interested in establishing an agency. Canada wanted
healthy Finns interested in farming, but the experiences with medically unfit
immigrants and radical Finns made this doubtful. If an agency was established it
would need to screen out radicals who not only opposed the Finnish government
but were detrimental to law and order as they existed in Canada. Rauanheimo
thought an agency would help direct loyal White Finns to Canada, so long as they
could be sent to places where the Red Finns did not dominate. Both governments
agreed to co-operate, but Finland maintained any collaboration could not be seen
as setting up a “Canadian” agency since it would appear that Finland was
encouraging emigration.

To help matters Rauanheimo tied to explain Finland to Canadian officials by
providing detailed reports in 1925 and 1928. The history he gave was from a White
Finn perspective and included a summary of Finnish migration to North America.
The opening of the Finnish consulate coincided with an upsurge in Finns moving
to Canada. Finland was not an overpopulated country he wrote and for this reason
the Finnish government did not encourage emigration. Among the first to leave
“were many adventurers and people who for one or another reason wanted to be far
away from a country where they were known.” This broad general statement
included those who left for economic reasons, to avoid the period of Russification
or for less honourable personal reasons such as to avoid paying debts. It was also
the circumspect way he described free thinking, progressive, and radical Finns who
wanted to leave because they found the political and social climate of Finland
oppressive. To add to this, after 1918 many Reds fled White justice for their crimes
and one place they sought refuge was Canada. He thought that most Finns would
admit Canada was suitable for them in every way. Before the US imposed
immigration restrictions, the preference was to go there, but now they went to
Canada and Australia. To counter any image Canadian officials might have had that all Finnish immigrants were trouble makers Rauanheimo added, that many of the recent immigrants are from Ostrobothnia, which he explained was a stronghold for the Whites, but in Canada they are persecuted by the Reds. proportionally in Finland the support for the Reds is low, he claimed, but in Canada it is high because they are permitted to agitate and bully other Finns into radicalism.  

Vice-Consul Adiel Saarimäki protested the negative Canadian view of Finns, claiming that the reason Finns did not immediately take up farming was they needed time to earn and save enough money to start a farm. Perhaps, he thought, a program of loans could be instituted by the Canadian government to facilitate this and thereby avoid exposing good Finns to the radicals working in the forests and mines. Saarimäki had been thinking along the lines of the Empire Settlement Act which was funded by the British and Canadian governments and designed to help encourage British emigration to Canada. He was told that no such thing for non-British immigrants would even be considered. Another solution Rauanheimo thought was to ensure that accurate information was available about the conditions in Canada. Since the American option had been closed to Finns, many mistakenly thought that if they went to Canada, it was a simple matter then to migrate to the US. When it was learned they cannot do this the Finns become restless and try to find work. However, they find the status of a farm labourer and employment conditions far worse than in Finland, with low wages, poor food, and accommodations. Once they have money to start farming the lack of fluency in English meant they could not learn where to get the best land. Frustrated in achieving their goal of self-sufficiency, Finns then turn to radical politics.

Three years later Rauanheimo tried again to get Canadian immigration officials to see sense. He provided yet another study of Finnish immigration to Canada. It covered much the same information as the previous one. He explained that early Finnish immigrants went to the US because “Canada was still to a large extent ‘an unknown country,’” despite the feeble attempts of Canadian officials to provide
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information pamphlets in Finnish over the years.\textsuperscript{580} If it were not for US restrictions fewer Finns would be going to Canada. The war had slowed immigration, but radical Finns fled the US to avoid the draft and contributed to the already existing pool of Reds in Canada. He noted,

It is being maintained that among immigrants arriving from Finland a great majority nurse revolutionary political opinions, are communists to put it short. It is true these elements are very much in evidence. In the communistic organizations of Canada the Finns constitute the majority or at least a very considerable part. Among Finns themselves there are more communistic organization than organization of any other kind and the only daily paper published among them is communistic.\textsuperscript{581}

The problem he went on to say was that Canada did not ask the political loyalties of its people. Most of the radicals by this point had been in Canada for a long time, learned the language and conditions, and had become naturalized citizens.

Proportionately the number of truly committed communists among Finns in Canada was likely very low, not much higher than the estimated 10% in Finland. Yet many of Finns become communists in Canada, and

The reason is chiefly that the communists are very well organized and they are doing efficient propaganda. More than anything conditions among which immigrants live here contribute to swell the lines of the communists. The institutions of the country take almost no care of them. They are absolutely lonely, left to their own resources to sink or swim in a country the language and customs of which they do not know. They are often cheated at the working places.\textsuperscript{582}

This was a problem because,

The Finn is constitutionally suspicious. When he does not know the language and is unfamiliar with conditions, he is often liable to suspect that he has been wronged even without just cause. All this is apt to arouse his bitterness and hatred against society at large and existing conditions. All this may explain why Finns in Canada have in such large numbers joined the communistic organizations. It is a fact, that they are not nearly as strong as may seem to the casual observer.\textsuperscript{583}
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The problem of radicalized Finns was therefore directly related to the laisse faire attitude of the Canadian government.

The Department of Immigration by the end of 1928 was prepared to implement a screening process. It was a decision spurred on by the controversy surrounding trial of the editor of *Vapaus*, Aaro Vaara. A departmental memorandum reported that,

recent events, particularly in connection with the attitude of the Socialistic Finns during the illness of the King, demonstrate the utter lack of loyalty to Canada and our Sovereign on the part of many Finns who have accepted the hospitality of this country and are using their liberty to carry on a propaganda subversive of our institutions.584

Despite all these concerns and although Canadian officials found Finns dangerous, Finland nonetheless had remained on the preferred list of countries for immigrants. In fact, lobbying efforts by farmers, businessmen, the railways, as well as mining and lumber companies had convinced the government to gradually relax immigration restrictions. Finnish immigration to Canada spiked from 1925–1931 as a result. During this second immigration boom, Canada admitted some 810,887 new residents, of which 22,075 were Finnish immigrants.585 Canada thereby got the workers it needed. As part of the preferred list, aside from the need for a passport, a visa, a medical exam, and to be “in a position to maintain themselves until employment can be secured,” Finns were free to migrate to Canada.586 There was no longer any stipulation about needing a certain amount of money, about being an agriculturalist or farm labourer.

Now in 1928 the intent was to take Finland from the preferred list and place in the same category as Italy. Finns would only be admitted based on their prospects for agricultural work, if their skills were in short supply or if they were relatives of Finnish-Canadians.587 Furthermore, all immigrants required a visa from a Canadian immigration officer, but there was none in Finland, so the department wanted Finns to get a visa from the British consul in Helsinki. At the same time immigrants would be screened so that Red Finns were not allowed to sail for Canada. This required the support of the Department of External Affairs, which was requested to ask the
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British to carry this out. Skelton replied that “From what I have learned of Communist propaganda among the Finns who have entered Canada recently, I can quite understand your action.” However, he found profiling problematic and unworkable,

The difficulty is how a ‘red’ Finn is to be defined. There are as you know all shades of redness in most Continental countries, from the pale pink of the Parliamentary Socialist to the deep scarlet of the revolutionary Communist. The question may therefore arise as to where the line is to be drawn, or what external index of suitability is to be applied.

Further, there was a good chance the Labour Party would come to power in Britain and they had opposed the efforts to ban communists arriving there. He reiterated the assessment that only 10% of Finns were communists and that many who come were not communists but became communists through the skilful propaganda and alleged lack of attention to immigrants given by Canadians. The proposed screening was abandoned and Finns, though they were now seen as less-desirable immigrants by some officials, remained on the preferred list.

The Great Depression changed all that. The economic situation made it impractical to admit large numbers of immigrants, since they would immediately join the ranks of the unemployed. In May 1930, the need to curtail Finnish immigration was explained in these terms,

Remove Finland from the Northern European list which means it would be left in the same position as Italy and we would admit only on nomination arising in Canada. Lots of our Finnish immigrants are no particular asset to this country and that has been well known for a good while.

Finland was finally removed from the preferred list. Now the only admissible Finns were wives and children under 18, if going to the husband and or father who was a legally admitted resident and who would care for them. Of course, agriculturalists that had the means to begin farming could still be admitted. In fact these same restrictions applied to all immigrants except British subjects and US citizens, who
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only needed sufficient funds to maintain themselves until employment could be secured.593

4.2 Radicalism

The downside of what had been regarded as a rather liberal immigration policy, from the perspective of Canadian authorities, was that disaffected and unemployed immigrant workers were the natural recruitment targets of radical groups, like the syndicalist IWW, the One Big Union, and the Bolsheviks, which by 1922 became the Communist Party of Canada (CPC).594 After the First World War government officials, police, and mainstream news media still feared the “Red menace,” which they perceived to be active throughout the country. Wartime restrictions on foreign language publications and organizations were not removed until April 1919. The legal tools which remained for authorities to use against those perceived to be a threat had to be found among the laws of Canada, such as the Criminal Code and the Immigration Act. The danger posed by Finns and others involved in radical politics and the labour movement was seen as sedition by the Canadian government and led to the continuation of state repression into 1930s. The Dominion Police and the Royal North West Mounted Police (RNWMP) infiltrated labour, socialist, and radical groups, including Finnish socialist organizations, and they produced files on known agitators and activists.595

It was feared that relaxing the restrictions on foreign language publications and organizations would see a revival of ethnic radicalism. In the Finnish case, this was thought to be obvious because “the Finnish Organization” was known to be affiliated with the CPC and was involved in what were considered dubious activities. In Port Arthur it had helped create a co-operative restaurant and supported the creation of union locals among lumber workers in the region. The voice of the Finnish Organization was also among those campaigning for an end to the restrictions on the foreign language press.596 The Finnish socialist organization underwent name changes during the early years of its existence, but a cultural group known as the Finnish Organization of Canada (FOC) was officially incorporated in
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1923 and in 1925 shed its political affiliations. Nonetheless, contrary to public remonstrations, the leadership of the FOC, some members, and its organ *Vapaus*, continued to associate with the CPC, something which the police and government were aware of.597

Allegations of intimidation and threats of violence by Red Finns against their White Finnish countrymen provided further justification for police attention.598 It was said that in some Northern Ontario communities, committees had been set up “to test newcomers...as to their political beliefs” and class loyalties.599 For example, two Finns who arrived in 1921 had difficulty finding non-socialist Finns in Canada. Most of the boarding houses in Toronto they claimed were dens of Red Finns, where they faced intimidation, threats of violence and had to endure insults like being called “Old country slaughters” and “worker’s murders.”600 On arrival at a lumber camp these men were immediately brought before a Red Finn inquisition, accused of crimes against the workers in Finland, and had to fight for their lives to escape. They were blacklisted and were apparently harassed by Reds for years after. *Vapaus* was an instrumental part of the harassment of White Finns, publishing photos and articles of those who were deemed enemies of the workers. In other cases, to end the harassment and thereby gain employment, some Finns allegedly apologized for their role in the White Guard and admitted to crimes they were accused of. These recantations were then published in *Vapaus*.601 Starting in August 1923 the RCMP began investigating these reports. Both the RCMP and the Ontario Provincial Police took it on themselves to defend the rights of Finnish-Canadians who were deemed “loyal to the institutions of this country.”602

One of the many tasks undertaken by Consul Erick J. Korte at Port Arthur was to counter the activities of Red Finns in Canada. He reaffirmed that Red Finns were
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interfering with law-abiding Canadians, as well as newcomers from Finland and offered to Canadian authorities in 1924 a White interpretation of recent Finnish history. The Red Finns and their allies led a rebellion soon after Finland declared independence from Russia. The aim was to establish a Bolshevik tyranny like Russia, which all classes of Finns resisted by forming White Guards. The effect was to “check the spread of Bolshevism westward” and “the outcome of their endeavour was that the reds’ rebellion was put out and the country was made safe for democracy.”  

Finland as a borderland, acted as a bulwark protecting Western civilization. The ban of the Communist Party and suppression of its activities significantly reduced the threat to democracy and freedom in Finland he thought. Canada was not so fortunate he said, and

The reds in Canada, however, (I speak of those of Finnish origin) have carried their propaganda more actively than ever. The Finnish government cannot reach them here and authorities in this country have so far regarded the struggles of the law-abiding Finns against the red element among their number as some minor and unimportant factional disagreement.

Along with this perceived disregard, there also seemed to be little the authorities in Canada could do to counter the problem. It gave the Reds a free hand to exploit the language barrier faced by newcomers and carry out intimidation. Even if the White Finns could bring the issue to the attention of the authorities it seemed there was no law which could stop the activities of the Reds. Faced with this situation many White Finns leave for the US, where their rights are better protected, but others were “driven to insanity or suicide.” Therefore, from this perspective Red Finnish involvement with the CPC was a major threat to Canadian security and if Canadian officials did something about this it would make life in Canada better for non-socialist Finns.

The Red Finn threat was therefore an ongoing problem in the minds of authorities. After the death of the Finnish honorary vice consul in Copper Cliff in 1931, Member of Parliament (MP) George Nicholson expressed the concern of the “law-abiding Finns” in his district who urged the appointment of a replacement because of the “large floating population of Finns who are not naturalized Canadians and many of them lean strongly towards Communism and are really the
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cause of a lot of trouble that develops in the district.”606 A consul would be able to help counteract their influence.

After the 1919 Winnipeg General Strike it was thought by Canadian authorities that the laws concerning sedition were not strong enough. A new section was added to the Criminal Code of Canada in 1921, which made it illegal to participate in an “unlawful association.” This law was broad and defined any unlawful association as any group advocating the use of force to bring about a change to the Canadian system of government. A party like the CPC, which advocated revolutionary change, fit this definition. On 11 August 1931 it was expanded and made it illegal for any organization to advocate change in the economic and political system by acts or threats of force, violence or injury to persons or property. Any organization that fit this description could be declared an unlawful association and any connection to it made a person liable to up to 20 years imprisonment.

The display of and possession of any insignia or literature was considered proof of a connection to the illegal organization and in the absence of contrary evidence, a person who attended a meeting, spoke publicly in favour of the organization or acting in any way in support of it, was considered a de facto member. Permitting a meeting or gathering of an unlawful organization on one’s property could also lead to a fine or jail time. Likewise, anyone publishing literature or advertising on behalf of the organization could be imprisoned. The law in effect made the CPC an illegal organization and banned it.607 For Finns attracted to radical politics and the labour movement this could pose a problem, since they would be more actively targeted.608 However, the application of the Criminal Code alone did not deal with the problem of radical Finnish immigrants in Canada, because although the law could be used to repress these individuals, they still remained after the jail term ended or they paid the fine.

According to Barbara Roberts, Donald Avery, and others, another way Canadian officials attempted to suppress these groups was by deporting them. Originally immigration legislation had no provision to prevent someone from arriving in Canada or for expelling them based on political beliefs alone, however, in 1919 the Immigration Act had been amended.609 It now prohibited immigrants
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who advocated the unlawful destruction of property, promoted riots or public disorder, belonging to a secret organization or advocated the overthrow of organized government. Now anyone not born in Canada, even if naturalized, found to be involved in these things could be deported. There was still nothing explicitly illegal in the organization of unions or participating in strikes, however, employers, authorities, and the police often acted as if such activities were illegal, immoral, and reprehensible. Grounds for deportation could also be shown if the person broke some law, such as vagrancy, rioting, assault, theft, or unlawful association. Likewise, if the person suffered mental or physical incapacity or had become a “public charge,” by receiving relief or welfare, they could be returned to their country of origin. These “non-political” grounds for deportation were therefore easier to substantiate and authorities used them to try to rid the country of radicals. The hidden function of deportations was therefore political.610

On the other hand, Henry Drystek notes deportation policy suited the outlook of middle-class Canadian society. Generally speaking, Canadian society was unwilling to fund social welfare for immigrants and the removal of those convicted of a criminal offense fit their views of social order and the rule of law.611 Other than the crackdown on the CPC in 1931, he points out there was no concerted effort to deport radicals, because prior to the Second World War only about 100 such individuals were deported. This was a small proportion of the 60,000 deportations which occurred in the same period.612

There was a bias against individuals and groups which called for revolutionary or violent political change and leftists of all types contend George Kealey, Reg Whitaker, and others, because the RCMP provided weekly reports summarizing the intelligence gathered on them. 613 The “Security Bulletins” circulated to government officials contain information on many left-wing people and organizations. Periodically mentioned are individual Finns, the FOC, Finnish language schools, and newspapers like Vapaus, leaving the impression that they were among the ethnic groups most susceptible to radicalism.614 Michelle McBride has found, it is not that police and government officials ignored radical right-wing groups like fascists or the Klu Klux Clan, since they did assign agents to keep an
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eye on these groups. Rather, it was because those responsible for Canadian security perceived leftists like the communists to be better organized, to have a wider base of support and therefore were the greatest perceived threat.\textsuperscript{615} As Drystek writes, this is not to say that the use of the threat of deportation to cow immigrants was not a factor, for this did enter the discussions of officials and politicians, but they never set deportation policy for that specific purpose. It was not necessary, since effectively the radicals and undesirables eventually were put into the position to be deported by their own actions or other circumstances and there was no need to target them. The common thread was these individuals reacted negatively to social and economic conditions in Canada and some of them resorted to violence or became a public charge and this made their deportation a matter of routine policy.\textsuperscript{616}

Mauri Jalava reached a similar conclusion when looking at Finns in the Sudbury area. The numbers he says “hardly support the assumption that the Government had bent under public clamour and formulated a deliberate policy of deportation as a solution to the country’s political or economic problems.”\textsuperscript{617} For example he cites the fact that between 1928 and 1933 there were only 916 Finns deported.\textsuperscript{618} It was hardly “an effective method of dealing with the “revolutionary Finns”” he observes.\textsuperscript{619} To some extent the threat of deportation would have had a moderating effect on the enthusiasm of left-wing Finns. Of more overall importance to the limitation of radicalism among Finns was the decision after 1930 to restrict immigration. When amending the Immigration Act, the Minister of Immigration and Colonization Wesley Gordon commented to the Prime Minister R.B. Bennett that it “was designed to control immigration in so far as the admission of newcomers to Canada might add to our internal problems.”\textsuperscript{620} Jalava notes at the end of the official statistical information detailing the Finns, there was the statement “no other nationality is so singled out.”\textsuperscript{621} This is because no similar statistical report had been made for other ethnic groups. Whether or not radicals in general

\textsuperscript{615} McBride 1997, xiv–xv.
\textsuperscript{616} Drystek 1982, 441.
\textsuperscript{617} Jalava 1983b, 241.
\textsuperscript{618} Oiva Saarinen indicates that between 1930 and 1935 some 1,006 Finns were deported for various reasons. Saarinen 1999, 144. Lindström calculated that during the years 1930–1937 over 25,000 immigrants of all backgrounds were deported. In particular she identified that in 1931–1932 alone there were 565 Finns deported for what were “non-political” grounds. In 1933 they were followed by 166 who were identified as “criminals and vagrants” in addition to 26 Finnish “communists” who were expelled. Lindström 2000a, 9–11.
\textsuperscript{619} Jalava 1983b, 241.
\textsuperscript{620} W.A. Gordon to R.B. Bennett, 14 August 1930, LAC, MG26 K, Vol. 362, Item 241109, Reel M1701.
were being targeted, Finns were seen as enough of a problem to keep separate statistics on them.

Regardless of if there was a specific immigration policy targeting radicals for deportation or not, there were still Finns who were found undesirable and deported.622 One of the highest profile cases involved the editor of Vapaus, Aaro Vaara. He was considered a trouble maker by authorities and his editorial policy produced a paper which professed radical economic, political, and social ideas they deemed objectionable. A committee of church groups, patriotic, social, and fraternal societies in the Sudbury area complained that Vapaus and the FOC were really communist front organizations and the propaganda they distributed had a negative effect on the Finnish-Canadian community. The paper routinely printed seditious, immoral, anti-Christian, anti-Canadian, and anti-British articles they pointed out. Its columns encouraged strikes and advertisements were thinly veiled solicitations for prostitution.623 Vapaus had frequently lampooned the clergy and religion, making missionary activity among Finnish-Canadians difficult.624 In 1928 King George V, was suffering from a serious illness in Britain. For many Canadians who felt a sense of loyalty to the man who was constitutionally Canada’s king and head of the British Commonwealth this was a time of concern. It was an inopportune time given the prevailing sentiments of mainstream Canadian society, but Vaara chose it to express his anti-monarchy views in a December 1928 article.625 Community outrage led the Crown Attorney to bring charges of seditious libel against Vaara.626 His conviction netted him a short prison sentence until August 1929.

On his release Vaara continued his activities with the FOC and Vapaus. The authorities kept him and the paper under surveillance. In November 1930, the Finnish National Society lamented, Vapaus and “its baneful influence not only among the Finns but among many Canadians as well.” 627 The paper perpetuated negative images of Finns and “among our countrymen here, there exists a very
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622 Some of these are document in the following sources: Roberts 1988, 71–73, 86, 135, 137; Drystek 1982, 425; Beaulieu 2011, 47, 126, 164; Radforth 1987, 110, 120, 123–126.


624 On humour and class politics see also Vokey 2000.

625 “Englannin kuningas oli maanantaina kuolleena muutaman tunnin ajan,” Vapaus 4 December 1928; Vasiliadis 1989, 142–143.


deplorable low moral condition...the direct cause of the vicious articles continuously appearing in its pages in which God and everything that is pure, noble and cared to us are disgracefully treadet [sic] and moched [sic].” The Red Finns therefore did not represent the true image of Finland, since “Having been taught in Finland, obedience to law, honour and loyalty to government, respect to religion and close adherence to exclusively associate with our countrymen we are deeply concerned about this.” The White Finns welcomed Canadian measures to repress communists, because that was the common foe. At about the same time the RCMP reported *Vapaus* was full of seditious content and

The newspaper, and the influence which it exerts, are the more deleterious to the public interest in that the society known as the ‘Finnish Socialist Organization of Canada,’ whose organ it is, constitutes the chief financial support of the Communist Party of Canada; without the contributions of the members of the Finnish organization, the Communist Party of Canada would scarcely exist.

The Minister of Justice agreed with these allegations and thought there was enough evidence to consider the publication seditious and prohibit its distribution through the postal system.

By 1932 Vaara’s involvement in a May Day demonstration, various “free speech” activities, and articles published by *Vapaus* deemed seditious, were enough to have him arrested again. During another crack down on the CPC by police in May 1932, Vaara and several other Finns were seized and whisked off to Halifax to appear before an Immigration Department board of inquiry. Deportation occurred on 17 December 1932, because Vaara was judged to be a “particularly clever individual...particularly dangerous. He is a menace to Canada and to the existing economic and governmental structure of this country.” Two colleagues from the staff of *Vapaus* were also expelled.
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630 *Canadian Uutiset* 24 January 1929.
633 They became known as the “Halifax Ten.” See Molinaro 2015.
634 Assistant Col R. Munroe to Jolliffe, 16 May 1932 in Roberts 1988, 143–144.
635 Ibid., 143-144. Also, the deportation case file LAC, RG13 A2, Vol. 2465, File A-3008. The two individuals were Martin Parker (Pohjansalo) and John (Toivo) Stahlberg.
There were large numbers of written protests, public meetings, and demonstrations in support of Vaara and the others. In particular the Department of Immigration were informed that if they were sent back to Finland, their lives were in danger.636 The letters pointed out that the “White” government of Finland had been carrying out its own anti-radical campaigns with “fascist” thugs and that for their safety they should be allowed to go to the Soviet Union.637 It appeared that immigration officials either did not take the warnings seriously or simply hid behind the law which required deportees return to their country of origin or the country to which they held citizenship. The Minister of Justice Hugh Guthrie observed about the written protests, there were far too many to reply to. He simply made it known that “I merely hand them over to the Mounted Police in order that a record may be kept of the names and addresses of the people who sign them and I make this statement so that the petitioners may know what I do with them.”638 The high level of deportations would continue until the election of 1935 returned the Liberals under W.L.M. King. The numbers of high profile deportations made it seem to more and more Canadians that the government was trampling on civil rights. In 1937 the Liberal government repealed Section 98 of the Criminal Code which allowed this and promised to end the arbitrary practices carried out by the Conservative government. It did not bring an end to deportations because the immigration apparatus was still intact. Authorities could still pursue those they deemed a threat, but now had to be more discreet and use other criminal charges to secure a deportation.639

While any activist could find themselves in trouble with the authorities, facing criminal charges and jail sentences for Finns in Canada made the fear of deportation a feature of life in the 1930s. Many Finns had not applied to become naturalized Canadian citizens, and often those who did apply were refused, likely because of their radical activities. In other ways radical Finns felt persecuted, such as in the area of employment. The forestry and mining companies hired Finnish translators, who were often thought to be anti-radical informers. Unemployment during this era often meant destitution and the need to seek relief from local government agencies, which meant in the process Finns risked deportation for becoming a “public charge.” Participating in a public demonstration protesting the lack of work also had the risk

636 Kelly and Trebilcock 2010, 248.
637 The term Fascist thugs appears to be a reference to the Lapua movement.
638 Minister of Immigration and Colonization W.A. Gordon to Canadian Labor Defence League, 17 December 1932 in Roberts 1988, 154.
of making oneself a target for the authorities. Radical Finns were painfully aware that the political climate in Finland was hostile to them. In some cases, their life and liberty would have been in danger if they were compelled by Canadian authorities to return to Finland. Certainly the police and some government officials were concerned that there was a connection between ethnicity and left-wing politics and in this the Finns featured prominently.

### 4.3 Karelian Exodus

Proof of the radical nature of many Finns in Canada and their commitment to building the “worker’s paradise” was demonstrated when several thousand went to Soviet Karelia in the 1930s. Disillusioned over the failure of Canadians to build a worker’s state, they went hoping to further the cause with their North American technology, organizational skills, and experience in lumbering. In the early 1930s an estimated 2–3,000 Canadian Finns were recruited by the Technical Aid to Soviet Karelia Bureau. The enthusiasm displayed by those involved has caused this to be labelled “Karelian fever” and the “Karelian Exodus.”

Police had heard rumours in the spring of 1929 that some Finnish-Canadian bush workers would be leaving “for the Vaterland of all communists—Soviet Russia.” From a “reliable” agent in the fall of 1930 the RCMP learned that a number of lumberjacks had been recruited in the Port Arthur area by the “Karala Wood Trust” and “Considering the fact that the above organization is handling the matter and the destination of the men it appears as if there was something very fishy.” It was thought there was no substance to the rumours, but when the men bought tools and spare clothing before they left it was clear they were in fact going to Karelia “to teach the workers (and prisoners) of Russia the art of cutting pulp.”

What was unclear was why they wanted people from Canada, when there were plenty of lumberjacks in “faithful communities close to Karelia, just across the line in Finland,” but perhaps it was thought the communists in Finland are too close to...
the “paradise” to want to go. The RCMP was happy to see them go: “The departure of these men from Canada will leave nothing to be regretted as they are all avowed Communists. It is quite possible that many of them will be wanting to return to Canada.”

One possible negative side effect was the impact it would have on the Canadian lumber industry. If the Soviets dumped large quantities of cheap lumber, particularly in the US market, Canada could not compete. Occasional reports of others leaving and intelligence about what they were doing in Russia were filed by the RCMP over the next few years. Canadian authorities looked on the departure of this band of “agitators” and “dangerous radicals” with some sense of relief. The other concern was that these people might eventually want to return to Canada and therefore there would be a need to watch out them.

The experience of these idealists in the Karelian Socialist Republic has been well documented. Actively recruited and initially welcome, the project eventually failed in the wake of a Stalinist backlash of denunciations, arrests, interrogations, imprisonments, deportations, torture, and executions. The irony of having departed “repressive” capitalist Canada only to find the workers state was actually a police state was not lost on many who had gone to Karelia. Those who could escape back to “White” Finland and Canada did so. Others who had not made the pilgrimage to the workers state, thought the reports of the returnees were at best incredulous and at worst treacherous. However, CPC membership declined as a result of the departure to Karelia from 1929–1931, even though the FOC continued to support the party. A large percentage of the CPC membership that remained was Finnish, however, the community was never the firm political base it once was after the experiences in Karelia.

In 1932 the RCMP received a tip that radical Finns were returning from Karelia. Immigration agents were ordered to scrutinize anyone who was returning to Canada and had been to the Soviet Union. If the person was a Canadian citizen, there were no legal grounds to hold them for further questioning. However, the immigration
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agents were told to conduct examinations “irrespective of the documents they present in the nature of passports or citizenship papers.”

During the unfolding of a Finnish espionage case in 1933–1934 the British consulate in Helsinki warned that Finland could be source of future spy plots. In the Finnish press there had been reports of Finns who had resided in Canada but had gone to the Soviet Union and lived there for a time and had returned to Finland. The British consul reported that a number of these returnees had confessed to Finnish police they had been recruited to act as spies for the Soviets. Immigration inspectors were directed to keep an eye for these individuals. Finnish authorities considered these people undesirable and those who claimed to have Canadian citizenship had been referred to the British consulate. In all cases the British reported they were moving cautiously given the circumstances. The obvious concern of the Canadian government was that some of these individuals might eventually return to Canada and even those not identified as spies should be viewed with suspicion. Evgeny Efremkin tracing the return migration of from Karelia back to Canada found that most Finns managed to conceal the fact they had recently resided in the Soviet Union or changed their identity, knowing full well that if they were found out they risked deportation. Canadian authorities despite the obvious concern did not stop many from returning. During the mid-1930s Efremkin found that only 7 of all the returnees indicated they had been to the Soviet Union, the rest managed to hide this fact from Canadian authorities. In total Efremkin found, only 15 were detained for questioning and in the end only 5 returnees were deported.

The Karelian migration was not the first or last time Canadian officials had shared intelligence about radicals. In fact, as Barbara Roberts notes, there were links to, if not outright co-operation with foreign security agencies. She particularly points out that many governments in Europe with anti-communist policies were “fascist and pro-fascist” and she clearly thought Finland fit that description. These countries regarded communists as enemies of the state, and their police would share relevant information through diplomatic and other channels. During these years, Canada relied on the British to handle a great deal of diplomatic communications with countries like Finland, where there was no Canadian
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representative. Roberts states that “the British were only too happy to co-operate with anti-communist authorities in Europe.”

For example, in 1926 the leading Finnish communist newspaper, the Työväenjärjestöjen Tiedonantaja celebrated its third anniversary. In one issue it published congratulatory letters from Finnish-Canadians, complete with names and addresses. Perhaps as a courtesy, or simply because the Finnish authorities assumed Canada would want to know about potential communist agitators, Commissioner Starnes of the RCMP obtained a copy. He forwarded it to the Deputy Minister of Immigration (DMoI), because it was likely the department would want to act. Once Finland began actively pursuing anti-communist policies information continued to be forwarded to the Canadian federal police force. In another case a number of Finnish communists had been purged from the party and a confidential source thought they might seek refuge in Canada. A list of names and subsequently photographs were sent from Finland to the RCMP in 1928. Immigration officers were provided with the information and directed to be on the lookout for these individuals. In other cases it was Canadians, like Reverend Thomas Jones, who thought it their patriotic duty to inform authorities about dangers Red Finns. With contacts in the Finnish community around Sudbury he was perhaps better placed than police to keep an eye on potentially dangerous Reds like Hannes Sula, who returned from a visit to the Soviet Union in 1930. In 1934 in connection with the above mentioned Finnish spy case, the RCMP shared with the British Security Service MI5 information about CPC leader Tim Buck, which had surfaced around his 1931 trial. In turn the British passed this information along to Finland.

By 1937 it appeared support for communism was on the decline among Finnish-Canadians, in no small part due to the Karelian experience. A CPR representative who paid a visit to the “Scandinavian” settlements in Canada told the RCMP that according to one returned Finn “a number of Canadian Finns have been visiting Finland and Russia and that their visits have had a surprising effect in
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curing them of Communism in Canada.” Vapaus was “fast losing ground on account of the general feeling that Communism does not offer these people what they have been looking for.” More and more Finns were settling down, marrying and taking up farming, creating a noted shortage of Finnish domestics.

Soon the dossiers about the subject of Karelia were filed away. That they had been forgotten was clear by 1942. At the height of the Second World War officers with the Polish Air Force serving in the Soviet Union encountered some 50 individuals working at a saw mill at the “Swierdlowskoj Oblasti” who spoke both Finnish and English. The Poles thought “that they were definitely English people” and passed the information along to British authorities. To emphasize the image of difference, the Poles observed these people “were better dressed than the Russians.” They claimed to have come from Britain around 1933. Their automobiles and other valuables were confiscated by the NKVD and they had been forced to work as conscript labour. Despite their requests to be allowed to return to Britain they had been detained in the Soviet Union. When the Continuation War began they had been evacuated from the Finnish frontier and moved inland.

The British Foreign Office realized that these men might actually be Finnish-Canadians who had immigrated to the Soviet Union to work as lumber jacks in Karelia. While the investigation continued, Canada was asked “whether any considerable number of these people failed to return to Canada.” External Affairs could not even confirm if any Finnish-Canadians had gone to Karelia, but the Director of Immigration F.C. Blair, was able to report that a group of about 30 left in 1930 and another 210 in 1932. He stressed that these people were all communists and had been recruited to take up residence in the Soviet Union. The names of the individuals could be provided if necessary, but his branch “cannot furnish definite information as to their citizenship though some were likely naturalized Canadians and others born in the country.” It was also impossible to say how many of them
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may have returned to Canada. There was no further inquiry into the situation. Part of the reason for this was the “Karelian Exodus” did something which Canadian authorities wanted, but except for a few high-profile exceptions were unable to accomplish. It rid the country of many who were deemed radical and dangerous.669

4.4 Spanish Civil War

Comparable to the departure for Karelia was the Canadian government response when many later left Canada to fight for the Republican side during the Spanish Civil War from 1936–1939. The civil war in Spain erupted in July 1936 when the Spanish Army, supported by conservative nationalist political parties and groups rebelled against the legitimate Republican government.670 The nationalist rebels were supported by Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy with contingents of troops, technical advisors, arms, and material. Opposing them on the Republican side was a coalition of labour unions, Basque and Catalan nationalists, left-wing and moderate liberal political parties, as well as various anarchist, socialist, and communist political movements. It was a mix of often conflicting visions of the image of a future Spain and in the confusion of the conflict at times Republicans were as much at odds with each other as the Nationalists, but the one thing that united them was their opposition to Franco or Fascism. Mexico and France provided some weapons and equipment, but the largest country to support the Republican side with military advisors, arms, and material was the Soviet Union. The Republican side was also bolstered by the arrival of thousands of foreign volunteers, most of who would be formed into units known as the International Brigades.671

Among the volunteers were individual Canadians who made their way to Spain, but the majority were recruited and funded by the CPC.672 The volunteers were a mixed group that included Canadian citizens and immigrants, of whom there were
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many Finns who were Canadian by birth, naturalized or immigrants. The motivations for these men to fight for Spain depended on the individual, as Michael Petrou has shown they varied from economic motives, for adventure, to ideological and political conviction. A large majority of the Canadians who went were members of the CPC or affiliated organizations. Because the CPC was screening the recruits, it is likely, Ian Parenteau argues, that many became party members to be found politically acceptable but were actually motivated by the Popular Front message that they were fighting against fascism and for democracy, more than communist ideology. Nonetheless the Canadians who fought in Spain were branded by the police and Canadian officials as “Red.”

Canada, like Britain and the US adopted a policy of neutrality and non-intervention. However, not until April 1937 did the government take any measures to prevent volunteers from leaving, by passing the Foreign Enlistment Act, which was followed in August by regulations prohibiting the issuing of passports to go to Spain. This was done in response to a growing rift in public opinion. English speaking Canada was largely sympathetic to the Republican cause, while more conservative Quebec was anti-Republican. Prime Minister King was of the view the prohibition was needed to preserve national unity. It now became illegal to enlist in a foreign military at war with a friendly country or induce someone to do so. This included civil wars, thereby making volunteering and recruiting to fight in Spain illegal. Recruiting by CPC had to be done discreetly to avoid the attention of the RCMP.

However, as the Security Bulletins for 1936–1937 clearly show the police were fully aware of what was going on and that Finnish-Canadians were raising funds and volunteering to fight. The RCMP expended considerable effort to keep an eye on these developments because they considered any volunteers a future threat, since it would provide many communist supporters with military training and experience. The upside of the situation was comparable to the migration to Karelia. Commissioner James H. Howden thought the Spanish situation was good, because
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“We are getting rid of a lot of undesirables who may never return, but laws should be enforced if possible.” However, despite the new law and police pressure to do something, the government did nothing fearing a public opinion backlash similar to the crackdowns on the CPC.

Even though there were no prosecutions under the Foreign Enlistment Act, the authorities could still use the existing immigration regulations to prevent some of the volunteers from returning to Canada. Two immigration officials were sent to Spain towards the end of 1938 to screen the Canadian volunteers to ensure they had in fact lived in Canada before the war. Only a few were rejected for not being able to prove their Canadian connection. The rest started to return to Canada in February 1939 in large groups and individually. Others returned to Canada indirectly by first going to another European country or the US. The RCMP kept these Spanish Civil War volunteers under surveillance for several decades thereafter, but Spain was soon overshadowed by the Second World War. Canadian military policy regarding Spanish Civil War veterans was inconsistent. Even though there was no policy or regulation which prohibited them from enlisting, some veterans found themselves rejected because they had fought in Spain. Some who apparently were on some black list were released from service because of their time in Spain, while many individuals served in the Canadian military at home and overseas without any trouble. This included men like Jules Päiviö and Sulo Heino who served out the war in Canada, but it was learned later this might have been, so authorities could keep an eye on them.

4.5 The Finnish Spy Case

An example of a situation which contributed to negative images of Finland as a source of dangerous people and ideas was a news story which broke worldwide in October 1933. It was learned that the Finnish authorities made several arrests and were investigating a spy ring. Some of those arrested had Canadian passports, such as the woman who went by the name Mary Martin. The case had been broken by espionage agents were caught with fraudulently Canadian passports. A similar controversy erupted again in 2006 and 2010 with Russians posing as Canadians. Al-Qaeda, Mossad, Hezbollah and the CIA at various times.
the dramatic defection to the Soviet Union, with state secrets pertaining to weapons designs, by Lieutenant Vilho Armas Pentikäinen, a member of the Finnish General Staff.\(^{684}\) This along with the subsequent suspicious death of the manager of Finland’s largest munitions plant exposed the spy ring to police. The investigation soon linked Pentikäinen to Martin and her associates Lydia Sthal, Arvid Verner Jacobson, Janis Alfred Tiltin, and others. Evidence connected the case to a similar spy ring in France and it soon interested most every national police force and intelligence agency in Europe and North America concerned about Soviet activities in their countries.\(^{685}\) Even though the case was sensational at the time, aside from the brief mention in secondary accounts about the history of espionage, it is not generally known outside Finland.\(^{686}\)

It was a wakeup call for the DEA and USSEA O.D. Skelton began to make inquiries. From the passport office he learned there had been no less than seven passports issued to women named Mary Martin since 1930.\(^{687}\) Though the newspaper reports indicated the spies were “Finnish Reds,” it occurred to Skelton “that the country chiefly interested in espionage in Finland would be the Soviet Union” and naively wondered if there were any persons in Canada connected with Soviet activities.\(^{688}\) Subsequent news reports confirmed Skelton’s suspicion. The RCMP was responsible for counter espionage and it was the logical place to ask. As Skelton received his education on spying in Canada he observed that “The plot thickens” the more was uncovered about Mrs. Martin.\(^{689}\)

The RCMP had managed to infiltrate the CPC and reported many of its findings in the Security Bulletins. Logically Canadian officials wanted to cancel any
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fraudulently obtained passports connected with the case. The problem was public announcement of this would endanger RCMP counter-espionage activities. The Finnish spy case provided some valuable intelligence, since the individuals who had signed the fraudulent passport applications, vouching for the identity of the people, later found to be spies, was useful in locating other spies.\footnote{MacBrien to Skelton, No. 33 D1026-Q-7, 8 November 1933; MacBrien to Skelton, No. 33 D 1026-Q-7, 13 November 1933, LAC, RG25 G1, Vol. 1674, File 1933-763.} If the suspicions of the CPC were aroused they would simply find others who the RCMP knew nothing about. It is for this reason as early as 1924 the RCMP had allowed their agent to supply to Tim Buck, who was a high ranking Canadian communist, his own birth certificate from the province of Quebec and others from his family with the name Pacquette.\footnote{The birth certificate document acquisition and passport applications involved Tim Buck and other well-known Canadian and American communists. In 1929 Tim Buck became the General Secretary of the CPC. MacBrien to Skelton, No. 33 D 1026-Q-7, 13 November 1933, LAC, Ibid. The RCMP reported in 1929 that C. Paquette was a member of the editorial committee for a new French language communist newspaper, the \textit{L'Ouvrier Canadien}. RCMP, No. 327, 17 July 1926, “Weekly Summary Notes Regarding Revolutionary Organizations and Agitators in Canada Report” in Kealey and Whitaker 1994, 306.} They had known about Mary Louise Martin since June 1929, but because of the “anxiety to protect our agent in Montreal” the RCMP had hesitated in sharing any details sooner.\footnote{MacBrien to USSEA, No. 33 D1026-Q7, 2 February 1934, LAC, RG25 G1, Vol. 1674, File 1933-763. This concern was derived from the fact in 1928 one highly placed RCMP agent had been exposed. See Parnaby and Kealey 1997.}

Scotland Yard was also interested because the names Marie Louise and Pacquette were connected to the prominent spy case of subverted British officer, Lieutenant Norman Baillie-Stewart.\footnote{MacBrien to Skelton, No. 33 D 1026-Q-7, 13 November 1933, LAC, RG25 G1, Vol. 1674, File 1933-763. The British authorities later learned their assessment had been incorrect. At the trial it was revealed he had been dealing with a male German officer who used the alias Marie Louise. Because the trial was held in camera the misinformation connecting Schul to the case was perpetuated for several decades. “Spy Linked with Baillie Stewart,” \textit{Montreal Star} 6 November 1933; “‘Canadian’ is Linked to Tower Prisoner,” \textit{Toronto Star} 6 November 1933; “Link Woman ‘Spy’ With British Case,” \textit{New York Times} 6 November 1933. See for example Newman 1940, 107–110, 270–271; Murphy 2003, 50–55; Baillie-Stewart 1967; Franklin 1967, 43–45; Volodarsky 2015, 531 n7; Makin 1937, 80–82, 89.} The Americans by this time also wanted to share information with Canada. One of the accomplices was an American citizen, Arvid Verner Jacobson, who some reports indicated had passed himself off as Canadian. He was a Finnish-American born in Michigan. The US authorities provided a physical description and photograph and thought this information might be of some use if the Canadian investigation involved Jacobson.\footnote{Many sources give his middle name as Werner. W.D. Herridge, Canadian Minister to the United States (CMUS) to Skelton, 6 December 1933; Canadian Legation Washington (CLW) to Skelton, 16}
What the RCMP had learned was that in December 1927 a person posing as J.C. Pacquette was issued a passport and a few months later one was issued to someone posing as his wife Marie Louise Pacquette. Later it was learned that it was Janis Alfred Tiltin and Marie Emma Schul posing as the Pacquette’s. The fraudulent Pacquette’s traveled around Canada and the US in the company of senior ranking communists to give the appearance of being a normal couple. In February 1930 using a document called a “deed poll,” the Paquette’s legally changed their name to Alfred Joseph Martin and Marie Louise Martin and obtained new passports. The name changes effectively covered the tracks of these agents, since it was only after the arrests in Finland that the RCMP made the connection of the Martin’s to the Soviet network.

Not until the beginning of December 1933 was there any contact with Finland on the matter. The consul general asked if the passport issued to Martin was genuine? Based on the Finnish investigation Martin was of Latvian origin. Therefore, the authenticity of the Canadian passport was in doubt and they needed to clarify who was posing as M.L. Martin. Unless otherwise advised the Finnish authorities were going to consider her a Canadian. This of course also concerned the British authorities since if she was a Canadian citizen Martian would be entitled to consular support. The Canadian response was to provide the details of the passport application and stress the fact it had been obtained using false documents which deceived Canadian officials. The Canadian response while factual was evasive,
likely part of the effort to protect the RCMP agent and failed to actually confirm if Martin was a Canadian citizen or not. Canadian officials needed a photo of the arrested person, so they could confirm if she was a citizen. Nonetheless by early January 1934 sufficient information had been gathered to cancel the passports issued in the names of Paquette and Martin.701

Finnish authorities closed the case by putting 28 individuals on trial at the court of appeal in Turku in February 1934 for espionage. The cases were heard in camera due to the sensitive security nature of the evidence and in part because the Finnish cabinet did not want to provoke the Soviet government. Twenty-four were convicted in April and the other four were acquitted.702 Martin, now identified as Maria Emma Schul, received a prison sentence of 8 years hard labour, a fine of 70,000 markkaa and had her civil rights revoked for 15 years.703 Jacobson was given 5 years hard labour and a fine of 50,000 markkaa.704 The others received similar punishments of varying severity.705 The conclusion of the trials did not
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701 Dominions Office to SSEA, No. 42, 29 January 1934; Skelton to MacBrien, 2 February 1934, LAC, Ibid.
703 Finnish television made a three-part drama around the case of Martin in December 1996. “Rotanloukku” (Rat-trap). Postimees 2 December 1996. http://www.postimees.ee (15.7.2015). Her given names are identified in various sources as Mary, Marie, Maria and Marija with or without the middle name Emma, which is sometimes hyphenated or incorrectly uses the assumed name Louise. These variations also apply to the aliases Paquette and Martin. For a time, she used the alias Maria Uspenskaya. Some Russian sources give the name Yurievna. Her last name is sometimes given as Schule or Schulin. Finnish sources occasionally refer to her as Schul-Martin. Her Latvian name was Marija Emma Sul. At other times she is identified using her married name Tiltin or Tyltyn, but also Tyltynin. After serving her 8 years of penal servitude Schul was “taken into protective custody.” It is often cited that she died in confinement in 1938, but one of the 27 aliens deported to German controlled Estonia on 6 November 1942 was “Marija-Emma Schul.” She was murdered at Auschwitz Concentration Camp, 15 December 1943. The camp records give her date and place of birth as 5 April 1896, Doblen. In the list provided to the Gestapo by the VALPO her birthdate was 22 March 1896. Rautkallio 1987, 138–139 n31, Appendix 261–262; Sana 2003, 259–262; Rislakki 1982, 531–537. See Lurie and Kochik 2003, 477 in “Tyltyn’ (Shul’), Maria (Maria-Emma) Yurievna (1896–1938?).” http://www.documentstalk.com (15.7.2015). Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum Archives, Camp Chancellery Records, Department II, Sterbebücher (Death Books), Schul, Marija. http://auschwitz.org/en/museum (15.7.2015).
704 After an appeal, Jacobson was pardoned because he agreed to reveal what he knew about Soviet espionage. Some popular accounts report, he then “disappeared from sight,” but this was not the case. He renounced communism and returned to Christianity. Contrary to the assessment by security services that he was unintelligent, Jacobson earned a PhD in mathematics from the University of Michigan and was hired as a professor at Wayne State University, Detroit in 1944. He became a pioneer in computer programming until he went into private consulting in 1959. Toledano and Lasky 1950, 104. On Jacobson’s post prison life see Lee 1995, 191–193.
bring an end to the interest in the case by police and intelligence services. Indeed, these agencies and espionage historians would continue to try to unravel the web of Soviet agents for decades after. The hope was that information and connections to other individuals in various countries would help make some sense of the relationship of the Martin case to other spy rings.

4.6 Canadian Images Red and White

It is evident that in Canada Finns acquired a perceived, but only partly justified reputation as dangerous agitators and radicals. The change in the image of Finns from ideal settlers and workers was obvious to observers in the 1920s and 1930s. The evolving negative image was something that troubled the various Finnish consuls and honorary vice consuls like Akseli Rauanheimo, Erick J. Korte and Adiel Saarimäki. Within their limited resources they did their best to try and counter the influence of Red Finns and the spread of radicalism. They were only partly successful at promoting the positive image of Finns and Finland. Canadian officials during the 1920s and 1930s did try to prevent immigration to Canada from Finland, but employers still wanted Finns. Even when immigration was effectively closed in 1931, reliable, hardworking Finns could still be admitted if they were going to become farmers or as domestics, which can be attributed to the residual aspects of the latent positive image Canadians had of Finns, more than it could to the efforts of the consuls.

During the Finnish Civil War pro-German sympathies among some of the White Finns created the image of Finland as an enemy. After the war, once it was clear Finland was not a satellite of Germany, Canadian images of Finland come to embrace White Finland as the true representation of the country and people. Lingering pro-German sympathies in the country, even if this was seen as a way to counter balance the threat of the Soviet Union, would be a cause for minor concern. The danger of Finland becoming a totalitarian state also existed because of the

---

706 For example, the British files start in 1933, with the last document dated in 1952, but the file was last consulted in 1985. TNA KV 2/1899 Parts 1 and 2; KV 2/1900 Parts 1 to 4; KV 2/1901 Parts 1 to 4, File “Tilton, Janis Alfred-Schuhl, Marija Emma.”

707 As one writer later noted there are conflicting dates and details depending on the accuracy of the sources used make it hard to unravel the mystery surrounding the case. Latham 1966, 80–81 n31.

708 Vasiliadis 1989, 141.

presence of right-wing extremist movements, as much as from the left. However, the country’s rejection of fascism during the failed “coup” in 1932 and the banning of the Lapua movement, offered hope that the Finns would remain democratic.\textsuperscript{710} Nonetheless, the positive images of Finland and Finns came to be associated with the recognised government of Finland. Conservative Finns could still use perceptions of Finland as a modern, liberal, democratic, Christian, and progressive country in their efforts to reinforce a positive image of Finns for Canadian society.

Left-wing influence was unopposed since for many years there was no group representing the conservative Finns. Conservative Finns could have united through the church and associated non-socialist temperance societies but, the Finnish Lutheran Church did not have an active missionary campaign among migrant Finns. The Suomi Synod, otherwise known as the Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, established some scattered congregations, but its missionary work was limited to sending some visiting pastors a few times a year. Individual congregations constructed churches such as in New Finland and Sault Ste. Marie, used lay clergy or met in people’s homes. Socialist Finns took advantage of this void and so did other religious denominations, with Pentecostal churches, the United Church of Canada, the Presbyterian Church of Canada, and others establishing Finnish congregations in various communities.\textsuperscript{711}

From the First World War on one of the self-proclaimed benefits many missionaries in Canada stressed according to historian Terrance Craig, was that religion was an antidote to communist ideas.\textsuperscript{712} In defence of conservative Finns Reverend Heinonen offered his 1930 publication \textit{Finnish Friends in Canada}. Heinonen called on fellow English-Canadian, United Church minister, Colin. G. Young to write the introduction. Young perpetuated the positive image by stating: “The Finnish people in Canada represent a high type of citizens. Capable, industrious, noted for their cleanliness and frugal habits, they are making a large contribution to the building of this new nation.”\textsuperscript{713} Finns were “sturdy people,” freedom loving, literate and “They readily adapt themselves to Canadian life for the climate is not unlike what they have left, and the industries of lumbering,

\textsuperscript{710} Its successor the Isänmaallinen kansanliike participated in democratic elections with limited success. It was of course part of the wider wave of extremism that existed in world during the interwar years. On Finnish nationalism and right-wing extremism see Rintala 1962; Rintala 1968. The newsmagazine \textit{Current History}, available in Canada, covered this aspect of Finland. Hertzberg 1933b; Crotch 1937.


\textsuperscript{712} Craig 1997, 37.

\textsuperscript{713} C.G. Young, “Introduction,” Heinonen 1930, v.
mining, and farming come naturally to them.”  

Finns therefore were desirable immigrants and future citizens regardless of if they became farmers or labourers and it was thought this was recognized by other Canadians. Yet, Young noted the difficulty of getting Finns to accept new ideas concerning farming and that the same applied to political ideas. It was a failing caused by the idealism of the Finn. In a country with extremes of climate and long dark winters, Finns “become dreamers and philosophers...pondering over deep questions.”  

Once an idea takes hold “they never drop it until they have drawn out the utmost consequences” in a sort of stubbornness they “throw themselves...into the fight of the hour” and “will go to the extreme in all their theories.”  

Once socialist ideas began to take root, “The world was divided into two parts,” black and white, where “All the dogmas, or none at all, had to be accepted, there could be no middle way.”

Church Finns therefore offered Canadians an alternative image to the radical dangerous socialist Finns. However, Heinonen and others had their own agenda to promote the missionary causes they worked for. Church life offered an alternative form of activism for Finns in Canada and their activities were revitalized by the arrival of many more religious Finns in the 1920s. These conservative Finns in Canada developed an ethnic nationalism which promoted the retention of Finnish language and culture and was supportive of Finland, while at the same time also in line with the political goals of the host Anglo-Canadian society. While there were some Finns in Canada who supported the Lapua movement, the number wearing black shirts and goose stepping their way around was very small. Most conservative groups forming in the 1920s and 1930s sought to unite nationalist Finns to fight communism, improve the image of Finns in Canada, and help their members find jobs. Conservative Finns, who could now also be called nationalist Finns, in the minds of Canadians represented what was good about Finland.

Such “loyalist” groups went to great length to demonstrate their commitment to Canada and its institutions. For example, during the spring of 1931 Reverend A.

\[714\] Ibid.
\[715\] Ibid., 49.
\[716\] Ibid.
\[717\] Ibid.
\[719\] The nationalist and conservative fraternal organization the Knights and Ladies of Kaleva was founded in the United States in 1898 by John Stone (anglicized from Johannes Oxelstein), an immigrant from Oulu. It had the aim of preserving and promoting Finnish culture, in particular the study of the national epic, the Kalevala. The organization was not able to establish any lodges (majat) in Canada until after the Second World War. Ukkonen 2002, 9–10, 13, 145, 150–151.
\[720\] Lindström 2000a, 23–24.
Lappala formed the Finnish Nationalist Society in Timmins. This group soon merged with several other conservative bodies which had formed across Canada in the previous decade, to form the Central Organization of the Loyal Finns in Canada or the Loyal Finns.721 Among the main aims of the new society was to fight the communist peril and promote the fact there were many Finns loyal to Canada. To demonstrate their intent, the minutes of meetings were often forwarded to the appropriate authorities in the Canadian and Ontario governments.722 The language used to describe their activities emphasized the danger of the radicals and showed it was the “loyalists” who opposed the professional “agitators” who spread “alien” ideologies. The Red Finns were by definition “aliens” and the conservatives were “good citizens,” not “aliens,” and the “good ethnics.”723 One benefit of loyalty was thought to be access to employment. Loyal Finn leaders would identify communists to employers and the authorities. Mine and lumber companies were then able to form “blacklists” to ensure communists Finns were not hired. There were cases where employers would insist on proof that a Finn was not a communist and a Loyal Finn letter of reference attesting to the “White character and religious spirit” of the applicant.724 The Loyal Finn organization also screened its members. A membership application could be rejected if a person was thought to be “too friendly with Communists,” if he was not legally married to the woman he lived with or was suspected of wanting membership only to secure employment.725 Loyalists could also help the authorities keep an eye on the radicals by translating radical literature and offer suggestions on how to respond to perceived threats.726

However, the Red scare had begun to abate by 1934. The case of Canada’s most populous province Ontario is illustrative. In 1934 the provincial election removed the Conservative Party from power and brought the Liberal Party of Michel Hepburn to office. The attorney general appointed by the Liberals was Arthur Roebuck, who had been Vaara’s lawyer during the sedition trial. Anti-radical rhetoric from Ontario government sources began to decline, since the radicals were seen to be in retreat and no longer a significant threat. For example, the pro-Liberal newspaper the Toronto Daily Star, began to run articles that criticized the

722 Examples of other such “loyalist” groups from other immigrant communities were the Ukrainian Prosvita Society, and the Croatian Peasant Party. Vasiliadis 1989, 158–163.
723 Vasiliadis 1989, 154–155. Similar descriptions of the loyalists can be found in Lindström 2000a, 24–27.
conservative Finns for running “job rackets” that bought and sold jobs for Finns.727 Socialist Finns were once again able to find jobs. The conservative Finns, on the other hand, continued to point out the danger the radical and socialist Finns posed and stress their own loyalty, even after the host society no longer found this useful.

Within left-wing Finnish-Canadian circles, there was also a divide, which resulted in a muting of the radicalism of part of the group. The efforts of the Comintern to “Bolshevize” and radicalize the CPC for a class struggle, included the elimination of the language federations within the party and this drew opposition from many Finns. It came to a head in 1931 when large numbers of more moderate socialist Finns rejected the CPC and its version of a class movement. The FOC membership split as the more moderate faction created its own rival organization, the Finnish Workers’ and Farmers’ Federation and soon after launched its own newspaper *Vapaa Sana*.728 In addition they built their own halls. The hall in South Porcupine was symbolically named “Harmony Hall” as a sign of reconciliation with the host society. As an organization it allied itself with the main Anglo-Canadian socialist party the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF). The CCF was not a party endorsed by the Canadian elites, but did have the benefit of legitimacy, since it advocated change through the existing political, economic, and social systems of Canada.729

Conclusion

By the end of the 1930s the majority of Finnish-Canadians had a positive image in Canada. What the evolving perceptions of Finnish-Canadians indicate is a particular image or set of images of Finland. In the minds of Canadian officials who dealt with Finnish-Canadians and the perceived danger that community harboured, Finland was a source of problems. Although there was recognition that among Finnish-Canadians there were law abiding individuals who wanted to contribute to Canadian society, there were also those who had been seduced by radical ideas, were enemies of the state, and posed a danger to the existing social, economic, and political order. When many radical Finns left the country to go to Karelia or fight in the Spanish Civil War it was greeted with a sense of relief that many of those radicals were no longer able to cause trouble in Canada. This enemy image was

727 Cited in Vasiliadis 1989, 158.
729 Vasiliadis 1989, 156.
also balanced by a more positive image of Finland as a liberal, democratic, capitalist country, which was in many ways similar to Canada. The intelligence information about Red Finns in Canada provided by Finnish authorities did not produce an image of an authoritarian regime suppressing civil liberties in the guise of anti-communist purges. Rather, it suggested that Finland was like Canada, struggling to maintain its democratic freedoms in the face of elements of the population who were attempting to use those same freedoms of speech, association, and assembly to subvert the liberal order which provided them. This was a sympathetic and friendly image of Finland.

Even during the 1930s as Canadians endured the economic dislocation of the Great Depression, the positive image persisted and even grew. Evidence of this is a clipping in the files of the Department of Immigration titled “Courage,” from the 1933 Canadian edition of a popular American general interest magazine. The writer found in the face of adversity an everyday hero in the Finnish labourer, who when the economic situation deteriorated, persevered on his farm “in the back country of Ontario.”730 This Finn was still seen as the other since he was “An alien, an oddity to the back-country Canadians among whom he has cast his lot, a queer foreigner who speaks stumbling English, he is ready for another winter. He meets it smiling, working, creating, owning, boss of his own destiny, a free man” who “has that quality of courage that can stand battering. He has the courage of the pioneers who carved homes out of the bush in Quebec and Ontario, who rumbled across the prairies in oxcarts to take up wilderness homesteads.”731 In other words he had “sisu,” though the article never used the word. Canadians understood a similar concept when they used words like “guts,” “grit,” determination, pluck, mettle, and fortitude. This was why Canada had wanted Finns in the first place and concepts like sisu would play an important role in the Canadian image of brave little Finland that evolved in the following decade.

731 Ibid.
Establishment of Normal Relations

The Canadian-Finnish relationship consisted of more than occasional official contacts at international bodies like the League of Nations. At home of more immediate concern had been immigration policy and the problem of Finnish-Canadian radicals. The official interactions that occurred over low policy areas during the 1920s and 1930s occupied more of the time of Canadian political leaders, diplomats, civil servants, and officials. Normal relations were conducted through a series of bilateral and multilateral agreements to which Canada and Finland were parties. These interactions involved such low policy areas as trade, with agreements to facilitate trade such as tonnage measurement, postal arrangements, mechanisms for legal proceedings, and also scientific exchanges. The Canadian-Finnish relationship also involved some of the typical diplomatic niceties, such as when during the 1927 Diamond Jubilee of the Canadian confederation, Finnish Prime Minister Väinö Tanner by telegram expressed “Finland’s admiration for the wonderful development of Canada during the period now passed through.”

The images involved in such routine normal relations were generally positive even though they were not explicitly presented in that way by civil servants at the Department of External Affairs and Trade and Commerce. If trade is regarded as a competition or zero-sum game, then Finland could be regraded as an opponent, the other against which Canadian trade competed. The general ideological outlook of the individuals who formed Canada’s trade and foreign policy favoured freer trade because as a trading nation Canada’s economic well being was dependant of foreign markets. Therefore, even though the Finnish market was small in terms of overall Canadian trade, the relationship was symbolically valuable as an example of how the Canadian government was working to open up markets for Canadian goods. Except for the issue of Finnish and Swedish language books and the method of calculating duty the trade relationship was regarded positively. On these issues Canadian trade officials found the Finns to be difficult, even stubborn, however, it was the Canadian failure to apply MFN treatment within a reasonable amount of time which lay at the root of the problem. Once diplomatic recognition of Finnish independence was in place such low policy interactions like trade and scientific exchanges constituted the establishment of normal relations.

732 Tanner to King, 1 July 1927, LAC, MG26 J1, Vol. 178, Reel C2201.
5.1 Trade and Commerce

High policy issues of war and peace have a larger profile, but it would be low policy areas which would constitute the larger portion of the Canadian-Finnish relationship. One of the first low policy decisions made by Canada was to permit letter and parcel mail to be sent to Finland. The movement of mail between countries was regulated by international agreement through the Universal Postal Union, established in 1878 by the Treaty of Bern. Canada received notice of Finnish adhesion to the treaty had occurred 12 February 1918. Postal service to Finland had been facilitated by the original Imperial Russian adhesion to the agreement. During the war ordinary mail service to Finland was maintained but was suspended when Finland was added to the territories under control of the enemy in September 1918. Tacit recognition of Finnish independence was made after 6 December 1918 when Britain suspended all mail to Russia, except for Finland and those areas where the British had expeditionary forces. With the recognition of the Finnish government in May 1919, Canadian letter mail service to Finland was resumed and parcels were routed through either Britain or Sweden. In August 1919 postal officials were informed of this by an amendment to the Canadian Official Postal Guide and its formal inclusion in the 1920 edition. Subsequent notice was received from Britain of the Finnish ratification of the postal union revisions stemming from the 1920 congress and subsidiary agreements regarding transmission of money orders, insured letters, boxes, parcels, and subscriptions for newspapers and periodicals. Canada would receive notice of future changes to postal polices either directly from the postal union offices in Switzerland, through the British Colonial Office, or directly from Finland through the consulate in Montreal. For example, in the last instance Canada dealt directly with Finland in late 1925 to create an agreement on the exchange of postal money orders. Postal service was an essential aspect of Canada-Finland trade and important for Finnish-Canadians to remain in contact with friends and family in Finland. Until the time it

733 It was the Universal Postal Convention, 26 May 1906. Ruffy, Le Directeur, Bureau International de L’Union Postale Universelle, No. 890/18, 18 March 1918, LAC, RG3 C1, Vol. 644, File 89090.
734 “Mail Service to Finland and Russia,” nd.; “Memorandum for File Re: Finland,” nd.; Postmaster General 1919, 5, LAC, Ibid.
735 Ibid.
736 It was the Spanish ambassador in London, informing Britain that Finland on 30 December 1921 had deposited the ratifications of the Universal Postal Convention and other conventions and agreements signed at Madrid 30 November 1920. Winston S. Churchill, SSFC to Duke of Devonshire, Governor General, No. 24, 21 January 1922, LAC, Ibid.
737 Canada 1926. The agreement came into effect 1 February 1926.
was once again suspended during the Continuation War, postal service to Finland from Canada was a sign of normal relations between the two countries.

There were numerous other treaties, agreements, conventions, and protocols, both bilateral and multilateral, signed in the interwar period, to which both Canada and Finland were a party that reflected the conduct of normal relations. For example, in 1924 Canada acceded to the Anglo-Finnish agreement regulating the measurement of ship tonnage.737 Canada extended notification in September 1928 that it would adhere to the treaty for the extradition of criminals signed between Britain and Finland in 1924.738 This was followed in 1935 by an exchange of notes extending the 1931 convention signed between Britain and Finland regarding legal proceedings in civil matters.739

Canada and Finland had a trade relationship which existed prior to Finnish independence. The trade in forest products historically had been an area of competition between the British North American colonies, which eventually became Canada and Finland. The areas broadly defined as the Baltic and Scandinavia were an essential source of timber for Britain from the seventeenth century onward. Finland was included in one of these areas either as part of the Swedish realm, part of the Russian Empire and later as an independent state. This included both timber and forest products for ship construction and lumber for building. The need for timber therefore had an influence on British foreign and commercial policy. Baltic timber, including Finnish timber was at a competitive advantage. In general, it sold in Britain for a lower cost than similar North American wood and benefited from lower freight rates.

When Baltic timber was cut off by the Napoleonie blockade after the Treaty of Tilsit in 1807, it became necessary to encourage British investment in Canadian timber production on a scale similar to the Baltic. The only drawback was in terms of certain species like oak, where Baltic timber was believed to be better for ship construction than the Canadian variety.740 Britain therefore had additional incentive to encourage immigration and settlement of Canada, because a by-product of clearing land for farming was timber production.741 However, timber magnates needed an incentive to invest in the Canadian trade and were unwilling to do so if


738 Canada 1929b.


Britain later turned to the Baltic as its main supplier. To prevent this British timber merchants and shipping companies were able to have a duty imposed on Baltic timber in 1809. This increased shipping costs, gave preferential treatment to Canadian timber and mirrored British commercial polices such as the Corn Laws, both of which remained in effect until 1860. Canadian wood as a proportion of total British timber imports rose steadily thereafter, but never managed to eliminate the Baltic as a source of supply for Britain. The net result was higher prices for timber in Britain.742 One oddity it created was that occasionally it was cheaper to ship Baltic timber to Canada and then re-export it back to Britain. It has widely been recognized that forestry was a key element in the growth of Canada and indirectly Finland could be said to have played a role, if only a tertiary one.743

Finland was a competitor in the area of forest products, but it was also a potential market for raw materials, agricultural products, and manufactured goods.744 Interest in Finland as a market existed prior to Finnish independence. For example, in 1895 Canada exchanged “Most Favoured Nation” (MFN) treatment with Russia and this included Finland.745 The Department of Trade and Commerce as part of its mandate to encourage Canadian trade, routinely gathered trade information of interest to Canada.746 As with other external activities of the Canadian government in this period, assistance was received from Britain. An example of this occurred in 1909 when advertisements offering pulpwood from “Russian Finland” for sale in US Atlantic ports appeared. It prompted Canada to make inquiries. The investigation determined that this was likely prompted by low prices in Europe, but while it was possible to ship logs or sawn lumber from Finland to North America, it was unlikely because the high cost of shipping at this time offset any cost savings.747 However, Finland generally had lower costs when it came to shipping. In the 1860s for example a Finnish built ship cost roughly 2/3 of a comparable British or Canadian built ship. The difference was they usually only had two decks compared to three for British and Canadian ships. Shipping
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742 Finnish timber was also cut off from British markets during the Crimean War 1854–1856. Finnish shipping and trade were targeted as part of the British war effort against Russia. Canada as part of the British Empire was technically at war with Imperial Russia and therefore also with the Grand Duchy of Finland. Greenhill and Giffard 1988, xi–xii.


745 Hill 1977, 57, 74, 94.

746 Ibid., 69.

747 Charles J. Cooke, His Majesty's British Consul Helsingfors to DMTC, 16 November 1909, LAC, RG25 B1b, Vol. 307, File T-3-87. There was also the implication at least some Canadians differentiated Finland from Russia. See Stewart 1903.
companies also had lower labour costs, with Finnish crews costing approximately 40% less than British and 50% less than Canadian crews. Consequently, there were also many Finnish merchant ships plying the North Atlantic timber trade carrying Canadian forest products to market. By the 1880s as iron and steam replaced wood and sail, Finnish companies were buying used windjammers in Canada, not because they were better than Finnish ships, but it was cheaper to buy used ships. Yrjö Kaukiainen in his history of Finnish shipping claims that among the fleet operating from Åland it was not uncommon to find “Novasotiamen.”

In another case Canada wanted to know about the Finnish import duty on grain and flour. During January 1914, a bill proposing a duty on four imports had been approved by the Russian Council of Ministers and introduced in the Imperial Duma. Prior to this grain had entered Finland duty free. It was also one of several instances in the era of Russification that the Tsar intervened with the Finnish Senate to have duties brought into line with those introduced in Russia. Finland was dependant on imported grain, with upwards of 60% coming from outside the country, mainly from Russia. This was significant because in 1913 there had been no import duty on these products in Finland and it was part of a wider trend of protectionist trade policies in Europe. Agricultural exports, particularly grain products had been an important part of the economic boom in Canada that existed in the first decade of the century. Even though the Finnish market formed only a small part of Canada’s exports, the proposed change to Finnish import duties was a minor concern, but a concern nonetheless. From sources in Britain it was learned that the duty would be 6 markkaa, 50 penniä per 100 kilograms for flour or groats. Rye, barley, oats, wheat, buck-wheat, peas, and beans would have a duty of 30 penni per hundred kilograms levied on them. The impact on the Canadian economy would be slight since the war would do more to disrupt normal trade patterns, but trade officials would continue to monitor Finnish tariffs.

The Department of Trade and Commerce took as one of its main tasks to help Canadian producers find markets for their products. This was done by gathering
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749 Hjerpe 1993, 57, 60.
751 De Matteo 1991.
752 Groats was any partly processed hulled grain, which usually retained the germ and bran portion of the kernel. ICCUK to Mr. F.C.T. O’Hara, DMTC, 10 March 1914, LAC, RG25 A2, Vol. 308, File T-5-73. Canadian trade statistics at this time did not differentiate Finland separately from the rest of the Russian Empire, but in general exports, including grains, had been steadily growing between 1895 and 1914. Canada 1915, 265.
trade information through the “Trade Commissioner Service,” which after 1911 was called the “Commercial Intelligence Service.”753 One task of the civil servants assigned to these offices was to report on the economic situation in the countries under their purview and identify commercial opportunities. The information provided in the periodic reports generated by the Canadian trade commissioners was published in the Commercial Intelligence Journal.754

During the period under consideration, from the end of the First World War to the end of the Second World War, there was no Canadian trade mission stationed in Finland. A “Commercial Agent” was first appointed for “Scandinavia” in 1893. Agents were selected based on their private business activities and paid an honorarium to act as a correspondent reporting on trade conditions. Strictly speaking they were not Canadian government officials, unlike the “Trade Commissioners,” who starting 1907 were employed on a full time basis as part of the Canadian civil service.755 As one of the early appointees Dana Wilgress noted the term trade commissioner “had the established connotation of a government representative.”756 This was the view held by the Department of Trade and Commerce that its trade officials functioned in a quasi-consular fashion, although in actuality they had no diplomatic status since they represented the department and not the government. In some instances, trade commissioners faced difficulty receiving any recognition, especially in non-Commonwealth countries, while others out of courtesy afforded them the same treatment as consuls. Where no Canadian trade commissioner or commercial agent operated, the British consul usually handled inquiries about trade with Canada.757 Information was shared with Canada by Britain through the British commercial intelligence publication the Board of Trade Journal.758 During this early period Finland is seldom mentioned and was loosely included as part of Scandinavia or Russia, which was often the responsibility of someone stationed in Germany or the Netherlands.

753 Hill 1977, 69.
754 It required a paid subscription of $1 per year. The format and frequency of the publications presenting commercial intelligence varied over the years. It began with the Weekly Report, which ran from February 1904–May 1915 and was followed by the Weekly Bulletin from May 1915–December 1921. The Commercial Intelligence Journal was published form January 1922–December 1946, which was superseded by the monthly Foreign Trade from January 1947–October 1973.
756 Wilgress 1967, 15.
758 For example, Proposed 1920. American trade information from the US consulate in Helsinki was also used, such as: Needs 1920.
There was some confusion over the status of Finland caused by the First World War. Because of the disruption to food imports by the Russian Revolution in 1917, Finland tried to acquire wheat and flour from Canada. The general policy during the war had been to restrict export licences for grain to other parts of the British Empire and Allied countries. When the Finnish request to purchase 6,500 tons of flour from the Ogilvie Company arrived in May 1917, the British government encouraged Canada to prohibit export of flour and grain to neutral countries. This was an interesting turn of phrase since Finland was still part of the Russian Empire and technically an ally. In the end Britain prevented the sale of the flour by citing that shipping was more urgently needed for the war effort and that Finland’s needs should be supplied by Russia.759

A similar Finnish purchase was stopped, and the flour requisitioned by the Canadian government in June 1918. There was confusion in the Canadian Department of Agriculture, where it was thought it had been purchased for Russia. The Finnish Legation in Washington had to educate Canadian officials that even within the Russian Empire, Finland had its own government, budget, state bank, currency, and public debts and that by the time this order had been placed Finland had gained independence. After Finland’s independence was recognized the Canadian government paid compensation for this expropriation in October 1919.760

Recognition of Finland’s independence by the British Empire did not include an automatic resumption of normal trade and commerce. The Allied and Associated Powers continued their economic warfare against Germany, despite the armistice of November 1918. The reason was to pressure Germany to accept Allied demands during the peace negotiations which began in January 1919. All exports to European countries were controlled and monitored by the Canadian Trade Commission. In this the Canadian authorities were guided by directives and policies provided by the British government. Any trade with Finland would require an import licence from the Inter-Allied Trade Committee office established at Helsinki in February.761 There was a substantial list of items that could be exported to Finland, but there were some items which were under embargo, “which for
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759 Harry Lambert, USS for Colonial Office to HCCUK, 3 July 1917; USS Colonial Office to Secretary, HCCUK, No. 53624/1917, 7 November 1917, LAC, RG25 B1b, Vol. 258, File P-3-14; OIC, PC1479, 17 June 1918, LAC, RG2 1Ad, Vol. 2814.
760 E. Ilves, Secretary, Finnish Legation, Washington DC to British Embassy, Washington, No. 827, 26 September 1919; Deputy Minister, DoA to USS, 8 October 1919, LAC, RG17 II, Vol. 1345, File 267725.
761 See Kuisma 2011; Bane and Lutz 1972, 57–61, 357–358, 363.
military reasons should not be imported into Finland.” The concern was that goods shipped to Finland might be re-exported to Germany or Russia. After closer consideration this was thought to be unlikely given the food shortages the country was experiencing and the view that Finland should be regarded as neutral territory, like the other Nordic countries for purposes of the economic blockade. By the end of the year trade restrictions had been relaxed to the point where trade relations could be considered normal.

From the achievement of Finnish independence trade would be a secondary function of one or another trade commissioner in Europe, until one was appointed which included Finland among the Scandinavian countries as part of his wider purview. During the interwar period the person assigned to look after Finland, was typically headquartered in Norway or the Netherlands. Finland was usually only a small part of a larger area that included the Low Countries, Scandinavia, Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Russia, but at times it was simply included in the area of the Baltic States. This seemed to reflect the peripheral nature of Finland in terms of Canadian interests.

On the other hand, Russia was seen by Canadian trade officials as a large untapped market and “border states” like Finland were the key to accessing that market according to Dana Wilgress. A pamphlet published by the Commercial Intelligence Service in 1922 to encourage trade with Scandinavia made little mention of Finland. The map published with it identifies the Scandinavian countries, but not Finland and the word Russia were printed on the land feature most people would describe as Finland. The report’s author was Norman D. Johnston, an energetic junior trade commissioner who in 1921 had been assigned to investigate if it was worthwhile opening a Scandinavian office. He reported to the Director of the Commercial Intelligence Service that the area was not just worthwhile in terms of the immediate trade potential, but also for the future, since
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762 SSFC to Governor General, No. 266, 9 April 1919; Governor General to SSFC, No. 405, 12 May 1919, LAC, RG25 B1b, Vol. 157, File C12/54.
764 For example, one of the Junior Trade Commissioners from Hamburg or Copenhagen would report on Finland separately or as part of Scandinavia. Johnston 1922a, Hill 1977, 299, 302.
765 For example, in January 1923 L.D. Wilgress was the Canadian Trade Commissioner whose territory covered Germany, Russia, the Eastern Baltic, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. Since Finland was not specifically mentioned it is included in the Eastern Baltic. In April 1924 B.S. Webb was the Canadian Trade Commissioner based out of Copenhagen and was responsible for Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland. Canadian Trade Commissioners 1923; Canadian Trade Commissioners 1924.
766 Wilgress 1922, 468.
767 The pamphlet was largely reprinted articles from the *Weekly Bulletin* by its author. Johnson 1922b, 10. Also, Hill 1977, 298–299.
“Several firms in Scandinavia have extensive and long-standing connections in Russia and the Baltic countries and when these countries become more settled there is bound to be an extensive trade throughout Scandinavia.”

Not yet convinced Director H.R. Poussette conducted his own visit to Scandinavia and the Baltic to discuss the potential for trade with Russia during the summer of 1922. The tour of Norway, Denmark, and Sweden was done by Poussette alone, but he asked Dana Wilgress, who was being considered for appointment as a trade commissioner in the Soviet Union, to accompany him through Finland and the Baltic States. They met in “Åbo” (Turku) and completed a “rushed tour.” This was the second trip to Finland for Wilgress. He had passed through in May 1916, while on his way to Omsk, Siberia where he was to be the Canadian Trade Commissioner. During that earlier trip he landed at Tornio and had a “delightful” two-day journey through “a region of thick forests with few signs of human habitation. The wooded area gave way to patches of farm lands between the forests. We stopped at Tammerfors [Tampere] with its numerous paper and sawmills and then entered the mixed farming and forest country of southern Finland.” Now that Canada had acceded to the Anglo-Soviet Trade Agreement of 1921, Poussette saw the potential and on Johnston’s recommendation agreed to open an office in Copenhagen in 1923 to cover Scandinavia and Finland.

This was short lived, since the office was closed a year later, and these responsibilities handed over to the trade commissioner in Hamburg. The new appointment did not mention Finland directly, but only spoke about Scandinavia and countries in the eastern Baltic. Finland, it could be said was an enigma to
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769 Wilgress 1967, 76.
770 Ibid.
771 Ibid., 28. The colleague was C.F. Just, stationed in Petrograd. He wrote reports about the confused situation in Russia after November 1917. Russia was not the quiet, safe appointment he had hoped for and soon applied for retirement. He planned to leave on a special train at the end of February 1918 along with British, French, and Belgian embassy staff and some British refugees. They were destined for Helsinki, where they would wait until the Brest Litovsk negotiations were concluded. Since the Finnish Civil War had begun and the Germans were expected to occupy Petrograd any day, he was advised to take a train to Tampere. He had to endure the White siege of that town and could not leave for Sweden until after the town was captured. Hill 1977, 216–217.
772 Canada acceded to the treaty 3 July 1922. Canada also adhered to a 1924 British treaty which granted de jure recognition of the Soviet government. B.S. Webb was appointed Canadian Trade Commissioner in Copenhagen in 1923, with responsibility for Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland. Canadian Trade Commissioners 1924; Hill 1977, 297; Balawyder 1981, 1.
773 L.D. Wilgress had the area of responsibility of Germany, Russia, eastern Baltic, Poland and Czechoslovakia. On the closing of the office in Denmark in the summer of 1924, he was told his responsibilities also included Scandinavia. Hill 1977, 302.
Canadian trade officials who were unsure where to position the Finns. Were they an appendage of Russia, an unspoken part of Scandinavia or just one of the Baltic countries. This imprecision extended to the racial origin of the Finns. In a pamphlet about trade opportunities in the Baltic States, by which he meant Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, Dana Wilgress described the Estonians as descended from the same “Mongol stock” as the Finns and Hungarians.\textsuperscript{774}

Again, in 1929 an office was opened to service the Scandinavian countries. The Finnish economy and opportunities for Canadian trade with Finland were the responsibility of the trade commissioner in Oslo.\textsuperscript{775} Despite this, the place of Finland in the workings of the Commercial Intelligence Service still moved about. Perhaps because the Scandinavian office was newly opened, Dana Wilgress, stationed in Hamburg began a tour of Canada in May 1929 to promote trade with Germany, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Poland, Scandinavia, and the Baltic States. The last two state groupings it has been noted often included Finland and the absence of specific mention of Finland meant that Finnish trade would play a minor role in the tour.\textsuperscript{776}

The reports from the various trade commissions printed in the Commercial Intelligence Journal about Finland, like those given for other countries, were quite detailed. Information on the state of the Finnish economy was gathered including stock market trends, balance of payments, foreign currency reserves, domestic prices, industrial output, agricultural production, the employment situation, and details of imports and exports. The reports on Finland were exceptional in several ways. One was that because Finland was a competitor with Canada for forest products, especially pulp and paper, it was one of the few countries which had details published on these topics.\textsuperscript{777} In one other respect Finland appeared in these journals, along with every other major world currency, each issue published the current exchange rate for the markka.

The other telling aspect of the information about Finland was the almost complete absence of reports of specific trade and commercial opportunities for Canadians in Finland. During its entire publication run from 1922–1946, there were

\textsuperscript{774} It was a compilation articles from the Commercial Intelligence Journal, Wilgress 1929, 6.

\textsuperscript{775} Frederick H. Palmer responsible for the “Scandinavian Countries and Finland,” was assigned the post from 1929–1934; he was replaced by A.S. Bleakeny, from 1934–1936, still working out of Oslo covered “Sweden, Denmark and Finland”; then by Richard Grew who looked after Finland until as a result of the war the Scandinavian office was left vacant after May 1940. Opening of Trade 1929; Canadian Trade Commissioners 1934; Canadian Trade Commissioners 1940; Hill 1977, 311–313.

\textsuperscript{776} Mr. Wilgress 1929.

\textsuperscript{777} Grew 1939a; Grew 1939b.
never more than a handful of notices of this sort, other than perhaps the periodic reports on the state of Finnish agricultural production and occasional notices of calls for tenders. It was usually implied that when Finnish crop yields were down it was an opening for Canadian suppliers.\textsuperscript{778} This amounts to a qualitative confirmation of the data borne out in the trade statistics. For example, Richard Grew noted that in 1937 and 1938 Finland’s largest trading partners were the UK, Germany, and Sweden, followed by the United States. The UK captured 22.2\% of Finnish imports and 44.7\% of Finnish exports in 1937 and in 1938 garnered 21.6\% and 43.9\% of imports and exports, respectively. While the US figures for Finnish imports were 8.4\% and 9.0\% and Finnish exports were 7.9\% and 9.2\% for the same years. Canada which was indistinguishable as part of the small category of “Other North American countries,” composed only 0.6\% and 0.8\% of Finnish imports and 1.6\% and 1.9\% of Finnish exports for 1937–1938.\textsuperscript{779} Other trade commissioners when reporting about countries with which Canada had a higher volume of trade would make specific mention of the Canadian share. There was some trade between Canada and Finland, but it was almost statistically insignificant from the Canadian perspective.\textsuperscript{780} Canada and Finland in terms of their exports were too much alike to generate much interest in each other’s products. For the astute observer, the conditions under which both economies operated were virtually identical. As Richard Grew also noted in another of his 1938 reports, “As the economy of Finland is dependent to a considerable extent upon exports, conditions in other markets have a strong influence on the economic development of this country. The unsatisfactory conditions which prevailed in 1938 in certain countries, particularly the United States, adversely affected certain Finnish industries.”\textsuperscript{781} He could easily have been speaking about Canada.

There was also a new trend in Finnish trade which Grew noted in his 1939 report. Britain was still Finland’s largest trading partner, but he considered the “most interesting feature” of the trade statistics, was that the German share of

\textsuperscript{778} See Agricultural Supplies 1922; Finland as a Field 1923; Palmer 1930b; Palmer 1931a; Grew 1939c.  
\textsuperscript{779} All trade statistics from Grew 1939b, 327.  
\textsuperscript{780} Finland on the other hand seems to have placed some value on trade with Canada. Canada did note the value of trade with Finland in its own year books. In 1937 the value of Finnish trade per head of population was listed as 7,200FM for Canada versus 2,140FM for the US. This placed Canada ahead of Britain which was pegged at 6,780FM. Using this measure Canada was the sixth largest trade partner for Finland. However, Canada comprised only 0.5\% of Finnish imports and 0.1\% of exports. Trade 1922, 52; Lindgren 1940, 301, 312–313; Canada, Dominion Bureau of Statistics 1939, 484, 494, 552, 554.  
\textsuperscript{781} Grew 1939a, 282.
Finnish trade had increased at the expense of the UK.\textsuperscript{782} The report appeared in the wake of the various international crises, of which Nazi Germany was at the centre. He made no other commentary on this trend, but it was in a sense a portent of Finland’s future economic position once the war began. As the war widened and particularly after the start of the Continuation War, Finland would be dependent on Germany especially for food supplies.\textsuperscript{783}

Until the end of the Second World War, Canada had no trade treaty or agreement of its own with Finland. Since approximately 1893 it had been the custom for Britain, when negotiating commercial or trade treaties, to insert a clause which excluded the self-governing Dominions from the effects of the treaty, unless they specifically acceded to them. By including the nominally sovereign Dominions, the British were able to retain at least the outward appearance of unity within the Empire, without offending local sensibilities. Canada even though it was in many respects gradually moving towards a more independent course which differentiated itself from Britain, at times took advantage of this ability to accede to British treaties. It allowed Canada the option of disassociating itself from British policy when it suited Canadian interests or given the limited diplomatic resources available to the country, to co-opt the weight of Britain to secure some advantage which Canada might otherwise not have been able to accomplish on its own.\textsuperscript{784}

One example was the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between Britain and Finland signed on 14 December 1923.\textsuperscript{785} Although Canadian trade with Finland was relatively low in terms of dollar value, the Finnish market was still regarded by as one where Canada could secure a greater share. The Canadian National Millers Association, for example saw the UK-Finland trade agreement as a way to secure a market for Canadian flour. As the association claimed, "This is a valuable market and one we would like to maintain."\textsuperscript{786} The United States had also been negotiating a trade agreement with Finland, and American flour competed with Canadian, making it necessary to gain some advantage by acceding to the British treaty.\textsuperscript{787} The pulp and paper industry on the other hand strongly opposed the deal.

\textsuperscript{782} Grew 1939b, 327.
\textsuperscript{783} Meinander 2012, 75; Vehviläinen 2002, 175, 187, 189.
\textsuperscript{784} Mackenzie 1925, 491.
\textsuperscript{785} It was also sometimes referred to as the “Anglo-Finnish Commercial Treaty.” United Kingdom 1924.
\textsuperscript{786} Canadian National Millers Association to T.A. Low, Minister for Trade and Commerce, 7 March 1924, LAC, RG20, Vol. 701, File A-F1-3.
\textsuperscript{787} The American agreement which caused this concern established MFN treatment between the two countries had been discussed through 1923 and 1924. Agreement Between the United States and Finland.
Reduced duties put Canadian manufactures at a disadvantage because of higher labour costs, heavier taxes, and the exchange rate. For example, the drop from 25% to 20.25% for the duty on kraft paper threatened the viability of a new plant built in New Westminster, British Columbia. Mills in Canada might have to close if Finnish forest products gained an advantage. During the ongoing economic depression, the trade agreement was thought to be against Canada’s best interests.  

The Liberal Party in its own publicity pamphlet contrasted this protectionist view. It praised the government policy saying, “The Liberal Administration in its trade policy stressed the possibilities of export trade with every country in the world, and its fulfilment of this has put forth its best efforts to attract and hold the trade of the smallest as well as of the largest countries” and participation the Anglo-Finnish treaty was “evidence of the Government’s determination to leave no stone unturned in opening markets in all parts of the world to Canadian goods.”

While the whole treaty was not applicable to Canada, it was decided to take advantage of Article 23. This article permitted Finland to treat the products and manufactured items of the self-governing Dominions in the same way as similar items from the UK, if that Dominion also extended MFN treatment to Finland. MFN treatment was a reciprocal bilateral trade relationship which meant that each country would extend to the other, the same trading privileges granted to other countries. Canada on 4 July 1924, through the British minister at Helsinki by an “exchange of notes,” informed the Finnish Foreign Minister of its intention to apply Article 23. The Canadian parliament subsequently passed the Finland Trade Agreement Act in June 1925, to come into effect 1 August. Any laws then in existence which were inconsistent with this agreement were suspended as far as the inconsistency was concerned. Canada agreed to give 6 months’ notice if it intended


788 W.G. McQuirre, MP, New Westminster to J.A. Robb, Minister of Finance, 22 January 1925, LAC, MG26 I3, Vol. 98, Reel C3455. A survey of the state of the industry done a year later did not mention the trade agreement with Finland having any impact. Hume 1926.


790 The Canadian adhesion did not occur in 1924 due to procedural delays in the Senate. It was finally passed by the Senate on 11 June 1925. Canada 1925b, 312. Also, Skelton, USSEA to DMTC, 7 August 1925; Bill 128 Fourth Session, Fourteenth Parliament, 15-16 George V, 1925, An Act Respecting Trade Between Canada and Finland; Governor General to SSFC, 31 July 1924, LAC, RG25 A3b, Vol. 1372, File 1924-262.
to cancel the agreement.\textsuperscript{791} It was thought that though this mechanism both Canada and Finland gained advantages derived from trade agreements they might not otherwise have been able to secure on their own. For the Canadian government it also represented a move towards liberalized or freer trade in general.\textsuperscript{792} The dominant social order in Canada supported this on philosophical grounds, since within the two major political parties, the Liberals, and the Conservatives, despite the occasional upsurge of protectionist sentiment, supported the concept of free trade in principle, if not always in practice.\textsuperscript{793}

As a trading nation the Great Depression of the 1930s impacted Canada particularly hard. Canada’s largest trade partner was the US. Even before the depression there had been considerable pressure to raise tariffs during the 1928 US presidential election. Despite the fact the US had raised tariffs in 1922, the Liberal Party under W.L.M. King which won the 1925 Canadian election, had campaigned on a low tariff designed to raise revenue, whereas the Conservative Party platform proposed using the tariff to protect Canadian industries. Coming as it did while the Canadian economy was in decline, the Smoot-Hawley Tariff passed by the US Congress in June 1930, made increasing Canadian tariffs as a retaliatory measure a major topic during election that fall. Many other countries, including Britain also began implementing protective tariffs, causing a further contraction of world trade and a worsening of the depression.\textsuperscript{794} Canada’s new Conservative prime minister, R.B. Bennett sought to remedy the loss of the American market by reorienting more of Canada’s trade towards the British Empire.

The return to a system of preferential tariffs among the countries of the British Empire became the topic of the Imperial Economic Conference, held at Ottawa from 21 July–20 August 1932. These talks did not involve Finland, however, the newly appointed Finnish Consul A.J. Jalkanen was present as an unofficial

\textsuperscript{791} Canada FINLAND Trade 1925. Also, DO to Governor General, No. 334, 28 July 1925; Austin Chamberlain, Foreign Office to Finnish Legation, London, 22 July 1925; “Note for Mr. S. Pierce” by P.E. Renaud, 22 June 1946, LAC, RG20, Vol. 701, File A-F1-3.

\textsuperscript{792} Bilateral trade agreements can also be seen as a sign of closing off trade, because they typically followed previous increases in tariffs. Hjerppe 1993, 65.

\textsuperscript{793} The idea stems from Ian McKay that Canada was a liberal order project, that had a liberal framework which valued liberty, equality, and property, but as Adam Chapnick points out it was one with a peculiar conservative tone of restraint, equilibrium, and moderation. Chapnick 2005.

\textsuperscript{794} The conference also covered other aspects of commerce and finance, but the largest aspect was the tariff issue. It was also known as the British Empire Economic Conference or the Ottawa Conference. The United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Irish Free State, Newfoundland, and Southern Rhodesia participated. McDonald 1997.
The aim of the talks was to increase trade between parts of the British Empire, and because Britain was also negotiating another bilateral trade agreement with Finland the results of the Ottawa conference would have an impact on those proceedings. Canada and the other Dominions wanted preferential access to the large British market and Britain wanted in return markets for British products. Of particular concern for Canada was the increased competition from Scandinavia, Finland, and the Soviet Union in the British market. The debate was at times acrimonious, but in the end, it produced a series of bilateral trade agreements, collectively known as the Ottawa Agreements. Britain agreed to allow larger quotas for Commonwealth countries and impose a duty on imported food such as wheat, meat, butter cheese, fruit, eggs, condensed milk, and honey, something which had not occurred for one hundred years. Britain also made a commitment that the 10% tariff on foreign timber, fish, asbestos, zinc, and lead would not be lowered without Canadian consent. In return Britain secured a reduction and in some cases elimination of Canadian tariffs and duties on British products and the promise to set up a more transparent tariff commission to oversee the process. One observer noted that Finland, the Scandinavian countries, Latvia, and the Soviet Union would now face real competition in the British timber market. Among economists there is considerable debate about the effects of the Ottawa Agreements. There was some noticeable increase in intra-Empire trade and the volume of Canadian exports to Britain did grow, but this had already been occurring prior to 1932. For example, the Canadian share of British imports of timber rose sharply, while the American share dropped substantially and though after 1934 the Finnish share began to decline, they were still the largest supplier. Perhaps the most telling sign that the Ottawa Agreements did not produce the desired effect in the degree hoped, was the fact that very soon afterwards Prime Minister Bennett sought a trade deal with the US.


796 Brebner 1932. Canada was more concerned about competition from Soviet timber and wheat, while Britain was concerned over possible sales of Soviet coal to Canada. Drummond 1972; Williams 1990.


798 The Americans were annoyed over the Ottawa Agreements, even though they were not to a barrier to Canada-US trade. They preferred to deal with the Liberals under King, rather than Bennett. Interfering in Canada’s domestic affairs the Americans told King about the trade talks, who requested they drag out the negotiations until he was re-elected. The deal signed by the Liberals in 1935 was in most respects the work of Bennett. Boyko 2010, 259–266; Kottman 1965.
Economic historian Sven-Olaf Olsson has noted that one response to the economic crisis in Europe at this time was the introduction of import quotas and the negotiation of bilateral trade agreements.\textsuperscript{799} Because of the Ottawa Agreements and pressure especially from Canada, there was little room for Britain to offer concessions to Finland in bilateral trade negotiations. Nonetheless UK-Finland trade was important for British officials to symbolically show they were making progress towards increased trade. The Anglo-Finnish Trade Agreement signed on 29 September 1933, therefore offered some minor tariff reduction.\textsuperscript{800} Despite this it was a source of concern for officials in the Department of Trade and Commerce.\textsuperscript{801} Among other things Finland agreed to buy 75\% of her coal requirements and 30,000 tons of wheat flour from Britain. Finnish newsprint, wooden pit props, wood pulp, bacon, and ham, all things Canada exported to Britain, would be duty free. Other forest products like softwood, birch, plywood, liquid resin, and various paper products would have a duty ranging from 10–16 2/3\%.\textsuperscript{802} It was important to note that there was no article which allowed Canada or any other part of the British Commonwealth to accede to the agreement. In part this was due to the fact that that this was not considered an “Empire” trade agreement and because after 1931 the Dominions were no longer expected to rely on British diplomacy for trade agreements. In the aftermath of the UK-Finland trade agreement there was an increased volume of trade. The amount of British exports to Finland grew by 77\% from 1929–1937 and by 1935 the British share of the Finnish market had reached 24\%.\textsuperscript{803} Comparatively by the mid–1930s 44\% of Finland’s exports went to the UK.\textsuperscript{804} While the new agreement did maintain previous rights and obligations extended to Canada, the issue now became one where Canada had to protect its share of the Finnish import quota for wheat flour. The Canadian quota in 1931 was set at 24,750 tons or about 32\% of the Finnish quota and this had declined to 5,270 tons or about 16\% in the first eight months of 1933.\textsuperscript{805} The Finnish import duties

\textsuperscript{799} An exception was the Oslo Agreements or the Convention of Economic Rapprochement, which included the Nordic and Benelux states, as an effort to create a low tariff area. This was done by a series of bilateral agreements, which in part were a reaction to the Ottawa Agreements. Finland joined the group in 1933. Olsson 2006, 2–3; Roon 1989a, viii–ix, 17–23; Roon 1989b, 657–664.

\textsuperscript{800} United Kingdom 1934.

\textsuperscript{801} Salmon 1987, 173–181. Though it does not deal with Finland this is illustrated in Hertzberg 1933a.

\textsuperscript{802} W.A. Wilson for HCCUK, 8 August 1933, LAC, MG26 K, Vol. 231, Reel M1224.

\textsuperscript{803} Rooth 1984, 224–225; Rooth 2010.

\textsuperscript{804} Hjerppe 1993, 61.

\textsuperscript{805} F.H. Palmer, Canadian Government Trade Commissioner to Director Commercial Intelligence Service, 23 October 1933, “Trade Agreement Between the United Kingdom and Finland” by Harrison
and regulations on flour and grain, including the milling and mixing of imported and domestic flour were an ongoing issue reported on by the Commercial Intelligence Service through the 1920s and 1930s.806

Alcohol smuggling was also a problem for Finland. Apparently, there were a number of British vessels engaged in this illicit trade, prompting an agreement between the UK and Finland to suppress it.807 The Canadian government was interested in following these developments, because Canada also faced a similar smuggling problem from the French islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon and via the Caribbean.808 Nationally Canada ended prohibition in 1920, but several provincial jurisdictions continued to enforce their own alcohol bans. Likewise, prohibition existed in the US and smuggling from Canada was also a problem. Bennett was likely interested in the Finnish solution to the problem because the issue was at times a source of diplomatic tension between Canada and the US. However, the Volstead Act was repealed by Congress in December 1933, making this a non-issue.809

Finland’s image as a reliable country that paid its debts was brought to the attention of the Canadian Department of Finance in 1934. The situation related to the US Federal Securities Act of 1933 which was passed as part of the “New Deal.” It was designed to regulate against deceitful practices in the sales of securities and was prompted by the stock market crash of 1929.810 One sign of the troubled economic times was the addition of a world financial crisis in September 1931. Many countries at this time chose to end their use of the Gold Standard. Finland did this in the fall of 1931, shortly after Britain and about the same time as Canada.811 Paper currency was no longer convertible into gold. This allowed for more flexibility in monetary policy and permitted the value of currencies to
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806 Of all the reports on Finland this issue seemed to dominate. Palmer 1930a; Palmer 1931b; MacDonald 1932e; Palmer 1932; MacDonald 1936; Grew 1938.
807 J.H. Thomas, SSDA to SSEA, No. 40, 28 September 1933; Convention between His Majesty in respect of the United Kingdom and the President of Finland regarding the Suppression of Illicit Importation of Alcoholic Liquors into Finland, Treaty Series Paper No. 36 1933, Cmd. 4436, 13 October 1933 in LAC, MG26K, Vol. 222, File F-300 1933, Reel M1219.
808 McDougall 1995, 42–43.
809 It was formally known as the National Prohibition Act, which was passed in 1919 to enact the 18th Amendment to the US constitution imposing prohibition. Kottman 1962.
810 See Bumgardner 2008, 2–3.
811 It was only supposed to be a temporary measure. Finland had been on the Gold Standard before independence, but only resumed it in 1926. Canada effectively abandoned the Gold Standard in 1929, but it was not made official until 31 October 1931. MacDonald 1932a; MacDonald 1932d; Powell 2005, 43; Singleton 1986, 49; Bordo and Schwartz 1999, 264–265.
fluctuate, which in most cases meant devaluation. The devalued markka made Finnish exports more competitive and produced a trade surplus. Shortly thereafter in 1933 unlike Canada, Finland joined the Sterling bloc. Countries in the Sterling area either pegged their currency to the value of the British pound and held large sterling balances for trade purposes or used the pound as their own currency. Canada opted not to join because more of her trade was with the US.

With the intent on educating Canadian officials about the new American securities law, the Vice President of Chase National Bank in New York provided the Department of Finance with a 20-page prospectus about a recent Finnish loan. What was significant about the $10 million in special notes offered by the Republic of Finland at 4% interest, was they were the first foreign issue since the Securities Act was passed. The act required registration of the securities, verifying the details of the issuer and independently audited financial statements. In this example the bank noted it was “a simple matter by reason of Finland’s past record and financial setup” that these were good investments. Proof of Finland’s reputation was that half of the bonds were sold in a short time and the remainder were likely to sell quickly. The response by W.G. Clark of the Department of Finance was positive, “While it is not quite as formidable as some of the private corporation issues, it is nevertheless, formidable enough.”

When describing Finland as a country that pays its debts, people are usually referring to the mislabeled “war debt.” In 1919 the US government had approved the purchase of gain and other food stuffs on credit. The food was from stocks that had built up during the war and it was doubtful the US would find a market for them, so the arrangement was mutually beneficial. However, congress included the $9 million loan to Finland with the debts other European countries had accumulated during the war, and hence called them war debts. During the interwar years Finland was the only country which continued to make payments on this debt. Finland’s ability to pay during the depression was in large part due to the trade agreement with Britain, which allowed the country to accumulate foreign exchange and due to the devaluation of the markka. For Americans, the image of an honest, hardworking Finland to use an American expression, “pulled itself up by the boot

---

813 See Eichengreen and Irwin 1995, 17; Stewart 1937; Cain 1996.
815 W.G. Clark, Department of Finance to Batchelder, 4 December 1934, LAC, RG19, Vol. 808, File 501-8-90A.
straps,” also typified their own idealized self-image. As a liberal, democratic country, Finland was a good world citizen behaving in the way Americans wanted the world to work, with liberalized trade and countries honouring their commitments.816 The same could be said for the Canadian image of Finland, which in this context fit the Canadian liberal order framework. Keijo Virtanen argues that more than any other factor in creating a positive image of Finland in the United States was the repayment of those loans. The honouring of these debts, even during the economic problems of the depression created and image of “small, but brave Finland, which always pays its debts.”817

The Finland-US trade agreement of May 1936 prompted similar interest for Canada. The deal extended MFN treatment for 3 years. It expanded on the 1925 exchange of MFN and the 1934 Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Consular Rights. Along with this went some duty reductions on products which Canada exported to Finland, like automobile tires and tubes, fresh apples, granite stone, cream separators, birch plywood, some cheeses, wooden spools, and sulphite wrapping paper. Since Canada benefited from MFN treatment with Finland these reductions would benefit Canadian exporters as well.818

Aside from a slight decline in Canadian exports of flour to Finland, trade between the two countries remained uneventful until 1936. At the end of December 1936, the honorary consul in Toronto, A.K. Graham questioned Canadian officials why books from Finland were subject to duty, when books from Poland were exempt? He was told that books from Finland were subject to an ad valorem duty of 22.5% on works of literature and fiction and 10% on texts relating to science, industry, and agriculture.819 The Finnish Consul General A.L. Jalkanen in early 1937 formally drew attention to the Canadian failure to extend MFN treatment to Finnish and Swedish language books printed in Finland. The Department of External Affairs forwarded the letter to the Department of Trade and Commerce, at which point the deputy minister simply acknowledged receipt of the query and nothing appears to have been done. One year later Jalkanen asked again. The reply he received from External Affairs was to say the least astounding. The answer was simply that because Canada had a treaty which granted duty free entry of books
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printed in Poland in Polish and Ukrainian it “could not, therefore, be extended to books printed in the official languages of other nations with which no such treaties have been concluded.”

It appeared as if the Canadian officials had forgotten about the Finland Trade Agreement Act of 1925.

Finland had raised no challenge to the longer standing agreement which granted duty free entry of books from France, since this was the only non-British country granted this privilege, and it was for the benefit of the sizable French-Canadian minority. However, once this was expanded to Poland in 1935, it was unclear why the same was not granted to Finland. After all the Department of Revenue had published a notice indicating that the Canadian-Polish treaty extended to other countries which had MFN. Jalkanen reported that the Finnish government considered the Canadian response unsatisfactory. It was unclear why, by his count, some 50–60,000 Finns, did not have the same benefit as 150,000 Poles or 20,000 Ukrainians. He stressed that access to Finnish and Swedish language literature was of great importance to his countrymen and their descendants living in Canada. After all, “having arrived in Canada comparatively recently most of the Finnish immigrants have not yet been able to learn the English language so well that they could make full use of the literature printed in the English language. They are so scattered all over Canada and too few to be able to maintain own [sic] publishing houses for the publication of good literature.”

Aside from the high duty, which made ordering books from Finland prohibitive, he could have pointed out that it meant that by Finnish-Canadians not having access to “good literature,” they had a choice between not reading, which was unfathomable for a people who prided themselves on literacy or they could choose to read material in their native tongue produced by the communists, something which would have caught the attention of Canadian officials.

Jalkanen pointed to Canadian official trade statistics which clearly showed that between 1931 and 1937 Finland had a trade deficit with Canada. In those years Canada sold to Finland anywhere from 4 to 15 times as much as Finland exported to Canada. Despite the comparative disadvantage in trade with Canada, the Finns had constantly applied MFN to Canadian products. Though it was a very small fraction of that total trade, books in English and French published in Canada entered Finland duty free. When Finland concluded an agreement with Britain in
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April 1937, which lowered the tariff on wheat flour, the same benefit was given to
Canada. Under these circumstances the consul general considered the concession
on books to be “very reasonable.”

Canadian officials scrambled to understand what had occurred and determine
its importance. The Department of Trade and Commerce agreed “the situation was
unsatisfactory and would always give rise to difficulties.” They did not, however,
show a willingness to concede the Finnish position, since in the first instance they
suggested cancelling the concession on books from Poland, effectively negating the
complaint that Canada discriminated against Finland. The other option was to apply
“a broader interpretation of Canadian obligations under most-favoured nation
agreements” or simply introduce “a tariff change in the next Budget.” Neither
method in fact acknowledged the Finnish position. A broader interpretation of MFN
obligations was hardly necessary because a reasonable interpretation of those
obligations would already have included Finland. Likewise, by simply changing
the tariff to benefit Finnish books begged the question, since Canada had already
agreed to MFN for Finland. Had Canada been acting in good faith the elimination
of the tariff on Finnish books would have occurred as a matter of course and would
not have required an official request.

Subsequently it was learned that this Canadian neglect of its MFN obligations
may have impacted the size of the Canadian flour quota. The UK-Finland trade
agreement signed in April 1937, which granted a reduced duty on British wheat
flour, also allowed for Finland to buy nearly 20,000 tons of that commodity from
Britain. Each country which had a trade agreement or treaty and exported wheat
flour to Finland was permitted a quota based on the average for the years 1935–
1936. The Canadian average was 2,320 tons, which was what Canada was
permitted to sell to Finland at the reduced duty for the year 1937. In September
1938 the Canadian trade commissioner at Oslo learned from the British commercial
secretary in Helsinki that the Canadian quota for flour was going to be abolished.
No date was set for the abolition of the quota, but a confidential informant at the
Finnish Foreign Office thought this was “owing to dissatisfaction caused by alleged
failure to grant Finnish imports most-favoured-nation treatment in all cases.”
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The Department of Trade and Commerce seemed to not understand the Finnish complaint that they had not been accorded MFN treatment and asked the trade commissioner to find out what they were talking about. In fact, the Canadian government was delaying because to agree that Finnish and Swedish language books should the same as Polish and French books would have opened up Canada to duty free English language books from the US. This would endanger the comparatively small Canadian publishing industry. Although Canadians did read large numbers of books printed in the US despite the duty, it did give a small advantage to Canadian publishers.

The same British source verified the proposed abolition of the Canadian quota was because on four separate occasions the Finnish government had inquired about duty on Finnish books and had not received any reply. Furthermore, the Canadian Board of Customs used an unsatisfactory method of assessing the ad valorem duty on Finnish goods in general. The calculation of the value of the goods was not based on the official exchange rate, but instead on a figure determined by Canadian officials, which the Finns deemed to be higher than the actual rate. The actual exchange rate should have been a simple matter to determine since the Finnish markka had been pegged against the British pound sterling for some time. The Finns could only conclude this was discrimination because a similar problem had occurred with Finnish granite, which competed with the locally produced product. Apparently, the situation with Finnish granite had been resolved in favour of using the official exchange rate, but no change in the Canadian policy regarding other Finnish exports to Canada had been made.

The trade commissioner went on to comment that “while the withdrawal of the Canadian flour quota would appear as a retaliatory action against Canada on account of the alleged treatment of Finnish products entering Canada, it was simply an excuse and that in all probability some other reason would be found if they did not have their present contention to use as an argument.” The real reason they thought was the Agrarian Party had been pressuring the government to increase the consumption of Finnish wheat. Finland could not alter the trade agreements with
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the US and UK, which included the sale of wheat flour to Finland. The ending of the Canadian quota was therefore one of the few options open to the Finnish government. The Canadian failure to quickly deal with the matter of Finnish books and the exchange rate simply provided the Finnish government with the justification.

Canadian millers disagreed with the trader commissioner’s assessment and considered the move discriminatory, since British and American flour was still permitted entry. Seeking to review the matter with the Finnish government, the trade commissioner in Oslo was sent to find out firsthand. He learned that on 23 September 1938, wheat and rye flour had to be mixed at a ratio of two parts domestic and one part imported flour. Wheat flour imported by the State Granary did not fall under these provisions. The introduction of the mixing regulations was prompted by a record Finnish crop and the resulting surplus for the domestic market. Otherwise, without the mixing of the flour, all imports of flour would have had to cease. Since the trade commissioner had no diplomatic standing, the matter was referred to External Affairs.

The information gathered by the Department of Trade and Commerce convinced the Canadian government to act on Finnish books. In a later summary of trade relations External Affairs officials described it this way: “The Finns, however, put the screws on by letting it be known that they were going to deprive us of the flour quota entering Finland under reduced rates” and it was this which prompted action. Within a few weeks the matter was handled expeditiously by the issuing of an Order in Council announcing that Finnish and Swedish language books published in Finland were accorded the same treatment as Polish and Ukrainian language books published in Poland. Finnish books could now enter duty free. The change in policy, small though it was, would play a role in the tariff reductions of Canada-US trade agreement in 1938.

By the end of the 1930s, with world tensions threatening war, the Canadian government supported the British policy of appeasement. Prime Minister King
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spurred on by US President F.D. Roosevelt and Secretary of State Cordell Hull presented the concept of “economic appeasement” at the 1937 Imperial Conference in London. The idea was that the current world problems had an economic root. If trade could be encouraged through lower tariffs it would promote peace. To set the example for the world there should be trilateral trade talks between the US, Canada, and Britain.835 British motives at the talks which occurred were driven by the hope economic appeasement would help the international situation, while the Americans were largely driven by any possible domestic political advantage a trade deal would earn. Canada claimed it was motivated to form stronger ties between the three countries and world peace they were after. However, during the negotiations it was clear that Canada also sought a domestic economic advantage.836 It was necessary that the talks involve the three countries because the US would want concessions on British items which had been guaranteed by the Ottawa Agreements and in order for this to occur, Canada wanted concessions from the other two. British preferential trade agreements like the Ottawa Agreements and those with Baltic countries like Finland annoyed the Americans. For the British the Baltic and the Commonwealth composed about 2/3 of all British exports. To the British the US was not an important enough market to jeopardise its other trade. Furthermore, there was little Britain could offer in terms of tariff reductions, since petroleum, cotton, tobacco, wheat, and some other agricultural products already entered Britain with a low duty or none at all. To Britain the Baltic trade agreements were also important politically, since they offered support and encouragement for small democratic European governments, like Finland, which otherwise might drift into the German orbit.837

The preliminary talks began in October 1937, but despite platitudes about the prospects of a deal, the negotiations were protracted and difficult. The political situation in each country made concessions hard to agree on. The complexity of the talks was evident, and the most difficult point was over timber. At issue was the US demand for a reduction on the British tariff for Douglas fir and some other lumber exports. Douglas fir competed with Baltic pine for building construction in Britain. This meant Canada would need to agree to a reduction on the Ottawa Agreement preference for British markets. The suggestion that creating a separate category for Douglas fir was unworkable because it would lead to a protest by such Baltic states
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as Finland, that this was a devious way to avoid MFN obligations. The solution was to lower the tariff on planed lumber over a certain size, since Douglas fir was usually shipped in longer lengths. By September 1938, an agreement was reached. Canada gave up some of its preference in the British market and lowered its tariff on US manufactured goods, in exchange for a lower US tariff.\textsuperscript{838}

The value of the exchange rate used to determine the value of Finnish exports to Canada and the Canadian flour quota remained ongoing issues. The Finnish government still preferred the official exchange rate for determining ad valorem duty and raised the issue again in March 1939. The Finns were “not impressed” with the handling of the book question, noting that the Canadian government waited until a few days before the trade agreement with the US was signed, which effectively gave free entry of books in any language other than English.\textsuperscript{839} The issue of the valuation of the Finnish markka for duty and customs purposes still had not been addressed. Canada now determined the value of a foreign currency based on the Gold Standard, using a five-year average. The “currency disturbance” which started in 1931, meant that all currencies had been devalued in relation to the Canadian dollar. The rate for 1939 therefore was $0.02144 to the Finnish markka.\textsuperscript{840}

The flour quota continued to be subject to mixing requirements, which in 1939 had risen to four parts domestic flour to one part imported flour. Because of the Anglo-Finnish trade agreement, British flour was still admitted, but on a proportion basis. British flour could be imported directly if the Finnish importer could prove that an equal amount of Finnish flour had been sold. Canadian exporters of flour had been told by their Finnish agents the same concession applied to Canada, but no Finnish official would put it in writing. The Canadian quota remained fixed at 2,320 tons.\textsuperscript{841}

5.2 Scientific Exchanges

Canadian-Finnish relations also involved other mundane contacts. Through the interwar years there were requests for exchanges of information on all sorts of agricultural topics such as animal feed, husbandry, fur production, and seeds.\textsuperscript{842} As well there were requests for visits of a scientific nature, like from Pentti Eskola of
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the Geological Survey of Finland. He came to assist the Geological Survey of Canada during the summer of 1922. Specifically, Eskola chose to study the rock formations near Lake Huron, he said because “The geological problems of Finland are very similar to those encountered by Canadian geologists who work in the Precambrian shield” and the exchange of ideas that occurred was “mutually profitable.”843 Others followed, like V. Aubert in 1927 to study Canadian peat deposits in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and the expeditions by Vaino Tanner to Newfoundland, Labrador, and northern Quebec in 1937 and 1939.844

In January 1930, the seed procurement company AB Proveniens of Helsinki, wrote to the Chief of the Tree Planting Division, at the forestry station in Indian Head, Saskatchewan, looking for seeds of Canadian tree species that could grow in central Finland.845 The request prompted research into the precedent regarding the provision of tree seeds to Finland. It was learned that Proveniens had sent free of charge to Canada somewhere between 16–20 pounds of Scotch pine (pinus sylvestris) seed in 1923.846 Canada had provided during 1927–1928 a total of slightly more than 111 pounds of seed to Finland, of various varieties, including Douglas fir (pseudotsuga menziesii), alpine fir (abies lasiocarpa), western yellow pine (ponderosa pine, pinus ponderosa), western white pine (pinus monticola), lodgepole pine (pinus contorta), western hemlock (tsuga heterophylla), western cedar (western red cedar, thuja plicata).847 All this had been part of the exchange of seed for research purposes.

In Finland it appears Proveniens had been involved with the research of Dr. C.G. Tigerstedt, a noted Finnish arborist. The company was also associated with many others connected to the Forest Research Institute of Finland (Metsäntutkimuslaitos or Metla) including the director general, Dr. Olli Heikinheimo, and Dr. Yrjö Ilvessalo, who were provided as references.848 Despite these references, the Forestry Branch was hesitant to provide seeds in this case. The
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normal practice was to collect “seed only on the special order of the various Forest Services throughout the Empire” and for official or academic research agencies from other countries through mutual exchange, as evident with the previous shipments to Finland. Proveniens was running a commercial enterprise and this did not fit the mandate. Seed for research into silviculture was one thing, but providing seed to help a business, even one conducting research was not normal practice. They were, however, willing to consider selling surplus seeds.

An unusual request came from Finland in the later part of 1937. V.K. Klemola arrived in August to study fur production in Canada. He looked at fur farming practices in Prince Edward Island and was interested in learning about Canadian efforts at wildlife conservation and fur trade regulation. Finland like Canada was a source of furs for the European market. Klemola had hoped to convince Canadian officials to conduct an experiment by introducing reindeer (Rangifer tarandus) to northern Canada. The ultimate purpose of his visit was a similar experiment whereby he planned to introduce some Canadian species to Finland. He had already secured some ranch bread foxes from Canada “with a view to improving the stock in Finland.” The plan was to do the same with Canadian beaver (Castor canadensis) and muskrat (Ondatra zibethicus) from Northern Ontario. Muskrat were plentiful in Finland, but the European beaver (Castor fiber) had been hunted to extinction.

In due course Klemola arranged to acquire a number of beaver and muskrat in the area of Moose Factory and obtained the necessary export permits. This was to occur the following spring. These were two of the several North American alien species introduced deliberately into Finland during the 1920s and 1930s. The muskrat had been introduced in the 1920s, the white-tailed deer (Odocoileus
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virginianus) and the mink (musta vison) arrived in the 1930s. The standard history of the Canadian beaver in Finland presented by biologists is that they were introduced from the United States in 1937. It would appear from the archival sources that a number were also directly introduced from Canada by Klemola at about the same time. It seems that Kelmola and others were unaware that the Canadian beaver and the European beaver were different species. They were not in fact reintroducing a native species. Canadian beaver eventually out competed the European beaver also reintroduced from Norway in the 1930s.

The diplomatic and bureaucratic handling of scientific exchanges and the issue of the tariff on books, the controversy notwithstanding, point to an image of Finns as a modern, literate, and educated people. Another area Finns were known for was athletic achievement. Such athletes as Hannes Kolehmainen (also known as the Smiling Finn), Paavo Nurmi, Ville Ritola and Volmari Iso-Hollo were well known medal winning Olympians during the first decades of the twentieth century, earning them the nickname “Flying Finns.” Another area that seemed to combine athletic endurance with scientific and technological advancement was long distance aviation. Aviation had captured the Canadian imagination during the 1920s and 1930s. In their own small way Finns contributed to this fascination.

In March 1933 Canadian officials learned that noted Finnish military aviator, Captain Väinö Bremer planned to include Canada in his around the world flight. The plan was for him to cross over from Asia to Alaska and his first Canadian stop would be Port Essington, British Columbia, from there he would make his way across Canada and then move up to Baffin Island for the trip back to Europe. The information was passed through the Dominions Office (DO) to Ottawa. Bremer needed to know which places he could purchase aviation fuel in Canada. The Canadian government had no objection to Bremer’s proposed trip and only cautioned him that aviation fuel was only available at a few locations. So, Bremer needed to be aware that he would have to prearrange fuel stops and that Baffin Island was only accessible from July to September.
Bremer flew out of Helsinki on 16 May and by the second week of June he had crossed Asia and planned to fly from Vladivostok to Alaska. Soviet authorities denied his request, so instead he had to ship the aircraft from Tokyo to North America. Diverted from his original route Bremer landed in San Francisco and crossed the continental United States. His Canadian tour was very brief, after landing in Ottawa on 13 July he went to Montreal and back to the US on the 14th. When he arrived in Canada he was met by contingents of Finnish-Canadians and Bremer explained that his plans changed because “I don’t think Russians like Finns” and they likely thought he “might see too much.” The trans-Atlantic portion of the flight had to be abandoned because he had to leave his aircraft pontoons behind in Singapore. The arrival of Bremer received only a small amount of publicity. This is likely because after he cancelled the Atlantic leg, he was less interesting. The few days he was in Canada, there were several reports about the Italian air armada touring the US, Charles Lindberg, Amelia Earhart, and several others attempting record making flights.

A low policy area that fit the scientific as well as sociological realm where the Canadian and Finnish governments may have shared some similarities was over the issue of alcohol consumption. Both counties had tried prohibition and failed. However, alcoholism was still seen as a problem in both countries. In March 1939, the Finnish government extended an invitation to the Canadian government to participate in the congress of the International Temperance Union, in Helsinki at the end of July 1939. There were various temperance societies in Canada lobbying for the government to participate, so the matter was given some serious consideration. Vice-Consul G.W. Tornroos wrote the Minister of National Defence I.A. Mackenzie that it would be a good move for Canada to attend, since his country was “very anxious to receive a delegate from the Dominion of Canada.”
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thought Canada should do so for no other reason than for government officials “to look over the country, particularly the cooperative movements which as you know, have been very successful in that country and has a great deal, I think, to do with the prosperity that Finland enjoys today.” Out of a population of 3.8 million, there were only 2,900 people unemployed. Clearly this was intended to be more than just participation at a conference; it was to be diplomatic showmanship. The visit by a Canadian official would take on the trappings of a state visit and show Finland’s connections to the West at a time when international tensions were escalating.

It turned out the last congress Canada had attended was in 1920 and the government even declined the invitation to the 1922 meeting held in Toronto. Likewise, Britain had declined to attend since 1920 and very few other countries sent official delegates. Prime Minister King was an advocate of personal temperance, but the sale and service of alcoholic beverages was a provincial area of responsibility. Ultimately King saw no reason to attend, since Britain was not, the provinces when consulted gave mixed reviews and the prime minister wrote this minute, the “International situation what it is multiplicity of conferences, all reason why we should not.”

Conclusion

The prime minister when referring to the international situation of course meant the tensions and events which would eventually lead to the Second World War. Canada officially declining the invitation to the temperance conference in Helsinki was the last diplomatic exchange between the two countries before a general war broke out in Europe. King and the staff of External Affairs was increasingly focused on high policy issues of war and peace. Up until this time relations between Canada and Finland had mainly involved low policy issues of trade and immigration. An image of the other existed with Finland as a trade competitor. Yet, Finland’s willingness to enter bilateral trade agreements and the extension of MFN treatment was a clear sign the country was part of the liberal capitalist world, trying to remove restrictions on the free flow of capital and goods. It fit nicely with Prime Minister King’s desire to create a more secure world by reliving the depression through economic

---

868 Ibid.
869 “Minute” by WLMK on Skelton to Prime Minister, 21 June 1939, LAC, RG25, Vol. 1904, File 1939-370.
appeasement. Likewise, officials in the Departments of Trade and Commerce and External Affairs had an ideological predisposition towards liberalized trade. Even though there some aspects of the Canadian-Finnish trade relationship which were difficult, Finland was still regarded as an untapped potential market for Canadian products.

Scientific exchanges and athletic achievement also helped bolster the positive image of Finland as a modern, progressive country. This helped balance those negative aspects of the Canadian image of Finland which dominated other aspects of the relationship. During the 1920s and 1930s a negative image of Finland as a source of dangerous ideas and a negative image as the other when Finnish-Canadians were regarded as a threat to the Canadian state and society because of their radical ideas and activities. Along side this existed a positive image of Finland and Finns as progressive, modern, Western, capitalist, liberal, and democratic. Finland and Finns might be different from Canada and Canadians, but not so much that the two countries could not have a friendly relationship. The positive Canadian images of Finland led Canadians to respond with sympathy and try to help Finland during the Winter War. The negative images in this context go dormant, only to resurface in 1941 during the Continuation War when Finland was no longer just a perceived enemy but became an actual enemy with a declaration of war. The images of Finland and Finns which existed during the pre-war period and were seen in low policy interactions between the two countries, would now operate at the high policy level of war and peace.
Part Two: “Brave Little Finland”
6 Harsh Winter

Canada entered the Second World War on 10 September 1939; seven days after Britain had declared war on Germany. Unlike the First World War, Canada was not automatically at war when Britain was at war. This had been part of the result of the Statute of Westminster in 1931. Within its constitutional authority the government did not require the approval of parliament, but Prime Minister King had made it a matter of policy to present the question of war to both the House of Commons and Senate.870 Parliament was in recess and had to be called for a special session. His rationale was simple. Having the decision for Canada to enter the war supported by parliament, would lend it a sense of legitimacy, show national unity, and resolve. It would also demonstrate that it was Canada’s choice as an independent nation to stand beside Britain.871 Over the course of the war, Canada would put over 1 million men and women into uniform and among other things contribute significantly to the Battle of the Atlantic, the Battle of Britain, the bomber offensive against Germany, and land operations in Italy and Northwest Europe. Over 47,000 Canadian military personnel were killed and over 54,000 wounded in the process. Additionally, Canada supplied resources, agricultural products, vehicles, aircraft, ships, and all sorts of arms and ammunition to the Allies. The cost of the war to Canada was calculated at over $21 billion. All of that was still in the future and for now the Canadian government hoped for what has been termed a “limited liability” war.872 There was considerable sympathy for Finland when that country was attacked by the Soviet Union in December 1939 and any aid or military assistance for Finland would be viewed through this limited liability lens by Canadian leaders.

The Canadian reaction to the Soviet attack against Finland, which came to be known as the Winter War drew on all the positive images Canadian held of Finland.

870 Declaration of war was a Royal Prerogative the King exercised on the constitutional advice of his Canadian ministers, which was represented by the Governor in Council, but embodied in the cabinet. The Governor General read the “Speech from the Throne,” which outlined government policy including the plan to declare war. The prime minister then gave an “Address” in reply. Approval of the address by parliament was considered support for the government policy. The motion passed on 9 September 1939. Since the next day was a Sunday, the OIC was tabled on 11 September proclaiming a formal state of war with the German Reich from 11:15 am 10 September. Rossignol 1992, 2–3, 6–7; Canada, House of Commons Debates, 9 September 1939, 51; 11 September 1939, 88–89.
871 Granatstein and Bothwell 1975. One side effect of Canada’s entry into the war was that Germany began seizing Finnish ships in the Baltic because as part of the wood pulp trade they visited ports on the American side of the Great Lakes. For a part of the journey these ships had to pass through enemy Canadian waters. Roon 1989a, 325–326; Butler 1980, 373–375.
872 Details on the war effort from Cook 2015, 434–437.
and Finns. The country and people which a few short years previously had been a
source of danger for Canada, was now a land worthy of admiration. Finland was a
modern, progressive, Western European, liberal democratic country, which like
Canada was defending its freedom against totalitarianism. Finland was a small
country and the Finns were bravely defending Western civilization against Eastern
Asiatic barbarism. As officials at the DEA, the prime minister and the Canadian
public became increasingly outraged at the naked aggression against Finland, the
question of what aid could be offered and the legal question of was it lawful for
Canadians to volunteer to fight for Finland had to be dealt with.

6.1 Canadian Reaction

Throughout the war for Canadian foreign policy decision-makers a major source of
information continued to be Britain. In the years leading up to war the volume of
messages crossing the Atlantic grew and rose substantially once the war started, as
Britain tried to keep the senior Dominion in the Commonwealth informed. They
also received on a regular basis reports from the Canadian Permanent Delegate at
the League of Nations (CPDLN). Included among the various dispatches, telegrams,
letters, circulars, reports, and summaries was information about the increasing
tensions between the Soviet Union and Finland. At the end of October 1939, it was
learned that Britain had been contemplating a new trade agreement with the USSR,
but the SSEA was informed: “This would be made impossible by Russian
aggression in Finland and steps have been taken to make the Russians aware of this
fact.”873 Given the urgency of working out the details of Canada’s contribution to
the Allied war effort, it is unlikely that officials in the DEA would have taken much
notice. They would have read news reports about negotiations that went on through
1938, Soviet demands in October 1939, and rumours of the Red Army deploying
near the Finnish frontier but given Canada’s position these would not have raised
any serious concerns. Developments in Finland were therefore drowned out by
other news of the war.874
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Through British sources Canada learned about the 26 November “border incident,” at Mainila, including the Soviet accusation that the Finns had fired artillery shells across the border. The Finns denied the charge and the Soviets in response claimed this was proof of Finnish provocation and justification for withdrawal from the non-aggression pact of 1932. The Soviet ambassador to Britain, Ivan Maisky, told the British SSFA that the crisis had been precipitated by the “provocative attitude of the Finns encouraged by the press in Scandinavia, United States and this country[Britain].” Events were moving quickly and Canadian officials received the news that the Soviets had invaded Finland on 30 November.

Prime Minister King first learned about the attack when he read the evening newspaper. In his diary King described this as “A ghastly bit of ruthless aggression.” It was also cause for trepidation. The head of the Canadian government thought Hitler and Stalin were collaborating in a plot to dominate Europe. Finland was one move of many that would eventually converge on Britain. If British security was threatened, then so was Canadian security. The fate of Finland would therefore indirectly impact Canada. The Soviet attack should not have been a surprise. Shortly after the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact was announced, King had learned from Frederick Maugham, the British Lord Chancellor, who was in Canada on a speaking tour, in August 1939, that one of the reasons Britain had not been able to reach an alliance with the Soviets was the insistence on being allowed to send troops into the Baltic States, Finland, and the other Scandinavian countries. From this he could easily have surmised that the Soviet-German agreement would lead to conflict with Finland, especially after it was reported in the papers that talks had failed. The day after the Winter War began he read of the “appalling situation regarding continued Russian aggression in Finland. Ruthless and wanton destruction of Finns despite their efforts to secure an Armistice.” He agreed with President Roosevelt that it “jeopardizes the rights of mankind for self-

876 The Soviets had the general feeling that British and Western diplomacy had been working against them through Finland. SSDA to SSEA, No. D109, 29 November 1939, LAC, Ibid.
877 Most of the English language writing on the Winter War relies on Finnish and Western sources and presents events from mainly a Finnish perspective. One attempt at objective view from the Soviet perspective is Irincheev 2011.
878 King Diary, 30 November 1939, LAC, MG26 J13.
879 Ibid.
880 King Diary, 24 August 1939, LAC, Ibid. On Canadian news media during the war see Allen 2013, 133–181.
881 King Diary, 1 December 1939, LAC, Ibid.
government.”882 He was also aware of Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain’s address to the British House of Commons, where he linked the Soviet aggression to German efforts to distract the Allies and that only by focusing on that threat “we can hope to save the nations of Europe.”883

No doubt many other Canadians had similar reactions. The Winter War marked a period when world attention and sympathy for Finland was the highest it had been since the campaign to mobilize public opinion against the policy of Russification. Interested Canadians wanting to know more information about Finland could turn to recently published books.884 If they had visited the Finland pavilion at the 1939 New York World’s Fair or read their companion volume Sketches of Finland, they would not be surprised at the love of his homeland and the stubborn resistance offered by the Finnish soldier. The sketches showed Finland was a sparsely populated country where people lived in closer contact with nature and “For this reason Finns, on the whole, are modest and retiring, though friendly and hospitable. Besides, they are, as a rule, straightforward, and honest. The struggle against relentless nature has given the Finns the quality best expressed by the slang term ‘guts’.”885 British General Walter Kirke, the former head of the Military Mission to Finland, described the young country, “To-day this virile, honest and enlightened people stand as an outpost of Western civilization on the frontiers of the unknown.”886 Perhaps it is no coincidence Kirke was writing the preface for a new book about the Finnish civil war, where Canadians learned about Soviet aggression and which included the final sentence: “In 1918 a buttress had been formed which secured the northern flank of Europe’s eastern front when the front was tottering during the first years after the Great War.”887 These images of a honest, hardy, and brave people were latent images held by Canadians about Finns and echoed in publicly expressed opinions at this time.

When the writers were not Finns, it seemed necessary to explain who the Finns were, Finnish history, their origins, their national character, and inevitably citing something from Topelius. When referring to Finnish national character, Canadians to an extent were familiar with various stereotypes and would have recognized them. Writing for a British audience J. Hampden Jackson, in his book simply titled
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887 Hannula 1939, 215.
Finland, which was widely available in Canada, quoted extensively from Topelius about the psychology of Finnishness. Another example which appeared in early 1940 was E.B. Elliston’s Finland Fights. Elliston, an American journalist, spent 10 days in Finland at the end of November and early December 1939 following Finnish diplomatic efforts and was on the Finnish frontier when the Soviets started their “false flag” campaign claiming Finnish aggression. He described Finland in terms of “Lilliput” facing the Soviet “Big Bear” or David versus “Goliath” and how “the Finns consider themselves the European or Western bastion against the ‘barbarous Asiatics.’” Like much of the rest of the coverage of Finland in Western Europe and North America, Elliston appealed to sympathy for the plight of Finland. Jackson thought this up swell of moral support was positive, but unusual since,

No one can be surprised that English speaking people take so little interest in Finland. It is the fault of the atlases and the history text-books. The maps show Finland as a semi-Arctic country lying between the same unattractive latitudes as Greenland; they fail to show that her northernmost coast is ice-free all the year round and that the whole country enjoys a summer that is hotter, if a trifle shorter, than that of the British Isles.

More importantly, given problems Europe had faced after the Treaty of Versailles, Finland, unlike Poland or Czechoslovakia did not owe its independence and borders to that document. For many people in Canada and Britain this was an

---

888 “The general traits of their character are: hardened, patient, passive strength; resignation; perseverance allied to a certain obstinacy; a slow, contemplative way of thinking; an unwillingness to become angry, but a tendency when anger has been roused, to indulge in unmeasured wrath; coolness in deadly peril, but caution afterwards; taciturn reticence, alternating with a great flow of words; an inclination for waiting, deferring, living for the day, interrupted sometimes by unreasonable haste; adherence to the old and well-known, an aversion to anything new; attention to duty; law-abiding habit of mind; love of liberty; hospitality; honesty; a predilection for religious meditation, revealing itself in true piety, which however, is apt to have too much respect for the mere letter. The Finn is recognized by his close, distant, reserved attitude. It takes him sometime to thaw and become intimate, but his friendship, when won, is to be depended upon. He is often too late, often stands in your way without noticing it; does not great a meeting friend till he has passed him, keeps quiet when he had better speak, and sometimes speaks when he ought to keep quiet. He is one of the finest solders in the world, but one of the last arithmeticians; see gold at his feet, but cannot make up his mind to pick it up.” Quoted in Jackson 1940, 21–22. Topelius 1894, 53–54. For a German perspective on images of Finland see Ahtiainen 2008.

889 He used the transcription from Topelius found in Young 1912, 153–171. Interestingly he also met the future Finnish ambassador to Canada, Urho Toivola who was then working as a press liaison officer at the Foreign Ministry. Elliston 1940, 37, 133–134.

890 Elliston 1940, 47–48.

891 Jackson 1940, 13. The first printing appeared in 1938. Bugbee says something similar regarding American knowledge of Finland. Bugbee 1940, ii.
essential element in their sympathy for Finland. German aggression was morally outrageous, but the Poles and Czechoslovaks were not innocent of the European power balance. It was important to remind Canadians of this, because even when they do learn of Finland from the “bolder writers” they are left with the impression that there is not “anything of moment to be learned from the country which so many of them vacantly describe as the Land of a Thousand Lakes.”892 The overall impression was Finland was a distant country on the boundary of Europe, and “In this telescopic treatment Finland never comes into focus.”893

Another version of the image of a borderland or bridge was that Finland offered a “middle way” between Eastern and Western ideas. Totalitarianism was regarded as an “Oriental” or Eastern mode of government. The West was the home of liberal democracy and free enterprise. Through the interwar years it was common for commentators and thinkers to claim the choice open to Europe was between the totalitarianism of fascism or communism and the freedom of democracy. Finland seemed to have found a workable middle ground. Finland was a country that supposedly had no Nazi or communist sympathies, even if individual citizens might have those sympathies, yet was able to have elements of social democracy within a liberal democracy. Private enterprise operated alongside state controlled enterprise and social co-operative activities, to create a “humane capitalism in ‘peasant dress.’”894 It was a progressive, civilized, European country which was able to accommodate its Swedish minority in a way British and Canadian statesmen could learn from when dealing with their own conquered minorities the Irish and French-Canadians.895 Of course this conveniently overlooked the ethno-linguistic problems Finland had experienced in the years after independence.

The image of Finland as a borderland between Europe and Asia was a self-image, deliberately cultivated by Finnish elites. That it was accepted without much reservation can be seen by the fact Jackson, concluded the prewar edition of his book on Finland with the statement, “Whatever it may be the general direction will not be far from that of the nations of the Western world, for Finland is the eastern outpost of Western civilization.”896 This was part of the message President Kyösti Kallio made explicit during his Independence Day address on 6 December 1939 when he said, “Fortunately it is understood in all sections of our population, and,
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893 Ibid., 13.
894 Ibid., 14–15.
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doubtless, beyond our frontier, that we are protecting not only our homes and independence, but also Western civilization.”\textsuperscript{897} It was an image embraced by the Western world and amplified in the news media.

Now that the Winter War had started, things began to move faster in Canadian foreign policy circles. The DEA seemed to become overwhelmed by the pace of events and the sheer volume of information, not just about Finland, but the entire world situation, as it tried to help co-ordinate the response of the Canadian government. Official British and Canadian sources and the press were used by King and External Affairs to understand the situation in Finland. The first concern was what response the League of Nations would give to the expected “Finnish appeal” for that body to do something regarding Soviet aggression. From the end of November 1939 until January 1940 the Canadian government tried to discern what aid Finland required, clarify what other countries especially Britain and the Allies were providing, and what if anything Canada could feasibly offer. Once a decision was reached on Canadian aid for Finland, energy was spent on trying to actually deliver it and deal with the question of Canadian and Finnish-Canadian volunteers who wanted to fight alongside the Finnish military.

6.2 Finland’s Appeal

The subsequent Canadian response grew out of how the League of Nations handled the situation and from the evolving policy of the Allies towards Scandinavia. The Secretary General Joseph Avenol on 2 December 1939 relayed the Finnish position to league members. Finland had maintained “neighbourly relations” since the Peace of Tartu and in 1932 signed a non-aggression pact which was extended in 1934 until 1945.\textsuperscript{898} Soviet claims that Finland had been intransigent or stubborn and refused to address Soviet concerns for the “strengthening of the security of Leningrad” were not correct since the Finns tried to reach an understanding. Instead the Soviets alleged “so called frontier incidents,” denounced the non-aggression pact and refused under its terms to have a neutral country adjudicate.\textsuperscript{899} They then launched a surprise attack, not only against frontier defences, but “open cities” from

\textsuperscript{897} Quoted in Jackson 1940, 234.
\textsuperscript{898} Secretary General of the League of Nations (SGLN) to SSEA, 2 December 1939, LAC, RG20, Vol. 254, File 32917. Nevakivi 1976, 53.
the air. This last point drew on images of the terror bombings which had occurred during the Spanish Civil War, placing Finland squarely in the Western civilized world, opposing fascism and Eastern barbarism. Finland wanted steps taken to stop this aggression and that the league should convene to consider the issue.900

Before anything more could be done the British SSDA relayed a general Finnish appeal for assistance, particularly things needed for defence purposes like raw materials, clothing, ammunition, and arms. Sweden had been the first country to send aid, so where appropriate these should replace supplies provided from Swedish stocks. Formed regular units were not being provided, but individual Swedish soldiers were being permitted to resign and go to Finland.901 The first inklings of the British and French policy towards Finland and the Scandinavian countries were also contained in these communications from London. Throughout the Winter War British diplomats observed the caution, hesitancy, and fear exhibited by the governments of the three Scandinavian countries who were anxious to avoid becoming entangled in either the Soviet-Finnish war or the wider European war. The Norwegian and Swedish governments feared that facilitating the movement of aid, as well as foreign and Finnish volunteers through their territory would at some point no longer be tolerated by the Soviet Union or its “ally” Germany.902 The British advised Canada in confidence that they hoped to draw the Scandinavian states closer to the Allies by capitalizing on the popular feeling which existed in those countries that Germany and the Soviet Union had to be stopped.903

Britain would stand at the league as part of the wider Allied opposition to aggression but would not raise the question of expelling the Soviets. Since France wanted the USSR expelled from the league, the British would only support this if there appeared no option when it came to Allied unity.904 It was feared that expulsion could lead to closer Soviet-German co-operation, could lead to a break in diplomatic relations, and even war with the USSR.905 Despite the information provided about how the French and British would vote, King in his capacity as SSEA preferred “to reserve judgement on that point until the views of those

900 This was done under articles 11 and 15 of the Covenant. SGLN to SSEA, 2 December 1939, LAC, RG20, Vol. 254, File 32917; Barros 1969, 199–200.
901 SSDA to SSEA, No. B399, 3 December 1939; and No. B401, 5 December 1939, LAC, Ibid.
902 SSDA to SSEA, No. B399, 3 December 1939, LAC, Ibid.
903 Ibid.
904 Ibid.
countries are more definitely indicated.\textsuperscript{906} The Canadian government held back even though this was only a day before the league council was set to meet.

Various league members expressed strong positions on the issue of Soviet aggression. Many of them openly condemned the Soviets, while others such as the “Oslo nations” exercised caution.\textsuperscript{907} The Canadian Advisory Officer in Geneva was uncertain what would happen with the Finnish appeal. There was an evident ground swell of support for the idea of expulsion. This became a primary goal for Secretary General Joseph Avenol, who hoped to use the Finnish appeal to breathe new life into the organization and he thought this could not be done with the USSR still a member.\textsuperscript{908} Finland did not in fact ask for expulsion, only requesting a league statement that aggression had occurred and an appeal for the Soviets to resume negotiations.

One possible outcome of the meeting the Canadian delegate thought was a resolution of support similar to that given to China in 1937. At that time the assembly “condemned” Japan for its actions in China, offered moral support, and urged member states to provide assistance, but deliberately avoided the thorny issue of sanctions.\textsuperscript{909} The Finns would have likely thought this comparison somewhat ironic since in the case when the council investigated the Manchurian crisis, it placed part of the blame on the Chinese for not maintaining order and violating Japanese treaty rights and the 1937 censure did nothing to stop Japanese attacks.\textsuperscript{910} League censure would not likely influence Soviet actions since they no longer recognized the government in Helsinki. The Soviets stated, after it was announced that the league would hear the Finnish appeal, that the meeting of the council would be unnecessary. After all they still maintained friendly relations with the “Democratic Republic of Finland” and their actions were at the request of this government to help “liquidate [a] ‘very dangerous seat of war’ created by former Finnish rulers.”\textsuperscript{911} This Soviet friendly Finland was of course the alternate government established in Terijoki, Karelia, under O.V. Kuusinen.

\textsuperscript{906} SSEA to CPDLN, No. 57, 8 December 1939 in Murray 1976, 1084–1085.
\textsuperscript{907} The Oslo nations refer to those who were part of the Oslo Agreements. See Roon 1989, 323–327.
\textsuperscript{909} Ibid., 58.
\textsuperscript{910} Renouvin 1969, 40–41, 102–103. For Canada’s role see Eastman 1946, 91–95; Veatch 1975, 115–124.
\textsuperscript{911} Canadian Advisory Officer, League of Nations to SSEA, No. 82, 6 December 1939, LAC, RG20, Vol. 254, File 32917; Edwards 2006, 139–140.
Elias Erkko the Finnish minister in Stockholm told the South Africans about air raids on Finnish towns creating hardship for the civilian population, where many Finns might “have to subsist precariously and primitively...as their ancestors did many centuries ago.”\textsuperscript{912} It was a reference to periods of famine and war from Finland’s past. This was also an allusion to the Nationalist bombing of cities during the Spanish Civil War. Done with German and Italian military aid this had been portrayed as an example of totalitarian barbarism and in this case, Finland represented Western civilization. From him something of the Finnish determination and attitude towards their enemy was learned. Apparently Erkko and many others did “not share [the] light hearted depreciation of [the] Red Army sometimes uttered here.”\textsuperscript{913} Erkko made it evident the “Finns realize that they are being attacked by an enemy vastly superior in numbers and equipment...But even against such odds we will fight to the last man.”\textsuperscript{914} The South African minister related the sympathy and admiration of his country for the brave Finns.

Certainly, the Canadian government was aware of popular sympathy for Finland through news reports and by Canadians writing to express these views.\textsuperscript{915} For example, the City of Winnipeg passed a resolution condemning the Soviet invasion of the small nation and stated their outrage at the attacks on the civilian population. They also called for more action by the Canadian government and for an embargo against the Soviets.\textsuperscript{916} At least eight other communities informed the Canadian government they passed similar resolutions.\textsuperscript{917} During the opening battles of the war the Finns were extremely successful at stopping the attacks of their much larger enemy. As C.P. Stacey, described it: “The Finns met their gigantic antagonist with a combination of courage and skill that has few parallels in modern

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{912} Copy Telegram South African Minister, Stockholm to South African High Commissioner, No. 30, 5 December 1939 in HCCUK to SSEA, No. A324, 7 December 1939, LAC, RG20, Vol. 254, File 32917.
\item \textsuperscript{913} Ibid.
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history, and which commanded the sympathy and admiration of the free world.”918
This was not lost on the Canadian prime minister who commented several times in
his diary about the courage of the Finns. While musing over Soviet war aims during
the first days of the invasion, he saw the attack on Finland was also aimed at Britain
and thought “The Finns’ resistance is splendid but they and the neutral countries
are very weak.”919

The League of Nations Council met as scheduled on 9 December and Rudolph
Holsti presented the Finnish appeal asking it, “to take steps to end the
aggression.”920 As he requested the appeal was referred to the assembly on 11
December. At this late point, the Canadian Permanent Delegate Hume Wrong
finally received some direction on Canada’s position on expulsion. There was some
doubt as to how the neutral countries would vote, but those closer to the war zone
would be in a more difficult position than the vocal Latin American countries. In
the end Wrong was told that “If the United Kingdom supports the resolution for
expulsion you should also support it.”921

The Finnish appeal was the only political item on the agenda of the assembly,
which included several administrative and budgetary questions. Holsti skilfully
presented the Finnish case. In so doing he referred to past Soviet statements where
they denounced aggression under all circumstances and had urged members to take
collective action against any aggressor state. He pointed out the audacity of the
Soviet claim that Finland had no right to present its case because they “had created
a puppet government in a Finnish frontier village,” yet previously in the assembly
they argued aiding rebels was a violation of international law.922 The Canadian
delegate reported back to Ottawa that “Sympathy for Finland and condemnation of
the Soviet Government, however, were not enough. Finland was fighting for her
life as well as for the highest ideals. She was entitled to expect assistance from all
civilized nations.”923 The appeal the Finnish government hoped would be a “means
to transform the world’s sympathy into active help.”924

The assembly created a special committee, of which Canada was a part, to
consider the appeal. It convened right away and sent a telegram to both the Soviet

918 Stacey 1981, 279.
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920 Canada 1940a, 5.
922 Canada 1940a, 5.
923 Ibid.
924 Ibid.
and Finnish governments calling on them to cease hostilities and begin negotiations. The Soviet negative reply came as no surprise. A report by the committee was presented on 14 December, outlining the facts of the situation as they were known and the treaty obligations of both belligerents. It noted that the Finns had sought conciliation and were willing to accept the arbitration of a neutral state, even after hostilities began. The attitude and actions of the Soviet government it concluded fit the accepted definition of aggression. Recommendations to accompany the report took the form of a draft two-part resolution. The first part condemned the actions of the Soviet Union and made an urgent appeal to all members “to provide Finland with such material and humanitarian assistance as may be in its power and refrain from such action which might weaken Finland’s power of resistance.” The secretary general was authorized to offer “technical services” in organizing the aid to Finland. Part two of the resolution outlined the events and concluded that the Soviet Union had not simply violated, “but has by its own action placed itself outside the Covenant.” These things would play a significant factor in how Canada responded in the weeks that followed.

During the plenary session of the assembly on 14 December, the report and recommendations were adopted. As one historian of the Winter War has described it, the discussion was “vaulting in its eloquence” when condemning Soviet actions. Based on the report by the Canadian delegates, Canada chose not to say anything. Their report gave detailed accounts of what each Canadian delegate said in the committees and sessions dealing with administrative and budgetary matters, but record nothing on the debate about Finland. As they had been directed the Canadian delegates voted in favour of the report and resolution. In what has been described as the last effective act of the League of Nations, the council passed a resolution condemning Soviet actions, which placed that country “outside the League of Nations” and it followed “that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is no longer a Member of the League.” The vote was technically unanimous, but Finland as a party to the dispute, as well as Greece, Yugoslavia, and China abstained.
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The historical and popular interpretation has been that the council declared the Soviet Union an aggressor and expelled it from the league. Finland had not asked for expulsion and based on the wording of the resolution it was not exactly what happened. The resolution by the council which formalized the league’s actions merely took into “cognisance” the resolution of the assembly and restated its main points. The resolution never expelled the Soviets explicitly, even though the Canadian delegate Hume Wrong advised the SSEA that “[The] Council has voted [for the] expulsion of Russia.” The sophistry of the technical wording was immaterial for how states like Canada would react.

As later commentator Mack Eastman noted, the interwar bankruptcy of Canada’s support for appeasement was evident in the Finnish case. During the latter part of the 1930s Canada insisted that the articles of the League of Nations Covenant dealing with sanctions and collective security no longer had any power behind them and that victims of aggression could not count on any support from Canada. Even as the aggressive nature of the totalitarian regimes such as Germany and the Soviet Union became apparent, Canada still urged small states to disarm. The Canadian example was he noted, was only surpassed by the “pathos” of “the Oslo group at the Assembly of 1939, when one of their number was appealing in vain for succour in face of the Russian invasion.”

The assembly did not “end” its session, but instead adjourned. They left in charge a General Committee of ten states, including Canada, to allow business to be conducted should the secretary general or the supervisory commission overseeing aid require a decision on any matter. The president of the assembly left the delegates with his thoughts that the members try to conduct the affairs considering the Finnish appeal in terms of the ideals of the league and international law. It was his hope that this was a move towards international solidarity and that in the future “it would be evident that the feeble efforts which they have made had not been entirely in vain.” Additionally, before it adjourned the assembly passed a resolution which amounted to a special appeal calling on nations both member and non-member to give what material and humanitarian aid they could and to do
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nothing that would impair Finland’s ability to resist. It was another half-hearted attempt at achieving a sense of moral authority, since of those present only seven voted in favour, with the rest abstaining. Domestic public opinion in many of the member nations was strongly in favour of more concrete action, but as with all previous efforts to respond to aggression the league was impotent. The rump administration left in charge of the affairs busied itself with efforts to co-ordinate aid for Finland which gave a semblance of action.

6.3 Canadian Aid to Finland

Four days after the passing of the resolution on aid to Finland, the secretary general sent a message to all member states asking what each government intended to do. Skelton relayed this to the prime minister on 19 December, saying “I assume you would wish to give some aid. Possibly the form or measure might depend upon word from other countries. We have had no communication as to what the United Kingdom is doing, much less the forty odd members of the League who did not happen to have another war on their hands.” However, his statement was inaccurate and a flurry of telegrams, starting the previous day, gave details on what various countries were offering and this news was relayed to Canada directly by the league, by the permanent delegate, and at times by the British. The somewhat acid comment by Skelton was a result of the strain brought about by the heavy work load his department was facing, but it also showed how good Skelton understood his superior. Prime Minister King would be inclined to offer aid to Finland, but Skelton had to temper that because Canada’s resources were already heavily committed. No matter how just the Finnish cause was, it was not Canada’s war. Perhaps his prime minister would see the wisdom presented by the Argentine government, which was willing to consider suggestions for aid to Finland, within the “limits imposed by the distance and their material circumstances which separate it from that country.” The Argentine phrasing matched Skelton’s outlook exactly and he could not have said it better himself.

---

940 “Memorandum for the Prime Minister” by ODS, 19 December 1939, LAC, Ibid.
The Canadian government or at least the prime minister was determined to help Finland, but not much could be done before the New Year. King delayed deciding on how Canada would respond, until his staff could get a clear picture. In part this was to avoid making an offer that contradicted Allied policy, but also to avoid duplication of effort, and ensure whatever Canada did had the maximum benefit. It was a reasonable stance, but given the fact Finnish needs were so great, it meant delaying any much-needed assistance. The USSEA on 2 January 1940, instructed the senior civil servants in all government ministries and departments to discuss among their staff what “form such aid might take.”

Always aware of contingencies, Skelton also cautioned that the “feasibility” of transporting that aid to Finland had to also be taken into account. They were to then brief their respective ministers for the cabinet meeting the next day.

Skelton summarized what was known about the aid other countries offered by the first part of January 1940. Britain and France had announced through the league they would offer any assistance they could. So far it appeared they had offered aircraft and various types of artillery, but it was unclear if these were a gift or being offered for purchase. The British and French offered Norway and Sweden assurances of support should their assistance to Finland jeopardize their security, though there was nothing to indicate they would accept this offer. The Norwegians and Swedes opposed French plans to send an expeditionary force to Finland or any Allied break in relations with the Soviets. Instead the two Scandinavian countries, to borrow a phrase form Canadian political scientist Nils Ørvik, tried to “defend against help,” by agreeing jointly “on a policy of great prudence.” Sweden and Norway were prepared to help along “Spanish lines,” to permit supplies and individual volunteers to pass through their territory.
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945 “Assistance to Finland” by ODS, 3 January 1940, LAC, Ibid. The phrase was coined by Ørvik to illustrate a policy he thought Canada should adopt vis-à-vis the US. At its core the strategy aims to build a credible enough military to reassure the larger neighbour that it does not need to station forces in the smaller state to ensure its own security. Ørvik pointed to Finland’s defence policy and the Paasikivi-Kekkonen Line as an example of a successful defence against help policy. It could be said that Sweden at least in the 1939–1945 period was also an effective example of this, first against the British and French and then the Germans. Ørvik 1973.
946 “Summary of Discussions Between the United Kingdom, France, Norway and Sweden, Regarding Aid to Finland,” 16 January 1940, LAC, RG25 G1, Vol. 1994, File 1191. The association of possible aid to Finland with the Spanish Civil War was perhaps unfortunate given the attitude of the Canadian
Additionally, South Africa had released some planes they had acquired in Britain. The US was prepared to make credits available and return the last instalment of the “war debt” paid by Finland, in addition to allowing the purchase of around 40 planes. Privately, the Finnish Relief Fund had provided $200,000.947 There were also in Skelton’s view a number of vague replies from Latin-American states.948

The reports provided by the departments were not promising and did not have anything concrete to suggest. The Minister of Agriculture thought it might be a good way to get rid of Canada’s surplus processed apples, the Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke of the possibility of sending wheat or flour, and the Minister of Pensions and National Health considered medical supplies and possibly having the military transfer ambulance units to Finland.949 The Department of National Defence regretted that nothing “useful could be done promptly,” though the acting minister thought there might be some planes available.950 The army in particular thought there was little they could do, since the only option open was to provide equipment, “but as we are ourselves deficient, this is not a practical proposition.”951 On the other hand while the Department of Customs did not think any means of assistance was within their purview, the Finance Minister J.L. Ilsley thought there might be aircraft still available, which had been denied an export permit because they were destined for Spain during the recent “Spanish Revolution.”952 His response qualified this by adding, “The usefulness of these machines to the Finns and the practicability of their shipment is, of course something on which the advice of the aircraft and naval experts would be required.”953 Depending upon what the government decided, the Finance Department would ensure the shipment moved through customs with a minimum of administrative procedure.

The matter had been looked at, but the prime minister recorded in his diary on 3 January 1940, that it was not given the importance it required. 954

947 The was popularly known as the Hoover Relief Fund. For an example of one American state see Oinas-Kukkonen 2011.
949 King to Norman McLarty, Chairman, Cabinet Committee on Public Information, 4 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.
950 K.S. MacLachlan, Acting Deputy Minister, Naval and Air, DND to Skelton, USSEA, 3 January 1940; W.L. Mackenzie King to McLarty, 4 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.
951 H. DesRosier, Acting Deputy Minister, Militia, DND to Skelton, USSEA, File HQC 83824, January 1940, LAC, Ibid.
952 Deputy Commissioner of Customs to Skelton, 4 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.
953 Ibid.
954 King Diary, 3 January 1940, LAC, MG26 J13.
Communications sent by Winston Churchill to the prime minister indicated the seriousness with which Britain viewed the Russian threat. If Finland fell, Sweden, and Norway were sure to follow, and the Soviets would have ports from which to strike at Britain. Hence the concern showed by King over the “importance of the situation” when he assigned Norman McLarty, the Minister of Labour and Chair of the Committee on Public Information to look into what aid Canada could provide and make recommendations to cabinet. 955 The prime minister would be away speaking as part of the ongoing election campaign and wanted to ensure the government was doing something about aid.

McLarty was eager to be ready for the cabinet meeting on 18 January but delayed his preparations by having External Affairs make inquiries about what other countries were providing. While this may have served the purpose of obtaining a clear picture, the information had already been provided and all it would have required was an examination of the files. The information he needed would come in fits and starts from already overworked offices in London, Geneva, and other departments in Ottawa over the next 14 days. One overriding concern McLarty had was the impact possible aid to Finland had on Canadian neutrality. McLarty thought Canadians would tend to ignore the fact they were neutral in the Russian-Finnish conflict but cautioned “we should not allow this feeling to run away with our judgement in giving consideration to the matter.” 956 How Canadian “neutrality” was affected he surmised would depend if Canadian government assistance was offered directly or was funneled through the Red Cross. 957

On this issue Skelton explained the Canadian situation in relation to the dilemma facing the Scandinavian countries which were “deeply apprehensive,” yet very “sympathetic with Finland,” but wanted to stay out of “both wars now waging in Europe.” 958 The Oslo States which advocated neutrality and non-alignment, also echoed Canada’s earlier stance on the collective security at the League of Nations and argued that there was no authority or machinery for collective action against an aggressor. Norway and Sweden, Skelton noted, faced “pressure from belligerents who feel that he who is not for us is against us, but they are determined to try.” 959 Skelton was referring to the fact “There are strategists in both Britain and France who would not mind a new north front developing in Scandinavia, but thus

956 McLarty to Skelton, USSEA, 5 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.
957 “Memorandum” by McLarty, nd., LAC, Ibid.
958 Skelton to Norman McLarty, Minister of Labour, 10 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.
959 Ibid.
far the countries directly concerned have shown no enthusiasm for such a project, even if accompanied by an Anglo-French guarantee." 960 At the same time there was no indication that Britain or France wanted to break relations or make war with the Soviet Union, even though military aid to Finland could be considered a belligerent action. Norway and Sweden also skirted belligerency by giving “aid on the Spanish plan” and allowing their nationals to go as volunteers and war supplies to move through their countries to Finland, the way Italy, Germany, France, and Russia did during the Spanish Civil War. 961 He argued that “There are nowadays no blacks or whites on the subject of neutrality, but a score of shades running from strict old fashioned neutrality to old fashioned belligerency.” 962 What Skelton preferred was Canadian aid to reflect a lighter shade of grey, in contrast to the darker shade Prime Minister King sought due to his outrage over the attack on Finland, but which failed to reflect the reality of what was possible in Canada’s situation.

To be certain about his recommendations, McLarty again asked Skelton to confirm what the US, UK, France, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand were doing. Skelton told McLarty on 10 January, with perhaps some frustration, that London had not yet sent complete replies to the telegrams asking the form and extent of the aid being given to Finland. When the reply from the Dominions Office came on 15 January it patiently collated the information which had already been received in Ottawa in at least four circulars on previous days and there was no hint of consternation at having to ask the burdened British departments to do clerical work for the Canadian Department of External Affairs. 963 The issue for Skelton was the lack of clarity as to which items were gifts, which were purchases, how much was from private donations and the Red Cross, and how were they being sent to Finland? 964

The difficulty with clarity was in part a result of the tragic comic situation at the League of Nations. Alfred Rive, the Acting Permanent Delegate wrote to Norman Robertson in despair over communication delays, “Sometime when you get a break between sitting in at meetings of the Exchange Control Board and playing bridge dictate a note to this lonely outpost of what is left of civilization. Mails to Geneva alternate with mails to Easter Island. What in hell is the department

960 Ibid.
961 Ibid.
962 Ibid.
963 J.J.S. Garner, DO to L. Mayrand, 15 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.
964 SSEA to HCCUK, No. 27, 7 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.
doing anyway? I gather everybody’s work but its own.” Rive was kept busy but accomplished little. In Geneva he wrote “[Thanassis Prodromou] Aghnides is humping himself around from Permanent Delegation to Permanent Delegation on a great series of hush-hush missions to get a bit of aid for Finland. The Secretary General is so scared that a bit of publicity will blow up and that all the governments will run and hide from him.” Reporters were banned from the league building to avoid the risk of media exposure. Rive tried to find out “what other governments were doing to aid Finland but got practically nowhere.” Eventually he got the information only in the “strictest confidence,” however, he added “if you think I would learn what countries were making outright gifts, what countries were selling against credits and what countries wanted to feel the cash first you’re a simple ink stained and baggy kn ked hick with no place in diplomacy.”

By now, External Affairs was able to paint a clearer picture of the aid going to Finland. Australia was limiting its aid to a humanitarian appeal and a grant of 10,000 Australian dollars to the Red Cross. South Africa was offering as a gift 29 Gauntlet aircraft it had purchased surplus from the RAF in Britain. The French and British were maintaining secrecy to conceal the nature of their aid. Inevitably details leaked out to the press and it appeared fighter and bomber aircraft, weapons, ammunition, and various types of military and civilian supplies were being sent by Britain. Finland was granted preferential treatment for the export of items being purchased, even if there were difficulties making payment. Other raw materials were indirectly provided by using British stocks to replenish Swedish and Norwegian commodities sent to Finland. The provision of these items was kept private and made to look as if they were sold to the Finns by the firms concerned.
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965 CPDLN to Robertson, 26 February 1940, LAC, RG25 D1, Vol. 774, File 355, Reel T1791.
966 Aghnides was the aid to the SGLN Joseph Avenol. LAC, Ibid.
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969 High Commissioner for Canada in Australia to SSEA, No. 6, 8 January 1940, LAC, RG25 G1, Vol. 1994, File 1191.
970 SSEA to HCCUK, No. 27, 7 January 1940, LAC, Ibid. These were Gloster Gauntlet II aircraft nicknamed the “Kotletti” (Cutlet). Shores and Ward 1969, 7–8.
972 SSDA to SSEA, B400, 4 December 1939, LAC, RG20, Vol. 254, File 32917. The numbers of aircraft vary depending on the source. The problem is differentiating between those purchased before December 1939, but not delivered until after the war started and purchases and gifts made during the war, some of which were not received until after the peace. In other cases, offers of gifts of aircraft, weapons, and supplies which did not arrive before the peace were withdrawn. Countries providing aircraft were Sweden, Great Britain, South Africa, France, Italy, and the United States. Treu 2003, 212; Lundin 1957, 276–277 n49; Keskinen and Stenman 1998, 7–8, 14.
so the Swedes could not be accused by the Soviets of collusion with British intervention.\textsuperscript{973} Norway and Sweden went further secretly providing aircraft, arms, and ammunition. Other countries not offering much in official aid like the Netherlands and Denmark permitted volunteers to go to and allowed private individuals and the Red Cross to raise funds. Hungary and Italy also sent volunteers and various quantities of military supplies. Most of this aid went through Britain, then to Norway and Sweden. A few volunteers managed to go by the more direct route through Germany, but military supplies sent this way were intercepted by the Nazi regime.\textsuperscript{974} 

At about the same time the Canadian minister in Washington telephoned External Affairs to provide details on how the US was responding. Loring Christie reported the most significant step taken was the granting of a $10 million credit, later raised to $30 million, by the Export Import Bank for agricultural and civilian supplies.\textsuperscript{975} There was also a limited “moral embargo” against selling some strategic items to both Finland and Russia.\textsuperscript{976} However, the US Navy did allow Finland to purchase 44 Brewster “Buffalo” F2A-1 fighters.\textsuperscript{977} For any items purchased by Finland, the US government was going to facilitate rapid delivery. The Finnish Relief Fund had sent $400,000 in civilian aid by early January 1940 and the Red Cross another $250,000 of medical supplies, in addition to numerous private donations sent directly to the Finnish minister in Washington. The most pressing issue the Finns identified was the need for military supplies and the current credits and donations were not much help in this regard. There was no indication

\textsuperscript{973} They were materials like wool, rubber, steel, cotton, brass wire, lubricating oil, jute, tin, and aluminium. Skelton to McLarty, 16 January 1940; SSDA to SSEA, D43, 25 January 1940, LAC, RG25 G1, Vol. 1994, File 1191.

\textsuperscript{974} Memorandum, 16 January 1940; SSDA to SSEA, No. D43, 25 January 1940, LAC, Ibid. The updated aircraft list included 12 “Short-nosed” Blenheims, 17 Lysanders, 12 Hurricanes, 20 Skuas, and 13 ROCs. Other arms and equipment included 100 anti-tank guns, 10,000 anti-tank mines, 25 howitzers, 100 machine guns, hand grenades, Very Light pistols, gas masks, and ammunition of all sorts.


\textsuperscript{976} Nevakivi found in the US archives that the government’s attitude behind closed doors was isolationist and obstructionist and contrary to public opinion. Arms supplies were blocked, a promised $150 million reconstruction loan was cancelled, and the American government bought gold from and financed arms and aviation fuel sales to the USSR. Nevakivi 2000, 302–325; “Nevakivi tyrmää Ylikankaan teesit talvisodan päättymisestä.” http://w3.verkkouutiset.fi (12.9.2015).

\textsuperscript{977} Americans were asked not to export the mineral molybdenum, which was used to produce steel alloys. They were also requested not to sell aluminium, and not provide engineering designs for the production of high quality aviation fuel. The version of the Brewster purchased was actually the export version, Model 239. Stenman and Thomas 2010, 10–11.
congress would take any further action to help Finland. Skelton characterized the American response as one of “a great deal of sympathy and practical action.”

With this background information McLarty met with the Finnish Consul General Kaarlo F. Altio who explained the civilian population near the war zones and refugees needed clothing of all sorts including underwear, socks, shoes, and boots. Food was another area Canada could help. Grain and fish Canada had plenty of, but countries like Argentina had offered 50,000 tons of wheat and Finland with her coasts and 60,000 lakes had plenty of fish. One possibility was that Canada could provide fresh apples. Munitions and military supplies Altio thought were best obtained in Britain. On the other hand, Canada could be a source of uniforms or cloth for uniforms. The rapid mobilization of the Finnish reserve troops meant these were in short supply and if Canada could supply them, “particularly in view of the fact that men without uniforms were liable to be shot as spies.” The Finnish air force which started the war with roughly 250 antiquated aircraft, was eager for more but, he cautioned slow planes would be of little use. Altio’s “personal hope was that if aid of a military nature could be given it might take the form of either a squadron of Canadian bombing planes with Canadian pilots or an infantry ski unit,” but more practically civilian aid through the Finnish Defence Fund or the Red Cross was the best option.

One of the practical considerations regarding Canadian aid was the issue of how the material would be transported to Finland. It would be an empty gesture if the aid could not be delivered. As far as the Department of Trade and Commerce determined, there was no ships going directly from Canada or the US to Finland. This was because the war risk made insurance so expensive it was impractical. Anything shipped from an American port would go to Norway, since the US government still permitted American ships to sail there. Canadian aid could still be sent by ship to Gothenburg or Malmo, Sweden, where it could be moved by rail to Finland. Still this would be expensive, and shipping could only be paid as far as Sweden, with the consignee paying the forwarding charges. It was thought the Canadian government could give a refund for these shipping costs. An alternative
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978 CMUS to SSEA, No. 7, 8 January 1940; CMUS to SSEA, No. 9, 8 January 1940, LAC, RG25 G1, Vol. 1994, File 1191.
979 Skelton to McLarty, 10 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.
980 “Aid to Finland” by ODS, 10 January 1940, LAC, Ibid. This was a reference to the “Model Cajander” named after Finnish Prime Minster Aimo Kaarlo Cajander, whereby soldiers were issued only belt and a badge to wear on their cap, but otherwise wore their own civilian clothes. Tuunainen 2016, 53.
981 “Aid to Finland” by ODS, 10 January 1940; Skelton to McLarty, 10 January 1940, LAC, RG25 G1, Vol. 1994, File 1191.
was to provide the aid to the Canadian Red Cross, which had the machinery to forward items to Britain and the British Red Cross would handle it from there. Later Ottawa was informed that the League Secretariat offices in London and Paris were co-ordinating transport with a committee in Stockholm, which was arranging for cargo space from US, British, and French ports. There were also Finnish ships currently loading in or on their way to US ports. The co-ordinating committee thought they could make the return voyage by calling into Halifax or St. John’s and there join British convoys. What was not mentioned in the messages was that if they did that, for the first half of the Atlantic crossing, the ships would be escorted by the Royal Canadian Navy (RCN).

While the question of aid to Finland was being looked at by External Affairs, on 8 January, the commissioner of customs informed them that the Canadian Car and Foundry plant at Fort William, Ontario (now Thunder Bay) had Grumman planes (G-23) sitting boxed and ready for shipment. He claimed they could be “easily” made available to Finland. These were the same aircraft that cabinet had dismissed four days earlier, but now were willing to look at more closely. The G-23’s had been assembled in Canada under licence from the American company in 1937–1938 at the time of the Spanish Civil War. They were ordered for the Spanish Republican Government, through intermediaries in Turkey to circumvent the US embargo on war materials for belligerents. Apparently a number of them had reached Spain this way before it was learned that the Turkish government had not ordered these aircraft and US authorities asked Canada to intervene. Caught in this unethical situation Canadian Car was left with some completed aircraft and parts to assemble 16 G-23s.

A Finnish “technical expert” who inspected the planes was impressed with their performance. Despite this the Canadian military did not support the offer of the
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982 Parmalee, Deputy Minister, Department of Trade and Commerce to Skelton, 8 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.
983 Acting CPDLN, No. 7, 14 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.
984 Canadian Minister in France to SSEA, No. 9, 16 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.
985 The RCN played a key role in the Battle of the Atlantic, escorting over 25,000 merchant ships to Britain. Schull 1987, 430.
986 “Memorandum for Dr. Skelton Assistance to Finland” by Robertson, 8 January 1940, LAC, RG25 D1, Vol. 774, File 355, Reel T1791.
987 Historians who have examined aircraft production at Canadian Car do not mention the offer to Finland. Burkowski 1995, 31–38; Kirton 2009, 30–32.
988 “Memorandum for Dr. Skelton Assistance to Finland” by Robertson, 8 January 1940, LAC, RG25 D1, Vol. 774, File 355, Reel T1791; Winchester 2002, 21; Fitzsimons 1978, 931–932.
planes to Finland. Before the war, the Defence Purchasing Board had looked at them and later the War Purchasing Board rejected them as possible trainers for the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan (BCAP) on the “technical advice” of DND. 990 Six of the planes still needed to be assembled and all of them needed to be fitted with armaments. There were several patterns of engines, which would pose a logistics and maintenance problem. Lastly, the military thought the planes were not suitable for combat against “first line aircraft and doubted whether we would be helping the Finns very much by facilitating their purchase.” 991 The question of the G-23s was also complicated by the fact that Finland did not apparently have the $41,000 to purchase them. The attitude of the US government was not known, since under the license the company had to comply with American law and not export to a belligerent country. However, the recent sale of Brewster fighters seemed to suggest a licence to export the G-23s was possible. Canada had yet to decide what form aid to Finland would take if any was offered at all and Skelton did not seem to favour military hardware.

On 15 January, the Postmaster General’s office finally offered its suggestions and under its responsibility the money order system could be used. To aid Finland they could promptly process every account and expedite approvals through the Foreign Exchange Control Board. However, the Deputy Postmaster General observed that

it would seem to be a matter for the consideration of the government as a whole. The chief need of Finland being more in connection with items such as food, clothing and munitions, a grant of money or materials or a credit of some kind is more likely to be of real benefit than anything individual departments such as the Post Office could do towards helping in what is apparently a very trying situation for that country. 992

Based on this and a suggestion by the Red Cross, food was the only practical and appropriate aid Canada could offer.

990 Ibid.
991 “Memorandum for Dr. Skelton Assistance to Finland” by Robertson, 10 January 1940, LAC, RG25 D1, Vol. 774, File 355, Reel T1791. At least 34 of them had reached Spain, where flown in combat, though, they avoided the modern German and Italian fighters, and filled a reconnaissance and ground attack role. About half of them were taken into service by the Nationalist government and continued to be used into the 1950s. The RCAF agreed to purchase G-23s in September 1939, changed its mind, but in July 1940 bought the remaining G-23s, dubbing them the Goblin. The G-23 was used in Canada for training and coastal patrol until April 1942. Burkowski 1995, 38–38; Kirton 2009, 49–54.
The Cabinet War Committee met mid-afternoon of 18 January and discussed McLarty’s findings.\footnote{McLarty to Ernest Lapointe, Acting Secretary of State, 15 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.} The situation had greater urgency after a telegram received earlier in the day, from the Finnish minister in London expressed his country’s gratitude for the aid that was being sent, but added “the situation was not so good as pictured in the foreign press.”\footnote{SSDA to SSEA, No. D31, 18 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.} His country needed more men and aircraft, since “The Russians could bring up almost unlimited numbers of fresh troops while Finnish losses though not great absolutely were considerable in proportion to the size of the Finnish army.”\footnote{Ibid.} Despite this the planes offered by Canadian Car were ruled out. Given the desperate need of the Finnish air force for any aircraft and the high degree of success they had using planes of varying quality against the Soviets, it is likely they would also have found a good use for the G-23. The Minister of Justice Ernest Lapointe shared the view with King that to offer planes posed more problems than it solved, especially since the US was not supplying aircraft, unless they were paid for.\footnote{King Diary, 18 January 1940, LAC, MG26 J13.} For the BCAP Canada had to train large numbers air crew for Commonwealth and other Allied nations. Sending planes to Finland would create the impression that Canada had a surplus, when in fact there were still shortages. Military aid was ruled out mainly because Canada was still mobilizing, and it might violate the country’s neutral position. Food, clothing, and medical supplies, all of which there was a surplus, could be provided. Alternatively, like Australia, a grant could be made to the Red Cross or to Finland for civilian purposes only. The decision reached was there would be a Canadian gift of a $100,000 credit Finland could use to buy and ship Canadian food products.\footnote{Granatstein 1994, 76.} No specific items were stipulated, to retain the freedom to provide whatever food products were most urgently needed.

Over the next few days in the background, the Clerk of the Privy Council was preparing the necessary legal documents to permit the Canadian gift in the form of an Order in Council and Governor General’s Warrant to authorize the expenditure. The submission referred “to the fact that wide spread desolation and suffering has been caused by the invasion of Finland by the forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,” that the League of Nations had made an appeal for material

\footnote{Ibid.}
and humanitarian assistance and that the expenditure of $100,000 in “relief” for Finland to purchase and transport Canadian foodstuffs was in the “public good.”

Meanwhile the Finnish consul general on 20 January advised External Affairs that he had learned Finland needed “Indian Corn,” peas for soup, apples, canned fish, and other canned goods in general. Altio told Skelton that there was a regular Finnish freight line running from New York to Finnish Baltic ports and bulk shipments could go that route. Skelton noted Canada had no surplus of corn to spare, but “the question of aid was under consideration” and he should be able to provide an answer the following week. Canada did have a surplus of apples and Norman Robertson took it on himself to propose to the Finnish consul that dried apples could be supplied. However, the Finns preferred to get fresh apples. When the idea was mentioned to the prime minister “he was annoyed that the proposal had even been put forward and said we were not to renew it to the Finnish Consul General.” Apples had been a point of contention during the trade talks of the 1930s and the issue would come up again.

Finally, on 23 January the Finnish consul was informed that $100,000 was at his disposal. For this Finnish Foreign Minister Vaino Tanner expressed “the gratitude of the Finnish Government for your generosity and the goodwill to help Finland. The amount donated will bring relief to thousands of Finns now suffering from the war.” This was an overly generous assessment by Tanner, given what other countries were promising. Prime Minister Risto Ryti had been more conservative if equally optimistic in his “governments heartfelt thanks for your splendid gift. The sympathy and financial aid given our people in its heavy fight for freedom right and Western civilization inspire gratitude and confidence in a happy outcome.” It was important for the government to take some action. However, the Canadian gift did not receive much attention because it was overshadowed in the press by the stopping of shipments of wheat to the Soviet Union and the illness and death of the governor general. Only some foreign papers

998 Draft, SSEA to His Excellency the Governor General, January 1940, LAC, Ibid; OIC, PC220 1/2, 18 January 1940, LAC, RG2 A1a, Vol. 1664. A Governor General’s Warrant was used to authorize the expenditure. Canada 1941, 245.
1000 “Memorandum for Mr. McLarty Aid to Finland” by NAR, 22 January 1940, “Minute” by NAR 22 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.
1001 Laurent Beaudry, Acting USSEA to K.F. Altio, CGF, 23 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.
1002 Vaino Tanner, Finnish Foreign Minister to Foreign Minister, Ottawa, 27 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.
and a few Canadian papers ran small articles towards the end of January covering the thank you letter from Tanner.1004

This was because Canadian papers had been inundated with “graphic, sentimental, and personalized” wire service reports from Finland including those by Canadian correspondent Matthew Halton, who told Canadians about the experiences of Finnish soldiers at the front and the civilian population behind it.1005 They learned from him about “Molotov cocktails” and the motti guerilla tactics used by the “ghost patrols” on skis, wearing white or “lumipuku” capes and trousers when he visited the battlefield of Suomussalmi. An early example of the later practice of “embedding” media, he even went out on a patrol at the front near Salla. The reports praise the bravery of the Finns and condemn the indiscriminate targeting of civilian areas by the Soviets. The dispatches from Finland made Halton a celebrity journalist, boosted circulation of newspapers, but also helped increase Canadian public sympathy and support for Finland. Halton was one of the journalists who compared the defensive battles fought by the Finns to the Spartans at Thermopylae in the wake of the renewed Soviet offensive in February 1940. In the same report, unlike other correspondents he did not underestimate the Red Army’s capacity to succeed with superior numbers of arms and manpower, especially if Finland did not get aid from Britain and France.1006

Finland was also used by the Canadian prime minister to give a greater sense of urgency to the mobilization of resources for the war effort at the end of January 1940. During this period often called the “Phoney War” the Cabinet War Committee had been slow in acting. The efforts of the various departments of the government seemed predicated on the idea that Canada would get what arms and munitions it required from Britain. With an election campaign under way this left the Liberal government open to accusations of not doing enough. Over the intervening weeks the messages from London pointed to the possibility that Finland

---


1005 Halton 2014, 147. Halton was one of two Canadian correspondents covering the Winter War. The other was Charles Bothwell Pyper, of the Toronto Evening Telegram. Both spent time in Helsinki and Rovaniemi. Both sent back stories about the depredations of the Red Army and bravery of the Finns. Bourrie 2012, 167.

1006 What was perhaps surprising was Halton managed to get that past the Finnish censors. Halton despite his anger over the Soviet attack still held his prewar view that Nazi Germany was a bigger threat than Soviet Russia. Matthew Halton, “‘Hold Forever’ With 150,000 Recruits, Finns Tell Halton,” Toronto Star 15 February 1940 in Halton 2014, 147.
would be defeated soon. The popular press reports of “Gallant Finland” and the sympathy and optimism it created in the public mind, did not accurately show how desperate the Finnish situation was. King did not suggest that Canada could have done more to help Finland, he was more concerned of the consequences for Canada of a Finnish defeat. Very soon thereafter he feared the threat to Canada’s Atlantic coast would cease to be a theoretical possibility and to this was added the threat of Japanese aggression on the West coast. Under these circumstances Canada could not hope for munitions from Britain. The government owed Canadian soldiers the arms and ammunition they required and public opinion demanded no less. Canada’s entry into the war at the side of Britain was in part based on the assessment that Canadian security was tied to that of Britain. This logic dictated that the best Canadian defence was forward, on the other side of the Atlantic. The extension of that argument to Finland could have been made given the scenario outlined by the prime minister, but the connection was not explicitly made.

While the government vacillated over what form Canadian aid to Finland should take, the delegation at Geneva, and the high commissioner’s office in London did their best to keep Canadian decision makers informed. This took the form of relaying lists of items urgently required, details of specific aid offered by various countries, and confirmation of the delivery of particular items to Finland. Most of these were general appeals, but occasionally they were specific requests that a source be found in Canada for an item. For example, specific requests arrived looking to acquire chloride of lime for disinfecting, as well as parts for gas masks, and drugs to counter gas poisoning. These were to be used in defence of the civilian population. There were not sufficient stocks of these items to provide any for Finland.

Another example was at the end of January 1940, Finland had an urgent need for 300 tons of “sole leather,” presumably for military boots and it was wondered if Canada could fill this need. Given the hectic pace of events, it appears for a time Canada neglected to give any consideration or response. In the meantime, in early February Sweden had in fact supplied 250 tons of sole leather, on condition that the supply was replenished by other countries and the appeal was changed to reflect

---

1007 King Diary, 29 January 1940, LAC, MG26 J13. A similar view was recorded 8 February 1940.
1008 Over and above military equipment and arms, the lists included all sorts of medical supplies and medicines, all variety of foodstuffs, wool, cloth, clothing, cooking utensils, tents, fertilizers, products like wire and sheet metal, various chemicals, and raw metals. Vincent Massey, HCCUK to SSEA, No. A49, 5 February 1940; Alfred Rive, Acting CPDLN to SSEA, 25 February 1940; Rive to SSEA, No. 25, 27 February 1940, LAC, RG25 G1, Vol. 1994, File 1191 Part 2.
1009 Rive to SSEA, No. 24, 26 February 1940, LAC, Ibid.
Canadian officials set about locating stocks of leather, but the request had been too vague. There were questions about what types, grades, thicknesses, and if they wanted actual soles or just the leather? Was this to be a gift to Sweden or was it a sale of leather? If it was a gift, Canada had yet to decide what aid to give and leather might be something that could be provided, if it was not of a grade and type required by the Canadian military. Of course, this made any Canadian offer pointless. In the hastily changing situation and volume of correspondence between Ottawa, London, Geneva, and Paris not much more was done by Canada, yet by this time some 22 countries, including Brazil and the US which were not league members had provided aid.\footnote{1011}

Shortly thereafter another inquiry came from Geneva, this time for wool yarn, green peas, and tin plate. Finland needed 400 tons of thick grey wool yarn. The Finnish Relief Fund had put up 100,000 Swedish Kronor to purchase the wool but supplies in Europe were low. Given that the Finnish Relief Fund was involved, the wool was likely intended to make warm clothing for refugees, rather than for military purposes. As with the leather, it turned out that Sweden had sold Finland 300 tons of green peas and 100 tons of tin plate for canning from its reserve stock in order to avoid delays. Regarding the availability of these items in Canada the Department of Trade and Commerce simply noted “these goods would not be available for export from Canada.”\footnote{1012} It was not evident if the rationale behind the response was because these items could not be exported to another country or if there simply was no surplus available. The wool was definitely needed to produce clothing for the Canadian military and there was none available for export.\footnote{1013} Regardless, while Finland’s situation grew more desperate, it left the question of what to do with the Canadian gift open.

Before the aid question Finland was resolved, the possibility of military supplies flowing through Canada arose in mid-January 1940.\footnote{1014} The British had been asking the US Army to provide surplus French 75mm guns left over from the First World War. If the US could be convinced to supply them, France would supply the ammunition. The Finnish minister Hjalmar Procopé planned to approach the US State Department, but the chances were slim it would be approved due to the...
neutrality law. However, Canada could use its good relations with the US to facilitate the transfer. Earlier in the war Canada had acquired from the US military, decommissioned tanks under the guise of “scrap metal” and aircraft were “abandoned” near the border and then towed across the boundary.\textsuperscript{1015} Perhaps a similar arrangement could be made for the guns. Like so many other opportunities for Canada to help Finland, this went no further. By facilitating the re-export of arms, it would have been “un-neutral act” and more openly taking sides in a war Canada was not a part of. In the end, the US military agreed to sell 200 of the guns to Finland, but they sailed from New York and joined an Allied convoy at Louisburg in May, too late to be used in the Winter War.\textsuperscript{1016}

By the beginning of March 1940, the delays were becoming an embarrassment as the news media began asking what Canada intended to do. Skelton advised a reporter from the \textit{Globe and Mail}, he would be informed once a decision was made taking into consideration “just how much information it would desirable to give from the standpoint of safe transportation of the purchases to their destination.”\textsuperscript{1017} Part of the delay was because the Finnish consul had yet to decide what food to buy. The consul was handicapped by the demands on his legation caused by the war and because he only received intermittent communications from his government. The lack of direction from Helsinki reflected the exigencies of the war and the fact that Canada was a low priority. External Affairs tried to make his job easier by relaying messages sent from Geneva containing lists of items Finland had requested.\textsuperscript{1018}

Even though the request to provide sole leather seemed to have been dropped, Finland had been making inquiries about the purchase of military boots but had not consulted Canadian authorities. Some Canadian manufacturers had over the previous weeks been asked for price quotes by J.T. Norell.\textsuperscript{1019} The possibility of

\textsuperscript{1015} Massey to SSEA, No. 210, 19 February 1940, LAC, RG25 G1, Vol. 1994, File 1191 Part 2; Dziuban 1959, 91. Regarding the guns Chief of the Imperial General Staff Edmund Ironside stated “They cannot be worth anything and would be of immense help to the Finns and perhaps even to us for training. I can think that they could be pushed over the frontier to Canada as the aeroplanes are being handled.” Macleod and Kelly 1962, 219–220.

\textsuperscript{1016} Admiralty to NSHQ, Naval Message 1247/22, 25 May 1940, LAC, RG24 D1c, Vol. 6842, File NSS 8702-842. The Finns classified them the 75 K/17 “Betlehem” which was actually a variation of the British 18 pounder fitted to fire French 75mm ammunition. It was in fact Ironside who knew of the existence of the guns and made the initial request on Finland’s behalf. Edwards 2006, 247-248; Macleod and Kelly 1962, 219–220; 75 K/17 “Betlehem.” http://www.jaegerplatoon.net (7.7.2016).

\textsuperscript{1017} “$100,000 Grant to Finland” by ODS, 1 March 1940, LAC, RG25 G1, Vol. 1994, File 1191 Part 2.

\textsuperscript{1018} Ibid.; Skelton, USSEA to Altio, 28 February 1940; Altio to Skelton, 29 February 1940, LAC, Ibid.

\textsuperscript{1019} He was the Canadian representative of the Finnish firm Fennia and the Finnish Foreign Trade Council, who presented himself as the “unofficial representative of Finland” in Canada. Likely he was working with the Suomen Huolto. Undated Clipping, Austin F. Cross, “He Carried Finnish Market in His Pocket,” LAC, RG20, Vol. 924, File 7-205.
Finland placing a large order was a problem because these fell within the purview of the War Supply Board. There were the needs of the military and the domestic market to consider. The Department of Trade and Commerce was concerned that if the Finnish purchase was not handled in an “orderly fashion” it would lead to “considerable advances in the price of leather.” Like the file on sole leather the file on military boots was “misplaced.”

Forest fire fighting was one area where it was thought Canada could aid based on the similarities with Finland in geography and ecology. Once the season changed it was speculated that the Soviets would launch incendiary attacks on the forest in Finland. Towards the end of February Alfred Rive relayed from Geneva, “it has been suggested that in North America considerable experience had been gained in the fighting of forest fires, and that special portable equipment had been developed and would be available.” Aside from the fact it was noted the discussion did not differentiate Canada from the US, it did reflect a common experience in the forest industry. The amount of equipment required was substantial: thousands of trucks, water tanks for the trucks, “hand fire engines,” buckets, axes, “adjustable saws,” “string” or “compass saws” (which were presumably “Swede or buck/bow saws”), hoes, spades, rolls of 25-yard hoses, and mattocks.

External Affairs set about finding Canadian suppliers for some of these items and provided information on Canadian firefighting methods. Part of the problem appeared to be interpreting what items were actually asked for. For example, did the trucks and tanks refer to automobiles or man pack water tanks, fitted with hand pumps and what were hand fire engines? What Skelton in the end sought were 5,000 of the man packs used by Canadians, as well as 5,000 buckets and 10,000 saws and axes. The Department of Mines and Resources thought there should be no difficulty providing them, but industrial water pumps and hoses were another matter. Stocks of pumps were low, and manufacturers could perhaps deliver 200–300 new pumps a week. Hoses were not generally made in Canada, instead jute or linen yarn fire hoses were usually acquired from the UK, but there the government
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had taken over the production for the war effort. The man packs also proved a problem. The type the Finns wanted were fitted with a water bag, but the style most often used in North America used a metal tank. The water bag material also came from the UK. None of this was resolved in time to be of any assistance to Finland.

Private Canadians in contrast were quick to provide funds and materials to help Finland. In December 1939 the consul general asked if this was legal and was advised, “the Canadian Government has no objection in principle to the collection and transmission to Finland of such funds as may be voluntarily contributed by persons resident in Canada for the relief of distress or other charitable purposes in the Republic.” G.W. Tornroos, the honorary vice-consul in Vancouver wanted to hold a tag day to raise funds and wondered if relief for Finland would qualify as a war charity under Canadian law. The War Charities Act was designed to identify and co-ordinate legitimate groups doing voluntary work in support of the Canadian war effort and that of her Allies in the war with Germany. As such it did not “apply to the hostilities between Finland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic.” He was free to do charitable work on behalf of Finland, so long as he complied with any local regulations and co-ordinated the forwarding of any money with the Foreign Exchange Control Board.

Naturally, the Canadian Red Cross was also “deeply interested in helping Finland in these tragic days” according to its chairman Norman Sommerville. From the start the Red Cross had been working with Finnish groups across the country to gather supplies and funds, which were forwarded to the Finnish Ambassador in London and then on to the Finnish Red Cross. By the middle of December 1939, they had already allocated $5,000 and all Canadian branches were accepting gifts of clothing and supplies. The cash donations would be used to purchase blankets, surgical, and hospital supplies and ship them along with the clothing. Hugh Keenleyside acknowledged this report for the department and said he would pass the news to the Finnish consulate about “the aid the Canadian Red Cross is giving Finland in these difficult days” and no doubt the consul general’s gratitude he knew “will be representative of that of the people of Finland as a

1025 Gibbon to Skelton, 24, 26, 27, and 29 February 1940; D. Roy Cameron, Dominion Forester, DMR to M. Wershof, DEA, 1 March 1940, LAC, Ibid.
1027 Skelton to Tornroos, 6 December 1939, LAC, Ibid.
1028 Norman Sommerville, Chairman Central Council and Central Committee, Canadian Red Cross Society to H.L. Keenleyside, DEA, 15 December 1939, LAC, Ibid.
Red Cross aid sent by 20 December had grown to $9,000. In its appeal the Canadian Red Cross stressed there were hundreds of thousands of refugees in Finland who, fled before the Russians, and this unforeseen flight in midwinter where there is very little surplus accommodation has created an intensely difficult situation for the people and has occasioned a good deal of suffering. This population will be without the necessary supplies of food, clothing and housing. Evidence of "what a very tragic situation faces the Finns" could be seen in the appeal for 1 million yards of surgical gauze.

At the end of February the League Secretariat was making an appeal for hospital supplies, including bedding, and clothing for patients to outfit 20,000 beds. External Affairs latched onto this and turned to the Red Cross as a possible avenue to direct government aid. Though Norman Sommerville was in a minority among his Red Cross colleagues, it was his view that the government should not provide funds to the society "at this time since that might have a tendency to affect the voluntary gifts of the people, which otherwise are available, and which themselves help to develop a splendid moral support to the Government in all its war activities." Private and government aid should be complementary, not overlapping. Clothing and medical supplies were things the Red Cross could provide, but not food at this time. Wheat, flour, condensed milk, and cheese were things the government might offer to "very readily assist the unfortunate Finns in their courageous fight." Sommerville advised Skelton this was Canada’s best option, since "I do not know of any action taken by the Government that would be more popular at the present time than prompt announcement of substantial aid to Finland."

Not all private efforts to help Finland were welcomed. One citizen in Montreal wanted to place an advertisement in the Financial Post, the national business...
newspaper, titled, “A Message to Men of Means.” The lengthy epistle drew on the images of Marshall Mannerheim nobly defending his country and gallant Finns, stalwartly defending their homes in an “epic fight” against Bolshevism for the values of the “free institutions” Canadians cherished, calling on the wealthy to use “enlightened self-interest and help provide funds so Finland could have the arms and ammunition needed in this struggle.” The paper referred the matter to the Bureau of Public Information, which sought advice from External Affairs. Skelton responded that the agreement with the consul general was that all funds collected in Canada were to be for civilian relief or some other charitable purpose. Clearly appealing for funds to buy military supplies did not fit and the individual was directed to the consulate to make sure his efforts conformed to Finland’s requirements. A revised version of the advertisement was drafted in an effort to remove the “ambiguities,” but Skelton stated it still “gives an erroneous impression.” Apparently dissuaded the advertisement was never published.

Many Canadians and Finnish-Canadians preferred to demonstrate support for Finland through various local and national Finland Aid (Suomi apu) movements. The various Finnish groups also supported the Canadian war effort. This was a key factor since raising aid for Finland could be interpreted as taking away from Canadian needs. Martha Allen notes one uniquely Finnish method of fund raising was for commercial saunas to donate the evening’s income to the war effort. In the Sudbury District alone $8,534.52 was raised. This effort continued after the Winter War ended with ongoing Finnish-Canadian support for the Canadian war, while also sending relief to Finland. Aside from contributing to one of the Suomi apu groups, Finnish-Canadians also contributed directly to the Suomen Huolto and the Canadian war effort through charitable organizations. However, most of the money raised did not reach Finland in time to be used before such aid to Finland was prohibited after June 1941. The remaining balance was saved and used after 1945 as relief for a devastated Finland in the form of food and clothing.

1039 Ibid.
1040 Skelton to Thompson, 3 January 1940, LAC, Ibid.
1041 Gowdy to Skelton, 3 January 1940; Skelton to Gowdy, nd., LAC, RG25 G1, Vol. 1994, File 1191.
1044 Laurent 2012, 325–328.
One political concern posed by private fundraising efforts was that Arthur Meighen, whom Prime Minister King disliked, had been actively promoting the Canadian Relief Fund campaign.\footnote{Lindström, “History of Finland-Canada Relations.” http://www.finland.ca (5.10.2010).} The former Conservative prime minister was now a Senator who gave speeches which tapped widespread popular sympathy for Finland and called for the Canadian government to do more. Meighen drew on all the positive images of Finland as a northern, civilized, democratic country with a high literacy rate, which found a middle way, tempering the extremes of capitalism with co-operatives, state enterprises, hospitals, social services, and progressive labour laws. The Finns were lovers of liberty, hardworking, industrious, intelligent, enlightened, progressive, Christian, peace loving, and brave. It was a David and Goliath struggle with the Soviet “octopus,” against “brutal bullies” who bombed women, children, hospitals, homes, and churches.\footnote{“Address of Rt. Hn. Arthur Meighen at Massey Hall, Toronto, January 4, 1940, on behalf of help to Finland,” LAC, MG26 I5, Vol. 208, Reel C3585. For the sections that contain the images see Meighen 1949, 355–359.}

Though Meighen no longer had any real political power, the popular enthusiasm his efforts raised, represented a danger in so far as the government could be pressured to act before it was ready or in a way that it considered not in the national interest.\footnote{Skelton to Colonel Clyde R. Scott, Military Secretary, DND, 19 February 1940, LAC, RG25, Vol. 1995, File 1939-1201-B.} In Britain, another nemesis of W.L.M. King, the former Conservative Prime Minister R.B. Bennett was acting as chairman of the Red Cross Finnish relief efforts and he was assisted by many leading Canadian businessmen.\footnote{Peggy de Gripenberg later wrote Bennett “thank you for all the Canadian Red Cross has done for Finland.” Gripenberg to Bennett, 4 August 1940, LAC, MG25 K, Vol. 937. Bennett had been commissioned the British government to do a speaking tour of Denmark, Norway, Finland, Lithuania, and Poland, scheduled for November 1939 to promote Britain and the Empire, but the war cut Poland and Finland out of the schedule. Waite 2012, 267–268.} It was another embarrassment for the government, since private citizens and retired politicians appeared to be more rapidly responding to Finland’s plight. However, the government could do little to prevent this and the delays in announcing official Canadian aid did not help.

### 6.4 Volunteers for Finland

Public opinion also pressed for more direct action and aside from the issue of aid there was the question of volunteers from Canada going to Finland to fight.\footnote{Stacey 1981, 279.} For
example, in January 1940 John Holzinger wrote asking if it was possible to organize an expedition of Hungarian-Canadians to fight for Finland, since “The Finns are the sister Nation of the Hungarians.”\textsuperscript{1051} Holzinger thought that a “Terrible ill fate is pursuing the Finn Nation. As it looks to me, this honourable Nation sooner or later have to fall under the overwhelming power of the Russians.”\textsuperscript{1052} His request was denied because it was not possible to authorize private military forces. Earlier that month Vivian Hack had inquired if it was permissible to join the Norwegian or Finnish armed forces. He and many Canadians like W.B. Scott of Montreal thought “Finland is fighting our battles.”\textsuperscript{1053} The problem as USSEA O.D. Skelton saw it, was that “The position with regard to Finland is different. Technically Finland is engaged in war with Russia, and Russia would be technically regarded as being a ‘friendly foreign state’ within the meaning of the words as used in the Foreign Enlistment Act.”\textsuperscript{1054} A similar proposal for a Ukrainian Canadian legion was rejected because of the perceived un-Canadian nature and pro-German sympathies of anti-communist nationalist Ukrainians.\textsuperscript{1055}

Legal concerns aside, evidence sympathy for Finland extended beyond the Finnish-Canadian community can be found in the fact a number of non-Finns volunteered to fight.\textsuperscript{1056} One such English-Canadian was Bill Newell of Toronto. Initially his departure was delayed because of passport difficulties, but these were cleared up and his travel expenses were covered by the Finnish Relief Fund. Newspapers on 31 January 1940 reported, he was going “because he likes Finns and ‘never did have any use for bullies.’”\textsuperscript{1057} He was also married to a Finnish woman and another paper added “I tried to get in the Canadian army and they didn’t need me, so my next best choice of wars was the one that’s going on in Finland.”\textsuperscript{1058}

The newspapers and the official telegrams from Geneva and London gave reports of thousands of foreign volunteers rushing to fight and many Canadians were among them. This was apparent in the dispatch sent by L.B. Pearson from 

\textsuperscript{1051} John Holzinger to King, 29 January 1940, LAC, RG25, Vol. 1995, File 1939-1201-B.
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\textsuperscript{1053} W.B. Scott to Skelton, 20 February 1940, LAC, MG26 J1, Vol. 295, Reel C4573.
\textsuperscript{1054} Skelton to Vivian John Hack, 10 January 1940, LAC, RG25, Vol. 1995, File 1939-1201-B.
\textsuperscript{1056} See Lindström 2000a, 57–64, 71–79.
\textsuperscript{1057} Toronto Evening Telegram 31 January 1940.
\textsuperscript{1058} Globe and Mail 31 January 1940. Both papers on 2 February 1940 ran a photo of his “wife” Elna being held up to the train carriage to kiss him goodbye. Like most Canadian volunteers he arrived too late to take part in much fighting before the armistice occurred in March 1940. The source of these images is a study of the trial in the fall of 1941 of Aircraftsman William Newell, for the murder of his Finnish-Canadian wife. Guillet 1943, 3–7, 195, 198.
London at the end of January 1940. The Soviet Tass news agency and Reuters commented on the foreign volunteer legion forming at Oulu, where at least 11 nationalities were represented. They specifically pointed out the presence of Canadians and Americans. The Canadians were welcome because they were accustomed to the climate and expert skiers. Canada, it was surmised had given unofficial blessing to the volunteers because the country had not imposed conscription, whereas British volunteers risked violating their obligation for national service and Americans risked losing their citizenship. Nonetheless the North American volunteers were unmistakeable with their trans-Atlantic accents.1059

Honorary Consul Graham also lobbied in early February 1940 to be able to send volunteers to Finland via Canada. Careful not to contravene Canadian law or government policy he sought the advice of O.D. Skelton. He pointed to Britain’s support of such efforts and asked if it was permitted to use the funds raised as aid for Finland, to cover travel expenses for volunteers. In this case it would be mainly Finnish nationals and a few Canadian pilots who had been rejected by the Royal Canadian Air Force (RCAF).1060 It was not the use of privately raised funds that caused concern, but the mere fact that volunteers were being recruited which potentially violated Canadian and international law. While, seeking legal advice about the applicability of the Foreign Enlistment Act, Skelton told John Read, “As usual in connection with this Finnish matter, there is a good deal of intentionally loose and exaggerated talk as to what is being done, though there are definite possibilities of something quite substantial developing later.”1061 Canada was at peace with the Soviet Union and permitting a belligerent to recruit in the country would constitute an “un-neutral act.” With the Spanish Civil War, Skelton noted the country had been careful to avoid any appearance of such an infraction. He of course was overlooking the fact despite the government knowing about recruitment for Spain no legal action was taken. H.L. Keenleyside told Skelton that if the Finnish consul wished to use the funds “and if they carry out that project without publicity and without the knowledge or connivance of the Canadian Government, I do not imagine any very strenuous efforts will be made by the Canadian authorities to uncover what is going on. That, however, is a different thing from

1061 “Memorandum for Mr. Read” by Skelton, 9 February 1940, LAC, RG25 D1, Vol. 774, File 355, Reel T1791.
giving specific approval to a proposed violation of a recognized principle of International Law.”  

Another request went further than recruitment. It was proposed by Graham that Canadian aviators volunteering for the Finnish air force should be trained by the RCAF. Skelton told Minister of National Defence Norman Rogers that this “presents a good deal of difficulty.” If the individuals were not enlisted until they went abroad then “in such cases there would be no fundamental objection to giving them special training in the country.” He added, “I fully appreciate that the governments of the world have strained the doctrines of neutrality, both during the Spanish conflict and the present conflict in Finland.” It did however raise other issues. To actually train Canadians to fight for Finland would mean Canada was going farther than the UK “and, indeed, that it was going as far as certain other of the European Governments whose methods the Canadian Government have, in the past, been disinclined to adopt.” Loring Christie pointed out that this raised the question “whether Canadian man-power is to be used by governments other than that of Canada.” Up to this point Canada had been able to limit military service to voluntary enlistment, and there had been no shortage of recruits. As spring 1940 approached it became increasingly apparent that some sort of compulsory service might have to be imposed. This divisive issue was a potential threat to national unity. If the Canadian government was seen to directly or indirectly encourage citizens to fight for another country while arguing for conscription, it could later prove a political liability, no matter how popular Finland was among voters. The matter was subsequently dropped.

Difficulties faced by prospective volunteers in the US also factored into the Canadian discussion. Colonel Per Zilliacus, the Finnish military attaché in Washington, during February wanted to know Canada’s attitude towards recruiting Canadian and foreign nationals. What Finland needed was technicians of all sorts to maintain and repair equipment used by the military. Press reports of what was occurring in Britain prompted his request. He wanted to do something similar in the US, but just like in Canada it was illegal to privately organize a military force.
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for use by a foreign government or for volunteers to go to a belligerent country. American volunteers, Zilliacus proposed, could proceed to Finland via a third country such as Norway, Sweden, or Canada if they did not indicate at the time of obtaining a passport they intended to go to Finland. 1068 This was odd, since Canada was also a belligerent in the wider war, but it offered a loophole to exploit. In order to evade US regulations, it appeared they might try to go to the UK from Canada and then on to Sweden. Furthermore, if an American citizen joined any foreign military, the oath of allegiance to the new country caused them to lose their US citizenship. All of this made it difficult to move American volunteers to Europe and he hoped to avoid this by first sending them to Canada. Zilliacus also suggested these recruits would all be civilians and not enrolled in the Finnish armed forces, thereby complying with US law. 1069

A similar situation occurred with the volunteers recruited by Count Folke Bernadotte. He had solicited the aid of retired American officer Colonel Charles Sweeney to recruit pilots for the Finnish air force and rented an airfield at Toronto to train them. 1070 The group included some Canadians, Poles, and Americans and it was possible the Swedish legation in Canada might issue them passports, though Bernadotte had arranged for visas from the British high commission in Ottawa. 1071 A delay occurred in moving the pilots to Canada, caused by scrutiny from the FBI over allegations of enlisting underage volunteers. No decision on how Canada would respond to the Zilliacus and Bernadotte initiatives was made before Finland signed the armistice. 1072

On this complicated issue External Affairs needed further legal advice. To the legal advisor John E. Read, Skelton said, “There is no question as to what the wishful attitude of the Government and public would be, and possibly on the technical matter the fact that war between Russia and Finland has not been proclaimed may have some bearing on our interpretation of the Foreign Enlistment Act.” 1073 Ever the one to recommend caution, Skelton was attempting to have his
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argument against more direct Canadian action prepared, in case his political masters tried to take any step he consider inadvisable. If Graham was correct and Britain was helping send volunteers to Finland, it would have policy implications for Canada, because it would be difficult in the face of public opinion to take an obstructionist stance. Indeed newspaper reports clipped by the department clearly made it appear Britain was in some way supporting the dispatch of volunteers to Finland.\footnote{Montreal Gazette 8, 14 February 1940; Toronto Star 13 February 1940; New York Times 9 February 1940. One British volunteer who later became a famous actor was Christopher Lee. There is some suggestion he made this up in an act of “stolen valour.” Guy Walters, “How film legend Christopher Lee made up his heroic war record: He claimed to be an SAS veteran and Nazi hunter. But the stories don’t add up.” Daily Mail (London) 17 July 2015. For example, his name does not appear on the lists in Brooke 1990, Appendix A, 207–225. Later in his career Lee would play a starring role in the film adaptation of the Lord of the Rings novels by J.R.R. Tolkien. The writings of Tolkien’s fiction, including some of the fictional languages were partly derived from Finnish and the Kalevala. Lee 2003, 59–60.} It was known that Britain was permitting a committee of British, Finnish, Norwegian, and Swedish representatives to recruit and that these British volunteers had to travel through Norway and Sweden in civilian clothes and could not be sworn into the Finnish military before they arrived in Finland.\footnote{SSDA to SSEA, D43, 25 January 1940; SSDA to SSEA, D44, 28 January 1940, RG25 G1, Vol. 1994, File 1191.} What was needed was confirmation about what if any financial support and assistance the British government was providing.

The legal opinion of the department suggested that the Foreign Enlistment Act was internally inconsistent and required interpretation. The act was intended to prevent diplomatic incidents caused by citizens involving themselves in a war where Canada was not a belligerent. What was meant in the act by the term war was unclear. There are formal legal definitions of what constitutes a war, but there were also situations where no formal state of war existed, yet there was armed conflict between two or more nations or an internal civil war. According to Read it was open to question if “the present state of international relations existing between Finland and the U.S.S.R. can be regarded as a state of war within the meaning of the Foreign Enlistment Act 1937.”\footnote{“Application of Foreign Enlistment Act of 1937 to the Finnish War” by JER, 10 February 1940, LAC, RG25, Vol. 1995, File 1939-1201-B.} A fine legal distinction needed to be made, because it was an “armed conflict,” even though most Canadians would have considered it a war.\footnote{“Memorandum for Dr. Skelton Use of Canadian Money to Forward Finnish Volunteers” by HLK, 14 February 1940, LAC, RG25 D1, Vol. 774, File 355, Reel T1791.} Some parts of the act seemed to suggest it applied to armed conflict, but this required the government to specifically invoke those parts of the law. There was nothing preventing a consul from recruiting their nationals living in
Canada. Canadians could volunteer, but they could not be actively induced to join, because unlike the British legislation there was no provision for exceptions or to grant licences for foreign states to recruit. It was also possible for Canadians to volunteer for the Soviet armed forces, though it was doubtful any would do so. Likewise, it was legal to raise funds to provide travel assistance to volunteers.  

Aside from legal considerations, the general principle was that Canada should not do anything that went farther than Britain or France. From 14 February Britain provided a licence exempting volunteers from that country’s Foreign Enlistment Act. Men who were liable for service in the British military or who were in an essential occupation could not volunteer.  

Skelton was of the view that the British actions were not a breach of neutrality, but that “It can only be justified by the fact that Russia is not prepared to admit the existence of war and cannot, therefore claim the consequences of strict neutrality.” Such an interpretation was necessary because Skelton thought, statements by politicians in the House of Commons and popular sentiment favouring involvement in the “Finnish war” meant that it would be politically difficult for the government to prevent Canadians and Finns in Canada from volunteering. As the matter was under consideration, the final Soviet offensive began, which compelled the Finnish government to consider peace terms.

Nonetheless, the announcement caused anxiety for one concerned citizen working to assist Canadians to go overseas to help Finland because of “the desperate plight: of the Finns “and the need for men is one of their greatest requirements.” It cost roughly $100 to send a man to Finland and this was deterring many from volunteering. Various groups were conducting fundraising appeals to cover these travel expenses. He was worried that the government might interpret such efforts as a violation of the law prohibiting inducement. External Affairs informed him that the Finnish consul general was aware raising funds for this purpose was permitted and there would be no likelihood of prosecution.

Left-wing Canadians and journalists criticized the decision to allow volunteers for Finland, when previously Canadians were forbidden to fight for the legitimate
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Republican Government of Spain. The Foreign Enlistment Act to their mind clearly prohibited enlistments in either case.\textsuperscript{1083} To a query by a reporter, the prime minister’s private secretary replied the circumstances were not parallel. The situation in Spain was a civil war, whereas Finland was a member of the League of Nations which had been attacked and was being given assistance at the request of the league.\textsuperscript{1084}

Even before the legal question had been cleared up, individuals and small groups of volunteers had been making their way to Finland. Finnish nationals who had gone to visit friends and family chose to stay or were conscripted. Individual men and women served in various Finnish army units or as pilots.\textsuperscript{1085} Most of the Canadians would end up along with American and Commonwealth volunteers as part of the Finnish American Legion.\textsuperscript{1086} The unit was given its name by Mannerheim soon after it was formed at Jyväskylä and Oulu. However, as Varpu Lindström has calculated, of the 337 men who joined the unit by the time of the armistice, 237 or 63\% were from Canada.\textsuperscript{1087} It likely should have been named the “Finnish Canadian Legion,” but “To most Finns, however, America and Canada were one and the same.”\textsuperscript{1088} They formed part of the roughly 12,000 foreign volunteers which arrived by March 1940 and the Canadian contribution is often overlooked in the literature on the Winter War.\textsuperscript{1089}

Once the government publicised its tacit approval of Canadians volunteering a more organized effort occurred. Colonel Fraser Hunter, the retired officer who was also involved with Bernadotte’s pilots, started gathering and training a group of volunteers. They received rifles from the Ontario government and training from Canadian war veterans. Though the RCMP and Canadian military officers questioned the legality of this, the volunteers were allowed to continue their training. Hunter made a formal request for the government to donate British style
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battle dress uniforms. However, the Winter War ended before they were able to leave Canada.\textsuperscript{1090}

A similar fate awaited Hunter’s effort training pilots for Finland. At the beginning of March 1940, he worked with the Finnish War Veterans Association branch in Toronto and approached the RCAF to provide instructors, “one or two obsolete aircraft,” plus camera guns, and machine guns for training.\textsuperscript{1091} The RCAF initially did not think the proposal was feasible. There was no aerodrome available and the instructors and equipment were needed for the BCAP. Some obsolete aircraft might be found, but it would take time to find them. The Toronto Flying Club agreed to make its facilities available and cover the training costs. Two old Wapati biplanes were found at the air base in Trenton and were in put into shipping crates. The RCAF agreed to pay the cost of shipping, but just as they were ready to move the planes to Toronto, news arrived the Winter War was over.\textsuperscript{1092}

With the Finnish defeat the problem of repatriating the foreign volunteers arose. The Finnish government assigned responsibility for co-ordinating the return voyage for the American, Canadian, and other British Commonwealth volunteers, to Dr. Rafael Engelberg and the Finland Society (Suomi Seura). This proved more difficult than it was initially thought and from the start there were problems and delays trying to find births on cargo ships. Starting in June 1940, small groups were able to start the trip back to Canada. Not all chose to accept the offer of passage back to North America and a small number remained with friends or family, while others thought the peace was temporary and wanted to be in Finland when the Soviets inevitably attacked again. Some had no choice. Those who were still Finnish nationals were compelled to complete their national military service and wound up serving in the Continuation War. Still others making their way out of Finland through Norway found their voyage interrupted by the German invasion and were captured, though the Finnish consul eventually secured their release.\textsuperscript{1093}

As the wider European war escalated the Canadian government was in no position

\textsuperscript{1090} V.A.M. Kemp, Superintendent Commanding “O” Division, Toronto to Commissioner RCMP, 9 March 1940, LAC, RG24 C1, File HQC 8382, Reel C5197. Also, Newton 2009, 254–255; Lindström 2000a, 75–79.

\textsuperscript{1091} A “camera gun” was a unique term for a Lewis Gun manufactured as a “gun camera” to record aerial combat. “Training of Pilots for Finland” by G.M. Croil, Air Vice Marshall, Chief of Air Staff to DM, C8382, 2 March 1940, LAC, RG24 C1, File HQC 8382, Reel C5197.

\textsuperscript{1092} “Loan of Obsolete Aircraft to Finnish War Veterans in Toronto” by L.S. Breadner, Air Commodore, A.M.A.S, to C.A.S., C8382, 9 March 1940; K.S. MacLachlan, Acting Deputy Minister (Naval and Air) to President Toronto Flying Club, 12 March 1940; MacLachlan to President Toronto Flying Club, 16 March 1940, LAC, Ibid.

\textsuperscript{1093} Lindström 2000a, 99–106.
to do much to assist stranded volunteers and had to work through the British Foreign Office. The British government working with the Finnish Aid Bureau, surprisingly was able to secure some transit visas from the Soviet Legation in Stockholm and a few went via Vladivostok or the Middle East.

6.5 Passports for Volunteers

The changing situation regarding aid and volunteers meant that several side issues developed. The question of passports had come up during the discussions in February 1940 about the legality of recruiting volunteers for Finland, and whether the standard $5 administrative fee for passport applications could be waived. The Finnish consulate was prepared to use some of the aid funds to cover this expense, but as Honorary Vice-Consul G.W. Tornroos noted there were apparently daily inquires by prospective volunteers. This could place a needless drain on the funds raised to help Finland, since “there are thousands of men in Canada who desire to go to Finland today to fight in her battle against Russian Aggression.” A.K. Graham added to this request the suggestion that a letter from a chief of police attesting the applicant had no criminal record should be sufficient to obtain a waiver. The volunteers would then proceed to Finland from New York.

Surprisingly when the prime minister learned of this, in a bold move told Norman Robertson, “that everything possible should be done to facilitate this work” and determine the procedures to put it into effect. As it turned out it was a simple matter of receiving cabinet approval and then issuing an Order in Council. King had the matter brought up at the 11 March meeting of the war cabinet. The staff at External Affairs cautioned cabinet, “Up to the present time, the Canadian Government, in dealing with problems arising out of the Finnish war, has taken no action of any sort that could possibly be regarded as unneutral” and that “The proposal to waive passport fees to persons proceeding to serve in the armed forces of Finland would be an active step taken by the Government of an unneutral

1097 A.K. Graham, Consul for Finland to DEA, 6 March 1940, LAC, Ibid.
1098 “Volunteering for Finland” by Robertson, 9 March 1940, LAC, Ibid.
character, in so far as it would discriminate between the opposing forces.”1099 Based on press reports that there were roughly 2,000 volunteers it was as if the Canadian government was offering $10,000 “to promote volunteering for service in Finland,” which was “a matter that the Russian Government could properly regard as being an unfriendly act.”1100 On the other hand, the matter was of so small a nature that it would not likely be noticed, but it “would involve a fundamental change in the policy followed by this country.”1101

King dismissed the concern and thought it was “defensible under our obligations as members of the League” and in the spirit of the French and British offer of all possible aid to Finland. He received the agreement of the Ministers of Justice and National Defence on this.1102 It was decided that for Canadian citizens who were volunteering for Finland the fee would be waived.1103 The value of the waived fees would be a small gift to Finland and the one “hostile” act offered by Canada during the Winter War.1104

Conclusion

King regarded the decision on the passport fees to be a demonstration of the reason he was needed in Ottawa, rather than off trying to win an election or out of the country at some meeting with the other Allied governments about the larger conduct of the war. Without his leadership, nothing might have been done regarding the passports. The same day the decision was made King was off to Montreal to campaign and he learned that an armistice had occurred, and the Finnish parliament was considering the question of the Soviet peace terms. While waiting at the train station he received an advance copy of the Montreal Gazette for the next day, which indicated the war was over, Finland had accepted the terms.1105 He was shocked to learn the terms were more severe than those demanded in the fall of 1939 and in his diary confided “was not sure in my own mind that the Finnish parliament will

1099 “Memorandum for the Acting USSEA,” 11 March 1940, LAC, Ibid.
1100 Ibid.
1101 Ibid.
1102 King Diary, 11 March 1940, LAC, MG26 J13. Stacey indicates that no Canadian volunteers went, but as has been demonstrated this is incorrect. Stacey 1981, 279.
1103 Memorandum, To His Excellency the Administrator of the Government from King, SSEA, 11 March 1940, LAC, RG25, Vol. 1995, File 1939-1201-B. The minutes of the War Cabinet were not preserved for March 1940. LAC, RG2 7C, Vol. 1, Reel C4653.
1105 The headline was “Finland Signs Peace, Cedes Vital Territories,” Montreal Gazette 13 March 1940.
accept the terms. One hardly knows what may prove best in the end. If by accepting, it saves Britain and France having Russia as an enemy in addition to Germany, it may perhaps confine the area of conflict in a manner which will help to serve the interests of the Allied powers.”

If the Finns had rejected the terms it most certainly would have meant war with the Soviets, since the French and British would join the Finns. Unlike Canada which courageously relaxed its passport regulations, even though it was a non-belligerent in the Winter War, “The part Norway and Sweden have played is cowardly in the extreme.” They know Britain and France will not attack them, but “fear Germany will, and are prepared to sacrifice Finland and their courage to save their own miserable skins. They will deserve to fall into the category of fourth rate powers while Finland rises to that of first.” Since the Finnish war was over it was not necessary to produce the order which implemented the exemption of passport fees.

The next day King railed again against the Norwegians and Swedes and regarded their behaviour with “almost contempt” as they stood by and “allowed their brave little neighbour to be crushed...to protect their own skins.” They were in effect siding with the German aggressor and may in the end regret their decisions, since Germany might still turn on them. The events of the war might yet develop so that “Before the present war is over we may witness strange things between Germany and Russia itself.” It might have been a bit much for the prime minister to criticize, since Canada’s aid to Finland amounted to far less than what those two countries did at much greater risk. The Norwegian and Swedish approach to neutrality was motivated by a desire to avoid entanglements in the wider European war. A similar stance Canada had taken at the league over collective security and towards consultation on British foreign policy. So, the stance of Norway and Sweden should have been explicable to the prime minister.

At the end of the Winter War the friendly image of Finland remained strong. Finland was a borderland of Western and European civilization, defending the values of freedom and democracy. Even though the Finns capitulated, brave little Finland had stood up to the aggressor and won the admiration of Canadians. Such images were clearly shared by the Canadian prime minister, members of the DEA.
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and other government departments as they grappled with how best to help Finland. Despite widespread Canadian sympathy for Finland and a plethora of positive images, the passports like pretty much every government initiative to aid Finland came too late to be of any help. Aid, volunteers, and passports were just three areas Canadian officials engaged with when dealing with the question of what to do for Finland. The Canadian-Finnish relationship during the Winter War also involved the possibility of an embargo against the Soviet Union, the potential scenario where Canadian troops were part of an Allied military expedition to help Finland and the influence Finnish military doctrine had on the Canadian military. Also relevant to the Canadian-Finnish relationship was the Canadian reaction to the Finnish defeat, the role of Finnish-Canadians in Canada’s war effort and the question of the restoration of trade with Finland. With all of these things the positive images of Finland remain active. However, as 1940 ended and into the early part of 1941 it became evident Finland began moving towards the German sphere and by June 1941 were openly siding with the aggressors. Just over 15 months after the Winter War Canadian officials, especially at External Affairs found an enemy image Finland to beginning to form.
7 Bitter Spring

A rapidly evolving situation like the Winter War and its aftermath raised many parallel and overlapping issues the Canadian prime minister and various government departments had to deal with. There was the initial outrage over the Soviet attack and then the appeal for aid, which led to the Canadian government gift. Wide spread Canadian sympathy was shown through private donations and volunteering to fight for Finland, both of which had legal and administrative problems to resolve. Other situations presented themselves, such as whether to place an embargo on the sale of grain to the Soviet Union and though it was essentially a non-issue there existed the possibility Canadian troops would be included among the Allied troops offered to aid Finland. The Winter War was of interest to the Canadian military, which studied Finnish tactics and weapons. In the aftermath of the Finnish defeat there was shock, proposals for accepting refugees as immigrants, and the need to facilitate the continued delivery of aid, as well as the possibility of resuming trade with Finland. In these areas the positive image of brave, liberal, democratic Finland remained dominant. Towards the end of 1940 a negative image of a country dominated first by the USSR and then by Germany crept in. Such concerns were evident when the output of the INCO operated Petsamo nickel mines seemed destined to fall into Nazi or Soviet hands. A closer Finnish-German relationship led to an ambiguous negative image, leaving Canadian officials uncertain if Finland was drifting towards the enemy camp.

7.1 Embargo on Russia

Two days after the gift to Finland was approved another issue came to the prime minister’s attention. He paid an afternoon visit to the ailing Governor General Lord Tweedsmuir. The governor general was concerned about some editorials he read which mentioned negative public opinion about continued Canadian grain exports to Russia and how this was inappropriate given the war with Finland. It was also inadvisable given the Soviet relationship with Germany, because Canadian wheat could be re-exported to the enemy or used to replace wheat sold to the Nazis from
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1112 John Buchan, 1st Baron Tweedsmuir (1870–1940). He was an historian but was probably best known as the novelist who wrote adventure fiction, most notably the book The Thirty-nine Steps and for instituting the Governor General’s Literary Awards. Buchan 1933; Hillmer 1999, 318. He is subject to scathing criticism for his positive views on British Imperialism in McKay and Swift 2012.
the Ukraine. King was unaware of this and telephoned Norman Robertson at External Affairs directing him to prepare a report and make recommendations for an embargo to be considered by the Cabinet War Committee. Normally King was on top of all aspects of government policy, but in this case, he was surprised and distressed to learn that his staff had not kept him appraised. He learned that earlier C.D. Howe, then the Minister of Transport, had asked External Affairs if grain could be sold to Russia. In the reply Robertson and Skelton were noncommittal “simply saying there was nothing against it legally.” In King’s view, this now put Canada in the position that if it took action it would be “equivalent to an economic sanction at a time when we know economic sanctions may require military sanctions to uphold them and may be construed as a cause of war.”

Robertson said they did not know yet what Britain and France were doing regarding trade with Russia. He was directed to send a cable informing them Canada was considering a grain embargo “and ascertain whether that would occasion embarrassment.”

To complicate matters the Americans had suggested that they might ask Canada to stop all trade with Japan, which could have a precedent set by an embargo on the Soviets. While King condemned Japanese aggression, he thought any embargo on Japan would force that country into the camp of Germany and the USSR. Knowing that President Roosevelt and the US government might try to avoid it by continuing to sell to the aggressors and thereby undermine the efforts to impose a voluntary “moral embargo.” Had King been kept informed he thought, it could have been managed in a proactive, rather than reactive fashion. The situation in Finland had upset his carefully stage-managed war effort, since public opinion would be all for an embargo and in favour of “sending wheat to Finland if anywhere.” In his view the situation “could not be more serious.” Canada would have to place a grain embargo on the USSR at a time when the country had
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1113 This argument was somewhat incongruous. Canada exported grain, copper, and zinc to Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Italy, Greece, and Turkey, all of which had trade agreements with Germany and could re-export the Canadian staples or use them to replace their own stock which could be sold to Germany. Balawdyer 1981, 3.
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1115 Ibid.

1116 Ibid.

1117 As noted earlier, Nevakivi has found that the US government only paid lip service to this embargo. Nevakivi 2000, 313.

1118 King Diary, 20 January 1940, LAC, MG26 J13.

1119 Ibid.
a surplus and overseas markets had dwindled.\textsuperscript{1120} The embargo was therefore implemented indirectly by requiring export permits to European neutral countries that bordered belligerents.

This was in fact keeping with other Canadian policies toward Russia since December 1939. The issue had come up as early as October 1939 in connection with the export of nickel to the Soviet Union. The Soviets wanted INCO to sell them 8,000 tons of nickel.\textsuperscript{1121} The company had been advised by the British to turn down the offer and now it appeared the Soviets were about to ask the Canadian government to allow the sale. The concern was that after the German-Soviet pact the nickel might be re-exported to Germany. In addition to its Canadian and other nickel mines the company had the concession at Petsamo and a Canadian refusal might be used as a pretext for the Soviets to pressure the Finns for access to those deposits, which the Allies exercised no control over.\textsuperscript{1122} Furthermore, it would be difficult to justify a refusal to grant the export on the suspicion it might fall into German hands, since the British had recently concluded a timber deal with the USSR. After consulting with British officials, it was learned they were of the view that it was undesirable to stop all trade with the Soviet Union. Instead there should be limits on the quantities exported. The solution was to impose a quota of 500 tons a month on condition that the Soviet government provide assurance it was for domestic use only. This policy was abandoned once the Soviets attacked Finland.\textsuperscript{1123}

\textbf{7.2 Question of Canadian Troops for Finland?}

From the start of the Winter War another aspect of Allied policy came to indirectly involve Canada. The British and French who were responsible for the higher direction of the war effort, had to consider all actions in terms of what impact they would have on the war with Germany. Military aid to Finland was one such consideration. Finland was generally considered a “side show” and German support for the USSR was seen as an effort to distract the Allies. The aid offered in terms of arms, ammunition, and equipment, and possible direct military assistance to Finland in the form of troops could not occur at the expense of other more important

\textsuperscript{1120} Fayrs 1965, 165.
\textsuperscript{1122} On INCO and Petsamo see Eloranta and Nummela 2007, 329–332.
\textsuperscript{1123} Fayrs 1965, 164–165.
theatres of operation. Despite this Finland retained some importance for Allied planners because even though aid to Finland would strain their already stretched resources, it also offered some strategic possibilities.\footnote{Stacey 1981, 279–280. This subject is covered in detail by Nevakivi 1976; Munch-Petersen 1981. Also, Häkkin 1983, 71–73, 80–84; Lambert 2013, 51–54.}

The plans to aid Finland, fluctuated in importance depending on the mood of the Allied councils and were ancillary to the question of Swedish iron ore. From the start of the war Swedish exports of iron ore to Germany, some of which left by Norwegian ports, had drawn the attention of the British and French governments. Once it became apparent that Finland needed direct military aid, this added a new strategic wrinkle. There were competing concepts over a land or sea focused operation to aid Finland and or deal with the Swedish ore. Through December 1939 and into March 1940 there were numerous discussions and plans about how to respond to this situation. Brian Bond notes that “So many arguments were entangled in the Scandinavian strategy that it is difficult to summarize them concisely.”\footnote{Bond 1990, 49.}

If Britain and France dispatched troops to help Finland, there was the problem of how they would get there. Assuming the naval resources could be found to transport them, the Baltic was closed by the German and Soviet navies. The other direct route was in the North via Petsamo but depending on when the planners were considering this option, it was either under Soviet threat or occupation. A secondary advantage of this option was it would keep the nickel mines out of Soviet hands and deny the Germans the use of it as a submarine base. If this plan were implemented it would put Allied troops in direct conflict with the Soviets.\footnote{The Petsamo option was strongly supported by members of the Finnish General Staff. The idea was presented as a revival of the operations conducted at Murmansk and Archangel in 1918–1919, except under “more favourable conditions.” One key player in all this was the Chief of the Imperial General Staff, General W.E. Ironside, who had at one time commanded that earlier expedition. He also for a time commanded the 4th Canadian Division in the First World War. Nevakivi 1976, 86–89.} The only secure route was to enter Finland by landing in a Norwegian port and crossing Swedish territory. Ideally this would be done with the consent of the two neutral countries involved.

There were also proposals involving naval forces to unilaterally stop the shipment of iron ore to Germany, but this violated neutral Norwegian waters. Other ideas also circulated that suggested the Allies send troops to occupy the ore fields and ports. The presence of French and British troops it was thought would offer Norway and Sweden some security against a German or Soviet attack and would
draw them onto the Allied side, creating a second front to face Germany. The option of sending military forces through Norway and Sweden, via the region of the mines seemed to offer the solution to both problems. Repeated requests by Britain and France that that Norway and Sweden consider allowing Allied troops to transit their countries were rebuffed.1127 That such a move would likely lead to war with the Soviet Union did not seem to concern planners in London and Paris. How the war would have gone with the Allies facing both Germany and Russia amounts to counterfactual speculation, but it is not hard to imagine it would not have been good.1128

The importance for Canada lays in the fact the British kept the Dominion informed throughout the discussions and occasionally sought consultation on policy. Typically, the Canadian response was to say nothing and treat the messages from London as merely for information purposes and when a reply was given it was circumspect, in keeping with King’s preference to avoid commitments. The other important factor was that in the discussions regarding the composition of the Allied force. Of the “British” troops the planners for a time at least considered including the 1st Canadian Infantry Division, which was arriving in Britain during December 1939. The records of the Canadian division show that either the commander or one of his senior staff met weekly with the Imperial General Staff for update briefings. Finland was certainly one item on the agenda of those meetings.1129 The Chief of the Imperial General Staff Edmund Ironside was keen on Canadian troops because during the last war he had good experiences with them in the trenches in France and the snow in Northern Russia.

Towards the end of December 1939, the British Chiefs of Staff had consulted with Major General Andrew McNaughton, the General Officer Commanding the 1st Canadian Infantry Division about possible participation in the venture. Brigadier H.D.G. Crerar, from the Canadian staff, recorded in his diary on 20 December that Ironside “raised the question of Canada supplying a ski or snowshoe battalion for possible use in Scandinavia. I informed him that as Canada was not at war with Russia I thought it would be a very difficult proposition to place before

1128 George Maude described it as “one of the most harebrained schemes of World War II.” Maude 1995a, 257. This assessment was first made by Major General Henry Pownall, while he was Chief of Staff for the British Expeditionary Force in France: “Of all the harebrained projects I have heard this is the most foolish—its inception smacks all too alarmingly of Gallipoli.” Pownall 1973, 282.
1129 War Diary General Staff 1st Canadian Division, December 1939–January 1940, LAC, RG24 C17, Vol. 13721.
The request Crerar insisted would have to go through the proper channels and suggested that a battalion of Canadian volunteers could be formed as a separate “British” unit. Ironside then reported to the Military Coordination Committee, that for the northern region, a force of 3,000 to 4,000 men consisting of French alpine troops trained to use skis and “special troops” picked “from the British Army and the Canadians who would be well fitted to operate under the difficult conditions prevailing in the mine-field area in the winter.”

After Ironside met with the Canadian commander, the Dominions Office sent two dispatches which gave further indications of Allied policy towards Finland and Scandinavia. Perhaps tellingly the first started off referencing possible aid to Finland and then moved on to look at Norway and Sweden, outlining the threat posed by iron ore deliveries to Germany. The next message expanded on these points, but avoided the iron ore question. France and Britain would offer Finland “unofficially” for the defence of her “national independence all indirect assistance in their power.” Assistance would be offered in the form of technical advisors and supply of material on credit or otherwise. Norway and Sweden were to be approached to ensure they were “similarly disposed and ready to afford all necessary facilities.” The two states had to act in their own national interests, but they had to realize the “subjugation of Finland” would be a danger to European security generally. In addition, Britain and France were going to see what assurances and under what circumstance the two countries would require help from the Allies, to protect their security from German or Soviet retaliation for their support for Finland.

On 31 December Ironside briefed the Imperial War Cabinet that because snow persisted in the Lulea area until April, French alpine troops could be used, but he thought “Canada would be the best source on which to draw for personnel of the first contingent.” Canadians would make supply problems less complicated since they used similar equipment to the British and “It is understood that a force
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of from 5,000 to 7,000 Canadians could probably be organized and dispatched to reach Narvik in March.”\textsuperscript{1137} This was actually a brigade sized formation, much larger than the battalion Crerar noted in his diary. In the New Year Ironside reiterated again to the war cabinet the number of troops Crerar thought could be ready by March 1940 for operations in “Northern Scandinavia.”\textsuperscript{1138} Given the publicity Finnish ski troops received there was concern over the lack of such training for the Canadians. To this Ironside countered that they had experience with snow shoes, and “Such troops could operate in deep snow just as well as ski troops.”\textsuperscript{1139} However, the SSDA, Anthony Eden, “did not propose, for the present, to make any approach to the Canadian Government in regard to the suggested provision of Canadian troops for operations in Scandinavia.”\textsuperscript{1140} Canada would be kept informed. The Foreign Secretary cautioned “In the meanwhile he would repeat the warning that he had no reason to suppose that the Canadian Government would be in a position to make the provision proposed.”\textsuperscript{1141} He had too much experience with the Canadian government’s unwillingness to make commitments to think otherwise.

British newspaper reports sent by the Canadian legation to the Netherlands showed that the Germans were aware of British and French efforts to use Norway and Sweden as a base from which to aid Finland and draw them into the war with Germany.\textsuperscript{1142} Lester Pearson noted that the high commissioners from the other Dominions had reacted negatively to the various proposals to deal with the iron ore question. Canada was the only Dominion that did not comment, even though the general attitude in External Affairs was opposed to any such plans. Prime Minister King he recalled was extremely angry Canada had even been consulted, since there was an election under way and the government would not have the time to duly consider it.\textsuperscript{1143} Regardless of how the plan went ahead the Allies surprisingly

\textsuperscript{1137} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1138} 2 January 1940, Minute 1, Confidential Annex 2, CAB, 65/11/1, TNA, War Cabinet No. 1 of 1940.
\textsuperscript{1140} 3 January 1940, Minute 1, Confidential Annex Conclusions, CAB, 65/11/2, TNA, War Cabinet No. 2 of 1940.
\textsuperscript{1141} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1142} Jean Desy, Canadian Legations to the Netherlands and Belgium to SSEA, No. 3, 9 January 1940, LAC, RG25 G1, Vol. 1994, File 1191.
\textsuperscript{1143} Pearson 1973, 163–164.
seemed undeterred that such a move would add the USSR to their list of enemies.\textsuperscript{1144}

What occurred on 20 January was the Dominions Office passed on the general outline of these discussions and plans to Ottawa, including sending troops via the Petsamo route, possible blockade of Norwegian ports, the interception of ore shipments, and the laying of mines in Norwegian waters.\textsuperscript{1145} Eventually plans for three land operations were prepared by the British military for Norway and Sweden, which could be part of a plan to aid Finland or independent of it. The first plan was Operation Avonmouth which took shape in mid-January 1940. At least two Allied divisions would be sent to northern Norway at Narvik, which would move to occupy the ore mines and then perhaps move to aid Finland.\textsuperscript{1146} To counter any possible German incursion that might result a smaller force of 5 brigades known as Operation Stratford would help Norway secure the south of the country. This would also secure a secondary route of supply to Finland. Operation Plymouth would send another small force to southern Sweden in the event of a German attack. All total these three operations required from 100,000 to 150,000 British, French, and Polish troops, of which only from 10,000 to 15,000 would go to Finland.\textsuperscript{1147} Canada was never specifically advised of these plans or the possibility of Canadian troops being involved.

However, consultations with the Canadian military were still ongoing. Subsequently on 22 January 1940 Crerar attended a meeting at the War Office “concerning war developments actual or potential” including the “extension of Allied operational area to Finland.”\textsuperscript{1148} A week later his diary recorded, they had considered the latest French plan to aid Finland, and “[I] Consider the project ill-conceived, militarily, and ill-advised politically.”\textsuperscript{1149} At the very least it was premature without the support of Norway and Sweden. Nonetheless Allied decision makers continued to work on a Scandinavian strategy.

\textsuperscript{1144} Ruotsila 2005, 78; Bond 1990, 49.
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The question of interruption German shipping in Norwegian waters did cause Prime Minister King in late February 1940 to have to consider the use of Canadian troops in Northern Europe. In late February 1940 it was proposed that the Royal Navy lay sea mines to stop the shipment of iron ore through Norwegian waters. This would be a clear violation of Norwegian neutrality, but it was evident the Germans were using Norway’s waters for military purposes as demonstrated during the middle of February 1940 with the *Altmark* incident. The Royal Navy seized the German supply vessel in Norwegian waters and rescued captured British sailors who were onboard. It was a propaganda victory but caused a rise in negative Norwegian public opinion towards the Allies.\(^{1150}\) The British government urgently wanted Canadian comments on draft statements announcing the mine policy. At the time King was working on the election campaign and most of the cabinet was dispersed on similar activities. He declined to comment indicating that up to this point all communication on the topic had been considered for information purposes only and as a result the question had never been considered.\(^{1151}\)

King did manage to discuss the sea mine issue and indirectly the use of Canadian troops being used in Scandinavia and or Finland with T.A. Crerar, the minister of agriculture and Ernest Lapointe, the minister of justice. Without being able to consult the whole cabinet it was not considered advisable to provide Britain with Canada’s views, given that the issue might prove controversial during an election campaign. It was evident that Britain wanted to be able to show that the Dominions had been consulted. The three of them agreed, that “while Canada was at the side of Britain and France with our war effort and, particularly, as the matter referred to was distinctly a European one, it should be kept as between France and Britain themselves.”\(^{1152}\)

Judging from King’s later diary entries about his conversations with Lapointe, they also considered using Canadian troops in Northern Europe. Finland was never mentioned in the British request, but nonetheless aware of the danger Allied proposals for military aid to Finland involved, King asked his two associates what Canada should do if the other Allies declared war on the Soviet Union. Lapointe had, “no objection to the distribution of our Forces in Europe in any direction that might be desired.”\(^{1153}\) This was an important concession from the man who was
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considered the Quebec lieutenant, able to convince French-Canadians to support government policies regarding the war. French-Canadians, especially in Quebec, under the influence of the Roman Catholic Church, had deep anti-communist prejudices. They would be sympathetic towards Finland and a widening of the war by allowing Canadian troops to fight the Soviets. King apparently agreed but pointed out that if Canada was to go to war with the USSR, parliament should be called and allowed to decide. It was the old formula so often used prior to the war when Britain attempted to get a commitment from Canada in case of a future war, only this time he argued that “we ought to get along, by using the League of Nations affiliation for whatever might be done.”\footnote{Ibid.} This was somewhat ironic given the prewar stance Canada had towards the league. He was consistent, as far as King had always argued, that Canada would decide on its own based on the circumstances. Only this time he was prepared to use the league as justification for war with Russia and possibly Canadian troops going to Scandinavia or fighting alongside Finns, the difference being that it would be Canada’s decision. This however, is never clearly stated. The choice not to provide Canadian comment on the sea mine issue was demonstration that he did not want to be consulted on the proposed British policy regarding Norway and a refusal to commit to a potentially controversial policy. In C.P. Stacey’s view it was likely he “presumably would also have made a similar refusal on Finland.”\footnote{Stacey 1981, 281.}

Shortly thereafter the High Commissioner for Canada Vincent Massey, relayed the South African view that the Norwegian question and aid to Finland should be separate issues. The communications from London over the previous few weeks could be confusing, since the Dominions were not aware of the background discussions and plans. The ore and aid were separate issues, each with associated proposals, but they were also at times inextricably linked. It was apparent, but not conclusively, that Germany had acted contrary to international law, but this did not justify a reprisal against a neutral country. The case for compelling the Scandinavian states to allow the transit of Allied troops and the occupation of Norwegian ports should rest on the moral high ground based on the League Covenant and the resolution by the assembly. A refusal by Norway and Sweden would place them in the wrong and make it appear they were submitting to Germany and justify the Allied seizure of ports and transit of those countries. Massey tended to agree and later it was learned so did Australia and New

\footnote{Ibid.}
\footnote{Stacey 1981, 281.}
Zealand. He seemed unaware of the details of the Allied plans, however, since he stated there was “no reason to believe that such action...regarding the seizure of ports is contemplated.” It was in fact a major component of the plans.

When the Allied Supreme War Council met at Paris on 5 February 1940 it was agreed to offer Finland direct military aid in the form of troops. The Narvik route was selected as the primary avenue for this aid to arrive, because it accomplished the two main aims. The Petsamo option was relegated to a secondary course of action, in case the plan for Norway and Sweden became untenable. The Allies placed the caveat on the whole scheme that it would occur as a result of a Finnish formal and public appeal for direct military assistance under the League of Nations resolution. With the Finnish appeal the Allies would inform the Norwegians and Swedes of their intention to transit their territory to aid Finland. Under these circumstances it was thought the two governments would yield and allow the Allies access. Numbers of troops were not specified at this point, but the plan was essentially the British Operations Avonmouth, Stratford and Plymouth. Depending on which source and at what point in the planning, diplomatic manoeuvres, and discussions were occurring, the numbers range widely from 100,000 to 150,000 troops in total and from 6,000 to 50,000 of those going to Finland. Allied planners calculated Finland should be able to hold out until the spring thaw around 20 April. For the troops to arrive in time the Finnish appeal needed to occur by 12 March. That would allow for the 17 to 18 days it took for the force to embark, land in Norway, and arrive in Finland by late April.

Although he was not at the meeting of the war council Crerar recorded that “The question of Finland [is] very much to the forefront.” It was reported that the French Prime Minister Edouard Daladier, though some sources indicate it was British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, who proposed sending the Canadian division as part of the Scandinavian operations. However, none of the participants of that meeting, in their published memoirs or diaries mention the use of Canadian troops. The same applies to later accounts by historians and
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1156 Massey to SSEA, No. 238, 28 February 1940 in Murray 1976, Document 918, 1068.
1157 Ibid., 1065–1066.
1158 By the end of February 1940, the Finns were requesting additional artillery, ammunition, aircraft, and at least 50,000 trained troops. Bayer 1981, 49–50; Conduit 1982, 30; Parker 1976, 379.
1159 Chew 1971, 204.
1161 Sydney Morning Herald (Australia) 16 March 1940; News (Adelaide, Australia) 15 March 1940. Also, Miller 1945, 357.
1162 For example, Gamelin 1947, 201; Dilks 1971, 253; Ismay 1960, 118–119.
journalists. When the proposed forces are mentioned, only specific Polish, French, and British troops are indicated and when the forces are detailed specific formations and units are named, but the Canadians are not included. Likewise, neither the British war cabinet report nor the more detailed French transcript of the meeting mention the possibility. Either the matter was not thought important enough to record or it was nothing more than loose talk among the entourages which was picked up by journalists.

Back in Ottawa on 6 February the British high commissioner delivered a detailed memorandum on Allied plans and they did not specifically mention Canadian troops. It reviewed among other things the Petsamo plan and the need for a secure base in Norway to support these operations. Petsamo was less preferred because of the limited scope of operations it offered and the prospect of hostilities with the Soviets. It would not in the end offer much assistance to Finland. Therefore, the Joint Chiefs of Staff agreed that the only viable option is to send large numbers of trained men to Finland through Scandinavia. This of course ideally needed the consent of the Norway and Sweden. The forces sent “from the United Kingdom would be units of the armed forces of the Crown but would volunteer for this service on the model of the Italian non-intervention in Spain.” This did not necessarily mean Canadian units.

However, as Pearson’s memoirs indicate the Canadian government did learn of the proposal to use Canadian troops. He recalled from his time in London that, “Canadian troops, accustomed to cold, snow, and northern terrain, were considered perfect material for this adventure.” The plans he indicates were first learned by the Canadian High Commission on 7 February. The possible use of Canadian troops was a poorly kept secret, because Soviet intelligence at least believed it was in the plans. Among the other aspects of his report on Allied plans, on 13 January head of the NKVD, L.P. Bera, told Stalin they included sending the Canadian division to northern Finland, specifically Petsamo. It was to be part of a large attack on the
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1164 5th Meeting, Supreme War Council, 5 February 1940, TNA, CAB 93, SWC 39/40. Also, Bédardia 1979, 235–276.
1165 Bédardia 1979, 41; Colville 1985, 81.
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Archangel and Murmansk areas to set up a counter revolutionary Russian
government.\textsuperscript{1169}

Canadian troops for Scandinavia had reached the point of being an
unsubstantiated rumour. Georg de Gripenberg, the Finnish ambassador in London,
learned on 6 February that the Allies had committed themselves to military
intervention. Details of the Allied discussions leaked out. That evening at a dinner
attended by politicians and American correspondents, de Gripenberg was pressed
for answers about the policy by reporters, who expressed their sympathy for
Finland. While he tried to evade the questions, they confided to him, they had
learned that “within a week a French, a Canadian, and a Polish division were going
to land in Finland!” but, he “insisted that this was an absurd assertion, that it was
simply impossible.”\textsuperscript{1170} Despite this they refused to believe him and this explains
the various international news reports that said the Canadian division was to be
included as part of the Allied force. Various papers around the world, both before
and after the armistice, printed reports that the Canadians were slated for Finland.
More cautious papers added that the report could not be confirmed.\textsuperscript{1171} One
syndicated columnist who seemed to have detailed knowledge of the Allied plans
thought, “It is hardly probable that regular French or Canadian units are being used
unless the Allies have made up their minds to declare war on the Soviet Union.”\textsuperscript{1172}

Canadian newspapers were more circumspect due to censorship rules and only
reported the Allies were making plans to aid Finland and did not speculate on the
involvement of the Canadian division.\textsuperscript{1173} Canadian reporters were certainly aware
of the rumours. On 17 February, a Canadian representative was at a press
conference held by the British Foreign Office, where plans to aid Finland were one
of the things talked about. There a Canadian corresponded asked the British Under-
SSFA, R.A. Butler “if the Canadian Division was involved in these plans and the
reply was ‘Yes, very definitely so.’”\textsuperscript{1174} He asked this to be reconfirmed, to ensure
there was no misunderstanding. The Canadian representative reported to Vincent
Massey his stupefaction, “As this is contrary to all the facts as we know them it is

\textsuperscript{1169} Rentola 2013, 1099.
\textsuperscript{1170} Gripenberg 1965, 117.
\textsuperscript{1171} \textit{Sydney Morning Herald} (Australia) 15 February 1940; \textit{Freelance Star} (Fredericksburg, Virginia)
15 February 1940; \textit{New York Times} 15 March 1940.
\textsuperscript{1172} Major George Fielding Eliot, “War Background,” \textit{Evening Independent} (St Petersburg Florida) 14
February 1940.
\textsuperscript{1173} For example \textit{Ottawa Citizen} 7 February 1940, \textit{Globe and Mail} 7 February, 13 March 1940.
\textsuperscript{1174} “Memorandum for Mr. Massey,” 17 February 1940, LAC, RG24 C2, Vol. 1225, Reel T17519, File
“Aid to Finland by CDN Army.”
difficult to understand how the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs should express himself to a Canadian journalist in this way.”  

This point about possible Canadian participation is never spelled out in the existing literature on the diplomacy of Allied aid to Finland. The reason was most likely because the Canadian government did not authorize their use for this expedition. Major General McNaughton was free to discuss, plan, and coordinate possible employment of the Canadian troops in Britain, but any new commitment required consent of the Canadian government and by suggesting Canadian troops were available for “Northern Scandinavia” he overstepped his authority. In the meetings between Ironside, Crerar, and McNaughton, Finland was only one of many topics discussed regarding the training and equipping of the Canadian division at Aldershot, England. In fact, the Canadian division was only at about one third of its strength and it would not be at complete until February 1940. 

Finland was an issue at these meetings not so much because Canadian troops might be sent there, but because an Allied operation in Scandinavia and Finnish requests for military equipment would reduce the amount available for the Canadians. Certainly the prospect of Canadians going to Finland was discussed because Crerar recorded it in his diary and the report to the British war cabinet said so, but this is not shown in the records of the 1st Canadian Division. The report had the Canadians going to Narvik, which was the landing point for Operation Avonmouth. Aside from the fact they were otherwise uncommitted, the reason Ironside recommended them was Canada’s northern climate to which it was thought suited the Canadian troops for winter warfare. The actions of the Canadian division do not reflect this as a possibility. There were no operations orders written or briefings conducted or anything else to suggest the Canadians should be prepared to go to Scandinavia or Finland.

Later in March as Britain and France waited for the Finnish appeal for direct military aid, correspondent Matthew H. Halton who had been to Finland to cover
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1175 Ibid.
1176 For example, Nevakivi mentions British, French, and Polish troops, as do Engle and, Paananen, while Tanner generally refers to French and British forces. Nevakivi 1976, 89; Engle, Paananen, and Paananen 1972, 132; Tanner 1957, passim.
1177 Stacey 1957, 262. Rive alluded to this in a letter to Robertson: “Scott [Macdonald] sent me a copy of Hugh’s [Keenleyside] letter to Skelton about the job with McNaughton, written with one eye on Skelton and the other on posterity, or will our generation be permitted to see the memoirs in print?” [Alfred Rive] CPDLN to Robertson, 26 February 1940, LAC, RG25 D1, Vol. 774, File 355, Reel T1791.
1178 War Diary General Staff 1st Canadian Division, 22 December 1939 and Appendix XII-22, LAC, RG24 C17, Vol. 13721.
the Winter War, visited the Canadian troops. He was interviewed by McNaughton on 11 March, during which Finland was one topic covered. It was proposed that Halton give presentations “on his experiences there,” but he never got the chance. The main reason for visiting was to do news stories on the Canadian troops. In a newspaper report he said of the Canadian troops, “For pride, confidence and efficiency I have never seen troops to surpass them, not even the Finns.”

This was perhaps hyperbole, designed to boost morale at home, because most of the Canadian troops he saw training had only been in uniform a few weeks and were still learning the art of soldiering. Instead of preparing for Finland the Canadian division continued to get ready to move to France, as it had in the previous two months.

There is enough circumstantial evidence to suggest that at least unofficially or in casual conversation the Canadian troops were sometimes discussed. Stacey also points out how this erroneously gave rise to a myth, often repeated, that King had saved the Allies and the Commonwealth from disaster by opposing active military intervention on behalf of Finland. The story was based on the memory of John Read from External Affairs. He claimed that the British had consulted with King on the plans for intervention on the side of Finland. As Read later recalled, King was alarmed that this would be disastrous since it would mean fighting both Germany and Russia simultaneously. The prime minister was also aware that public opinion in Canada strongly favoured Allied intervention in Finland. The tactic employed, which apparently saved the day, was delay. King despite repeated requests simply did not answer, in the process contriving to cause Allied plans to be deferred until Finland surrendered. Stacey could find no evidence supporting this claim. Several months after his retirement from politics, in February 1949, King recorded in his diary a conversation with C.J. Farris. Read had related to him how King “had opposed Br[itain] from going to war with Russia over Finland.” In this way “the greatest possible war service had been rendered at that time.” King did “not recall the matter one way or the other.” The reason of course was because it never occurred.

1179 8 March 1940, LAC, Ibid.
1180 Mathew Halton had been the special correspondent of the Toronto Daily Star and a radio broadcaster for the CBC. “Every C.A.S.F. Man has 2 Pairs Boots 3 Uniform Changes,” Toronto Star nd. in Halton 2014, 150.
1181 King Diary, 11 February 1949, LAC, MG26 J13.
1182 Ibid.
1183 Ibid.
In King’s diary he made it evident at the time of the calls for the expulsion of the Soviet Union from the league that it might lead to a disastrous situation, but by the end of February he appears to have changed his mind, or at least accepted that it was inevitable once Allied military aid was dispatched to Finland. At that point he was prepared to have Canada in solidarity with the other Allies. Given the speed at which diplomatic exchanges occurred between the British, French, Scandinavian, and Finnish governments during February and March 1940, Britain did not ask Canada’s views on intervention in Finland. As Nevakivi and others have shown, the Allied proposal that Finland publicly request military intervention was devised in London and Paris and nothing Canada could have done would have changed that.

These were desperate times at the end of February for the Finnish army on the Karelian Isthmus, because the Soviets had breached the Mannerheim Line and would soon be in the suburbs of Viipuri. In the midst of all this, the Finnish government sent a note to Canada outlining the plight of their country and the “reprehensible methods of warfare adopted by the Russian army” and “expressing the hope the Finns will continue to enjoy the sympathy and all possible assistance of the Canadian government.” The Finnish consulate in Canada made the text of the note public on 1 March. This could be seen as an appeal for Canada to approve the sending of troops to Finland, but a similar message was sent to the other governments of the British Commonwealth.

Through February and March 1940 Allied diplomacy worked towards convincing Norway and Sweden to allow the landing of British and French forces, to occupy the iron mines, to accept offers of troops as a guarantee against German attack, and then allow transit of some of these soldiers to Finland. At the same time diplomats worked to convince Finland to make a public appeal for troops. The Finnish government while it welcomed the offer, realized that the number of troops which would arrive was insufficient and would take too long to get there. Consequently, it deferred and instead sought peace terms with the Soviets later in February. The terms the Soviets offered nonetheless demanded significant
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1185 Nevakivi 1976, passim. The revised edition published only in Finnish shows a shift in his interpretation to mean “aid or assistance was not given.” Nevakivi 2000.
1187 It was published in many Canadian newspapers, for example Winnipeg Free Press 2 March 1940.
1188 Allowing Finland to keep Petsamo, with the Canadian owned nickel mines was seen by the Soviets as a concession to the British. A threatened Allied attack on the oil fields of Baku in the Caucasus also helped Stalin decide to end the war quickly. The likelihood of an Allied move into Scandinavia also
terриториальныe уступки, позволившій Финляндії зберегти своє незалежність. Даже тоді, коли наложені умови стали очевидними, Финляндія залучила призначені для неї сили. На тлі боротьби за увагу Франції і Великої Британії Фінляндія нарешті зобов’язалася згодитися на умови СРСР.

and Norway. The troops originally slated to occupy the ore fields and aid Finland now had to oppose the Germans in Norway.\textsuperscript{1193}

The rumour of a Canadian role in the proposed Finnish intervention was still active during operations in Norway. The Reuter News Agency was sending reports from Stockholm that the 1st Canadian Division was in Norway fighting the Germans. It claimed that “The Canadian contingent consists of troops who volunteered for the force originally intended to go to Finland. They have been undergoing intensive training in methods of warfare particularly suitable for action in mountainous and snowbound country” and “It is believed that when Germany invaded Norway the Finnish expeditionary force was reconstituted and that the Canadians were served with equipment such as would be used in Northern Norway.”\textsuperscript{1194} Similar reports by the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) seemed to lend credibility to these claims. In fact, only two Canadian battalions had been activated as reinforcements for the assault on Narvik but not sent. Initially Canada wanted to counter the press reports, but agreed not to publicly confirm or deny the reports in order to deceive the Germans.\textsuperscript{1195} This would partly explain the failure of the Canadian government to counter the rumors regarding Canadian troops for Finland, but also because to counter reports only made outside the country with a statement that Canada never planned on sending military forces to aid Finland, could result in criticism of the government in Canada.

7.3 Influence of the Winter War on the Canadian Military

To many people it was astounding that Finland was able to hold out for so long against a numerically and materially superior enemy. The Winter War, as V.A.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1193} Bayer and Ørvik 1984, 139–146; Derry 1952, 14–16, 23–26, 145.
\textsuperscript{1194} Glasgow Herald 17 April 1940.
\textsuperscript{1195} The two regiments were the Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry and the Edmonton Regiment, both part of the 2nd Canadian Infantry Brigade. Among the maps they received were maps of Finland. Initially the Canadian government was angered at what was seen as a commitment of Canadian troops without authority, but also wanted to publicize the participation in Canada for home front consumption to make it look like Canada was doing its share. The Canadian Army had in fact announced the recall to the soldiers involved in the operation while they were in movie theatres. According to the Cypher Officer at the Canadian Headquarters Lieutenant Lord Tweedsmuir this caused a security leak about their destination. Otherwise known as John Norman Stuart Buchan, 2nd Baron Tweedsmuir, he was the son of the Canadian Governor General. He served with a Canadian unit, the Hastings and Prince Edward Regiment. Stacey 1957, 259; “Norway Proposed Cdn Ops in 1940 Plans, Int. Summaries, Maps, Correspondence etc. Apr/May 40 (Hammerforce)” Part 1 and 2, Captain C.C. Mann, General Staff, HQ 1 Cdn Div, GSO(3)(I) to GSO(1), 20 April 1940; No. 437, DEA to DO, No. 437, 21 April 1940; DEA to DO, No. 415, 17 April 1940; Massey to DEA, No. 451, 16 April 1940, LAC, RG24 G31, Vol. 1854, File 232C1(D6).
\end{flushright}
Firsoff who wrote about the use of ski troops, made known to the general public “and some equally astounded military professionals as how well effective ski troops operating in proper conditions can be against a ski-less enemy.”\textsuperscript{1196} The fighting on the Karelian Isthmus made headlines for its intensity. The Soviet offensive, which was in theory at least, well planned, and prepared, ran up against Finnish determination. The fighting here was a high tribute to the Finns who were able to resist for months against a determined and powerful Soviet offensive. It was however, the fighting in the woods on the eastern frontier which captured the Western imagination and was romanticized. The world and the Canadian public learned of the valiant Finnish ski troops using hit and run tactics, cutting the Soviet columns into “sausage slices,” as Firsoff described the “motti,” before eventually annihilating each pocket. In particular the famous battle of Suomussalmi was often cited.\textsuperscript{1197} The eventual Soviet victory came in spite of incompetent leadership and poor preparations for winter warfare. What was apparent was the Soviets had “obviously underestimated the Finnish power of resistance and the possibilities of ski warfare.”\textsuperscript{1198}

The Winter War could be said to have played some influence on the use of skis by the Canadian Army. The use of skis for military purposes in Canada had been sporadic. Perhaps, Firsoff thought the earliest use of them occurred in the Seventeenth Century when French Canadian Militia and their First Nation allies used them on raids against the then British settlements in New York. The use of skis in this case seems unlikely since the First Nations people had snow shoes as the indigenous technology, which the French adopted.\textsuperscript{1199} Skiing for sport and recreation, whether of the Nordic or Alpine variety was very likely the result of Scandinavian and Finnish immigrants using them from the late nineteenth century onward, and by the 1930s it had become a popular Canadian activity. The first Canadian military application was attempted in 1914 when a small contingent of Canadian troops began practicing with them.\textsuperscript{1200} This was more a result of the example of alpine troops in European armies than the Finnish experience. British

\textsuperscript{1196} Firsoff 1942, 124.
\textsuperscript{1197} Motti is more often translated as cordwood or fire wood. Ibid, 124–135.
\textsuperscript{1198} Firsoff 1942, 125.
\textsuperscript{1199} Sources from this era used the now less commonly used term “Indian” to describe Canada’s Aboriginal peoples. More commonly accepted terms are First Nations, Native Peoples, Native Canadians, Indigenous Peoples and Aboriginal Peoples. One Canadian military historian has compared the Finnish tactics to the “petite guerre” of the French-Canadian militia of the colonial period. Chartrand 2007, 51 n17.
\textsuperscript{1200} Pratt 1934, 38–39.
troops, which included several hundred Canadian artillerymen, in North Russia, did make some use of skis in the Allied intervention against the Bolsheviks during 1918–1919. Skis as an aid to military mobility continued to be a novel experiment through the 1930s.1201 There was some renewed interest in skis in both Britain and Canada starting in the fall of 1939, but these again amounted to little more than an exploration of the concept. There was a lack of skilled military instructors with the understanding of the tactical concepts necessary to employ ski troops.1202

During her tour of Canada in December 1939, Madame de Gripenberg noted “that there is already a great number of Finns enlisted in the Canadian Army, mostly in Northern Ontario Regiments,” like the Lake Superior Regiment and the Algonquin Regiment, which were “units of expert skiers and woodsmen.”1203 This was an exaggeration. She was hoping to have them released to volunteer for Finland. The army was not able to provide an estimate on the number of Finns involved, but they did not want to lose them because they were essential for ski training. The apparent Finnish success at employing ski troops and the possibility that the Allies might send troops to Finland made the British and Canadian military look again at their use. Soon there were units training to use skis, but these efforts were abandoned once Finland signed the armistice in March 1940.1204 In Canada there appears to have been further consideration of skis. Later in February 1940 that 6,000 pairs of skis were acquired for training the Canadian Army.1205 No specific ski units were contemplated, but the skis would at first be used for recreation, and eventually applied to tactical employment. In Canadian newspapers at this time the occasional photo began to appear of soldiers wearing white smocks and trouser covers, practicing with skis, and trying to mimic Finnish tactics.1206 The First Special Service Force or “Devils Brigade” was among the Canadian troops that

1201 Firsoff 1942, 99–100.
trained extensively on the use of skis. As well infantry units were instructed on the use of skis and snow shoes.\textsuperscript{1207} Canadian troops used various types of sleds and toboggans for winter transport. A variation of the “Lapp-sledge” or “pulka” was eventually adopted by the Canadian military to move supplies and equipment, though it was termed a toboggan after the Native Canadian transport device. It was designed to be pulled by soldiers on skis or more often snow shoes. Likewise influenced by the Finns and others white smocks and trouser covers were adopted for winter camouflage.\textsuperscript{1208} As it turned out the nature of the fighting in Northwest Europe and Italy, where the Canadians contributed ground troops, did not require the issuing of specialised winter equipment such as skis and white camouflage. A notable exception was the winter of 1944–1945 in Holland when Canadians were occasionally issued white smocks.\textsuperscript{1209}

The Soviets also learned valuable lessons from the Winter War and by the winter of 1941 were using ski troops and winter tactics to good effect against the Germans.\textsuperscript{1210} Ultimately the British, American, and Canadian militaries incorporated Finnish winter warfare expertise into their respective doctrines.\textsuperscript{1211} In the early Cold War period, in an effort to understand the strategy and tactics of the Soviets, the Canadian Army Operational Research Establishment, among other things examined the Winter War and Continuation War, in particular the Battle of Suomussalmi.\textsuperscript{1212} As well copies of German manuals for winter warfare in Finland and the Suomi MG M1944 submachine gun became topics of inquiry for Canadian soldiers.\textsuperscript{1213}

\textsuperscript{1207} For example, the Lake Superior Regiment had 2 ski instructors and 3 snow shoe instructors and did some brief periods of practice in the first two months of 1941. Report on Winter Training, 22 February 1940, LAC, RG24 C1a, Vol. 2154, File HQS S4-27-35-76.

\textsuperscript{1208} Firsoff 1942, 46, 61.

\textsuperscript{1209} For example, Stanley 1960, 241–242. For another Northern Ontario Regiment see the history of the Algonquin Regiment: Cassidy 1980, 30–32.

\textsuperscript{1210} See Armstrong and Welsh 1997.

\textsuperscript{1211} For example, by September 1941 the Canadian Army was studying Finnish tactics. They were unable to comply with a British request for a “Finnish officer” to teach skiing and tactics. Letter to Captain Stein, War Office, 10 September 1941; Brigadier M.A. Pope, Canadian Military Headquarters to External, nd, LAC, RG24 C2, Vol. 12539, File 6/Ski Tps/1. See Tuunainen 2014, 93; Tuunainen 2012, 208–280.

\textsuperscript{1212} Godefroy 2014, 89–90. One report on the Winter War and two on the Continuation War were produced: Bauer and Maskell 1952; Bauer 1953; Rae 1953.

Finland’s use of mortars as a simple cost-effective way to increase indirect fire support for infantry was recognized. A mortar is essentially a tube with a firing pin. Bombs that have propellant charges attached are dropped down them and then launched at low velocity, on a high arcing trajectory, across relatively short distances of several thousand metres. During the Second World War, Canada employed British designed 2, 3 and 4.2-inch diameter mortars. Lieutenant General Andrew McNaughton, who was at the time in command of the Canadian Army in Britain, was impressed with the Finnish Tampella 120mm Krh/40 mortar, though this model was not in Finnish service until after the Winter War. Drawings of the Finnish design were obtained in London and in October 1941 McNaughton directed the Canadian military technical staff to develop a Canadian version.1214

By May 1943, the British War Office questioned the Canadian wisdom in trying to develop this weapon. However, intelligence reports showed that the Germans had successfully reverse engineered the Soviet version and were making good use of them in large numbers. On this basis the Canadian Army continued testing. Despite this optimism, development plagued by problems with the accuracy and the reliability of the ammunition and the project was shelved in 1947.1215

### 7.4 Aftermath of the Finnish Defeat

Sisu and superior tactics caused many Canadians, despite the odds stacked against Finland, to remain optimistic about the country’s ability to resist. Newspaper headlines expressed surprise and shock when Finland did finally succumb on 12 March 1940. Publicly Canadian government officials made no comment on the outcome of the Finnish-Soviet war because, “this country had not taken any side in the struggle.”1216 Jean Désy at the Canadian legation in Belgium tried to capture the mood surrounding the Finnish defeat. There was the sense that it represented the “triumph of aggression” and that because the Allies failed to help Finland in any meaningful way, that small states could not expect any help from the major
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1214 The Tampella and Soviet M1938 mortars were influenced by the French Brandt M1935. Lucy 2006, 24; Godefroy 2014, 66.
1216 Globe and Mail, 14 March 1940.
powers. From the legation in the Netherlands the attitude was seen in much the same light. The Russian victory was a diplomatic setback adding to the list of Allied defeats. Vincent Massey at Canada House in London also attempted to describe the atmosphere in Britain and along with the observations he gives some indication of his perception of events. He noted the “deepest sympathy” the Finnish cause elicited and “The human appeal of a small and courageous victim and a bullying and brutal aggressor was particularly strong in this case. It was the story of David and Goliath, but with the wrong ending.” The cause of Finland seemed to appeal to all segments of society from property owners, to those with religious beliefs, but also labour leaders and socialists, “whose admiration for the social institutions of this progressive little country strengthened their feeling of outrage at the aggression.” This was something he thought was absent from the situation with the Polish defeat.

A few weeks later Consul General K.F. Altio provided the Canadian government with a copy of the “Finnish Blue Book” detailing the history of Finnish-Soviet relations in the lead up to the war. Selected and written from the Finnish perspective these published documents only served to reinforce the sense of injustice around the Soviet attack. The Finnish defeat came up in the casual conversation of the staff at External Affairs. Later in the year for example, William Patterson argued with Henry Ferns that the disasters in Europe were because of the incompetence of the French and British who failed to come to an understanding with the Soviets. Soviet incompetence he added was clear from the conduct of the Winter War. Ferns countered this by saying “so long as Stalin thought he could overthrow Marshall Mannerheim by playing the Internationale on a tin whistle, the Red army was, as he said incompetent, but once it was evident the Finns would and could fight, Stalin ‘turned it on’ and the Finns capitulated.” Further he added,
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“that Stalin displayed statesmanlike prudence in taking from the Finns only what was necessary to protect the security of Leningrad.” Ferns was unique and ran against the grain in the department with his sympathy for Marxism, even if he did not have sympathy for the regime which developed in the Soviet Union. He was one of the few leftists among the departments staff.

Evidence of the continued sympathy Prime Minister King had for Finland was seen at the end of April 1940. He was in the US on vacation and paid a private visit to the president and other officials. Part of the trip took him to New York to attend the play There Shall Be No Night. The play was recommended by Henry Morgenthau, the US Secretary of the Treasury, and it was the premier of the play on Broadway at the Alvin Theatre. King had never “seen or read” anything so “gripping” and thought the playwright Robert E. Sherwood, had given “a marvellous portrayal of the deception which led to the conquest of that part of Finland” and “one could not leave the theatre without feeling one ought to get at the throat of Germany.” The play was inspired by the news broadcasts from Finland during Christmas 1939. Many Canadians would have heard these rebroadcast on Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) affiliates, from the BBC, and various American stations.

In Sherwood’s play the protagonists were Finnish-Americans and the drama showed their changing responses to the war in Finland. The play King thought was a “frank reflection upon the U.S. not participating in the war to save European civilization and, above all, the utter mockery of the whole peace propaganda as it has been put forward and relied upon in certain years.” He saw the play

1223 Ibid.
1224 It was first staged at the Opera House in Providence Rhode Island, 29 March 1940. Sherwood, an American citizen, had fought in the First World War with the Canadian Expeditionary Force in France. After the war he for a time was a supporter of the League of Nations as a means to avoid the injustice of war, but soon became a vociferous critic of that “impractical” organization. He had also been sympathetic of the Soviet Union and thought it was a bulwark against Fascism, but the attack on Finland disabused him of those ideas. Brown 1968, 126; King Diary, 29 April 1940, LAC, MG26 J13.
1225 The play won the Gold Medal from the National Institute of Arts and Letters and the Pulitzer Prize in 1941. Sherwood 1945, “Preface,” x-xii, xxvii-xxviii, xxx. The most famous broadcast was by William Lindsay White from Helsinki by the Columbia Broadcasting System on 25 December 1939, often called “The Last Christmas Tree,” though it was his editorial for the European news segment. CBS Program Book, December 1939, 33. It is reprinted in Hinshaw 1952, 239–242. In 1943 the play was rewritten placing it in Greece, since Finland had sided with Germany. After his death, a number of his plays were adapted for television in his honour. There Shall Be No Night was broadcast in 1957, but substituted Hungary for the location, in response to Soviet repression of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution. See Joki and Sell 1989; Jernigan 1997, 117–121. On his military service see Sherwood, Robert Emmet. 2075473,” LAC, RG150, Accn. 1992-93/166, Box 8862-28.
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interpreting the war as a conflict of ideas and postulated if the new era in civilization would belong to the “brute” or the “intellectual.” The play in his view was very effective, but “Had the play been put on by the British it would have been openly ruled out as most obvious propaganda for the Allies against Germany” and “It proves the terrible tragedy of a nation inadequately protected.” Despite this hearty approval, the play received the worst possible condemnation by critics who mainly ignored it. Nonetheless it was a success since it tapped into popular feeling and went on to tour the US and parts of Canada. Sherwood donated some of the royalties to the Finnish Relief Fund, the Canadian Hurricane Spitfire Fund, and the Canadian Red Cross.

While the prime minister attended Broadway, Hollywood served ordinary Canadians to learn about Finland. Even compared to sold out stage performances as Melvin Small noted the “average feature film reached more people than any single book, newspaper, or magazine.” Too late to influence opinion about the Winter War the movie Ski Patrol, was released during May 1940 in the US and played Canadian movie houses from June until he end of the summer. It was a low budget or “B film” which usually ran as the second half of a “double bill” or “double feature” and had to compete with more popular films such as Northwest Passage and Dr. Cyclops. Nonetheless, Ski Patrol was the only feature film produced specifically looking at Finland during this time. Anachronistically it portrayed a group of Finnish ski troops defending a snow-covered mountain pass

---

1227 Ibid.
1228 Canadian military historians would find such statements by King ironic, given Canada’s lack of preparation. Ibid.
1229 King later had Sherwood over to his home for tea when the play was on tour. King Diary, 9 November 1940, LAC, MG26 J13.
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and included yodeling. After a short run it was withdrawn from distribution. According to Mieczysław Biskupski in his study of Hollywood’s attitude towards Poland, this was “Probably the first, and certainly the last, Hollywood film to criticize the Soviet Union” during the war. This may be an oversimplification, since Small notes there were several films which provided unflattering portals of communists and the Soviet system, but these were typically satirical comedies where they are shown “more as buffoons than beasts.” By 1941 with Russian now an ally, the handful of films which mentioned the Winter War “were appropriately doctored” to remove negative portrayals of a “friendly” country.

For the duration of the Winter War there had also been some newsreels which played in Canadian movie theatres before the feature film. Newsreels were intended to inform people about world events and those which featured Finland covered the events of the fighting, Finnish society, culture, and of course skiing. The effect was a favourable image of a cultured and civilized European people, who lived in brave little Finland standing up to the Soviet Goliath. After the war, the newsreels about Finland decreased. One exception was short documentary film called Finland Marches On. As Lindström notes, it was “designed to create goodwill towards Finland and emphasize the nation’s great efforts at reconstruction, with scenes of happy Finns during peace-time and the devastation and destruction of the Winter War.”

Finland still featured in the thoughts of King when he planned a dinner party, at his home Laurier House, at the end of November. Among the distinguished guests were Otto of Austria, the pretender to the Austro-Hungarian throne and early advocate of European integration, the Belgian minister to Canada, the head of the RAF Liaison Mission to Canada and his wife, C.D. Howe and Mrs. Howe, the Canadian ambassador to Belgium and the Netherlands, the widow of Sir Joseph
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Pope, the first SSEA, and a few others. Also present was Madame Peggy de Gripenberg, the wife of the Finnish minister in London, Georg A. de Gripenberg. She was touring Canada and the US speaking on behalf of humanitarian aid for Finland. King had given cautious permission for these engagements. He found her “quite interesting and pleasant” but perhaps “a little embarrassed at the letter I sent her in reply to her desire to secure a chance to do propaganda work in Canada and the States.” Still he thought “She is a bit of a poser; too fond of mentioning people she has met and places she has visited, but a fine woman.” She had struck up a friendship with R.B. Bennett, so perhaps this was the reason for some of King’s attitude. She nonetheless elicited sympathy for herself and Finland, since their residence in Britain had been bombed, killing a number of servants.

Despite these pleasantries a year later she had difficulty getting permission to come to Canada. The Canadian minister in Washington spoke on her behalf, claiming “She is an ardent anti-Nazi and I can vouch for her sincerity.” Despite this the SSEA thought it inadvisable to encourage her to visit, “In view of anomalous and uncertain status of Finland.” He was “very doubtful in [the] present circumstances about allowing Mme. Gripenberg to come to Canada where her propaganda proclivities, however, well intentioned, might have mischievous results.”

During mid-1940 there was still a lot of sympathy for Finland and with the large loss of territory to the Soviets came another problem, Finland had over 400,000 displaced persons from the evacuated areas. This of course was just one aspect of the humanitarian problems resulting from war devastation. The idea that Canada should accept large numbers of Finnish refugees was started in the
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newspapers within days of Finland’s surrender. 1246 The first was the Globe and Mail which said that though no official statement had been made if this would be government policy, “Canada could provide a humanitarian service and at the same time get settlers of real value to the Dominion.” 1247 One Montreal newspaper focused on the positive qualities of “courage, initiative and enterprise” a northern climate gave both Finns and Canadians and said “The Finns are the kind of people a northern climate breeds. And we are proud to be classed with the Finns as a northern nation.” 1248 There were similar proposals in the US, as well both Australia and Brazil had offered to take large numbers of Finnish refugees. 1249

In a briefing note F.C. Blair indicated it was not government policy, but the general conclusion was that it would be difficult to transport the refugees across mine and U-boat infested waters. The cost of transport, settlement, provision of equipment, and supplies to the new settlers would be prohibitive. It was also difficult to see why the Finns should be singled out for special treatment, there were lots of deserving groups of refugees such as the Poles. When speaking to the press Blair publicly praised the idea but urged caution due to the problems and costs involved. 1250 Indeed, there was a popular groundswell of support for the idea of renewed Finnish immigration, despite official restrictions. The idea was spurred on by the very public appeals of the Premier of Ontario Mitchell Hepburn that his province would accept 100,000 refugees. Immigration was a federal government responsibility and Hepburn had no authority to make the offer. While Hepburn may have had some genuine sympathy for the Finns, the offer also served to embarrass the prime minister whom he disliked. 1251 Port Arthur City Council, for instance, passed a resolution on 27 March calling for the government to get Finnish refugees to settle in Northern Ontario. Drawing on the well-established positive image of Finns it claimed they were the “most suitable to this type of settler, having similar climate and soil to their own country.” 1252 Gone were the images of radical and
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dangerous Finns a previous Port Arthur council had feared. Hardworking and heroic Finns were very much in demand.

The prime minister advised the war cabinet on 2 April 1940 that many Finns might wish to immigrate to Canada as a result. He said Canada “must be prepared to open up the country to some of these people.” Preparing notes for the Minister of Mines and Resources, Blair calculated it would cost $2,500 per family to bring them to Canada. If 20,000 families were brought over the cost would be $40–50 million. The money was needed to cover shipping and to provide them funds to build homes, buy animals and machinery for their new farms. They would need to be moved in small groups and the consent of the British Admiralty was needed since they controlled trans-Atlantic shipping and the ships carrying the Finns would have to be part of a convoy. The Immigration Branch had a shortage of temporary accommodations, since most of what they had was used by the Canadian military. Acquiring more facilities was an additional cost. The Finnish government had not responded with a yes or no to the Hepburn offer, but news reports stated that they expected to be able to find land in Finland for the displaced people.

Adding to this Blair indicated he had visited Finland in 1923–1924 and while the Finnish government did not encourage emigration, they did not hinder those who wanted to leave. For those who left Finland, Canada was seen by the Finnish government to be the best option. In reply to a concerned citizen he said, “The weather was bitterly cold in Finland but the hospitality was warm and I came away with a very favourable impression of these splendid people which has been strengthened in the numerous contacts we have had with them in Canada.” Blair claimed to know that there were Red and White Finns. The Reds, “for a while their colour spread like the measles. I am glad to say, however, that in recent years there has been a very noticeable change.” Blair had been one of the Canadian officials most opposed to Finnish immigration because of the radical element among them. Scandinavian countries were generally not eager for immigration and “I shall be very much surprised if that is not the present attitude of Finland, particularly in view of the fact that any peace pact made by Russia or Germany is liable to treated as a scrap of paper and the Finns as well as any other of these northern neighbours
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are likely to have to fight it out again." Canada would welcome more Finns he thought, but the cost to bring them here was too much considering he claimed the country spent $41 million a day on the war effort. Smaller numbers would have to be accepted, unless some private benefactor was found.

At the beginning of April, Blair advised the Finnish Consul General K.F. Altio, “It is perhaps unnecessary for me to add that our Minister is very greatly interested in the proposal to find homes here for these Finnish people who have been so ruthlessly dispossessed of their homes in Finland.” He added that the dispossessed Finns likely lost everything and were unlikely able to pay for transport or have enough money to re-establish themselves in Canada. Canada was therefore prepared to accept Finnish refugees but needed to know the attitude of the Finnish government to the proposal. Altio who had yet to hear from his government on the issue, replied that something might be worked out in conjunction with recovery and reconstruction efforts, but Finland needed every person to help rebuild, so there would be no mass migration. He said, I “assure you that the good will of the Canadian Government in offering its kind cooperation to help the Finnish people in their hour of trial is greatly appreciated.” That effectively ended the proposals to move large numbers of Finns to Canada.

After the war, there was still the need to show support for Finland. The day after the peace the British government informed the Finnish minister in London that there would be no formal demand to return war material already sent to Finland, but items not yet delivered would be retained by Britain. A small gesture though it was, it recognized that the present “peace was an armed truce and that to take away for the present equipment would be a severe blow to Finland who might at any time have to resume her struggle against U.S.S.R.” Implicit in this was the notion that in any future war with the Soviets, Finland would still be the victim of aggression and not a perpetrator of it. When they considered this, British and Canadian officials were in no way offering a pre-dated acceptance of Finland’s future co-belligerency at the side of Germany.

Finland was assured it would not be forgotten. To ensure this would not be the case, on 21 March the Finnish government relayed through the league its desire for continued assistance, “in order to bring about the complete restoration of the
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country as speedily as possible, with a view to guaranteeing its future.”

In some ways the need was even greater. Suomen Huolto, the umbrella organization that had been set up by the Finnish government to oversee the provision of relief, now reported there were 550,000 refugees from the ceded areas, the overwhelming majority were women and children, thousands of homes were destroyed, thousands were without shelter and there were a yet unknown number of war widows and orphans. Finland desperately needed food, clothing, household items, and cleaning supplies. The League of Nations bureau, which had tried to co-ordinate aid for Finland was now no longer accepting proposals for further aid. Aid to Finland could now be handled directly with the Finnish government. Canada had yet to officially supply any concrete aid by April 1940 despite the promised gift.

A figure involved with earlier Finnish aid activities, J.T. Norell, now appeared as the secretary of the Finnish Aid Committee in Montreal and told reporters that there was still a need to respond to civilian emergencies. Indeed, President Kyösti Kallio had asked Herbert Hoover to continue his efforts to provide aid. Canadians continued to show sympathy for Finland such as when the South Alberta Finnish Aid Committee wrote the Secretary of State in mid-May 1940 asking to forward the war relief money raised in Calgary to the British minister in Finland. On behalf of the group E. Peterson stated, “We naturally wish to be assured that these funds does [sic] not fall in the hands of the Germans.” In passing the case over to External Affairs, E.H. Coleman stressed it was necessary to clarify what the funds were for, before allowing the transmission to occur. The committee in Alberta was not a registered war charity, since the War Charities Act applied to “the war which Canada is engaged, and technically at least. I assume we were neutral in the Russia-Finnish conflict,” Coleman wrote. It was clarified the money was for relief of distressed war victims, especially widows and orphans, but could be used at the discretion of the British minister for any Finnish charity.
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Satisfied with this Skelton was “glad to forward the money” and he added, “I am sure it will help to meet a great need.” As a matter of procedure he would seek the approval of the Foreign Exchange Board and suggested to make things easier, in the future such donations might be submitted to the Red Cross. Further evidence of the sympathy of the members of External Affairs for Finland was the suggestion by Max Wershof and John E. Read of the Legal Division that the department could cover any charges involved with the transaction, to ensure the maximum amount arrived in Finland. The Foreign Exchange Control Board a few days later agreed to the sending of this money to “distressed war victims,” since it was the policy “to permit benevolent transmissions of this nature.” With the necessary forms and approvals the $1,802.58 was on its way to Finland by July 1940. There the British legation reported it gave the money to Dr. Stena de Gripenberg, president of the Sub-Committee for Great Britain and the United States of the Mannerheim League for Child Welfare to help Finnish war orphans.

The shift from a friendly image began as early as March 1940, when Canada added Finland to the list of countries to which exports were “prohibited.” This was essentially following British policy, which also restricted what things could be shipped there. In order to export from Canada to these prohibited countries a permit was required from the Ministry of National Revenue. The list included pro-Axis countries like Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, the Soviet Union, as well as the occupied Baltic States, and neutral countries which either bordered these countries or could be used for transhipment to them. It was a security measure to prevent the enemy from using these countries to gain access to Canadian materials. Complicating matters for Canadians wanting to help Finland, starting in April 1940 Britain was regarding Finland “for the time being” as an “ordinary neutral.” Export licenses were once again required to ship to Finland and the consignee had
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to guarantee against re-export. The licences would be based on quotas, using the average trade in an item between 1935 and 1937. Such restrictions impacted any possible Canadian aid to Finland, since it would have to travel via Britain and comply with the quota.1274

Canada still had not used the official gift because the Finnish consul was slow in deciding how to use it, though O.D. Skelton noted there had been “much cabling back and forth to his Government as to alternative commodities.”1275 Only at the end of March did the consul general request to use the Canadian government gift to buy rye flour. Despite all the delays, the Finnish government conveyed its thanks for the assistance by Canada.1276 The Department of Agriculture was concerned that if too many mills started buying up rye to fill the Finnish request, the price would rise and impact the amount of aid that could be delivered.1277 Canada had a surplus of other types of grain, but rye was cultivated in smaller quantities and was more often used to produce whisky. It would take several months to locate enough. Nonetheless an order for 20,000, 50-kilogram bags was placed and shipped out between March and July 1940.1278 The flour moved through US ports to Britain on Finnish ships to Sweden or went straight to Finland via Petsamo. Canadian officials spent some time worrying over what labelling should appear on the flour bags. They wanted to ensure the people of Finland knew that the flour was an official Canadian gift.1279 Shipping costs also had to be paid out of the gift and in early June this left a balance of $7,852.83.1280

The league secretary general in June 1940 requested details of exactly what aid Canada had sent, however, External Affairs had difficulty ascertaining precisely how much aid came from private sources, because some donations were being double reported. By March 1940 the Canadian Red Cross had provided $50,000 in cash, which paid for 10 ambulances and sent $20,000 in hospital supplies and other “comforts.”1281 This did not include the cost of production, warehousing, packaging, and shipping, which the society absorbed and was “very practical evidence” of the
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As of mid-April the Finnish consulate reported that two private Finnish-Canadian organizations in Montreal had sent $6,358 directly to relief organizations in Finland, consuls had collected from individuals and organizations across the country $88,335 and large quantities of used clothing of indeterminate value had been sent. Total donations from individuals, private organizations, and consuls amounted to $113,501.27.

In June the Red Cross figures had been revised to reflect $67,000 in cash, with an additional $10,000 in reserve for further relief efforts once shipment to Finland could be secured and $24,433.08 worth of bedding, knitwear, clothing, baby supplies, toys, personal grooming supplies, fabric, wool, hospital supplies, as well as 25 tons of dried and 18 tons of canned apples had been sent. In addition Canadians sent $592.80 to the Finnish Relief Fund in the US, though this figure was not reported to External Affairs. The Finnish Relief Fund also received Canadian support through the government operated radio system the CBC by broadcasting appeals across the border to upper state New York. Despite all these details External Affairs never actually provided the league with a final total of the value of Canadian aid. From the figures provided in the files of the department, including the $100,000 gift, which was never fully used, and donations sent to the US relief campaign, Canadian aid to Finland amounted to $214,094.07. This would have been sufficient for External Affairs to show, that despite the delays in providing government aid, something had been done.

For the remainder of the gift, because the Canadian supply of rye was low, at the end of August 1940 it was again suggested that maybe the Finns could still be convinced to accept dried and canned apples. No decision had been made by March 1941 when the Loyal Finns were in the process of raising an additional $15–20,000 to purchase and ship wheat and rye to Finland. There was a food shortage in Finland and they were eager to help. The consul general asked if the Canadian
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government would grant the export permit. He also suggested that this would be a good time to use the remainder of the gift, which by combining the two could realise savings on shipping and obtain a better price purchasing in volume.1290 Dana Wilgress pointed out that the ability to ship the flour now rested on the attitude of British authorities. Finland under the navicert system, was in the same rationing category as Spain and Portugal and the quota fixed at 25,000 Metric tonnes per quarter.1291 In the previous quarter Finland had exceeded the quota and the amount permitted for the second quarter of 1941 was reduced in proportion to 7,600 tonnes. The $20,000 would buy about 500 tonnes and the comparative smallness of the amount, meant there was no reason to refuse the request, however, if more was raised it might pose a problem. The SSEA was “inclined to give this request favourable consideration,” but first wanted the view of British “authorities in light of their more intimate knowledge of the situation in Finland.”1292 Vincent Massey in London thought Britain would likely approve the shipment, but “the political situation in Finland is at present obscure.”1293 The Dominions Office cautioned, “we are asking the Finnish authorities the meaning of certain developments which are apparently unfavourable to us. No doubt if there were to be any marked change in relations with Finland the Canadian Government would wish to withhold the shipment.”1294 The obscurity was due to the signs of Finnish rapprochement with Germany. In the opinion of Wilgress it would be better to use the Canadian government money to pay for the shipment of the flour paid for by the gift from the Loyal Finns, just in case there is any “marked change in Finland’s relations with the British Empire.”1295

With the exception of the discussion about the political situation Altio was advised of these things. Even with the shipping payment there would still be an unused balance, Canadian officials delayed, stating it was best to wait until the situation became clear before doing anything further. As the political situation deteriorated, the balance remained unspent. It was written off in 1943, “In view of
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the fact that this country is now at war with Finland, it appears unlikely to us that this balance will ever be used for the purpose provided.”1296

7.5 Finnish-Canadians and Canada’s War

For Finnish-Canadians the Winter War and its aftermath posed some potential problems. Canada’s entry into the Second World War found various ethnic communities, such as conservative Finns, reaffirming their loyalty to Canada out of fear that they might be targeted as internal enemies. Leftist groups such as the FOC attempted to do the same, and show the host society their support for Canada, freedom, and democracy.1297 The expressions of loyalty were not accepted because for groups like the FOC the motives were suspect and there was the fear it was just as subversive as the CPC. Indeed, Soviet aggression as much as any genuine sympathy for Finland coloured the Canadian response. Lindström has concluded that “The popularity of the Finnish Winter War was firmly rooted in the Canadian antipathy of communism.”1298 In this context all left-wing Finns as before were seen as a danger. The RCMP kept up its surveillance of Finns who were broadly labelled as Reds or communists, no matter how politically active they were. Using translators, informants, and agents to infiltrate left-wing Finnish groups, the force kept an eye on these people for security threats. All Finnish language publications were examined looking for proof of radical activities. Conservative Finns waged a campaign through 1939 and 1940, by informing on neighbours who were leftist, signing petitions, wrote letters in order to have the FOC, Vapaus and the CPC banned, as well as have Finnish communists deported.1299 The police and government officials struggled to keep the various Finnish groups on the left and right clear in their minds. This was because one tactic of the leftist Finns was to falsely report rightist Finns as communists or Nazis and give misleading information suggesting the Loyal Finns in Canada were secretly a branch of the IWW or other radical labour groups.1300

Soviet foreign policy seemed to prove the position that leftist Finns were a potential threat. The signing of the Treaty of Non-Aggression and Friendship, otherwise known as the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact, in August 1939 had caught all
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left-wing Finns and the CPC by surprise. Initially they found themselves justifying it on the grounds it contributed to peace in Europe, but when war broke out a short time later it placed them on the wrong side of the conflict. The CPC found itself having to condemn Canada for participating in an imperialist war, fought at the expense of the workers. Nazi Germany was not the real threat to peace they had to argue, but it was the war policies of the Canadian government. The main target of FOC propaganda therefore was “war profiteers” on the home front, while at the same time maintaining the appearance of loyalty. To the Canadian government this was immaterial, since the main concern was with potential provocateurs, not war profiteers. The FOC stressed its love for the Finnish people and reiterated its anti-Fascist stance by pointing to what it saw as the control of Finland by the right-wing which also harboured sympathy for Germany. The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact was by this logic also anti-fascist since it bought Moscow time before the inevitable Soviet fight against fascism.\textsuperscript{1301}

All this placed the FOC in a bad position. To support the CPC line and oppose the war would invite repression.\textsuperscript{1302} Organizations which were sympathetic to the Soviet Union, now seen as an “ally” of Nazi Germany were a problem. Consequently 16 organizations were declared illegal on 4 June 1940, which included some pro-German and fascist groups, along with the CPC and several communist “affiliated” groups like the FOC.\textsuperscript{1303} The Finnish Society of Toronto and “The Finnish Society” were added in August.\textsuperscript{1304} Very quickly police confiscated the property of these banned organizations and arrested CPC leaders. Roughly 200 CPC members were interned in prison camps, including A.T. Hill the former editor of \textit{Vapaus}, FOC leader, and labour organizer.\textsuperscript{1305} As an independently registered company, the newspaper \textit{Vapaus} was permitted to continue operations, subject to Canadian censorship rules.\textsuperscript{1306} The FOC was driven underground and
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\item Avakumovic 1975, 138–142.\textsuperscript{1302}
\item Sixteen organizations in all were banned at this time. OIC, PC2363, 4 June 1940, LAC, RG2 A1a, Vol. 1675. See Whitaker 1986.\textsuperscript{1303}
\item OIC, PC4255, 27 August 1940; OIC, PC1223, 19 February 1941, LAC, RG2 A1a, Vol. 1685 and 1705.\textsuperscript{1304}
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continued to meet secretly. In order to continue to operate the FOC reformed itself into the Finnish Canadian Democratic League in December 1941, and in the process placed the emphasis on its cultural role and down played its former political activities.\textsuperscript{1307}

7.6 Trade

Related to humanitarian aid was also a desire to recapture at least part of the Finnish market for Canadian products. There was a sense that Canada could be a potential vendor when the Finns were purchasing material and food to carry out reconstruction activities. Wheat and flour, which was a large part of the pre-war Canadian exports to Finland, was a logical area in which Canada could supply of Finnish needs. Finland had to be careful how it used the available reserves of foreign exchange and this made imports from Canada unattractive. Towards the end of March 1940, the Dominion Flour Mills of Montreal offered to sell wheat flour but found no interested buyers in hard pressed Finland. The company managers learned that the Finnish government wanted to take advantage of the substantial credits offered by the US government. Even though the credits could only be used to purchase products that were of wholly American origin, this was too good an opportunity for Finland to pass up, despite the fact the American price was higher than that offered by Canadian millers. As a result, the Finns had recently purchased 10,000 tons of wheat flour from the US, which in turn agreed to purchase cellulose and this helped with the Finnish balance of payments. There was no market for Finnish cellulose in Canada, as the country was a net exporter of this material. The Finnish contact for the Dominion Flour Mills suggested that they lobby the Canadian government to offer 1–2 million markkaa in credits.\textsuperscript{1308} The Ogilvie Flour Mills, which was also interested in selling wheat flour and rolled oats, found there were no import licences for Canadian commodities being issued by Finland in April 1940. It was thought the reason for this was that most of the Finnish quota for wheat

\textsuperscript{1307} Avakumovic 1975, 142; Vasilidis 1989, 183–184, 186; Eklund 1987, 237–238.

\textsuperscript{1308} Walde Tefke, Helsingfors to H.C. Moore, Dominion Flour Mills, Montreal, 20 March 1941 and 27 July 1940, LAC, RG20 Vol. 254, File 32917.
flour was being filled by the United States. The company asked the Canadian
government to provide any help it could.\footnote{The company was writing on behalf of its subsidiary the Fort William Milling Company. Fort William later became part of the modern City of Thunder Bay, which still has a large Finnish-Canadian population. Ogilvie Flour Mills, to Wilgress, Director Commercial Intelligence, LAC, Ibid.}

The response of the Department of Trade and Commerce was not favourable. The scale of the American credits, which started at $10 million in December 1939 and had been raised by an additional $20 million in February 1940, was simply beyond the scope of anything Canada was prepared to offer. Dana Wilgress summed the situation up by saying, “Needless to say, there is very little which we can do to compete against this kind of business because obviously, with the urgent financial demands which are being thrown upon the Government in connection with the war effort, it would not be possible to contemplate granting of credits to such countries as Finland covering the purchase of Canadian goods.”\footnote{Wilgress to H.C. Moore, Dominion Flour Mills, 6 September 1940, LAC, Ibid.} The terms of the American credit arrangement were firm. They could only be used for purchases exclusively in the United States and the Canadian government was not prepared to ask for an exception.

The terms of the Moscow Peace Treaty signed 12 March 1940 resulted in the loss of roughly 11% of Finland’s prewar territory, which contained about 30% of her “economic assets.”\footnote{Edwards 2006, 18.} Aside from the sympathy generated by the hardship Finland had to endure, in the weeks after the peace treaty Canadian trade officials pondered the significance of the loss of so much industrial capacity and the need to reorganize transportation systems. Though it never expressed in such terms directly, Finland’s position as a competitor in the US market for wood pulp was one aspect explored. Reports received via American sources about the portion of US wood pulp demand filled by Finland and the amount of production capacity lost. The territory ceded to the Soviets included twelve pulp and paper mills, some of them modern chemical mills. This area had a combined output of chemical pulp of 270,000 tons a year. In terms of the overall Finnish pulp industry it meant a loss of 23.4% of sulphite, 27.9% of sulphate and 3.4% of mechanical pulp produced per year. In addition, the ceded areas contained 5.9% of Finnish newsprint and 23.7% paperboard production.\footnote{R.S. Kellogg, News Print Service Bureau, New York, 27 March 1940, LAC, RG20, Vol. 719, File 7-273.}

Finland was the third largest supplier of pulp to the United States, after Canada and Sweden at 16.5% of imports. This had doubled over the past decade. Finnish
imports amounted to 332,975 tons or 21% of US domestic consumption of the three types of pulp produced. It was unclear how all of this would impact Finland, since it was known the country had surplus production capacity. That meant there was room for the remainder of the Finnish pulp and paper industry to increase production without any capital outlay. One thing was clear, Canada benefited from Finland’s misfortune, since as a consequence US imports from Canada, Norway, and Sweden were up over the 1939 amount.

Nickel and the mines at Petsamo were again a concern in April 1940. The strategic issue was whether the Germans or the Soviets would try to get access to the resource through a Canadian controlled company. In June, the Germans demanded that Finland transfer the concession to their control, which the Finns refused, but were willing to sell them ore and refined matte. The British government strongly suggested to Mond Nickel Company that it was in the Allied interest that INCO should retain the rights. The condition was the company should move slowly installing the new electric smelter and producing the ore. Sale of nickel to the Finnish government would not be considered trading with the enemy, even though it may eventually fall into German hands. This posed a dilemma for the Canadian government which did not concur with the proposed course of action. It was a matter of appearances and practicality. In effect the sale of the ore to Finland was no different than if the Germans operated the mines themselves. The quantity would not matter because the Germans would make good propaganda use of the fact an Allied government had permitted the sale of ore produced by a Canadian/British company. This Prime Minister King thought “would be met with scorn and would not be countenanced by public opinion on any grounds.” Furthermore it was thought the priority of keeping control of the concessions was motivated by the future commercial value of the mines.

1313 Douglas S. Cole, Canadian Government Trade Commissioner, New York to Wilgress, No. 2667, 12 April 1940, LAC, Ibid.
1314 Ibid.
1316 SSEA to HCCUK, No. 810, 25 June 1940, LAC, Ibid.
Regardless of what Britain or Canada did, the ore would reach Germany and maybe the Soviet Union. The British felt the only course of action was to intercede and slow the production as much as possible. Since the shipments would go by sea, the British Admiralty would be able to learn when the shipments would occur and interdict them.\textsuperscript{1317} INCO reported it would take 12 to 15 months, regardless of who controlled the mines, to bring them into production. There was nothing preventing the Germans from pressuring Finland to hand over the mines, once it was learned INCO was only providing the minimum at the request of the Allies. In the end it would be more disadvantageous for the Allies. Outweighing and economic and military importance in limiting the supply was the negative political and psychological effects of appearing to collude with the enemy.\textsuperscript{1318} These Canadian objections put an end to the idea and left the Finnish government having to play off competing Soviet and German demands for the ore. By the end of July, the Finns were instructing Petsamon Nikkeli OY to accelerate production and sell nickel to buyers approved by the Foreign Ministry. This of course meant the USSR and Germany. It was realized INCO could not comply, and the Finnish government took over the mines, but the company was reassured it would have its concessions restore after the war.\textsuperscript{1319}

During the fall of 1940, the question of whether Canada should sell wheat to Russia was under consideration. Through the summer the Soviets had made several inquiries with the Canadian Wheat Board and were asking again. There were a number of factors in favour of the sale. The US continued to sell wheat to the USSR since January, Canada’s markets in neutral countries were shrinking, there was a surplus from the previous year, and the 1940 harvest was likely to be a bumper crop. There was also the need to maintain some degree of good relations with the Soviet Union to help keep that country from more actively siding with Germany. After all, Canada still exported wheat to Japan, despite that country’s belligerency. After the meeting of the war cabinet on 1 October 1940 the prime minister met with some key ministers. The Soviets were prepared to pay cash for Canadian wheat. C.D. Howe was strongly in favour of allowing the sale, while most of his colleagues were silent on the issue, either because they had no views on the matter or were torn between the obvious commercial advantage to Canada and their moral scruples. King had no such doubts; he “took strong exception to anything of the kind on the
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\textsuperscript{1319} HCCUK to SSEA, No. 1234, 29 July 1940; HCCUK to USSEA, 19 November 1940, LAC, Ibid. On the diplomacy of the issue see Bray 1994; Krosby 1965, 1966 and 1968.
score that present strategy was blockade and ending the war by ending supplies to
gangster nations.”\(^\text{1320}\) To him “Russia is one of them—was Britain’s enemy, and our
enemy, against Poland and Finland.”\(^\text{1321}\) Furthermore the Canadian public “would
be incensed” if Canada sold wheat which would free up Soviet stocks to be
exported to Germany or do anything that appeared to help Russia when she was
“not openly on our side.”\(^\text{1322}\) Only one cabinet minister shared the prime minister’s
opinion. The British had no objection to granting permits for the export of wheat to
the Soviet Union, with the hope that it would foster better relations. The Soviets
counter with an offer to barter with Britain for flax, hemp, oil, chrome,
unspecified types of military supplies, and plywood in exchange for wheat. Canada
only had need for some of the flax and chrome ore but given the need for better
relations agreed to sell the wheat.\(^\text{1323}\)

**Conclusion**

The Canadian image of Finland in the months after the Winter War remained
positive and friendly. Finland was the victim of aggression and Canadians were still
very eager to help, whether through trade restrictions against the Soviets or
humanitarian aid. Finland did eventually use part of the Canadian gift, but
donations by the Canadian public exceeded what the government offered. Although
there never was any real prospect of Canadian troops fighting alongside Finns, the
Finnish example did have a small influence on Canadian military thinking.
Canadian trade officials were willing to consider using Finland’s misfortunes and
need for reconstruction to expand markets for Canada’s products. Practical
considerations regarding shipment and lack of foreign exchange credits meant
selling food to Finland was out of the question. For Finnish-Canadians the Winter
War was a mixed blessing. Left-wing, socialist Finns were still subject to suspicion
because of their pro-Soviet orientation. Conservative nationalist Finns benefited
from the public sympathy for Finland and from their very open displays of loyalty
and support for the Canadian war effort. Cost, transportation shortages and a lack
of enthusiasm by the Finnish government put an end to proposals to encourage
Finnish refugees to resettle to Canada. The enthusiasm in Canada for this idea

\(^{1320}\) King Diary, 1 October 1940, LAC, MG26 J13.
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\(^{1323}\) SSEA to Dominions Secretary, No. 191, 1 November 1941, LAC, RG25 A3b, Vol. 2725, File 158-
40.
appears in the emotional appeals to the government to implement the plan drew on the long held positive images of brave, hardworking, and reliable Finns.

With so much goodwill and a reservoir of positive images of Finland, the sale of wheat towards the end of 1940, to a country which Canada considered an aggressor against a friendly nation reflected the changing international situation. Not only because the Soviet Union became a de facto ally of Germany and had attacked Finland, but because of the threat of communist subversion at home, the Canadian image of the USSR was negative. Over the months that followed things would change, with Finland seen to be siding with Germany. While many Canadians would still have seen Finland, as the victim, with a positive friendly image, in the prime minister’s office and External Affairs the images of Finland and the Soviet Union were realigning. The Soviet Union would become an ally and Finland the enemy of Canada by the end of 1941.
Part Three: Enemy Images
8  Prelude to War

Before the Second World War, Finland seldom crossed the minds of the Canadian prime minister or anyone else in the government bureaucracy. Since the end of November 1939, it appeared more frequently. The amount of time devoted to relations with Finland was still a minor part in the overall Canadian diplomatic effort, given the issues involved with the war. Whereas in previous decades there were only a few files on Finland and they only contained at most a few dozen documents, now the files were more numerous and thicker. This was also true of the events recorded in the diary of the Prime Minister King. Previously there were at most one or two entries that could be remotely connected to Finland or Finns, but from the start of the Winter War, it began to appear more frequently, usually in between other ruminations about domestic politics and the war. On 17 January 1941 Finland was mentioned while recording his conversations and thoughts on the recently tabled Rowell-Sirois Report about the economy and relations between the federal and provincial governments. King gave thought to the war, fearful that Japan might soon enter the conflict, fearful that the war would expand to the Balkans and parts of the Mediterranean and how essential good Canada-US relations were for ensuring that Britain could access American supplies. The same time a year previous Canada had resolved to provide aid and he recalled how we were. “watching the Finns fight and were admiring their courage.”1324 Not quite a year later, on New Year’s Day, 1942 the prime minister, at the request of King George VI, would be participating in a day of prayer for the safety of the peoples of the Empire, Commonwealth and Allied nations, and for the succor of all those who suffered at the hands of the Nazi Reich and her allies, including Finland.1325

In that time much had changed with regard to the Canadian-Finnish relationship, a series of developments pushed positive images to the back. Negative images of Finland were difficult for Canadians and government officials to accept, given the sympathy that remained from the Winter War. Finland’s gradual move into the German camp culminated in the participation in the German invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941. This was met with surprise by the Canadian prime minister and External Affairs staff. It was thought that this was some aberration and that Finland was simply seeking redress for the Winter War. Germany was Canada’s enemy and despite Finnish claims they were simply co-belligerents, there had to be

1324 King Diary, 17 January 1941, LAC, MG26 J13.
1325 Canada Proclamation 1941, 1–2.
consequences. The reaction was to rationalise events and treat Finland as if it was under the occupation of the enemy. The first step was the closing of Finnish consulates in Canada, then the seizure of Finnish registered merchant ships, and internment of Finnish merchant seamen as enemy aliens. It was a gradual move down the path towards the image of Finland as an enemy, which followed the British lead in the hope that Finland could be made to see reason, stop fighting at the side of Germany and leave the war.

Once it became obvious Finland was committed to fighting a war against Canada’s new ally and thereby helping to further the cause of Nazi Germany, the enemy image was now front and centre. Because of Soviet pressure and the need to show solidarity among the Allies, Canada and the rest of the British Commonwealth declared war against Finland in December 1941. Finland now became Canada’s enemy. An image of Finland as the enemy, was seen with varying degrees of clarity, depending on when and by who they image was seen. Finland may have been fighting on the other side and legally an enemy of Canada, but there was always some lingering doubt and the possibility that the country was not an enemy in the way Germany or Japan was.

8.1 Closing the Finnish Consulates

Finland’s invasion of the Soviet Union on 22 June 1941 produced mixed reactions among Canadians. Since mid-1940 Britain advised Canada of warming relations between Finland and Germany that might lead to co-operation in military operations against the Soviet Union. There was no surprise that Finland chose to exact some revenge on the old enemy, but in this case, it was at the side of Canada’s enemy. Finland justified its role in the German attack, by claiming this was merely a continuation of the Winter War. It was just coincidence that they were co-belligerents alongside Germany against a common enemy. For a time, at least many ordinary Canadians if they were even aware, were willing to accept that Finland’s war was a separate one. The Americans and the British had tried to convince Finland to remain neutral. Norman Robertson concluded that “Her isolated and dependant position, coupled with her very natural desire for revenge for last year’s Russian aggression, appear to have been too strong for British and American diplomacy to contend with. Whatever the outcome of the Russo-German

war, Finland must be its first and most regretted casualty.”1327 For the prime minister, Robertson outlined three areas of concern for Canada: the Finnish-Canadian population, the Finnish consular offices, and Finnish ships. These things would be the focus of the official Canadian response to the Continuation War.

The Continuation War also, raised concerns in the Canadian diplomatic community. Almost immediately the Canadian minister in Washington L.G. McCarthy cabled Ottawa for instructions. Parliament was not sitting at the time, so the government was not in a position to take any action regarding Finland. Robertson advised him that “Finland has not presented any difficulties up to the present time, but the action of the Finnish Government in co-operating with Germany in the present war against Russia, creates a situation which cannot permanently be overlooked.”1328 He thought, “It is possible that some action may need to be taken with regard to the special position of Finland, because of the maintenance in this country of a Finnish Consulate.”1329 Until that time he was not to engage in any actions with Finnish representatives without instructions from Ottawa. The reason was any premature activity might be inconsistent with government policy given the present situation where the “Soviet Union is actively engaged in war against a common enemy.”1330 With the special case of Finland he added, “while it is impossible to entirely forget the past, it is equally impossible to overlook the present and great care should be taken to avoid any suggestion of approval of the course of action which is presently being followed by the Finnish Government.”1331

For the Canadian government, the admiration for the Finns had changed by July 1941. At that time the Swedish consul general spoke with King and said he found his country, like Canada, was now in a “very embarrassing situation.”1332 Sweden wished to keep good relations with both Norway and Finland, but now Norway was occupied by Germany and “Finland sided by the Germans against the Russians.”1333 Finland was now on the wrong side and as the year wore on the Soviets were pushing for the British to declare war on Finland, Hungary, and Romania, which were seen as German allies.1334

---
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was uncertainty regarding how Canada should respond to the situation with Finland and a lot would depend on what Britain decided. Britain intended to continue diplomatic relations, “unless or until Finland becomes effective[ly an] enemy occupied country, or Finnish Government make it impossible or useless” for the British minister to remain in Helsinki. The aim was to attempt to counter German influence and to negotiate for use of Finnish merchant ships. The US agreed to handle British interests in Finland if a diplomatic break was necessary. Canada followed the British example and continued relations with Finland and for the time being did not consider Finland territory controlled by the enemy.

British-Finnish relations had been slowly deteriorating since the export licence and navicert system had been applied to Finland in April 1940. Initially this simply meant Finland was regarded like any other neutral country, but there was also the concern that shipments might be re-exported to the USSR and then reach German hands or indirectly by freeing up exports to Germany. A symptom of the mistrust that was building over suspected influence and later the presence of German troops in that country was the ban on shipping traffic to Petsamo on 14 June 1941. By 29 July, the Finnish minister in London reported to the UK government, his country was “by force of events co-belligerent with Germany” and since Britain had concluded an alliance with the Soviet Union, relations would be suspended to avoid complications. Relations were not officially broken between the two countries, but for practical purposes and to all appearances they were, and the language used reflected that. Finland was only prepared to “suspend” the “functions” of its consulate in London “for the time being.” If Finland went ahead with this Britain thought it had no option but to withdraw their legation from Helsinki.

Canadian military authorities intercepted a telegram from the Finnish foreign minister to the Finnish consul general on 29 July which outlined what action to take. Consul General Kaarlo Kuusamo was advised that reports of a break in relations were unfounded. However, the British restriction of Finnish shipping and “their military alliance with the Soviet [Union] involves assistance by all means [and] endangers our military interests. Already in [a] communicative sense our government inquired whether England also does not see it but reasonable to
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suspend [the] activities of our Legations for the time being.**1339 In keeping with the image of Finland, the Finnish minister in London also later pointed out his government “would continue to pay instalments on loans.”**1340 Relations between the two countries might be cool, but Finland still paid its debts. For now, the Finnish consulates in Canada would remain open, however, the consul general was placed under surveillance by the RCMP.**1341 Britain hoped to keep the legation in Helsinki open to counter German influence and because it was a source of useful intelligence. Finland was also under considerable pressure from Berlin to close the British legation.**1342 In a show of support for its new ally the Soviet Union, Britain used a naval airstrike on 30 July to attack the port of Petsamo which was being used by German shipping. Though technically an attack on Finland, the intended targets were German troops and facilities in the area. The attack accomplished nothing of military value, resulting in some civilians injured, one Finnish ship damaged, and an indeterminate number of German aircraft damaged for the loss of 16 British planes. The effect was to solidify the Finnish decision to suspend relations.**1343 Finally, on 1 August Britain closed its consulate in Helsinki and US assumed responsibility for British interests. Instructions were issued that Finnish consular officers could no longer carry out any functions on behalf of Finland. Canada should do the same. The Trading With the Enemy Act was applied by the British to Finland on 2 August and it was hoped the Commonwealth governments would also apply these restrictions.**1344 In due course the Canadian government complied and the Custodian of Enemy Property advised all departments and the general public that trading with Finland, now was considered trading with the enemy, that all regulations applied “mustis mutandis” and were “extended and deemed to apply to Finland as enemy territory.”**1345 The decision was made to order the Finnish consul in Canada closed, but due to an administrative error the message was not
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delivered to the consulate until 6 August. Kuusamo was directed to wind up his affairs, turn over the consulates archives to a custodian and direct the honorary and vice-consuls to do the same. He was told that the reason for this was “In view of the share which Finland is now taking in the war on the side of the enemy, and the withdrawal of the Finnish Legation in London” that authorization for the consulate was revoked. His immunity from censorship was ended and restrictions on the transfer of money to Finland put in place. Until Britain had safely evacuated its staff from Helsinki, none of the Finnish consulate staff would be permitted to leave. All the Finnish consulates in Canada closed on 7 August and Kuusamo agreed to stay until this was resolved.

There appeared to be some confusion or misunderstanding on the part of Finnish officials in Canada over whether or not diplomatic relations had been broken by Britain and Canada. In fact, neither the British or Canadian governments specifically stated that diplomatic relations were being broken. All the British announced was their legation in Helsinki would be closed and Canada ordered the closing of the Finnish consulate to show displeasure over the war policy of the Finnish government. Under the norms of diplomacy this would constitute a break in diplomatic relations and should have been clear to all concerned. However, there also exists the practice of a host state showing disapproval of another government’s policy by withholding occupancy of an embassy or by requesting the closing of one or more offices without actually breaking diplomatic relations. The British never specifically said relations had been ruptured, because there was still the lingering hope that even in the absence of official representation in their respective capitals, both countries could reach some understanding which would remove Finland from the war at the side of Germany. Nonetheless, the British government acted as if a break had occurred. For Canada, the closing of the Finnish consulate
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was a break in diplomatic relations and Canadian newspapers reported it as such. This was the case even though the discussion leading up to the closure and the announcement never used the expression. The earlier closing of the Hungarian, Romanian, and Bulgarian consuls on the other hand was presented to parliament as a break. Clearly this was a case of misperception. The Finnish government treated this situation as if diplomatic relations were being reduced, but not broken, whereas, the British and Canadian governments regarded this as a break in relations.

While the US agreed to look after Canadian interests in Finland, Sweden did the same for Finland in Canada on 11 August. Documents and funds from the Finnish consulate were transferred to Swedish care. Canadian officials were initially uncertain how to handle this. For a time, mail sent to the former Finnish consuls were held up by Canadian censors and not forwarded to the Swedish consul general. Consul Per Wijkman would later complain this made his job difficult.

What to do about the staff of the Finnish consulate in Montreal and the various vice-consuls become an issue, since several of them were still Finnish citizens and the Swedish consulate wished to retain them to handle Finnish matters. H.A.O. Ekengren, the vice-consul in Vancouver, was investigated by the RCMP. They determined he was “of good character” and respected in the community. In addition he had provided assistance in the past regarding investigations and intelligence. F.A. Mustonen on the other hand was not so well regarded by the Finnish community in Montreal, because of a perceived moral failing exhibited by “his questionable activities with women of doubtful reputation.” Despite this “it is the consensus of opinion that he is not pro-Nazi and is in sympathy with Great Britain” and has not been identified as having subversive tendencies or engaged in such activities. Four other Finnish citizens were also retained by the Swedish consulate as clerical staff and domestic workers. None of them were deemed a security risk by the RCMP and had met the requirements under the Immigration

---
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Act of acquiring a “domicile.” Later when Finnish nationals became enemy aliens, Finns employed at the Swedish consulate did not have to register. By early 1942 it was decided to avoid possible complications, to have them register under the Defence of Canada Regulations (DOCR) and they would be issued exemptions.

8.2 SS Ericus and SS Carolus

A somewhat odd relationship existed between Finland and Canada, when improved relations between Finland and Germany was evident, especially after the start of the Continuation War, but before the closing of the consulates. The problem was what to do with Finnish merchant vessels and how to treat Finnish seamen employed on ships entering Canadian waters. There were 27 Finnish ships plying the Americas trade and there were some Finnish crews working on other ships, at a time when there was a shortage of ships and sailors for the Atlantic convoys. The status of Finland in this way impacted the Battle of the Atlantic and the movement of supplies to Britain. In June 1941, there were at least four Finnish ships operating on the Canadian side of the Atlantic: SS Ericus, SS Carolus, SS Kemi, and SS Vicia. Despite the obvious fact that Finnish troops had invaded the Soviet Union, British and Canadian authorities at this early stage had yet to clarify what official position to take towards Finland. Was Finland an enemy of Canada or at least a security risk? Should Finnish merchant ships be detained because that country was giving aid to the enemy? For the sake of Allied unity Canada wanted to make sure its policies and actions, as far as possible, followed Britain and the other Dominions. When the German invasion began on 22 June the British requested that Finnish ships which landed in a Canadian port be detained pending clarification of any changes in the diplomatic relationship with Finland and the following day asked that any intercepted at sea be redirected to a British port, which also meant Canadian
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1359 J.E. Read for USSEA to Commissioner, RCMP, Ottawa, 26 December 1941; Beaudry, Assistant USSEA to Wijkman, CGS, Montreal, 16 April 1942, LAC, Ibid.
1360 “Treatment of Finnish Ships by Canada” by RGR, 7 October 1941; “Control of Finnish Ships” by RGR, 7 October 1941; Bruce A. Macdonald, Secretary, Canadian Shipping Board to J.S. Macdonald, Counsellor, DEA, 29 November 1941, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 2899, File 2298-B-40.
ports. Britain had already started detaining Finnish ships on 19 June since that country “no longer regards Finland as independent.”

When the British request came only *Ericus* and *Carolus* were in Canadian ports. *Ericus* was employed under charter to the Dominion Steel and Coal Company to carry coal from Sydney, Nova Scotia. *Carolus* was under charter to an American corporation and used to carry gypsum from Nova Scotia to the US and on the return trip to carry sugar from the Caribbean for the Canadian Sugar Administrator. Both ships were doing valuable service in support of Canadian trade and the war effort. The *Kemi* was due at Halifax at the end of June and *Vicia* was destined for Port Alfred, Quebec with a load of bauxite, a strategic material. Considering *Ericus* and *Carolus* were in Canadian ports, the Director of Shipping thought, “It seems a waste of tonnage to keep these two ships immobilized if they can be allowed, with safety, to continue their present trading for Canadian account [sic] in water where they could be kept under scrutiny by Canadian and U.S. authorities.” The Finnish members of the crews were hesitant to continue to sail for Canadian interests given the unclear situation. There was a “fear of reprisals if Germany should occupy Finland.” If they could be convinced to sail, the concurrence of UK shipping authorities would be necessary even if the Finns were only employed on the western Atlantic trade. The view of the British was important, because co-ordination of all western Allied shipping was Britain’s responsibility.

The fact that Canadian officials were considering the detention of Finnish ships means that it was recognized that Finland might be an enemy nation. However, the acceptance of the statement by the Finnish sailors who feared reprisals means that at this point Finland was not seen as occupied or under the control of Germany. Through the end of 1940 and into 1941 German troops had been “transiting” and eventually stationed in Finland. Even once Operation Barbarossa began it was unclear where things stood, since the German troops in Finland and the Finnish military did not participate in the initial attack. What was unknown in Canada was the extent Finland was involved in German aggression. The possibility existed, but it was not yet clear that Finland had become a German satellite. The Canadian response reflected this uncertainty. A hasty message drafted by T.A. Stone on 27
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June which read that “Finland was occupied by Germany” and Finnish ships should be seized, but it was never sent. After consulting others in the department and shipping officials the USSEA decided to detain them and investigate the attitude and loyalty of the crews. The *Ericus* was clearly employed by Canadians and therefore could be supervised, but the *Carolus* was not. Given recent events Robertson thought it unwise to let any Finnish ship sail “for [a] foreign destination until the situation is further clarified.”

The crew of the *Ericus* were the first to be examined by Canadian authorities at the end of June. The ship’s captain, A.E. Fallstrom was “straight-forward and honest in his manner and opinions.” He was eager to resume sailing to earn money for the ship owners. Fallstrom stressed that only 1% of the company capital was Finnish owned, the rest came from a British source. This was news to Canadian officials. The Naval Control Service Officer noted: “The difficulty with these Finns is their intense hatred of Russia and anything Russian. They are quite willing, in fact eager, to accept British friendliness but the situation would deteriorate rapidly if we were compelled, at any time, to assist Russia either against or through Finland.” Many of the crew were fed up with waiting and were willing to sail on trade to the US, rather than on Atlantic convoys. However, they would do so under a Finnish flag and not without the permission of the Finnish government. The reason was the “rather dubious diplomatic relationship between Finland and England,” which meant they “did not know where they stood…and after the war is over they want to be in a position to proceed home and welcomed home with open arms-not be treated as deserters or traitors.” If the diplomatic situation deteriorated, the Contraband Control Officer who questioned the men, did not think they “could be trusted, as they are extremely loyal Finns and great believers in their country.” Placing an armed guard on the ship to ensure it did not aid the enemy would only antagonize them and lead to passive resistance or sabotage. Despite this, the Naval Control Service thought the ship should continue to be employed carrying coal for the charter company. Finnish ships were permitted to operate in
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Canadian waters under the scrutiny of the Royal Canadian Navy for the time being. 1372

Things quickly changed in the wake of the British raid on Petsamo and the break in diplomatic relations which followed on 1 August. The UK requested that Canada seize Finnish ships in prize. The expressed intent was to prevent them from falling into enemy hands. For the time being ships sailing to US ports would not be interfered with. 1373 The Americans agreed to a British request, that despite the fact the US did not break relations with Finland, all Finnish ships in US waters would be detained and taken under charter for the duration of the war. 1374 Ericus and Carolus were still in Canadian waters and were seized on 9 August. The Kemi had been sold earlier in the year and renamed, something which Canadian and British authorities seemed unaware of, but she was eventually requisitioned by the US in December. The Vicia was permitted to sail to the neutral port of Dublin, where it was sold to an Irish company. 1375

Canada initiated proceedings in “prize court” for Ericus and Carolus immediately. 1376 The Justice Department agent handling the cases was advised that although no state of war existed with that country, as of 2 August 1941, Canada considered “Finland is territory in occupation of Germany” and from that date “considered Enemy Territory” and the Consolidated Regulations Regarding Trading With the Enemy (1939) applied. 1377 Not unexpectedly the British owner of Ericus and Carolus, Sir Eric J. Ohlson protested. 1378 Since the normal practice
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1374 SSDA to SSEA, No. D498, 15 August 1941, LAC, MG26 J1, Vol. 316, Reel C4870.
1376 A prize court is a court authorized to determine if it was lawfully seized during time of war. If this was proven in court the ship and cargo could be condemned and become the property of the belligerent which seized it. British and Canadian prize law allowed for seized ships and cargo to be requisitioned pending adjudication. Tucker 2005, 308.
1378 He was Sir Eric James Ohlson, 2nd Baronet. His name also appears as Ohlsen in the Canadian documents. The Baronetcy of Scarborough in the North Riding of the Country of York was created 24 January 1920 to reward his father Erik Olof Ohlson a Swedish born shipping magnate and coal and timber merchant. The surname appears to have been anglicized from Ohlsson. He had been knighted 18 June 1915 and then made a baron for “Public service undertaken at the request of the Foreign Office in connection with Propaganda during the war.” This was the surreptitious way of saying for his efforts to convince the Swedish government to side with the British during the First World War. The family emigrated to Hull, England in 1902. London Gazette, Fourth Supplement, No. 31712, 30 December 1919, 2; London Gazette, No. 318030, 19 March 1920, 3432; Burke’s Peerage 1949, 1526.
would be to condemn the ships in prize court as enemy property, Ohlson submitted claims in an effort to demonstrate the ships were not controlled by the enemy. He argued therefore there was no just cause for the seizure since there was no state of war with Finland.1379

Max Wershof helped prepare the counter case. By determining that Finland was “occupied” by Germany, he argued, it was sufficient grounds for the seizure of Finnish ships. International law covered this situation and he quoted subject matter expert C.J. Colombos in making this point: “territory in the occupation of the enemy is dealt with on the footing of enemy territory being considered as part of the domain of the conqueror so long as he remains in the possession of it.”1380 In Canadian practice the situation with Danish ships in the spring of 1940 was a precedent. In prize court Canada argued that Denmark was occupied by Germany, the Danish government was collaborating with the enemy and “a state of war existed between Canada and Denmark.”1381 Danish ships and cargo were therefore deemed to possess an “enemy character.”1382 Wershof noted that this was an overstatement of the case, since Canada had not declared war on Denmark and the case was won on the basis of enemy occupation alone. The one flaw in the Canadian handling of the situation was Ohlson’s ships were not appraised to determine their condition and value when they were requisitioned. However, this was only really a problem if Canada opted to return the ships after the war or provide compensation to the owners.1383

Britain chose to delay condemnation of Danish and Finnish ships in prize court and was instead requisitioning them for the war effort. No policy had been enunciated if the ships would be returned to Finland after the war. As with Danish ships, British policy was that any contention by the owners over the seizure of Finnish ships was seen as grounds for not providing compensation for their loss if the condemnation in prize court was in favour of the government.1384

1379 Prize No. 6 was Carolus and Prize No. 7 Ericus. Sir Eric Ohlsen, London claims to Canadian Prize Court, 21 August 1941; “Control of Finnish Ships” by RGR, 7 October 1941, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 2899, File 2298-B-40. The ships were listed with Ohlson Steamship Company, Hull until 1932 then they were registered in Finland for AB Ohlson Steamship Company OY in partnership with AB Nielsen & Thorđen OY, Helsinki. OY stands for Osakeyhtiö or stock company and AB stands for Aktiebolag the Swedish equivalent. Kaukiainen notes most of the ships registered in Finland as a “convenience” changed flags earlier in 1939, clearly Ohlsen failed to do that. Kaukiainen 1993, 154–155.
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Carolus were apparently owned by a British subject, but the fact they were under Finnish registry and Finland was deemed occupied by the enemy should be sufficient to win the condemnation and allow Canada to take ownership. Another option would be to move the ships to the British prize court, since the UK had asked for the ships to be transferred to the British Ministry of War Transport (BMWT), but this would make the ships British property, not Canadian. Their rationale was that regardless they “were almost entirely British owned.” The British attitude towards Ohlson, would colour the Canadian response until well after the war. The BMWT made it clear that Ohlson’s employment of the ships was not “in a manner satisfactory to the Ministry” and they “felt no sympathy for him now that, with the turn of events, his vessels had been seized in prize.” What to do then appeared to be one of policy, not law, since the case against Ohlson was sound. The policy External Affairs would follow took the British lead; prize proceedings would be left in abeyance until the end of the war and the ships would be requisitioned.

C.D. Howe the Minister for Munitions and Supply opposed giving the ships to Britain and instead had them taken over by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine for use by the Transport Controller.

The problem remained of ensuring there was sufficient crew for the ships to sail. Norman Robertson advised the Deputy Minister of National Defence for Naval Services that the situation for Finnish crewmen was like that for Finnish nationals who were enemy aliens in Canada. He said that “it is recognized that most persons of Finnish nationality residing in Canada are law-abiding and well-disposed to this country” and only in the exceptional cases “of those individuals whose actions give rise to suspicion.” will they be interned. The Finnish sailors were to be interviewed to determine if they were a security risk and if they were willing to serve under Canadian control. The officers and crew of Carolus expressed their desire to serve. Given the general attitude towards Finnish nationals, “there is no reason why the services of the Officers and crew of the S.S. ‘Carolus’ should not be retained, provided of course, the authorities directly concerned consider they are trustworthy individuals.”
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For the time being the matter of *Ericus* and *Carolus* was settled. As long as the Canadian government held the ships in requisition out of court, Ohlson could not force the consideration of his claim. Canadian policy regarding Finland, however, could be complicated by the need to synchronize that policy with Canada’s allies. External Affairs legal advisor John E. Read noted the “complete interlocking” of Canadian and British policy regarding prize proceedings.\(^\text{1392}\) The end result of all this was the Finnish registered ships *Ericus* and *Carolus* remained under Canadian control and sailed in support of the Canadian war effort. Later the *Carolus* was torpedoed by the enemy in the Gulf of St. Lawrence during October 1942.\(^\text{1393}\)

### 8.3 Declaration of War

Though the British attack on Petsamo at the end of July proved ineffectual, Stalin thought that it, the break in relations, and the Allied embargo had brought about a division of opinion in Finland. Unaware of how effective Finnish censorship limited what knowledge the Finnish people had about their country’s military and diplomatic position, it was thought many Finns wanted peace with the Soviet Union and the removal of German troops from the country.\(^\text{1394}\) If the Americans could be convinced to threaten to break off relations with Finland, it might pressure them into leaving the war. The US was unwilling to do this because it would mean they would have to work with the Finnish communists and the possibility of Finland extracting herself from Germany seemed remote.\(^\text{1395}\) The alternative was for the US to act as an intermediary. By mid-August, in exchange for a cessation of hostilities the Soviets were prepared to return some parts of the territory ceded by Finland “after the last war.”\(^\text{1396}\) Britain leant her support to this idea. British intelligence also learned a Finnish general had gone to Berlin to inform the Germans that his country had no intention of fighting beyond the “1918 frontier” and once reached Finland would negotiate a separate peace. Hitler reportedly was furious and refused

\(^{1392}\) “Canadian Prize Proceedings Against Finnish Ships” by MW, 6 March 1942, LAC, Ibid.

\(^{1393}\) *Carolus* sailed with a cargo of empty barrels as part of Convoy NL-9 and was torpedoed and sunk by U-69 in the Gulf of St. Lawrence on 9 October 1942. Of the 30 crew there were 19 survivors and of the 11 killed, 6 were Finnish nationals. In total 8 Finnish merchant seamen, who were enemy aliens are commemorated in the *Canadian Merchant Navy Book of Remembrance* and the name *SS Carolus* is included in the list of ships lost in Canadian service at Battle of the Atlantic commemorations each year. Fisher 1995; Sarty 2012, 205, 209.

\(^{1394}\) On press censorship see Pilke 2009.


\(^{1396}\) SSDA to SSEA, No. M227, 8 August 1941, LAC, Ibid.
to permit it.\textsuperscript{1397} This came after the Finns rebuffed the latest Soviet peace feeler, while they were also resisting German calls to participate in the assault on Leningrad and to cut the Murmansk railway. Here the Finnish contention they were waging a separate war found some traction. It offered some hope that eventually Finland would seek or could be convinced to seek a separate peace.

Nonetheless the Finns continued to advance and to recapture lost territory. Viipuri was liberated on 29 August at a high cost in casualties and by 2 September they had reached the old frontier. In places along the front the advance continued into “Soviet territory,” despite the protest of many ordinary Finnish soldiers. Finnish troops would not go fully over to defensive operations until mid-November. The justification was the need to occupy tactically advantageous positions to defend the ground recaptured. Although on military grounds this would seem reasonable, it would eventually be a diplomatic factor weighing against Finland. Perhaps now with American pressure the Finns could be enticed to cease hostilities or at least suspend “active operations” instead of continued “fighting on behalf of purely German aims of no direct Finnish interest.”\textsuperscript{1398} The United States was held in high regard by Finns, so it followed the British thought, that if a “firm attitude” towards continued hostilities was adopted, Finns would come to see they would forfeit American sympathy “since they will be ranging themselves more openly among aggressive nations.”\textsuperscript{1399} By September the Finns and Germans had resumed their attacks and threatened western aid to Russia along the Murmansk railway. Notwithstanding Finland’s pronouncements about fighting a separate war to regain lost territory, it was now evident that they were fighting a war of expansion and aiding Germany’s aims, something which had cost them a good deal of American government sympathy. It had already lost the sympathy of the Canadian government, though that mattered little to Finland’s position.\textsuperscript{1400}

Identical action by all the British Commonwealth governments was thought to be important, so at the end of October 1941 Britain sought the view of Canada, the other Dominions, and the US about what to do regarding Finland, Hungary, and

\textsuperscript{1397} SSDA to SSEA, No. M288, 2 September 1941, LAC, Ibid. The reference to the 1918 frontier was unusual, because the Finns usually talked about the 1939 frontier. It is unclear which general this refers to or which incident. Likely it was an oblique reference to the comments at the end of August by the Finnish military attaché in Washington that Finland was fighting a separate war and could end it by a separate peace. The British were likely trying to conceal the source of the information, but there were also press reports with similar themes. Menger 1997, 535; Vancouver Daily Province 7 August 1941.

\textsuperscript{1398} SSDA to SSEA, No. M292, 4 September 1941, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 2930, File 2859-40.

\textsuperscript{1399} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{1400} Langer and Gleason 1953, 826–829.
Romania. A few weeks earlier Churchill had conveyed to Stalin that “We are willing to put any pressure upon Finland in our power, including immediate intimation that will declare war upon them if they continue beyond the old frontiers.” Stalin preferred that Britain simply declare war on Finland immediately, a message he relayed several times in the weeks that followed adding Hungary and Romania to the list but not Bulgaria. This placed Britain at a quandary. To refuse the request, which “the Soviet Government attach very great importance…we naturally are anxious not to rebuff or discourage them when at this critical juncture they ask us to make a gesture of this kind.” This could cause the Soviets, who were always suspicious of Western governments, to question British motives or even seek a separate peace.

There were several practical reasons why the British thought a declaration of war was inadvisable. By this point Britain, along with Canada and the other Dominions had “taken all practical measures that are taken on Declaration of War except for internment of Finns, Hungarians and Roumanians” The threat of making Finland an open enemy was only effective as a bargaining point if it remained a threat, whereas open war removed it. Prime Minister King noted on the margin of the telegram, that logically “can it therefore even be made?” A formal declaration of war would have “no practical effect of a beneficial nature” and could leave those elements opposed to Germany in Finland and the other countries with no other option but to side with the Germans. Then at some future date Germany could pressure these states to use their forces against the British Commonwealth. There was also the need to consider the impact of a declaration of war on American public opinion. Many Americans still had a favourable image of Finland and would find a British Commonwealth declaration of war distasteful. It would also diverge from the American policy towards Finland. US officials believed there were differences of opinion in Finland regarding their country’s aggressive action and that these could be exploited to change Finnish policy.

External Affairs could also have pointed out that a large portion of Canadian public opinion was still favourably disposed towards Finland. However, with
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almost daily newspaper coverage of the fighting on the Finnish front the image of Finland presented began to change. In June and July many Canadian newspapers Lindström has noted were willing to give Finland the benefit of the doubt that it was a defensive war, a separate war, a continuation of the Winter War, and the country was a co-belligerent and not an ally of Germany.\textsuperscript{1407} By August this had shifted to show Finland as a reluctant, unwilling partner of Germany which had been duped by the real enemy who were the Nazis. Germany had not provided Finland with sufficient military aid, left them to do the brunt of the fighting and as military progress was slow, it was thought the Finnish people and soldiers were disillusioned. The recapture of Karelia was seen as positive, but the desired peace had not been achieved. As troops moved into Eastern Karelia in October the mood started to sour, they were stubbornly advancing beyond the old border and Soviet resistance stiffened, though in rare moments of sympathy it was still presented as the Germans placing the Finns in this untenable position. Yet Finland still publicly maintained it was in no way subordinate to Germany and making its own military decisions. Within six months heroic, brave, little Finland had shifted to become an aggressor and the barbaric Soviets were now the heroic, courageous, and tenacious ally. It would take time to convince many Canadians the Soviets were now their friends, but as news appeared of Finland’s rejection of the offers to seek a negotiated peace, Lindström concludes it made them more willing “to think of Finland as the aggressor and an enemy.”\textsuperscript{1408} It was an important development, because public support or at least acceptance would make the decision easier should it become necessary to declare war against Finland.

Within External Affairs, the British position was interpreted as leaning toward not declaring war. Robertson advised the prime minister that “All the prudential considerations are against issuing a declaration of war.”\textsuperscript{1409} This was despite the urgency and importance the Soviets placed on the matter. The need for identical action by Commonwealth governments was seen as a ploy by Britain in the hope one of the Dominion governments, which had not been consulted on Churchill’s promise to Stalin, would object. Using this as a rationale, the UK would have an “honourable” reason to back out of its commitment.

Norman Robertson also pointed out there were two reasons it was not in Canada’s interest to declare war. This action “against the smaller German satellite

\textsuperscript{1407} Lindström 2000a, 140–144.
\textsuperscript{1408} Lindström 2000a, 144.
\textsuperscript{1409} “Memorandum for the Prime Minister” by Robertson, 28 October 1941, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 2930, File 2859-40.
states” would set a “formal precedent.”1410 Japan, an original signatory to the Anti-
Comintern Pact and one of the Axis Powers to this point had remained focused on
attacking China. War with Finland and the other satellites would prejudice the
decision to declare war on Japan if it attacked the Soviet Union. Such a decision
should be made based on the circumstances and the probable consequences and not
the automatic result of a precedent. Canada also had a lot of Finns “probably more
in this country than in the rest of the Empire put together” he said, and they were
“engaged in essential industries.”1411 How a declaration of war might affect the
attitude of these people should be considered. Overall, he concluded, “The present
situation, though confused, is not unsatisfactory” and he advised the prime minister
against war.1412 Going through the motions of declaring war on the smaller German
allies would not change anything. Shored up by this advice and confident they were
in line with British policy, King wrote in his diary for 29 October 1941, when the
war cabinet met they “were all agreed, and the balance inclined against any such
declaration by Britain.”1413 These concerns were relayed to London.1414

However, Vincent Massey reminded Ottawa from his London post closer to the
events, that a “Declaration of War against the three countries named would
obviously be of no material advantage to the Russians in the present issue, but the
fact that they attach importance to it would seem to be of great significance. We
can hardly refuse to do anything within reason to hearten the Russians at
present.”1415 As background to this were 25 years of mutual distrust between the
Soviets and the governments of the British Commonwealth. To fail to meet their
wishes would raise suspicions, however unfounded Massey thought, that the
Western nations “were holding our hands free to influence after the war settlements
in a manner which might be prejudicial to Russian interests.”1416 Any such
declaration of war by London would mean that to remain consistent with her pledge
to stand by Britain, inevitably Canada would have to follow suit.

The reaction in the other Dominions was mixed. New Zealand thought
Commonwealth countries were not in a military position to provide direct aid to
the Soviets. This created misgivings on the part of the Soviets and a token measure
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like declaring war on the small Axis powers would help alleviate this. Hungary and Romania were clearly in the “enemy camp” and were “To all intents and purposes at war with us.”1417 Finland was on the other hand “in a different category.”1418 Aside from the effect a declaration would have on US opinion, it is clear Finland is only trying to recover lost territory, and not that long ago had the “sympathies of practically the whole world.”1419 Despite the fact Finland was attacking an ally of the Commonwealth, it would be difficult build support for a declaration of war, especially if the Finns were sincere about the limited objectives. War would be counterproductive and would lead to renewed offensive activity by Finland. Furthermore, to not include Bulgaria in the declaration of war was logically inconsistent. Australia fully supported declaring war, since none of the reasons for opposing a declaration could offset the impact a refusal would have on the Soviet Union. Many of the reasons were “unconvincing and could not be justified publicly.”1420 This “knotty question” was a decision best made by Britain in consultation with the US government, was the position from Pretoria.1421 The Soviet government should not try to force a declaration South Africa cautioned. Increasingly in international affairs the situation of undeclared war was common, and it was possible, as demonstrated by the actions of the Commonwealth against these three countries, to treat them as enemy states. The situation with Finland was especially complicated because the country “has many sympathizers as the Russians started trouble by attacking Finland in collusion with Germany.”1422 There was also the consideration of the future peace settlement. It would involve the Commonwealth in Soviet territorial expansion should any of these new enemy countries have to cede territory.

This was a real possibility. Sometime after the Atlantic Conference in August 1941, American Ambassador, Jay Pierrepont Moffat pointed out privately that Canada should not officially or unofficially agree to recognize Soviet territorial conquests. Despite Soviet pronouncements about the right of nations to independence and territorial integrity, Soviet expansion could not be reconciled with the Atlantic Charter. This obvious inconstancy made it a source of ridicule in Axis propaganda. His concerns were brushed aside by Norman Robertson who said
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“Nobody worried about Finland” its losses and those of the other Baltic nations “was a small price to pay to convince Russia of [our]...trust and earnestness.” Moffat cautioned that while for the present the Commonwealth and the Soviets, shared a common enemy the defeat of Germany and possibly Japan would place the Soviet Union in a position of dominance. Adding to the list of enemies would only serve to make the post war peace settlement more difficult.

The United States did not want to advise Britain on what course of action to take. Secretary of State Hull thought the US could better influence larger issues like this by remaining distanced from them. He then went on to reiterate a similar list of reasons which had been provided by Commonwealth officials against war with Finland and the other countries, which nonetheless sounded like advice. The US State Department through October and November preferred to continue to try to influence Finland with private, but occasionally public prodding. Before any more drastic action was taken it was thought “that American public opinion has to be educated about the dangers to the Allied cause of a successful German-Finnish offensive against the Soviet Arctic ports.” Likewise, news coverage was slowly educating Canadians, but Robertson advised the prime minister time was still needed to allow the public to grasp that Finland was now on the wrong side.

There was little indication that the Canadian government might try to influence events at this juncture. The former Honorary Vice Consul Kingsley Graham told Norman Robertson, he thought it might help if some Finnish-Canadians or someone such as Senator Meighen, who had been prominent in the campaign for aid to Finland, made an appeal to the Finnish people broadcast over the BBC short wave. They had been grateful for the aid from Canada and it might help move Finnish public opinion towards leaving the war. The suggestion was briefly considered, but there was little to suggest it would work. Canada preferred to leave influencing Finland up to Britain and the US.

Canada then was not the only Commonwealth government to oppose declaring war but was the first to respond on 31 October and provided the British with the convenient excuse to defer the matter. There was no objection at External Affairs to the British using Canada’s concerns, with the exception of the possible precedent
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it would create in the event of a Japanese attack on the Soviets, as the reason for not declaring war. The problem was the British government when it explained to the press the reasons for not meeting Soviet wishes, cited Canadian misgivings, which were not that much different than those of the UK. The Canadian Press news agency picked this up on 3 November and it had the potential to embarrass the Canadian government if domestic opinion shifted in support of the Soviets. The Soviets were rightly unsatisfied with this approach and Stalin made it clear he still attached the “greatest importance” to the need to declare war and regretted the lack of “clarity” in the relations between Britain and the USSR. He had “been much embarrassed by the wide publicity in the press which this matter received.”

Throughout the fall Stalin continued to pressure the British to do something regarding Finland and coordinate war aims and plans for the peace.

Earlier in September Britain had sent a message to Finland that if it did stop invading Soviet territory, they would be treated as an open enemy. The Finns did not respond to this but said “their war against Soviet Russia does not involve participation in [the] general European war.” This the British would not accept. In November, the Finns suggested to the US they might consider proposals for an end to offensive action or even an end to hostilities if it received an Anglo-American guarantee. However, the US did not think it could offer Finland what it wanted, so the UK government proposed an Anglo-Soviet guarantee. While it might not be possible at this time to give any definite indication of what the boundaries might be, the existence of an independent Finland could be assured.

King highlighted these sections of the telegram and also the section which linked it with the possible declaration of war against Hungary and Romania which “would depend on subsequent developments in the case of Finland.” Finland was an important consideration for future Canada actions. The aim was to get Finland to leave the war. Ivan Maisky the Soviet ambassador in London responded that his

---
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1434 Ibid.
government did not favour the proposal and was of the conclusion “it would be impossible to induce the Finns to withdraw from [the] present war,” especially since it seemed Finland would soon sign the Anti-Comintern Pact.1435 With the firm Soviet stand, the British government was now leaning towards war. An ultimatum would be sent demanding compliance with the September message or else a state of war would exist.

Britain still tried to defer and while the ultimatum was being formulated, sought Canada’s views. Failure of Finland to provide a satisfactory response would prompt a declaration of war by Britain. This message was to be delivered to Finland by the US.1436 When the war cabinet considered the cable and on 26 November it decided to approve the British move, however, this did not necessarily commit Canada to war.1437 The next day Malcolm MacDonald, the British high commissioner clarified things. Britain recognized Canada’s situation regarding Finnish-Canadians. The implications a declaration of war had regarding Japan, would be considered based on the circumstances at the time and Finland would not be treated as a precedent. Regarding the effect on American opinion, he noted the US government’s attitude had “clearly stiffened.”1438 The Finnish reaction to British overtures was also unsatisfactory. He pointed out that the dispatch from London did not make clear what was wanted was a commitment that Canada would “associate themselves with the United Kingdom Government in the action to be taken.”1439 Britain would declare “war on Finland unless by December 3rd the Finnish Government ceases military operations and in practice withdrew from all active participation in hostilities.”1440 The war cabinet agreed on 27 November that Canada would stand beside Britain against Finland if war was declared. Though this bothered the prime minister who ruminated in his diary, “Yet, it shows how like a prairie fire this war is, drawing all nations into conflict with each other. Why Canada should be at war with Finland when we have been doing nothing up to the present but applauding her actions in the campaign at the time of the Russian invasion, it is hard to see except that those who are not for us are against us in the
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present life and death struggle.”

On 28 November the United States agreed to deliver for the British similar, but separate ultimatums to the Finnish, Hungarian, and Romanian governments.

At this time, the Canadian parliament was not sitting. Though legally not required too, the impending hostilities with Finland could be an embarrassment for the prime minister given his often-stated position that “parliament will decide.” The legal advisor for the DEA was therefore asked to look into the constitutional aspects of declaring war without the consent of parliament. The matter was urgent since on 28 November the Cabinet War Committee decided that Canada would in fact associate herself with the UK and declare war on Finland in the event that became necessary. This was communicated to the British high commissioner, with the “hope that the Finnish Government will recognize the force and reasonableness of the communication which your Government has sent to them through the United States Minister in Helsinki.” It was agreed that the Commonwealth countries would simultaneously declare war on Finland, Hungary, and Romania on 3 December if favourable replies were not received. Almost immediately it was decided to delay the declaration until 5 December to give time for the replies to be communicated and considered. This was because it was thought the replies would be intermediate responses and not simple yes or no answers. In that case there would be a need to consult with Stalin. War would not automatically be declared on 5 December and the issue of Hungary and Romania would depend on what happened with Finland.

Regarding the constitutional legality of declaring war legal advisor J.E. Read provided a draft statement for the prime minister. He explained that in 1939 the government had taken the position that the country would not be committed to war with Germany without the consent of the people of Canada, expressed through their elected representatives in parliament. Approval was given, and a similar event occurred with the declaration of war against Italy. When the diplomatic “consular representatives of countries which had taken up arms against our allies” were expelled the House of Commons was informed. The difference was that parliament

---
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was in session on these occasions but would not be when war with Finland became necessary. The war situation now dictated that there might be situations that required action before parliament could be consulted. For significant incidents he said, “Parliament would be summoned, but in the meantime the Government would act so as to prevent any prejudice to our cause during the intervening period.”

For less urgent matters action would be taken and parliament informed at the next sitting. War with Finland was an extension of the war started in 1939, he said, “The war is one and indivisible and the adding of a new country to the forces of evil does not create any question in the mind of any Canadian as to whether such country is, or is not, to be listed with our enemies.” Legally for Canada the proposition that they were co-belligerents and not German allies and therefore fighting a separate war had no status and Finland was fighting on the side of Canada’s enemies.

Shortly after the ultimatum was delivered to Finland, Prime Minister Churchill sent a personal message to Mannerheim, in an attempt to leverage the mutual respect that existed between the two leaders. Churchill urged him to stop the war immediately with the Soviet Union, at least in practical terms by stopping offensive action. The US also applied public pressure to show that it found the current Finnish actions unacceptable. A diplomatic note sent outlined how “Finnish military policy” was clearly “one of combined operations of Germans and Finns” which aimed “vitaly to injure Great Britain and her associates.”

Northern supply routes used by Britain and the US to provide aid to the Soviets were threatened by the Finnish actions. A recent trip by the Finnish foreign minister to Berlin with the intent to sign the Anti-Comintern Pact demonstrated Finland was joining “Hitler’s puppet governments” to “wage a war of conquest and domination against free peoples.” No amount of propaganda could conceal this reality and this was a clear “menace to all America’s aims for self-defence.” What the British and American moves did was confirm the fears members of External Affairs had regarding Finland, but had not fully committed to paper. Despite Churchill’s efforts to reason with Mannerheim, the Finns were being stubborn and

---
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unreasonable. Cordell Hull’s public statement showed the US government recognized that Finland was firmly in the German camp and no matter how Finns might wish to characterise this war, it was a war of aggression which indirectly threatened Canadian interests. The American press release articulated what Canadian officials were coming to realise; that Finland was an enemy.

The American minister in Helsinki learned second hand that the “note came as unexpected shock to the Finnish Government, particularly the President, Mannerheim and Tanner.”1454 The Finnish reply was given to the American consul on 1 December, but it still had not arrived in London by the deadline on 3 December. The Finnish foreign minister hoped that the reply would be satisfactory, and a declaration of war avoided.1455 With this in mind it was inadvisable to declare war on 5 December. Hungary had provided a partial unsatisfactory answer and Romania had yet to respond. If the Finns responded with a straightforward yes or no, the course of action would be clear. However, the aim was to get Finland out of the war and if they proposed some acceptable compromise, war could be avoided.1456 Yet for some unexplained reason the Finnish response had yet to be forwarded by the Americans by 5 December.

On 5 December 1941, King recorded in his diary that the Cabinet War Committee agreed to the British requests. Though the enthusiasm of his ministers caused him concern:

The war committee was, for the most part, about ready to have war either declared or incurred without further debate, on 5 countries at once. A pretty big order for Canada with what she already has on hand with Germany and Italy.

When men get war minded, their vision becomes completely blurred.1457 For Canada to have declined would have created the impression the country was not participating in a united front with the rest of the Commonwealth and the Soviets. The Soviets were doing most of the fighting and had a right to expect support. In the end “These considerations outweigh to my mind the seeming absurdity from other points of view, of Canada taking on war with 3 countries in Europe, with which she has directly no quarrel whatever, and one of which she has recently been applauding and assisting for its bravery.”1458

1454 SSDA to SSEA, M410, 1 December 1941, LAC, Ibid.
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1457 The number five was based on the existing war with Germany and Italy. King Diary, 5 December 1941, LAC, MG26 J13.
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The Finnish reply was received in London late on the 5 December and the text forwarded to Canada early the next morning, at which point the whole cabinet considered it. Since Canada had been content to allow Britain to make the ultimatum to Finland, the reply did not specifically refer to Canada. Therefore, the Finnish government was unaware that if Britain declared war, the Dominions would follow suit. Not that that would have altered anything regarding the Finnish attitude. Finland maintained its military operations were defensive in nature, “dictated by vital considerations of her own [in] relation to her existence and security.”1459 The Finnish government thought it had made clear in previous communication it was fighting a defensive war, separate from Germany, to recover lost territory and “that the struggle Finland is waging has no other aims than the safeguarding of [the] existence and security of the Finnish nation which have been threatened with total destruction. The Finnish people possess a sense of reality and are aware of their limitations, and do not strive any further in their pursuit of the war than is essentially demanded by their own aims.”1460 This would be achieved very soon, but also required “rendering harmless areas from where the enemy had been preparing to destroy Finland.”1461 Finland found “it difficult to conceive there is anything in their attitude which could give the British Government cause to declare the existence of a State of War between the two countries.”1462 Had they known about Canada’s position, similar observations could have been made. It was clear Finland would not comply with the conditions of the ultimatum.

Canada would synchronize the declaration of war to occur at the same time as Britain. Arrangements were made with the high commissioner in London to obtain King George VI’s approval of the declaration of war. The urgent request would come in the form of a cryptic telegram which stated “Roumania, Hungary and Finland obtain King’s approval.”1463 The King was away from London, so the approval would first be received orally over the telephone, with the written submission presented later, to be dated when the oral approval was given.1464 It was decided the declaration of war would occur on 7 December. External Affairs of its own initiative had given the “essential features of this matter to the press” without

---
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consulting the prime minister.\textsuperscript{1465} The normally controlling W.L.M. King did not object, since “it might prepare the public mind against what otherwise would be a considerable shock.”\textsuperscript{1466} King carefully drafted the Order in Council, to ensure the proclamation did not appear to be “an Empire decision,” but rather one made by “each self-governing part of the Empire on its own.”\textsuperscript{1467} He spent a good part of the day rewriting and double checking everything, including changing the declarations from “a state of war existing against the governments” to just the countries themselves.\textsuperscript{1468}

The matter was duly sent to the Privy Council for approval, the Order in Council issued, and the Americans agreed to have their representative inform the Finnish government of Canada’s declaration.\textsuperscript{1469} The order made it clear Canada thought the three countries were “fighting on the side of Germany,” against an allied nation and by “assisting the Axis powers are helping to jeopardize the defence of all the nations of the British Commonwealth and the freedom of all countries.”\textsuperscript{1470} By 10pm the oral approval of the King was received and Canada would be at war with Finland, Hungary, and Romania effective 1201am 7 December 1941.\textsuperscript{1471}

The prime minister’s statement broadcast by the CBC at 1115pm on 6 December informed Canadians of the state of war. Few Canadians were likely listening to their radio at that late hour. He reiterated in nearly identical terms much of the information from the order. Canada, like the other Dominions was associating itself with the declaration of war by Britain on the three countries in keeping with the previous decision “for effective co-operation at the side of Britain to resist aggression.”\textsuperscript{1472} In the statement Finland was clearly presented as a separate case from Hungary and Romania. Because the two central European states “When Germany wantonly attacked Russia” they “joined in that attack”, but “So
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\textsuperscript{1472} “Statement by Prime Minister re declaration of war on Hungary, Roumania and Finland,” 6 December 1941, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 2930, File 2859-40. The speech was rebroadcast on 8 and 11 December to ensure as many Canadians as possible heard it. The prime minister’s speech was published as a booklet. King 1941.
also did the Government of Finland.”1473 He needed to justify war with a country so recently many Canadians had sympathized with as the victim of aggression. Canada had “to treat Finland now as an enemy” because that government had “followed a course” which made this necessary.1474 Now, “Finnish troops have been fighting alongside the Nazi enemy on Russian soil, and the territory of Finland has been used increasingly as a base for German naval, military and air operations.”1475 Even the exiled government of Norway had tried to reason with Finland, while the US and UK issued repeated warnings, “that if it persisted in the invasion of purely Russian territory” it would lead to war.1476 If Finland complied and withdrew to the 1939 frontier, “every consideration would be given to proposals for guaranteeing her present and future security, and to measures for economic co-operation.”1477 These warnings were ignored and in spite of protests by Finns at home and abroad, “the present Finnish regime has persisted in its armed support of the Nazis; has become, indeed, an Axis ally in a general war.”1478 There was now “unmistakable evidence that the actions of Hungary, Roumania and Finland had become completely subordinated to the polices of Nazi Germany.”1479

8.4 Subsidiary Matters and Canada’s New Enemy

The state of war also impacted the low policy areas of trade and communications. Now quite logically all trade with Finland was prohibited. Already after the closing of the consulates, trade with Finland had been stopped, but now the trade and commerce of Finland was to be interdicted and disrupted whenever possible.1480 The February 1942 Order in Council publicizing this made it clear Finland was an enemy like all the other Axis states. It proclaimed that “Hungary, Roumania and
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1479 ibid. This view was accepted in some of the commercially published literature available in Canada during the war. Finland was presented as pro-German, because it owed its independence to that country. However, it was presented to the public in “occupation by Germany” and “Finland is nominally independent today, but she no longer can determine whether she will be at war or peace…as much occupied as is Mussolini’s Italy.” Even Mannerheim was subject to such criticism as the perpetrator of the post-civil war “White terror” and he was part of the “fascist clique” which tied the fate of Finland to Germany to gain “living space” for his “greater Finland.” Singer 1943, 158, 160.
1480 Trading Prohibited 1941, 201. Also, “Note for Mr. S. Pierce” by Renaud, 22 June 1946, LAC, RG20, Vol. 701, File A-F1-3.
Finland, by associating themselves with Germany and Italy in the present war, have made themselves parties to methods of waging war adopted by Germany and Italy and share in any advantage derived therefrom” and that the “commerce of Hungary, Roumania and Finland is, equally with that of Germany and Italy deployed to further the common cause of enemies of Canada.”

Trading With the Enemy Regulations therefore applied to Finland, with all the restrictions and lists of contraband war materials.

Censorship measures came into effect which limited mail and telegraph communication, that were standard for countries Canada was at war with. Mail headed for or received from European neutral countries including Finland had been diverted to the Ottawa for postal censorship since September 1939. Parcels were handled by the Department of Customs. The Department of National Defence looked after telegraph censorship and all incoming and outgoing cable and wireless messages were examined. Regular mail service to Finland as an enemy country stopped in December 1941. Canada, the US, and UK co-operated on matters of postal and telegraph censorship and as of 7 December, terminal telegrams to Finland were stopped at the cable office. Private and commercial telegrams to Finland from a neutral country which transited Canada or Britain could still be forwarded but were held for 24 hours to determine if there was no security risk. Messages sent by neutral governments to Finland could be sent without delay. Letters received from Finland were examined closely and released if they were approved. Mail transhipped from neutral countries to Finland could pass through Canada the same way as mail to or from Italy and Germany. However, letters sent directly from Canada to Finland would be returned to the sender as undeliverable. Canadian censorship remained in effect until August 1945.
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Diplomatically the US minister in Helsinki continued to represent Canada. From December 1941 onward, there was always the chance that the US might break relations with Finland. As a contingency Canada approached Switzerland requesting they take over in the event of a US withdrawal from the Finnish capital.  

This arrangement was put in place by December 1942 and when the US broke off relations with Finland on 30 June 1944 the Swiss stepped up to fill the role. Sweden had already taken over looking after Finnish interests in Canada when the consulates had been closed back in August.

The next subsidiary issue was the need to provide justification for the declaration of war without “the calling of Parliament.” King had to manage potential fallout. External Affairs officials were directed to prepare an official statement with the reasons. Parliament would not return until the New Year and the urgency of the situation made recalling it impractical. It was decided that the public statement by the government and the throne speech before parliament in January 1942 would emphasise three points: that Canada was at the side of Britain resisting aggression; that the government was taking the necessary steps for Canada’s own defence; and that it opposed all attempts to use force to settle international disputes. The war with Romania, Hungary, and Finland was “all part of the same war which began with Germany against Poland…extended by the entry of Italy into the war.”

Canada was in “the struggle” to defend, preserve, and restore freedom, “that freedom is one and indivisible” and the “defence of Canada is bound up with the defence of freedom in any part of the world.” These countries, by actively engaging “in warfare at the side of Germany against Britain’s ally Russia, whose success so largely depends upon the preservation of the democratic powers and freedom in all parts of the world” to have delayed the making a declaration of war until parliament could be called for what was “more or less a pure formality would be foolish.”

King presented the motion to the House of Commons when it resumed business on 21 January 1942, seeking ratification of the declaration of war on Romania,  
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Hungary, Finland, and Japan. Later that evening, the Governor General’s speech from the throne to both houses presented the government’s war policy. General aspects of the policy were covered, and it was explained that the world aspect of the conflict has been reflected by formal declarations of the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan, and shortly before, by similar declarations against Hungary, Roumania, and Finland, whose governments had passed completely under nazi [sic] domination. Canada’s action in this respect was a part of the solidarity which now embraces the war effort of the allies. The enemy image was now official; Finland was a satellite of and dominated by Nazi Germany. A few opposition members objected to the fact parliament had not been recalled, but instead focused on taking issue with how the conscription issue had been handled. The passing of a motion approving the throne speech constituted parliamentary approval of the declarations of war.

Conclusion

Four new external enemies were added and internally the nationals of those countries living in Canada became enemy aliens. It had been a gradual process since the end of the Winter War, but rapprochement with Germany and participation in the attack in June 1941 began the process of creating an enemy image. Closing of the Finnish consulates and the seizure of Finnish registered ships were the types of actions taken against unfriendly countries, but the Canadian prime minister and his staff at External Affairs were reluctant to take the next step and admit that Finland was now an enemy. By the end of November 1941, the messages received were clear that Finland was fighting a war of aggression like Germany and Italy. The decision to declare war had been made for the sake of Commonwealth unity, but the prime minister and the people at External Affairs did not think the war with the minor German satellites added any material advantage to the Allied war effort. In private they also felt it was done under of Soviet pressure for the sake of Allied unity. War with Finland was especially regretted given the recent sympathy the
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country had earned. Revenge against the Soviet enemy was understandable, but collusion with German was not and made Finland an enigma in the minds of officials at External Affairs.

It would take time before Canadians and Finnish-Canadians understood that Finland was now the enemy, yet the positive images created by the Winter War lingered causing some confusion. For the Canadian government, the question was should Finnish nationals be considered dangerous enemy aliens and treated accordingly or did the situation merit exceptional measures considering the contributions Finns had made to Canada? Equally as pressing was what to do with Finnish merchant ships and Finnish seamen operating on Canadian trade routes? Once war commenced the ships and men were detained, but what should Canada do with them? The ships had been requisitioned for war service, but the seamen even if they were considered “reliable” could be a security risk. The discussions within the Canadian government about how to respond to these situations utilized the competing positive and negative images of Finland and Finns which had circulated in Canada over the previous years.
9 Enemy Aliens

The formal declaration of war made Finland an enemy and, in most respects, that was how the government of Canada responded. During the build-up to war Finland was regarded as a country under occupation of the German enemy, the Finnish consulates were closed, mail and trade with Finland ceased and Finnish registered ships were seized, and Finnish seamen were subjected to security screening. Continued involvement after June 1941 in the German invasion of the Soviet Union forced the issue and Finland became an enemy nation. Enemy status was formalized on 7 December 1941, but the image of Finland as the enemy always retained some ambiguity. Finnish property was seized, and trade interdicted like Canada’s other enemies, but in other areas Finland was exceptional.

The mere fact Canada followed the British example and delayed the declaration of war by nearly 6 months was the first indication Finland was not perceived as an enemy in the usual sense. There was also the differentiation made between the Finnish government, its war policies, and the Finnish people. It was a nuanced view within which the enemy image of Finland operated and can be discerned with the handling of the enemy alien question and Finnish merchant sailors. Such subtility did at times cause confusion for Finnish-Canadians and Canadians alike. Finnish nationals were strictly speaking enemy citizens, but this was outweighed by the positive images of Finns as hard working, reliable, and loyal contributors to the development of Canada and the war effort. The positive images of Finns contributed to the policy of issuing exemptions to the restrictions enemy alien status carried with it under the DOCR. Positive images were also clearly evident when, because of the necessities of the war, Canadian officials were willing to permit enemy alien Finnish seamen serve on ships operated by Canada. With the exception of the Japanese, the other enemy alien peoples in Canada were treated similarly to the Finns. The Hungarians and Romanians received exemptions and later the restrictions were relaxed on Italians and Germans, but there was a sense the Finns were in a separate category.

9.1 Finns as Enemy Aliens

Even before it occurred, the declaration of war against Finland Canadian officials realised would make any Finnish national in Canada automatically an “enemy alien.” It applied to any person who held Finnish citizenship at the time Finland became an enemy nation. There were thousands of Finns who had immigrated to
Canada and had resided there for many years but had not applied for naturalization. Many of these were employed in areas essential to the Canadian economy and war effort. It had been one of the reservations the Canadian government expressed when asked by the British about the issue of war with Finland. Now something would have to be done about Finnish nationals in Canada.

Back on 22 June Norman Robertson had assessed the situation in the Finnish-Canadian community. There were large numbers of Finns employed in the lumber camps and mines of Northern Ontario and British Columbia. The communist “influence” among these workers had been lessened by the Winter War and the community “will be further torn and confused by today’s developments.” Whatever action was taken towards the government of Finland, he thought “I think we can safely count on the loyalty of the great bulk of the Finnish population.”

“The Russophil Finns, who have been hitherto been the trouble makers,” he noted, “may be expected to cease their troubling” and the “anti-Russian nationalists” did not take kindly to “Germany’s connivance in the Russian attack” and “from the perspective of this side of the ocean” will not “take Germany’s new found interest in the emancipation of Finland very seriously.” Robertson sought a formula that could address security concerns without any harsh measures which would “at the same time, give the Soviet Union the diplomatic support to which, as an Ally, it is entitled.”

He thought Canada should not be pushed by international law into treating these people as enemies, since there seemed to be good reason “for distinguishing between the Finnish people and their puppet government which, under Nazi pressure, has been forced into a false and humiliating position.” Speaking with the now former Honorary Vice Consul Kingsley Graham, Robertson asked how the “Finnish community in Toronto reacted to the Finnish alliance with Germany in attacking Soviet Russia.” Graham thought, “they were pretty perplexed and divided in their own minds on the issue. A good many of them were continuing to
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work with the Canadian Red Cross, but a good many of them undoubtedly sympathized with the Finns even at this stage of the war."\textsuperscript{1504} This seemed to confirm Robertson’s own assessment of the situation; the Finnish government was the enemy and Finnish-Canadians remained no threat to Canada. Robertson’s initiative proved successful. While the British government awaited a response to its ultimatum that Finland cease hostilities, the Cabinet War Committee met. On 28 November it decided that if war with Finland occurred, “that a distinction should be made in that event between Finnish nationals and other enemy aliens resident in Canada; such distinction to be conditional upon good behaviour.”\textsuperscript{1505} Canadian policy would therefore resemble British policy which would only selectively intern those civilians deemed a security risk.

With the hectic activity which occurred between 28 November–6 December, Robertson and Read had to remind the prime minister that if an exception was made for Romanians, Hungarians and “Finlanders,” they also needed exemption under the DOCR. To have made the regulations applicable to them, would have classed them as “enemy aliens,” required them to be finger printed, and report to the police on a monthly basis among other things. Exempting them would “keep them loyal to Canada” since “practically all of them being of that attitude at present.”\textsuperscript{1506} Consequently, after the request to the Privy Council to authorize a declaration of war, a supplementary request was made for a proclamation exempting Finns, Hungarians, and Romanians from being classified as enemy aliens based on their “special position.”\textsuperscript{1507} This was because “it is recognized that most persons of Roumanian, Hungarian or Finnish origin or nationality residing in Canada are law-abiding, well-disposed and loyal inhabitants of this country, contributing to its war effort, and disavowing any allegiance to the Nazi controlled puppet governments of their countries of origin.”\textsuperscript{1508}

At the cabinet meeting on 6 December the matter was debated. McLarty wanted the regulations “applicable without exception.”\textsuperscript{1509} King thought that from the perspective “of foreign policy it was imperative we should keep the country as united as possible and not make enemies of any classes where that could be avoided
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without endangering the situation.”1510 J.T. Thorson the Minister of National War Services went further and pointed out during the drafting process any reference to the fact the three countries had signed the Anti-Comintern Pact should be removed. The proclamation regarding the status of the foreign nationals from these three countries should also avoid referring to the DOCR.1511 This internal debate over the content and wording of the order to exempt Finns delayed the implementation of the policy because it was decided on 6 December to wait.1512 After revisions were made J.E. Read spoke for External Affairs on 18 December and advised the Department of Justice that “It is the opinion of members of this Department that it would provide a sound solution to the problem.”1513

Subsequently, the order was signed on 23 December and enemy nationals were required to report by 7 February 1942 to receive their exemptions.1514 Specifically they would not be enemy aliens for the purposes of regulations 24, 25, 26, 26a and 26b. These sections related to such things as trying to leave to join the armed forces of the enemy, assisting the enemy, espionage, the need to register with the Registrar of Enemy Aliens, the keeping of a list of enemy aliens, the ability of the Minister of Justice to release an interned enemy alien, the application of this to all German and Italian citizens and an exemption for Czechoslovaks, and that this retroactively applied to those who had been naturalized British subjects since 1922.1515

Section 26c was added, specifically authorizing the granting of exemption to Finns, Hungarians, and Romanians once the registrar was assured they were not a threat. In fact, all of this was in some ways unnecessary and more of a public relations activity. Section 26 of the DOCR already gave the Registrar of Enemy Aliens the power to issue exemptions. By amending the regulations to specify that Hungarians, Romanians, and Finns were exempt merely clarified the issue and prevented any misunderstanding on the part of the officials involved.1516 Finns over the age of 16 still had to report in order to receive the exemption certificate. Failure to do so could result in arrest or internment. They were also fingerprinted and had

---

1510 ibid.
1511 ibid. Thorson had served in the First World War as a captain in the 223rd (Scandinavian) Battalion which also actively recruited Finns. See Ratz 2018.
1512 Cabinet War Committee, 6 December 1941, LAC, RG2 7C, Vol. 6, Reel C4654.
1514 OIC, PC9543, 23 December 1941, LAC, RG2 A1a, Vol. 1742. A transcript of the proclamation can be found in Lindström 20001, 147.
1515 Canada Defence 1941, 30–36.
1516 Canada Defence 1942, 40.
to report annually to verify their address. Finns were prohibited from owning firearms and those owned by Finns would be confiscated by police. They also had restrictions on their freedom of movement because they had to notify the registrar of their intent to relocate and get a certificate giving them permission to do so.\footnote{Lindström 2000a, 151–152, 160–163.}

The RCMP, provincial attorneys general, as well as provincial and municipal police were told to liberally interpret the time limit and to only refuse exemptions in the most extreme cases where individuals were not “loyal to all British institutions.”\footnote{D.C. Saul, Inspector for Registrar of Enemy Aliens to Wershof, 16 January 1942; “Memorandum for Mr. Read,” 26 December 1941, LAC, RG25 A3b, Vol. 2797, File 773-40; S.T. Wood, Commissioner, Registrar General of Enemy Aliens to DMJ, 6 January 1942, LAC, RG13, Vol. 42, File 142873 Accn 891-90/067.} As the Registrar General of Enemy Aliens noted they were enemy aliens “at least technically,” however, because many lived in remote communities and there was room for misunderstanding due to language barriers and only those who deliberately flouted the law should be prosecuted.\footnote{Wood to DMJ, 6 January 1942, LAC, RG13, Vol. 42, File 142873 Accn 891-90/067.} Nonetheless, there was confusion within the Finnish community about what to do. There was also annoyance that the posters put up to publicize the regulations branded them as enemy aliens who had to be finger printed. Today finger printing is a routine part of security screening, but at the time it carried a stigma attached to criminal convictions, so this also caused some embarrassment. The Swedish consulate was inundated with requests for information about the new rules. Robertson advised them the granting of exemptions showed “the faith the Canadian government has in the loyalty and law-abiding nature of these people, even though technically they are enemy aliens.”\footnote{Robertson to Wijkman, 19 January 1942, LAC, RG25 A3b, Vol. 2797, File 773-40. On German-Canadians see Keyserlingk 1993.}

Finns who had been naturalized were exempt, but Germans, Italians, and Japanese who received their citizenship after 1922 still had to register. Robertson explained that they were not being registered as enemy aliens, only providing information so an exemption certificate could be issued. This was somewhat disingenuous, since by providing that information their names were put in file as having received an exemption, which still allowed the government to keep tabs on them.\footnote{SSDA to SSEA, No. G75, 5 December 1941, LAC, RG25 D1, Vol. 800, File 531, Reel T1806. Excluding Japanese and using National Defence, External Affairs, Correction Service, RCMP, Special Committee on the Defence of Canada Regulations files, and the papers of Norman Robertson, McBride identified over 1,550 internes. Keyserlingk using RCMP reports and External Affairs files, does not include Jehovah’s Witnesses and gives totals for each reporting period and shows a high of 1,239} The Japanese were to fare worse. They suffered xenophobia and
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\footnote{SSDA to SSEA, No. G75, 5 December 1941, LAC, RG25 D1, Vol. 800, File 531, Reel T1806. Excluding Japanese and using National Defence, External Affairs, Correction Service, RCMP, Special Committee on the Defence of Canada Regulations files, and the papers of Norman Robertson, McBride identified over 1,550 internes. Keyserlingk using RCMP reports and External Affairs files, does not include Jehovah’s Witnesses and gives totals for each reporting period and shows a high of 1,239}
racism in the face of Japan’s military advances in the Pacific and in 1942 the whole Japanese and Japanese-Canadian population in British Columbia had their property confiscated and were interned.\textsuperscript{1522}

The Order in Council put into effect the official attitude the prime minister had publicized earlier in his address regarding the declaration of war. Nationals and recently naturalized Canadians from these enemy states residing in Canada would not deemed enemy aliens, because “The government is fully convinced of the loyalty of the overwhelming majority of these people, a loyalty which extend to Canada and the great cause to which the Allied nations are committed.”\textsuperscript{1523} The state would still take what security measures it deemed necessary, but the Finns, Hungarians, and Romanians would not be singled out because of their country of origin. They would be expected to continue to play a full part in the current struggle. The people in these countries were “clearly under Nazi control” and could only resist passively or risk “the firing squad and the concentration camp.”\textsuperscript{1524} Canada was fighting for freedom of thought and action.” All these were reasons, “As loyal residents of Canada…why the Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian peoples should continue to contribute in fullest measure to the war effort of our country.”\textsuperscript{1525}

Apparently, this message was not received by all Canadians. In June 1942, Olof Hanson a member of parliament from British Columbia, had to ask the question was Canada at war with Finland? Hanson questioned that if Canada was at war with Finland, why were so many “Fins [sic]” employed as loggers on the Queen Charlotte Islands?\textsuperscript{1526} Furthermore, why were their wages so high when Canadian military personnel only earn a dollar per day? They were employed cutting Sitka spruce used to make aircraft. Since this was the only stand of this essential war material in the British Empire, why he asked, run the risk of “fifth columnists, of which there were plenty in Canada” damaging the war effort?\textsuperscript{1527} No doubt there were other Canadians who shared these concerns. Since April 1940 there had been

\textsuperscript{1522} The literature on the internment of Japanese Canadians is extensive. See Roy, Granatstein, limo and Takamura 1990. On the treatment of Germans and Italians see Keyserlingk 1984; Canton, Cusmano, Mirolla, and Zucchero 2012.

\textsuperscript{1523} “Statement by Prime Minister re Declaration of War on Hungary, Roumania and Finland,” 6 December 1941, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 2930, File 2859-40.

\textsuperscript{1524} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{1525} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{1526} Olof Hanson, MP to W.J. Turnbull, Principle Secretary to the Prime Minister of Canada, 1 June 1942, LAC, MG 26 J1, Vol. 325, Reel C6806.

\textsuperscript{1527} Ibid.
a wide spread fear among the public and in the press of a “5th column” in the country and people saw saboteurs everywhere among the ethnic communities. This culminated in the June 1940 ban on communist and Nazi/fascist organizations.\textsuperscript{1528} From the start of the war there had been calls to dismiss from their jobs immigrant workers who were not naturalized and to deny them relief or social assistance.\textsuperscript{1529} The reply educated Hanson on the diplomatic status of Finland, the rules regarding Finnish nationals and that Finns were regarded as loyal and law-abiding citizens. Canada did not discriminate on “racial origin” in terms of wages, which were set based on the industry standard and wartime regulations.\textsuperscript{1530}

The classification of Finnish nationals in Canada as an exceptional category of enemy aliens created problems aside from issuing exemptions. The army, navy, and air force also wondered what to do with Finnish nationals who were serving with the Canadian forces.\textsuperscript{1531} From 1939 until the end of 1941 numerous Finns living in Canada had voluntarily joined the Canadian military. Most of these could be considered conservative or White Finns who found Canada’s war an indirect way to damage the Soviet Union, because Germany had signed a non-aggression pact with that country and supported it during the Winter War. Others joined for varying reasons, such as a demonstration of their loyalty to their new home, to obtain relief from unemployment or adventure. Only once Canada declared war against Finland in 1941 did left-wing or socialist Finns join in any numbers.\textsuperscript{1532} Regardless of their motivation or political orientation after December 1941, those who were not naturalized Canadians or British subjects were automatically enemy aliens and ineligible to serve, despite their exceptional status.

The Canadian Army raised the question in December 1941. First the army had received numerous requests to enlist Finns, Hungarians, and Romanians and regulations clearly prohibited this. Furthermore, it needed direction on what to do with those already serving. Government policy regarding the treatment of these enemy nationals placed them in a category separate from Germans and Italians.

\textsuperscript{1528} Hannant 1993, 106–111.  
\textsuperscript{1529} The provinces of Ontario and Alberta had cut off relief for all non-naturalized immigrants. Patrias 2012, 20–21.  
\textsuperscript{1530} Turnbull to Hansen, 3 July 1942, LAC, MG 26 J1, Vol. 325, Reel C6806.  
\textsuperscript{1531} On this issue in Australia see Leach 2013.  
\textsuperscript{1532} On participation of Finns in the Canadian war effort see Sillanpää 2004. On those connected to the FOC see Vapaus 1946.
They were technically enemies, but not deemed a threat. The DND requested that External Affairs advise it on what procedure to follow.  

Robertson responded by pointing out the granting of exemptions. He considered that “In view of the fact that the great majority of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian nationals are loyal to the Allied cause, it is expected that such certificates of exemption will be issued in the majority of cases.” In his, own opinion, “in view of the special status of Finnish, Hungarian and Roumanian nationals, there is no reason why those to whom certificates of exemption have been granted, after a check by the R.C.M.P. authorities, should not be accepted for service with the Canadian Forces.” For those already serving the best practice would be to keep them in service.

On the other hand, W.J.P. O’Meara, the Assistant Undersecretary of State advised DND on the view of the office responsible for enemy aliens. He wrote, “So far as this Department is concerned, the nationals of all countries presently at war with Canada are refused naturalization, no distinction being drawn between Finns, Rumanians [sic] and Hungarians in this regard.” In other words there was no exception when it came to citizenship and Finnish nationals would be ineligible to serve. Obviously, there was no agreement within the Canadian government over how to handle this situation. Finns continued to apply to join the Canadian military and the issue had not been resolved by the end of February 1942. The demand for able volunteers overruled any security concerns and those Finnish nationals who had received their exemption certificates could enlist. Later in 1942 the restrictions on communists were removed allowing Spanish Civil War veterans to sign up. Just before Christmas 1942 the section of the DOCR was rescinded, which made enemy aliens out of long term residents who had become naturalized citizens. By the beginning of 1943 even the need for an exemption certificate had been removed and any enemy national, except Japanese, was free to enlist if they declared an intention to apply for citizenship after the war.

1534 Robertson to DND, National Defence for Air, National Defence for Naval Services, RCMP, Secretary of State and National War Services, 21 December 1941, LAC, Ibid.
1535 Ibid.
1536 W.P.J. O’Meara to DesRosiers, 26 December 1941, LAC, Ibid.
1537 DesRosiers, Acting Deputy Minister, DND (Army) to Robertson, 27 February 1942, LAC, Ibid.
1538 Dreisziger 2002, 185.
1539 Lindström 2000a, 177–179.
9.2 What War with Finland?

Soon after Canada and Finland were at war there was a dinner attended by “nationally minded Finns” in Toronto on 6 December-Finnish Independence Day. In attendance were Finnish clergymen, newspaper staff, various former consuls, and community leaders. They were endeavouring to have a gathering, while avoiding reference to the Finnish national day and politics of any sort. The RCMP officer who reported on the event noted there was a “depressed and sad atmosphere prevailed among those attending” and “it appeared “that those persons of Finnish race present at this dinner are bewildered by the changing events which have led to our being at war with Finland.” All of the guests were Canadians or naturalized Canadians and had never exhibited any disloyalty to Canada. As if to emphasize this there was no Finnish flag shown, only the “Canadian flag” and “they sang our National Anthem” at the end.

The views of the Canadian government regarding the nature of the regime in Finland resonated with other Finns, mostly leftists, such as the Associations of Finnish Democrats. The secretary of its Sudbury Regional Committee claimed to represent most of the Finnish speaking people of the area and gave his organizations “indivisible support of Canada’s declaration of war against Hitler’s puppet government of Finland.” The message was that the Canadian government considered it a war against the regime and it was understood by this group, “that this is not a war against Finnish people, [the] large majority of whom are democratically inclined, but against the present-day rulers of Finland.” His committee pledged “to work unceasingly until nazi and fascist barbarians and their puppets are defeated all over the world.” The Finns living at Sointula, thought “the war weary people of Finland oppose the pro-Nazi stand taken by their government” and the whole community gave “unqualified support to Canada and its Allies in the task of abolishing Hitlerism and ii it stands for from this earth.”

The Finnish-Canadian Anti-Fascist V-League in Port Arthur expressed similar

1541 Ibid.
1542 Ibid.
1543 U. Mäkelä, Secretary, Sudbury Regional Committee to King, 9 December 1941, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 2930, File 2859-40.
1544 Ibid.
1545 Ibid.
views of the Ryti-Mannerheim-Tanner “Quisling government,” which the Finnish people clandestinely opposed and put its support behind Canada’s war effort.1547 Despite the title of these organizations, some were the cover or front organizations the FOC and CPC had created when their bodies had been made illegal. These Red Finns had opposed Canada’s entry into the war against Germany in 1939 largely due to Comintern pressure after the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. This show of support by Finnish-Canadians was of course greatly appreciated by the government and proved the wisdom of the restraint shown the Finnish-Canadian population.1548 One possible source of national disunity was effectively neutralized.

Not all Finnish communities in Canada and the United States were as well informed as these. As late as June 1943 the DEA learned that despite the closing of the Finnish consuls in Canada, it appeared former Vice-Consul Ekengren in Vancouver was still issuing Finnish passports. Apparently there appeared in the newspaper Norden, from the US, a report and an advertisement to this effect.1549 The 1943 Vancouver telephone directory still listed the Finnish consul. If these things were correct, it was illegal, and the Swedish consulate was asked to look into the matter. The entry in the telephone directory could easily be explained as a clerical error, but the issuing of passports was harder to explain.

As it turned out both Statius in Toronto and Ekengren in Vancouver had carried out some Finnish related activities. Ekengren had apparently approved some documents to assist with old age pensions, translated Finnish birth certificates and some “certificates of identity” verifying nationality, but had done so unofficially and without a seal.1550 The verification of identity had been done for Finns who had received notice to report for military training. He had been advised by the local War Service Board Chairman that his documents would be recognized as proof of citizenship. This of course was so they could avoid military service, but that was not mentioned. Regarding passports, he had simply been forwarding the documents. Using consul stationary, he had forwarded to Stockholm death notices, but insisted he was acting as a private citizen. All of this was done on incorrect advice he had received. When reporting this the Swedish consul general confided “off the record”

1550 Henrik Ramel, Attaché to E. D'Arcy McGreer, 18 June 1943, LAC, Ibid.
instances where many Finns had no idea what was meant by a “break in relations” and indeed refused to believe a break had taken place. He went on to give his opinion that “this was a quirk in their character and that it was necessary to repeat things to them many times before they realized the real situation.”

9.3 Canadian War Propaganda and Immigrant Communities

Lindström has noted some in the Finnish community found the application of the DOCR and the issuing of exemptions inconvenient or personally degrading. On the other hand Sillanpää contends “In most cases, the restrictions prescribed by the Canadian government for its resident Finnish citizens were purely routine. This is not to minimize the initial fear many felt when they realized they had to report to a police station to be registered as a citizen of an enemy state and fingerprinted.” What most soon realized was this had been brought about by world events and that it consisted of minor inconveniences compared to say what the Japanese Canadians experienced. In almost all cases exemptions were granted. The policy set after 7 December 1941 was one of expediency and practicality. Blame for any inconvenience could be easily shifted onto the “Nazi-controlled puppet government” in Helsinki.

Nonetheless, mainstream Anglo and Franco Canadians were in general distrustful and even antagonistic towards “foreigners” and immigrants. There were many examples of employers discriminating against “new Canadians,” immigrants and racialized minority groups. Of course this was unfair, because friendly aliens from Allied countries, immigrant Canadians who were naturalized British subjects and eventually even enemy aliens could serve in the military. Aside from this it threatened the unity of the country behind the war effort. Canadian society it was thought by some government officials, needed to adapt, and try to accommodate “new Canadians,” however employment regulation was a provincial responsibility. The only tool in this area the federal government had access too was
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propaganda, which could be used to educate Canadians about tolerance, at least for new Canadians of European origin.1557

Sympathizers and friends of immigrants from enemy countries resisted the call for more stringent application of the DOCR by the RCMP, some prominent politicians, and a wide variety of citizens and organizations.1558 Opinion within the government and bureaucracy, as well as the public was varied, divided, and kept changing throughout the war. Little of this internal official discussion was specifically directed at Finns, but rather at the ethnic and immigrant communities generally and the need for “patriotic publicity” directed towards them. It was part of an evolving official attitude towards ethnic communities. Dreisziger proposes that “Viewed from a distance of more than half-a-century, it is not the measures taken after 7 December 1941 against the Japanese that seem to contain the seeds of future Canadian policy towards ethnic minorities, but those that were introduced in connection with the declarations of war against Finland, Hungary and Romania.”1559 Those seeds grew into the Canadian multiculturalism of later decades.1560

The priority of the government was to ensure the minimum disruption of the war effort and the encouragement of voluntary enlistment. In 1940 under the Department of National War Services, the Bureau of Public Information was created, which was renamed the War Information Board (WIB) in 1942. The Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship (CCCC) and the Nationalities Branch (NB) were formed by the end of 1941 with the job of spreading information to ethnic communities about Canada’s war effort. The idea was to integrate the diverse ethnic groups into the fabric of Canadian society, make them feel Canadian, think in terms of Canada, and support the Canadian government. Ethnic communities would be one target audience in the wider Canadian propaganda effort. Information about the war effort would be channeled through the foreign language press, by launching sponsored newspapers in those languages, broadcasts, lectures, films, and pamphlets describing each group and their contributions to Canada.1561

1557 Ibid., 30–32.
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Broadly defined the wartime activities of these organizations were involved with establishing a sense of Canadian nationalism which was a combination of chauvinistic patriotism and a general sense of Canadian nationhood or “Canadianism.” In practical terms this meant presenting an image of wartime events, the enemy, and the Allies, to mobilize support for the government’s policies. When it came to create an image of the enemy the focus was mainly Germany and Japan and to a lesser extent Italy. The minor Axis powers like Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, and Finland were only targeted incidentally. Selling to Canadians that Finland was an enemy country was problematic, considering that the messages Canadians had received where the Finns were the victims of aggression. In almost all cases the propaganda tried to differentiate between the people of the enemy state and the leaders who were responsible for the war.1562

Canadianism was to be achieved by stressing Canada’s separate nationhood and that the country declared war on its own. The image of the Allies was presented with Canada as a partner fighting the common enemy and as an arsenal supplying the other Allies. Canada was needed by the other Allies, particularly Britain. This was balanced against Canada’s close economic and defence relationship with the US by stressing the country was a “bridge” or “linchpin” between the two great democracies. After 1941 selling the Soviet Union as an ally was difficult, considering the propaganda message earlier had been that communists were agents of the Nazis trying to undermine the war effort. The messages presented to Canadians now stressed that the real threat was Nazism, which the Soviets were bravely resisting and that the Allies were building a sense of lasting good will which would contribute to postwar stability.1563

By 1943, though an undertone of chauvinistic patriotism remained, the focus shifted to trying to awaken a feeling of participation within alienated groups, to educate Canadians, and show that individual’s needs were taken into consideration and provoke discussion about the direction of government policy. Canada would be a progressive liberal democracy, with a stable economic system and social programs like employment insurance, old age pensions and family allowances, which would benefit all Canadians. It also required the need to create an image of Canadianism which included the ethnic communities as well as English and French Canadians. In 1945 the NB was renamed the Citizenship Branch and moved to the Department of the Secretary of State, where it would work to integrate ethnic

---
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communities into Canadian society and reassure native born Canadians that “New Canadians” had a valuable contribution to make to Canadian culture. William Young in his study of Canada’s wartime information program argues that the propaganda effort was a success insofar as it dissipated domestic dissatisfaction, convinced Canadians they were on the side of right, that it was a just war, and gained support for the war effort. It failed in the larger aim of creating a nationalistic Canadianism uniting all ethnic groups.

The Canadian government information efforts directed at Finnish-Canadians followed this pattern. During 1939 and 1940 government authorities were confident that most ethnic groups were loyal, based on their high enlistment rates and participation in war related work. The only two they were not so sure about were the Ukrainians and the Finns. Throughout the war the Censorship Directorate, the Customs Department, the postal censors, and the RCMP monitored the foreign language press to detect subversion. The NB monitored the foreign language press to gauge the response of the ethnic communities to the war, domestic issues, and Canadian government policies. To counter any subversive propaganda there were officially sanctioned efforts to demonstrate the loyalty of the ethnic communities, because they were still necessary for nation building and the war effort. Those which specifically included Finnish-Canadians were done before the June 1941 invasion and the declaration of war in December 1941 and therefore contained an anti-communist and anti-Soviet tone. Until 1942 the Finns were targeted as part of the wider message of tolerance and unity directed at the war effort. Thereafter Finns were included in the broad messages including them as Canadians, the move towards integration in the wider community, and prospects for a better country after the war.

Educating Canadians with a view to promote tolerance and unity by informing them about the ethnic communities in their midst, had a precedent with pre-war CBC programming. In 1938 the network simultaneously approached ethnographer John Murray Gibbon and Robert England about making a series of radio programs to “convey a message and an opportunity of mutual understanding to a large audience of listeners.” The idea would be to use folk music and classical compositions from various European ethnic groups to create good will with Anglo-
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Canadians. The thinking was that with war looming in Europe, it was necessary to unite all Canadians. Each show would be introduced by comments about each group. The 13-episode radio program which ran in the later part of 1938 was hosted by England and was called “Ventures in Citizenship.” The prefaces to each ethnic group formed the basis of Gibbon’s book Canadian Mosaic. The concept of Canada being made up of a mosaic of cultures was made popular if not invented by Gibbon.

Gibbon included Finland in the section on the eastern Baltic and relied a lot on Reverend Heinonen as a source of information. Canadians were presented with a survey of Finnish history, including the period of Russian oppression and the civil war. The radical element is downplayed, since it was thought most of those who were “Reds” left for the Soviet Union. No mention is made of the Ugric origins of the Finns, other than to say the migrated from the Ural Mountains, since the author citing Heinonen explains they are “Aryans,” “Caucasians” and “related to the Teutons.” As well they are introduced to the Kalevala and the sauna, which is used to explain the vigour and hardiness of the Finns. Finnish communities across the country are surveyed and here are found hard working Finnish miners, lumber jacks, farmers, domestics, and skilled tradesmen, some of whom played an important part in building the CPR. Finns are educated, literate and most of those over 10 years old have learned English. Comment is made on the number of Finnish-Canadian athletes, especially skiers. Finns were thought to love singing and of course it was noted that Canadians were “thrilled” by Finnish choral groups and the music of Sibelius, with his Valse Triste and Finlandia played over the radio, and a wider selection of his music being performed by symphony orchestras. Finland was a place where women had equal rights and “The Finn is a lover of peace, of liberty and of independence, and if treated with sympathy and consideration makes a first-rate Canadian citizen.”

Prompted by a series of radio broadcasts in the US directed at the foreign language speaking population during the fall of 1940, Canadian officials in the Departments of Justice and External Affairs re-examined their approach to ethnic communities. Skelton on 11 October suggested to E.H. Colman, who was the Under
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Secretary of State and Custodian of Enemy Property, that Canada do something similar. Coleman did not think that was the appropriate vehicle and instead suggested that to counter the Nazi, Fascist, and Communist propaganda ethnic communities had been inundated with, in the many of the now banned newspapers, he thought that “We might accomplish a great deal by publishing papers or pamphlets in Finnish, Ukrainian and other languages.” 1574 The various agencies under the Department of National War Services would indeed do that, but they also pursued the more modern media.

The first effort was a series of radio broadcasts, followed by an information booklet by the Director of Public Information called Canadians All: A Primer of National Unity. 1575 The series of eleven weekly broadcasts ran from February–May 1941. Each was 30 minutes long, with a short introduction outlining how praiseworthy the highlighted nationality was. This was followed by short musical pieces chosen from the nationality and ended with inspirational words from some representative of the group. 1576 As a result, on 2 April 1941 before hearing renditions of Sibelius, Canadians were reminded that the “little Finnish nation” had stood in a “heroic struggle against the Soviet Goliath.” 1577 They were told Finnish was a Turanian language like Magyar and like the Hungarians they were “today predominantly European in stock.” 1578 Like the Scandinavians, Finland was “very democratic and highly civilized,” producing great composers like Sibelius, painters like Eero Järnefelt and Pekka Halonen, renowned sociologists like Dr. E.A. Westermarck, and Olympic champions. 1579 Sure, many of the 50,000 Finns in Canada were communists and “fugitives from a brief red revolution in 1917, engineered by the Russian garrisons in Finland and these have provided a radical element in the mining towns of Northern Ontario,” yet the “great majority of our Finns, however, are loyal Canadians and worthy representatives of their
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fatherland.”  

The spokesman for Finnish-Canadians was William Arthur Erikson, who had moved from Helsinki as a child with his parents. In September 1939, he volunteered for the Royal Canadian Air Force. He praised living under the liberty offered by the “British flag” and that Finns stood “untied with our Anglo-Saxon comrades” and pledged himself and “my Finnish-Canadian brothers that we will all work with you, unafraid, without regard to sacrifice, toward the liberation of the world and ultimate victory.”

No sooner had the booklet Canadians All been released, then it was withdrawn “Following Russia’s reorientation in world affairs.” A new edition was rushed out with some additions about the 1941 Anglo-Soviet Treaty and the need to collaborate with Russia against Hitler, slight modifications to the Norwegian, Czech, and Slovak sections and added in a section on the Indigenous Peoples the “Indian” and “Eskimo.” The Finnish section, however, was not one of those modified. The pamphlet and radio programming was as much about convincing members of ethnic communities, like the Finns, they had something to contribute, as it was to promote appreciation of the new Canadians.

One of the first films by the newly created National Film Board (NFB), as part of the series Canada Carries On, called Peoples of Canada, was released later in 1941. Finns are only mentioned once as one of the many builders of Canada. The message is one of tolerance, liberalism, and a common citizenship. The film coincided with the publication of the Macmillan War Pamphlets Canadian Series, which included one by Gibbon called The New Canadian Loyalists. The title drew on one of Canada’s founding myths about the refugees from the American Revolution known as the United Empire Loyalists, who helped found the country. For the Finns it started off capitalizing on the sympathy for “little Finland” created by the Winter War. It praised the “sterling qualities” of the roughly 40,000 Canadian Finns. The Nazi attack on the USSR it went on “has complicated the situation,
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and in spite of their declared desire for peace, the Finns in Europe are sucked into the maelstrom.” 1588 Finns value co-operative democracy as shown by their formation of co-operatives it added and they also were excellent farmers, miners, construction workers, and above all “a godsend to the timber lands of Ontario.”1589

One example that at least part of mainstream Canada was open to accommodating new Canadians was the Winnipeg Free Press, which had since 1929, run an article offering in multiple languages “a Happy New Year.” In January 1942, the paper bragged it could now do so in 73 tongues. It explained, “Although the British Empire is now at war with Italy, Germany and Japan and technically with certain other nations in the Axis group, the greetings in these languages are given as before to the many loyal Canadians who, although descended from these nations are giving support to Canada and the Empire in the present struggle.”1590 They were listed in no particular order, but nationalistic Finns could perhaps note that “Onnellista Uutta Vuotta!” appeared higher on the list than the Swedish greeting. The newspaper of course was known to be a supporter of the Liberal Party and in this gesture of goodwill was also supporting government policy.

These early propaganda efforts described ethnic groups in a format used by others in Canada during the first part of the twentieth century. It demonstrated the dominant Anglo-Canadian culture still regarded racial character and culture as synonymous. It was a perspective which saw Canada as a British nation by political institutions, tradition, by its way of life, its attitudes, and by a British instinct for democracy. Foreign-born meant not born in Great Britain or other part of the Empire and alien was used to signify some legal allegiance to a foreign entity. Foreignness was evaluated on the perception of a group’s cultural aptitude or individual willingness to join the broad national community by assimilating linguistically and ideologically and the ability to contribute to the nation building project. It did not matter that they had gone through the naturalization process and legally became Canadian. Efforts to remove the stigma by using labels like “new Canadians” “today’s Canadians” or just immigrants still implied a degree of foreignness and points to the hybrid, marginal, and temporary condition. Hence, increasingly there was the use of hyphenated labels like Finnish-Canadian. As Zoë Druick argues this discourse emphasizes “the cultural and racial difference of the ethnic community in question for purposes of appreciation by a non-ethnic
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Canadian ‘outsider.’ Yet in so doing they categorize and reify difference as that which is essentially marginal to an imaginary Canadian middle.1591

The conclusion was that it was possible to create unity if not uniformity. This was done by treating each group separately, through sympathetic celebration of their contributions as opposed to the melting pot concept where all newcomers would be homogenised. Canadianization would occur slowly over time. Blending into Canadian society would occur gradually as each adapted the way they dressed, ate, entertained themselves, learned one of the official languages, began to participate in the neighbouring community, and become active citizens. These propaganda efforts are early examples of the unity in diversity concept that evolved into the concept of multiculturalism.

Canadianization it was thought could be helped along by education, guidance, and reinforcement, but Tracy Philipps at the NB considered groups like the Ukrainians, Romanians, Hungarians, and Finns to need more than most since many still lived, spoke, and thought in terms of the old country and its conflicts.1592 In January 1942 it was proposed that the WIB work with mainstream media to reach ethnic groups, by transmitting from stations in major Canadian cities, a 30 minute radio program, once a week in Hungarian, Italian, Ukrainian, and Finnish. They would contain segments of Canadian news, interpretations of news from the old country, descriptions of Canadian institutions, rights, and duties, offer helpful advice on business practices, vignettes of Canadian history and the homeland, music, and cultural information. The CBC, NFB, CCCC, and RCMP all endorsed the idea, but External Affairs vetoed it.1593 The new government policy wanted to avoid group particularism. Now each group would be approached from perspective of being Canadian nationals not of an ethnic group.

The full range of the work done by the WIB, the CCCC, and NB is beyond the scope of this thesis. Dreisziger notes that at times individuals within these underfunded and understaffed organizations were at odds and “their recommendations were implemented only after constant delays and in a haphazard manner, and resulted often in half-measures and ineffective arrangements.”1594 He goes on to add, “it must be kept in mind that more was done to involve ethnics in Canadian life in 1940 and 1941 than had been done in nearly three-quarters of a
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century since Confederation.”¹⁵⁹⁵ William Young found the focus on Canadianism was offset by the anti-communist “red-baiting” common to individuals such as Watson Krikconnell and Tracy Philipps, as well as the RCMP, which did not differentiate between legitimate social and political criticism and subversion. This proved more divisive especially once the Soviet Union became an ally.¹⁵⁹⁶ For example it was thought the various information programs did not help the Victory Loan campaign, which reported in 1942 that the ethnic group contributions were lower than anticipated.¹⁵⁹⁷ As well the propaganda efforts by the end of the war did not penetrate the latent xenophobia of English and French Canadians. During the war, the WIB public opinion surveys still found these Canadians disliked foreigners and did not believe they could become good Canadians and in 1945 found 30% of Canadians favored a closed-door immigration policy. Young concluded that “The age of the cultural mosaic and multiculturalism lay far in the future.”¹⁵⁹⁸

Notwithstanding W.R. Young’s assessment of the ineffectiveness of the propaganda effort directed at ethnic communities, Sillanpää argues that in most cases the response of the Finnish community to appeals for support of the war effort was positive. Finnish-Canadians actively participated as much “as any other ethnic group in Canada’s victory.”¹⁵⁹⁹ Those Finnish-Canadians who had fought in Spain or had communist affiliations with only a few exceptions were permitted to serve in the military. Some like Jules Päiviö were held back in Canada or monitored by security officers, but these were the exception and not typical of the overall Finnish-Canadian war effort.¹⁶⁰⁰ In terms of military service Sillanpää calculates there were between 4,500 and 5,500 Finnish-Canadians, whether Finnish or Canadian born who were eligible. Of those an estimated 2,000 did serve, which meant between 50 to 60% of the Finnish community had a direct interest in the success of the Canadian war effort.¹⁶⁰¹ Similarly, many thousands of other Finnish-Canadians,

¹⁵⁹⁵ Ibid.
¹⁵⁹⁷ David B. Mansur to A.D. Dunton, 23 December 1942, LAC, RG36-31, Vol. 13, File 8-9-1 in Young 1988, 41–42. One of few studies to cover the Victory Loan Campaign in any detail focused on the city of Winnipeg is Perrun 2014, 82–129.
¹⁶⁰⁰ Saarinen 1999, 163–164; Lindström 2000a, 177–181. The policy of restrictions on armed forces members who were communists was applied unevenly. On the monitoring of communists in the military see Frazer 1996.
¹⁶⁰¹ Sillanpää 2004, 4–5. Lindström estimates there were 5,000 of enlistment age and 1,500 did serve. Lindström 2000a, 177. There has been no detailed examination of ethnic or religious group enlistment in the Canadian military during the Second World War. See Granatstein 2013.
like the rest of the Canadian population found employment in essential war related work such as lumbering, nickel mining, farming, and manufacturing.

The invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941 modified the situation for the radical Finns. The whole nature of the war effort was changed in the process. The defence of the Soviet Union, now a Canadian ally, was equivalent to the defence of Canada. The image of Stalin and the USSR had to be rehabilitated and there was a need to provide support for Russia. Increasingly in the press the Bolsheviks were now portrayed as “republicans” who had opposed Tsarist oppression and were now fighting for democracy and freedom against fascism. The imperialist war became a “just war” and a “people’s war.” A fiction had to be created. The government continued to ban the CPC while at the same time trying not to antagonize an indispensable military ally. There was a problem with this because the majority of CPC members were from the very ethnic nationalities, like the Ukrainians and Finns who had been the target of war information propaganda. As a compromise, the CPC successor the Labour-Progressive Party, formed in August 1943, would be permitted to remain legal as long as it did not advocate political violence to change the social order. Communists who had been interned were released quietly in one’s and two’s so that by the end of 1942 there were none left in internment camps. However, the CPC remained a proscribed organization until the end of the war and Canada as it would turn out was the only western country to do so.

FOC and CPC supporters now sided with their former opponents in the support of Canada’s war against fascism. Since the FOC was still outlawed its members kept active through various Finnish-Canadian athletic organizations and the Canadian Finnish Democratic League formed in December 1941. The FOC and communists encouraged Finnish-Canadians to enlist in the armed forces, opposed labour strikes for the duration of the war, and encouraged an all-out war effort. During the conscription plebiscite in April 1942 they supported the pro-conscription stance of the government and again in 1944 when a crisis over the need to send conscripts overseas arose, the communists supported the policy. In Timmins, Ontario for example, socialist Finns created their own patriotic organizations like the “Finnish V Club” where the “V” stood for victory or raised funds for the Canadian Aid to Russia Fund. By 1943 key political leaders like Prime Minister King and Ontario Premier Mitchell Hepburn were seen at pro-
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Soviet rallies and fundraising activities. The public and politicians greeted Soviet diplomats and military representatives with increasing enthusiasm as the war continued.\footnote{1606 Caccia 2010, 164–165.}

Conservative Finns, particularly the Loyal Finns in Canada, had to adjust to the new circumstances. Their reaction was to openly and actively declare their loyalty to Canada. The organization had been formed to fight the spread of communism and promote loyalty to Canada. It was seen by some to be too conservative and slow in promoting the use of English and assimilation. Also, the Loyal Finns had over the years been active in promoting contacts with Finland. During the Winter War this was not a problem, but as Finland drew closer to Germany this prompted some Sudbury area Finns to create the pro-Canadian Voima organization in late 1940.\footnote{1607 Allen 1954, 92–96, 104; Pikkusaari 1947, 146.} Like all parts of the Finnish-Canadian community they had reasons to support the cause, since many had family members serving in the Canadian military. Many also realised that Canada meant more to them than just a place to earn money, it was their home. Now it was a duty to help Canada. It hastened the process of Canadianization. Encouraged by the younger generations, more conservative Finns began seeking interaction and integration with Canadian society and became less clannish. They participated in marches, rallies, tag days, fund raising, and bought war bonds in the Victory Loan campaigns.\footnote{1608 Lindström 2000a, 172–173. On government regulation of war charities see Oppenheimer 2004.}

Some Finland Aid groups continued to operate. They could no longer openly raise funds for Finland, so many redirected their efforts instead towards Canadian causes and the Red Cross. Privately funds and packages were set aside for the time when it would once again be legal to send them to Finland.\footnote{1609 Garth and Brooks 2010, 71–76.} Still, despite the expressions of loyalty, there were some conservative Finns who laughed off the state of war between Finland and Canada, asserting that Russia was the only enemy Finland ever had. There was still a strong attachment and patriotism directed towards Finland. Before the war, the RCMP had surveyed the Finnish community looking for any hint of Nazi or fascist sympathies, but found little in the way of black shirted, goose stepping Finns. Particularly in 1941 and 1942 there were some problems within the conservative Finnish community which drew the attention of the RCMP and the press. Out of force of habit or a failure to understand the implications of their actions, some Loyal Finn chapters kept the photo of Mannerheim hanging in their hall, sang the Finnish national anthem at meetings or...
addressed former Finnish consuls as if they still held their posts. There practices were stopped once officials learned of them. Nonetheless, the RCMP found the left-wing Finns to be the most active in support of the war effort and saw the potential for subversion among conservative Finns. With some irony then Lindström notes that the FOC had to fight to remove the legal ban on their organization, since none of the conservative organizations were prohibited.1610

Reluctant to classify Finnish-Canadians as enemy aliens, the Canadian government now found it was equally hard to think of Finnish communists as friends. From the declaration of war onwards the FOC began a campaign to have the ban lifted and its property restored. It was a clear case of injustice they argued since the ex-members of the FOC fully supported the Allied cause and sent considerable amounts of money to aid the Soviet Union. The Committee for the Legal Rights of the Finnish Organization of Canada was formed to lobby the government and Vapaus became a venue to voice these objections. In June 1942, the paper published a pamphlet by William Eklund and Pekka Mertanen called The Illegal Finnish Organization of Canada, Inc. It was directed at the Minister of Justice Louis St. Laurent and copies were also sent to all Members of Parliament. It argued when the halls of the FOC were confiscated it hindered the work of democratic Finnish-Canadians in support of the war effort and these should be returned. The ban placed on the FOC was based on misleading information from the organizations opponents among the “fascist” Mannerheim supporters. The FOC they thought was essential for combating the work of these agents. It was an independent organization and not a branch of some other body or affiliated with any political party. The aims of the FOC were to assimilate the Finnish speaking people into Canadian society, to teach them English, the history, laws customs, traditions, and current events of Canada to further their intellectual development, as well as to encourage and advance the standard of living of the Finnish community. These efforts had been hampered by the opponents of the organization who prejudiced authorities into thinking that the FOC members are Reds, communists, and Bolsheviks.1611

Mertanen and Eklund stressed that the FOC was an anti-fascist organization, which supported progressive social movements. Some of its members had served in the Canadian military during the First World War, fought fascism in Spain, and enlisted in the current war. Many of its members had opposed the oppression of the
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Tsars. It had always opposed the fascist “rebels” during the civil war, as they described the White Finns. The current regime came to power when the rebels turned to the Germans for help in 1918. Democracy is an illusion in Finland and the ruling clique in power sympathizes with Hitler and Mussolini. Finland’s current rulers, who led the country into the war at the side of Germany, had provoked the Winter War. In Canada, their Finnish-Canadian supporters, the same ones who had spread the “spook tales” about life in the Soviet Union and opposed the FOC, presented the Whites as heroes, patriots, and defenders of democracy. Now that the Finnish rulers have joined with Hitler, enthusiasm for these so-called heroes fell off. It was of course an interpretation of history from the FOC leftist perspective, but it also aligned the organizations supporters with the prevailing image that was evolving among Canadian authorities of Finland as an enemy.

St. Laurent moved slowly, concerned that showing leniency to the FOC or any other communist organization could lead to problems particularly in anti-communist Quebec. Opinion polls seemed to show 62% of Canadians supported the ban on the CPC, so why would it be any different with the FOC. Those sympathetic towards the communists lobbied to have the ban removed, considering that the Soviet Union was now an ally. Agnes McPhail from the Civil Liberties Association of Toronto, though she opposed communism, thought that the ban actually helped the party attract sympathy and supporters. In particular the men, who had voluntarily surrendered and were interned, should be released. She convinced the prime minister to raise the matter before cabinet. There it faced strong opposition from several ministers who argued foreign elements like the Finns and Ukrainians would resent it, and so would some labour organizations and the Roman Catholic Church. Though the ban had been lifted in Britain, St. Laurent felt that the situation in Canada was different and there would be more public opposition than support for lifting the ban. Regarding those who had been interned, only those who agreed to work in support of Canada’s war effort should be released.

The RCMP also supported the ban, advised the Justice Minister against lifting it in September 1942 and thought it naive that the FOC would think the claims that
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there was no connection to the CPC would be believed. The FOC had been one of the groups supporting the CPC when it was founded. The pamphlet was full of fictions and with years of intelligence reports to back them up, the RCMP said the claims made by Ecklund and Mertanen were not the actual practices of the organization.\textsuperscript{1615} FOC halls and educational programs were simply a cover for the propagation of socialist ideology and the RCMP intelligence gathering activities determined there were links with the CPC.\textsuperscript{1616} Despite a recommendation from the Parliamentary Committee on the Defence of Canada Regulations to lift the ban and restore property to the FOC nothing was done. The Committee for the Legal Rights of the Finnish Organization of Canada wrote directly to the Vincent Dupuis, the chair of that committee on 23 June 1943 asking that the Justice Minister disregard the criticism by the organizations opponents who had supported Canada’s enemy and still raised funds in secret. The FOC was a supporter of progressive ideas and the war effort.\textsuperscript{1617} Not until October 1943 was the ban finally lifted on the FOC, the Finnish Society in Vancouver, and the one in Toronto, and their property was to be returned.\textsuperscript{1618}

Finnish-Canadians despite some negative images played a role in Canada’s war effort. The title of Lindström’s book, From Heroes to Enemies, implies that the reputation of Finns and therefore the image in Canada was dependent on events in Europe, particularly Finland. To a certain extent this was true. The positive image of Finns owed much to the nations struggle during the Winter War. The negative image associated with Finns because of left-wing politics and labour activism had a lot to do with Finnish-Canadian involvement in the CPC and the polices of the Soviet Union. By 1941 conservative Finns contributed to the negative image because of the enemy status of Finland. However, Sillanpää contends this is perhaps too simplistic. The recognition of the loyalty of Finnish-Canadians by the Canadian government and officials like Norman Robertson was motivated by the needs of the country during wartime, but it also was the result of Finns not allowing themselves to be the passive victims of events in Finland.\textsuperscript{1619}
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years and in the early part of the Second World War the Finnish-Canadian community, adapted to changing circumstances and on both the left and right worked to try to create a positive image.

9.4 Interned Finnish Seamen

The start of the Continuation War in June 1941 and the break in diplomatic relations with Finland by Canada in August created a difficult situation regarding Finnish merchant seamen. The situation between June and December 1941 had raised the question of what to do with merchant seamen from enemy countries like Finland. These sailors were employed on several vessels registered under various flags which operated between Canada and ports in neutral and Allied countries. There were also those sailors on board ships with a Finnish registry. When these ships arrived in a Canadian port the Finnish sailors would automatically become enemy aliens and therefore a security problem.

Given the shortage of trained crews the potential loss of Finnish sailors would negatively impact the war effort. The problem first surfaced when the *Éricus* and *Carolus* were seized. Among the crew of these ships were men of various nationalities, including Finns, who also held the key leadership positions of captain, mates, and engineers. Sailors from countries occupied by Germany or the Soviet Union had been permitted to sail on Canadian controlled ships and even captain them. The question raised by the Department of Transport at the end of October 1941 was could Finns be added to the list of those that could be trusted? 1620 Norman Robertson responded at the end of November, while his department was in the midst of deliberating over the possibility of war with Finland. He tried to clarify the situation regarding Finland which was “not without a certain obscurity.” 1621 Finland was an ally of Germany fighting against the Soviet Union. It was expected that the UK would declare war soon and that Canada would do the same. Even if Canada did not declare war, he thought “I should expect that sufficient ill-feeling would be engendered to make it undesirable for Finns generally to be placed in positions of trust and responsibility as captains or engineers of Canadian boats.” 1622 To employ Finns in this way would be “unwise,” however, it “would depend on the
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temperament and background of the individual concerned.” 1623 This was because, “The present struggle has some of the characteristics of a vast Civil War in which the loyalties of the individual are very often not altogether on the side of his own Government and considerable latitude thus exists for adjustment to opportunity or circumstance.” 1624 The best option would be to wait until the general situation was clarified and the relationship with Finland and Finnish nationals in Canada was determined.

Through the latter part of 1941 Finnish seamen onboard ships which called at a Canadian port were detained by Canadian authorities. 1625 Each Finnish sailor was interrogated by an RCMP officer to determine the degree of risk each individual posed. For Finnish sailors, these questions were designed to differentiate “good” Finns from “bad” by assessing the person’s sympathies for the regime in Finland and its war aims. Those who were ambivalent or expressed opposition to the Ryti government were considered safe and permitted with some restrictions to work on ships sailing to ports within the Americas. Those who were actively sympathetic towards the Finnish government or who had reservations about working for the Allies, because the risk it posed to their families back home, were detained. At this time Canadian regulations prohibited alien seamen, even those from Allied countries from staying in Canada. Alien seamen were required to leave Canada onboard the ship they arrived on. Those who left a ship were treated under immigration regulations and since immigration to Canada was restricted, they were detained at an immigration facility until a suitable billet could be found on another ship or they were deported. In this respect the Finnish sailors were being treated the same.

The declaration of war caused the whole issue to be raised in detail again. An element of confusion was caused by a disconnection between British and Canadian policy and the inconstancy with which Canadian policy worked in practice. A delay between the public expression of Canadian policy by the prime minister in his speech and the promulgation of the Order in Council authorizing exemptions caused officials to work in a vacuum. British policy was clearly explained to Canadian officials. Finnish civilians in Britain would not be interned, but Finnish seamen were automatically interned when they arrived at a port, in the UK or in the colonies. Those civilians and seamen not interned would be subject to the
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restrictions imposed on enemy aliens. The problem for Canada was that Finnish sailors who had been vetted simply as aliens were now enemy aliens. Canadian policy was to treat Finnish nationals living in Canada differently from other enemy aliens, but the arrival of a Finnish seaman in Canada made them an immigration, as well as a security matter. The decision surrounding the exemption of Finnish nationals did not make clear what to do with the seamen. The Immigration Branch needed to know if these men should be detained and turned over to the RCMP for internment as regulations indicated or if some other intermediary step was needed. The number of sailors detained before the declaration of war and after is not clearly known. Depending on which report is examined it varied from 100–200 men, but as Lindström has noted the varied sources needed to make a nominal list, makes “the list incomplete and uneven.”

The crew of the Carolus who were mostly Finnish had been examined by Canadian naval intelligence and the RCMP shortly after the ship was seized in August. All were found willing to continue to serve on the Carolus while she was in Canadian service. The Finnish crew were found to be “pro-Finnish,” “anti-Russia,” “pro-British,” and “anti-German.” Their position was explained in this way, “Cooperation with Germany [was] favored only as [it] regard[s] Russian operations and if Russia would declare in favor of [the] return of Finnish territory they had seized [the] Finns would swing to quite definite anti-Axis. In no case will they do anything to hamper [the] pro-British cause excepting only [the] present Russian operations.” After further interrogations, only one was deemed a threat, because he was a trouble maker, too ardent a Finnish nationalist, and supporter of the present government. It was recommended that the services of the others be retained, and the ship only sail on the trans-Atlantic and western hemisphere routes, to avoid the risk of the ship falling into German hands. The seven Finnish crew onboard the Ericus on the other hand were removed until their attitude could be clarified, and they were replaced by Canadians. By early November all of them had been cleared for service.

In practice this policy continued after December 1941. In other cases, because British policy differed, Finnish sailors were removed from ships headed for the UK.
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to avoid the risk of internment. By now the shortage of sailors to assist Canadian trade was endemic. There were so few crews that three badly needed Canadian ships sat idle. L.D. Wilgress, who at one time had been the trade commissioner responsible for Finland, was now as the Chairman of the Canadian Shipping Board prepared to recommend that Finns be employed once they had been screened, but to avoid internment in Britain, they would only be employed only in the “Western hemisphere trade.” This was made Canadian policy by the war cabinet on 7 January 1942.

The detention and reassignment of Finnish sailors would set a double standard, since requests by seamen from friendly or Allied countries for transfer to another ship had been routinely denied. To have allowed otherwise risked “denuding the Trans-Atlantic service of much needed seamen” according to Immigration Commissioner A.L. Jolliffe. There was some confusion implementing this, since in some cases the RCMP thought the men removed were to be sent for internment. This was what the regulations required but given the policy of the government towards Finns in Canada it was not clear what should be done. As a result, the Canadian policy was being inconsistently applied. The British at the end of December agreed to this Canadian proposal to use them on the “western hemisphere coastal trade,” but wanted the number Finnish crew members on any ship minimized and they were not to be employed as deck officers or wireless operators, because these positions allowed enemy aliens access to convoy instructions and codes. However, Finns arriving in a British port were still subject to internment. The British high commissioner pointed out the double standard of offering Finns ship reassignment, and the UK was not willing to consider covering the costs associated with detention, adding it meant “at the worst that they will become idle and a charge on Canada, with internment possibly as the only ultimate solution.”

1632 Cabinet War Committee to P.J.A. Cardin, Minister of Transport, 12 January 1942, LAC, RG12, Vol. 1099, File 11-40-11; Cabinet War Committee, 7 January 1942, LAC, RG2 7C, Vol. 8, Reel C4874.
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To further illustrate the poor communications within the Canadian government and between Canada and Britain, towards the end of January 1942, two Finnish crew members which sailed from Halifax for Bermuda were interned by British authorities. The Finns had done so in good faith trusting that it was legal for them to do so. Still F.C. Blair, the Director of the Immigration Branch had warned External Affairs they should not be put on a ship bound for a British port, even in the western hemisphere. Voyages to Newfoundland were not a problem, because officials there were following the Canadian example, but British colonies in the Caribbean were not. Before they could be employed in this way it was necessary to have the British reconsider their internment policy. Norman Robertson lashed out at the British high commissioner, saying that “Some, at least, of the difficulty seems to have arisen from the fact that, while it was clearly a question for consultation no attempt was made to deal with it on that basis through the regularly established machinery of communication and consultation.” He had also recently learned that the UK Ministry of War Transport had directed its staff to remove Finns from ships sailing for Britain from Canada. This should not have been news to him since External Affairs had known for some time this was the policy. Robertson surmised that perhaps the British thought this expeditious and a demonstration of good faith to the Finnish sailors, but he felt it “has delayed rather than advanced the constructive consideration of this problem.” The problem was it made them a Canadian responsibility to detain, accommodate and feed. The solution had been to reassign them to other ships on the western hemisphere trade. Yet he was surprised the British interned the two Finns, who were determined to be no security risk, but the point Robertson failed to grasp was Canada should never have allowed them to sail for a British port. He admitted there was a remote danger from all such enemy alien seamen. Having said that he went on to say that all who sign with us “will be regarded by their own Government as traitors and subject to the sanction reserved for such persons, there seems slight probability that any of them would be tempted to return home.” Asking Finnish sailors to serve on Allied merchant vessels was a moral dilemma. These sailors were still Finnish citizens and by offering their services they were in fact defectors. Only an Allied victory could prevent them from receiving some legal sanction, punishment or
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worse when and if they returned to Finland. Pleading ignorance, he added, “It is, however, a matter on which your Government would have much more complete information than is available here.”1642 If the British continued their existing policy the Canadian initiative would have to be abandoned.

The response from the high commission was regret at the impression that had been created. It was however, still the British view that internment was the best policy. The fact the Finns removed would become a Canadian charge was seen as trivial. The root of the miscommunication was evident in the rest of the reply which explained the confusion. Even though in a message sent to Canada in mid-December 1940 British authorities agreed with the Canadian move to use the Finns on western hemisphere trade routes, the impression the British seemed to have was they would only be used on “coastal trade” between Canada, the US, and Newfoundland and they were not aware this extend as far south as Bermuda.1643 The confusion stemmed from the term “coastal trade,” by which meant shipping routes along Canadian coasts only, which by law was restricted to Canadian seamen. This was very different from the idea of western hemisphere trade. There was MacDonald thought not likely to be a change of British policy.

He was wrong because within days’ Canadian naval authorities were advised from London that Finnish sailors could be employed on Canadian registered and Canadian controlled ships on Canadian and western hemisphere routes. Each seaman would be employed based on their individual merit and reliability, but notification would still be needed when the “circumstances justify special consideration.”1644 By which it was implied that if a Finn or other enemy alien was employed on a vessel travelling to a particular port or carrying a particular cargo which had higher security concerns surrounding them, the relevant British authorities had to be notified.1645

The question still remained about what to do with those Finns removed and detained for whatever reason. Norman Robertson spelled out what Canada would do. The policy would continue whereby immigration officials detained and then interned those who were declared fascists and a security risk.1646 Those who were not a risk but were not willing to serve on a Canadian controlled ship posed another

1642 Ibid.
1643 HCUK to Robertson, 12 February 1942, LAC, Ibid.
1644 Admiralty to NSHQ, 2036Z/13 [nd February 1942], LAC, Ibid.
1646 At various times Canadian officials described those who were a security risk as “Fascists,” “pro-Nazi,” or “pro-German”. The Finns not considered a risk were often described as “anti-Nazi.”
problem. These men had to be detained, for the duration of the war, but immigration stations did not have accommodations designed for long term residence. These men had to be treated as enemy aliens and interned. A number of already operating internment camps holding civilian enemy aliens were therefore designated as immigration stations.\footnote{Specifically, the ones at Petawawa and Fredericton. Director of Internment Operations to DEA, 28 April 1942, LAC, RG25 A3b, Vol. 2797, File 773-40. See Zimmerman 2015.} Care had to be taken so that this did not appear to be punishment for refusing to serve. Men willing to serve, but who did not yet have a billet on a ship were a separate issue. A willingness to serve along with the RCMP concurrence Robertson thought, should be proof enough of their reliability.\footnote{Robertson to Blair, Director of Immigration, 11 February 1942; “Disposition of Finnish Seamen Under Detention at Halifax” by Robertson, 11 February 1942, LAC, Ibid.} In some cases, they had been detained until a ship vacancy occurred. In other cases, officials permitted them to be “discharged” or “paroled” to find work ashore, which meant they needed to apply for exemption certificates.

None of this seemed to allay Canadian concerns. The \textit{Carolus} was due to sail for Caribbean ports on 6 March and assurances were needed the crew would not be interned.\footnote{Director of Shipping, The Canadian Shipping Board to J. Scott MacDonald, DEA, 27 February 1942, LAC, Ibid.} A restriction had been placed by the British on ships hauling bauxite and on any ship calling at British Guiana or the US Virgin Islands.\footnote{Patrick Duff, Deputy HCCUK to Robertson, 6 March 1942, LAC, Ibid.} That of course was exactly what the \textit{Carolus} planned to do and Canadian authorities requested an exemption.\footnote{Robertson to Duff, 9 March 1942, LAC, Ibid.} Unlike the \textit{Ericus}, where the entire complement of Finns was removed, the \textit{Carolus} was an exception and 19 of her 22 crew members were Finnish. An exception was also made by employing Finnish deck officers. The reports about the crew were all positive. The Canadian Merchant Marine said "We have found these Finnish men to be especially good seamen, they take a keen interest in their vessels and we have really no fault of any kind to find with them."\footnote{General Manger Canadian National Steamships to Brand, 18 March 1942, LAC, Ibid.} Canadian Naval Intelligence added, the Finnish crew were “good seamen” as they “amply proved themselves to be during the voyage of ‘Carolus’ to Labrador and Iceland.”\footnote{Brand to R.B. Teakle, General Manger Canadian National Steamships, 21 March 1942, LAC, Ibid.} By now the reality of the situation had occurred to British authorities, who in effect followed the Canadian lead and by mid-March 1942 was screening and permitting Finnish seamen to work on the UK coastal trade. Those not employed in this way would continue to be interned.\footnote{Admiralty to N.S.H.Q, Ottawa, Naval Message, My2036/13/2, 23 March 1942, LAC, Ibid.} So in the end
British authorities reluctantly agreed to allow Carolus to sail but requested notice of its departure so it could “receive special attention in British Guiana.”[1655] They would still have preferred a smaller proportion of Finnish crew however.

British policy continued to evolve, and by June they were prepared to use Finnish sailors on all trade routes and convoys. In an effort to have a uniform Commonwealth policy the “new” procedures were outlined. Those considered reliable were exempt from internment and those cleared by a security officer could serve as crew. Numbers of Finnish crew employed should be a small proportion on each ship and they should not be deck officers or wireless operators. This was because they had access to confidential papers and codes. As far as practical, Finns should not be on ships sent to the Soviet Union.[1656] Canada found no objection to such a uniform Commonwealth policy, since it was in essence what they had wanted all along and had partly implemented. The exception was the Carolus. Britain had recommended that Finnish deck officers and wireless operators might be able to find work on US controlled ships, since that country did not have the same restriction.[1657]

This put into doubt how much of a security risk these men actually posed, since the US did not see an issue with their access to documents and codes and Canada still wanted to employ them on Carolus. The three deck officers involved had proven reliable and the ship would be restricted to the western hemisphere trade.[1658] To the Canadian Ministry of Transport the restrictions seemed more applicable to the British side of the Atlantic and the unique security concerns there posed by Finns, “on account of the position of Finland in relation to the German Reich.”[1659]

Despite Robertson’s earlier annoyance over the apparent poor communications with Britain on this matter, Canadian approval of the uniform policy had not been conveyed until December 1942 and the British assumed Canada had agreed.[1660] At which point it was perhaps with some annoyance that in January 1943 it was learned Canada had refused a request to transfer five Finnish sailors from Newfoundland to the British Ministry of War Transport manning pool at Halifax.

[1655] Duff to Robertson, 26 March 1942, LAC, Ibid.
[1656] SSDA to SSEA, No. D294, 12 June 1942; SSDA to SSEA, No. D275, 3 June 1942, LAC, Ibid.
[1657] SSDA to SSEA, No. 135, 12 June 1942, LAC, Ibid.
[1658] SSEA to SSDA, 24 June 1942, LAC, Ibid.
[1659] Edwards to USSEA, No. 11-40-11, 17 June 1942, LAC, Ibid.
[1660] The matter never seemed to go away. Later one of these men was employed as a deck officer on the Ericus, after surviving the sinking of the Carolus. It raised security alarms when the ship called at Jamaica and caused the British to make inquiries yet again. SSDA to SSEA, No. 210, 12 October 1942; Duff to Robertson, 28 December 1942; Duff to USSEA, Robertson, 8 March 1943, LAC, Ibid.
Robertson’s excuse was that Canada already had enough Finnish seamen and it would be difficult to find them work.\textsuperscript{1661} This was odd since the whole issue of employing enemy alien crewmen existed because of a shortage. It was the rationale behind allowing those wished to go to sea but had to wait for a ship with a vacancy, to land and find temporary work on shore.\textsuperscript{1662} Canadian officials were not above being petty.

The Swedish consul general, representing Finnish interests in Canada also acted as the “protecting power” for interned Finnish nationals under the Geneva Convention. Either the Consul General Per Wijkman or a representative would make periodic visits to check on the conditions in the camps which held interned sailors. In general, they were treated well, were satisfied with the food, and there were few complaints. The Swedish representative on his visit to Camp 70 near Fredericton, where some of the Finns were held, found two problems.\textsuperscript{1663} One was that mail sent by the prisoners to their home in Finland was returned by the British Royal Mail as undeliverable. Canadian mail sent to Europe went to London for distribution, but both Canada and Britain had terminated mail service to Finland shortly after the declaration of war. Unlike other prisoners of war and internees the Finns had been denied by camp officials the same the right to have their letters forwarded by the Red Cross. This was because they were technically immigration detainees. The second issue was that other prisoners received an allowance from their governments through the Swedish consulate, but not the Finns.\textsuperscript{1664} On learning this, the DEA had no objection of the Finns receiving a similar allowance, not to exceed $6 a month.\textsuperscript{1665} The issue of mail required further investigation. It turned out that Canadian censors had not held up any mail for the internees. It could be speculated that the internee had not received any mail because none had been sent to him from Finland.

At the end of December 1943, the Finnish seamen serving in the Canadian Merchant Marine asked the Swedish legation in Ottawa to intercede on their behalf to provide financial assistance to their families back home. Without the income of these sailors their families were undergoing hardship. The matter was directed to Alfred Rive the head of the Special Section of the Department of External Affairs responsible for all matters relating to internees and prisoners of war. While
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\textsuperscript{1662} Robertson to Varcoe, 9 January 1943; Varcoe to USSEA, 12 January 1943, LAC, Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1663} On life in the camp see Jones 1989.
\textsuperscript{1664} Minister of Sweden to USSEA, 30 August 1942, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 3041, File 4203-40.
\textsuperscript{1665} USSEA to CGS, No. F19, 6 October 1942, LAC, RG25 A3b, Vol. 2778, File 621-EH-40.
preparing a briefing memorandum on the issue Rive indicated that Canadian nationals in enemy territory received aid from the Canadian government. All the Finnish seamen were asking was to be allowed to send small remittances. These would not be money sent to Finland but would be money sent to the Swedish foreign office, which would transfer it to the Finnish legation in Stockholm. Rive pointed out, “they were serving Canada just as much as if they were in the Armed Forces and that in addition to the moral claim which they might have on us, there was also the possibility that that the feeling we were preventing them from helping their families, might discourage them and make them less useful to us.” 1666 Wijkman later tried to make the request less daunting by pointing out it was only a few of the sailors which made this request and they were only looking to make occasional payments. After consulting with other members of the department Rive learned that other Allied seamen from occupied territory, such as Norway, did not have this privilege. He advised Wijkman his request could not be granted. The response to the requests of the interned Finnish seamen it was thought could be reconsidered when the “unhappy state of war with Finland” was over.1667

Conclusion

The treatment of Finnish-Canadians as an exception to the rules for enemy aliens and the employment of Finnish sailors on Canadian and Allied merchant vessels in a sense demonstrated some of the various aspects of the image of Finland current among Canadian officials. These sailors as Finns were legally enemy aliens and a potential threat, if only a very minor and remote one. The decision to employ them as sailors was done as has been shown for the very practical reasons. Finns also had some reputation as excellent sailors and by interrogating those taken into custody to determine where each individual stood regarding Finland’s war policy, served to differentiate the good Finns from the bad. The restriction placed on their employment also reflects the two sides of the Canadian image of Finland. It was possible for Canada to permit the employment of Finnish sailors, who were citizens of an enemy country, because in the minds of Canadian officials there was a differentiation between the regime in power and the people. It was thought that the leaders of Finland criminally lead their country into the war at the side of Germany

1667 Rive to Wijkman, 29 February 1944, LAC, Ibid.
and that the democratically minded and peace-loving Finnish people did not support the governments war policy. A similar situation applied to Finnish-Canadians and enemy alien status. Finnish-Canadians were easily seen as loyal citizens, contributing to Canada’s war effort because of the heritage of positive images that existed of honest, hardworking Finns. They could also be regarded as loyal and not a security risk, because of the differentiation between the government of Finland and Finns made by the prime minister and External Affairs.

The staff at External Affairs in the months after the issue of enemy alien status for Finns had been resolved, were aware of the ongoing peace feelers the Finnish government was making. The war would continue, but soon Britain was not just providing Ottawa with the details about the Finnish situation for information purposes. Canada as a belligerent in the war with Finland, was now being consulted on Allied policy that would lead to an armistice and eventually peace.
10 War Continues

International events were at the heart of the interactions which made up the Canadian-Finnish relationship through 1941 into 1945, but a majority of the interactions involved the Canadian domestic response to these concerns. The aftermath of the Winter War saw the need to continue aid to Finland, but this was now complicated by wartime trade controls and the development of a closer relationship with Germany by Finland. The transition to an official enemy image of Finland was facilitated by the Finnish participation in Operation Barbarossa and culminated with the declaration of war against Finland by Canada in December 1941. The Canadian enemy image of Finland differentiated the people from the government, as illustrated by the lenient treatment of Finnish nationals and seamen in Canada.

Enemy status left the question unresolved of the fate of Finnish registered ships that were seized. Canadian officials did no accept the thesis that Finland was fighting a separate war and was not a German satellite. As Finland continued to fight the perception that the country was dominated by Germany clarified and solidified the enemy image, though Canadian officials continued to hope that the Finns could be convinced to leave the war. With some frustration these officials observed from the side line the faltering peace feelers and armistice talks from the end of 1943 into the middle of 1944. In diplomatic jargon a “peace feeler” is a move to determine if a belligerent is ready and willing to end hostilities.

The talks occurred between the Finns and Soviets, but the British represented the Commonwealth when commenting on proposed armistice terms and what form the peace settlement would take. Up to this point the war with Finland had been only a small part of the country’s overall contribution to the Allied cause and no Canadian forces had actually engaged in fighting the Finns. The situation now had some symbolic importance for Canada. As one of the countries at war with Finland, Canada had a right to sign the armistice and participate in the creation of the peace treaty. Canada needed to demonstrate its independence from Britain, even though that country acted as an intermediary on Canada’s behalf.
10.1 The Finnish Enemy

The Continuation War of 1941–1944 proved to be a conundrum regarding perceptions of Finland. When Finland participated in the German invasion of Russia in June 1941, the Finns regarded themselves as co-belligerents, not allies or a satellite of Nazi Germany. To the Allied leaders there was no practical difference between a co-belligerent and a German ally or satellite. The Germans after all described them as brothers or comrades in arms. The general public was at times confused over Finland’s status. After all was not communism a threat to Canadian society, the Soviet Union a dictatorship and Stalin the megalomaniac dictator? It was “little Finland” that had been attacked in 1939 and that country which garnered the respect and support of Canadians. Finland was one of the democracies and certainly in the minds of many Canadians the Winter War placed Finland on the side of the Allies. There was no formal alliance, but it was obvious to the casual observer that Canada and Finland were fighting the same enemy, which in the public mind did not differentiate between the totalitarianism of Nazism and Communism.

Now the Soviet Union was an ally and the image of that country and its leaders had to be reinvented as a country fighting against fascism. A similar transformation occurred in the image of Russia in 1914, where in the years previous to the First World War the Canadian press and opinion leaders had portrayed the country using negative images. Russia was a dark, ignorant, superstitious, Asiatic country, plagued by autocracy, a corrupt and oppressive bureaucracy, a lack of civil liberties, a threat to peace and civilization in the Balkans, India, Persia, and China, whose Russification policies were destroying “the brave nation of Finland,” and threatened Norway and Sweden. The day the Germans and their allies invaded the USSR the Canadian prime minister issued a statement of support for the Soviets. Canadians were urged not to be fooled by Hitler’s claim that this was a fight against Bolshevism. It was in fact an extension of the war against the British Commonwealth, since the defeat of the USSR would eliminate the threat of a two-front war and open Russia’s vast resources to be used against the democracies. He
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claimed “the plain fact is today that, as Russia fights Germany, it is not Russia which is a threat to freedom and peace. That threat is Nazi Germany” and that “Everyone who engages our enemy advances our cause.” 1672 King also added that Canadians could expect communist activists in Canada would restrain their “Communistic activities.” 1673

It was a good step towards shifting public perceptions. Norman Roberts the next day confided to Pierpont Moffat, the American minister in Ottawa, the problems the alliance posed. He was interested to see the reactions of Catholics who desperately opposed communism, Ukrainians who might see the opportunity for an autonomous Ukraine and of Finns, “among whom there were more actual Communists than in any other racial group in Canada.” 1674 It was not much, but Canadian public opinion began to shift in an inconsistent way towards supporting the idea that Canada should aid the Soviet Union. The support given to the Canadian Aid to Russia Fund and the Red Cross and other relief programs for Russia is evidence of this. Now instead of public rallies in support of Finland Canadians and politicians attended rallies in support of the Soviet Union. Eventually Canada would provide grain, natural resources, arms, and other supplies to the Soviets through the Mutual Aid program. 1675 These war supplies would be used to fight Germany and though most Canadians would not have recognized it, this also included her allies like Finland. Diplomatic contacts were formalized with the opening of a Soviet legation in Ottawa during October 1942. Canada followed by opening a temporary legation at Kuibyshev in April 1943, which moved to Moscow in August and converted to an embassy in 1944. This was not surprising given the importance of the USSR to the Allied cause, but Finland would not receive Canadian representation until after peaceful relations were restored.

A December 1941 poll published by the Gallup agency showed 91% of Canadians supported Canada and Britain selling arms and other supplies to the USSR. However, the same poll results showed 27% of Canadians thought the Soviets would continue to try to spread communism, but 57% thought the Soviets, British and Americans would permit the countries of Europe to choose their own system of government. On the other hand 62% wanted the ban on the CPC to stay
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in effect. A year later a survey done by the Wartime Information Board which found a similar pattern of opinion, concluded that the “general impressions of the Soviet system built up over the years” made it hard for Canadians to fully accept the USSR as an ally. The images since 1917 of the Soviet Union as an atheistic, savage, cruel regime which starved its people and lowered the standard of living, had taken effect the report explained. This was reinforced prior to June 1941 by the activities of the Soviet Union internationally, such as the Winter War and the behaviour of those who support the communist cause in Canada, such as the Red Finns. Canadians then were willing to grudgingly accept the Soviet Union as an ally but were careful this did not indicate a support for communist doctrine and practices.

Now the Russian bear was no longer the feral beast threatening civilization, but instead was a nobler animal defending its home. The Red Army soldier was no longer the violent goon, raping, and pillaging, but rather the brave worker or peasant resisting Nazi aggression and defending mother Russia. Stalin was no longer the megalomaniac but was now likable Uncle Joe with his fabulous moustache. The improving image of the Soviet Union matched the deteriorating image of Finland. An example of the change in how the Soviets were portrayed can be seen in the popular work on military skiing by V.A. Firsoff, then available in Canada. The Germans who with a superior war machine it was said, had victory snatched from them by a Soviet army, which had learned the lessons of the Finnish war. The Soviets were now skilled at winter combat and effectively using ski troops. The Finns however, still come out with a positive image as skilled soldiers. In the Petsamo area the German alpine troops were said to “have proved, in fact a spectacular failure” and the German tactics in Eastern Karelia were supposed to “have earned them the derision of the Finns.” Perhaps a sign of the continued ambivalence toward the Finnish involvement in the war against Russia, Frisoff seems to be distancing them from their German comrades.

Mathew Halton, now employed as an official war correspondent with the Canadian military, had a book about his journalism experiences published. Though it was first published in October 1944, it was written and being prepared by the
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printer while Finland was still fighting the Continuation War. In the opening section
of the chapter “War in the Snows” he reflected the Soviet Union’s status as an ally
by condemning the policy of appeasement and stubborn anti-communism. Although his account of the time spent in Finland did not differ from his 1940 news
reports in terms of the bravery and skill of the Finnish soldiers and the hardiness of
the Finnish people, Finland was no longer the innocent victim. Though he never
touched on the issue of co-belligerence he hinted that Finnish stubbornness in
refusing Soviet demands in 1939 was really helping Hitler. Gone was the anger
over the Soviet attack since, “Russia’s purpose was plain to all but incurable
Russophobes. It was to seize strategic vantage-points in preparation for the
inevitable war with Germany.” Regarding the initial Soviet defeats he attributed
it to poor planning, preparation, and leadership. Stalin also failed to subdue Finland
quickly because he sent third and fourth rate troops. He kept his best troops
watching the real threat along the frontier with Germany according to Halton. When
he itemized the four reasons for the initial failure the fact the “Finns are superb
soldiers” was placed last.

Continuing the subtext that Finland was on the wrong side, Halton said,
“Fortunately, however, the Russians decided one day, after a number of disasters,
that Finland was not a pushover and that they had better send some real troops to
clean it up quickly.” To Halton proof of the real quality of the Red Army had
been illustrated in the success it achieved from 1941 to 1944. The tough fighting
ability of the Finns clearly still impressed Prime Minister King. In February 1944
during a reception at the Soviet legation in Ottawa, in an uncharacteristically
impolitic move, he asked diplomat Eugene S. Sergeev if the “the first attacks on
Finland and the poor showing the Russians had made, was a deliberate design” and
said he did not have “to answer if it was embarrassing.” To this Sergeev replied,
“there may have been design in it.”

10.2 Ericus and Carolus Yet Again

Now that war with Finland had been declared, Canada inquired if there was any
change in British policy regarding condemnation of Finnish ships? The response at
the end of February 1942 was that the British no longer thought that proof of enemy occupation was enough of a justification for the seizure of the ships. In court it was thought this could be presented as evidence, but it “cannot be treated as conclusively establishing the enemy character of Finnish owned of ships seized as prize” before 7 December 1941.\footnote{“Canadian Prize Proceedings Against Finnish Ships” by MW, 6 March 1942, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 2899, File 2298-B-40.} Britain now planned to stop prize proceedings and start over using the declaration of war as justification. It was suggested Canada do the same. Whatever Canada decided the British wanted to know, since it was important to avoid a court verdict which found the seizures were unjustified.

This perplexed Canadian officials. Legal advisor Max Wershof thought that the UK authorities “have developed legal cold feet.”\footnote{Ibid.} Surely he wrote, “When they asked us to commence prize proceedings against Finnish ships, they must have known that the only basis for supporting prize proceedings would be the argument that Finland was and is an enemy-occupied territory. It seems from the latest telegram that the United Kingdom authorities never had much faith in this argument and that they are escaping the possibility of having to defend it.”\footnote{Ibid.} His supervisor J.E. Read thought Canada should do as Britain suggested. In that event Wershof proposed the position External Affairs should contend was that the initial seizure was justified on the grounds Finland was occupied by Germany, but the case should ultimately be based on the formal state of war.

The British also doubted if the seizure of the ships could be challenged on the ground that they were owned by a British subject. Ohlson owned 298 of the 300 shares of the company which owned the ships. The British Procurator General who had to present the UK government position, was the one who did not think the argument Finland was under German control would hold up in court. It was unclear in this situation what weight the court would give to Ohlson’s ownership. The court would have to be convinced these Finnish ships were of a “German character,” unless Ohlson was in fact directing the ships operations. The declaration of war changed this situation in favour of the government. The procurator’s opinion was that “A vessel entitled to fly an enemy flag is liable to condemnation even if she be wholly beneficially owned and in fact controlled by a British subject.”\footnote{Duff, HCUK to Robertson, USSEA, 18 May 1942, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 2899, File 2298-B-40.} This was because with the war the ships were of an enemy character in the ordinary sense and made Ohlson’s ownership irrelevant. To keep the policy in line with the rest of
the Commonwealth, Canada was now prepared to discontinue the court procedures and start new ones. However, the Department of Justice delayed acting on these instructions on the premise that it needed to be certain the court would permit it. In practice this meant Canada did not discontinue its proceedings, since the original cases were still before the court by July 1943. By this time, the British asked Canada to let matters stand as they were until a decision was reached in the UK courts.  

Then in November the procurator submitted a 14-page affidavit summarizing the information known about Finland and its occupation by the enemy, as evidence in the court case. The statement outlined the events from 1 September 1939 and contained details about Finnish-German relations, the transit and stationing of German troops in Finland, staff talks between the militaries of both countries, the participation in the German attack on the Soviet Union, and Mannerheim’s order of the day which spoke of an alliance with Germany against Finland’s enemy. The document also gave details regarding Britain’s relations with Finland, the warnings issued to the Finnish government that they were aiding Britain’s enemy, the decision to seize Finnish ships and the declaration of war. After submitting this Britain intended to let the condemnation of the ships wait until after the war. This suited Canada since with the ships were requisitioned under the Defence of Canada Regulations, the Canadian courts could not proceed and there were no plans to release the ships until peace returned.

10.3 Armistice Negotiations

Given the message traffic between Ottawa, London, and Moscow, through the first part of 1944 it seemed possible Finland would seek a separate peace and leave the war soon. Prime Minister King now regarded the decision to declare war on Finland as one that created unforeseen challenges. Canada would now have to decide what attitude it would take towards the peace treaty with Finland and push for the right to sign it and the friction that would cause with the other Allies. King’s predilection to focus on the minutia of policies to ensure they had a broad appeal,
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his compunction towards avoiding commitments which might cause controversy, and simply because of the demands the war effort placed on the Canadian government, no real policy regarding future peace initiatives had been formulated. Back in April 1943, an interesting debate did occur among some of the staff of External Affairs about the best policy to follow to bring a favourable end to the war. The internal discussion was prompted by the announcement of the policy of “unconditional surrender” during the Casablanca Conference of January 1943. Prior to this there had always appeared to be the possibility of ending the war sooner through internal regime changes in the Axis countries, however unlikely this appears in retrospect. Internal domestic resistance to the Axis powers it was thought might be able to establish interim regimes recognized by the Allied powers, which could bring about a negotiated peace. This was a view shared by some individuals in the foreign offices of the Western Allies, even if it was not explicit policy.1693

It was also a view shared by J.E. Read the legal advisor at External Affairs. Most of the discussion centred on Germany, but the public pronouncements of the “Big Three” regarding the policy made it clear that it also applied to the Axis satellites, including Finland.1694 Read questioned the efficacy of the aspect of the unconditional surrender policy which required the prosecution of “war criminals” in the Axis countries. To him it seemed the policy was intended to “deter the enemy from behaving badly during the balance of the war,” but there was nothing to indicate Germany or any of the other countries would be deterred by this.1695 He could only conclude that this was a political move designed to be popular with Allied governments in exile and domestic voters. Germany was defeated in 1918 because her armies were beaten on the battlefield and the collapse of the home front. Read thought the Allied position as it stood in 1943 made it doubtful they could “achieve such a military defeat as would result in unconditional surrender” and therefore the policy on war criminals and unconditional surrender should be reversed.1696 There would be more of an effort to build up resistance to Hitler and the leaders of the other Axis countries if the people knew they would be treated fairly. Nothing could be gained by lengthening the war to “hang Hitler,” which was what unconditional surrender meant, and it was doubtful that this would appeal to
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the troops and their families if it was learned it would unnecessarily lengthen the war.\textsuperscript{1697} The policy appeared to be one concocted by Roosevelt and supported by Churchill who both “have gone off the rails” and if Stalin would not challenge it, despite the fact he was apparently willing to consider negotiated settlements for countries like Romania and Finland, Canada should publicly suggest a change in policy.\textsuperscript{1698}

His colleague R.G. Riddell, who had been brought on as a temporary assistant, agreed the policy on war criminals was intended as a deterrent, but also doubted it would have the “moral conclusions desired.”\textsuperscript{1699} The problem as Riddell saw it was the policy was one sided and meant that only war criminals on the losing side would be tried. In the process it would diminish the moral effect since it would not demonstrate international law was enforceable and that war did not pay, but rather it was the vengeance of the victors. On the other hand, he thought reversing the policy of unconditional surrender was now politically impossible because it would imply the United Nations could not obtain peace except by negotiation. This meant that the Allies would have to work with collaborators, turn coats, or other nefarious individuals in power in the various Axis countries.

Kathleen Bingay, who had been assigned to draft documents for Read, disagreed with him. She was a lawyer who had been hired in 1942 as a clerk, but given the responsibilities of a third secretary, a position only open to men. Read and others in the department respected her abilities and opinions.\textsuperscript{1700} She recognized that the policy was designed to show that war crimes would be punished and served to boost morale in occupied countries. The problem with the policy was that it was a general unqualified statement. The danger was it would bolster resistance in Axis countries, particularly Germany because no one could be certain if they would be considered a war criminal or not.\textsuperscript{1701}

All these misgivings in the Legal Division about unconditional surrender Marjorie McKenzie found interesting because she also shared them.\textsuperscript{1702} It was to the hands of McKenzie that Read’s memorandum passed through on the way to the under secretary. Like Bingay and other highly qualified women hired by the
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department, she was only given the lesser position of stenographer. She had a master’s degree in French and German and was assigned to the under-secretary’s office to oversee the paper flow.\textsuperscript{1703} Despite this she “exerted, on the basis of her particular talents, a good deal more influence on the department than her rank might have suggested” according to the departments historian John Hilliker.\textsuperscript{1704} She did not just concern herself with administrative matters, but also took an interest in the substance of Canadian foreign policy. After Skelton’s death in 1941 she remained in the post, with her responsibilities shifting to maintaining working files, preparing correspondence, writing summaries of current events and British dispatches, and converting Prime Minister King’s marginal notes into documents. She also added her own marginal comments to drafts submitted to the under-secretary’s office by the department.\textsuperscript{1705}

McKenzie penetrated to the heart of the matter by saying that the real need was to end the war quickly and overthrow the Nazi and fascist regimes. However, “these people are incorrigible” and remained this way so long as domestic opposition to these regimes was weak.\textsuperscript{1706} The victorious Allies would need to be firm with the Axis countries, but should not bring about dismemberment, disarmament, and economic deprivation. The people of the defeated Axis countries still need to be able to protect themselves from predatory neighbours and provide for their own economic well-being. Nothing can guarantee there will not be another war, but a discontented and oppressive peace settlement were a sure recipe that would “start the kettle boiling for the war of 1970.”\textsuperscript{1707} The best chance of avoiding a war in the future was restoring democracy to the Axis states and ensuring they had the ability to keep the people content. A better slogan than unconditional surrender would be in her sardonic view, “Milk from contented cows.”\textsuperscript{1708} Unfortunately she noted that “At present what our people hear about the people of the Axis countries is everything about them that is bad and nothing is good. This gives a distorted view and leads to false conclusions.”\textsuperscript{1709} Public opinion on this matter, which none of the Allied leaders seemed to be willing to counter, appeared to be in favour of a harsher peace settlement than imposed in 1919.

\textsuperscript{1703} Weiers 1995.
\textsuperscript{1704} Hilliker 1990, 103.
\textsuperscript{1705} Ibid., 243.
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All this discussion would amount to little, since even if the prime minister could be convinced to oppose the Big Three, it was doubtful it would have any impact. The concerns of the members of the department could be lessened somewhat because as Paul Kecskemeti has noted “It was not easy to put the rules of unconditionally into effect.”\footnote{Kecskemeti 1958, 219.} Sooner or later the Allies would be faced with the prospect of one of the satellites seeking surrender terms and a negotiated exit from the war which would help the Allied cause. Formally then the policy of unconditional surrender applied to Finland, but in practice the case of each satellite was considered under the circumstances that existed when negotiations began.\footnote{For example, in June 1944 the Soviets insisted on unconditional surrender, but in August were open to a negotiated armistice. Hanhimäki 1997, 6–7; Törngren 1961, 602–603.} Because Finland was in fact seeking a separate peace, the need to avoid a harsh settlement apparent in the discussion in the department and the issues of war guilt, reparations, and the prosecution of war criminals would nonetheless have a bearing on the attitude of Canada towards the peace process involving Finland.\footnote{In fact, in 1943 the Big Three had softened the stance on unconditional surrender for the minor enemy states and by May 1944 had dropped the policy. Instead they stressed the longer the smaller states resisted the harsher the treatment would be. Lundstad 1975, 78.}

There had been previous peace initiatives that had amounted to nothing, but Finland at the start of 1944 approached the Soviet Union about starting conversations about ending the conflict. The Soviets said they had no confidence in the present government, but if there was no alternative they could discuss peace and presented draft armistice terms on 22 February 1944 to Finnish representatives in Stockholm. Prior to the Soviet ambassador, Aleksandra Kollantai delivering them to Juho Paasikivi, Britain, Canada and the other Commonwealth nations had assented to the terms.\footnote{SSDA to SSEA, No. D294, 25 February 1944; SSDA to SSEA, No. D22, 26 February 1944, LAC, RG25 A3b, Vol. 5748, File 48(s).} To his cabinet on 21 February the Canadian prime minister thought the fact Finland was soon to leave the war demonstrated the wisdom of his caution in 1941. Retrospectively, he claimed his hesitancy had an element of predictive wisdom attached to it, since it should have been obvious to his colleagues and advisors, that the minor Allies of Germany would eventually by force of circumstances voluntarily leave the war. The prime minister and officials at External Affairs had never really mentally come to grips with who the “minor Axis” or German “satellite” states were. When King discussed this with Robertson and Wrong in February 1944 he thought they recognized the “wisdom of my stand in not having Canada declare war on Roumania and Bulgaria as they had pressed
He was wrong of course on one point, Canada did declare war against Romania.

There were six parts to the Soviet terms, which included breaking relations with Germany, interning all German forces in Finland, restoring the 1940 frontier, the evacuation of all Finnish forces beyond that border, and the immediate return of all Soviet and Allied POWs and civilians. In addition, the level of demobilization of Finnish armed forces were to undergo, the amount of reparations and the question of the Petsamo area were to be left until conversations were held in Moscow. The terms were considered the minimum Finland had to comply with and were not open to negotiation.

A few days later Stalin met with the British ambassador, A.C. Kerr. The Soviet leader expressed the view that the Finns “may have sought peace terms...with the connivance of the Germans. They may have expected the terms to be impossibly harsh, which would have satisfied Finnish public opinion there was no alternative to carrying on the war against the Soviet Union.” For this reason it was thought the Soviets had published the terms in the newspapers. The Soviets regarded the terms to be moderate, considering that they had not asked for an unconditional surrender, but opinion was divided over what the Finnish response would be. Maxim M. Litvinov, Vice-Commissar of Foreign Affairs noted “the Finns are very stubborn and therefore, it is difficult to foretell what their decision will be.”

Wilgress was told by the Swedish chargé d’affaires that the need to intern German forces was the likely source of Finnish hesitancy. Most Finnish officers had “been trained on German lines and this has given them a great respect for the Germans.” On the other hand the ordinary soldiers in general disliked the Germans. When the time came it would be unclear how the military would react to the order to turn on their German allies. If the military did not move with sufficient determination it might give the Soviets the excuse to intervene and occupy the

---
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country. This was something the Finnish government feared and would likely mean they will reject the terms.1719

If Finland accepted the armistice terms, a peace settlement would follow. From the Canadian perspective it was important that Stalin conceded that the UK could participate in negotiations for a peace treaty, because otherwise Canada would not have had a voice in the proceedings. Such involvement was to be limited to the general terms of the peace treaty and not details like the restoration of the 1940 frontier, repatriation of prisoners, and reparations. The question of Canadian claims to the nickel mines at Petsamo would have to wait for further discussions. The SSEA told the Canadian ambassador to the Soviet Union “that the Canadian interest in the nickel workings at Petsamo would not warrant any claim on our part to participate in armistice negotiations with Finland in Moscow.”1720 Nor was it seen to be grounds to insist that the Petsamo region remain a part of Finland. Canada would have a good case for compensation, since Swedish companies had been compensated when the Baltic States had been absorbed by the Soviet Union.1721

The wording of this statement highlights the misperception that existed between the Soviets and the British and therefore the Canadian understanding of the procedures to be followed in dealing with Finland. Stalin and his ministers at various times made it clear there was to be no negotiations over the armistice terms and Finland had to accept them in order to end hostilities. This is noted in various communications between Ottawa and London; however, other communications and the published armistice terms add confusion by implying there would be conversations in Moscow on some details. For example, one week later on 12 March the Soviet ambassador in London replied in the affirmative when asked “whether Soviet terms were intended merely as [the] principle on which [the] negotiation of an armistice would be based and whether further negotiation of a peace treaty was contemplated.”1722 This problem was caused by the fact that at this juncture the two major powers had not fully agreed on the process of ending the war with Finland. At times it appeared Stalin wanted to proceed straight to a peace treaty, while the British favoured an armistice, followed later by peace negotiations. It would take several months of diplomacy before the matter was clarified.

1719 Ibid.
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1722 SSDA to SSEA, No. D369, 12 March 1944, LAC, Ibid.
Nonetheless, the Canadian government was “anxious to secure” Canada’s signature on any armistice agreement.\textsuperscript{1723} It was agreed previously when it came to armistice agreements with the Axis Powers and their allies, representatives of the Big Three would sign on behalf of all the United Nations. In this case it was understood that the Soviets would do this and would make it clear to the Finns they were representing Allied nations such as Canada. Failing that the Canadian ambassador would sign the agreement.\textsuperscript{1724} Despite the relative unimportance of the war with Finland from the Canadian perspective, the armistice was an opportunity to show a separate international personality. Given the practical consideration of limiting the principle participants in negotiations with Finland “all we could reasonably ask would be to be kept currently informed of principle matters under discussion.”\textsuperscript{1725} A subtle change had occurred. Typically, when Britain provided information to Canada about any aspect of foreign policy the Canadian government avoided any comment, input, commitment, and support for British policy, by treating it as just that, for information purposes only. Any information about the Finnish armistice would now require an answer containing Canada’s position on the details. Canada was increasingly willing to take an active part in international affairs. This was not just because of Finland, but a wider effect of the size of Canada’s war effort and commitment to the Allied cause.

Swedish foreign affairs officials informed the British that the reaction in the Finnish press was not encouraging. They were doing everything they could to convince the Finns to accept, but according to Foreign Minister Christian Günther, “Finns were always slow to make up their minds, and owing to strict censorship the armistice terms had come as a shock to the public.”\textsuperscript{1726} The British minister in Stockholm Victor Mallet, had been allowed to see the draft Finnish reply and reported it was not a flat refusal, but neither was it a clear acceptance. He thought “that [the] Finns would be foolish to haggle” and advised them to agree to the armistice and send a delegation to Moscow.\textsuperscript{1727} The mood in Stockholm remained optimistic despite this.

In response to the negative reaction to the armistice terms in the Finnish press, the Soviets printed an editorial in \textit{Pravda}, which outlined why they considered the terms fair and just. External Affairs received a translated summary from the
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embassy in Moscow. Finland was “one of the most ardent supporters of Hitlerite Germany in the present war” and the Soviet Union had every right to make these “demands in view of Finland’s role in the criminal Hitlerite war against the USSR, particularly her participation in the blockade of Leningrad,” the paper printed.\(^{1728}\) Then it went on to add, Finland was an ally of “Fascist Germany” which had no right to expect “magnanimous Soviet armistice terms” and it seemed strange to see a hostile attitude in the Finnish press which appeared to parrot the German press claiming “the Soviet demands are unconditional surrender, though in a disguised form.”\(^{1729}\) Unlike what occurred with Italy this was not a demand for unconditional surrender since there was no requisition of ports, bases, and ships and there was no total demobilization of the armed forces. The armistice terms if accepted by Finland leave room for talks on the details and questions raised by the proposals. A Finnish delegation would be allowed to go to Moscow for conversations, but only after the terms had been accepted as a preliminary. Furthermore, Finland had a choice about how to intern the German forces on her territory. She could either do it herself or with the aid of the Soviets. Unconditional surrender did not offer such choices.

The article continued that the Finnish press argued it would “be treachery to their German ally,” but it was “now late in the day to talk about this inasmuch as Finland herself raised the question of withdrawing from the war.”\(^{1730}\) This same press had “been stubbornly stating for many months that Finland was conducting her own ‘isolated’ war ought not to have recourse to arguments of this kind.”\(^{1731}\) There could be no armistice if there were German troops on Finnish soil, especially if Finland truly wanted to become a neutral country. If the Finnish elite think the terms are a sign of Soviet weakness they will be mistaken and “share the inglorious fate of Hitlerite Germany which is irresistibly moving towards ruin.”\(^{1732}\)

Finland gave its initial response to the terms on 8 March. It stressed they were eager for peace and wanted to re-establish their neutrality by avoiding the presence of the armed forces of a belligerent power on its territory. To this end they wanted talks to commence so they could express their views. This was an unacceptable response to the Soviets, who had the concurrence of the other Allies including Canada, that the terms were a minimum condition to cease hostilities. A new
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deadline of 18 March was set. The Finns were to reconsider their position and though they had not rejected the terms outright, remained hesitant. Views of the situation from other Allied governments were shared with Canada and the general opinion was the terms would be rejected.

Per Wijkman visited Hume Wrong of the Political Division at External Affairs on 21 March. He was seeking Canada’s views and was advised Canada had been consulted, but “had no comments to offer on the Soviet proposals.” Wijkman thought the Finns would be “ill advised” to refuse the chance to leave the war without “severe conditions.” The problem in his view, lay in a characteristic of the Finnish people to take always an optimistic view of their own situation. This was accentuated by strict censorship which prevented them from getting a realistic view of the present state of German fortunes. Many Finns were convinced that the United States would intercede because of the reputation they had earned through paying interest on their war debts. Recent urgings by Roosevelt and the Swedish King he thought had gone a long way towards enlightening Finns to their situation. A similar statement by the Canadian government would be of value “in educating the Finnish people coming as it would from a distant country believed in spite of the war to be not unfriendly towards Finland and known to have no axe to grind in that area.” On the departmental memorandum about the meeting, King wrote a minute saying “I doubt this.” There would be no Canadian pressure, public or private on the topic of an armistice with Finland.

It was learned that on 17 March the Finns rejected the armistice terms. Privately what had transpired was the Finns “were not prepared to express an opinion” and wanted “clarification not only of [the] formal but also of [the] actual interpretation to be placed on [the] terms which touched on a series of complicated questions.” They wanted peaceful relations, but were not prepared to agree to the terms without advance discussion of their meaning. The Soviets saw no objection to a small delegation going to Moscow to receive the interpretation of the
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terms. As it turned out all of this was “intended as a smoke screen to hide further negotiations.”\textsuperscript{1741} The Finnish government, which was still operating under the authority given to it by the Eduskunta to negotiate, wanted the fact it had accepted the invitation to go to Moscow for discussions to be kept secret. Only about 3 or 4 key officials knew about the planned trip.

With the arrival of the Finnish delegation in Moscow on 26 March, the British asked for Canadian comments on a list of points they wanted covered in the discussions clarifying the terms. Regarding the break in relations with Germany, this was to include a prohibition on commercial activity with Germany by Finns and enemy war material and property was to be turned over to Allied control. The repatriation of prisoners of war and internees should also include British subjects, including Canadians. Finland would of course have to make reparations, but any British interest in indemnities was related to claims by individuals and companies for damages. This included the Petsamo mines if the territory was ceded to the Soviet Union. Additionally, the British added the use of Finnish shipping by the Allies, the obligation for Finland to provide the Allies information, transit rights, and access to Finnish exportable products. There should also be a control commission to supervise the implementation of the terms. Indirectly Britain was concerned about possible indemnities “because, if the Soviet Government [should] impose heavy demands, Finland may be rendered incapable of meeting [the] outstanding obligations to us. We may need timber, pulp and paper from Finland and it would be undesirable that all available supplies should be diverted to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by way of reparations.”\textsuperscript{1742} To these points the Canadian government replied that they were “entirely acceptable.”\textsuperscript{1743} There were only known to be about nine Canadian citizens in Finland and a small number of property claims which had been filed.

The result of the two meetings with the Finns in Moscow was an amended list of the original six terms providing greater detail. Finland now had the option of interning or expelling German troops and ships by the end of April. In either case Soviet armed forces were available to assist the Finns if required. The 1940 Soviet-Finnish treaty was to be restored and Finnish troops would withdraw gradually across the 1940 frontier. Allied and Soviet prisoners of war and interned civilians “being kept in concentration camps and being used by the Finns for labour” were
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to be returned, but if a peace treaty were concluded the repatriation of prisoners would be mutual. 1744 Fifty percent of the Finnish armed forces would be demobilized during April and it would return to a peace footing by the end of July. Compensation for damages done by Finland to the Soviet Union would amount to $600 million US to be paid in goods over 5 years. Petsamo would be returned to the Soviet Union, which would also relinquish the lease on Hango without compensation. 1745 There was no deadline for Finland to reply to the demands, but there was to “be no procrastination.” 1746 It was thought the Finnish decision would be determined by reaction of the Finnish people.

Britain essentially concurred with the revised Soviet terms. They reinforced the point that the armistice would be the starting point for negotiations leading to a peace treaty. The only real area of contention was over reparations. Britain still wanted access to Finnish products and it was thought the amount demanded for reparations was too high. 1747 Dana Wilgress in Moscow confirmed that the Swedish secretary general also thought it was too severe since this was roughly three quarters the value of all Finnish exports and “With practically no foreign trade Finns would starve.” 1748 Norway was also unhappy with aspects of the terms, since Soviet acquisition of Petsamo would give them a common border. Though the amount of reparations was very heavy, it was more “preferable treatment” compared to what the Poles received. Trygve Lie the Norwegian Minister of Foreign Affairs “could only explain it by the fact that the Finnish divisions are still numerous enough to represent a major campaign for the Soviet forces. Moreover, the territory with its forests and lakes is particularly difficult for mechanized warfare.” 1749

Aside from the question of the German troops in Finland, the issue of reparations appeared to be the major reason for possible Finnish rejection of the armistice terms. Because of this Léon Mayrand of the Economic Warfare Division examined the demands in detail to inform a possible Canadian position on them.
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Reparations were to be paid over 5 years or 120 million dollars a year. The payments were to be made in kind with paper, cellulose, ships, and machinery. Mayrand thought “Considering the damage caused to the Soviet Union...by Finnish participation in the war, this figure, if not generous, is certainly reasonable.”\(^{1750}\) He reached this by using Bank of Finland statistics for 1943 which cited state expenditure at roughly $560 million, excluding amortization of the national debt and compensation paid to those who lost property in Karelia. The annual reparations payment would then only amount to about 31.43% of national expenditure. In the same period Finland allocated roughly $380 million to war related expenditures, while state revenue amounted to $360 million. The yearly indemnity would compose 31.5% and 33.3% of these two figures, respectively. Therefore, he went on, “it will thus be seen that considered in terms of her war effort, Finland is well able to meet the Soviet claims.”\(^{1751}\)

These reparations were also seen as a way to avoid inflation by reducing the amount of short term credit available domestically. By retaining wartime taxation and controls Finland should be able to meet reparations demands, Mayrand thought and still be able to run the state administration and finance the national debt, while also starting a modest reconstruction effort. In comparable terms the national debt to income ratio was better for Finland than Sweden, Germany, the UK, and US. Simply by ending war expenditures Finland would be able to pay reparations, do some reconstruction and move towards financial stability. Indeed, the terms were by far more generous than Germany had received in 1918–1919.

Only in comparison with Finnish pre-war trade could the reparations be seen as onerous. Using the 1938 figure of $167,936,000, the annual reparation payment would represent 71.45% of annual trade. Roughly 79.3% of all Finnish exports consisted of forest products. It could be assumed then that the Soviets would absorb a large share of this part of Finnish exports for reparations. As well the loss of Karelia which produced 15% of the gross value of these forest products would impact the payments. Karelia, which contained such major centres as Viipuri would reduce Finnish industrial output by 10–11%. Similarly, the loss of these districts would reduce agricultural production by 12–14%, which was thought to be no more a problem than the difference between a good or bad harvest. However, given the
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available land and numbers of people released from war work, Finland could restore this in a reasonable time.1752

What was overlooked, Maynard observed was the impact this would have on Finland’s ability to import. Prior to the war the value of imports exceeded exports by $1,589,000. These were largely purchased in Britain, Germany, and Sweden, consisting mainly of food, petroleum products, coal, and machinery. War disrupted this flow and eventually made Finland dependant on Germany. Clearly Finland needed imports to survive and it was thought the Soviets or long-term foreign loans could help provide Finland’s requirements. One unlikely option was that the Soviets might allow Finland to spread the delivery of reparations over a longer period. Completely missed by Maynard was the fact that imports were in fact essential if Finland was going to be able to produce the products the Soviets might demand, let alone for the normal operation of the economy. Finland simply did not have a lot of its own natural resources beyond its forests which might be used to produce machinery or ships.

The Canadian assessment of British objections to the Soviet armistice terms were based in part on the fear they might stiffen Finnish resistance and determination to keep fighting. However, the more telling objection was that reparation payments would limit British access to Finnish forest products, which were badly needed for reconstruction. Britain was Finland’s principle customer, absorbing as much as 44.7% of Finnish exports. The positive note was that “From the point of view of Canada’s forest products industry, however, the Soviet terms cannot be considered objectionable, for if they are accepted we should be in a position to supply the requirements of the United Kingdom.”1753 Canada stood to benefit from Finnish reparations.

Canada continued to receive confidential opinions and information from various Allied governments on the issue. Through the Norwegian Foreign Office, Pierre Dupuy in London had been assured Sweden had applied pressure to convince the Finns to accept the terms, fearing “that if Finland misses this opportunity, another might not occur, and Finland might be incorporated into Soviet Russia.”1754 It appeared the majority of Finnish politicians opposed an armistice. After imposing strict censorship, they have repeatedly told their people that Germany would win the war and kept the people ignorant of Finland’s actual situation. Now they were
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“in the dilemma of having to maintain the position they have held since 1941 or confessing that they have made a mistake.” The Norwegians were of the opinion the problem in Finland was a political one rather than about Finland’s strategic situation. Dupuy thought the situation pointed to the contrary.

The Finnish reply to the Soviet terms came on 19 April. It did not explicitly reject the terms, but rather claimed for technical reasons they could not comply with all the terms because they “would weaken and violate to a considerable degree conditions under which Finland would continue to exist as an independent state” and place a burden on the Finnish people they could not bear. Nonetheless Finland wanted to restore good, stable, and peaceful relations with the Soviet Union, but the terms did not make that possible. To the Soviets this was a rejection of the terms as the basis for negotiations and an end to the talks. Britain responded to the Soviets on behalf of the Commonwealth that if the main point of contention was reparations, it must be remembered the problems they caused after the last war. Since the Finnish reply appeared to be a rejection of the terms as a whole, Britain endorsed the Soviet response. It had been learned from the Swedish envoy who passed along the Finnish reply that Sweden has urged Finland to give “a detailed reasoned argument” and offer “constructive suggestions” about the issue of expelling German troops and the reparations. Instead what they offered as an awkwardly worded answer that implied that reparations were the main problem. The Soviet Ambassador Alexandra Kollontai, who was known to have a fondness for Finland where she spent part of her childhood, was hopeful because by dragging out the process Soviet military successes in the Baltic States would bring the “Finns to their senses.”

The Canadian embassy in Moscow learned the details of the Soviet reply at a press conference held by the Soviet People’s Commissariat of Foreign Affairs on 22 April. Dana Wilgress thought the statement read by Vice-Commissar A.Y. Vyshinsky was “entirely free of the vindictiveness so often characteristic of Soviet Government statements.” Both the British and American governments agreed with the Soviet reply. Having been consulted during the drafting of the terms
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Canadian support for the statement was implicit in the British stance. The statement gave a straightforward account of the exchange of notes and negotiations which occurred, in an effort to show the reasonableness of Soviet demands and behaviour. The Finnish reply seemed to identify reparations as a major obstacle to peace, which was seen as an attempt to avoid responsibility for the damage caused by Finland’s aggression. It was also regarded with incredulity since the Finnish delegation had never mentioned the issue of reparations was a problem.

What the delegation did focus on was the technical question of the internment of German forces in Finland. To this the Soviets offered the solution of allowing for the expulsion of the German forces, which could be done with or without the help of the Red Army. Reaction to this and the premise that complying with the demands would compromise Finland’s independence was harsher. The Soviets contended the opposite would have been the case since, “Present day Finland has no state independence. She lost it when she allowed German troops on to her territory.”1760 The German troops stationed in the north of the country were “now the real masters and who have turned Finland into a semi-occupied country.”1761 Even in the south the Finnish government has “ceased to be masters in their own home” and “handed over their country to serve the interests of Hitlerite Germany.”1762 This was why the real problems for the Finnish government were the expulsion of German troops and breaking relations with Germany. They were now so closely allied to Germany they did not truly want peace and “prefer to allow their country to remain a vassal of Hitlerite Germany.”1763 Only by expelling German troops would restore Finland’s independence and bring peace.

Wilgress provided further commentary and analysis drawn from his conversations with the Swedish envoy. During the first meeting with Molotov, Paasikivi made it clear that dealing with the Germans forces and breaking relations would not stand in the way of peace, so long as the other provisions were not too unsatisfactory. So, the Swedish envoy thought Molotov was not “being quite fair to Finland in blaming the breakdown of the negotiations on the unwillingness of the Finns to intern or expel the German troops.”1764 It could not be confirmed if the Finnish delegates made any mention the amount of reparations would be an
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obstacle, however, they did talk to the Swedish envoy about the impossibility of such a heavy reparations burden.

He also got the Swedish impression of the attitude in Finland. Finnish officers had apparently “swallowed unconditionally the German propaganda.”1765 There was no doubt the Germans could repel an invasion in the west. They were convinced the Germans would withdraw to a shorter, more defensible position on the Soviet front. Here they could make a stand to prepare to deliver a knockout blow or at least reach a stalemate that would end in a negotiated peace. He thought, “the Finnish Government have so misled their public opinion and that the views held by the Finnish officers about the war are so unrealistic that it is impossible for the Finnish leaders to persuade their parliament and their public opinion that the time has come to pay the penalty for participation in the war on the side of Germany in order to escape a worse fate later on.”1766 The Soviets now seemed to be counting on the overthrow of the present government and even for the installation of a communist regime, but his was “only likely to take place when the Finns are completely disillusioned about [the] German ability to withstand the increasing might of Allied arms.”1767

Still later Canada learned more of the Swedish view. It appeared from Stockholm “that the Finnish government were rather relieved that Soviet Government had, by making such a large indemnity demand, made it easier for them to refuse.”1768 Political parties who had previously favoured accepting the terms now support the Finnish government’s decision and “Finns were now more completely united.”1769 If the Soviets had truly been interested in securing Finnish acceptance they might have given a concession over the city of Viborg and the Saimaa Canal which was essential for timber exports. Instead the possible loss of the city “appealed to Finnish patriotism and made it difficult for any Finnish Government to surrender until defeated in battle.”1770 Finnish stubbornness also came in for criticism. If they had really been interested in peace the Finns would have heeded the Swedish advice to provide “constructive proposals” or at least send a short conciliatory reply, but instead then sent a “short and badly worded reply.”1771

1765 Ibid.
1766 Ibid.
1767 Ibid.
1768 SSDA to SSEA, No. D666, 2 May 1944, LAC, Ibid.
1769 Ibid.
1770 Ibid.
1771 Ibid.
They made no effort to show why the amount of reparations demanded was unfair. Kollontai as much as confirmed this to the British, claiming that if the reply to the other points had been more satisfactory, her government would have been willing to compromise on the size of reparations. As the likelihood of Soviet victory became more obvious she thought the “Finns, if left alone would gradually come to their senses.” She also later advised the British minister that the Finns would likely put out peace feelers again, but the only option was for them to accept the terms already presented. Only then could discussions occur about the implementation of the terms. She said this was done “to prevent interminable discussions as in the past,” but if they presented a “really constructive proposal” Moscow would consider it. The important thing was for Moscow not to appear weak and thereby encourage the other satellites to continue to resist.

The Finnish government also seemed under the illusion that once they had wrung a compromise out of the Soviets they could easily persuade the Germans to leave. Now in May 1944 it was thought only a minority of Finnish military officers were pro-German and the “Finns seem to hope that if they do nothing now except hold out [the] war may end before [the] Russians can bother about invading Finland.” The time to reach an armistice with the Soviets would be once the general armistice with Germany occurs. At that time, it was doubted the Soviets would launch a campaign just to give Finland a lesson. On this “all Finns are now gambling.”

Noted Swedish banker Marcus Wallenberg was convinced it was a Soviet ploy and they never seriously wanted peace in the spring of 1944. The peace talks were in fact designed to tie up German troops in Finland and Norway and prevent them from being redeployed to other fronts. This was why the “Russian peace terms had been so stupidly and inconsistently framed.” The Finns needed their troops to intern or drive out the Germans, but the Soviets demanded immediate demobilization, making this impractical. The ever-practical Finns noted this and saw it as a cover for moves to erode their independence, since the Soviets could then apply sanctions for the failure to deal with the German problem. The Finnish government had always argued it needed its military forces to guard their neutrality. Compounding the perception of Soviet duplicity were the territorial demands. The
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Finnish delegate Paasikivi had in effect been as by Moscow to decide between “committing suicide or being murdered.” The effect was to more fully unite Finns behind their government.

Events on the battlefield put further pressure on Finland. Since the spring, the Germans had tried to coerce Finland into staying the course by curbing the supply of grain and arms exports. Then on 9 June the Soviets launched a successful major offensive on the Karelian Isthmus. Mannerheim was reported to have advised the newly formed government that the Finnish army would not be able to resist any longer. Viipuri fell on 20 June. Finland turned to Germany for help and two days later Foreign Minister Ribbentrop arrived in Helsinki. He offered additional German troops, arms, and supplies in return for Finland remaining in the war and not seek a separate peace.

Finnish peace feelers had in fact been made through Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 22 June. The Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Erik Boheman confided this information but did not want the Soviets to know the British had learned it through Swedish channels. The Finns were prepared to end their participation in the war alongside the Germans and seek peace with the Soviets. If the proposal was accepted by the Soviets a new government in Finland would be formed and a delegation sent to Moscow. In reply the Soviets demanded a written declaration by the president and counter signed by the foreign minister that the “Finns were prepared to capitulate and were definitely asking for peace.” The reason for this formality was “that they had been betrayed so often by Finns.” The use of the word “capitulate” apparently unnerved the Finns and they feared “that Russians intend to absorb [the] whole of Finland and deport Finns to Siberia.” The Soviet conditions for talks to resume were likely to be rejected by parliament and Mannerheim was said to have strongly opposed capitulation. The
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timing could not have been worse, since it coincided with the visit of Ribbentrop to Helsinki. It was unclear to the Allies at the time what he offered the Finns, but the assessment of the British minister was the Soviets had once again thrown the Finns into the arms of Germany.

Boheman indicated he “deplored the decision of Finns to go on fighting which he could only explain by their ineradicable suspicion and hatred of Russians,” but also regretted the Russians “had parlayed their cards badly and quite probably could have got Finland out of the war last week if they had not insisted on formal capitulation.”

Ribbentrop who started his visit with friendliness, but left Finns fearing German occupation as additional German troops had been sent to help stabilize the Karelian front. President Risto Ryti then on 26 June conveyed a message to Hitler that the Finnish government would continue to fight and not negotiate an armistice or peace without German agreement. This sort of agreement normally should have been submitted to the Eduskunta for approval, but by suggesting that it would not pass, Ryti was able to deceive Ribbentrop into accepting his personal commitment, one which could be disregarded by a presidential successor. The Swedish government noted “that many Finns were saying that, this bound Ryti but not the Finnish nation.”

Sweden no longer wished to act as an intermediary for Finland while Ryti was in power. On an undated memorandum summarizing the gist of this exchange of telegrams between Ottawa and London, Hume Wrong wrote to his colleagues G. de P. Glazebrook and Leo Malania, those “Poor beleaguered Finns!” It is unclear if this was genuine sympathy or sarcasm.

The Canadian ambassador in Moscow thought the new coalition government would remove obstructionist elements like Väinö Tanner, Edwin Linkomies, and others. Dana Wilgress thought the Finns would now be less stubborn and sue for peace.

The success of Soviet military operations meant that there would not be much time to consider armistice proposals. The British began pressing the Soviets to discuss possible terms in advance. It had been agreed at the Moscow Conference in October 1943 that the European Advisory Commission should make recommendations on dealing with the surrender of European Axis countries. However, the tripartite commission included the United States, which was not at war with Finland. The speed of developments might make leisurely discussion of
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the surrender terms impractical. Therefore, Britain and the USSR should develop and draft an armistice proposal in advance. The reason Britain advised Canada it wanted this in order to avoid being presented “at the last moment with terms which are unduly harsh” or do not consider British interests. 1787

For Canada at the end of June how the future armistice with Finland would be signed, as King wrote has “acquired additional importance.” 1788 In the recent case of the draft instrument of surrender for Germany proposed by the European Advisory Commission the suggestion was the USSR, UK, and US sign on behalf of their governments and all the United Nations. Canada preferred the wording to say on behalf of all nations at war with Germany. Canada now also thought it more practical for the Soviet military representative to sign on behalf of all countries at war with Finland. Of course, in order for Canada to support this, advance notice of the armistice terms was needed. Britain supported the Canadian position and conveyed this to the Soviets. Even if a draft armistice could be prepared before negotiations began, previous negotiations demonstrated how the Soviets liked to control things and therefore comments on the terms needed to be provided by Britain and Canada quickly. Because of the “major Soviet interest in Finland” the British thought “it best to confine any comments on Soviet suggestions to matters in which substantial British interests are directly affected.” 1789 “British” interests in this case also meant Canadian interests.

In the meantime, the Americans ejected the Finnish minister and embassy staff. Hjalmar Procopé had been publicly critical of US policy towards the Soviet Union, President Roosevelt himself, and also consorted with American elements which were hostile to the government’s European policy in general. 1790 On 16 June Procopé and three Finnish counsellors were declared persona non grata and expelled. Diplomatic relations were severed on 30 June in response to Finland continuing the fight alongside Germany. The US legation closed on 4 July, with the Swiss agreeing to represent American interests. 1791 They also took over looking after British and Canadian interests.

By the middle of July, it seemed auspicious for a Finnish parliamentary opposition group to press for a change in government. Germany had withdrawn one division from Finland to reinforce the Estonian front and the Soviet Karelian
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offensive had been effectively stopped, largely by Finnish troops. As well, news of the “July Plot” to assassinate Hitler had been received, so events seemed to favour seeking peace terms again.1792 This Finnish assessment was overly optimistic, since the additional German troops and arms, particularly anti-tank weapons had made this possible, and Finland continued to ask for additional aid through July.

A change of government did occur. Mannerheim was reported to have said to Field Marshall Keitel, “that he did not consider himself bound by the undertakings given to Germans by President Ryti.”1793 To the peace feelers that followed, Molotov proposed to the British and American ministers that, a reply should include the requirement Finland publicly declare its break with Germany and that within 2 weeks all German troops had to be expelled or turned over as prisoners of war. Of concern to Canada and Britain was despite repeated requests over the previous 3 months, the Soviets had yet to provide a draft of any proposed armistice terms. Nonetheless, Canada expressed no objection to the Soviet reply sent on 29 August.

Before any armistice could occur, a cease fire was necessary to end the actual fighting. Mannerheim replied to the Soviets on 2 September that it was necessary to determine if Finland had within its power to intern or evacuate all the German troops in the southern half of the country. The Soviets agreed that so long as the Finns announced the break with Germany and agreed to deal with the German troops, fighting would cease at 8am on 4 September. By 6 September Finnish troops were to withdraw behind the 1940 frontier. Possible Soviet assistance in disarming or interning German troops in the north and the other details of the armistice could be settled during negotiations.1794

### 10.4 Ceasefire and Post Armistice Activities

Within days the Soviets presented Britain with a draft peace treaty, which they wanted to conclude quickly. The draft contained 21 articles which included such things as the break with Germany, disarming German troops, use of Finland by the Allies as a base to operate against Germany, restoration of most of the 1940 Peace Treaty, an agreement concerning the Åland Islands, the return of Hango in exchange for a lease of Porkkala, the cession of Petsamo, the return of Allied
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prisoners of war, the payment of an indemnity of $300 million in commodities, and the establishment of an Allied Control Commission to oversee the implementation of the armistice.\textsuperscript{1795} As a draft treaty it was unacceptable according to the British. Many of the articles were of a transitory nature and were best included in an armistice agreement, while others needed more details to be useful. The more general clauses it was thought should be standardized for all peace treaties that would need to be concluded and it would therefore be better to wait for a Finnish peace treaty. One such point better left until later was the issue of Finnish reparations to the Soviet Union. The amount demanded was deemed by Britain to be too large and disproportionate compared to other German satellites like Romania. If the Soviets wanted to deal with matters they thought more pressing there should be a “preliminaries of peace agreement.”\textsuperscript{1796} Furthermore, no draft of the armistice had been provided by the Soviets and it was premature to start discussing a peace treaty without it. Despite the fact Britain had made it clear Dominions like Canada would want to have their own representatives sign the peace treaty, the draft had the British representative signing on behalf of the all the countries of the Commonwealth. In the discussions that followed Molotov made no objection to the other Commonwealth states signing the treaty.

Molotov pressed the issue of the peace treaty proposing the use of protocols to deal with those issues raised by the British. The use of protocols Britain thought was unusual and instead thought the issues should be included in or as an annex to the preliminaries of peace and the armistice. British concerns over these protocols centred on Petsamo, the issue of prisoners of war, and the transfer of war material to the Allies. Petsamo would be dealt with by a separate protocol and the Soviets thought Finland was responsible to compensate any third-party British and Canadian interests in the region.\textsuperscript{1797} Handing over Petsamo free from third party claims and debts was not a reasonable request, since the receiving country normally is required to compensate third parties whose rights are impinged upon by the cession of territory. In the case of Petsamo the need for compensation did not arise from the transfer of the territory, but rather from Soviet polices regarding foreign owned industrial enterprises. It was Soviet policy to nationalise such enterprises.

What constituted war material needed to be more clearly defined and Britain might have an interest in some of these items. On the other hand, Britain did not
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have any Finnish prisoners of war and only had a small number of interned Finnish sailors, so how that issue was handled was not a major concern. Since the armistice was the more pressing of the two and because the Soviets were the only ally actively engaged in combat operations against Finland, it was expedient that the Soviet military representative sign on behalf of all the United Nations at war with Finland. Faced with this, Molotov withdrew the proposed peace treaty and agreed to proceed with the preliminaries of peace, the armistice and use protocols to deal with these issues. Canada’s views on these things were now “urgently” needed.1798

Interest was piqued in the Commonwealth and European Division which had followed the Finnish situation at External Affairs. As with many other aspects of relations with Finland, Canada agreed with the UK and made “a few minor suggestions for their consideration.”1799 Canada was not interested in Finnish war material and had only four interned Finnish sailors, so the issue of prisoners of war was of little importance. Petsamo on the other hand drew more detailed comments. Because the nickel mines in Petsamo were the efforts of a Canadian incorporated company, the government was indirectly interested. Officials in External Affairs also were of the opinion the USSR and not Finland was liable to provide compensation for the loss of the mines. The British government it seemed was operating on the mistaken premise that it was the British firm Mond Nickel which was the primary business involved.1800 INCO had a British and an American subsidiary which opened the possibility of US involvement and caused some concern for Canadian officials. However, US interests were at best remote; the governments that should be involved in settling the Petsamo issue were Canada, UK, USSR, and Finland. When dealing with the USSR it was thought best if both Canada and the UK acted jointly.1801

Petsamo then became the means of interjecting Canada into the next step of the Finnish peace process the “Preliminaries of Peace.” The thought process was that Finland had accepted the armistice terms and now the preliminaries of peace would expand or further clarify them and include additional terms which would then as a whole represent a peace treaty. This seemed an unnecessarily complication which effectively repeated the armistice terms and essentially drafted the general
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settlement which would appear in the final peace treaty. Unlike the armistice, the preliminaries agreement would be between the governments of each country at war with Finland. All that would be left to do was to negotiate the final form of the peace treaty. Supposedly by proceeding with the preliminaries it would avoid protracted discussions over the peace treaty and smooth the way to its signature. The preliminaries of peace would include articles on Petsamo, Porkkala, the definition of what commodities were to be delivered as part of the indemnity, and the timetable for delivery.

The British view was that if the Soviets could not be convinced to accept responsibility for compensation for Petsamo, then there was no need for a protocol and the issue could be dealt with in the articles of the preliminaries of peace. If the Soviets accepted the liability it was best to use a separate agreement between the UK-USSR and perhaps Canada. In general the Canadian government agreed and the Cabinet War Committee thought it “desirable for Canada to be associated with the United Kingdom in seeking more satisfactory compensatory arrangement without pressing the matter unduly.”

The British minister then spent an hour on 12 September trying to convince Molotov of the merits of this and pointed out the responsibility to pay compensation occurred because the Soviet government would nationalize the properties concerned.

Evidently Molotov was convinced. The Soviets agreed to pay compensation of around $20 million, without making a definite commitment and “only as a guess.” Reference to compensation would be removed from the protocol to the preliminaries of peace and made into a separate agreement. Molotov inferred that his government did not expect to be pressed to settle the claim until they had received something from Finland. The compensation would be paid out of the reparations made by Finland. Furthermore, “it would be essential that this should not be quoted against the Soviet Government as a precedent and privacy was
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essential.”1808 If the Soviets could be persuaded to make a firm offer, Britain saw no objection to this and the details could be worked out later in the separate protocol. Nothing was said about the fact that Finland would in effect be paying compensation indirectly, since the amount of reparations had already been stipulated. However, until Canada gave its views on this offer, Britain delayed accepting it. Complete secrecy could not be maintained if the companies involved were brought into the discussion or if questions were raised in parliament. Nothing was to be said to Mond or INCO at this time.

Although the Canadian government generally agreed with the British position, it had been slow in responding to the numerous telegrams emanating from London on the question of the armistice, the preliminaries of peace and Petsamo. Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa had on the other hand provided prompt replies. For example, the Prime Minister of New Zealand thought the draft peace treaty was inappropriate at this time. His government preferred to wait until settlements with all enemy countries were prepared or at least until there was further clarity on the situation. There was no objection to the preliminaries of peace because it appeared the Soviets “attach importance to this being done at this time.”1809 The reason for Canadian tardiness was the prime minister and the USSEA, Norman Robertson were both at the Second Quebec Conference and not in a position to consider responses.

Prompted by the New Zealand telegram and further requests from London, Acting USSEA G de t. Glazebrook hastily drafted replies which the prime minister amended. The Canadian ambassador in Moscow was authorized to sign the preliminaries of peace on behalf of Canada. Regarding Petsamo, Glazebrook advised the prime minister, “I do not think that the proposed Petsamo arrangement is a satisfactory one but International Nickel has taken a risk in Finland and we can do no more than accept the Soviet proposals if our efforts for revision are unsuccessful.”1810 London was then told, “We reluctantly agree to the policy suggested” and “we feel that you have made all possible efforts to revise the Soviet proposals on Petsamo and that further action you suggest is the best that can [be] taken under the circumstances.”1811 However, it would not be possible to determine
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the actual value of the Petsamo property or to decide if the suggested $20 million was acceptable without consulting the company. It was best to wait until the cession of Petsamo was made public. Once this occurred, no doubt the company would approach the Canadian government about compensation and the value of the property could be made known then, without divulging information about the Soviet proposal.1812

With events in Finland moving rapidly, Britain and the Soviet Union agreed on the wording of the armistice and preliminaries of peace by the afternoon of 14 September. However, Molotov added that if the Dominions and Czechoslovakia were to sign the preliminaries of peace, then the Constituent Republics of the USSR, which bordered Finland, would also have to be included. The British therefore proposed dropping the preliminaries of peace and have the terms added into the armistice agreement.1813 At this point, when pressed Molotov affirmed that $20 million was the amount of compensation the Soviets were prepared to pay for the mines and reference to it was removed from the armistice. Petsamo was now a separate matter between the three countries involved. However, it was suggested if a lower sum could be agreed on it would promote goodwill. This was another reason to keep the details about the compensation proposal confidential for the time being and not let the company know about it.1814 Despite this, Canadian authorities divulged the Soviet offer to the president and secretary of INCO during their visit to Ottawa on 17 September. No explanation was given for this breach in confidentiality, but it was likely to forestall the possible embarrassment in the event the company raised the question publicly or through members of parliament. The company thought the property was worth more than what was offered but were willing to accept the best settlement that could be made.1815

Later the next evening the armistice agreement was presented to the Finnish delegation which arrived a few days earlier headed by Prime Minister Antti Hackzell. The Canadian ambassador later confirmed the Finnish delegation was “treated with great courtesy” and plied with large amounts of food.1816 Once the Allies were ready to officially receive the Finnish delegation on 14 September
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Hackzell was advised by phone. To the suggestion that the British ambassador was to take part in the reception, “Mr. Hacksell [Hackzell] is said to have enquired in a puzzled voice as to why the British Ambassador was to take part and to have expressed amazement when told that Great Britain was at war with Finland.” This confusion was attributed to the fact Hackzell was only recently appointed prime minister and “it is possible that with the close censorship maintained in Finland” he “had not been aware that his country was engaged in war with any other country except the Soviet Union, with which country Finland had been waging a ‘private war’ of its own.”

He suffered a stroke shortly thereafter and this caused a delay while a new representative was sent from Finland. Leo Malania, the special wartime assistant to the under secretary, in preparing a briefing memorandum to the department described the incident as “ludicrous” and surmised “This painful shock may have had some connection with Mr. Hackzell’s sudden stroke.” Hackzell had not been told Finland was at war with Canada and several other countries as well.

Several days later Canada received a copy of the final text and accompanying maps relating to the armistice and learned how the discussions transpired. This was not an official copy and the government had to be satisfied with the unofficial translated text which appeared in the New York Times once the armistice was announced publicly. The possibility of Canada and the other countries at war with Finland signing the armistice was again proposed by Britain, but quickly dropped when Molotov added that Estonia and the Finnish-Karelian Republic would also have to sign. This was an odd assertion, since ultimately it was two other constituent republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, which signed the final peace treaty. Therefore, only Britain and the USSR would sign on behalf of all United Nations at war with Finland.

The Finns were allowed to present their views, but there was little in the way of negotiation. During the discussions, the “Soviet attitude was throughout stern
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and unyielding.”1822 Regarding Petsamo the Finns reminded their counterparts the Soviet Union had guaranteed Finland northern sea access. To which Molotov “reminded them that as a result of Finland’s subsequent action, [the] situation had radically changed since 1940 and Finland must now pay [the] penalty for over three years of war on the side of Germany.”1823 The Soviets would settle the liability for the mines and it would not fall on Finland to pay for them. Exchanging the lease of Hango for the Porkkala naval was presented by the Soviets as a compromise, despite Finnish protests it was close the capital city. The war had demonstrated the need for a forward defence of the city of Leningrad and they would not yield on the demand. Finland had participated in the siege of Leningrad and the demand for Porkkala “was justified by the extra six months of blockade resulting from Finnish stubbornness.”1824 Due to Finland’s exhausted position they wanted a reduction and a postponement of reparations because the goods were needed for reconstruction. To this the Soviets countered that the amount required each year was roughly equivalent to Finland’s annual war expenditure. The Soviet Union urgently needed the goods required as part of the indemnity for reconstruction as well but conceded the term of payment could be extended to 6 years.

Despite the harsh demeanour of Molotov, it was thought the Finnish delegation which had arrived in a mood of suspicion and mistrust, left the talks with “more of a conviction that the Soviet Union would respect the integrity of Finland.”1825 It all depended on how both sides acted in the coming months. If the Soviets did not go beyond the provisions of the armistice, then it was likely good relations could be established and Finns could hope for the future. In this Canadian assessment of the situation, it was thought Finland received better terms than would likely be placed on Germany. Both sides had finally agreed on the wording the evening of 18 September. It was signed the next day and made public in Moscow on 20 September.

The armistice did not, however, mean that peace had been restored, a formal state of war still existed between Finland and the United Nations, including Canada. Normal official relations therefore could not be re-established at the present time the Dominions Office reminded Commonwealth countries. There would likely be some personal and unofficial contacts made by Finnish diplomatic staff, especially in neutral countries where Finland maintained missions. In general, the British government wanted to discourage contacts other than those necessary to conduct
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armistice and peace treaty related business. Regarding contacts between private individuals and non-government officials, these could be facilitated at the discretion of consular staff. Beyond this, fraternization with Finns, especially with representatives of the press was to be avoided. Any proposed commerce with Finland was still governed by the Trading With the Enemy Act. For the most part Britain had no authority to insist on these things, but Canadian policies and procedures regarding Finland inevitably followed the British example, especially considering the fact that in a majority of cases it was the British mission which represented Canada in foreign countries.  

In the days that followed the Armistice Control Commission was set up in Helsinki to monitor Finnish compliance. Finland had already begun complying with the armistice terms on 2 September when an ultimatum was issued demanding the withdrawal of German troops by 15 September. This was because the removal of German troops was also part of the ceasefire agreement. Germany refused and began a scorched earth withdrawal through northern Finland. A state of war then existed between the two countries from that date until the fighting ended in April 1945. What has become known as the Lapland War or the “Lapin sota” in Finnish, in an twist of fate made Finland a co-belligerent with the “United Nations,” though none of the Allies referred to it in that way. Dana Wigless in Moscow noted an article from Tass news agency, which expressed mild Soviet criticism of the Finnish rate of progress. Implementing many of the terms Finland was progressing as expected, but the Soviet paper thought the Finns were slow in repatriating Soviet citizens, who were mostly prisoners of war, slow in turning over German and Hungarian military property to the Allies, and not pursuing the disarmament of German troops vigorously enough. Only on 1 October had the Finnish army started military operations against German troops in the north and even then, with only a small proportion of their forces. 

Wilgress’ observations were prescient. The British Political Representative F.M. Shepherd reported that Mannerheim thought the criticism of Finnish efforts to disarm the Germans was unjust. The Finnish army had been expected to move
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troops to cut off the German retreat in the north, while at the same time
demobilizing in the south. Despite the delays from the need to manoeuvre troops
into position, they were still advancing in the face of a German scorched earth
policy and rear-guard actions. Mannerheim and many of his countrymen were
pessimistic about Soviet intentions. He thought the Soviet security concerns would
not be satisfied by small buffer states and they would eventually be annexed.1831
Despite such criticism, the Soviets Union was “on the whole is friendly to the
Finnish Government,” the Tass article “undoubtedly is intended to prepare the
Soviet public for more friendly relations between the two countries. The Soviet
Government for their part, have been most scrupulous in avoiding the creation of
further mistrust on the part of the Finnish people.”1832 The feared Soviet occupation
of the north did not occur, and Soviet troops only entered Petsamo to drive out
German forces.

The defeat of Germany in May and the surrender of Japan in August 1945
shifted attention to preparing the draft Finnish peace treaty by the fall. Parts of the
armistice agreement would be included in the treaty and the rest would be drafted
by the major powers, with Canada and the others asked to comment on the
proposals.1833 To this end Canada received a copy of the British Chiefs of Staff
assessment of military factors that needed to be considered for the peace treaty.
Broadly it thought, “We have no strategic interests in Finland and the size and
composition of her armed forces do not directly affect us.”1834 There was no need
to increase the size of the Finnish military, “As Finland is dominated by Russia,
and is extremely unlikely to be threatened by her Scandinavian neighbours, it
should be our policy that her armed forces are such as to ensure her own internal
tranquility without furnishing a source of military potential for Russia.”1835 If the
Soviets wished to reduce the Finnish numbers further, it was acceptable, but needed
strong reasons if they want to increase the size. The armistice figures for the number
of aircraft and their type should be reduced and submarines and assault craft should
also be prohibited. War industries should be reduced to a minimum, there should
be no subsidy for the building of civilian aircraft and merchant ships and things like
artillery and aircraft should have to be purchased abroad. The only argument in
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favour of returning Finnish merchant ships seized in prize was the need to help build up the Finnish economy. The Åland Islands should be demilitarized once again, since they threaten Sweden and give Finland and Russia control of the Gulf of Bothnia. However, this was not seen as a pressing issue, nor were there any objections to the lease of Porkkala or any reason to oppose the annexation of Petsamo.

Major General Maurice Pope essentially agreed with the British evaluation when he did the Canadian assessment of the military clauses. Writing off Finland when considering the Åland Islands he “thought that the chances are that Russia, over the next score of years, will control the entire Baltic. Consequently, control of the Gulf of Bothnia can be of no significance.”\textsuperscript{1836} He went further and said, “I conclude, therefore, that the military aspects of the proposed treaty with Finland are of no special concern to us, not only as a matter of fact, but also because situations which are quite beyond our power to control should be philosophically accepted. Any other course of action would tend only to disclose our impotence, and that would not serve any good purpose.”\textsuperscript{1837} Commenting on the British views, an External Affairs memorandum noted “that in any case the peace terms will inevitably be dictated by the Soviet Government, presumably the request for comments is purely pro forma.”\textsuperscript{1838}

When the Council of Foreign Ministers met on 20 September, the British and Soviets were clearly at odds over the Finnish treaty. That afternoon the Commonwealth representatives met at the Foreign Office. It was Australian Minister for External Affairs H.V. Evatt, the who took the most active part in the discussions. Evatt pointed out the absurdity that countries not at war with Finland, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria were allowed to be present, but not countries actually at war with them like Canada and Australia. Britain was at least aware of and interested in the views of the Commonwealth countries, but the Americans and Soviets were not so inclined. During the discussions he kept referring to the view of the Canadian prime minister. King’s view was that he thought Canada’s contribution to the war had earned her a seat at the council to help make the peace. The pattern set by the war where the Big Three, Four or Five dictated all the
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decisions, should not carry over to the preparing the final settlement.1839 The major powers had difficulty co-operating during the war, and it was doubtful they would co-operate to build a lasting peace at the council and in the end they would need to have a larger body to “thrash out the problems.”1840 The agreed policy for the council’s sessions was that all five of the major powers (the US, the UK, the USSR, France, and China) would attend, but only those countries at war with the country discussed would vote on proposals. Representing Britain at the meeting Canadian High Commissioner Joseph Addison reported, that in his opinion King was essentially correct, and that “the force of circumstances would make a solution along the lines you proposed inevitable.”1841 In effect King was predicting a situation not unlike what occurred the following year in Paris.

Shortly after Canada received the British memorandum regarding the military clauses of the treaty a similar memorandum was sent about the economic clauses. Like Britain these articles were not much of a concern for Canada. Things like industrial disarmament, the return of war loot, German property in Finland, and the return of prisoners of war were mainly a Soviet concern. Reparations were perhaps the largest issue, but except for the need to settle claims by United Nations citizens for the loss or damage of property due to the war, both Canada and Britain had no direct interest in this area.1842 Britain wanted provisions added concerning contracts, the return of seized Finnish property and the reestablishment of commercial relations. Regarding seized assets, United Nations should be able to reserve the right to use them to pay compensation for loss or damage to Allied property in Finland. Related to this was adding a statement into the treaty which served as Finnish recognition of Allied prise courts for Finnish property, such as ships seized in the “exercise, of belligerent rights” starting from 1 May 1941.1843 Another important consideration was Britain wanted included the obligation for Finland to unilaterally extend MFN treatment to the United Nations countries.

Reparations payments were a complicated issue. In the September 1944 Armistice Agreement, the Soviets had reduced the amount to $300 million and two months later it was learned that the Soviets had advised the Finns that the reparations would be valued in 1938 prices. The British thought it understandable.
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that the Soviets would want to protect themselves from fluctuating Finnish domestic prices, but the “natural” interpretation of the armistice should be to value the products and commodities at current world prices.1844 This made the Soviet reduction in the amount of reparations by 50% an illusion. Finland still had to import and produce the products needed for reparations at current prices.1845 Handling reparations in this way threatened to cripple the Finnish economy and diverted surplus production away from other markets like the UK, which badly needed them for reconstruction. In response the Soviets pointed out that the amount of reparations was far less than the actual damage done by Finland to that country. Current world prices were abnormally high and fluctuated too much. The property destroyed by Finland could only accurately be valued at pre-war prices and therefore so should the deliveries on these “modest reparations.”1846 Even so they have allowed for increases in the value for machinery and manufactured items. Doing so, gave everyone a stable baseline from which to operate.

When gathering information in preparation the eventual peace conference the Economic Division detailed all this information, and the amount of reparations, the schedule, and the pricing were accepted by Canada as fait accompli. On most of the British proposals Canada took no position but agreed that Finland should compensate Canadian nationals for loss or damage to their assets in Finland and that the idea of Finland granting most MFN treatment was a good idea. There was support for the apparent British desire for “to establish the open door in Finland,” and counter Soviet efforts to monopolize Finnish trade, through bilateral agreements.1847 It also fit “Canada’s general interest in the creation of a multilateral system of world trade,” even though the volume of Canadian trade with Finland was small and Finland in some areas such as forest products was in competition with Canada.1848

**Conclusion**

From the end of 1945 until the peace conference convened in July 1946 Canadian officials would discuss and assess the information they received about Finland. The

---

1844 SSDA to SSEA, No. D1714, 22 November 1944, LAC, Ibid.
1845 This meant in reality the actual amount paid by 1952 was between $600 and $900 million 1944 dollars. Charles Kindleberger, “Finnish War Reparations Revisited” in Andersen 2011, 203.
1846 SSDA to SSEA, No. D1887, 29 December 1944, LAC, Ibid.
1848 Ibid.
diplomatic exchanges about the proposals and counter proposals for the armistice and drafting the peace treaty did not directly involve Canadian-Finnish relations. Canada had broken relations with Finland and the armistice and talks were mainly between the Finns and Soviets, with British input occasionally injecting Canada into the discussion. Indirect interaction with Finland over the postwar settlement proposals did set the stage for the eventual return to normal relations. Initially the enemy image of Finland was clearly evident, as Canada easily acquiesced to armistice terms offered by the Soviets and the suggestions made by Britain. As the fighting in the world war was coming to an end, the positive image gained strength, and this was seen in a number of ways as the peace talks approached but can be summarized as concern over possible Soviet dominance over Finland. The country would once again garner the sympathy of Canadian foreign policy makers. Even though Canada was not willing to do much to lessen the burden the peace treaty imposed, diplomatic and trade contacts would offer moral support as Finland struggled to find its place in the post-war world and preserve her independence.
11 Visions of Peace

After the armistice, the Canadian officials, waited for the Big Three to prepare the draft peace treaty with Finland, so it could be considered in the lead up to the expected peace conference. The conference would deal with the peace settlements for Italy and the other four German satellites: Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, and Finland. The situation with these countries was seen to be similar and the resolution of these treaties would lay the ground work for the later peace settlements with Germany and Japan. Occasionally in this period Canadian officials thought Finland was a special case, but nonetheless is described as a satellite, clearly showing the enemy image remained strong. It was recognized that Finland had a liberal, democratic, and capitalist tradition which suggested the country could return to the community of nations as a stable and peaceful member. Once the final draft of the treaty was done there was the political and administrative steps necessary to ratify and sign the treaty. Normal relations would then have to be established and the resumption of trade with Finland, but those would be considered later.

By the time of the peace conference, a more sympathetic image emerges that echoes the earlier friendly images of a heroic Finland, of a progressive, modern, liberal, democratic Finland, a Finland that was a borderland between East and West, an interface periphery on Europe’s northeastern frontier. The opposite side of this coin was that Finland could be seen as falling within the Soviet sphere, as a satellite penetrated and dominated by the Soviet Union. Finland’s good neighbour policy, depending on the circumstances fostered positive or negative images of a neutral, sovereign independent nation following a middle road or a semi-independent, but subordinate state. These were the beginnings of the image later commentators would describe with the inaccurate term “Finlandization.”

In and around this was Canada’s evolving internationalist foreign policy orientation and the country’s part in the early stages of the Cold War. Finland was one of the stages on which this drama unfolded and the images the Canadian political leaders and officials had of that country and its people punctuate the relationship between the two states. The enemy image is gradually revised by the image of Finland and Finns as a source danger or a threat because of the communist presence. However, the hardworking, honest, reliable images of Finns had never fully disappeared, though the perception of such negative qualities as stubbornness remain, this could even at times be presented as a positive trait in the face of adversity. With this in mind, even though it still formed a minor part of Canada’s external relations in the post war era, Finland would attract the attention of
Canadian political leaders and foreign policy advisors more often than before the war.

11.1 Images of Finland to the Peace Conference

Since 1939 the high commission in London and after 1943 the legation and later the embassy in the USSR provided regular information about what was happening in Finland. Also keeping an eye on the situation in Finland was the legation in Oslo from September 1945, which like all Canadian diplomatic offices had the additional responsibility of reporting on significant happenings in the countries neighbouring the one they were posted too. For the more detailed assessments and reports there could be a delay of several days or weeks before the information was sent to Ottawa, but pertinent communications about situations concerning Canada could arrive within hours by telegraph. As before the British kept the Canadian government apprised of developments in Finland and the occasional bit of intelligence was offered by US officials. On an almost weekly basis the Dominions Office sent circulars summarising information provided in reports about Finland. Occasionally Canada received this information several months after they were received in London, lessening the value of any time sensitive information. Timelier was the transmission of messages about discussions that involved both Canada and the UK. Breaking news about Finland would have been followed in the major newspapers by the various officials in External Affairs. Nonetheless, all of these are important to the development of the Canadian image of Finland because they are the main sources of expert information about the country. Subjects covered varied with each dispatch but were generally a summary of local news and covered the economic situation, domestic attitudes, and political developments. The picture painted of
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Finland for Canadian officials in Ottawa consisted of a combination of verifiable facts, rumours, and evaluations.

The enemy image dominated from the armistice until the peace conference. External Affairs watched with some interest as Finland complied with the terms and began to make reparations payments. They also noted the mood in Finland, as well as the political and economic climate. How the issue of war guilt was regarded and in particular how the war crimes trials were conducted, were seen as a yardstick against which the Finnish willingness to change was measured. These along with attitudes towards the Soviet Union were used to assess if Finland had the potential to be a stabilizing or destabilizing factor in the world. How the Finns handled these things would determine to what extent the enemy image would remain or if a friendly image would emerge. Which ever image came to the foreground would influence how Canadian-Finnish relations would develop now that a peace settlement was in the offering.

From September 1944, the Finns began to implement the terms of the armistice, such as demobilization and the banning of “fascist” organizations like the Lotta Svärd and the Civil Guard (Suojeluskunta), though it was thought they were slow in expelling Germans troops from Finland. Both British and Canadian officials were concerned the Soviets might use some failure on the part of the Finns as a pretext for ending the country’s independence. In early November 1944, Dana Wilgress the Canadian ambassador in Moscow did his best to assess Soviet attitudes and intentions. It was an effort at a balanced view. The Soviets were not as aggressive as many in the West feared, but neither were they as noble as they presented themselves. There were signs the Soviets were willing to co-operate with the West in the post war world, but they would also aggressively pursue their own interests. The apparent magnanimity of the armistice negotiations with Finland and the other satellites was a sign of this. One of the most encouraging examples was thought to be the correctness of the Soviet behaviour towards Finland since the armistice. Wilgress said, “Finnish stubbornness has won the respect of the Soviet leaders and with the faithful execution by the Finns of the armistice terms there has developed a trend towards the cultivation of friendly feelings between the peoples
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of the two countries.”

The British reports contained detailed observations which seemed to confirm the Canadian assessment. The removal of wartime political leaders, along with calls to abandon the policies which led to the war, and for a closer friendship with the Soviet Union by Paasikivi and others, could be regarded as appositive step toward rehabilitation of the country. Another theme in the circulars was an underlying fear of Soviet penetration of Finland. The pledge of the Communist Party of Finland to work within the democratic political system was thought a ruse. The party joined with other left groups in a popular front, but there did not appear to be any undue Soviet influence, other than an increase in rhetoric, meetings, and rallies. The free and peaceful election in March 1945, with an unprecedented 80% voter turnout, was a sign of hope for the future of Finland.

The Nordic, specifically Swedish aspects of Finnish culture were seen to offer a liberal democratic future. This provides one of the few references to Finnish-Swedes in the External Affairs records relating to Finland for the period. The British saw many Finns were turning to the cultural bonds with Sweden “as a shield against Russian cultural penetration and for the maintenance of the national character of Finland. Ideas of the west as a counterweight to Russia, and ‘Finland as the Eastern Outpost,’ are probably powerful stimulants to the Finnish readiness to repair past injuries” committed against the linguistic minority.

The circulars and dispatches also noted an incongruent mood in the country, where a general tension, depression, and apathy pressed on all sides, and competed with optimism the country could persevere through its economic and political problems. Contributing to this was an unsettled economic and political situation including internal dissent, strikes, inflation, food shortages, the need to import raw materials to meet reparations payments, and the problem of resettling Karelian evacuees. Political leaders called on Finns to work hard to overcome the country’s problems and stressed that despite the bad situation the country’s independence had been preserved. Much of this mood among ordinary Finns was caused by the

1856 Ibid.
1858 “Political situation in Finland,” Scandinavia and Baltic States, Shepherd to Eden, 30 June 1945, LAC, Ibid.
feeling of uncertainty especially in relation to Soviet intentions. One dispatch in June 1945 noted “The habit of expecting the worst as far as the Russians are concerned is, however, too ingrained in the national mind.”

The report by a group of Canadian academics and scientists who visited the USSR to attend the jubilee celebrations for the Academy of Sciences in June 1945 seemed to confirm these views. The representative from the Canadian Geographic Society, A.E. Porsild, spoke Swedish and arranged for his return trip via Helsinki and Stockholm. On arrival in Finland, he noted “the Finns apprehensive about the future.” The friend who greeted him reportedly said: “Welcome to Finland—at least what we hope will someday be Finland.” Among the economic problems he noted the shortage of fuel and food. Finns had resorted to burning peat and made the remarkable development of being able to extract oil from types of shale which had not been considered oil bearing. He found the damage in Helsinki light, considering how heavily the Soviets had bombed the capital: “A curious thing was that during the bombing of the city the Russians had repeatedly hit the botanical gardens which lie outside Helsinki proper. Their accuracy of fire, however, was quite good on the whole and he thought the explanation was that the Russians wished to frighten the Finns but not damage the city.” Why Porsild noted the damage to the botanical gardens was likely because he was the curator of the National Herbarium at the National Museum of Canada. A more likely reason for the bombing of the garden was simply because the Soviets missed their target. Strategic bombing despite the claims of some of its proponents at the time, was never very precise. That the Soviets missed their intended targets was more of a credit to the crews of the Finnish anti-aircraft guns.

One problem was that Finns seemed to be in denial of their war guilt. The British Political Representative F.M. Shepherd observed, “As I have frequently reported, it is extremely difficult to convince the Finns that they have supped with the devil and used too short a spoon.” The revelation of illegal secret arms caches seemed to point to the lack of contrition by some Finns. Many Finns could
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not or would not see that their present economic and political troubles were a direct result of the war. Despite the publicity of the new orientation of Finland, he noted “It would be easy, when dealing with a slow-moving, stubborn and ruminative people, to over-estimate the depth or abiding result of such a psychological atmosphere.”

This is why despite the depressed atmosphere there was optimism they could weather the storm, but also a sense of unreality in the perception by Finns that all would return to normal with the end of the war. War guilt did not seem to concern most Finns, who thought the Allies would allow normal communications and trade soon.

Similarly, the Finnish trials of politicians and officials accused of “war guilt” which began in November 1945 revealed the state of denial. Certainly there was some doubt in Finnish minds as to what the guilt was. Except for the extreme left there was no enthusiasm for the trials and there was a feeling the trials were forced on them by the Russians. Paasikivi for example, did not want the trials to be the farcical show trials that had occurred in Bulgaria and thought Finnish leaders were not in a similar category to those of Vichy France. Finnish newspapers did make an effort to downplay the popular perception that the accused were scapegoats, the British reports noted and “they do not hesitate to acknowledge that the whole country was to a great extent to blame, though the fault is considered to lie more with a leadership that brought the country into an unsuccessful war and delayed extricating the country from it, than with any moral guilt in connexion with making war at the side of an aggressive Nazi Germany.”

At the trials, the evidence presented concerned the various events and Finnish government policies which had occurred since 1939. In their testimony the accused did not seem to see anything wrong with the policies they adopted. After the Winter War they perceived ongoing Soviet threats to Finnish independence and the rapprochement with Germany was necessary to counter that. The Soviet Union
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was the real threat to freedom, not Nazi Germany. Risto Ryti for example insisted that even after June 1941, for Finland it was a completely separate defensive war and they were fighting “in defence of Western democracy.”\textsuperscript{1869} The presence of German troops in Finland and the collaboration and even instances of Finnish troops falling under German command were overlooked. Regarding Britain’s declaration of war on Finland, Ryti maintained this came as a surprise and shock. Canada’s and the other Allied countries which concurrently declared war did not rate a mention. As far as the Finnish government was concerned it had conceded to the British ultimatum in its reply to those demands.\textsuperscript{1870} Again it was hard for officials in Western countries to fathom this line of thinking since the ultimatum demanded a withdrawal to the 1940 frontier. Finland had only agreed to cease offensive activities once it reached the old 1939 frontier and despite this continued fighting to obtain better defensive positions to hold the ground recovered. At best this was considered stubborn, pigheadedness and at the worst it was duplicitous. In the same vein, the failure to withdraw from the war once the Soviets began offering peace terms in 1943 showed a lack of understanding of Finland’s deteriorating strategic position.

The other defendants argued along similar lines. Despite the arguments of the defenders, none of this was a positive image and did not absolve the country of the war guilt the victors placed on Finland. As Sheppard observed, “The conception that Finland was fighting a completely separate war of self-defence is a very popular one, and the Finns are probably as far as ever they were from being able to apply world conditions to Finnish problems.”\textsuperscript{1871} Furthermore, he concluded, “the trial has so far not had the desired effect of emphasising Finland’s break with the past.”\textsuperscript{1872} Still, when the trials ended in February 1946, all 8 accused were found guilty and received prison sentences. It was at least a tentative step away from the past.

As the summer of 1946 arrived and before the peace treaty negotiations had begun, Western observers, including Canada’s Department of External Affairs had grave doubts that Finland could retain her independence from the Soviet Union. This was especially the case because since the armistice the Finnish communists
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were active in politics working through the Finnish People’s Democratic League and had secured through coalitions several cabinet posts. This included the Minister of the Interior, Yrjö Leino, who was responsible for the intelligence service or state police, the Valtio llinen poliisi. The communists had systematically replaced many of its officers with their own supporters and it seemed they were attempting to gain control of the country. These interpretations of events in Finland received from British sources reinforced existing images of Finland held by those involved with Canadian foreign policy.

Canada also got information through third party unofficial sources. Early in 1946 the CPR sent their representatives G.A. Hobbs and J.D. Cameron on a visit to the Scandinavian countries. They were to report on political and economic conditions and especially identify how to encourage immigration. Finland was included in their visit, as an afterthought, because until the peace treaty was concluded and the enemy alien status of Finns was revoked, there would be no immigration to Canada from that country. Hobbs wrote that reparations were taking their toll on the people of Finland and “practically the whole population is living under difficult conditions.” While the American $35 million loan made things “a little brighter” and even though there was no unemployment the standard of living was low due to the need to export as much as possible to finance the “Russian debt.”

His assessment of Soviet intentions was that “it is felt that good relations with Russia will not be disturbed largely because of Russia’s interest in keeping production in Finland at a high level in order that she may be paid.” Cameron found the attitude of ordinary Finns slow to change, but they were adjusting: “Even when the Finnish Press reported matters unpleasant to the Russians, there was no interference, and they are making allowances for much traditional anti-Russian sentiment which still exists among the Finns.” They also noted the rationing and substitution of ersatz products caused by the shortages of almost everything. Yet, Finland still managed to make the required reparations payments. Finland wanted to trade with other countries, especially Britain, but did not want to
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accumulate sterling surpluses that could not be used to buy anything due to British exchange controls. Before the war Finland mostly traded with the West, but now was buying most of its coal and food from the Soviet Union. Finland, he said, now “tends to face both ways.”\textsuperscript{1878} The refugees from the ceded territories were restless and eager to emigrate, but even if they could go to Canada, Finnish authorities were restricting exit permits except for business purposes.

Cameron saw Finland coming to terms with the recent past. Finland he thought had “pursued a disastrously short-sighted policy, but now has turned over a new leaf, and if all Europe were like Finland the world would be happier.”\textsuperscript{1879} Economically and in territory Finland was paying a heavy price for her “alliance with Germany.”\textsuperscript{1880} The country was a model of peace and stability, “Her Government is orderly and free from violence, and the transition from [a] pro-German wartime government to a peacetime one was smoothly carried out.”\textsuperscript{1881} The past could not be erased, and “One of Finland’s most important tasks is to rid her Civil Service of pro-Germans and former fascists. But since nearly everybody was more or less pro-German at some time and may not be now, the Government has let sleeping dogs lie and hopes that it will do no harm.”\textsuperscript{1882} As a former enemy this showed that the image of Finland could still be rehabilitated.

With these reports the image of Finland as a modern, democratic, progressive country stands out. It is a borderland, on the edge of western civilization, gallantly defending her independence, and steadfastly trying to preserve her Western values. Contrasted with this was the image of the communists and the Soviet Union, which as the Eastern Asiatic other, was despotic and the opposite of Western values. The other aspect of the steadfast Finn was the stubborn Finn. In this case it was Finland which was caught up in world power conflict and unwisely, even naively and stubbornly prosecuted a war against the Soviet Union. It was a partial acceptance by many in the West of what would later be called the driftwood thesis which many Finns adopted. First formulated by Wipert von Blücher, the German envoy in Helsinki during 1941, it described “little Finland being helplessly dragged along in
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\item \textsuperscript{1882} Extracts from a Report Prepared by Mr. J.D. Cameron, European Colonization Manager, C.P.R. in London, England, Covering a Visit to the Scandinavian Countries,” nd., [1946], LAC, Ibid.
\end{footnotes}
the turbulence of international politics, like driftwood in the raging Finnish rivers."\textsuperscript{1883}

The image of Finland as an enemy country was held by the foreign policy decision makers in Canada, though an effort was made during the war to differentiate the Finnish people, from the leaders who criminally lead their country into war against the Soviet Union in 1941. It was now evident that despite their ignorance of the Western attempts to guide Finland away from the war, large numbers of Finnish people supported their government’s war aims as a co-belligerent of Germany. Despite efforts of Finnish officials to invoke the image of Finland as a borderland, defending freedom, democracy and the West in a separate war, the country had sided with the “devil” and aided Canada’s enemies. No matter how unjust the outcome of the Winter War had been, it did not justify the Continuation War. Rationalizations for Finland’s wartime actions provided post hoc only made the country appear to be dangerous, conniving, and unrepentant. Finns, it seemed could not understand this outside interpretation of their actions. Though Canadian officials retained some sympathy for the country, their reactions in this respect were now more hardened towards Gallant Finland than in the past. It was positive that Finland took the steps required to comply with the armistice, which were preconditions for a formal peace. Once this was accomplished, Finland could return to the international community as a full member.

There was growing concern that Finland would suffer Soviet meddling in her internal affairs and would be pulled into the Russian obit. The efforts to resist communist subversion also once again raised the image of Gallant Finland. To the Canadian officials who dealt with foreign affairs, this would have suited their own increasingly anti-communist orientation and Cold War views. Many Western observers, including Canadians thought it possible, even inevitable that Finland would lose her independence and be absorbed by the Soviet Union. The urgency with which Finns had to pursue a policy of maintaining good relations with the Soviet Union was evidence they had already lost some degree of independence. In effect Finland was being written off by many Western observers. It would take some time before a more wholly positive image of Finland would come to the foreground once again. By that time Canada would be willing to make some token gestures to help Finland maintain her independence and at keep least a partial Western orientation.

\textsuperscript{1883} Menger 1997, 526.
11.2 The Paris Peace Conference 1946

The end to the fighting in Europe was not the technical end to the war. The state of war between Finland and Canada remained to be terminated by a formalized peace treaty. At the Paris Peace Conference which ran from July–October 1946, the status of Finland was tied to the other German “satellites” of Italy, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria. This was because it was thought best that each treaty be structured the same, with many of the articles common to all.\(^{1884}\) The Soviet Union prior to the start of the conference and on two occasions during the conference tried to restrict the discussions about particular treaties to only those countries which had engaged in direct military action against the Axis country under discussion. Though Canadian forces did not attack Finland directly, this policy ignored the contributions made by Canada to the war in Eastern Europe through Mutual Aid, the protection of convoys to Murmansk and the bombing campaign. On behalf of Canada as one of the “Allied Nations” at war with Finland would play a role in the discussion of the terms of the peace treaty, but in the end the final document would be drawn up by the foreign ministers of the UK and USSR.

The Canadian delegation to the conference varied in size over the course of the talks, but never exceeded 10 members at any one time. It was led by the prime minister and when King left at the end of August it was chaired by the Minister of National Health and Welfare Brooke Claxton.\(^{1886}\) It was one of the smallest delegations at Paris and as a result Canada did not have representation on all the commissions and sub-commissions formed during the 10 weeks of the conference. The General Commission and the Military Commission had representation from all participants. Claxton represented Canada on the Legal and Drafting Commission and was chosen to chair it. Dana Wilgress represented Canada on the Economic Commission for the Balkans and Finland, while Lieutenant General M.A. Pope and Marcel Cadieux sat on the Political and Territorial Commission for Finland.\(^{1887}\)

---

\(^{1884}\) The delay in calling a conference for settling the peace treaties was in part due to the concurrent discussions to establish the organization for the United Nations and preparations for the first General Assembly. Leiss and Dennett 1954, 6.

\(^{1885}\) Soward 1950, 204–205.

\(^{1886}\) Claxton 1947, 124. The program for the conference listed Canada as having 24 accredited delegates. Šutaj 2015, 57.

\(^{1887}\) The small delegation meant a heavy workload. Canada was able to provide a representative at all of the main commissions except for Bulgaria, because they did not meet all at the same time. Pope
The DEA prepared a briefing document with factual summaries and guidance for the delegation. The delegation was operating at a disadvantage, because the draft treaties were only made available to the Big Three, prior to the conference. Therefore, the guidance given to the delegates before arriving in Paris was only of a general nature, providing commentary explaining Canada’s interests in areas that were likely to be included in the treaties. The section on the peace settlement with Finland began by making a positive observation about the strength of Finnish political institutions and government structure. This set the tone of the Canadian response to the peace conditions imposed on Finland. It stated that:

The political settlement with Finland will be influenced by the stability which Finnish political institutions have shown during the crisis in her relations with the U.S.S.R. No political group of importance in Finland was opposed to the Finnish parliamentary system itself, although here was, of course, some opposition to the reactionary interests under whose control it had fallen. As a consequence of this stability, the Finnish political system has been able to withstand two unsuccessful foreign wars within half a decade and to emerge unchanged in form.

Evidence of the positive nature of the Finnish system was seen in the fact that the men who made peace in both 1940 and 1944, and therefore opposed the previous government war policy, did not have to emerge from prison or exile to accomplish this. Changes to the regime occurred in an orderly and constitutional manner. A further example of the continuity of Finnish political affairs was seen in the role Mannerheim played during the war as the commander in chief and as the interim president during the armistice in 1944. On the other hand, “The element of stability in the Finnish political system was, however, greatly endangered by the high degree of inflexibility in the policies and political leaders who carried Finland into the second war against the U.S.S.R.”

As far as this was a reflection the Allied and Canadian interpretation of events it was accurate. The guidance commentary was less precise when it came to describe the inflexibility seen in the events surrounding the early stages of the Finnish war against the Soviet Union in 1941. The summary of events given by recalled, “I was also put down for the Commission on Finland, but fortunately this body met infrequently.” Pope 1962, 311. See Pickersgill, and Forster 1970a, 287–327; Eayrs 1972, 174–183. 1888 “A Commentary for the Guidance of the Canadian Delegation to the Paris Conference, to Prepare Peace Treaties with Italy, Roumania, Hungary, Bulgaria and Finland, July 29, 1946,” 2, LAC, RG25 B2, Vol. 2124. 1889 Ibid., 127. 1890 Ibid.
External Affairs contained a few subtle or nuanced deviations from the information contained in department’s files. In the months prior to the invasion both the UK and US made unsuccessful efforts to dissuade the Finns from participating. As the department’s files show Britain had provided Canada with intelligence summaries which suggested an attack appeared imminent. After the invasion was underway the commentary states that those same two states tried to discourage Finland from joining the war. While this is not a false statement, the department was aware from Foreign Office dispatches and circulars that Finnish forces were committed to the assault and what London and Washington were attempting at this juncture was to convince the Finns to refrain from further aggressive action. It goes on to add that when these diplomatic efforts failed, the focus was on convincing the Finns to restrict military operations to the 1939 frontier. Even this warning was not heeded by the intransigent Finns and they “gradually became fully committed on the side of Germany in the war against the U.S.S.R.” While these points were intended to show Finnish inflexibility, there was one positive point, which was, Finland refused to follow Germany’s lead and declare war on the US. This coupled with the fact that the US “did not add Finland to the list of her enemies, and kept her diplomatic mission open in Helsinki throughout the war” allowed her to maintain contact with one of the major allies.” It was true the United States did not break diplomatic relations with Finland, however, the department was fully aware that in June 1944 the American diplomatic mission was closed and Finnish diplomats expelled from the US in response to what was seen as the Finnish failure to seriously consider armistice terms. This was something the drafters of the guidance should have been aware of since the department took steps to have Canadian interests in Finland, which up until that point had been represented by the US, represented by Switzerland.

These deviations were comparatively minor. No draft versions of the guidance commentary remain in the files, so the reason for this interpretation of events is unclear. The inattention to detail might reflect the workload the department faced as a result of the war and Canada’s expanded diplomatic activity. To face the new demands placed on the department, it had expanded, but there was a shortage of qualified and experienced staff. As a précis it is accurate enough and provided sufficient background information to set the stage for the conference, but they also

1891 Ibid.
1892 Ibid.
point to the reality of Canadian-Finnish relations. This reality was that although individual members of the department might have a great deal of sympathy for Finland, when it came right down to it Canada had few interests in Finland.

Stubbornness on the part of Finland the briefing note pointed out was evident with regard to the offers of peace terms. From 1941 onward, there were attempts by the Soviets and the Western Allies to get the Finnish government to discuss an end to hostilities. In each case the Soviets offered the 1940 boundaries as a territorial settlement. Finland held out for a restoration of the 1939 borders. They continued to do so “even after the tide had turned against Germany,” and “seemed convinced either that Germany would win or that the fate of Finland was inextricably bound up with that of her fascist ally. The intransigence lasted on into the period of German collapse and led the Finns to abandon one set of negotiations which were under way in the spring of 1944.”

The reason given for breaking off negotiations was the excessive indemnity demanded by the Soviets. In all probability it was thought, the Finns hoped by delaying, the Soviets could be persuaded to reduce their territorial demands in Karelia and that size of the German force in Finland which had to be subdued would decrease.

As a tactic to improve the terms of the armistice it was in vain. The armistice when it was finally signed on 19 September, though as the commentary notes it was amended based on British suggestions, it was in essence little different from that proposed in the spring. The guidance surprisingly does not mention that throughout the UK was careful to consult Canada on the armistice terms and any proposed alterations. Since the UK was acting on behalf of the Western Allies it actively sought Canadian input and concurrence on the armistice terms. In each case Canada had nothing to add and either agreed with or differed to the British, but nonetheless played a minor part in the drafting of the armistice. Even though the document was never intended for public scrutiny, by omitting this from the commentary Canada was consciously or unconsciously distancing itself from the severe aspects of the terms. Subtly it was also a resurfacing of the Canadian government’s attitude towards involvement in British policy which had occasionally been evident in situations in the lead up to the Second World War. Canada did not want to be bound by any commitments that might stem from British policy, because Canada did not have input into that policy. At the same time, they resisted efforts by the British to

consult Canada, because consultation implied input and a commitment to the implementation of that policy. Britain was acting on Canada’s behalf as a practical necessity. Regardless, if Canada had raised any objections to the proposed armistice terms, it was doubtful that the Soviets would have been willing to make any concessions and therefore the result would be the same, no Canadian input.

Each treaty had a preamble, clauses which were common to all five of the treaties and clauses specific to that country. The Finnish treaty contained 6 parts, with 26 articles and 7 annexes. The main aspects of the treaty are as follows. The preamble dismissed the idea of Finnish co-belligerency clearly placing the country as part of the Axis: “Finland, having become an ally of Hitlerite Germany and having participated on her side in the war against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and other United Nations, bears her share of responsibility for this war.”

Finland acknowledged the return to the 1940 borders and the loss of Petsamo as a consequence of the 1944 Armistice Agreement, reconfirmed the demilitarization of the Åland Islands and granted the Soviets a lease on the Porkkala area for a naval base. There were clauses guaranteeing human rights and the outlawing of “Fascist type” organizations and those which conducted anti-Soviet and anti-United Nations propaganda. Limitations on the size of her armed forces, the types of weapons, aircraft, and ships permitted, and the requirement to hand over to excess war material to the UK and USSR. The amount of reparations was set at $300 million. German assets in Finland were to be handed over to the Soviet Union. Finnish property in Allied countries was to be returned as well as property of United Nations citizens seized in Finland. Allied countries could pursue war claims, but Finland waived all such claims against the Allies. Unlike other enemy powers Finland retained the right to make claims against Germany.

Finland was also required to negotiate commercial treaties with and grant MFN treatment to the countries of the United Nations. Subsequent application by Finland for membership in the United Nations was according to the terms of the treaty to be supported by the Allied signatories.

---

1895 Canada 1948a.
1897 The terms like the Allies, the Allied Powers and so on were technically incorrect, though they were commonly used, and the term “Allied and Associated Powers” was included in the Finnish treaty. There had been no formal alliance between the countries at war with the Axis, even though they behaved as such. The term United Nations in this context applied to those countries which signed the United Nations Declaration of 1 January 1942. A country which was at war with one of the former ex-enemy countries, but not a signatory of the declaration was considered an Associated Power. Leiss and Dennett 1954, 4.
1898 The details on each clause of the treaty can be found in Alexander 1954, 153–159. Also, Wuorinen 1948b, 91–93.
The Canadian delegation generally met each morning to hear reports from the previous day’s events. Periodically, the heads of the various Commonwealth delegations met to express views on topics and where possible achieve agreement on how to approach them. There were press conferences most days attended by Canadian, French, British, and American correspondents. In general the treaties with Italy, Hungary, and Romanian were the focus of Canadian delegates, because they considered the “Finnish Treaty” to be generally straightforward. Of the 12 speeches made by Canadian delegates before the various commissions, only the prime minister mentioned Finland. At the Economic Commission for the Balkans and Finland, Dana Wilgress avoided Finland in his opening statement and instead spoke only about Romania.

Prime Minister King addressed the fifth meeting of the plenary session on 2 August, outlining Canada’s position at the conference. The main aim was to secure an enduring peace, he said, “Our concern as a nation is to see that, as far as we can help to make them so, the peace treaties will be based upon broad and enduring principle of justice and equality. Canada seeks no territory, no reparations, no special concessions of any kind, but we do seek to build a lasting peace.” He reiterated old themes about Canada’s geographic remoteness from the concerns of Central Europe and that the country had entered the war as a deliberate decision of the Canadian parliament. This last point was proof, Canada had become more internationalist in outlook, because “of our immediate realization that the peace of the world was one and indivisible. If the peace and security of Europe were threatened, so also were the peace and security of Canada. No one could say where the aggressor might strike.” Canada contributed to the war effort to the maximum of her ability, to bring the war to a speedy end and earn an entitlement to share in the making of peace. He then offered an olive branch to the Italians, Finns, Hungarians, and Romanians in Canada:

Italy and Finland, Hungary and Roumania have, like other nations of Europe, each made their contribution to the up-building of the Canadian people. Many thousands of our citizens, whose parents came to Canada as humble

---

1899 Claxton 1947, 125.  
1901 “Statement Delivered by the Prime Minister Before the Plenary Conference, August 2, 1946,” LAC, Ibid.  
1902 Ibid.
immigrants not so very long ago, returned to fight in Europe as Canadian soldier volunteers in the war to preserve democracy from Fascist aggression. We welcome the opportunity which the making of peace affords, for the emergence, in the lands of their forefathers, of new governments and institutions dedicated to the realization of those ideals of Right and Justice for which we believe the war was fought. Of the countries in the world taking part in this Conference, Canada has, from these close associations of blood and history a particular interest in hoping that, out of the peace treaties, will come settlements which will be definitive, because they will be recognized as fair and just.\footnote{1903}{Ibid.}

It was a return to the positive image of Finns as builders of Canada.\footnote{1904}{King recorded the speech was well received. However, Mansergh notes that King did not always realise the applause his speeches earned was at times not so much for the content, but out of relief his talk had finally meandered its way to a conclusion. Mansergh 1963–1964, 63; Pickersgill, and Forster 1970a, 293–294.} Canada would keep a low profile at the conference, unlike Australia, which took an activist approach. The Australians put forward 73 amendments to the treaties, most of which were defeated, compared to just one by Canada and that related to the Italian treaty.\footnote{1905}{Stacey 1981, 389; Holmes 1979, 114.} In keeping with the low profile, Canada made no comment when the Finnish Foreign Minister Carl Enckell made representations to the plenary session on 15 August. Enckell pointed out that Finnish foreign policy was based on cooperation with the Soviet Union and asked for some modifications to the territorial clauses and a reduction of the amount of reparations by one third. Canadian officials were sympathetic, if not in full support of the rancour with which Molotov replied, that Finland had not been occupied.\footnote{1906}{The Finns it appeared ultimately accepted their situation, though there was some sensitivity over the fact they had been grouped with the Balkan states, which delayed the finalization of the less complicated Finnish treaty. Kertesz 1992, 32. Shepherd to Bevin, “Annual Political Report on Finland, 1946,” 28 January 1947, Scandinavia, Section 1, 6 February 1947, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 3885, File 9199-40.}

Except for the section of the treaty dealing with Finnish reparations, Canada had little to add at the commissions dealing with Finland. For example, Lieutenant General Pope in his 7 September report, said that “The consideration given by the Commission to the Military clauses of the Draft Peace Treaties with Hungary and Finland do not merit special comment.”\footnote{1907}{[Lieutenant General M. Pope], “Report on the Military Commission,” 7 September 1946, LAC, RG25 A3b, Vol. 5730, File 7-D-F, Part 2.2.} The aim of the clauses was to ensure that the defeated ex-enemy states did not in the future become aggressor powers...
and kept only enough military forces for local defence. This was largely a UK driven approach. The USSR thought a distinction should be made between the major aggressors like Germany and Italy and the small states like Finland. The Soviets were “interested” in, but “not frightened of Finland” they said. Britain was of the view that all the former enemy states should be treated the same, even if it was hard to explain to the Finnish public why their country should be treated the same as the Balkans. In fact, the British had written off Finland and the Balkans. Those countries were in the Soviet sphere and would soon become satellites and it was hoped by limiting their military power, it would deny this to the Soviets in any future confrontation. What they advised Canada was that Britain had no strategic interests in Finland, but since “Finland is dominated by Russia” the size of her military should be limited. Consequently Canada did not propose any amendments to these articles.

Likewise, the Political and Territorial Commission for Finland by mid-September had finished its work early. Most of its time had been spent considering Australian amendments. An Australian proposal requiring Finland to apply for United Nations membership was opposed by Canada. Claxton reported that,

We fully understood the Australian intention to raise the ‘iron curtain’ and to establish between Finland and the other Allied Nations a relationship which would enable Finland to resist Soviet penetration. We could not agree however that membership of such organizations should in fact be made compulsory by being written into the peace treaty. This smacked of punishment and did not correspond at all to the principles of such international organizations which were voluntary in character and based on enlightened self-interest.

Instead he offered a Finnish variation on the Canadian formula that “parliament will decide.” He thought that the decision for membership should be up to the

1909 American policy towards Finland and Eastern Europe frequently shifted during the period 1943–1947. In general, they wanted independent, democratic countries which were friendly to the Soviet Union. Finland was an ideal case, since it was in the Soviet sphere of influence, but had clear links to the Western world through trade and culture. American support for Finnish sovereignty and independence was motivated at different times by a varying combination of security concerns, idealism and capitalist impulses. See Upton 2005. On the shifting American approach and the historiographic debate see Lundstad 1975; Berry, 1990.
1912 Ibid.
Finnish government and that the members of the UN would decide on the merits of
the application at the time it was made.

At the 28 August meeting of the Economic Commission for the Balkans and
Finland, Canada proposed setting up a body to monitor reparations payments where
more than one country was the recipient. This was raised in relation to Romania,
but potentially it could also apply to Finland. As a Canadian initiative this was
unusual, because the countries which conceivably had an interest in this were
Canada and Britain, but Canada had made it clear the Petsamo mines were not
related to Finnish reparations. France, Australia, and the US thought this was useful,
but the Soviets did not. Molotov thought it “indicated clearly the instability of the
Canadian approach to reparations, as it had not previously questioned the Armistice
terms.”1913 Then late in the evening on 4 October the US proposed an amendment
to Article 22 reducing the amount of Finnish reparations to $200 million. The
USSR opposed this on procedural grounds, since the deadline for amendment
proposals had been 20 August. The Americans had delayed thinking the
commission would discuss the concerns about Finland’s ability to pay which had
been raised at the beginning by the Finnish delegation. The Soviets reminded the
US it had not participated in the drafting of the Finnish treaty because she had not
declared war against Finland.1914 The Canadian delegation argued unsuccessfully,
“the reparations burden on Finland was proportionally and unjustifiably much
greater than that of Roumania.”1915 With a much larger population Romania was
having smaller reparations demands placed on them. The article on reparations was
approved 9 to 4, in what proved to be a marathon 29-hour session.1916

When the final version the article was voted on at the plenary session on 14
October, K.V. Kiselev of Belorussia angrily pointed out Finland had done damage
to his and other Soviet Republics. This effort to reduce reparations had been
politically motivated to ruin good relations between Finland and Russia, rather than
truly considering the economic situation and was done at the expense of the Soviet
Union. He questioned Canada’s motives, saying that “if she is to act in line with

1913 United States 1970a, 298.
1914 The US played no part in the drafting of the Armistice and the Peace Treaty since that country had
not declared war against Finland. The US was however able to interject itself into discussions about the
Finnish treaty at meetings of the Economic Commission for the Balkans and Finland and at Plenary
Sessions.
4697-G-40 Pocket 1.
1916 The US, Canada, South Africa, and New Zealand opposed the article, while Australia abstained.
Belorussia, France, the UK, Greece, India, Czechoslovakia, Ukrainian SSR, the USSR, and Yugoslavia
voted in favour. United States 1970b, 575.
her professed motives,” Kiselev speculated the $20 million the Soviets agreed to pay in compensation for Petsamo should also be reduced. It was overpriced Kiselev thought, but Canada had her interests protected and “Now the Government of Canada was also being noble at the expense of the Soviet Union.” He was virtually accusing Canada of cheating on the Petsamo deal. Next, Molotov apparently rambled on about how the Finns had once before fallen for such efforts to seduce them and “had thus been led to participation in Hitler’s crimes. But Finland had surely now learned from their past experience to distinguish true from false.” This Soviet intransigence put the US, Canada, and several others in a position of voting against the article in order to have it considered at the plenary session. This implied incorrectly they opposed reparations, when what was wanted as a just settlement. The article on reparations was passed in the plenary session and became part of the final text 11 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions. Once it was finalized the text of the Finnish treaty was submitted to all the United Nations countries at war with Finland for approval. However, the treaty only would come into force when it had been ratified by the Allies signatory to the 1944 Armistice, which meant the UK and USSR. All other countries were then permitted to accede to the treaty.

From the start of the conference there was a strong sense that there was little Canada could do, except as far as possible ensure that the terms were fair. The prime minister characterised the Canadian presence as that of a “commentator.” Canada was concerned that the peace process followed general principles of justice and maintain international security, while not doing anything that that would further contribute to the growing tension between the West and the Soviet Union.

---

1921 United States 1970a, 840.
1924 Eayrs 1972, 182.
end, other than raise moral objections there was little Canada could do or was prepared to do regarding the details of the treaty. The overwhelming weight of Soviet views and to a lesser extent those of the UK, determined the final text. Brook Claxton in his February 1947 report, which was presented to parliament for example noted, “In the political and territorial clauses of the Balkan and Finnish treaties slight modifications were agreed upon which changed only in minor respects the basic pattern of the drafts laid down by the Council of Foreign Ministers.”1926 The eight page report made comments about the other peace treaties, but made no other comments about the Finnish treaty, suggesting it was not considered that important.1927 Aside from that, it mentioned that Dana Wilgress had worked to secure commerce and trade advantages for Canada in the treaties. Essentially this amounted to the requirement for Finland to extend MFN treatment after the treaty was ratified, but he failed to note this was originally a British idea.

The limited Canadian input into the Finnish peace treaty was understandable from the point of view that although Canada was at war with Finland, there had been no direct conflict between the two countries and the delegation was for the most part willing to follow the lead of Britain and the US. Although the fact Canada had been at war with Finland would have been well known by the Canadian delegates, it is surprising the number of officials who in their memoirs and subsequent accounts, either placed little importance on the fact and deliberately omit mention of Finland or seem confused on the issue. For example, in his memoir regarding his role as the Canadian delegate at the League of Nations, Walter Riddell concluded with an overview of the events that lead to the end of that organization and Canada’s part in the war. When mentioning the countries in the Axis camp he lists mentioned Hungary, Romania, as well as Bulgaria, the one German ally Canada did not declare war on but omits Finland.1928 It is unclear if this is tacit acceptance of the Finnish proposition they were simply co-belligerents, amnesia, or part of the general, often subconscious and unspoken desire of the West to “rehabilitate” Finland.

---

1926 Claxton to Louis St Laurent, SSEA forward to Prime Minister, 10 February 1947, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 3654, File 4697-G-40.
1927 Ibid.
1928 Riddell 1947, 208.
11.3 Image of Finland After Paris

With the Paris conference over, the peace treaty still needed to be ratified and normal diplomatic relations had yet to be resumed. External Affairs remained dependent on Foreign Office reports and dispatches regarding Finland. The British political representative in Helsinki reported the general mood remained gloomy and oppressive through the latter half of 1946. The results of the “war guilt” trials were not favourably received, there was still apprehension over Russian intentions and a belief that though Finland may have been wrong siding with Germany, the blame ultimately lay with the Soviet Union which had attacked in 1939. Towards the end of the year and into 1947 the mood had improved because the Soviets and the Finnish communists seemed to act with some constraint and even though Russophobia was deeply ingrained among the Finnish people, a friendly attitude towards the Soviets was a political necessity and for the time being it appeared Finland would keep its independence. Further support for a positive attitude lays in the realization that despite the hardship, Finland was able to meet most of its reparations payments on schedule, except where the products depended on delivery of foreign materials. 1929

When discussing joint defence issues during 1946 and 1947 with the Americans, the Canadian assessment of the situation regarding the Soviet Union, while not contradicting this, took a different view. The Soviet Union was seen as an expanding power. The creation of satellites in Mongolia, North Korea, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, East Germany, and the territorial acquisitions since 1939, including those taken from Finland in 1940 and 1944, were ample proof of Soviet ambitions. Czechoslovakia was not yet under the Soviet yoke and Finland was precariously close. The possibility existed one of the Soviet satellites or a rogue military leader might precipitate a war. Because the USSR was not secure internally it needed to use repression. There was a possibility, Soviet leaders might use an external conflict to distract its people from the problems at home. From this it flowed, that some incident in Finland, which leads to a Soviet occupation of the country or a communist takeover, might be the catalyst of the next war. 1930

On the other hand, another assessment in 1946 thought that the Soviets might only seek limited expansion. The aim would be to create a security zone around the Soviet Union, which explained why they sought the establishment of friendly regimes in countries on their borders. Therefore, Finland’s friendly neighbour policy was welcomed by the Soviets. Compared to the other countries in Eastern Europe, most of which were satellites, Finland seemed to have more independence and had a “free hand” in both its internal and external polices.

By the latter part of 1947 the Canadian view from Moscow was less sanguine about Finland’s position. The Canadian embassy there thought the Soviets would act decisively to protect communism from military and economic attack by keeping the satellite governments subservient to Moscow. The same applied to those “independent governments which are nevertheless irrevocably committed to closest co-operation with the U.S.S.R., as in Finland.” Beyond a doubt, Finland was in the Soviet defence area.

The political leadership in Finland received a favourable assessment. The change in national leadership from Mannerheim to Paasikivi was seen as positive. Mannerheim was still regarded by many Finns as a national hero who had saved Finnish independence. When the British and Canadian reports are critical of past Finnish government policy, the image of Mannerheim remains mainly positive. Similarly, Paasikivi was presented as a great statesman, which many Finns saw as the man of the hour, who helped Finns recognize "that friendship with Soviet Russia was not only desirable but an overriding condition of continued independence."

He was seen as the great captain who steered the ship of state through troubled waters, effectively navigating the war guilt trials, the peace negotiations, the end of the Armistice Control Commission, and dealing with the “conspiracy” of arms caches, and secret mobilization plans perpetrated by extreme nationalists. The presence of the communists in the cabinet under Mauno Pekkala would mean some instability, but the Finns would resist any attempt to seize power. The Finnish press, at Paasikivi’s urging, exercised self-restraint and few blatantly offensive articles about the Soviet Union were printed. The economy faced problems, with a high cost of living, and difficulties imposing wage and price controls caused considerable labour unrest, which presented an opportunity for the

communists to exploit. However, imports were focused on rehabilitating industry and meeting reparations payments rather than to satisfy consumer demand.\footnote{1934}

Countering Soviet influence were the increased diplomatic contacts Finland was making with the West including Britain, Holland, France, the US, and Brazil. Other countries such as Belgium, Greece, Poland, Turkey, and the USSR appointed ministers to Helsinki. The West then “took a more prominent part in the Finnish mind than the previous year” and proof this was so was seen in the criticism of it in the left-wing press. Unlike Finland’s past efforts at a Western orientation, which was done out of anti-Soviet fear, “the Finns are perfectly aware that so far as physical assistance is concerned they cannot depend on help from any Western Power, the extent of sympathy felt in the west for Finland and the spread of Finnish trade among Western Powers has had a steadying and mollifying effect on the country in general.”\footnote{1935}

These examples from the External Affairs files and subsequent examples show that in the period from the armistice into 1947 the Canadian government was paying significantly more attention to the situation in Finland. At this time, Canada was managing relations with its two closest allies the US and UK, involved with the start up of the UN and numerous international organizations, and concerned with the evolution of the Commonwealth with the independence of India, among other things. This was remarkable considering how comparatively little attention Finland attracted previously. Of course, the overriding concern of all Canada’s external affairs was the heightening Cold War. This best explains the increased attention Canada gave Finland. The deteriorating relations between East and West threatened world peace and Finland could become a flash point that started the next war.\footnote{1936}

How things developed in Finland therefore was vital to Canada’s national interest, which lay in a peaceful, stable world.

11.4 Ratification of the Peace Treaty

Once the final drafts of the treaties for Finland, Hungary, Romania, and Italy were available it was necessary for them to be reviewed by the relevant departments before Canada would consent to sign them. Parliament would only get a chance to review the treaties after they were signed, in order to ratify them. This process

\footnote{1934} Ibid.  \footnote{1935} Ibid. \footnote{1936} “Working Papers for Use in Discussions with the United States,” 6 December 1946, LAC, RG25 A3b, Vol. 5749, File 52-C(s).
began in January 1947. R.G. Riddell from External Affairs when he passed this on
to the departments cautioned, “it should, of course, be borne in mind that the treaties
are not at this stage subject to alteration, and it would therefore seem that any
objections which may be raised to the texts of the treaties would have to be of a
relatively serious nature before any Canadian refusal to sign could be
considered.”1937 The problem was the “authentic” bound copies of the treaties had
not yet been received from Paris. Neither Canada nor any of the other minor powers
would receive them before they had to be signed in February. Riddell advised
departments to consult to the *New York Times* for 18 January, which had the
compete texts of the treaties.1938

The treaty signing ceremony occurred at the Quay d’Orsay, Paris on 10
February 1947. Major General Georges Vanier the ambassador to France, signed
on behalf of Canada. Representatives from the Allied countries and former enemy
nations were present, and Vanier reported “The ceremony which took less than an
hour was simple and dignified.”1939 The treaty with Finland was signed last and the
other former enemy countries all presented formal reservations about the treaties,
except for Finland, which with “sisu,” stoically accepted the result. Canada’s next
step was to ratify the treaty.

Later that day the final text of the treaties and a report about the peace
conference by Brooke Claxton, were tabled in the House of Commons.1940
Although in the throne speech on 30 January the government had announced the
intention of having the treaties ratified, they could not be put before parliament
before they had been signed. When presenting the treaties and report Louis St.
Laurent, the SSEA, referred to the prime minister’s speech at the conference and
noted Canada’s disappointment that the smaller powers were not involved in the
drafting of the texts of the settlements. The draft statement had originally said the
part played by the “lesser allies was small indeed,” but instead putting a positive
spin on things St. Laurent tried to show they had an opportunity to make a

1937 Riddell for, USSEA to Deputy Minister, DND (Army), 17 January 1947, LAC, RG24 C1, File HQS
7275-4, Reel C5100.
1938 Riddell for, USSEA to Deputy Minister, DND (Army), 24 January 1947, LAC, Ibid.; “Texts of
4697-G-40.
1940 Owing to the different time zones Paris is 5 hours ahead of Ottawa. The report was given as a
statement by St. Laurent and Claxton gave a more detailed account on 3 March 1947. Canada, *House of
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difference in areas the major powers were not yet in agreement.\footnote{436} Canada did not have as direct an interest as some of the other Allies, but he reiterated the prime ministers statement that, “Canada... had a vital interest in the kind of settlement that resulted, and in seeing that the principles upon which the treaties were based were those of justice and equity likely to obtain a lasting peace.”\footnote{437} However, it would be sometime before the house could ratify them, because there were apparently other more pressing legislative matters that needed to be dealt with.

Over the next few weeks there was the occasional reference to the treaties concerning the status of Canadian property in enemy countries, the claim for the Petsamo nickel mines, how enemy property in Canada would be dealt with, concern over Soviet territorial expansion, concern over why there still were no treaties for Germany and Austria, and questions about how much input Canada had into the treaties.\footnote{438} One MP reminded Canadians, that Finland had been an enemy country, within the context of a debate about markets for Canadian apples. To keep the industry viable the government had shipped canned apples to Britain and “Then we dried some of them and sent some to Finland when Finland was supposed to be fighting on our side.”\footnote{439} The comment also of course illustrates the confused nature of Finland’s wars, since the Winter War, unlike the Continuation War was considered a separate war by the Canadian government. The maps that were supposed to accompany the treaties were received sometime later. When these were distributed separately to the MPs it caused some stir. The map of Finland was labeled in Russian and the Romanian map in “Czechoslovak.” There were complaints about why it was not in English and since the issue was raised during a defence related debate it was asked if Canada had received “a future map of Canada in the Russian language.”\footnote{440} In total MPs had about four months to consider the treaties and ask questions, but few chose to do so. In the Senate the treaties were tabled on 29 April where they were subjected to some scrutiny and discussion. However, the Finnish treaty was largely passed over. For example, Senator James F. Brynes spoke before the Foreign Relations Committee at length, but only

\footnote{436}{“Draft Statement for Mr. St. Laurent,” 8 February 1947, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 3654, File 4697-G-40; Canada, \textit{House of Commons Debates}. Vol. 1, 10 February 1947, 229–230, Mr. St. Laurent, SSEA.}
\footnote{437}{Ibid., 230.}
\footnote{438}{Canada, \textit{House of Commons Debates}. 18 February 1947, 535–536, 543, 547.}
\footnote{439}{Canada, \textit{House of Commons Debates}. 18 March 1947, 1501, Mr. Gardner, Cons.}
\footnote{440}{Canada, \textit{House of Commons Debates}. 5 June 1947, 3853, Mr. Hlynka, Cons. The Canadian published version of the peace treaties included the maps. However, the Finnish treaty included the maps of the western Hungarian border, the Hungarian treaty included the Finnish and Romanian map and the Romanian treaty contained the Hungarian map, all in error. The error persists in the archived versions. Canada 1947a; Canada 1947b; Canada 1947c; http://gac.canadiana.ca (3.8.2016).}
mentioned Finland in passing and spent a lot of time talking about Bulgaria, a country Canada had not declared war against.\textsuperscript{1946}

The motion to approve the treaties was presented to the House of Commons on 30 June by Prime Minister King. He summarized the process for drafting the final texts of the treaties and noted they had already been approved by the legislatures of the US, UK, and France, though they had yet to deposit the instruments of ratification. This would occur at a later date. However, Canada could not end the state of war with Finland, Italy, Hungary, and Romania and deposit its own instruments of ratification until the major powers had brought the treaties into force. Canada therefore needed parliamentary approval, so it could proceed on schedule.\textsuperscript{1947} There was some misconception that these were draft treaties and that they would be considered in committee. These were the final texts and could not be changed by Canada alone and the prime minister made it clear they would not be considered in committee. A number of MPs took an interest in the Italian and Hungarian treaties and questioned how much of a role Canada really played at the conference.\textsuperscript{1948} The last questions before the debate was closed concerned Finland, about the amount of a concession the $300 million in reparations was and what was meant by the MFN requirement, did it mean a return to the trade agreement from before the war and what amount of trade it would facilitate? Eager to end the debate the prime minister side stepped the issue of reparations by saying the trade issues should be directed to the minister of trade and commerce and asking the member to refresh his memory on the other question. The answer changed the question slightly to ask what concessions were made in the treaty with Finland. Claiming neither he nor anyone else could effectively answer that question, the prime minister once again dodged the issue, even though the original amount of $600 million in reparations had been made known to his government during the armistice negotiations.\textsuperscript{1949} After some further discussion the motion to approve the treaties was called and passed. Approval was subsequently granted by the Senate on 2 July.\textsuperscript{1950}


\textsuperscript{1947} Canada, \textit{House of Commons Debates}. 30 June 1947, 4819–4821, Mr. King, PM.


\textsuperscript{1949} Canada, \textit{House of Commons Debates}. 30 June 1947, 4834, Mr. King, PM; Mr. Macdonnell, Cons.

\textsuperscript{1950} The bill moved through the Senate with no Senator offering any debate. The instruments were then forwarded to London for the King’s signature on 16 August 1947. Of note the title “Emperor of India” was stroked out “so that historians who may be so inclined will still be able to understand [the] sense of
The Big Three deposited their ratifications on 15 September and Canada followed four days later, simultaneously depositing the instruments of ratification at Paris and Moscow, thereby bringing them into force. The next step proposed by St. Laurent was to put a resolution before the House of Commons authorizing the government to take the necessary measures to bring the treaties into effect. The question was sent to committee for consideration and brought to a vote a few weeks later when the first draft of the bill to give it statutory authority was read. Procedural delays meant the matter was still not resolved by the spring of 1948. It should have been a routine matter, however, the opposition in the House of Commons used it as an opportunity to criticize the government. It also remained unclear to some MPs why the resolution and then a bill was required to implement the treaties. During the discussion of the proposal St. Laurent had to educate them on constitutional principles. Once Canada ratified them the government was obligated to follow the terms of the treaties. Unlike in the US where a treaty once ratified imposes obligations on American citizens, in Canada the government could bind itself to a treaty, but no obligations accrued to Canadian citizens until it is legislated. He also might have noted that failure to do this meant a delay in returning to normal relations and trade.

Thomas L. Church wondered why if Canada had been at “peace” with these countries for several years had it taken so long to raise the matter of putting them into effect? He also doubted that Canada should be putting them into effect, since the time the treaties were negotiated, he said “they have become Soviet satellite countries. Finland is a Soviet satellite.” Was Canada considering opening diplomatic offices in these countries? If so he thought it ill-advised since “These countries are Soviet police states; that is all they are. They are absolutely under the control of this dictator country.” The ever-vocal Conservative MP, Jean Pouliot questioned the whole process by which Canada declared war on Finland and the other countries. He thought it was inappropriate that parliament had not been
recalled, since “during that brief period of time, shortly after the adjournment, Canada declared war on five countries. And still we call ourselves a peace-loving nation.” He was wrong on one aspect, since Canada only issued 4 declarations of war at that time. Furthermore, he claimed, “Not only that, but what business did we have to declare war on Roumania, Hungary and Finland? We did not send a man to fight them. We did not send a plane.” The only reason we were at war with them was because Britain declared war against them he thought. He did not seem to remember the rationale was to help an ally, but now that the Cold War was under way this was conveniently overlooked.

Illustrating the dissonance surrounding the Canadian state of war with countries like Finland, Pouliot related a story. During the war he “telephoned the Department of External Affairs and asked one of the higher-ups to tell me with what countries we were at war. He replied, ‘Wait a minute, I am not sure about that. You had better ask somebody else.’” Pouliot called two or three others and said, “I did not know with whom I was at war and I could not be told by the experts.” The only reason Bulgaria was not included he guessed was because these experts had forgotten too. He found the discussion of international affairs “childish” since the war with Finland and the others was merely “a theoretical war, a war on paper. How is it that a peace-loving nation decides to declare war and do nothing afterwards?” The whole matter of the resolution was pointless because it did nothing for Canada’s status and the countries involved would only see “Canada as a satellite of England just as Ukraine, Roumania, Hungary and Finland—although Finland not so much—are supposed to be satellites of Russia.” He went on to press for precise details on the role Canada played in the drafting of the treaties and what contributions were made at the peace conference. St. Laurent reminded him those sorts of things should have been asked last year when the treaties were presented to the House of Commons. After some additional questions and debate about the financial implications of the resolution and bill, and the ability of Canadians to make war claims, the motion was passed, and the bill moved on to the second reading.

---

1956 Ibid., Mr. Pouliot, Cons.
1957 Ibid.
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Finland was mentioned again during the second reading. Church identified the historic use of “slave labour” in the “Arctic” by the Russians and the Soviets and was concerned that Hungarians, Romanians were suffering this fate and possibly Finns who “have always loved liberty and freedom” might soon follow.\footnote{Canada, \textit{House of Commons Debates}. 14 May 1948, 3945, Mr. Church, Cons.} Canada he thought did not have a coherent policy regarding Soviet satellite countries and did not see how Canada’s signature on the treaties and the implementation of them helped these oppressed peoples, considering Canada had so little input into their formulation. Another Conservative, Gordon Graydon, though he recognized the needed to implement the treaties, during the third reading reminded his fellow MPs that Hungary and Romania had fallen to communism and made Soviet satellites. Finland was “a country with a pretty checkered career since 1939. That checkered career has not always been of her own making, but Finland today certainly is not the envy of any nation of the world, in view of the obvious pressure which has been brought to bear by her powerful neighbour the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.”\footnote{Ibid., 3947, Mr. Graydon, Cons.} To which he added that “Finland must be congratulated on standing out as long as humanly possible against the great pressure that has been exercised against her.”\footnote{Ibid.} This was an allusion to the Agreement of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance which had been signed between Finland and the Soviet Union in April. It came about not long after the communist coup in Czechoslovakia. Given the pessimism that surrounded perceptions of affairs in Eastern Europe in the West, it was feared that the friendship treaty was at worst a precursor to a similar fate for Finland or at best simply signaled that Finland was being drawn into a closer Soviet orbit.\footnote{In the West it sometimes referred to as the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance. Bellquist 1949; Singleton 1998, 182–184.} However Finland, Graydon continued, “is a small nation right beside one of the major powers of the world. For that reason, of course, we may expect almost anything to happen, having in mind what has happened in other states coming within the Russian orbit.”\footnote{Canada, \textit{House of Commons Debates}. 14 May 1948, 3947, Mr. Graydon, Cons.} There was at this time considerable international attention to the upcoming Finnish national election in July 1948, where either an electoral victory or a coup might lead to a communist regime in Finland. The point behind this exchange from Graydon’s perspective was these countries in the Soviet orbit were not free and independent and Finland might soon join them. Under those circumstances Graydon thought Canada should look at a
different style of relations with those states than existed in the past; implying a more hard-line approach towards communism everywhere. St. Laurent replied that it was unfortunate that communist totalitarian governments had seized power in Hungary and Romania, but left it assumed and unsaid that Finland might follow a similar fate and that in any case it changed nothing with regard to the treaties.1967

The exchanges and opinions expressed in the Canadian parliament during the process of implementing the Finnish peace treaty, were mainly from opposition MPs who wanted to embarrass the government or express their views on international affairs. This was because as some of them noted there were few opportunities in the Canadian parliament to debate foreign policy. This of course was how Prime Minister King preferred things, since by limiting debate on foreign policy and international affairs he could avoid controversies that would divide the country.1968 Finland was rarely mentioned in the Canadian parliament, except in passing in relation to issues of immigration and trade. What is remarkable about the debate over the implementation of the peace treaty was that MPs passed observation on the Finnish situation. The concern shown over Finland’s relationship with the Soviet Union were in fact shared by many MPs on the government side, including St. Laurent, Pearson, and others, as well as some of the staff at External Affairs.

With the closing of the debate on the bill and the granting of royal assent the treaties became law in Canada.1969 A proclamation was issued on 11 May 1948 announcing the end of the state of war. Although normal relations with Finland had technically resumed when the treaty was ratified, this was the final step in the peace process with Finland.1970

Conclusion

The peace process with the fulfilment of the armistice terms, the Paris peace conference and the ratification of the treaty demonstrated the resilience of the Canadian images of Finland and Finns. Enemy images had pushed positive images of Finland and Finns to the background. From the armistice until the peace

1967 A similar view that Finland was among those countries penetrated by the Soviet Union was expressed by Senator J.W. de B. Farris in response to the throne speech in February 1948. Canada 1948d, 156.
conference there was a sense that Finland had to atone for siding with Nazi Germany. Therefore, when Finland faithfully implemented the terms of the armistice this was seen as a positive move towards rehabilitation and showed a desire to break with the past. In this the actions of statesmen such as Paasikivi and his desire to build friendly relations with the Soviets, the preservation of democratic institutions, and the institution of the war guilt trials were signs Finland was breaking with the past. Despite this, Finns could still appear stubborn because so many ordinary citizens could not grasp the concept of Finland’s war guilt and seemed to not understand that the Continuation War and the policies the government followed form 1941–1944 was not a separate defensive war, but rather one of aggression. From this perspective the enemy image justified in the minds of staff at External Affairs the loss of territory, reparation payments and other restrictions on Finland imposed by the armistice and the peace treaty that followed.

Always in the background was the apprehension that somehow Finland would be dominated by the Soviet Union or lose her independence. In this perception the Finnish communists were the real enemy. The positive aspects of the Canadian image of Finland suggested there might be a future for Finland. The residue of the positive image can be discerned in the favourable impressions of men like Paasikivi and the hope leaders like him offered for Finnish democracy. Even which the punishing weight of reparations, the hardworking image seemed to suggest that Finland would meet its obligations. The stubborn image could also add to this. On one hand it could be seen in the reluctance to accept war guilt and the continued anti-Russian sentiment, but it showed that Finns would fight for their values, for freedom, democracy, and national independence. It complemented the revived image of Finland as an outpost of European civilization and a borderland resisting totalitarian Asian influences.

Despite this, at the Paris Peace Conference the enemy image remained the official stance. This was seen when Canada admitted that Finland should make reparations for the damage done through aggression against the Soviet Union. Yet there was a sense the amount of reparations was unfair, and that Finland might not be able to fulfil the obligation and thereby justify Soviet dominance, interference in the domestic affairs and even absorption of the country. There was a clear fear that Finland would be by the force of circumstance become a Soviet satellite if it did not lose its independence completely. This fear was shared by many Canadians as shown during the debates and discussions of the peace treaty during the ratification process.
There was nothing that Canada could do to prevent Finland from drifting into the Soviet orbit. The only things that could be done to help was to give Finland connections with the West by re-establishing normal diplomatic relations and trade. The concluding of the peace process opened up the possibility of Finland and Canada accrediting ministers to each other’s capital and a return to normal trade relations. There were a number of other concerns relating to Finland such as immigration, war claims and the repatriation of enemy alien seamen, which the government focused on before steps would be taken to formally restore normal relations.
12 Aftermath

The peace treaty ended the state of war and in a technical sense reopened normal relations between Canada and Finland. To do that would require the accreditation of representatives in Ottawa and Helsinki, but in the meantime, there were other aspects of the Canadian-Finnish relationship which needed to be normalized and returned to the status that had existed before the war. Immigration was still restricted by the 1931 immigration regulations and the prohibition on Finns from migrating to Canada was further inhibited by enemy alien status. Restrictions on Finnish migration to Canada were gradually reduced until 1947 when Finns were placed on the same footing as other desirable categories of immigrants. With the Finnish people facing all sorts of hardships, Finnish-Canadians were eager to send parcels to friends and family and contribute to larger scale aid programs. These efforts were initially hampered by the fact that mail service to Finland had been terminated and trading with the enemy regulations continued to apply until the peace treaty had been ratified. Resumption of trade and the opening of consulates would have to wait. Articles of the treaty provided mechanisms for Canadians to make war claims against Finland and required Canada to return seized enemy property. Finland also suffered its share of war damage and economic dislocation. Peace meant there was the problem of war claims and the return of interned enemy aliens and merchant seamen to resolve.

12.1 Finnish-Canadians and Immigration

At the end of the war the Department of the Secretary of State, which was responsible for citizenship matters produced a report on Finns in Canada. It identified the two main Finnish groups as the communists and the anti-communists. As with any community there were those who had political or ideological commitments, but also those who did not; those who were religious and those who did not have any religious conviction or were atheist. There was a pronounced antagonism between the two main groups. The communists even though they were considered a small minority of all Finns in Canada, “exercise, notwithstanding, a controlling or at least an equal voice in directing the life and affairs of Finns in Canada” and present themselves as representing the Finnish-Canadian community to other Canadians. 1971 As “internationalists” the communists were strong

supporters of the Soviet Union. The FOC had many communists among its members. On the other hand, the anti-communists as nationalists are anti-Soviet and “with many of them the hate of Russia being quite intense.”1972 The anti-communists were not well organized and lacked unity, except when it came to love for Finland and hatred of Russia. The Organization of Loyal Finns was not very active and failed to capitalize on the popular sympathy generated by the Winter War. Whereas the communists were intensely interested in Canadian politics, the anti-communists were mainly apathetic in this regard.

During the war, the FOC was most active after its ban was lifted in 1944. The women’s auxiliaries knitted garments for Canadians soldiers. The FOC urged workers to avoid absenteeism, donate blood, support the Red Cross, buy Victory Loans, and participate in salvage drives. This work was gradually shifted towards the Canadian Aid to Russia Fund. They also encouraged Finns to apply for citizenship through naturalization. Beside them the anti-communists were “sincerely and fully loyal to Canada.”1973 They supported “real democracy” and “for this reason most of them condemn the actions of the Soviet Union and cannot understand how the Western Allies could have abandoned Finland to her fate.”1974 At the same time they held the unsympathetic position where “They justify Finland’s collaboration with Germany, quite apart from any admiration for Germans or Hitlerism, which is non-existent among them. Therefore, the spirit among these elements upon the victorious conclusion of the war in Europe for the Allies is one of depression and misgivings for the future.”1975 Notwithstanding this, they were able to be loyal citizens and render service to the Canadian war effort. Canadian private aid to Finland during the Winter War was largely the product of their efforts, but when the “prevailing contingencies became impossible, these societies have been most active in rendering aid to the Canadian Red Cross and the British War victims.”1976

Written as the Cold War began the report to an extent rehabilitated the image of Finns in Canada. Conservative Finns were presented as the true representatives of the Finnish community and their inherent anti-communism made them into loyal Canadians. Socialist Finns, despite their noteworthy contributions to Canada’s war effort were suspect no matter what shade of Red they were. They were always under
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the suspicion that their true loyalty lay with Moscow and not Canada. Radical Finns once again became the subject of police surveillance and harassment both official and unofficial and were regarded as a potential security threat.

The peace treaty also led to a change in Canadian immigration policy. In May 1947, the Cabinet Committee on Immigration Policy recommended that once the peace treaties with Finland, Hungary, Italy, and Romania had been ratified that the nationals of these countries should no longer be considered enemy aliens for immigration purposes. The new policy was approved on 31 July and the immigration regulations were amended. Once the peace treaty was ratified, immigration would also be open to those who had served in the Finnish armed forces, so long as they were not listed as a war criminal. Finns could now immigrate to Canada under the normal rules.1977

After the war, with the need for reconstruction of the economy and the reestablishment of military personnel Canada was slow to open the doors to immigrants. The same restrictions which had been put in place in 1931 remained essentially in effect until 1946, when the regulations expand the definition of family members who could be sponsored to include orphaned nieces and nephews, brothers, sisters, and parents. That same year the Canadian Citizenship Act created a distinct Canadian citizenship, separate from British nationality. Canadians were no longer British subjects. As of 1 January 1947, anyone who was considered a citizen under previous legislation and regulations automatically became Canadian citizens, such as those Finns who had become naturalized Canadians. 1978

Coinciding with the opening up of immigration to Finns, the classes of admissible people were broadened to include farm workers, miners, loggers, and agriculturalists that had a Canadian relative even if they could not afford to start a farm. Canada also began accepting its first groups of displaced persons from


1978 Until 1 January 1947 Canadians were a class of British subjects. People born in Canada or any British territory were deemed British subjects. A foreign woman marrying a male British subject received that status and a female British subject marrying a foreign man lost her status. Foreign born people who met the residency requirements could become British subjects by the administrative process of naturalization. The British subject sub-category of “Canadian citizen” was created by the Immigration Act, 1910. A Canadian citizen was a British subject who was born in Canada, naturalized or other British subject who had “domiciled” or lived in Canada for 3 years. The Canadian Nationals Act, 1921, created the separate status of “Canadian national” which included Canadian citizens and extended this status to their wives and children who had not yet landed in Canada. The Canadian Citizen Act, 1946 gave Canadians a citizenship in a distinct category separate from that of British subjects. Kelly and Trebilcock 2010, 319.
Europe at this time. In this period the Finns who came to Canada were not refugees. They were in general not sympathetic towards communism or the Soviet Union. Many of them had fought in the Winter War and the Continuation War. When they arrived in Canada, they did however, support the co-operative stores and credit unions, but were primarily interested in learning English and quickly assimilating. New churches and cultural clubs were formed. The clubs were in theory apolitical and open to all, but it was clear communists were not welcome.

The Gouzenko Affair also occurred in 1946, exposing a Soviet spy ring in Canada. The Red scare continued to escalate into 1948 with international tensions caused by the Berlin blockade, the coup in Czechoslovakia, and Soviet pressure on Finland. Security screening of prospective immigrants by the RCMP at Canadian visa offices overseas was introduced in 1946 as a result. The intent was to give preference to admitting to Canada, immigrants who were conservative and weed out the communists, but it added a considerable administrative burden and delay in processing applications. The problem for Finns was the nearest Canadian office was in Stockholm.

In January 1948, the services of the British Legation in Helsinki were offered to “examine” prospective Finnish immigrants and issue visas on behalf of Canada. J.D. Foote at the Canadian legation in Stockholm replied he thought the permission of authorities in Canada would still be needed to grant a visa, but that “I know my government will be pleased, as you say, there are many Finnish Communists who desire to go to Canada and it is this type of person in particular we are most desirous of keeping out.”

Canadian immigration officials were certainly interested in accepting this offer to carefully screen Finnish applications. In the meantime, in May the Canadian cabinet considered the possibility that there might be numerous Finnish anti-communist refugees seeking asylum in Canada. Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent in his capacity as the SSEA thought it likely this would occur if the Soviets gained complete control of the country by a communist victory in the

1980 Vasiliadis 1989, 208, 212; Allen 1954, 93.
upcoming election or by some military action. Till that occurred Finns would have to apply under the normal immigration rules.1983

External Affairs later in the year effectively quashed the idea of the British issuing visas for Canada. Finland would be treated like Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, and Greece, except that Finns would go to Stockholm to be examined by Canadian officials, because, “Finland is not considered as being among the so-called ‘iron curtain’ countries and nationals of Finland may be dealt with as the other countries mentioned above.”1984 Finland had weathered the storm through the summer of 1948, there were no masses of refugees coming from the country and there was no need to treat Finns differently. Political screening was to say the least problematic and it would be difficult to say who was a dangerous radical and who was a progressive social democrat. It was doubtful the British Labour government would agree to have its officials conduct ideological screening. A similar proposal in the 1920s was abandoned for this reason. No doubt for External Affairs it was also a matter of appearances. In places like Finland when necessary Canada would use British diplomatic staff, but the department had been working to define Canada separate from Britain. It was perhaps another reason Canada would eventually need its own diplomatic mission for Finland.

12.2 Aid to Finland Again and UNRRA

With the war over, once again there was a need to aid Finland. The country had suffered war damage, especially in Lapland and the north, faced economic disruption and had to help thousands of refugees from the ceded territories. After the armistice Finnish-Canadians waited for news from Finland and the opportunity to send letters, parcels, and aid to friends and family. Postal restrictions were eased, on 24 February 1945, but only letters were allowed and mail to Finland at this time was still censored.1985 It was possible to send a parcel via the United States, but this required contact with a person willing to forward them to Finland. Another way to get around the Canadian regulations was to support the Religious Society of Friends, otherwise known as the Quakers, who established a mission for relief and rehabilitation in “middle Finland” and Lapland. This was done by sending money

1985 Mail Service 1945.
to either the United Finnish Relief, Inc., or the various Help Finland groups in the US.1986

Not until a few months into 1945 did individuals and groups formally ask the Canadian government if it was possible to send aid directly. However, the Trading With the Enemy Regulations prevented individuals and organizations from sending aid to help Finland deal with the food shortage after the armistice. Former Vice Consul Kingsley Graham in May asked External Affairs if the aid group he represented could use the $20,000 that had been raised during 1939 and 1940 to buy and ship wheat and oats. Canada had those commodities in the quantities desired, but the request was denied due to Finland’s technical status as an enemy country.1987 When the St. Lawrence Flour Mills Company of Montreal was approached by their pre-war Finnish agents on 8 June 1945, for a shipment of flour, the request was again refused by the Minister of Trade and Commerce because the regulations still applied to Finland which was regarded as “enemy territory.”1988 Graham again raised the question of shipping items to Finland in July. He approached External Affairs on behalf of some Finnish nationals and naturalized Finnish-Canadians who wanted to send parcels to their family and friends but found they could not ship them to Finland. They had gathered some boxes of clothing and “comforts” which were badly needed in the homeland, which was facing “a great deal of hardship” and the warm clothing would be needed in the fall and winter.1989 Graham pointed out that similar parcels could be mailed from Britain and that the US treated Finland as neutral territory permitting care packages to be sent. Graham and his clients were frustrated with the situation and wondered why Canada did not allow something similar. The response he received was simply that, “normal relations between Finland and Canada have not yet been restored.”1990

The Department of Trade and Commerce unlike their colleagues at External Affairs, found the situation incongruous. With the case of the St. Lawrence Flour Mills orders Finland was prepared to pay in US dollars, something which Canada needed to help its balance of payments situation. Canada’s interest lay in the restoration of international trade as soon as possible and the legalistic stance of
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External Affairs was a barrier. All the more significant was the fact Finland was facing a food shortage and needed aid in the form clothing and other necessities. Though there were other parts of Europe, Asia, and Africa that faced famine, the situation in Finland was desperate enough that the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) was providing some assistance to that country. Indirectly then, Canada as a member of UNRRA was aiding Finland anyway.

Due to the easing of restrictions on mail and communications with Finland, in August 1945 the Loyal Finns were pleased to learn that it was now permitted to send parcels to relatives and friends. At the end of October, the group was raising funds for general relief in Finland. Antti Hyppönen stressed this was important, since many Finns read in the “communist” paper *Vapaus* that some of the funds raised by socialist Finns were used to operate communist printing presses in Finland. It was also alarming that the communists had been pressing for government control of all newspapers. Funds raised in Canada for Finland could serve to counter this propaganda. The Loyal Finns were seeking authorization for this activity, since they were a registered charity, but not a registered war charity. External Affairs referred the matter to the War Charities Division of the Department of National War Services, but there was little that could be done given the restrictions which were still in place. Finns of every political orientation wanted to help. In fact, three Finnish Canadian organizations, the FOC, the Loyal Finns and the Toronto Finnish Advancement Association had each applied for permits to raise funds as war charities. Because of Finland’s enemy status each application was denied.

By November 1945, the postal restrictions were removed, and this unleashed a flood of packages destined for Finland, since many people had been saving them since 1941. Personal parcels offered a way around the trade regulations, however, there was a weight restriction of 11 pounds on each package. Typical packages contained coffee, sugar, candy, especially chewing gum, tobacco, new and used clothing, fabric, and sewing supplies. These came spontaneously from individuals and through more organized group efforts by the Red Cross, the Canadian Save the

1992 On Canada and UNRRA see Armstrong-Reid and Murray 2008.
Children Fund, Godmother Clubs, sewing circles, the Finnish War Aid Association of Sudbury, the Finland Ladies Aid organization at Kirkland Lake and so on. The aid went to numerous organizations requesting help, such as the Onnela Orphanage, the children’s hospital in Oulu, and war invalids. The Loyal Finns tended to support conservative organizations like the Mannerheim League for Child Welfare with its “War Orphan Committee” and “God Mother Committee,” while the FOC tended to support working class organizations in Finland. The Finnish postal service was overwhelmed by the volume of parcels from North America but adapted quickly to distribute them. The problem was that this ad hoc form of aid tended to overlook the Finns most in need in the devastated areas and refugees.1995

Kingsley Graham continued to apply pressure on the government to allow large scale fund raising for Finnish aid to occur. The Department of National War Services agreed to compromise. There would be one group granted a permit to raise funds, but it had to be neutral and represent all Finnish-Canadians, so it could present a united front. The problem was no such group existed, so a new one, the Canadian Finland Aid Society was formed on 6 March 1946, with representatives from various groups. External Affairs was asked about the “suitability” of the people, mostly Finns, who had declared their support from Sudbury, Toronto, Montreal, Timmins, and Copper Cliff. There were no objections raised.1996 The RCMP, however, kept an eye on the activities of the group. The proposed aim would be to raise funds to buy medicine and medical supplies and ship them to Finland via the Red Cross, which would then turn them over to the Suomen Huolto. To avoid any negative publicity, they could only advertise the fund raising in Finnish language newspapers.

To avoid duplication of effort regarding relief for Finland, War Services was hesitant to approve a visit by Dr. Heikki Waris, representing the Suomen Huolto.1997 He was then in the US on a speaking tour and wanted to come to Canada in May 1946. Escott Reid cautioned, “This fund is operating under definite limitations in this country and difficulties might arise if Dr. Waris were to make a trip across Canada in the interests of Finnish relief.”1998 The fear was that he would try to solicit aid directly for Suomen Huolto. Waris did not intend to appeal for funds, but

only wanted to speak to Finnish groups about conditions in Finland. Since the Canadian Finland Aid Society agreed to take Waris under their auspices he was permitted entry to Canada.\footnote{1999 Reid for USSEA to Director of Immigration, Attention Mr. Baldwin, 30 April 1946; Jolliffe to USSEA, Attention Mr. Sicotte, 1 May 1946, LAC, Ibid.}

The goal was $20,000, but in the first year alone $76,000 was raised and by the time it ceased operation in December 1947 over $100,000 was donated. The money went towards buying medicine, clothing, shoes, wool, and grain. This aid was certainly welcome, but as Lindström notes, this only amounted to about $2.50 per Finnish-Canadian over a two-year period, which was hardly an outstanding performance. The problem she notes was despite the official unified front, it was hard for the various Finnish groups to trust each other. The administration of the fund was highly centralized and Toronto centric. More Finns preferred to send their own private parcels, which allowed them to see the direct results when the grateful recipients wrote to thank them.\footnote{2000 Lindström 2000a, 240–246.}

As important as humanitarian aid was, at this time Finland urgently needed export credits or loans for post-war reconstruction and relief. Finnish industries to a great extent relied on imported raw and semi-processed materials to produce items for domestic consumption and export. Domestic agriculture did not produce sufficient quantities and variety of foodstuffs to meet Finnish requirements and like Britain, Finland needed imports to provide an adequate food supply for its population. Funds generated from the export of forest products tended to provide for a balance of payments by earning the necessary foreign exchange to finance these imports. The war disrupted trade patterns and until the summer of 1944 Finland had been dependant on Germany for these requirements. With the end of the fighting it would be some time before normal trade patterns would resume.\footnote{2001 The Finnish government had three economic goals in this postwar period: make war reparations payments, the resettlement of Karelian refugees and demobilized veterans and increasing the level of production and standard of living. Pihkala 1999.}

During the latter part of 1945 and into 1947 the Finnish economy faced collapse because of these trade difficulties. The country faced serious food shortages and malnutrition, especially among the very young became common.\footnote{2002 United States Department of Agriculture, Famine Emergency Committee, Hoover Reports, 9 April 1946, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 3822, File 8740-40.}

Export credits and loans were the logical first remedy for this situation. To stave off a crisis short term direct aid was required. One potential source of aid was UNRRA. Created in the latter part of 1943 UNRRA was designed to provide relief

\footnote{1999 Reid for USSEA to Director of Immigration, Attention Mr. Baldwin, 30 April 1946; Jolliffe to USSEA, Attention Mr. Sicotte, 1 May 1946, LAC, Ibid. 2000 Lindström 2000a, 240–246. 2001 The Finnish government had three economic goals in this postwar period: make war reparations payments, the resettlement of Karelian refugees and demobilized veterans and increasing the level of production and standard of living. Pihkala 1999. 2002 United States Department of Agriculture, Famine Emergency Committee, Hoover Reports, 9 April 1946, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 3822, File 8740-40.}
and assist in agricultural and industrial rehabilitation in war ravaged areas. Eventually 48 governments, including Canada signed onto the program as contributing countries. Each non-enemy occupied country agreed to give 1% of the national income to the administration, 90% of which would be used to purchase relief supplies in the donating country. In addition to the funds provided by the Canadian government, UNRRA purchased a wide range of supplies in Canada using the funds donated by other countries. Canada and other countries then exempted goods destined for UNRRA from customs duties and excise taxes. The intent was not to disrupt existing trade arrangements or destabilize the domestic markets of donor countries. Relief and rehabilitation supplies were to be offered for sale by the recipient government to its citizens and all or part of the proceeds were then to be used for further relief and rehabilitation in the receiving country and in the process, help to revive economic activity.

Its first goal was to provide emergency assistance to the hundreds of millions of people of liberated territories where the economy had been left devastated by the war. Once the immediate crisis had been ameliorated, UNRRA would contribute towards rehabilitation of the economy in the affected area. The programs offered by UNRRA were therefore limited in scope. Such humanitarian activity was in the self-interest of the nations involved, because it was thought peace could only be maintained when international relations and trade could occur in a more stable environment.

Countries requiring UNRRA assistance had to demonstrate their need and the inability to pay for the needed supplies and services. Regarding the latter, critical foreign exchange assets and the source of those assets were the key factors considered, but no country would be expected to acquire an enduring foreign exchange deficit when it came to relief and rehabilitation. Finland submitted a memorandum outlining their reconstruction and relief needs to UNRRA in early November 1945. The decision of UNRRA was that limited emergency aid only would be provided. Any reconstruction Finland wanted to accomplish would have to be financed by other means. Also the aid had to be primarily used in the
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northern areas of the country devastated during the fight to expel German forces from the country. In total $2,450,000 US worth of relief was delivered to Finland by UNRRA, which for distribution was fed into the efficiently operating system set up by Suomen Huolto.2007

Another aspect of Canada’s indirect UNRRA aid to Finland came in the form of motor vehicles. The issue was first made public during the debate in April 1946 over a Canadian loan to the UK.2008 The opposition Conservative MPs were criticizing the government for not getting enough in return for the loans Canada was granting to the UK and questioning the ability of Canada’s negotiators and advisors. The loan effectively meant Canada was supporting the Sterling Area and that would hobble the ability to trade with countries outside the area. The loan of course was necessary to help support the British economy as it underwent reconstruction, but the opposition claimed Canada was already helping about 13 countries. Conservative MP Jean Pouliot thought Canada should look out for Canadians first and not foreigners or strangers. In Canada there was apparently a shortage of trucks for farming, logging, and other industries. He was shocked to learn “that Finland, a country with which Canada has been at war without a single soldier there, now receives Ford trucks built in Canada.”2009 This was especially troublesome he thought because Canada had yet to make peace with Finland.

The government did not respond directly to this, but later in the day J.A. MacKinnon the Minister of Trade and Commerce reported on Canada’s contributions to UNRRA. He explained that as of the end of March 1946 Canada had given $154 million which had to be expended through the purchase of Canadian goods, but 10% had been reserved as a free fund that UNRRA could spend anywhere in the world. The Canadian funds along with additional funds from other countries were used by UNRRA to buy in Canada food, supplies, farm machinery, clothing, textiles, medical supplies, soap, and trucks among other things which were then provided as aid. Among the questions fielded by the minister was one from Pouliot asking how many automobiles and trucks had been provided to each country as part of Canada’s share? The minister said he would look into it.2010

The criticism of the British loan continued the next day, with a Liberal MP questioning his own government’s policy and taking issue with the fact that despite the Ottawa Agreements and other trade deals, he argued Britain did not do much to help

2008 On the loan negotiations see Mackenzie 1982.
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Canadian producers. So why should Canada help Britain? While Canada was having trouble finding markets Britain bought bacon from Denmark, wheat from Romania and now if it suited Britain to buy pulpwood from Norway and Finland, “she will buy them in Norway and Finland and not care for Canada.”

There was another question in February 1947 about the disposal of Canadian vehicles by the War Assets Corporation, regarding how many trucks and what countries were involved. Only now did the Minister of Trade and Commerce identify that of the 6,291 military trucks Canada sold to foreign governments and UNRRA, 200 surplus military vehicles, from the stock in Britain, had been purchased by UNRRA for use in Finland. The official history of UNRRA reports that 101 Canadian trucks were provided of the 3/4 ton and 1 1/2-ton classifications. They were among the first aid from the organization to arrive in Finland and were essential to distributing later aid shipments. It was a small token compared to the massive effort Canada provided to UNRRA as a whole. Like other aspects of the UNRRA program the Canadian portion contributed to the overall ability of the organization to help countries like Finland. Since they were Chevrolet and Ford military trucks, American brand names, and provided by UNRRA most Finns would not have known that some of the vehicles delivering aid in Finland were in fact Canadian.

For Canada, and likely most of the other member nations of UNRRA, the situation in Finland though poor, was overshadowed by the greater need in other parts of Europe, India, China, and Africa. To avoid any negative publicity about helping an ex-enemy nation, the Canadian government down played any aid that went to Finland. Nevertheless, through UNRRA, Canada did play an indirect role in providing emergency aid to Finland, since everything was contributed to a common pool. Indeed, Canada’s part in UNRRA was significant. As Minister of National Defence Brooke Claxton said about UNRRA and military relief in his report on the Paris Peace Conference, “we had sought to assist all nations and all

---
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peoples on the path to economic reconstruction and recovery. After the US and UK, Canada’s contribution was the third largest, which by the end of 1947 amounted to $138,738,739 in US dollars. In terms of the total relief burden, in addition to UNRRA and such agencies as the Combined Food Board, Canada provided 1/5 of the 10 million tons of food distributed worldwide and 25% of all relief. Canada’s contribution was acknowledged by Herbert Hoover, the former president of the United States who had been appointed in February 1946 to head the US government Famine Emergency Committee. The committee had been formed to act in an advisory capacity for the direction of American aid and help coordinate international efforts. Through the first part of 1946 he had traveled to various parts of the world surveying the crisis and encouraging countries to contribute aid. He chose to give his final report from Ottawa as a “complement to the Canadian people.” The report was broadcast by the CBC on 28 June 1946. In his introductory remarks Prime Minister King acknowledged that Hoover has been known as one of the foremost humanitarians since the First World War. To Finns the name Hoover has a special meaning since during the aftermath of the civil war and during the Winter War he had played a key role in providing aid to Finland.

12.3 War Claims and Enemy Property

Even before the peace treaty negotiations had been completed, early in October 1946 the British government took the initiative regarding the settlement of war claims against Finland and the other former German satellite countries. The British
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provided Canada with a copy of the guidance issued by their own Trading With the Enemy Department. They did this to help Canada draft up its own procedures and to attain some degree of Commonwealth uniformity in handling war claims. Canada had yet to consider how to handle claims, so this proved helpful and the Canadian rules were “copied mutatis mutandis from the instructions prepared by the British authorities.” Uniformity was desirable to avoid complications, since Canada had no representative in Finland, it was presumed the United Kingdom would represent Canadian interests. Articles 11 and 12 of the armistice and the economic clauses of the peace treaty stipulated that Finland would return property owned by United Nations nationals which had been seized as enemy property. If the property could not be returned or had been damaged as a result of the war, the owners were to be indemnified and compensated. A similar provision was included in the peace treaty for the return of property owned by Finnish nationals, although Finland waived any right to make any claims for losses caused by the war, including ships seized by the Allies.

As this applied to Canada, property claims could be made by those who were “Canadian citizens” on the date of the signing of the armistice, a person who was a British national on that date and resident in Canada, and a business incorporated under Canadian law. A claimant was expected to make their own efforts to have restitution made first and if unsuccessful could then make a claim. Those wishing to make a claim could apply directly to the UK office handling the matter or register in Canada with the Custodian of Enemy Property. It was up to the claimant to provide proof of ownership when filing. In either case the British authorities would forward the claim to the British representative in Finland who would pass it on to the Finnish government. Claims were limited to loss or damage to real property, but claims for commercial debts, bank balances, securities, rents, etc., would have to wait until later when the policy and procedures for this type of loss were formalized with Finland. Canadians were formally informed of the right to apply for compensation through a notice in the Canada Gazette in January 1947.
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Despite this there was still some uncertainty at External Affairs on how this process would work. Having adopted the British policy wholesale in February 1947, it was realized afterwards the definition used regarding who was eligible to claim had left out one category of possible claimants. In Canada, a number of Finns had become naturalized Canadians after the armistice, and during the war it was possible they had been “treated as an enemy” under Finnish law, which under the peace treaty would entitle them to make a claim for losses.\textsuperscript{2029} It would be necessary to differentiate if the person was just treated as an enemy in fact or under some law in force. Another problem was caused by the option of applying for compensation directly through British authorities, was that the Canadian government would have no record of the claim. For claims filed in Canada, External Affairs would have to ask British authorities if they had already given assistance to the claimant in order to prevent duplication of effort.\textsuperscript{2030} In any case, in the spring of 1947 when all this was under consideration in Ottawa and London, the Finns were not yet in a position to pass legislation or set policy on how the compensation process would work.\textsuperscript{2031}

Aware of the room for confusion and duplication of effort the British Foreign Office in June proposed establishing a Commonwealth committee to consider issues that might arise. High Commissioner Norman Robertson thought, “although it is open to the Dominions Governments to take their own line vis à vis foreign Governments, and not follow the view of the United Kingdom Government, it will of no doubt, be of great value first to discuss variations of view and to appreciate the effects they may have upon their claims being considered at the same time.”\textsuperscript{2032} E.R. Hopkins of the Legal Division at External Affairs agreed, a committee would be useful, since he has had to make several requests for clarification of the UK interpretation of the relevant sections of the peace treaty and it seemed likely each signatory to the treaty will have to enter into agreements with Finland and the other former enemy countries on the procedures to be followed.\textsuperscript{2033} His colleague R.G. Riddell, thought it “would serve a very useful purpose,” but “Canada would not

\textsuperscript{2030} Hopkins for SSEA to HCCUK, No. 519, 18 March 1947, LAC, Ibid.
\textsuperscript{2032} Robertson, HCCUK to SSEA, No. 742, 2 June 1947, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 3873, File 9159-40.
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necessarily be bound by the findings of such a Committee.”2034 Riddell also thought it was important to avoid the image that the Commonwealth was working as a “bloc” and the meetings kept informal. He was in that comment suggesting the West as represented by the Commonwealth not present itself as a monolithic entity like the communist countries under the leadership of the Soviet Union and the Cominform (Communist Information Bureau) or the Eastern Bloc as it was increasingly referred to as. At the same time, he was also careful to assert Canada’s independence within the Commonwealth. These points became Canadian policy and were used in the qualified Canadian response to the Foreign Office supporting the proposal.2035 In the end the Foreign Office found there was no real interest in the idea among the other Dominions, but the other Dominions suggested that if necessary ad hoc meetings could occur to discuss any issues.2036

The issue of the nickel mines in Petsamo operated by INCO, which had been ceded to the USSR, was the post war claim which occupied the most attention of the Canadian government.2037 Because the property was owned by citizens of an Allied country compensation needed to be paid. A three-way protocol was worked out in October 1944, shortly after the armistice with Finland, between Canada, Britain, and the USSR establishing the amount to be paid.2038 It was agreed that the Soviet Union would pay the Canadian government $20 million in US dollars or the equivalent in gold, in equal instalments over 6 years.2039 The Canadian government acting as an intermediary would then transfer the money to INCO.2040

It should have been a straight forward process to settle the claim, since the Soviets by signing the protocol had accepted the responsibility to compensate the company. The first payment was received on schedule at the end of March 1945.2041 Thereafter payments arrived twice a year and were supposed to continue until the end of 1951. In February 1947, the Soviets asked that the protocol be revised. The
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2040 OIC, PC2551, 12 April 1945, LAC, RG2 A1a, Vol. 1885.
2041 $1,666,700 was sent to the Federal Reserve Bank in New York on 28 March 1945 and then transferred to the Bank of Canada. Ambassador of the USSR to Canada to Robertson, USSEA, 2 April 1945, LAC, RG19, Vol. 33, Boxes 33–34, File 101-108.
note from the Soviet Foreign Minister claimed that the payments for Petsamo were tied to the Finnish reparations schedule. Since the schedule for Finnish payments had been extended from 6 to 8 years, the payment schedule for Petsamo should also be adjusted.\textsuperscript{2042} The Canadian government did not hold the view the payments were connected to Finnish reparations, but explained that “in view of the general dislocation of economic conditions which has complicated and may continue to complicate the task of bringing the nickel mines into full operation” Canada was willing to co-operate and negotiate an amendment to the protocol.\textsuperscript{2043} The result was a supplemental protocol signed in September 1947 with a revised schedule of payments.\textsuperscript{2044} Only $8,333,500 of the compensation package had been paid so far and the remaining $11,666,500 was to be paid out in 10 instalments from October 1947 to December 1951.

The payments were received on time until October 1950, when the Soviets began to default. For reasons that were never made clear to Canadian authorities, in April 1950 the Soviets began trying to make payment in pounds sterling, converted to US dollars, rather than directly in US dollars as agreed in the protocol.\textsuperscript{2045} Though mildly irritated at the Soviet audacity at unilaterally trying to modify the protocol, because there was little that could be done other than oral protests, but the real problem was current British exchange restrictions would not permit the conversion of sterling to US dollars. So, the funds were only useful if INCO wanted to buy something from a Sterling Area country.\textsuperscript{2046} There were some sharp exchanges between Canadian and British officials over the exchange policy, but nothing changed. The protests did not alter the Soviet approach to the issue and the default carried on into 1953, when the final payment was eventually made in
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pounds sterling. INCO and Mond reached an agreement with the UK government to accept and use the money in Britain.2047

Connected with Petsamo was the claim made by the Custodis Canadian Chimney Company, for equipment valued at $17,735.92, left behind when the Finns were forced to withdraw from the region during the Winter War. The company had been contracted to erect a 500-foot reinforced concrete chimney for Petsamon Nikkeli OY. Construction was done by the end of October 1939 and the tools, forms, scaffolding, and leftover construction materials were being prepared for shipment when the Soviet-Finnish war interrupted the process.2048 After the Moscow Peace Treaty in 1940 the company had their engineer Walter Nordin investigate the whereabouts of the materials, so they could be returned. He concluded that the Red Army had either removed the stuff as war booty or in error. Nothing further was done until 1945 when the Soviets awarded the US parent company of Custodis the contract to rebuild the chimney. All that remained of the supplies abandoned at the end of 1939 were a few bags of hardware.2049

Consequently, in early March 1945 Custodis informed External Affairs of the loss and then requested the Canadian ambassador ask the Soviets what had happened to the material, with the proviso that at this point there was to be no suggestion of the Soviet government compensating the company if the material had been lost or destroyed. The Soviet reply later that year was that they had been unable to find any trace of the equipment. The Commissariat of Foreign Affairs thought it quite possible it had been removed by the Germans when they occupied the area.2050 A second request that the Canadian government look into this was made by the company in March 1946. The Canadian Ambassador, Dana Wilgress, said “I think no harm may come of further representations to the Soviet authorities even though they may result in a further refusal on their part to acknowledge any responsibility. The advantages will be to have on file a final refusal which may conceivably be of value in future negotiations concerning property claims and to have presented the Company's claim as fully as possible.”2051 The reply, which took
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over a year to come indicated “the competent Soviet organizations have for the second time made very through inquiries concerning the property of the “Custodis Canadian Chimney Company,” but these inquires have given no positive results.”2052 Nothing more could be done without further information such as the current exact location of the lost items, which it was up to the company to provide.

Although External Affairs accepted the company’s version of events, there were no grounds in this case to ask for compensation.2053 It would have been fruitless to make any claims in this situation since Canada was a neutral nation in relation to the Winter War. Under international law the enemy of a belligerent can regard the property of citizens of a neutral country in that belligerent country as enemy property. It was one of the “hazards” of owning property in another country in time of war. As a result, Canada could not make a claim for the loss of the chimney construction material because it was not covered under the terms of the Paris peace treaty and the loss occurred before Canada was at war with Finland.2054

The company was advised to submit a claim under the Finnish law which provided for claims by foreigners who suffered losses as a result of the transfer of Finnish territory to Soviet control, which it did in November 1947.2055 Thereafter External Affairs seems to have mislaid the file, only forwarding the claim to the Commonwealth Relations Office in January 1948. Now that this oversight was discovered by the officials in the department, it was learned the Commonwealth Relations Office chose not to forward the claim to Finland for processing because the Finnish compensation law only applied to foreigners who had served in the Finnish armed forces.2056 In fact the high commissioner’s office in London had made it clear the law only applied to foreigners who had served in the Finnish military in a dispatch sent to Ottawa in August 1947 outlining the background to the compensation law.2057 It was an oversight that should not have occurred because the department had reviewed the situation created by the Finnish law passed on 1
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June 1947. The review had been prompted by the haste required by the British request for details on any Canadian claims under the law. This was because the deadline to apply was set at 1 August, but the problem was the request was not received until mid-July. Canadian officials at External Affairs disliked working under relatively short time constraints and grumbled among themselves over the fact the Finns put them in this position, because it would mean legitimate claims might not be considered.\textsuperscript{2058} It was decided not to publish any official notice in the \textit{Canada Gazette} and Canadian newspapers because the information would not reach Canadians in time. The publicity already in the Canadian press announcing the new law was thought to be enough.\textsuperscript{2059} It is for this reason the department informed the Custodis that they might possibly make a claim under the Finnish law. Even though it would be made after the deadline, Canada would ask the Commonwealth Relations Office to raise it with Finnish authorities.\textsuperscript{2060} Of course all this amounted to nothing since the law did not apply. As it turned out, although some Canadians had served during the Winter War, there were no claimants under the compensation law from Canada.\textsuperscript{2061}

The company was advised there was no hope of compensation. The company would try periodically over the next couple of years to recover its losses. Though the department did its best to help, as L.B. Pearson later noted when deferring the company representative, the “question of the satisfaction of claims against the Soviet Union is vexatious.”\textsuperscript{2062} As far as External Affairs was concerned the matter was essentially closed, since the American parent company had accepted a contract to rebuild the chimney and had negotiated a fee that also effectively covered the Canadian affiliate’s losses.\textsuperscript{2063}

The Mond/INCO Petsamo nickel mine and related claims were the only major “war claim” issues Canada had to deal with. Aside from this there about 11 small claims made by Canadians for compensation for property, financial assets, and debts owned or owed to Finnish-Canadians or Finns in Canada. They amounted to
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\textsuperscript{2063} “Memorandum for Mr. Hopkins” by G.C. Langille, 18 May 1948, “Claim of Custodis Canadian Chimney Company for Equipment Lost in Finland,” LAC, Ibid.
roughly $7.7 million at the end of 1945 and were gradually settled by 1952.\textsuperscript{2064} For example the Banque Canadienne Nationale from Montreal made a claim for a client who appeared to be owed 236 markkaa deposited at the NordiskaForening Banken.\textsuperscript{2065} Finland was prepared to restore rights and provide compensation for these types of claims, but there was no provision in the peace treaty for how to handle money in bank deposits. According to External Affairs it was up to the depositor to communicate directly with the bank in Helsinki to protect their interests until such time as Finland clarified what to do.\textsuperscript{2066}

The other property issue left to be settled was the ships \textit{Ericus} and \textit{Carolus}. As Canadian officials had learned they were owned by a naturalized British subject, Sir Eric Ohlson, but the company and ships were registered in Finland. The ships had been seized in August 1941 on the premise that Finland was an enemy occupied country. In this way Canada followed the example of Britain. There was some question among British and some Canadian officials whether the legality of this would stand up in prize court. However, in the peace treaty Finland had renounced all claims arising out of the exercise or purported exercise by the Allied and Associated Powers, whether or not a state of war existed with Finland and agreed to accept the findings of prize courts.\textsuperscript{2067} On this basis Canada proceeded to condemn the ships in prize in the exchequer court. \textit{Carolus} was sunk by enemy action in 1942 and what was at issue was should the insurance money be given to the owner or retained by the Canadian government. \textit{Ericus} on the other hand had been transferred to the UK Ministry of War Transport in June 1944. After the war, the British continued to employ the ship, while they waited for a Canadian decision about what to do. In that time, it collided with another vessel, incurring damage in 1948. After it was repaired the British kept it docked from April 1949 onward. The

\textsuperscript{2064} For example, there were three claims for property owned in Finland by Finnish-Canadians or Finns in Canada, “Claim of Karl Ivor Rinne to property in Finland,” “Claim of Mrs. Emmy Sladey to property in Finland,” “Claim of Lavern Churchill on behalf of Eurenia J. de Meyer to property in Finland,” LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 3873, Files 9159-K-40, 9159-G-40, 9159-F-40. Also, the claims listed in LAC, RG117 A2b, Vol. 1580, File Claims-Austria, Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Roumania, China, Belgium, Czechoslovakia-All countries, 1-13; RG117 A2b, Vol. 1578, File Claims Control Journal-Austria, Finland, Italy, Newfoundland (Refugees) and RG117 A3, Vol. 2253, File 13497.
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question was should the ship be returned to the owner and who should absorb the
cost of the repairs and caretaking while it was laid up at dock?

Both Britain and the United States had resolved the issue of the Finnish ships
they had seized. Britain had opted to return all six seized ships to Finland. The
British officials involved still expressed their misgivings over the conduct of
Ohlson during the war. The ships had only been transferred in 1933 to Finnish
registry by the father Sir Erik Olof Ohlson. It was the British authorities thought a
purely business decision, but also one which sought to avoid UK control of them
during a war. Despite the protests of the current owner Sir Erik Ohlson, that he
operated them in the interests of the Allies, he did not try to transfer them back to
the British flag. The UK Ministry of Transport advised that “Despite our general
lack of sympathy with Ohlsen [Ohlson] it seems to us that as the move for the return
of surviving uncondemned ships to the Finns was made more as a political gesture
than anything else, and as in agreeing to return our six we have not worried very
much about the owner's records.”  2068 If Ericus had been one of the ships seized by
Britain, it would also have been returned “in the gesture to the Finnish Government
and should not have allowed our dissatisfaction with the original transfer to Finland
to lead us to exclude the ‘ERICUS’ from the present return and thereby diminish
the goodwill value of the gesture.”  2069 Likewise the Americans returned 15 ships to
Finland and eventually paid $5.5 million in compensation. 2070 The Canadian
Department of Transport noted that “This action was perhaps taken in furtherance
of U.S. foreign policy with the object of lending economic and moral assistance to
Finland.” 2071

Canadian authorities in this light offered to return Ericus and the insurance
money for Carolus in 1948, under the condition the Ohlson accept the ship in its
current condition and pay the caretaking fees and costs of the prize court. 2072
Ohlson rejected the offer and the matter dragged on. He argued that his ships
should be treated the same as French and Danish ships which were seized because those
countries were occupied by Germany. He also continued to insist he operated the
ships in the interest of the Allied war effort. The government disagreed because
those ships had been sized as a protective measure, because Canada did declare war

\[\text{Footnotes:}\]
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against Finland. Canadian officials seemed to accept the British view that Ohlson used the Finnish registry of the vessels “to evade full Allied control and permit the ships to operate in more profitable and less hazardous areas.” He could have changed the ships back to British registry any time before the Winter War, if he was truly patriotic. During the Winter War the Finnish government requisitioned the ships and made it difficult to move the registry. Ohlson’s claim that his arrangement was designed to benefit the Allies was seen as incredulous. The decision was made 6 years before the war and it was maintained because neutral ships were at less risk than Allied ships. Likewise, British ships could be requisitioned at fixed rates and sailed regardless of the risk. In this way direct control by the Allies was of more use than independent control by Ohlson.

Consequently, Canada was unsympathetic towards Ohlson and the seizure of 

Carolus and Ericus was a direct result of his actions. Had the ships been registered in an Allied country they would not have been seized. Canadian officials saw that, Sir Eric apparently preferred, however, to continue to have the vessel registered in Finland, a country that was in danger of being occupied by the enemy. Accordingly he took the risk that the ships would be seized in Prize. Having taken this risk, he cannot now be heard to say that he should be compensated out of public moneys of Canada because his venture turned out to be unprofitable.

Nonetheless, it was a political decision to return Ericus and the insurance money from Carolus without interest to Ohlson. The Canadian Maritime Commission shared these views but was less convinced of the political value and more concerned about Finland’s place in the Cold War. The vice-chairman L.C. Audette wrote, “I do not think we should express any view on the political value of a gesture to Finland but in the event of war, it seems to me that ships or money under the control of a country as close to Russia as Finland is would probably be of assistance to us in our hour of need and might well be a source of comfort and convenience to our enemies.” To External Affairs the recommendation that a gesture of goodwill towards Finland, similar to that done by the US and UK was of more

---

2074 Ibid.
2076 “Finnish Ships ERICUS and CAROLUS Prize Proceedings” by AJM, 30 June 1952, LAC, Ibid.
2077 L.C. Audette, Vice-Chairman, Canadian Maritime Commission to Mr. Cline and Mr. McGugan, 10 March 1950, LAC, RG46 EI, Vol. 1172, File 1102.5 C.251 and C252.
benefit than continuing to harass Ohlson. What is interesting about this case is that the value of the good will gesture was minimal, given Ohlson’s citizenship and the fact that in the various files concerning this situation there is no evidence the Finnish government ever tried to comment or intercede. No doubt sufficiently frustrated Ohlson accepted the final offer in May 1952, which was the same as that offered in 1948.\textsuperscript{2078} It was perhaps anticlimactic, since in June Ohlson sold Ericus for scrap.\textsuperscript{2079}

The other side of the coin in terms of the peace treaty was that Canada was required to restore to the rightful owners any property owned by Finnish nationals prior 22 June 1941. The Custodian of Enemy Property complied with this in March 1948. The furniture and papers from the Finnish consulate were returned. Most of the property seized had been of a financial nature. Since, financial transactions were now normalized, and funds could be transferred between Canada and Finland, it meant that inheritances, insurance money, and other finances which had been diverted because the recipients had been enemy aliens were also returned.

12.4 Interned Civilians and Seamen

A concern related to the armistice and peace treaty was the Canadian citizens interned by Finland during the war. According to an External Affairs dispatch to London in August 1944 about 20 Canadian men, women, and children had been detained by Finnish officials during the war. As with other lists compiled concerning the Canadian government and Finnish matters, such as the lists of people who went to Karelia and accounts of how many people were interned in Canada, no two accountings or lists show exactly the same individuals. It can be speculated the External Affairs total is incomplete or inaccurate. The individuals included naturalized Finnish-Canadians, Finnish-Canadians, and other Canadians. Among them were one Finnish national who was simply visiting and was conscripted when the Continuation War started and at least one of the Canadians was among the few hold overs from the Winter War volunteers.\textsuperscript{2080} Others had simply gone to visit family and had gotten caught in the tides of international politics. These were a relatively minor concern. They needed to be identified because Article 10 of the Armistice required that they be repatriated and in case
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any of them needed to make a claim against the Finnish government. Based on the
Canadian records it does not appear any of them applied through those channels for
compensation. In the Canadian files they were reported to have been interned, but
the Finnish government did not intern British subjects and they had been allowed
to leave the country at the end of the war. This meant Finland had already complied
with the armistice terms.2081

On the other hand, John Read at External Affairs could boast to the Registrar
of Enemy Aliens that, “In view of the cessation of hostilities with Finland we would
be glad to be in a position to state that no Finnish nationals were interned in
Canada.”2082 According to the RCMP by February 1945 some 54 Finns had been
granted parole and a further 13,430 had been issued exemptions under the Defence
of Canada Regulations. This compared to 11,605 Italians, 4,870 Romanians and
9,070 Hungarians.2083 The report did not indicate how many German and Japanese
Canadians had been affected. Those who had been exempted had to report once a
year to renew their certificates. There was no restriction on their movements, they
could even leave Canada if they wished, but they did have to give notice when they
changed their residence. In the main it was thought these enemy nationals had been
of “good behaviour.”2084 Not all of this was precisely correct, but it was noted at
the time the commissioner proposed relaxing the regulations further, except in clear
cases of disloyalty, which meant the restrictions were actually more severe than
Read was claiming. External Affairs in reply said that “it seems clear that the
burden now imposed on Finnish persons in this country is not as great as might be
thought from an examination of the regulations,” because “at the present time the
proportion of Finns in Canada who do not have to report as compared to those who
have to report is approximately 249 to 1.”2085 After all a “technical state of war
continues to exist,” they added2086 The regulations remained in effect until the end

2081 Legation of Sweden to SSEA 11 October 1944 in Lindström, 2000a, 232.
2083 Wood to USSEA, 22 February 1945, LAC, Ibid. The Defence of Canada Regulations do not
explicitly indicate what is meant by parole, since the word is only used once in the regulations. It appears
from contextual analysis that it applied to an enemy alien who was arrested and detained or interned,
but then released after signing an undertaking to the effect that they would report regularly as required
by the regulations and not engage in activity in support of the enemy. It was the same undertaking those
Finns who had been granted exemptions had to sign. Canada Defence 1942, Section 24, paragraphs 4–
6.
2085 USSEA to G. Sundqvist, Secretary Finnish Organization of Canada, 27 February 1945, LAC, Ibid.
2086 Ibid.
of December 1945.\footnote{Lindström 2000a, 231; Memorandum, Wood to Registrars of Enemy Aliens and Reporting Officials, 5 January 1946, LAC, RG76, Vol. 447, File 675985 Part 4, Reel C10323; OIC, PC7509, 28 December 1945, LAC, RG2 A1a, Vol. 1961.} To reassure Finnish-Canadians all documents and materials relating to the registration and issue of exemptions were destroyed 3 months later.\footnote{Memorandum, Wood to Registrars of Enemy Aliens and Reporting Officials, 5 January 1946, LAC, RG76, Vol. 447, File 675985 Part 4.} However, Finnish nationals were still legally enemy aliens and prohibited from immigrating to Canada, until the regulations were changed in 1947.

The armistice also reopened the question of the Finnish merchant seamen. Depending on which list is used, this applied to the roughly six seamen who had been interned as security risks and in need of repatriation. Lindström in her study found roughly 102 Finnish sailors who had been interned. Most of these in fact had only been detained by immigration officials for short periods while they waited for an opening on a ship and were not sent to internment camps.\footnote{Lindström 2000a, 208–209.} The Finns employed on Canadian ships were another matter. Whereas during the war they were in high demand, now that the war was over there was a shortage of work. Strictly speaking the armistice terms did not apply to them, so it would have to be handled as an immigration matter. Immigration in general was still effectively closed and as enemy aliens they were ineligible to immigrate. They would have to be deported. This was a technicality, since at times Canadian officials talked about the repatriation of the 49 or so sailors still serving on Canadian vessels.\footnote{C.E.S. Smith, DMR to Jolliffe, 21 March 1946, LAC, RG76, Vol. 447, File 675985 Part 4.} A shortage of space on Canadian passenger ships made repatriation difficult. The solution was to use Swedish ships. All of this would take time and there were other larger more pressing matters Canada had to deal with.

At first it was unclear who was had to pay for the repatriation. The Swedish consul had efficiently arranged for the return of the few Finns held in Newfoundland between May and June 1945. Aside from embarrassing the slow-moving Canadians, this action seemed to suggest Sweden on behalf of Finland was covering the costs. It was, however, Canada’s responsibility. The number of seamen involved gradually diminished as some left Canada on their own or found employment on other ships. Others were at large and could not be found by immigration officials. There were still about 12–15 who were underemployed and were a financial burden to Canada. A number of them wished to remain permanently in Canada. External Affairs was prepared to pursue an exception for these men, but it was necessary to know if it was just because they “preferred
Canada” or if they actually faced reprisals back home. Immigration officials opposed allowing them permanent residence since they were technically “inadmissible.” Canada had been pressed on all sides by seamen from Allied countries and they were denied because of the shortage of work on ships. It was unwise to allow a few Finns to stay when Canadian sailors were unemployed. Nonetheless it was the position of Canadian transport officials and External Affairs, that the country had a responsibility for them, “Owing to the fact that they had so volunteered and that their position as regards their home government was ambiguous, the Canadian Government has, from the beginning undertaken to see that they do not suffer by their decision.” Only 2 or 3 of those who wished to stay in Canada expressed any concern about possible reprisals on the return home. Nonetheless they all would be sent home.

The difficulty in sorting this situation out is reflected in a revived negative image of Finns. Quite naturally since the issue lagged into 1946 the men were “getting pretty restive” and “exceedingly discontented over the delays.” They were becoming difficult to deal with and a manager at Canadian Steamship Lines, which was looking after many of them, complained, “As far as I can make out these Finns and others are somewhat unstable as their wishes seem to change as frequently as the weather.” A memorandum in June 1945 by External Affairs trying to get a picture of the entire prisoner of war situation, now grouped the seamen with enemy prisoners of war. It reported briefly that they “are mostly merchant seamen and I think an effort ought to be made to dispose of that group. There will be some disciples of Mannerheim who have represented themselves as Germans throughout.” It is unclear how they presented themselves as “Germans,” but the enemy image is clear.

Complicating matters further External Affairs tried unsuccessfully to have them repatriated via Hamburg in occupied Germany. Aside from the issues of sending enemy aliens through occupied territory, the port was bottlenecked, and the
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2094 Read for USSEA to Jolliffe, 21 December 1945, LAC, Ibid.
2095 “Note for Mr. Robertson, Repatriation of Seamen from the Finnish Vessels ‘Carolus’ and ‘Ericus,’” 9 February 1946; Canadian National Steamship Lines, Manager Insurance Claims Department to USSEA, 12 February 1946, LAC, Ibid.
2096 Waugh to USSEA, 9 January 1946; SSEA to Waugh, 14 February 1946, LAC, Ibid.
2097 “Disposition of Miscellaneous Groups of Prisoners of War,” 5 June 1945, LAC, Ibid.
request was refused. This caused more weeks of delay. They could not go through the UK because they “have Finnish troubles of their own,” so they had to go via Sweden.2098 Adding to this delay and expense was the fact at least four of the men had been diagnosed with debilitating psychological illnesses. These men as well as those deemed flight risks required Canadian medical and military escorts until they arrived in Sweden.2099 In small groups they eventually left Canada through the remainder of 1946, with the last delayed until March 1948 because of health issues. Periodically into the 1950s Canadian officials had to help settle the estates of those who had died while in Canadian service, sort out back pay for the crew of Ericus and Carolus and pay the allowances due the interned seamen.2100

Conclusion

Repatriating Finnish seamen, clearing up war claims, immigration, postal regulations, and aid were all low policy areas which should have been relatively simple matters to deal with. However, the uncertain political and economic situation and the Cold War connected everything about Canadian-Finnish relations to high policy. Canada and Finland were now friendly nations. Trade could resume between the two countries. The exchange of diplomatic representatives and a formal trade agreement were another matter. The peace settlement had put Finland, a liberal, democratic, capitalist state, within the Soviet sphere of influence. Initially Canadian officials had written off Finland. Between 1946 and 1948, it was thought to be only a matter of time before the communists seized power or the Soviets occupied the country. Officially Finland was a neutral state but had to walk fine line between maintaining good relations with the Soviets and continued political, economic, and cultural contacts with the West. How Finland handled its internal problems, while making reparations payments, and responding to Soviet demands was important to Canadian security. As a borderland between East and West, Finland was a potential flash point which could turn the Cold War hot.
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13 Brave New Image

A common Canadian image of Finland during the years 1946–1948 was one of an occupied, satellite, penetrated by the Soviets and their Finnish communist allies. Though Canadian officials placed Finland within the Soviet sphere, the country was at least nominally independent because it retained its democratic and capitalist system. There was a Finnish exception in Soviet policy, which seemed to tolerate for now, a non-communist border state. As expressions of earlier positive Canadian images of Finland this still offered some hope, but should the communists seize power, or the Soviets send in troops to bring about a regime change, the satellite image would be given substance. In the context of the Cold War this meant Finland would once again become an adversary as part of the Eastern Bloc, with an enemy image. Once it was apparent the Finns were determined to resist, could diplomatically handle Soviet demands, and for the time being at least retain their independence, the image became more positive. Images returned of cultured, Western, democratic, and heroic Finland, home to stalwart, freedom loving Finns, to vie with the fears of Soviet domination. Such contending images occupied Canadian officials, who had to balance concern and sympathy for Finland with practical or legal constraints. Could or should Canada take measures, however small, such as a trade agreement or receiving accredited representatives, as a gesture to help Finland retain some degree of Western orientation and independence or would legal technicalities and the Canadian fiscal situation prevent it?

13.1 Normal Relations Resume

With the fighting at an end, Finland was complying in good faith with the terms of the armistice and a peace conference planned, the Finnish political representative in Britain during mid-December 1945 raised the question of consular offices in Canada and some other parts of the British Commonwealth. He asked the Foreign Office if consular officers could be appointed before the peace treaty was signed and if not, could temporary officials be established to deal with consular affairs?2101 Towards the end of the Potsdam Conference it was agreed that the Big Three would re-establish diplomatic contacts with Finland as far as was practical. Since the spring of 1945 Finland and the Big Three had at various times indicated the desire

---

to return to normal relations as soon as possible. The timetable for this would
depend on the circumstances within each of the former Germans satellites. Even
though it was constitutionally impossible for any of “his Majesty’s Governments”
to establish diplomatic relations with a country with which a state of war still
eXisted, this did not preclude “quasi-diplomatic contacts” and in August the British
had agreed to receive an unaccredited Finnish “political representative” in London,
granting him direct access to the UK government. The reason given was “we are satisfied they are a true democratic Government and enjoy the support of a majority in [a] freely elected Diet.” Finland made the same offer to the British. The US also agreed to reappoint a representative, since they had not been at war with Finland. Clearly the circumstances in Finland were acceptable enough for the reestablishment of relations and the Finns wanted to do this in Canada. In referring the Finnish request, the Dominions Office reiterated the constitutional limitations involved, but wondered if Canada would be willing to follow the British example. In turn the high commissioner communicated this information to Ottawa and thought the Italian situation was analogous. The British in this situation accepted an Italian representative “with the personal rank of Consul-General.”

Using this precedent Britain had resumed “direct relations with Finland” on 18 September 1945 and both countries appointed a political representative with the “personal rank of Minister.” At the same time they also partly lifted the ban on communications by British subjects on UK territory with Finnish citizens.

External Affairs took the matter under advisement. Escott Reid initially drafted a reply agreeing to the request, because “There would be some political advantage to having one or more Finnish representatives here.” The Italian case was a good example, he thought and “understood the Finnish Government is unobjectionable.” However, he second guessed himself and thought this was “probably too hasty,” since there may “be similar requests made by other enemy
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states (which are not co-belligerents).”2110 Norman Robertson the USSEA briefed the prime minister on the matter and reminded him strictly speaking, consuls could not be appointed until the state of war was formally terminated. Canada could allow designated persons to carry out Finnish government business, but he was more inclined to wait until after the upcoming peace conference and have the Finns appoint them in the ordinary way.2111 Finally at the beginning of April the Finnish government was informed the Canadian government preferred to wait.2112

The message does not appear to have been delivered by the British officials Canada was required to work through, due to a lack of diplomatic representation in Finland. This was apparent because Eero A. Wuori, the political representative approached the high commissioner again, because on 3 June the Union of South Africa announced it was willing to accept an “Agent of the Government of Finland” and the Finns were interested in learning if Canada had considered the question.2113 On investigation it was learned that the Foreign Office had passed the message on to Wuori regarding Canada’s intentions. What had not been relayed back to Canada was the desire of the Finnish government to negotiate directly on the topic, rather than work through British intermediaries.2114 Still there was no change in the Canadian position.

Later, the former Honorary Consul Graham informally approached External Affairs on 7 October about the possibility of diplomatic relations being established with Finland. Reid reported he “gave the usual answer that there were many states which, for various reasons, had higher priority than Finland, and that we suffered from grave shortages of staff.”2115 He “was careful not to give the impression that it would be possible for us to do anything even after the signature of the Treaty of Peace with Finland.”2116 So it sat, Cold War concerns aside, Finland was a small country, on the margin of Europe of little significance to Canada.

To complicate matters was the way Graham had been conducting himself. Despite the fact he lost his consular status, he had actually continued to act in an unofficial capacity as a Finnish representative, entertaining visiting Finns, and responding to requests about visiting or emigrating to Canada. When the former
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Finnish ambassador to the United States, Hjalmar Procopé could not get a visitor’s visa to remain in Canada, Graham tried to intercede. According to Graham, Procopé was still persona grata with his own country, but was persona non grata with “those who rule over the government.” 2117 The Protocol Division confirmed for the Department of External Affairs that Graham had no official status in Canada and Escott Reid advised that Graham should be given no attention, whatsoever, but then contradicted this by saying there was no status “since he represents a former enemy State.” 2118 Leslie Chance of the Consular Division noted nothing had been done to officially revoke Graham’s commission, even though there had been a break in relations which de facto ended his status and thought the whole circumstance was “all a mildly Gilbertian situation.” 2119

No doubt the substance of the Canadian reply to Graham about representation was learned by Finnish diplomats. Wuori determinedly pressed the issue in London a few months later. This time he requested information regarding which countries had diplomatic missions in Canada and which powers had consular officers, but no official diplomatic representation. 2120 Clearly, he was trying to determine if Canada was discriminating against Finland in this regard. In addition to the five high commissioners from British Commonwealth states, there were 21 countries with diplomatic missions in Ottawa, and 20 nations which had consular officers in Canada, but had no diplomatic mission. 2121 Italy was the only exceptional case. The others were all Allied countries, neutrals, or American states.

Two weeks after Britain formally re-established relations with Finland, the Finnish legation in London once again approached Canada on 29 September 1947 with a formal request to appoint a representative. 2122 Since Canada had ratified the peace treaty there was no reason for Finland to expect Canada to reject the offer. The nominee for the position was experienced diplomat and bureaucrat, Urho Vilpitön Toivola and his curriculum vitae accompanied the request. 2123 The request
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was directed to the British Foreign Secretary with a copy delivered by the Finnish chargé d’affaires to the Canadian high commissioner a few days later. The practice of using British ministers as a channel of communications with countries where Canada had no representation, such as Finland, had been in place for some time. However, the Finns were not attuned to the fact that officials in the DEA, also jealously guarded Canada’s prerogatives and were steering an independent course for the country to avoid the appearance of colonial subordination and only used British good offices reluctantly. The high commissioner advised the Foreign Office, “that it would be more convenient if, as is our usual custom, we communicated our reply direct to the Finnish Legation.”2124 When the brief on the proposal was prepared for the USSEA by Lester B. Pearson, he thought the Finnish chargé d’affaires “for some curious reason” had addressed the note to the Foreign Secretary.2125

Despite this the Canadian government was in a receptive mood and now thought to be a good idea to open a Finnish legation. It was to be made clear to the Finns that Canada would not be able to reciprocate due to a shortage of staff. The Canadian minister to Sweden could also be accredited to Finland. He would be resident in Stockholm and make only periodic visits to Helsinki.2126 A similar situation existed for Canada with several other countries and both Greece and Egypt had dual representation for Finland and Sweden.2127 The implication was that if this was not acceptable, there likely would be no Canadian representation to Finland. Even before the high commissioner could communicate the reply, word was received by the British Foreign Office that the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs was arranging transport for Toivola on 27 October. As the high commissioner stated, “We had no previous indication that Finns were in such a hurry.”2128 Wuori assured the high commissioner verbally “that the Finnish Government was anxious to appoint a Minister in Ottawa regardless of our inability to reciprocate” and that dual accreditation was acceptable.2129 There needed to be a delay because as Canadian
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officials insisted, getting the approval of the King for the appointment took some
time, and the Canadian government needed the reply in writing. They preferred
Toivola arrive after the appointment was official. If the Finns insisted on sending
him early, they had to avoid publicity.\footnote{SSEA to Acting HCCUK, No. 1634, 23 October 1947; Hudd, HCCUK to Chargé d’Affaires, Finnish Legation, London, 24 October 1947, LAC, Ibid.} Finland agreed to wait.

By 14 November, the necessary documentation was ready and normal relations
were established effective 21 November 1947 and Toivola was named the head of
the new legation, with the rank of envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary
on 1 December.\footnote{HCCUK to SSEA, No 1660, 31 October 1947; SSEA to HCCUK, No. 1694, 5 November 1947; SSEA to HCCUK, No. 1739, 14 November 1947; SSEA to CAUS, No. 1694, 14 November 1947, LAC, Ibid; Lindström, “History of Finland-Canada Relations,” http://finland.ca/ (5.10.2010).} All that remained was for the arrangement of a simultaneous
press release and the arrival of Toivola in Ottawa. He arrived on 26 December 1947
and presented his credentials to the governor general on 7 January 1948.

The briefing memorandum prepared for the governor general in advance of the
presentation of the letter of credence is interesting. After outlining the events
leading up to the resumption of diplomatic relations it went on to talk about Finns
in Canada. The points presented positive images of Finns and avoided the radical
political and labour activism of many Finnish-Canadians. Finns, it said “have
become known for their hardiness and industry. Ninety per cent of them came to
this country were able to read and write and the vast majority have quickly learned
English.”\footnote{“Relations Between Canada and Finland,” 3 January 1948, LAC, RG25 A3b, Vol. 6238, File 8775-40.} The claim was also made that the “bulk of Finns” were practicing
Lutherans.\footnote{Ibid.} This of course was only true if you accept the fact that all Finns were
nominally part of the state Lutheran Church and ignore the fact more Finns in
Canada supported one or another of the socialist and radical political movements
and were atheists.\footnote{Lindström-Best 1985, 13–14.} Another positive thing Finns contributed to Canada was their
“skill at skiing” which “has added a good deal to the development of this sport in
Canada, particularly cross-country racing.”\footnote{“Relations Between Canada and Finland,” 3 January 1948, LAC, RG25 A3b, Vol. 6238, File 8775-40.} External Affairs officials seemed
pleased with the choice of Toivola. Both Urho and his wife Lyyli were said to be
interested in cultural activities, music, art, and literature, and apparently were both
acquaintances with “the great Jan Sibelius.”\footnote{Palmer to Wrong, CAUS, 27 November 1947, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 3748, file 6993-N40e.} As Frederick Palmer wrote to
Lester Pearson, “I think you will enjoy having Mr. and Mrs. Toivola with you as they are very well informed on most of those matters which make life worth living.”

Here Finns were cultured and educated, but also it was an image not often associated with Finns, as having joie de vivre.

As Toivola settled in the routine was re-established. F.A. Mustonen resumed working for the Finnish legation as an attaché. Kingsley Graham was reappointed as the consul in Toronto and Helge K.O. Ekengren as vice-consul in Vancouver. With the legation needing time to get functioning, Toivola requested that Sweden continue to protect Finnish interests in Canada for the time being. Sweden turned over all files relating to the protection of Finnish interests on 18 March 1948, concluding that chapter of wartime relations between Canada and Finland.

A legation was opened in Stockholm in February 1947 and on 21 March Thomas A. Stone presented his letter of introduction as chargé d’affaires, ad interim. The office was in place and it would not have been unreasonable to expect Canada to accredit a minister to Finland by the end of 1947. When Stone assumed his duties in Stockholm he was advised that a letter of instruction covering his assignment to Finland would be forthcoming. In the meantime, Stone and his staff operated towards Finland with only informal direction. As it stood the letter of instruction was not actually sent until May 1949. This was because it was not until March 1949 that his appointment to Finland had been approved. An office was opened in Helsinki in the spring of 1951. In December it was decided to make
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2137 Palmer to Pearson, 27 November 1947, LAC, Ibid.
2139 Canada 1948c, 53–54, 88; Minute of Meeting of the Committee of the Privy Council, N.A. Robertson, Clerk of the Privy Council, approved 31 March 1949, LAC, MG26 L, Vol. 50, File F-11-2.
2140 A.D.P. Heeney, USSA for SSEA to Stone, 26 May 1949, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 3660, File 4900-C-17-40. The whole issue of the letter of instructions seemed to be surrounded with an air of confusion. It seems no one in External Affairs could find a copy or recall if the letter of instructions had actually been sent to Stone. Likewise, a copy could not be found in Stockholm when it was needed for the opening of the office in Helsinki. Arnold Heeney, the drafter of that letter went so far as to say it “was never written” and to “repair the oversight” sent a new one on 18 March 1952. It was more detailed and up to date but contained essentially the same information. Heeney to Stone, 18 March 1952, LAC, Ibid.
2141 He was at the same time the Minister to Norway and Iceland. Cabinet Conclusions, 10 March 1949, LAC, RG2, A5a, Vol. 2643, Reel T2366.
it more permanent with a secretary posted there but supervised from Stockholm.\textsuperscript{2142} This was later raised to the status of an embassy in June 1961.\textsuperscript{2143}

While the issuing of these instructions falls outside the time frame of this study, they are illuminating because they are the first formal elucidation of a Canadian foreign policy towards Finland.\textsuperscript{2144} The activities of Stone and his staff through 1947–1948 nonetheless did not substantially deviate from the policy established in 1949. The letter merely committed to paper what previously had been an ad hoc policy regarding Finland.\textsuperscript{2145} As a later version of the letter stated, “In so far as Canada can be said to have a policy with respect to Finland it might be defined as follows: to afford Finland all possible moral support in its struggle to retain its independence and individuality in the face of Soviet pressure.”\textsuperscript{2146}

The document went through several drafts, with various sections of the department proposing suggested amendments and additions to the issued letter.\textsuperscript{2147} The main objectives were similar to those for Sweden and included: “the maintenance and strengthening of the mutual respect and understanding which exist between the people and Government of Finland and our own and the increase of trade.”\textsuperscript{2148} He of course would be expected to make periodic visits to Helsinki, but mainly sources available in Sweden would have to be used to keep the department updated on important developments. Their number and timing would be up to Stone, though “There will be undoubtedly be events in Finland that will appear to you to be suitable occasions for your visits.”\textsuperscript{2149}

Stone was given an outline of the history of Finns in Canada. The image presented of Finnish-Canadians was stereotypically positive, “The Finns are born

\textsuperscript{2142} Record of Cabinet Discussions, No. 140, 20 December 1951, LAC, RG2 B2, Vol. 159, File F-35. On 23 February 1952, T. Wainman-Wood was appointed as Second Secretary and Vice Consul, resident in Helsinki and in the absence the minister the acting Chargé d’Affaires. The decision to open the office “at least in part” was to aid Finland in maintaining its independence. Canada 1953, 14–15; Press Release, No. 9, DEA, 23 February 1952; Heeney to Stone, 18 March 1952; Stone to Heeney, 12 April 1952, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 3660, File 4900-C-17-40. When the European Division staff was asked in the autumn of 1951 to rank the importance of possible new missions in the Middle East and Europe, Finland was tied with Austria in fourth place. Soward nd., 67.

\textsuperscript{2143} Cabinet Conclusions, 22 March 1960, LAC, RG2 A5a, Vol. 2746, Item 19548.

\textsuperscript{2144} Heeney, USSA for SSEA to Stone, 26 May 1949, LAC, RG25 G2, Vol. 3660, File 4900-C-17-40.

\textsuperscript{2145} The addition of some information by the Defence Liaison Section about Finland and Sweden in relation to the negotiations surrounding the North Atlantic Treaty transformed what otherwise would have been a document classified confidential into one that had to be treated as top secret. “Memorandum for European Division” by G.G. Crean, 14 May 1949, LAC, Ibid.

\textsuperscript{2146} Heeney to Stone, 18 March 1952, LAC, Ibid.

\textsuperscript{2147} Heeney, USSA for SSEA to Stone, 26 May 1949, LAC, Ibid.

\textsuperscript{2148} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{2149} Ibid.
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pioneers, they have been quick to learn English, and their hardiness and industry have become well known in Canada.”

Cultural contacts between Finland and Canada were few, but “there is a high regard amongst Canadians for Finnish achievements in this respect,” especially the well-known works of Sibelius. To this was added the noted contribution of Finns to the development of skiing as a sport in Canada. Gone were the dangerous, stubborn, clannish Finns, replaced with the older image of Finns as valuable, cultured members of Canadian society.

A synopsis of the history of Canada-Finland relations from the appointment of the first vice-consul to the arrival of Toivola in 1947 was provided. In this the enemy image of Finland was excised. While it was acknowledged that Finland went to war against the Soviet Union “at the side of Germany” in June 1941, what was implied was an acceptance of the Finnish thesis of co-belligerency. There was no mention of Finland as an ally or satellite of Germany, rather there was the mitigating factor that this was done “in order to regain Finnish territory taken by the Russians in 1939.” Aside from the factual error in the date the territory was taken, since it was not lost until the Treaty of Moscow in 1940, this is in effect an acceptance of Finnish exceptionalism. Finland may have been on the wrong side in the last war, but it was not an enemy like other countries. The letter does, however, note that from 7 December 1941 both Canada and Britain considered a “state of war with Finland existed from that date.”

That other states, notably other Commonwealth countries, also declared war against Finland around the same time was not mentioned.

Details on trade relations, the Petsamo nickel mines compensation claims, Finnish internal affairs and consular duties were provided in the letter. With no permanent trade commissioner in Finland, the UK consul continued to handle matters regarding Canadian merchant shipping. Likewise, British consular officers assisted with passport related issues, though passports for Canadians in Finland were to be issued from the Canadian legation in Stockholm. External Affairs made it clear they were grateful for this assistance. However, in terms of foreign policy the real meat of Stone’s duties was the routine and periodic reports he was expected to make about Finland.

First and foremost, Stone was to keep an eye on the state of Finnish-Soviet relations. Stone was reminded that, “Finland’s relations with the Soviet Union are,
of course, the chief concern of Finnish foreign policy.”2154 As it was later noted “Finland is also a useful listening post for information from the Soviet Union.”2155 He was expected to report evidence of Soviet pressure on Finland and the reaction to it. There was the possibility the Soviets might take some overt action to seize control of Finland. Over time this fear seemed to subside in the minds of officials in the department, because the Soviets did not attempt this at the time of the armistice and in the context which the letter was written an occupation of Finland might push Sweden into a Western alliance. Therefore, Finnish relations with the Scandinavian countries, especially Swedish reactions to events in Finland were to be monitored. In the same spirit Finland’s relations with the US, the UK, and other Western powers should also be noted. Stone was also to inform the department about Finnish fulfilment of its peace treaty obligations and any developments in the Finnish Foreign Office. He was to observe the activities of the Finnish communists, political trends, and internal unrest.2156

Trade with Finland was considered small and “Canada has not a very large economic interest in Finland.”2157 Finland’s desire for greater trade with Canada it was thought was “perhaps due in part to its anxiety not to submit to Soviet attempts at complete domination of Finnish foreign trade.”2158 Therefore, Stone was to keep an eye on the extent to which the Finnish economy and foreign trade were being subordinated to Soviet interests. The corollary to this was the need to record Finnish efforts to diversify trade relations, particularly with Western countries.

On top of all this the Canadian legation was expected to answer inquiries regarding Canada and disseminate information about the country in Finland. The idea was to foster closer cultural contacts and create “a favourable public opinion” towards Canada in Finland.2159 Personal relationships with Finnish publishers, editors, and directors were thought to be important in ensuring messages about Canada were carried in Finland. The CBC International Service had already been broadcasting to Sweden and Finland, in Swedish for some time and based on the popularity of those, began producing transmissions in Finnish in 1948. With the help of the legation it was hoped Finnish radio would rebroadcast or record the
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CBC transmissions. In addition, films, musical recordings, photographs, pamphlets, newsletters, information sheets, and presentation books about Canada would be available for distribution. The legation was also to encourage exhibitions of Canadian art. Fostering better cultural relations it was argued had a broader effect on commercial and political relations by developing positive mutual images. This was part of the larger propaganda and “cultural diplomacy” used by both sides during the Cold War. In his study of the subject Marek Fields found that the Cold War was as much about ideas as it was political, economic, and military. Through the use of words, images, perceptions, motives, and expectations both sides tried to change attitudes and perceptions to influence international public opinion in the furtherance of foreign policy objectives. Although proportionately smaller, the Canadian effort was complementary to that of the British and Americans in attempting to counter communist propaganda and influence public opinion to ensure that Finland retained an attachment to the West.

With the resumption of normal relations activities devolved to the routine level. The official correspondence between the two countries consisted mainly of the exchange of consular diplomatic credentials and requests for information. For example, in late 1947 the Finnish government requested information on labour conditions, and legislation about the safe operation of mines in Canada. For the most part this was the responsibility of each province to regulate. The federal government was, however, responsible for mines operating in the Yukon and the Northwest Territory. The matter was referred to the provinces and what information the Canadian government had was provided.
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2160 Ibid. The CBC International Service gave weekly short-wave broadcasts of around 2.5 hours of news and commentary, “magazine” format programs, talk shows, music, drama, and sports in Swedish, which was in part directed towards Finland. Again in 1951–1955, about 45 minutes of programming a week was broadcast in Finnish. In the Cold War environment, it was ‘psychological warfare’ or propaganda to create a positive image of Canada in Western Europe and make Canada’s position and identity known. Hall 1997, 31–35, 43–44, 85, 100. The Finnish national radio Yleisradio did rebroadcast the programs but refused to include the opening portion of the transmission to maintain some “passive” distance. The Canadian programs captured about 25,000 listeners. Fields 2015, 190, 195. Also, LAC, RG25, A3b, Vol. 2222, File 9901-CJ-40 CBC/IS Transcription Services to Finland.
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13.2 Image of Finland “In a Period of Major Significance”

Canadian interest in Finland was again high in the period after the signing of the peace treaty. Starting in 1947, the DEA began receiving dispatches regarding Finland on a more frequent basis from its own staff in London, Stockholm, Moscow, and elsewhere with which it could supplement, confirm, or offset similar reports provided by the British. The information was often simply summaries of what was gleaned from local newspapers, and the content of conversations and meetings with citizens and diplomats from other countries. All aspects of Finnish politics, the economy, and social life were monitored for signs of they might lead to a crisis in world affairs. The manoeuvrings of political parties and coalitions were watched for signs of communist and Soviet influence or events which might provoke the USSR. How well Finland was managing economic problems such as the balance of payments, trade relations, shortages of consumer goods and raw materials, inflation, and labour unrest was important not only because it impacted the ability to make reparations payments, but because the social unrest this caused could work to benefit the Finnish communists. Unifying all these concerns was the implications for Finland’s relations with the West and the Soviet Union. The dramatic communist coup in Czechoslovakia caused Canadian officials to draw parallels with Finland. The results of the upcoming July 1948 election and Soviet interest in a mutual assistance pact could endanger Finnish sovereignty and independence. The correspondence indicates this interest stemmed from a desire to keep an eye on Soviet activities and interest in Finland was a secondary consideration.

Events in Finland during 1947 gave grounds for caution and optimism and most of the details Canada learned from the British. There had been plenty of problems, economic disturbances, social unrest, and political perplexities, but at least the peace treaty had been ratified.2164 The economic position of Finland in terms of international trade had improved, in spite of internal inflation and a government in danger of becoming ineffectual by dissention. Trade and political relations remained good with countries in both the East and West. Evidence of Soviet pressure on Finland was seen when the country did not attend the June meeting in Paris to implement the Marshall Plan, despite the wishes of the Eduskunta, the Foreign Affairs Committee, and economic experts.2165 The Soviets also made it clear they preferred the cabinet of Prime Minister Mauno Pekkala, who
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2165 On Finland’s decision not to participate in the plan see Majander 1994.
was a communist and had been in place since March 1946. When that government fell in April 1947, “Soviet pressure and the apathy which characterises the political life of the country” saw it restored soon after. 2166 Pekkala was regarded as unpopular due to his “hard drinking and truculent manner” and his ineffectiveness at dealing with wage and price inflation. 2167 The only reason he remained in office was to please the Soviets, because there had been a significant drop in electoral support for the communists in the municipal elections. The Social Democrats had also successfully countered communist efforts to expand their influence among the trade unions, though it was expected that the pressure would be resumed as the election approached and was “dependent upon what show of force the Soviet Union may choose to throw in for support.” 2168

The Soviets through communist propaganda in 1947, were thought to be trying to obstruct Finland’s rapidly growing trade with the West, to disrupt the economy with strikes, protests, and other types of agitation, in order to cause a default on reparations payments. Despite these pressures, economic decisions were conditioned by the need to meet reparations obligations and domestic conditions at times suffered further, causing social unrest. Government policy was to encourage exports in order to secure the foreign exchange which was necessary to buy raw materials for reparations. Restrictions were placed on the import of items that were not essential to stimulating exports, paying reparations or were essential to the functioning of the domestic economy. For this reason, the country negotiated a number of bi-lateral trade agreements with countries such as Belgium, Britain, the Soviet Union, Norway, Sweden, France Denmark, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Bulgaria, Poland, the Soviet Zone of Germany, and Czechoslovakia. It was an austere policy, but one which made it possible for Finland to generally meet the delivery dates for most reparations payments. This was so successful that over 42% of the total $300 million had been paid by the end of 1947. The possibility existed that Finland would fulfil its obligation early, even though the Soviets had changed some of the items required from Finland’s forest industry to manufactured goods. Nonetheless, all this placed a strain on government finances and caused inflation in the Finnish economy. 2169

2167 Ibid.
2168 Ibid.
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Finland also appeared a place of intrigue. There was an “obscure bomb incident at the Soviet Legation” in May 1947 which the state police tried to connect to nationalist “underground youth groups.” Twenty-three Finns accused of involvement in what became known as the “Stella Polaris” espionage affair went on trial early in the year. The charges centred on the smuggling of equipment and documents by the Finnish military signals intelligence service to Sweden after the armistice. This was also connected to the arms caching conspiracy, whereby some Finnish military officers took it upon themselves to secretly store arms for a guerrilla war, if Finland was occupied by the Soviets. There was also the trials of the individuals caught tapping the phone lines of the Soviet headquarters in Helsinki. Heino Kuunus, a former chief of police who was charged with espionage on behalf of the United States and other Western countries was arrested and went on trial in July. From June onward there were sporadic trials of various individuals accused of war crimes, from recruiting for the German Waffen SS, to the mistreatment of prisoners of war.

In terms of foreign relations, the results for 1947 were a mixed blessing for Finland. After the peace treaty was signed in February the Soviet Union maintained a policy of alternating tension and detente similar to that displayed in the armistice period. This policy served to keep the “more bumptious right-wing Finns in check, and its application consisted mainly of prods and pinpricks on relatively minor issues, with persistent emphasis on maintenance of the existing political direction of the country.” Reports seemed to suggest the attitude of Finns towards the US and UK and by extension Canada was generally positive. Officially the Finnish government had to be “circumspect in its expressions of friendliness towards the Western Powers, any suggestion that Finland might be in a similar plight to the Balkan ex-German satellites, or even Hungary, has been consistently resented.”
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There was a strange sense of satisfaction in Finland over the neutrality policy, when
*Pravda* published its critique of the armistice period it condemned Italy, praised the
other “ex-satellites,” but omitted mention of Finland.2176

British sources filled the void of Canadian information about Finland, but now
this could be corroborated from Canadian sources. Both the Oslo and Stockholm
legations received from their Finnish counterpart’s copies of President Juho
Paasikivi’s 18 September 1947 “Peace Celebration” speech and forwarded them to
Ottawa. The occasion marked the deposit of the instruments of ratifications by the
UK and the USSR which was the requirement that brought the peace treaty into
force. It also of course marked Canada’s ratification, but ratification by the minor
powers did not affect the status of the treaty. Aside from noting the contents of the
speech, each commented on the situation in Finland. Palmer felt “that no comments
are necessary as the speech is short and self-explanatory and the difficulties which
Finland is at present encountering are quite obvious.”2177 Writing from Oslo,
Shirley MacDonald also thought “The trials and tribulations of the Republic of
Finland are recognized throughout the world to-day, and the tight-rope which the
people of that country are perforce required to walk adds greatly to the miseries of
the Finnish people.”2178 In particular he pointed out that the speech referred
“particularly to the relationship which Finland must maintain with Soviet Russia
and also insofar as the community of United Nations is concerned” and “the part
that the Finnish people must play in the internal development of the country in
order to enable the Republic to meet obligations abroad, and give other powers the
opportunity of finding that Finland can fit into the workings of international co-
operation.”2179 He noted the text of Paasikivi’s speech celebrated “The transition
from armistice to peace” which signaled “the end of the road of misfortunes we
have trodden during the past eight years” and sends the message “which guarantees
and confirms the political sovereignty and the national right of self-determination
of the people of Finland.”2180 Paasikivi recognized that “during the period of
independence” the Finnish government “despite peaceful intentions” did not have
“the right attitude towards our most important problem in foreign policy, that is our
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2180 “Speech held by the President of the Republic at the Peace Celebrations at Messuhelli [Messuhalli].
September 18, 1947,” enclosed Palmer to SSEA, No. 190, 8 October 1947, LAC, Ibid.
relations to the Soviet Union."\textsuperscript{2181} As a small country it was difficult for Finland to stand aside from the fluctuations of international politics and “Mistakes and false steps can be made. We have gone through a hard school and, when henceforth seeking the right solutions, we must make use of the experience we have acquired.”\textsuperscript{2182} Here Paasikivi was acknowledging the past policy errors made by the Finnish government. The international legal order was not sufficient for Finland to maintain its international status in the community of nations, but peaceful cooperation was also required. He cautioned his fellow Finns to not let the peace celebrations cause them to think all the trials are at an end. Finland still had obligations to fulfill, by which he meant reparations payments. The fulfillment of those obligations required foreign support, especially from the Soviet Union and in order to merit that support the nation need to display “fitness in its internal affairs. Lack of order and self-discipline always makes a negative impression on the onlookers.”\textsuperscript{2183} This was a reference to the domestic political, social, and labour unrest Finland was then experiencing. The country needed self-control or even self-censorship regarding negative attitudes towards the Soviet Union which were still being loudly voiced within Finland. National unity was essential to meeting the present challenges and also the “pre-requisites” for preserving Finland’s “constitutional parliamentary democracy, and the rights and freedom under the Law that every Finnish citizen enjoys.”\textsuperscript{2184}

The speech covered many important themes that would form the basis of Finland’s foreign policy for years to come. However, what officials in the DEA highlighted were two items. The first was a section in the paragraph where Paasikivi addressed Finland’s membership in the family of nations and the relationship with the Soviet Union based on “mutual confidence and mutual respect.”\textsuperscript{2185} The key part of this section External Affairs thought was: “which successfully has led us from war to lasting peace and which has given us a new starting-point for our present and future relations to the powerful Soviet Union.”\textsuperscript{2186} The other part highlighted was part of the paragraph in which Finland’s entry to
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}
“the community of United Nations” was covered. The newly ratified peace treaty included a provision for this and it was expected that Britain and the Soviet Union would support such a move. Though no comments were specifically written regarding these passages, it is evident there was concern about the relationship with the Soviet Union and the possible impact on the independence of the country. The question was could Finland retain its independence, or would it become a Soviet satellite?

Finland’s response to the post-war grouping of nations was described as “painstakingly neutral.” There was some question whether Finland could still be considered part of the Nordic bloc of countries or if it was part of the Soviet bloc. This played a part in the Finnish application for UN membership which was submitted on 19 September 1947. The peace treaty stipulated that the US, UK, and USSR would support an application for membership and now that the peace treaty had been ratified Finland qualified under Article 4 of the UN Charter. Finland had also waited until it was free of its armistice obligations before applying, unlike the other three ex-German satellites. When the application went before the Security Council, the Soviets insisted on a “package” admission by linking Finland’s membership to the admission of Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria. It was a Soviet strategy which tied up UN admissions from 1947 to 1955. The UK and US had supported Finland’s application, but opposed membership for the other three because of their questionable human rights record. In this regard Finland was an exception. The British view was even though it was thought the Soviets would pressure Finland to vote in certain ways, the country “has given sufficient indication of her good intentions as a democratic country to justify our support.” Canada was also willing to support the Finnish application, but in March 1948, USSEA Pearson advised the American ambassador that Canada preferred to wait until the result of the Finnish-Soviet negotiations for a mutual assistance pact was known. The Soviets continued to insist on packaging the applications.
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When the major powers could not reach an agreement on the membership of the former German-satellites, it was with “some relief” the news was received in Finland. The rationale behind the sense of relief was it furthered the cause of Finnish neutrality. Membership in the UN was an important symbol for Finland’s status as an independent country, but it would potentially entangle the nation in “discussion for and against East or West.” They were still, however, invited to continue participation in the non-political activities and agencies of the organization. Finland would have observer status until 1955 when the application was finally approved.

To External Affairs, Eastern Europe in the years 1947–1948 appeared ominous. There was the Czech coup, the Berlin blockade, the slow progress of the Marshall Plan, and “Norway appeared to be in danger of going the way of Finland” the unpublished External Affairs history of this period observed. Finland was also a matter of intense interest and concern. Soon after his appointment as the Finnish minister to Canada in December 1947, Urho Toivola began having conversations with officials at the DEA about the conditions in Finland. Anticipating any future crisis, in one of his first acts of diplomacy, Toivola asked the Canadian prime minister to consider “the Finnish problem.” He wanted Canada to help “ascertain what position the United States government would be should any serious problem arise in Finland.” No record was preserved in the Canadian files of what Toivola learned, but clearly the danger of a communist coup or the danger of Soviet occupation was on the minds of both him and Canadian officials. That Christmas he sent the prime minister a copy of a biography of architect Eliel Saarinen as a gift, reinforcing the image of Finland as a land of fine architecture and Western civilization.

Toivola met with John Watkins of the European Division in mid-January 1948. Things appear to have improved in Finland over the previous 16 months, there was now enough food, reconstruction was progressing, and for the most part Finland was making reparations payments. The reparations were burdensome, with in some
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cases Finland not meeting and other times exceeding quantities required. For those times when Finland had trouble making a payment on schedule the Soviets were “unexpectedly reasonable” and did not demanded the fines applicable under the peace treaty.\textsuperscript{2199} From the Finnish perspective recent trade negotiations with the USSR had gone well.

As for the Communist Party of Finland, it was noted their support had been declining in elections since the end of 1946. Watkins asked if the Soviets would interfere with the upcoming general election or accept the verdict of the Finnish voters. Toivola spoke with Interior Minister Yrjö Leino before leaving Finland, asking if the Communist Party did not achieve its aim legally would it resort to illegal means. Leino, who Toivola thought was sincere, was reported to have said, “he would wager his head on it that the Communist Party in Finland would not attempt to achieve power illegally.”\textsuperscript{2200}

When Watkins asked if the Soviets “were being more lenient with Finland than with some of the other limitrophe countries,” Toivola thought that “Finland had proved a much harder nut to crack in the 1939–40 war than the Russians expected” and they had rediscovered that even the Tsar had been forced to stop oppressing the Finns by world opinion.\textsuperscript{2201} He added that, “The Finns, in spite of their proximity, find no less difficulty than the rest of the Western world in guessing what the Kremlin is thinking.”\textsuperscript{2202} That is why Finland miscalculated in 1939, but they can no more today, as then, “figure out what the Russians will do or why.”\textsuperscript{2203} He thought “that the fact that they are motivated largely by fear makes them all the more unpredictable.”\textsuperscript{2204}

About the same time at the high commission in London, Norman Robertson wrote to Pearson about newspaper reports of Soviet displeasure over the decline in support for the Finnish Communist Party, the “desire to bring Finland politically more into line with the other western neighbours,” and rumours that a Finnish-Soviet alliance had been discussed in November 1947.\textsuperscript{2205} Robert Ford from the commissions staff had a long conversation the Finnish minister Eero Wuori and the first secretary Martti Ingman. Wuori noted that until 1948 the Soviets had been

\textsuperscript{2200} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{2201} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{2202} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{2203} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{2204} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{2205} HCCUK to Pearson, 4 February 1948, LAC, Ibid.
“perfectly correct with the Finns, tough but correct” and were happy with a non-communist government so long as it was clearly pro-Soviet.2206 There were two factors which prevented the Soviets from putting more pressure on Finland for a military alliance before this time. Russia needed the material provided by the reparations payments and bilateral trade for reconstruction, and since the Finns “had scrupulously paid their reparations” they did not want to disrupt this.2207 The other reason was the Soviets were treating the Scandinavian countries with care to avoid driving them into the Western orbit, by dealing too harshly with Finland. The declining fortunes of the communists in Finland and the suggestion that the West was trying to lure Finland into an alliance, was causing the Soviets to rethink their whole approach.2208

Frederick Palmer had also kept himself informed about what was happening in Finland. In February 1948 he wrote, “I have frequently observed in letters and despatches to you that Stockholm is one of the principal listening posts in Northern Europe.”2209 Palmer’s observations on Finland were “based on conversations with individuals whose positions ought to ensure the reliability of their evidence, although it will be obvious that I have no means of checking their accuracy.”2210 He went on to say, “My commercial interest in Finland has compelled me, since I arrived in Scandinavia in May 1946, to display more than a little interest in Finland. Consequently, now I believe the most important factors affecting Finland’s future arise out of the Peace Treaty with Russia and Russia’s claim to reparations.”2211 Nevertheless, based on his first conversations with Finns about the state of reparations payments, that at least until the fall of 1947 the view was optimistic that deliveries could be made on time and that Finland might even make the final instalment before the scheduled due date. However, the Soviets were using the slightest pretext to declare a payment late and using the high 1938 exchange rate to calculate penalties. The result was over the past three months “there has been a steady decline in this particular Finnish optimism.”2212 The basis for this statement was a conversation with a Finnish businessman, and it seemed to contradict what Wuori had told officials in London.
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Not all the intelligence gathered was completely accurate. Palmer tried to correct an earlier message from Robertson by clarifying that the wife of the Leino was not Hertta “Kuusinnen” (Kuusinen), but her sister, though he did not say which one. Leino was in fact married to Hertta. Despite this Palmer was able to read the Finnish mood, regarding these developments, “With such a family contact and recent change in the Russian diplomatic representation at Helsingfors, it is easy to understand why some Finns are becoming somewhat anxious.”

Nonetheless the position held by Leino was reason for concern. An example of Soviet influence with respect to Leino was the recent deportation of 38 “Balts” to the USSR, before any official request had been received or approved by parliament. Another was, many Finns owned firearms for hunting and the Soviets claimed this violated the disarmament terms in the peace treaty. Efforts to have the Finnish parliament pass a law banning private gun ownership were unsuccessful, as Palmer’s business contact put it, “men in Finland were similar to Swedes, in that nearly everyone had a bicycle and a rifle and one reason why the Finnish Government were hesitant was that they knew it would be practically impossible to carry it out.”

Western observers saw such dubious Soviet claims of Finnish violations of the peace treaty, as their efforts to establish a casus belli to force a regime change or occupy the country. A general fear existed that,

plans have nearly been completed by which the Russians could gain control of Finland as they have other countries. The plans contemplated would include the usual foundation of protests; for example, regarding fascist dominated elections and the inability or refusal of the Finnish government to carry out the terms of the Peace Agreement with particular emphasis on the refusal to disarm.

Regardless of whether control of Finland was achieved by the communists or by military action it would put Russia closer to the North Sea. Still from other visitors he learned, “that the Finns openly criticize Russian tactics and the activities of Finnish Communists. Everyone seems to agree that the state elections which are to be held this summer will be entirely free and genuinely democratic” and the communists will suffer a setback.

Palmer’s dispatches then, highlighted a number of aspects of the image of Finland. Stoic Finns were quietly, even if less quietly that before, bearing the brunt
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of reparations payments. Soviet intransigence over reparation deliveries, when taken with other evidence, demonstrated meddling or attempts at influencing Finnish internal affairs. A default on a reparation payment might be enough of a justification to end Finnish independence. The activities of the Finnish Communist Party pointed to a possible “Fifth Column” as a means to either seize power directly or through provoking a Soviet take over. In the face of all this Gallant Finland did her best to retain her independence and dignity.

Certainly, the rumours of a “mutual defence pact” Palmer heard opened the possibility of a situation similar to the Baltic States or others in Eastern Europe, where the Soviets used this as a pretext for occupation. The appointment as the minister for the USSR in Finland of hardliner Lieutenant-General Grigori Savonenkov, who had served on the Allied Control Commission, was also seen as a sign “to all observers of Finnish affairs that a tightening up can be expected.” Soon after Savonenkov’s arrival he accused the Finns of various violations of the peace treaty and stalling on the issue of a Finnish-Soviet pact. Finally, on 23 February he delivered a message from Stalin, calling for open negotiations in Moscow for a defence pact similar to Hungary and Romania. However, this occurred while the communist coup was occurring in Czechoslovakia. In public and in private observers were comparing this situation with Finland.

A short time later the legation in Stockholm had a visit from former Finnish army officer who identified himself as “Colonel Tera.” He was one of many “Baltic refugees” of which there were around 60,000 in Sweden, and Palmer thought “at times it seems to me that practically every one of them has been to this Legation enquiring about immigration to Canada.” Tera claimed to have intelligence regarding Russian activities in Finland. The Russians, he told Third Secretary James D. Foote, were building fortifications and munitions dumps in Finnish territory, and had set up organizations to support the Communist Party in Finland. Palmer had these claims investigated and it turned out there was no substance to the question of fortifications and arms dumps. There was a Soviet sponsored school set up in Harviala to train “Finnish Communist officers in their methods of
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warfare."2220 Another was set up in the old castle and the Russians had leased the Sirola Institute, though no evidence of weapons training was found. A number of hunting and sportsmen’s clubs had also been formed, which had not become affiliated with the Finnish Sportsmen’s Association. The idea seems to be so their members with “Communistic leanings” can own firearms.2221

The Canadian assessment of Tera in the end was that his accounts were unreliable and should be regarded with some scepticism.2222 His anti-Soviet views were filled “with the usual rantings common to other refugees in this country but seemed to be substantiated with facts.” 2223 Tera was not deliberately being untruthful but “only following the Finnish trait of making subconscious propaganda.”2224 Canadian officials needed to be reminded of the “need for caution in dealing with persons of this type who are ‘very desirous of giving information’.”2225

Prompted by growing amount of intelligence about Finland by March 1914, in a conversation with Governor General Lord Alexander, Prime Minister King speculated about Soviet intentions. It seemed to the prime minister that the Berlin blockade was really designed to draw attention away from Soviet machinations in Greece, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Norway, and Finland. Alexander who was a military man, was of the opinion it was necessary to stand up to the Soviets to deter further aggression.2226 Certainly it was thought the communists were making headway in the Scandinavian countries, especially Finland. King feared, “There is every possibility of some repetition of Czechoslovakia in some other country, almost at any time during the next couple of weeks.”2227

The situation was ominous. In Ottawa, after a briefing on the situation in Finland based on British reports, the Canadian cabinet on 15 March 1948 considered that, “It was probable that the period immediately ahead would be of major significance.”2228 Indeed it was, the Canadian assessment was that Finland was a powder keg which could precipitate a global war. The Finnish minister again
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visited External Affairs on 17 March 1948 and spoke with Escott Reid about the international situation. Reid suggested to Toivola that Soviet pressure in the north was just a feint to conceal their real intentions in Italy and Palestine. The Finnish minister conceded this might be the case, but was more “concerned about the position that Finland is now being put in by the fact that it is omitted from some of the lists of countries which people are saying must be defended against the Soviet Union.”

Finland was the only country other than the 16 participants in the European Recovery Plan, which was not under Soviet control. The best Reid could offer was the suggestion that Finland “try to spin out as long as possible its negotiations with the Soviet Government” since the situation was fluid “it might be that the situation would be easier for Finland in a couple of months’ time.” He also added “that heretofore the Russians had been extremely careful to make certain that they could demonstrate that all the proper constitutional forms had been gone through before one of their puppet governments took over, and that this might be some comfort to Finland.”

Toivola thought the likelihood of a communist coup was non-existent. Even though the national police force was controlled by the communists, it was small compared to the other police forces. The military also remained loyal. Only about one third of trade unionists were thought to be communists and they did not control the important railway workers and dock workers unions. The Soviets would move “warily in order not to prejudice the prospects of the Finnish Communists in the July election.” If the Soviets pressed for concessions, such as military garrisons as part of a mutual defence pact, the Finnish government would likely refuse and protest to the United Nations. He added “that if the Finns felt they were bound to have a showdown with the Russians sooner or later, they might well prefer to have it now. He seemed to be certain that, given a guarantee by the United States, the
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Finns would be prepared to fight rather than give in to the Russians.”2235 The picture was looking much like it had in the fall of 1939.

It was these portents which pushed Canadian officials to seek an Atlantic alliance with the US and Britain, which ultimately led to the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). A briefing note prepared for Prime Minister King in March for discussions in Washington on British proposals for a mutual assistance pact against Soviet aggression, drew on recent events. There were indications the Soviets would soon make demands on Norway, Denmark, and Sweden. The USSR had gained control of Czechoslovakia and now Pearson wrote, “It looks like it is about to secure complete control of Finland.”2236 An even more detailed note prepared for the Canadian delegates heading to Washington stressed the speed with which an agreement should be reached, the scope and obligations it would involve and the merits of which countries to invite as original signatories of an Atlantic security pact. Whether to include Italy and some of the non-Atlantic Commonwealth countries was a tough question, but the author Escott Reid thought, “An even more difficult decision is whether Finland should be included in the list of original signatories.”2237 The danger was “the Russians might assume we had given Finland up.”2238 He went on, “My guess is that the present regime is a liberal free state which does believe in the principle cited in the Brussels Treaty and that on balance it is in our interests to invite Finland.”2239 Furthermore, “This would be carrying the war into the enemy’s camp with a vengeance” he added, “but the Russians have surely taught us the advantages of going on the offensive.”2240

The fact the West was tentatively courting Finland for an alliance was known to the Soviets. Savonenkov made the accusation on 5 March that Finland had shared information about the proposed mutual assistance pact with Western states and “was aware that Paasikivi and members of the cabinet were seeking contacts for an orientation with the Anglo-Saxons for purposes unfriendly to the Soviets.”2241 The Soviets of course could not permit this. Indeed, Paasikivi had been deliberately
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pursuing the proper constitutional consultations and stalling in order to prepare for
the eventual talks and stall until the details of the proposed pact to be leaked to
Western countries. Realistically he did not expect any direct aid from the US and
UK, but the moral support they could provide would be useful during negotiations.
The reaction to the Soviet proposal in Helsinki, London, Washington, and Ottawa,
was that it was the beginning of the end of Finnish independence. The Soviets
would use the treaty to militarily occupy Finland and draw the country fully into
their sphere. For the Americans, British, and Canadians the proposed pact had
wider implications, since the Scandinavian countries might be offered similar
treaties and that would threaten the security of the Atlantic countries. Previously
Britain and the US had tended try to discourage Finland from signing such a pact,
but now they were careful to offer public support, while not appearing to be having
closer contacts. There were few options open to Finland, since refusing to sign a
pact or entering an alliance with the West would antagonize the Soviets and
potentially cause a situation like occurred in Czechoslovakia.\footnote{2242}

While the Finnish delegation was in Moscow, the British, Americans and
Canadians were in Washington from 22 March to 1 April discussing the possibility
of a “North Atlantic Security Pact.” By the time Reid had drafted his briefing note,
the topic of a pact had been discussed since the latter part of 1946 and he was one
of the biggest Canadian proponents of collective security. His idea that Finland
should be part of the Atlantic pact did not have much traction. As sympathetic as
the negotiators may have been towards Finland, none of them would have wanted
to put the country in jeopardy. While the meeting was underway, the Soviets had
issued orders restricting air and rail traffic to the Western occupation zones of
Berlin and by the time the conference ended there was in force a full blockade.
East-West tensions were high and on the brink of war. Under these circumstances
there was no way Finland would be invited to become a member of the alliance,
because to do so would have been a clear threat to the Soviets. At this time Finland
becoming a part of the Western alliance was largely Reid’s own illusion. In his own
history of the creation of NATO, Reid does not even mention the possibility of
Finland as a prospective member.\footnote{2243}

Canada had greatly expanded its foreign service since the start of the Second
World War. Information about Finland came at times from diverse sources, in this
case the Canadian ambassador to Turkey Victor W. Odlum in Ankara. During a

\footnote{2242}{Allison 1985, 21, 26–29; Hanhimäki 1997, 26–33.}
\footnote{2243}{Reid 1977.}
social visit on 31 March 1948 to the home of the Danish minister, he was joined by several other diplomats and the Finnish minister Baron Aarno Yrjö-Koskinen. It was the Canadian who took the lead and asked, “the significance of what had been happening during the last two days in Helsinki.” The answer was simply that the Finnish delegation had gone to Moscow with one set of broad instructions but found that the Soviet proposal was outside what they had been authorized to discuss. The matter had to be forwarded back to Finland for review and new instructions sent. Odlum persisted and queried about the level of anxiety in Finland over the proposal and how the country would respond if the Soviet demands were for a government “designed to be parallel to and cooperating with Russia in the broad framework of Communism.” Koskinen told Odlum: “Helsinki recognized the situation to be extremely grave” and it was possible the Soviets would ask for a government with key posts held by Communists or their sympathizers. If the demands were “impossible” he went on, “Finland would in effect, be practically helpless. Finland had no adequate army with which to oppose the application of force by Russia. All that Finland could do would be to protest and then submit.” All present agreed with this assessment. In response Odlum said, “we understood that Finland was in as difficult a position as Czechoslovakia had been prior to the recent revolution in that country.” To this Koskinen warned, “that things that have just been happening between Russia on one side and Sweden and Norway on the other, indicated to him that Russia's designs would not be limited by the boundaries of Finland. He felt that if and when Russia had accomplished her purpose in Finland, she would commence to exert similar pressure on the other two Scandinavian countries.”

The result of the consultations in Moscow was on 5 April the Agreement of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance (hereafter YYA). President Paasikivi recognized his country should be neutral and avoid any “alliance” which might draw it into a war. However, he also recognized the imperative that Finland needed to maintain good relations with the Soviet Union if it was to have any hope
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retaining its independence and democratic system. In exchange for some Soviet influence in Finland’s external affairs, the country retained its sovereignty and liberal democratic system. True the pact made Finland’s policy of neutrality lean to one side, but continued cultural, trade and diplomatic contacts with the West and the “Paasikivi Line” of good relations with the neighbour to the east, was a realistic interpretation of the country’s place between East and West.

It was the office in Oslo which provided Ottawa with the first details of the agreement and commentary on it. E.J. Garland, wrote, “that the tension in Norway resulting from the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia and fear of increased Russian pressure on Finland has now abated.” The reason for this was it was thought that the Finnish-Soviet agreement would be modeled on those imposed on Romania and Hungary, whereas the actual treaty was “much less severe.” Another positive point and reason for “considerable satisfaction” was “that the Finnish negotiators succeeded in rejecting two Russian drafts before reaching agreement on the third and final version.” Garland explained, “Finland has not committed herself to any extra-territorial commitments,” and furthermore her sovereignty and independence appear to have been acknowledge in Article 6, which was proof the Finns had successfully resisted further Soviet influence on the country.

Despite the general relief in Norway, there still remained a heightened alert and “suspicion” of Soviet intentions. Both the British and Danish governments had cancelled the leave or restricted the movements of its staff in Oslo in case a crisis developed. There was still some optimism in Ottawa. It was learned the Finns through a patient and firm attitude managed to get the best terms they could hope for. There would be no Soviet troops stationed in Finland, the Finnish military would not be required to support operations except within the Finnish frontier, and Soviet aid would only come after an attack on Finland took place. Finland could not enter into an alliance that was deemed to be anti-Soviet, precluding any Nordic security pact or possible membership in what would become NATO. What caused some concern was the part of the agreement on consultations, which were
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interpreted as a pretext for direct Soviet military intervention into Finland, once a threat from Germany or her allies appeared. What this meant in practice was open to speculation, but for the time being it meant there would be no immediate or automatic Soviet occupation of Finland. Still there was much speculation about what the significance and implications of the terms were. In Ottawa and elsewhere there was also the suspicion there were secret articles to the treaty, much as there had been for the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. The general assessment was that the treaty was more lenient than had been predicted, but the future of Finland was still very much in question.

After the YYA it was the prospect of a communist coup and what would happen during the Finnish general election in July which focused the attention of Canadian officials. Czechoslovakia was still thought to be the template for Finland. Communists and their “fellow-travellers” controlled about 25% of the seats in the Eduskunta. They held many key offices, which meant there were many aspects of state administration the communists controlled or influenced. However, there was hope for the Finns because they were not in an identical situation and opposition to the communists was better organized. At least 75% of the remaining members of the Eduskunta were anti-communist and held more than half of the key posts, preventing complete control of the government by the communists. Paasikivi was seen as the key bulwark against communist domination or any other effort to subvert the constitution. It was also seen as important that the president retained control of the armed forces, through a Social Democrat minister. The State Police were thoroughly “communized,” but they numbered only about 500 and the “mobile police” which numbered 1,600 were also infiltrated, but these were outnumbered by the many municipal police officers who would likely resist a takeover. On the other hand, the relative leniency of the YYA suggested the Soviets were playing a different game. It was possible the Soviets were simply delaying a coup or were trying to build a false sense of security among the other Nordic countries to avoid driving them into a Western alliance. There were a lot of questions about the future of Finland.
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Norman Robertson, the high commissioner in London provided information on the Finnish Communist Party Board which occurred from 17 to 18 April 1948. Though he essentially relayed information from the British Foreign Office it confirmed that the communists remained active. The party claimed it had grown in support from 670 active cells a year previous, to 828 and from 368 party groups to 586 by April 1948. Overall membership had risen from 37,321 to over 50,000 and they could secure control of the country by force if they wanted. The fear was still that social unrest caused by economic problems could be harnessed by the communists, or if it could show that the current regime in Finland was “fascist” or “un-democratic” and therefore in violation of the peace treaty, it could be used as a justification for the outlawing of anti-communist groups and parties in preparation for a takeover. The communists considered themselves to have made three major achievements in recent months. They took credit for Finland rejecting the Marshall Plan, the pact with the Soviet Union, which they described as “the creation of a protective wall for Finland’s independence and inviolability” and advances in social welfare programs.

There was also evidence of the determination of Finns to resist. The Social Democratic Party chairman made what Robertson described as a useful speech on 15 April 1948. He warned that “patriots, the true friends of democracy would meet violence with violence.” However, in Robertson’s view Czechoslovakia was the fate awaiting Finland. The Minister of Education Eino Kilpi he thought was “the would-be Fierlinger of Finland,” a reference to the Zdeněk Fierlinger the Czechoslovakia Social Democratic Party leader who used his party as a communist front organization to conceal its penetration into government and collaborated with the coup. The appointment to the embassy of M.A.N. Feodorov, who had been the NKVD representative on the Allied Control Commission, was thought by the British to foreshadow trouble, not unlike when Valerian Zorin arrived in Prague to help organize the coup. His arrival coincided with intimidation and threats of reprisals directed at the opponents of the communists in the trade unions and other organizations.

British concern shared by their Canadian counterparts was the main danger from the communists lay with the Minister of the Interior Yrjö Leino. If he could
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be removed before the elections in July, Finland would be better able to “resist Soviet pressure” and the government would “less exposed to Communist influence.”

So it was seen as positive when James Foote could report from Stockholm that Paasikivi had “taken strong measures against Finland’s Communists.”

The lack of permanent representation in Finland was perhaps apparent, since the staff from the legation in Stockholm had to rely on information from “a recent visitor to Finland” who “assured” them “that it is factual and added that the most inspirational thing to him in troubled Finland is the freedom of discussion stubbornly maintained by the press.”

Foote learned that during April 1948 the communists had prepared to overthrow the government while the negotiations were underway with the Soviet Union. Czechoslovakia was indeed the model for the Finland. The communists had carried out demonstrations, instigated strikes, and propaganda to disrupt the government. Given Finland’s economic problems and Soviet pressure for the defence agreement it was hoped to bring about government collapse. A united front was presented by various political parties to oppose the communists. Leino’s influence was neutralized by Paasikivi, when he made two other non-communist cabinet ministers responsible for public order and the police. The threat was eliminated by removing the country’s three police forces “the non-political civilian police, the Communist dominated mobile police, and the State police corps” from Leino’s control. It was a move of censure for the disgraced interior minister, who had also acted un-constitutionally when he had earlier handed over 20 naturalized Finns to the Soviets. Paasikivi however, Foote reported, declined to go ahead with impeachment proceedings. The civilian police had been advised to be on the alert for “all eventualities” and the army secured the arms that had been gathered in preparation for shipment to the Soviet Union as part of the disarmament requirements of the peace treaty, which the communists planned to seize to use in their coup.

A number of communist agitators who had made threats against their non-communist workmates had also been charged with terrorism, but despite these developments demonstrations and strikes continued.
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The lack of firsthand information about Finland made Canadian reports incomplete and less reliable. The incident with Leino is an example. Foote claimed it was Paasikivi who had declined to proceed with impeachment proceedings. A circular received from the British clarified things. The Eduskunta had in fact investigated Leino’s April 1945 actions where he turned over the former Soviet citizens who had Finnish or Nansen passports and found these actions unconstitutional since he did not have the approval of cabinet. They referred the matter to the Constitutional Law Committee which reported in March 1947, but there was no agreement on how to proceed. His actions were in fact later approved by the cabinet in 1947 and therefore the matter should be dropped. On 19 May, the Eduskunta approved this. Immediately the leader of the Conservative Party made a motion of non-confidence in the minister of the interior, which passed. Foote’s earlier dispatch had left the impression Leino had been removed from office earlier in the month, whereas his key responsibilities had only been transferred to two other ministers jointly. Only now was Leino removed from office and the office temporarily assigned to the Minister of Education, Eino Kilpi.\textsuperscript{2272} Further confirmation of these events came at the end of May, not from Stockholm, but rather from the high commission in London. Norman Robertson reported he got from the Foreign Office the background information on the Leino case, “which gives every indication of developing into a first-class political crisis.”\textsuperscript{2273}

The immediate threat of a coup had been removed and now the remaining concern was how the election would go. A Canadian observer was sent to gather firsthand information of the results of the July 1948 election. J.D. Foote, arrived in Helsinki in order to observe the results on 2 July, not long before the polls closed. With large numbers of foreign observers and correspondents descending on the capital, the hotels were booked up and it was fortunate that the British legation had made a reservation on his behalf. He considered it “an indication of the great interest shown by the world in these elections.”\textsuperscript{2274} Thanks to the connections of a friend, Foote was invited to a press reception at the Finnish Foreign Office, where he hoped to be able to meet some cabinet ministers and party leaders.

At the reception, over “Finnish ersatz coffee,” Foote was not able to speak to as many people as he would have liked too because of the large number of
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attendees. Despite her politics he found the “most infamous of the Communists in Finland,” Hertta Kuusinen to possess “great charm and a keen wit” and she answered questions from the foreign press “neatly” refusing to speculate on the election outcome. Urho Kekkonen also made a few comments on the election, but he was in a “fine humour” since he would very likely be the next prime minister. He said privately to Foote that he was in fact a Liberal, but had joined the Agrarians to take advantage of their large support among Finnish voters.

Afterwards he went to the press headquarters at another hotel to watch the results. Among those present was Joel Toivola, the Secretary of the Finnish Legation in Copenhagen, and the son of the Finnish Minister in Ottawa. He informed Foote his father had no difficulty finding suitable accommodations for the legation in Ottawa and “was enjoying his stay there.” Later, several correspondents informed Foote that the younger Toivola was a very active communist and had campaigned in the election. To avoid alarm at External Affairs, Foote added that “his father was not sympathetic with his son’s political ideals.”

He also provided a summary of the Finnish electoral system. Based on proportional representation the Finnish Eduskunta would have been somewhat unusual to the officials in Ottawa, even though it was used by many countries around the world. The Finnish system was a liberal democratic, representative form of government, but unlike Canada where the bicameral Westminster model was followed, which used a first past the post system, in Finland it was unicameral. In Canada members of parliament were chosen based on the candidate with the most votes in each riding. Finland selected the 200 members of the Eduskunta using the d’Hondt method to calculate percentages and assign seats for each of the 15 electoral districts.

Though he was only in Helsinki for a short time and did not visit any other part of the country, Foote was of the view “The elections could not have been conducted on a more fair and free basis.” It was with some relief he reported that the communists only received 18% of the popular vote, and the Social Democrats and Agrarians increased their representation. To him it “would appear that the Finnish
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people are determined to protect their liberties against external influences.”

During the election the communists “held their fire,” however, when it came time for Paasikivi to select the cabinet, there may be some trouble. The communists had come to expect several important positions as their prerogative.

Ottawa welcomed the results with a sense of relief. Confirmation of the country’s independent status was seen when the 32nd government of Finland was announced. Karl-August Fagerholm was approved by President Paasikivi as the new prime minister on 29 July. Most members of the cabinet were Social Democrats and it was the first time since the armistice when the Finnish People’s Democratic League was not part of government. Ignoring signs of indirect influence by the Soviets, Fagerholm said he would continue the policy of the previous government, “basing itself upon Finland’s sovereignty and independence” while strengthening “the country’s international position” based on the peace treaty, the UN, the YYA, and good relations with the Soviet Union. Above all, this foreign policy would “ensure unhampered functioning of the government and legal protection of all citizens supported by a democratic and independent judicial system.”

Reporting on a follow up visit to Helsinki in August 1948, J.A.C. Watkins, found that the Finns say, “that they know very well how to deal with the Russians and could get along very well with them if only their own Communists would keep quiet and not confuse the issues.” He thought, “Considering what they have suffered at the hands of the Russians, the spirit and courage of the Finns is amazing. In their own country they criticize the Russians so openly and so provocatively that foreign visitors are frequently alarmed for their safety.” In contrast to the Czechs who were depressed, now the Finns were cheerful, energetic, and indifferent to the opinion of Moscow regarding their internal affairs. “It may be that the sheer translucence of the Finns,” he added, “commands a grudging respect from the Russians that no amount of obsequiousness or adulation could win them. They have long had to recognize Finland as an indigestible morsel.” Their fighting prowess
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earned them the respect of the Soviet high command and Finland’s connections to Scandinavia may make it useful for the Soviets to have an independent Finland as a buffer state, but “Whatever the reason, even in Moscow the Finns are treated neither as domestic pets, like the Albanians, nor as household pests, like the Yugoslavs.”

The support the Fagerholm government had with the Finnish electorate seemed to suggest that Finland had moved away from the brink. By the October 1948, the situation appeared to deteriorate once again, as a series of “unofficial strikes” swept the country. The strikes had originated in the Arabia Porcelain factory in Helsinki and spread to the docks in Helsinki and other ports. Clashes between police and strikers followed. The strikes petered out at the end of October for a number of reasons Palmer suggested. The first was that Prime Minister Fagerholm and Minister of the Interior Aarre Simonen acted firmly against the strikers. Second, the communist presence in the trade unions formed a minority and thirdly the average Finnish worker supported the government, realizing that the demands for wage increases were excessive and a violation of existing labour contracts. Finally, the Trades Union Federation also disavowed the strikes and had reached an agreement with the government that it would continue to oppose them, so long as steps were taken to alleviate some minor grievances around wage disparities. This made the strikes ineffective in their efforts to disrupt the economy, because non-striking workers were not considered “scabs.” Throughout the transportation and production networks continued to operate. The real damage was done by the People’s Democrats from their ongoing campaign to bring disrepute upon the Finnish government internationally. By making allegations that the government had violated the peace treaty by sanctioning paramilitary shooting clubs, a deterioration of relations with the Soviet Union occurred, despite the fact investigations showed no such clubs existed. Fagerholm felt justified leaving the People’s Democrats out of cabinet and in maintaining Finland’s foreign policy, which all parties except the communists supported. Overtime Finland’s “eastern neighbour” it was hoped would see the Finnish communist efforts to “blacken” the country’s reputation for what it was, an effort to cover up their tactical errors.
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13.3 Trade and Commerce

Developing concurrent to the moves towards normal relations and concerns over Finland’s future, was the issue of trade and commerce. The reciprocal MFN treatment between Canada and Finland ended due to the declaration of war and because the UK-Finland trade agreement of 1923 had been abrogated by the British declaration of war. From the armistice in 1944 onward, Finland needed material and financial aid for reconstruction. For example, the trade commissioner in London learned that, even as the war with Germany dragged on, in early 1945 the British Timber Pulp and Paper Commission had gone to Finland and met with their counterparts there to arrange for the purchase of large quantities of softwood, plywood, pit props for mines, and wood pulp. By June, the details of a deal had been finalized. British officials informed Canada but made it clear that they did not want the deal publicized. This was because general trade with Finland was still prohibited by the trading with the enemy legislation and drawing attention to the deal would cause confusion. It seems that although the British wished to facilitate Finland’s return to the international community of nations and saw no legal barriers to the resumption of some trade, they also shared some of Canada’s concerns about appearances. The British SSDA was careful to point out that during the talks with Finland it was “understood there would be no question of resumption of diplomatic relations being involved.” He also offered “our good offices” should “any Dominion Government would wish to negotiate similar agreement.” It was an offer Canada did not take up.

One might expect that the Canadian government would have some concerns about the resumption of the export of Finnish forest products to Britain. When trade with Finland ceased as a result of the war, Canada was able to fill some of Britain’s requirements. Spools for industrial use in fabric making, was the example the high commissioner’s office drew attention to in June 1945. Compared to the 1 million spools imported from Finland, Canada was only able to provide a small portion of the deficit caused by the stoppage of trade. As with wood pulp, Finnish production of spools was below pre-war levels, and this meant that given British needs,
Canadian exports to Britain would not likely decrease.\textsuperscript{2297} Therefore Canada raised no concerns about the deal.

By the end of July 1945, the UK-Finland trade arrangement apparently was no longer much of a secret. The commercial secretary for Norway Shirley G. MacDonald submitted a report which talked about the deal and it was published in the \textit{Commercial Intelligence Journal}. He described Finland as a “former enemy” and “an ex-enemy-country,” but cautioned that it was still subject the wartime restrictions and ordinary trade was not permitted.\textsuperscript{2298} Unlike some of the other former enemy countries perhaps Finland could be thought of as an exception he added, “However, it is considered that the position of Finland is somewhat different to that of other axis countries and accordingly some sympathetic consideration has been given to her to recommence trade with the United Kingdom along certain lines.”\textsuperscript{2299} Britain badly needed the Finnish forest products for reconstruction, and the items Finland required from Britain were in short supply, so there would be little in the way of reciprocal trade. Given the balance of payment situation, for the most part it meant Britain would be accumulating Finnish credits. The actual transactions were arranged by the British Ministry of Supply and Finnish officials only. It was expected this situation would last for several months, until “the political position of Finland is clear.”\textsuperscript{2300} In summary he added, “Finland economically is in a very difficult position on account of reparations, and while Britain is sympathetic towards placing the republic in the position of an ex-enemy which, as Mr. Churchill has put it, ‘has worked its passage,’ nevertheless, no free trade with Finland can be anticipated for some time to come.”\textsuperscript{2301}

Some of the British restrictions on trade with Finland had therefore been gradually lifted in February and again in August 1945.\textsuperscript{2302} There were now in place procedures for the liquidation of debts between the two countries, as well as the use of sterling accounts for imports and exports. MacDonald described the situation in his follow up report as one where “trading with the enemy” rules had been relaxed
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to the point where normal trade and financial transactions had resumed.\textsuperscript{2303} Despite this, because of the need for reconstruction in both countries, much of the trade would still be handled between the two governments and in some cases export licences would be needed. His use of quotations around the expression trading with the enemy and its subsequent publication in the \textit{Commercial Intelligence Journal} showed that MacDonald and others in the Department of Trade and Commerce were in accord with the British view of Finland as an exception. Even though diplomatic relations could not be resumed with a country with which Britain was still at war, this did not preclude “friendly relations” such as trade from occurring.\textsuperscript{2304} To men like MacDonald, Finland might technically be an ex-enemy, but it was not an enemy in the way Germany or Japan had been enemies of Canada. The officials at External Affairs, however, would not be so pragmatic. Despite the small scale of Finnish-Canadian trade before the war and the clear need for Finland to restore that trade, External Affairs officials would persist with a legalistic interpretation of the situation and held to a line that argued that no arrangements could be reached until the peace treaty was ratified ending the state of war.

Some Canadian officials may have been reticent regarding the possibility of any sort of trade agreement with Finland, but they generally kept pace with the British regarding other aspects of this larger issue. By the end of February 1945, the Secretary of State authorized communication with the “liberated areas of Finland.”\textsuperscript{2305} Most of the German forces had been driven from Finland by this time, so it effectively meant all of the country was liberated and anyone transmitting or receiving communications for personal business, financial, and commercial matters “will not now be deemed to be trading with the enemy.”\textsuperscript{2306} Legal documents such as death, birth and marriage certificates, wills, and legal notices could now be sent, but other types of legal documents such as power of attorney needed the permission of the Custodian of Enemy Property. Banks and financial institutions could reply to enquiries from depositors and businesses could re-establish contacts and exchange information, though no actual trading could take place. Also, in February, the United States went farther, removing Finland “from the status of enemy
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territory” and permitted trade and financial transactions with a Treasury Board licence. This made the Canadian situation seem even more incongruous.

Finally, on 17 September 1945, Secretary of State Paul Martin, announced that permission was granted to resume trade with Finland from Canada. The regulations had been amended so that trade with Finland could legally resume and people doing so would not be deemed to be trading with the enemy even though Canada was not legally at peace with Finland. Just over one week later the Foreign Exchange Control Board made it possible to facilitate trade by placing Finland in the category with “non-sterling area countries.” Finnish-Canadians could now send money through “authorized dealers” to their friends and families back home for “support and maintenance,” but were limited to 30 pounds per person or 100 pounds per family per month. The reason for this was because money transfers did not send money directly to Finland, the money had to go via Britain. Foreign exchange controls had been imposed because they were facing a balance of payments crisis and was managing this by restricting the amount of foreign currency which left Britain, regardless of its source. British capital accounts had a surplus of pounds sterling and the Bank of England was willing to allow transactions in that currency to be transmitted to Finland, but not for example in US dollars.

While this was occurring, the United States was approached by Finland for loans or credits to assist in purchasing raw materials in that country. In Washington, the Canadian ambassador who was processing economic summaries received from Britain, learned that the “Finnish Economic Mission” in the US by the end of November 1945 appeared likely to secure a loan. This would be done like the loans during the Winter War, via the Export Import Bank. The Finns had asked for $65 million for 1946 and a further $45 million for 1947. American authorities had hesitated for a time and “were unfavourably inclined towards the providing of financial assistance to Finland since they felt that such assistance at this stage would be used at least indirectly to finance reparations payments being made by Finland.” On closer scrutiny, it was confirmed that the nature of the reparations
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Finland had to pay to the USSR were fixed in terms of the type and quantities of goods and did not expose the US to the criticism that they were financing Finnish reparations. The question the ambassador had was if a similar request had been received by the Canadian government and if any information could be provided to US authorities on the subject. Indeed, a request for an export credit of $500,000 had been made to buy vitamins, vitamin oils, and eye glass lenses, but nothing was done because to the negative balance of payments situation facing Canada.2313

As the Finnish request was processed through the American approval process, it appeared the amount requested by Finland would not be granted. The Canadian embassy learned in conversations with US officials that 25–35 million in US dollars would be loaned, plus a five million dollar credit to purchase cotton.2314 Despite earlier reassurances that the loans would not finance reparations payments, the directors of the Export Import Bank deferred their decision in January 1946. They had “considered approving” a loan for 35 million dollars, only “if they could be assured that no publicity would be given to it at this particular time.”2315 However, now “Apparently they felt that public reaction might be unfavourable to such a loan at this particular time in view of certain criticisms expressed by the Finnish community in the United States concerning the trials of war criminals in Helsinki and concerning certain aspects of political relations between Finland and the U.S.S.R.” 2316 Alongside the negative press, the British economic summary received in Ottawa pointed out that the American press was reminding everyone that Finland was “the only nation…that never defaulted on World War I debts to the United States.”2317 Once the negative publicity died down they agreed to the loan in February 1946.2318

A request that Canada also provide loans or credits followed in June 1946. The first request came unofficially. In this case it was J.T. ‘Tobby’ Norell, who was now the Canadian representative of the Finnish firm Fennia and the Finnish Foreign Trade Council, who presented himself as the “unofficial representative of Finland” in Canada.2319 Canadian offices had previously encountered him during the Winter
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War. It was learned from the press that he was a naturalized Canadian, who had emigrated from Finland in 1926. A flamboyant individual, he was heralded as an immigration success story, learning fluent English within a few years and made a small fortune importing Finnish granite. Now that the war was over, Norell was looking to secure a share of “Suomi” trade, as he reminded Canadians the name Finns give to their own country. His aim was to find suppliers of rolling stock for the Finnish state railway. They were mainly interested in locomotives and rail cars from the US, but if a two million dollar credit could be provided, part of the order could be placed in Canada. In meetings between Norell and the Department of Reconstruction and Supply it was learned Canadian manufacturers were “keen to have the order.”

The balance of payments problem, postwar reconstruction, and domestic demand meant that there was very little surplus capacity in the Canadian economy. More trade would actually lead to inflation, since there would be more money seeking the scarce supply. When the matter was raised with the Minister of Finance J.L. Ilsley “he felt that in view of the action we had taken with other countries and also the general policy of the Government at the present time, we should make no undertaking to Finland just now, even though this means Canada's losing the business to the United States.” Norell was informed of the denial and he asked if the request could be raised again in a few months. In principle he was told there was no reason why not. By that time, Finland would be looking for surplus broad-gauge rail cars. Canadian cars even though they were somewhat larger than those required, were of the same gauge as Finnish rails. The one hurdle would be the Soviets had raised some difficulties over the issue. To purchase these Finland would still require credits, but unless the economic situation had changed, Canada could still not help. It was suggested that the War Assets Corporation might be willing to extend their own credit to facilitate the sale. However, in the end the answer was that Finland had no Canadian government credit and was unlikely to receive any in the short term. Any Finnish trade with Canada had to be conducted in US dollars. Even if a credit was available Canadian manufacturers of locomotives faced a steel
shortage, had orders that would tie up their plants into 1947, and would not be able
to supply any to Finland before 1948 or 1949.2324

The second request came more formally from the Finnish political
representative in London. Eero Wuori asked Canada to look into providing a credit
of $10–15 million and at the same meeting raised the question of the appointment
of Finnish consular representatives in Canada now that the war was over. Perhaps
with the intention of allaying Canadian concerns over resuming economic relations
with Finland in advance of a peace treaty, the Foreign Office a short time later
provided an update concerning Finland-UK commercial relations.2325 For the time
being nothing more happened.

It would appear that Finland was approaching the matter of Canadian loans and
credits from several different avenues, or quite possibly in a haphazard manner.
Within a few days the former Honorary Consul for Finland A. Kingsley Graham
made another inquiry into the same topic, at the request of the Dr. K.T. Jutila, the
Finnish minister in Washington. This time the appeal was made to the DEA. Jutila
had discussed it with the Canadian minister in Washington and was told, “a credit
could probably not be granted. We gave Graham the same reply and gave our
reasons the heavy export credit commitments which we have already undertaken
and the lack of availability, this year at any rate, of the most of the commodities
which Finland wished to procure—largely cereals, machinery and clothing.”2326
Graham countered this by urging, “that Finland be assisted because she was a buffer
state between Western Europe and the U.S.S.R., and because of her difficult post-
war problems which included the care of 425,000 displaced persons.”2327 For
Canada the SSEA considered this immaterial, “because a loan was not available on
supply and financial grounds the political considerations did not arise. In so far as
Finland's reconstruction problem was concerned, we pointed out that export credits
were—for trade purposes only and were not available for relief or
rehabilitation.”2328
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Even as the negative reply was provided, the high commission in London sent by air mail further explanation of the Finnish situation and an aide mémoire from the Finnish political representative explaining the request. What was wanted from Canada was a 10–15 million dollar credit in the form of a loan tied to the purchase of Canadian goods. It was hoped that grain, hides, leather, lead, aluminium, automobile tires, and other rubber products purchased from Canada in the past, could be obtained once again. The need for credit was, “the result both of the familiar exigencies of the post-war transition period, and also of the fact that, in the fulfilment during the next six years of the war reparations imposed upon her by the Allied Nations, she will be unable to develop exports to such an extent as to permit the financing of all her necessary imports.”

It was pointed out that not only the US, but Sweden and Brazil had granted loans and that “The granting of credits is an indication that these countries have confidence, not only in Finland’s sincere wish to maintain service on her loans, but also in her ability to discharge herself of them.”

The Economic Relations Department of the British Foreign Office explained for Canada’s benefit, its view of the situation. The reason Finland had not made a similar request of the UK, was no doubt they were aware Britain was in no position to grant credits. Nevertheless, there was still a considerable amount of trade between Finland and Britain. The agreement reached in August 1945 facilitated this, but because a large part of that trade was timber and pulp from Finland, the balance of payments was in Finland’s favour. Due to shortages of commodities and the financial necessity of exchange controls, Britain has been unable to supply much of Finland’s needs. Finland was therefore put into the position of having to threaten to stop shipments of the timber and pulp, much needed in Britain’s own reconstruction efforts. In the end Britain was able to supply some badly needed sugar and glue to Finland. These special arrangements had now come to an end, but exports continued to go to Finland as reported in the British press.

The British commercial counsellor in Helsinki was of the view, that as much as possible, exports should continue to go to Finland, not only from Britain but the West in general, to help Finland recover. The prospects for Finnish economic recovery were optimistic but faced difficulties because of shortages. Britain was
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doing all it could to help, but also faced economic problems. The “sympathetic” British policy was motivated by a “practical desire to facilitate Finnish production of goods which are urgently needed” in Britain, but also “it is thought desirable, on political grounds, to increase trade between Finland and the West.”\(^{2332}\) Despite the widespread popular view to the contrary, “The Foreign Office do not take the view that it is inevitable for Finland to fall entirely within the commercial orbit of the Soviet Union.”\(^{2333}\) This view was supported by the results of the Finnish trade delegation which went to the USSR earlier in the year. Details on the agreement were scarce, but it is generally known that it allowed for the barter of Finnish forest products in exchange for wheat. The commercial councillor saw no indication of an effort to monopolize Finnish trade and “the Foreign Office is proceeding on the assumption that is not Soviet policy.”\(^{2334}\) Though the assumption could be questioned, they felt it was worth the risk “to keep this window open on the Baltic.”\(^{2335}\)

The high commissioner reminded officials in Ottawa that the 300 million dollars in reparations “is very heavy for so small a country.”\(^{2336}\) To this point Finland was able to use existing stocks to maintain timely delivery of payments. Over the upcoming 18 months it was thought that Finland would have great difficulty without increasing imports, both to meet domestic needs and to “rehabilitate” the Finnish economy so it can finance its reparations payments. The Foreign Office was of the view “that Finland will be able to meet its reparations obligations, and that the credits from other countries will be repaid and will not simply go into the pockets of the Soviet Union in the form of reparations.”\(^{2337}\) The implication was Canada should consider helping Finland in the interests of the West.

All this seemed to amount to little, because the reply from External Affairs simply reiterated the reasons for Canada’s refusal. The SSEA wrote to the high commissioner, “we have replied that the prospects were not good because we are already heavily committed financially in our export credit programme and because
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there does not appear to be, in 1946 at any rate, the goods available which Finland most requires.”

Similar “approaches” from Greece, Italy, Poland, Denmark, Austria, and one from Czechoslovakia for additional credit had all been declined, “our replies have been uniformly discouraging.” There was nothing to suggest in this pattern, no matter what political considerations might be raised, that it would be any different for Finland.

The United States on the other hand, with its larger economy, was able to continue to help Finland. It was announced in January 1947 by the Export Import Bank that a long term 20 million dollar credit was issued to Finland, tied to the purchase of machinery, equipment, and materials in the US. These would then be used to help the recovery of the forest industry and the export production of lumber, pulp, and paper. An additional short-term credit of 10 million dollars, to be repaid at the end of 1947 was granted, to buy essential foodstuffs from the US through the winter. This was to offset the decline in Finland’s foreign exchange receipts. Further loans of two million dollars to finance the shipment of cotton and five million dollars were made to allow Finland to buy needed materials, equipment, and services. All of this was in addition to the loans provided in 1946. The stated aim was to help Finland to work towards establishing foreign trade on a “self-sustaining basis.”

Even with this Finland needed to generate the funds to pay for an estimated 230 million dollars in imports per year. Canada simply did not have the financial resources to compete with this, even given the smaller figures requested by the Finns.

This was the case when Tobby Norell, now acting as the Commercial Representative of Finland, came looking for credits again in April 1947. He was looking to finance purchases Finland hoped to make in Canada over the next 12–18 months. He once again outlined the economic problems facing Finland. There were goods and materials available in Canada which Finland required, but because there was a shortage of dollar reserves, this would be difficult without a credit. Among the items Norell wished to procure were steel in the form of plate for ship construction, lead, brass strip, paints, planning mill machinery, cod liver oil, and eye glass lenses. What was wanted was a 10-year loan, with payments starting in 1951. In fact, on terms not unlike those offered by the US, Norell, it was reported “was at first very reluctant to mention any amounts saying that they would
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prefer to have us decide on the figure that we could afford to give them, but later he indicated that even a token amount would be very welcome to them for psychological and political reasons, if we felt that we could not do anything very substantial.”

An internal memorandum by the Department of Finance noted past credit requests had been denied “in accordance with the general policy we were following at that time and also in part because we had not yet concluded a treaty of peace with Finland.” The last point was not in fact relayed to Finnish officials as a justification for turning down the requests. It had been part of the larger issue of the resumption of trade relations with Finland. R.B. Bryce the Department of Finance official who spoke with him, “did not discuss the Finnish situation at great length with Norell but I endeavoured to make clear to him that new loans at this juncture would be contrary to the policy and practice which the Government has been following” and “It would be hard to justify making a flagrant exception to our general policy now in order to give Finland a relatively small loan.” Instead what was proposed was obtaining a 10-year loan of $750,000 from one of the private Canadian banks or insurance companies, guaranteed by the Canadian government. This might prove to “be quite attractive to one of these institutions and would not constitute a very serious departure from our general policy,” especially if the loan was in US dollars, it would justify a “departure from the general policy which we are following now largely on exchange grounds.”

To his colleagues Bryce cautioned, “There is, of course, the problem of Finland's credit and political situation. I gathered from Mr. Pearson that on broad political grounds he would very much support a small credit to Finland at the present time. Finland's credit record is also spectacularly good, although of course her economic future is now much more clouded than it has been in the past.” L.B. Pearson was of course on the staff at External Affairs and held a different perspective on Canada’s national interest as it involved Finland. Pearson was deeply concerned that every support be given to Finland to maintain her sovereignty. Despite his misgivings, a few days later Bryce forwarded detailed information received from Norell about Finland’s trade situation to the M.W. Mackenzie, the Deputy Minister of the Department of Trade and Commerce, in case the Department of Finance, “may wish
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518
to discuss with you shortly the question of whether or not the Government should undertake to guarantee a small credit to Finland” and the information might prove useful.2347

The Department of Trade and Commerce took note of the publicity surrounding the US credits to Finland.2348 K. Nyenhuis, wrote to the director, that “Credits extended to Finland will mainly serve the purpose of enabling this country to fulfill the obligations to Russia, and to improve the domestic situation, but I would think a small private loan…would be fully justified, as it will most likely be the sole means of keeping Canada's name and products alive in the country, although $750,000 won’t go very far.”2349 The director, G.R. Heasman, spoke about “discretion” and wondered if the products desired could be supplied and if they would lead to a “continuing market” in later years?2350 On closer investigation it was learned that except for eye glass lenses, planning mill machinery and cod liver oil, all the products Finland wanted were in short supply and would take 12–18 months for Canadian suppliers to produce enough for export.2351

R.B. Bryce informed Norell, they were “not prepared to recommend to the Government any further export credit projects this year, no matter what the circumstances.”2352 In an effort to placate, he assured him “our decision in this matter has not in any way been concerned with the situation of Finland, but rather with the position of Canada itself.”2353 This meant that trade with Finland would only increase once the Finnish economy had recovered sufficiently to be able to purchase Canadian exports in cash and a trade agreement would have to wait until the peace treaty was ratified. Until that time, Norell was advised by External Affairs, “Since Canada is still technically at war with Finland general tariff rates are still in effect.”2354 Finland was required to grant MFN treatment to all the United Nations within 18 months of the treaty coming into effect, so Norell would have to wait until then or until a more permanent agreement was in place.
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Later that fall from Stockholm, Frederick Palmer tried to offer political reasons for reconsidering the decision. He said, “I am convinced that a small credit to Finland would be a good business risk as the reputation of the Finns for paying off foreign loans is of the highest.” 2355 He went on to say, “A small credit to Finland, say five or ten million dollars might be regarded as a segment of a small Canadian ‘Marshall Plan.’” 2356 Despite these sound reasons and the sympathy of USSEA Pearson, in the end Canada’s financial guardians had carried the decision because of the general policy of limiting export credits to a level that would not place a strain on domestic demand, the potential inflationary pressure increased demand would cause, and the need to maintain a favourable balance of payments. The fact the peace treaty with Finland had yet to be finalized provided a formal, if only subsidiary rationalization for refusing the request. 2357

Palmer’s observations showed that economic matters regarding Finland remained a matter of interest, though less as a potential Canadian market and more as a barometer of relations between East and West. Acting as the Canadian commercial counsellor Palmer produced periodic reports about conditions in Finland. In March 1947 he hosted a pair of representatives of British companies involved with the forest industry and two delegates who were studying Finnish forestry practices and recently attend conferences there. While the report does mention interest in Canadian forestry and made some remarks about the state of the Finnish industry, a portion of the text was about conditions in Finland. Palmer relayed comments about Finnish morale by George Wiskeman, a former British consul in Moscow and a representative of several British firms in Scandinavia and the Baltic. Wiskeman,

was impressed with the attitude the Finns have adopted to meeting the Russian reparations demand and their attitude to work generally while a year ago the Finns appeared to be apathetic and were indifferent to the need for greater production [and]…found today a very hard working population. Not only are the Finns all impressed with the necessity for meeting Russian reparation demands as they come due but they know that imports are dependent on the export of surpluses over the needs for reparations. 2358
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Despite the fact that Finland was making great strides at meeting reparations payments, they faced one problem after another. Industrial production was made more difficult by significantly lower than average snow falls the winter of 1946–1947. This made for lower water levels and less hydroelectric power being generated. The Baltic Sea does not become completely ice covered in winter, but nevertheless the Gulf of Bothnia and the Gulf of Finland do eventually become ice covered. Finland as a consequence had developed a high level of ice breaking technology, which enabled the shipping season to be extended. This posed a problem as a result of reparations, since one of the items demanded by the Soviets were Finnish ice breaking ships. All these factors made it more of a challenge for Finland to meet the onerous reparations payment schedule imposed on them.

It was noted that as part of the peace treaty obligations, Finland had turned over to the Soviets, German capital, and firms. This was seen as part of Soviet preparations to take a direct part in the Finnish economy. German firms which had branch plants in Finland had been transferred to Soviet control and there were reports some would be merged. The Soviets were seen to be infiltrating the Finnish economy through the energy sector, with a large amount of the Finnish requirement for petroleum being provided by the Soviets through Finska Petroleum and control of a former German coal company. Similar infiltration was occurring among electric companies, shipping firms, the metal industry, and the manufacture of artificial silk. These were wholly owned by the Soviets, with Finnish communists appointed to head them or partly sold to Finnish business men as joint companies, designed to take advantage of trade between the two countries.

Canadian officials monitored the situation in Finland because that country’s geopolitical importance in the East-West confrontation. There were concerns that the Soviets were penetrating the Finnish economy and political life, thereby undermining the countries policy of neutrality. They were also concerned about the status of Finnish reparations, because if Finland were forced to default, it was unclear how the Soviets would react. Although Canada could play only a small or supporting role in the Cold War, Finland was seen as a bellwether of tensions in Europe and the Soviet treatment of Finland would be an indication that war might be imminent. Finland was therefore of interest to Canadian foreign policy decision-makers.

---
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makers and explains the support for a loan and a trade agreement by people such as Palmer and Pearson.

The question was still left unresolved was MFN treatment for Finland. In response to queries about the status of trade relations it was noted by a Department of Trade and Commerce official that “in absence of any peace with her, they have not been reinstated.”2362 Britain had moved ahead with a trade agreement despite the legal technicalities and an exchange of notes occurred on 6 April 1946. Like the 1945 timber deal this was also to be kept confidential. Importantly for Canada, unlike the 1923 agreement, the new one did not cover Canadian goods. It would be up to Canada to find its own mechanism for the resuming trade with Finland.2363 Canadian officials still preferred to wait. Most ordinary Finnish-Canadians and others likely regarded the legalistic rationale behind this to be hard to grasp, since in the popular perception the war ended with the armistice. To those obtuse Canadian officials, it was best for Canada to wait they thought, until the peace treaty was ratified, to avoid legal complications and embarrassing questions, before resuming anything that resembled normal relations like a trade deal.

However, starting in February 1945 prohibitions under the Trading With the Enemy Regulations as they applied to Finland had been gradually reduced, if not completely removed. So the Canadian stance was at best incongruous with the reality.2364 The Commercial Intelligence Service despite the restrictions placed on Canadian-Finnish trade at the time, began reporting on economic conditions and trade in Scandinavia and Finland in June 1945.2365 By mid-1946, F.H. Palmer, who had held this post from 1929 to 1934, was in Stockholm providing commercial intelligence.2366 Trade did resume between Canada and Finland in 1946, albeit in a limited way due to the continuation of wartime regulations. Canadian exports to Finland amounted to slightly more than $507,000 and imports roughly $23,000.2367 The discussions with Norell then, had perhaps been misleading. There were no credits for Finland, but some trade was possible.

---
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Canadians officials were also kept abreast of economic developments in Finland during 1946 and 1947 by the Canadian Military Mission in Germany. With the Treaty of Paris ratified and deposited Finland reached a trade agreement with Britain and the United States that permitted trade with their occupation Zones in Germany. Finland would buy metal products and sell wood pulp and other products to Germany.2368 With such a high-profile international precedent and the removal of the legal obstacles, the way was set for the resumption of normal Canada-Finland trade.

R.G. Riddell of External Affairs pushed the issue at the end of January 1947, because the peace treaty was to be signed the following month. By the peace treaty Finland was required to afford Canada MFN treatment for a period of 18 months after the signing. M.W. Mackenzie from Trade and Commerce. replied that in deciding whether to extend MFN to Finland, Canada should “consider the trade possibilities involved, pre-war relationships, and broader questions of economic reconstruction and revival of world trade involved.”2369 Trade possibilities would likely remain limited because of the need for reconstruction. Reparations would also for some time place them, “under the influence” and “subservient to any trade policy” the Soviets might want to impose on them as the recipient of those payments. 2370 Historic trade patterns made it obvious there was no specific advantage for Canada. It was likely that any provision of MFN to Finland might be eclipsed by the ongoing efforts to form the International Trade Organization (ITO). Nonetheless, it was recommended, “that action might well be taken by Canada to exchange most favoured nation treatment” with Finland and the other former enemy countries.2371 External Affairs later reminded Trade and Commerce that in fact Canada was obligated to extend MFN to Finland, Italy, Romania, and Hungary. At the peace conference, though it was originally a British idea, it was Canada which sponsored the clause in the treaties and had actually pushed for a period of 3 years, not the 18 months which was eventually adopted. Furthermore, if MFN was not offered then Finland would not be obligated to do so to Canada.2372

An External Affairs intra-departmental memorandum saw three options for Canada. The country could pass an Order in Council and unilaterally extend MFN.
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Then through the good offices of the UK inform Finland and the others of this action and request they reciprocate. Secondly, Finland and the four other countries could be asked through the British to make a formal request for MFN treatment. Lastly, Canada could initiate talks leading to a mutual exchange of notes creating a “form of a commercial modus vivendi.” The last two options had “merit…from a political point of view” because they offered Finland an opportunity to engage politically with the West, but the first option was recommended because under the Customs Act authority existed to implement MFN. This matter of fact approach was preferred by the increasingly nationally conscious DEA, who were aware of the limits of Canada’s diplomatic representation abroad, but hoped to “avoid a certain amount of negotiation which of necessity would have to be conducted on our behalf by the United Kingdom.” Though it was recognized this was mainly a trade matter, the inclusion of a 3 month escape clause was necessary, “in view of the economic and political situation in most of these countries.” By mid-May 1947 it was decided to proceed unilaterally, once the peace treaty was ratified by Canada, however, officials deferred on the matter pending the results of the meeting of the preparatory committee carrying out multilateral discussions on tariffs and ITO which began in April. There was also the need to consider, the UN Conference on Trade and Employment, also aimed at creating the ITO, set to meet in Havana in November 1947. Hesitation existed over MFN treatment, because Canada did not want to commit to an arrangement with Finland which would be nullified by the results of these talks.

External Affairs brought up the topic again in December 1947. As a result of the declaration of war all treaties, agreements, and protocols with Finland had either been annulled or put in abeyance. Canada had been required by the peace treaty to formally notify Finland of the pre-war arrangements it wished to resume. In this case Trade and Commerce were asked about the advisability of Canada resuming its adhesion to MFN under Article 23 of the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation.

---
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Between the United Kingdom and Finland. 2380 This treaty had not been restored by both Finland and Britain, but replaced with a new agreement with no provision for Canada to accede. Therefore, it was doubtful Canada could revive the agreement and a new agreement would be necessary. Again, no decision was reached. 2381

Toivola, presented a request for MFN treatment for Finland to Escott Reid in writing on 9 February 1948. The request had been prompted by the Finns drawing attention to the prejudicial tariff their granite faced against competing stone from Norway and Sweden. Department officials selectively focused on that issue and did not try to deal with MFN treatment. 2382 Canada continued to delay claiming that it was desirable to wait until the results of the ongoing Havana Conference regarding the ITO were known and nothing more would be done until August. 2383 When the topic was revisited in August 1948 another delay was instituted. The Interim Commission of the ITO proposed approaching a number of countries including Finland, to become contracting parties of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). 2384 Now it was best to wait until Finland’s response to the invitation was known, since the main feature of GATT was MFN treatment. 2385 Canada was unwilling to contract with Finland for MFN treatment if ultimately Finland did not accede to GATT. After all Canada had been among the first nations to propose the idea of an agreement to reduce tariffs in 1945. 2386

The lack of action could be attributed to the fact that “Canada’s trade with Finland has been small and of an inconsistent pattern,” as a report several years later confirmed. 2387 For example in 1939 Finland purchased $380,000 worth of wheat, flour, steel, electrical appliances, porcelain insulators, rubber tires, tobacco, leather, canned fish, copper and farm implements; while Canada imported in return only $88,000 worth of farm implements, paper, fur, and cheese. 2388 Nonetheless Canadian exports to Finland during 1947 valued at $1,212,660 and imports from

---
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Finland worth $30,000 occurred without a trade agreement.\textsuperscript{2389} Simply put, the department thought “There was no great advantage to be obtained for Canadian trade…Our principal exports to Finland would probably not suffer from tariff barriers.” \textsuperscript{2390} Furthermore, Finnish exports to Canada were “not of great importance.”\textsuperscript{2391} Through the whole process the Finnish government remained patient. Which was all the more apparent, because even while Canada dithered, Finland in compliance with the treaty, extended MFN treatment in compliance to Canada unilaterally in early September 1948.\textsuperscript{2392} Once Finland announced its intention to accede to GATT, the department conceded there might be some political advantages to granting MFN in the interim until the agreement took effect.\textsuperscript{2393}

For his part Toivola met again with Escott Reid at the end the month. He needed to show his government that some progress had been made, “and partly because it would indicate the sympathy of the Canadian Government to the Finnish Government.”\textsuperscript{2394} Reid agreed that Toivola had been doing good work on behalf of Finland and some gesture should be shown because, “his Government has shown amazing courage in sailing so close to the wind in its relations with the Soviet Union. I think no one would have forecast a few months ago that it would have been possible for Finland to set up a government which contains no Communists, which has thoroughly investigated Communist penetration into its police and which is now engaging in purging the police.”\textsuperscript{2395} The next round of GATT talks was not scheduled until 1949 and this would mean an inordinate delay. Toivola stressed Finland’s need to have a bilateral agreement in place until the GATT was acceded too. Haste was also essential he argued since after 1 December Finnish ports would freeze up. It was agreed that MFN treatment between the two countries would be implemented by an exchange of notes.\textsuperscript{2396}
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It was the SSEA Lester B. Pearson who championed the Finnish cause, eventually gaining the support of his fellow ministers in Finance, Trade and Commerce and National Revenue. When the matter was brought before Cabinet on 27 October 1948, he stressed Finland’s commitment to participate in the GATT negotiations.2397 There were also no disadvantages in extending MFN in the interim period before GATT came into force, since the balance of trade was in Canada’s favour and the Finns paid in US dollars. He also thought “From the political point of view, there are strong reasons for an Exchange of Notes with Finland at once so” trade could occur before freeze up.2398 As well, “Finland has retained a remarkably democratic form of government, with free elections despite obvious strong pressure for the Soviet Union. The recent elections in Finland would indicate a weakening of the Communist support in the country. I feel, therefore, that every encouragement should be given to Finland to co-operate with democratic countries.”2399 Finally on 28 October 1948 the documents to accord MFN treatment to Finland were prepared.2400 No sooner than this had occurred, then it was realized that the announcement did not have a start date assigned to it. As well, Canadian trade officials who were preparing to participate in the 1949 GATT conference, which Finland also was attending, thought it would be advisable to modify the agreement to reflect the anticipated changes in the tariff structure. The exchange of notes announced on 19 November 1948, granted Finnish products the same treatment as similar goods produced in the United Kingdom, and stipulated the agreement would remain in force for 1 year, could be terminated with 3 months’ notice by either government, but none the less would expire once GATT was signed.2401

The choice of wording for the notes was reflective of the older 1923 UK-Finland agreement. The rationale was that because the Finnish parliament would not have convened until the following spring and thereby avoided the need for approval of a “new” agreement. This was outlined in a memorandum to the Department of Trade and Commerce to justify the deviation from the standard Canadian wording for MFN treatment. It also added the explanation, about Finnish
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ports freezing up. Canadian images of Finland as a northern country beset by ice and snow were clearly at work. However, when the information was relayed to the Canadian legation in Stockholm, Frederick Palmer had to remind them “it is quite true that this severe weather in the north of the Baltic does result in severe freeze-ups but I think you should remember that great efforts are exerted to keep the port of Åbo [Turku] open throughout the winter. As a result of these efforts, ships, certainly from Stockholm, can always get into Åbo although there are frequently serious delays.” At least the Canadian minister responsible for Finland was aware that the country had superior ice breaking ship technology, which Toivola had conveniently not mentioned.

The press release which accompanied the agreement saw it to be of benefit to both countries. The main Canadian import from Finland was granite and Canada exported sole leather, metal products, cordage, and twine. From the Canadian point of view it was a fresh agreement, though in substance it was a revival of the 1923 adhesion. Finland on the other hand opted to regard it as part of a legislative program designed to renew or revive certain bi-lateral and multilateral trade agreements with the USSR, the UK, and Canada. In this case it was an extension of the renewal of the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation with Britain and the application of Article 23. It was an unusual twist, because Canadian officials had earlier thought it was not possible to revive that agreement and had been working on the premise this was a new one.

With MFN treatment Finland-Canada trade rose substantially. The main products exported to Finland in 1947 included much needed iron, steel, lead and aluminium, machinery parts, electrical appliances, red clover seed, tires, and powdered milk valued at $2,280,000. Whereas Finnish exports remained low at $39,000 consisting mostly of granite, Finnish and Swedish language books, and cream separators. As a proportion of overall Canadian or Finnish trade these figures still represented a minor part of each country’s trade. However, the importance for Finland, especially the metal products, lay in satisfying domestic consumption and helping in a small way to provide the materials necessary to produce manufactured goods for reparations payments.
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Thereafter normal trade between Canada and Finland resumed. In the two years after the trade agreement inquiries from Finland about the purchase of items made in Canada rose. They included items as diverse as outboard motors, electrical parts, hunting rifles, shot guns, sights and ammunition, sport fishing rods, lures, and other sporting equipment. Other items included spelter and electrolytic zinc, aluminium cable, accessories for electrical power transmission lines and towers, tin, lead, iron, steel, various non-ferrous metals, steel rolling mills, and industrial machine parts. In addition, there were two girls looking for Canadian pen pals and many others looking for a free fountain pen.

Conclusion

Mundane as this was, it was a positive development. The Canadian hand wringing over trade relations which had been part of the wider concerns of the Cold War and the future independence of Finland. The establishment of normal relations as it has been shown involved various images of Finland. There were concerns that Finland might still lose her independence through direct Soviet occupation or a communist coup. This generated an image of Finland subject to Soviet penetration or domination. With the Cold War in the background, this made Finland indirectly a threat to Canada, because the country was one of the zones of contact between East and West which could escalate tensions. Although this was a negative image, there was also some genuine concern for the fate of the Finns in the mind of Prime Minister St. Laurent and among some members of External Affairs and other departments. The technical position taken by staff at External Affairs which used the need to ratify the peace treaty to justify delays in re-establishing normal diplomatic and trade relations used the now fading enemy image. Canada’s economic and fiscal situation was used as the explanation why credits or loans could not be granted, but the legalistic fact Canada was still at war with Finland also entered the considerations. External Affairs did not want to risk any negative public reaction to what could have appeared as if Canada was helping Finland finance war reparations.

What the External Affairs advisors who took this hard line failed to appreciate was that positive images of Finland were returning, and the Canadian public could
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have been easily convinced any help offered aided the Finns to preserve their national independence. People like Pearson and Palmer recognized this and there was certainly enough information flowing into Ottawa to revive older positive images. Brave Finland can be seen struggling to preserve her national independence and democratic values in the face of threatened Soviet domination. Hardworking Finns were facing adversity while trying to make reparations payments and reconstruct the country after a devastating war. When it came to helping Finland many members of the Departments of External Affairs, Trade and Commerce and Finance thought there was little Canada could do. External Affairs justified delaying the exchange of diplomatic representatives until after the peace treaty was ratified, but then on the ground that Canada could not reciprocate because of Canada’s rapidly expanding bilateral relations with other countries, there simply was not enough trained staff. When Finland insisted at the end of 1947, External Affairs relented and compromised by having the minister in Stockholm dually accredited. It was now justified as a small but important step which allowed Finland to maintain official contacts with a Western country and act as a counter balance to the Soviets.

The same applied to the creation of a trade agreement extending MFN treatment. Finland had to offer MFN treatment as a requirement of the peace treaty, but also was eager to encourage Canada-Finland trade as a source of badly needed materials for reconstruction and domestic use. As it has been shown many officials at the Department of Trade and Commerce did not see any advantage to Canada in entering into a trade agreement with Finland. The volume of that trade had historically been low and despite existing tariff barriers there still was some trade between the two countries. It was External Affairs which carried the day on the matter, under the influence of men like Pearson who saw the political value in the proposal. By encouraging Canada-Finland trade, even thought it was an inconsequential portion of Finland’s overall trade, it offered a window on the West and in a small contribution to the effort to diversify the country’s trade and reduce dependence on Soviet sources. By these gestures normal relations could be re-established and Canada in doing so was giving Finland much needed symbolic and moral support in the country’s effort to maintain a balance between East and West.

Prior to the Second World War, Canadian-Finnish relations were symbolically important, but routine. The war and its aftermath made Finland a part, if subsidiary aspect of Canada’s larger external polices. The concern for Finland shown during the troubled 1947–1948 period would remain for the duration of the Cold War, but there were larger issues Canadian officials would have to deal with such as
involvement with the United Nations, relations with Britain, the US and dozens of other countries, the evolving nature of the Commonwealth, collective security, nuclear arms, and trade. The situation had come full circle in a sense. Even though in the future both governments would continue to spout truisms about how important the relationship between Canada and Finland was, this was mainly symbolic since they also said the same thing about many other bilateral relationships.
14 Conclusion

The Canadian government files at the LAC used to examine the Canadian image of Finland between 1919 and 1948 present perceptions of continuity and change. When research for this study began, there was the assumption that the documents found in the Canadian government files would not make obvious references to value judgements about the national character of Finns and Finland. The implication was they would have to be inferred or deduced indirectly by interpreting policy decisions and actions within some abstract idea of what the image should or could have been. What was remarkable about the Canadian image of Finland was how often Canadian officials expressed thoughts which contain very obvious images.

The study of the “Canadian Image of Finland” drew out those images and elucidated the positive and negative connotations associated with them. The approach taken surveyed the presence of those images roughly chronologically as they appeared during the unfolding of Canadian-Finnish relations, but also in broad thematic areas such as immigration, trade, during war, and the restoration of peace. As such not every instance of a particular image was examined, nor were specific images exhaustively studied spatially and temporally. When dealing with issues concerning Finland or Finns, Canadian government decision-makers drew on these images when looking at policy choices and recommending courses of action. The images did not dictate what course of action was taken, but they did serve to narrow the range of available policy responses. Canadian decision makers still relied on realist considerations of power, resources, and capabilities to determine what was possible, but socially constructed perceptions of that reality seen through ideological predispositions and definitions of national identity framed the logic of appropriateness. The decisions about what to do in situations involving Finland or Finns were political decisions, even if it was claimed they were grounded in hard reality. What the Canadian officials subjectively thought Finland or Finns were, conditioned the attitude adopted in any given situation and was often more important than objective reality. How Finland and Finns were perceived was that reality to Canadian leaders and civil servants. Positive or negative images of the other could then be used to provide meaning to the hard facts of a situation and justify taking a particular stance or as an excuse for not doing something.

The paradigm used to draw out the Canadian images of Finland has been a simple positive-negative dichotomy. This was done for analytical simplicity, but also because typically the images of Finland were like a coin and had two sides.
For every positive image there is usually a version of the image which could have a negative meaning. On any given issue and during any period one or the other of the positive or negative aspects of the specific Finnish image, which was being perceived, would be in the foreground. Because we are not dealing with a monolithic entity, the Canadian government and the officials in the various departments and offices, would at times see both often conflicting aspects of an image of Finland. Even if cognitively those decision makers were weighing the merits of a particular situation using realist assessments and political considerations, there was always an emotive component derived from the image which could be used to support the position eventually taken. The images at work were often implied, but as has been seen during the ongoing Canadian-Finnish relationship during the first half of the twentieth century they were just as frequently explicitly evoked. There was not always a consistent logic evident in these mental images, nor were they always an accurate reflection of reality, but they were an operative part of the environment in which the Canadian-Finnish relationship existed.

Finland and Canada were comparatively similar in terms of their relative power, since both could be considered small powers or using the later Canadian auto-image they were “Middle Powers.” Canada’s economy was larger and the close relationship with the UK and US meant that Canada’s ability to influence situations that were in the national interest, as defined by the government in power, was greater than Finland’s. This is not to dismiss Finland’s regional importance, but as Canadian diplomats later would uncharacteristically boast, the country “punched above its weight” internationally. Geographic distance meant that neither country posed a strategic threat to the other, and the overall relationship was generally friendly. The exception of course was the negative images caused by the Continuation War, which made Finland an enemy, but never fully erased the positive images which existed. The limitation was that despite such a positive arrangement, there were no significant interests at play on either side and the net value of Canadian-Finnish relations was symbolic. Both countries found value in that symbolism because it contributed to recognition of each others independence and international stature. Canada offered Finland a Western connection. Finland was an area Canada could exercise its independence from Britain, in spite of the delay establishing diplomatic representation in Helsinki.

Distance can also contribute to a sense of otherness, but Finland’s perceived culture was liberal, democratic, progressive, and capitalist, which meant that although Finns were different, they were not that much different from Canadians in their values. The positioning of Finland as part of the Scandinavian cultural area
contributed to the sense it was Western and European, not Eastern and Asian, furthering the sense of similarity. Though many Finns might object to this failure to differentiate, particularly when Canadians conflated Finns and Swedes, it was a positive image, which credited Finland with being a modern progressive society. When Finland faced external or internal threats such positive images created a good deal of sympathy from Canadians. Adding to those feelings was the idea Finland was a borderland, the eastern end of European civilization and a bulwark against barbarism and totalitarian ideas from Asia. As a periphery it was porous, because Finland could be a gateway for such alien influences from the East, particularly when it was the Grand Duchy, subject to Tsarist repression or during the Cold War when it could be seen as penetrated and falling within the sphere of the Soviet Union.

Location also presented images of Finland as a Northern country, which is something it shared with Canada. True, North, strong and free, were key lyrics in the popular song O Canada, which many Canadians would have been familiar with during the first half of the twentieth century. After roughly 1939 it was unofficially the national anthem, and officially after 1980. The North had a sense of purity, of nature, where sturdy, honest and freedom loving people lived, which was equally applicable to the auto and hetro-images shared by Canada and Finland. Conversely, there were things that could be seen as negative aspects to this and the North also represented mystery, isolation, remoteness, backwardness, primitiveness, and lack of sophistication.

Positive cultural traits, or national character were also clearly at work when Finns were seen as literate, as valuing education, hardworking, reliable, honest, quiet, and tenacious. Finland was a nation which was cultured, produced art, music, literature, and was noted for athletic accomplishments. Obversely, Finns could be regarded as stubborn, violent, unstable, dangerous, and adherents of radical ideologies. The image of Finns so created, is one of a perceived threat. Finland was the source of those dangerous, radical Finns. In Canada, Finns were not the only group to espouse socialist ideologies, but they were prominent among the groups seen to be challenging the established political, economic, and social order. When applied to the state, the perceived threat Finland posed created enemy images. Whether it was the ideological threat from Finns or when the Finnish government developed closer a relationship with a country Canada regarded as unfriendly, this was treated as a danger to the Canadian national interest. Another area Finland was at odds with Canada was as a trade competitor. Even though Canada-Finland trade was small in absolute terms, the Finnish market could be perceived as a small but
valuable opportunity, especially when symbolic or political potential was factored in.

All of the possible positive and negative images of Finland were circulating among Canadian decision-makers during the period 1919–1948. Positive images were formed from the start with Finns thought of as hard working, honest, reliable, and possessing plenty of sisu or whatever English synonym was applied. Consequently, Finns were welcomed as preferred immigrants and excellent workers. Countering this were the negative images of Finns as dangerous radicals which prompted immigration officials to try to have Finland removed from the preferred list. They failed to do that, but the broad restrictions imposed in the 1930s accomplished the same end. Negative images also made Finns targets of state repression and deportation.

However, the overriding concepts for Canadian-Finnish relations in the pre-war era were positive. If Finland was seen as a source of alien ideologies from the East, it was also a place many Canadians could relate too because of the country’s fewer threatening attributes. After the defeat of the Reds in the civil war and the country’s entry into community of nations, White Finland came to represent all that was positive in the image. Finland was cultured, modern, liberal democratic, and bravely resisted forces which attempted to subvert those things. Even though Finland competed with Canada for the export of forest products, the positive image won out, with the Canadian government seeing market opportunities and liberalized trade through the granting of MFN treatment.

During wartime, the positive image remained strong. Brave little Finland resisting Soviet aggression during the Winter War, elicited considerable sympathy among the Canadian government and people. Though there was not much Canada as a neutral observer could do, except provide a small amount of humanitarian aid. There was the sense that Finland was defending Western civilization and deserved admiration and respect. So strong was the positive image in Canada, that the Canadian government resisted the formation of an enemy image when Finland became an aggressor at the side of Germany. Despite Finland’s attack against Canada’s new ally the Soviet Union, the government delayed declaring war for as long as was practical. Finland was in many ways seen as an exception and not an enemy like Germany or Japan and the enemy image was created only by the force of circumstances. The unique nature of Finland’s enemy image can be seen in the differentiation by Canadian officials, as seen in the exemption from Finnish nationals in Canada, from the regulations affecting enemy aliens and the treatment of Finnish merchant sailors.
The enemy image persisted until well after the war ended, but the residue of positive images served at the Paris peace conference, to have Canada support an ineffectual effort to reduce the size of the reparations burden imposed on Finland. The fact this occurred at all, meant the image of Finland could be rehabilitated in the eyes of Canadian officials. A variation of the enemy image remained within the context of the beginnings of the Cold War. Initially Finland was written off and positioned clearly within the Soviet sphere of influence. The country was seen as a penetrated satellite of the Soviet Union and it was only a matter of time before Finland lost its independence completely. The possibility existed that Finland could be a flash point that would precipitate a war between Western nations and the Soviets, which kept concerned Canadian officials monitoring the situation. Brave Finland was a powerful image and it served to counter the negative images the Canadian government harboured. Once it was known the Finns would resist efforts, from within and without to undermine their freedom, democratic system, and independence, Canada began to see once again a noble people defending their values in the face of the economic hardship caused by war disruption, reparations, and efforts at internal subversion. Canada was not in a position to do more than offer sympathy and make token gestures. Symbolic though these things were, the signing of a trade agreement extending MFN treatment, the acceptance of a Finnish minister in Ottawa, and the accrediting of a Canadian minister to Helsinki, even if he was dually accredited to Sweden and stationed in Stockholm, were welcomed by Finland. Canada was able through these actions to help Finland maintain something of a Western orientation and maintain its position balanced between East and West.

In many ways the images uncovered in this study are not new, since they compare with the images identified by other scholars who have studied images of Finland in the English-speaking world. The borderland, northern, as well and the mysterious and by implication dangerous images, among others were evident in the studies of British images done by W.R. Mead and Anssi Halmesvirta. Positive American images examined by Juhani Paasivirta, Keijo Virtanen and Auvo Kostiainen include the modern, liberal, democratic, and brave Finland, which pays its debts, among others. Images of hard working Finns compete with dangerous radicals, while freedom loving Finns are juxtaposed against enemy images of a country dominated by the Soviets. Mixed in and around these are images of saunas, sisu, and Sibelius.

Regarding foreign policy and international relations, the findings of “The Canadian Image of Finland” also compare favourably to the American images of
Finland Michael Berry examines in his various studies of US-Finland relations. There are he postulates, two key factors to understand that relationship. The first is the American ideological preference for political and economic liberalism and the place Finland has economically and politically in relation to the core and periphery of the Western capitalist regime. Until the 1930s both countries were on the periphery, but the US became the economic core during the interwar period and by the Second World War was also the political centre. On the other hand, Finland from 1917 to 1944 was continually trying to secure its position on the periphery. Finland was linked symbolically during this period to economic and political liberalism through the images of the country which paid its debts and bravely fought for its freedom in the Winter War. As Elina Melgin found Finnish propaganda and cultural diplomacy worked to reinforce these positive images in the West.2409

American liberalism also desired a multilateral post-war world, with the major powers having “open” spheres of influence. Finland fell within the Soviet sphere, since there was nothing realistically the United States could do to prevent it. As a formula for the post-war world order it was the origin of the idea that the Soviets might be willing to permit “friendly democratic” nations on their borders. The Paasikivi Line whereby Finnish foreign policy sought good relations with the neighbour to the East was certainly influenced this American view.2410 By helping Finland maintain ties to the West, without provoking the Soviets, Finland could retain its democratic and capitalist system, and function as an interface periphery. To provide the counter balance to the Soviets, as Marek Fields found, American and British propaganda and cultural diplomacy in the post-war era and on into the Cold War, could offer Finland a window on the West.2411

Looking at British policy towards Finland Kimmo Rentola and Juhana Aunesluoma in their respective studies confirmed earlier assessments which indicate that Finland had been “written off” by the end of the Second World War. Finland was clearly within the Soviet economic, political, and military sphere and there was nothing Britain could do to prevent this.2412 Yet contrary to the received interpretation British policy did evolve. As Finland weathered each storm, through 1944–1948, British perceptions shifted. In each case such as elections where communists gained considerable popular support, to economic problems and the

2411 Fields 2015
2412 Rentola 2012; Aunesluoma 2012.
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need to make reparations payments, to the treat of a communist take over, and the
negotiation of a friendship, co-operation, and mutual assistance treaty with the
Soviets, the Finns proved they could walk a tight rope and keep their independence.
Britain then concluded much like the US that nothing directly could be done to
bolster the Finns, which would provoke the Soviets. Instead economic links, along
with propaganda and cultural diplomacy could encourage Finland to maintain its
Western values.

Canadian foreign policy towards Finland and the images which surround it
clearly share many similarities with those seen in the American and British
examples. Sharing the values and having many cultural similarities with the United
States and Great Britain it is not surprising that Canadian images show similar
perceptions of Finland and Finns. Concomitantly, Canada tended to follow the
American and British lead, even if at times with reservation, which means it is no
coincidence that Canadian policy towards Finland did not greatly differ and
therefore the images which come to the fore share many common features. While
Canada shares many similarities with the United States and Britain, where this
study contributes to our greater understanding, is by identifying the Canadian
variants of the images of Finland and Finns and their role in Canadian foreign
policy towards Finland from 1919 to 1948. By contextualizing the perceptions of
Finland and Finns held by the Canadian government and the bureaucrats, diplomats
and politicians, the study of the Canadian image of Finland has produced a
subsidiary achievement. Up until now there has been no study done which provides
a detailed examination of Canadian-Finnish relations from the time of Finland’s
independence until the end of the Second World War. There are of course many
areas into which further research can be conducted regarding Canadian images of
Finland. The logical next step would be to extrapolate the study of the Canadian
government image of Finland forward to the present. Each of the Canadian images
of Finland presented here also merits further research to detail their variations over
time. As well, there is the interesting topic of Canadian gendered images Finland
and the existence images of Finland and Finns found in the wider Canadian society,
Canadian, literature and news media.
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