



Documents
concerning
Finnish -
Soviet
Relations

THE DEVELOPMENT
OF FINNISH—SOVIET
RELATIONS

THE DEVELOPMENT OF FINNISH—SOVIET RELATIONS

DURING THE AUTUMN OF 1939

*IN THE LIGHT OF
OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS*

Publication of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland

O Y. SUOMEN KIRJA
HELSINKI-FINLAND

Printed in Finland
by F. TILGMANN, LTD.
Helsinki 1940

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	7
-------------------	---

DOCUMENTS:

1. Treaty of Non-Aggression and Pacific Settlement of Disputes, concluded at Helsinki on January 21st, 1932, between Finland and the U.S.S.R.	23
2. Convention of Conciliation, concluded at Helsinki on April 22nd, 1932, between Finland and the U.S.S.R.	27
3. Convention for the Definition of Aggression, concluded at London on July 3rd, 1933.	31
4. Protocol renewing until December 31st, 1945, the Treaty of Non-Aggression and Pacific Settlement of Disputes concluded on January 21st, 1932, between Finland and the U.S.S.R., signed at Moscow on April 7th, 1934.	36
5. Neutrality Declaration of Finland, issued at Helsinki on September 1st, 1939.	38
6. Statement published on September 1st, 1939, regarding the Neutrality Declarations of the Northern Countries.	38
7. Neutrality Declaration of the U.S.S.R., communicated by M. Molotov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs, to M. Yrjö-Koskinen, Finnish Minister at Moscow, with a Note of September 17th, 1939.	39
8. Statement of M. Erkkö, Minister for Foreign Affairs, to the Finnish News Service on September 18th, 1939, with reference to the Neutrality Declaration of the U.S.S.R.	40
Communique issued after the Conference of the Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers of the Northern Countries, at Copenhagen on September 18th, 1939.	41
10. Reports of M. Yrjö-Koskinen, Finnish Minister at Moscow, to M. Erkkö, Minister for Foreign Affairs, on October 5th, 1939.	42
11. Notes of M. Erkkö, Minister for Foreign Affairs, concerning his conversation with M. Derevianski, Minister of the U.S.S.R. at Helsinki, on October 8th, 1939.	43
12. Instructions of October 9th, 1939, for the Delegate of the Finnish Government M. J. K. Paasikivi, Minister Plenipotentiary, concerning the discussions of political nature to be held at Moscow.	46
13. Memorandum of the Government of the U.S.S.R., handed in Moscow on October 14th, 1939, by MM. Stalin and Molotov to M. Paasikivi.	49
14. Memorandum of the Finnish Government handed in Moscow on October 23rd, 1939, by MM. Paasikivi and Tanner to MM. Stalin and Molotov.	51
15. Memorandum of the Government of the U.S.S.R. handed in Moscow on October 23rd, 1939, by MM. Stalin and Molotov to MM. Paasikivi and Tanner.	54

16. Extracts from speech of M. Molotov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs, to the Supreme Soviet, on October 31st, 1939.	56
17. Statement of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland on November 1st, 1939.	60
18. Memorandum of the Finnish Government, handed in Moscow on November 3rd, 1939, by MM. Paasikivi and Tanner to M. Molotov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs.	61
19. Communication handed during the negotiations in Moscow on November 9th, 1939, by M. Paasikivi to M. Molotov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs	66
20. Letter of M. Molotov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs, handed in Moscow on November 9th, 1939, to MM. Paasikivi and Tanner	66
21. Letter of MM. Paasikivi and Tanner, handed in Moscow on November 10th, 1939, to M. Molotov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs.	68
22. Letter of MM. Paasikivi and Tanner, handed in Moscow on November 13th, 1939, to M. Molotov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs.	69
23. Note of M. Molotov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs, handed on November 26th, 1939, to M. Yrjö-Koskinen, Finnish Minister at Moscow	70
24. Note of M. Yrjö-Koskinen, Finnish Minister at Moscow, handed on November 27th, 1939, to M. Molotov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs.	71
25. Note of M. Molotov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs, handed on November 28th, 1939, to M. Yrjö-Koskinen, Finnish Minister at Moscow.	72
26. Note of M. Molotov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs, handed on November 29th, 1939, to M. Yrjö-Koskinen, Finnish Minister at Moscow.	74
27. Note of M. Yrjö-Koskinen, Finnish Minister at Moscow, handed on November 29th, 1939, to M. Molotov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs.	75
28. Letter of M. Holsti, Delegate of Finland to the League of Nations, handed on December 3rd, 1939, to M. Avenol, Secretary-General of the League of Nations.	76
29. Speech of M. Ryti, Prime Minister, broadcast on December 8th, 1939.	77
30. Aide-Mémoire of M. Holsti, Delegate of Finland to the League of Nations, handed on December 9th, 1939, to M. Avenol, Secretary-General of the League of Nations.	80
31. Appeal of the Finnish Parliament, adopted at its Plenary Session on December 10th, 1939.	87
32. Exposé of M. Holsti, Delegate to the League of Nations, presented at the Session of the Assembly of the League of Nations on December 11th, 1939.	88
33. Report and Resolution adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations, dated December 14th, 1939.	94
34. Resolution adopted by the Council of the League of Nations, dated December 14th, 1939.	111
35. Message of M. Tanner, Minister for Foreign Affairs, addressed on December 15th, 1939, to M. Molotov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs	111

SUPPLEMENTS:

2 Maps.

INTRODUCTION

The surprising change, threatening the integrity and neutrality of Finland, which occurred in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union last October, can in no way have been caused by the relations which existed between these two States before that date. On the contrary, it can be stated with justification that the demands made by the Soviet Union are in sharp conflict with the treaties which it had concluded with Finland on its own initiative. There has not been, nor can there be, any suggestion that Finland on her part failed to observe these treaties scrupulously.

The basic document establishing the relations between Finland and the Soviet Union is the Peace Treaty of Tartu, signed on October 14th, 1920. Even prior to that date Russia's Council of People's Commissars, under the chairmanship of Lenin, had submitted to the Central Executive Committee, on December 31st, 1917, a proposal to the effect that the political independence of the Republic of Finland should be recognised, and at its meeting on January 4th, 1918, the Central Executive Committee had adopted the proposal. In spite of this recognition, war broke out between Finland and the Soviet Union, and later all the questions at issue between the two States were fully dealt with in the Tartu peace negotiations. At the very beginning of the negotiations the chairman of the Soviet Union delegation stated that he represented a State which recognised the right of the self-determination of nations as a principle of its international policy. Accordingly it could be considered as an axiom in the negotiations that the Soviet Union had no right to demand from Finland any cession of territory. This was all the more

obvious, seeing that during the entire period, from 1809 to 1917, during which Finland had been connected with Russia, she had been independent as regards internal affairs, a Grand Duchy, possessing precisely determined frontiers with Russia. These frontiers are of very old standing. The western part of the frontier running across the Carelian Isthmus, the removal of which further north has now been demanded by the Soviet Union, dates from the year 1323, and the eastern section from 1618. No change has occurred in this frontier for centuries, except that in 1864 the territory on which the Rajajoki arms factory stood was cut off from Finland and joined on to Russia, though at the same time the Emperor of Russia gave an undertaking that Finland would receive territory on the coast of the Arctic Ocean in exchange. The frontier to the north of Lake Ladoga is also of very old standing. Its southern part up to Nurmes dates from 1618 and the northern part from 1595. The only alterations made to this frontier have been comparatively slight. It was solely in the Arctic Coast frontier that an adjustment was made in 1920, the Soviet Union agreeing at the Peace of Tartu to cede the Petsamo district to Finland »for all time for possession in virtue of complete sovereign right». At that time it was in reality only a question of fulfilling the promise given in 1864 and of compensation for the delimitation of the frontier in 1826. The territory jointly enjoyed by Russia, Finland and Norway, was partitioned between Russia and Norway in 1826 with the result that Finland lost the outlet to the Arctic Ocean she had freely used until then. The territorial composition of Finland was thus so distinct that the Soviet Union had no reason to put forward any demands in this respect.

While acknowledging the integrity of Finland's old political territory, the representatives of the Soviet Union made a large number of military demands in the Tartu peace negotiations, the acceptance of which they considered essential to the security of their State and especially of its former capital Leningrad. In this respect Finland made far-reaching concessions, which proved that she was even prepared to make sacrifices in order to preserve amicable relations with her big eastern neighbour. Thus, Finland undertook to abstain from fortifying the islands of Someri, Narvi, Seiskari, Peninsaari, Lavansaari, Great and Small Tytärsaari and Ruuskeri in the Gulf

of Finland. The agreement regarding these islands provided that »no fortifications, batteries, military observation posts, wireless stations exceeding a power of half a kilowatt, naval ports or naval artillery posts, stores of army property or war materials should be built or situated on them, nor more troops be stationed there than was necessary for maintaining order. On the islands of Someri and Narvi, however, Finland is allowed to maintain a military observation posts». It was provided in respect of Suursaari that »no fortifications, batteries, wireless stations exceeding a power of one kilowatt, naval ports and naval artillery posts, stores of army property and war materials should be built or situated on this island nor more troops be maintained than was necessary for maintaining order». The neutrality of Suursaari was to be internationally guaranteed, but the guarantee did not materialise. On the western coast of the Carelian Isthmus Finland undertook to satisfy the wishes of the Soviet Union by demolishing the forts of Ino and Puumala and by undertaking »not to build between Seivästö and Inonniemi within a distance of twenty kilometres from the coast armoured towers and batteries, the firing sectors of which could possibly extend beyond the limit of Finnish territorial waters, and on the coast between Inonniemi and the mouth of the River Rajajoki, within twenty kilometres of the coast, batteries with a range beyond the limit of Finnish territorial waters». To increase Russia's freedom of action the extent of Finnish territorial waters was made very narrow in the eastern part of the Gulf of Finland, a fact which has proved very disadvantageous to the fishermen on the Finnish coast. As regards the other restrictions of a similar nature it should be mentioned that Finland undertook not to maintain in Petsamo »naval vessels and other armed vessels, with the exception of armed vessels of less than one hundred tons, which Finland is entitled to maintain without restriction, and a maximum of fifteen naval and other armed vessels, the tonnage of each of which does not exceed four hundred tons». Finland also undertook not to maintain submarines and armed aeroplanes in these waters and not to construct naval ports and other similar constructions on this coast of a larger size than was necessary for the vessels referred to and their equipment.

To prevent incidents on the frontier between Lake Ladoga and

the Arctic Ocean, Finland and the Soviet Union concluded a treaty on June 1st, 1922, whereby zones were established on both sides of the frontier, in which each of the contracting parties could maintain contingents of regular troops or frontier guards numbering not more than 2,500 men. Their equipment was to consist only of small arms and machine guns, the latter, however, not to exceed the number normally supplied to a corresponding detachment of regular troops.

Thus, by the signing of the Peace of Tartu and of the subsequent treaties, Finland satisfied all the demands for security which a Great Power can reasonably present to a small neighbouring State.

The nineteen years which have elapsed since the signing of the Tartu Peace Treaty have proved that it was based on enduring principles. From the Finnish point of view in particular it may be said that this Treaty did not come into being as a result of fortuitous circumstances, but that it simply consolidated the conditions existing previously. Finland received nothing which was not indisputably hers or to which any other State could have had a judicial, moral or national right. The relations between the two States were therefore able to develop peacefully and without that risk of their being broken off which exists when treaties are made on an arbitrary basis.

The Soviet Union, too, considered it worth while to respect the Tartu Peace Treaty, judging by the fact that on its own initiative it concluded a Treaty of Non-Agression with Finland on January 21st, 1932 (document No. 1). To this a Convention of Conciliation, concluded in the same year, was annexed (document No. 2). The maintenance of the non-aggression treaty up to the end of 1945 without the right of denunciation was agreed upon by a protocol of the year 1934 (document No. 4). These agreements were supplemented by the treaty of July 3rd, 1933, defining the term »aggressor» (document No. 3).

When relations between the Great Powers became strained, Finland already four years ago declared that she intended to work closely together with the group of Northern Countries and would with them remain absolutely neutral in the disputes between the Great Powers. Finland, which geographically forms a part of Fenno-Scandia, has since ancient times been firmly established within the cultural

sphere of the Northern Countries. For nearly seven centuries she lived in political union with Sweden, and during the entire period of her independence she has been closely connected, economically and politically, with the Northern States. Finland's adherence to a group of neutral States tended to provide the Soviet Union with an additional guarantee that Finland would not permit any belligerent country to make use of her territory for purposes of war. This attitude of Finland's is in accordance with the interests of the Soviet Union, on the assumption that one of objects of the latter is to preserve peace in the Baltic area.

It is only in regard to two questions that there has been any divergence of opinion between Finland and the Soviet Union in recent years.

In order to protect the neutrality of the Aaland Islands, neutralised and demilitarised by a treaty between Finland and nine other Powers (1921), Finland took steps in the spring of 1938, in agreement with Sweden — the initiator of that treaty — without abrogating the neutralisation and demilitarisation clauses, to obtain permission to organise the military defence of the neutralised zone to a limited extent. All the signatory States gave their consent to the Finnish-Swedish proposal, but the Soviet Union, which is not a party to the treaty, raised objections to it. This occurred in spite of the fact that, when the matter was brought before the Council of the League of Nations in May, 1939, it was stated in the report of the rapporteur appointed by the Council that approval of the proposal made by Finland and Sweden was a matter concerning only the signatory States. Nevertheless, in the recent Moscow negotiations, the Soviet Union stated that it would agree to the fortification of the Aaland Islands on condition that Finland alone undertook it. To this it was pointed out on behalf of Finland that she never intended to carry out the fortification otherwise than by herself.

The other and graver difference of opinion occurred last summer in connection with the negotiations carried on by France and Great Britain in Moscow for the conclusion of a treaty between the three States. The Soviet Union was desirous at that time of offering Finland, among other things, without consulting her wishes or obtaining her consent, some form of guarantee which might in certain circumstances have endangered the neutrality and indepen-

dence of the country receiving the guarantee. Finland made it known in various ways that she was not able to consent to an indefinite and ambiguous guarantee which might cause endless difference of interpretation and complications and might prove incompatible with the independence of the country. For various reasons, the plan was abandoned, but it cast a portentous shadow over the future.

On the outbreak of war between the Great Powers, Finland proclaimed her neutrality on September 1st, 1939 (documents Nos. 5 and 6). In conjunction with the other Northern States, Finland proclaimed her firm resolve to observe strictly impartial neutrality in regard to the belligerents and to pursue this policy in close cooperation with the other Northern States. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, in taking part in the conquest of Poland, informed the Finnish Government, among others, that it would observe a policy of neutrality in the relations between the Soviet Union and Finland (document No. 7). »This statement«, the Finnish Foreign Minister said in an interview granted to the press, »has been received in Finland with great satisfaction and is in accordance with the spirit of the peaceful and friendly conversations which Finland has had with the Foreign Commissariat of the Soviet Union« (document No. 8).

It soon became evident, however, that in this statement of the Soviet Union the term »neutrality« was employed in an unusual and hitherto unknown sense, for in September and October the Soviet Union induced the Baltic States, which had also received an assurance of neutrality from the Soviet Union, to conclude separate defence pacts with it and to cede certain territory to the Soviet Union for use as military bases.

When the Finnish representative in Moscow received a request from the Soviet Government on October 5th, 1939, that Finland should send a delegate to Moscow for the purpose of negotiations (document No. 10), the Finnish Government had good reason to expect, particularly in view of a statement made by M. Derevianski to Foreign Minister Erkko on October 8th, 1939 (document No. 11), that proposals similar to those made to the Baltic States would be made to Finland. M. J. K. Paasikivi, who was appointed as the Finnish delegate, was therefore instructed, on October 9th, 1939, to draw the attention of the representatives of the Soviet Union to

the recognition of the frontiers of Finland and to the fact that the Tartu Peace Treaty, the Non-Aggression Treaty and the treaty regarding the definition of the term »aggression» were in force. Further, he was to refer to Finland's decision, made in conjunction with the other Northern States, to observe a policy of neutrality, and was to reject all demands which would infringe the political status and neutral policy of Finland. The only subject for negotiation could be that dealing with certain islands in the Gulf of Finland, but only on condition that all decisions be made on a reciprocal basis. (Document No. 12).

On October 14th, 1939, the Soviet Union demanded, for the sake of the security of Leningrad, the Soviet Union and Estonia, that an area on the Cape of Hanko should be ceded to Soviet Russia for a period of 30 years, together with the islands of Suursaari, Seiskari, Lavansaari and the Tytärsaari Islands in the Gulf of Finland, the part of the Carelian Isthmus south of the Koivisto—Lipola line, and the western parts of Kalastajasaarento (Fishermen's Peninsula): altogether some 2,761 sq. km., in exchange for an area of 5,529 sq. km. east of the Finnish frontier in the Repola and Porajärvi districts. In addition to this the non-aggression pact between Finland and the Soviet Union was to be strengthened. The Soviet Union regarded the latter proposal as a concession on their part, since they withdrew the proposal they had put forward for the conclusion of a mutual assistance pact at a meeting of the negotiators on October 12th, prior to its proposal in writing on October 14th. Further, the fortified zones on the Carelian Isthmus were to be demolished, but the fortification of the Aaland Islands by Finland alone would be permitted. (Document No. 13). The proposals of the Soviet Union were so far-reaching and alarming that M. Paasikivi returned immediately to Helsinki to consult his Government. The Government issued fresh instructions and M. Paasikivi and M. Väinö Tanner were then sent to Moscow as delegates.

The proposals which these delegates presented to the representatives of the Soviet Union on October 23rd, 1939, contained far-reaching concessions made for the sake of the preservation of peace and good relations. It was promised that Seiskari, Peninsaari, Lavansaari and the Tytärsaari Islands as well as the »Kuokkalabend» to the south of the Haapala—Kellomäki line would be ceded to the Soviet Union in exchange for other territory. The other demands

of the Soviet Union were refused as infringing Finland's neutrality, but it was stated that Finland agreed to strengthen the non-aggression treaty in the sense »that the contracting parties undertake not to give support in any manner to any State starting such aggression*. (Document No. 14).

In his reply given on the same day the President of the Council of People's Commissars, M. V. Molotov, explained that the memorandum of the Soviet Union presented on October 14th, 1939, represented their minimum requirements, but stated that the Soviet Union now agreed to maintain a slightly smaller force than before in the Hanko area until the conclusion of the British-French-German war and to reduce the area of the territory demanded on the Carelian Isthmus to some extent. He still unconditionally demanded, however, that the frontier should be moved as far as Koivisto and stated that the Soviet Union accepted Finland's proposal for expanding the non-aggression treaty. (Document No. 15).

As no common basis for negotiation was found, the Finnish representatives returned to Helsinki to consult their Government. The attitude of the Finnish Government at this stage of the negotiations was defined by the Foreign Minister, M. Erkkö, in a speech on October 26th, 1939. He said that although citizens who had made sacrifices when various precautionary measures had become indispensable were entitled to know exactly why these measures had been taken, it had not been possible so far to publish the reasons, owing to the delicate nature of the relations with foreign States and to the confidential nature of the conversations, the premature publication of which might be dangerous. He confirmed that, before a final decision was taken, the Finnish nation would be able to make its decision through its Parliament. He further stated that Finland had never taken unfair advantage of the weakness of a neighbour, but had always been content with what was rightfully hers. Finland would always fulfil her obligations scrupulously and hoped that others would do likewise. In spite of her small size, she demanded that importance be attached to her opinion, when vital questions concerning her existence were discussed. While adhering to her neutrality, she refuses to enter into undertakings which make it possible for her territory to be used for other purposes than those for which she herself can use it as a neutral State.

After consulting the party leaders in the Parliament and establishing that there was complete unanimity regarding the reply to be given to the Soviet Union, the Government finally approved the wording of the reply on October 31st. The reply fully covered all the proposals made by the Soviet Government during the negotiations. In order to be able to preserve her integrity and neutrality, Finland refused to cede the Hanko area. The Soviet Union should be willing to waive its claim regarding Hanko as it had declared that it accepted the principle that Finland's absolute neutrality should be maintained. On the other hand, Finland was willing to cede to the Soviet Union the islands in the Gulf of Finland previously referred to, in return for territorial compensation, while in regard to Suursaari an agreement should be made which took into account the security both of Leningrad and of Finland. Finland could not accept the Koivisto—Lipola frontier demanded by the Soviet Union, as it would be too close to Finland's largest export harbour, Viipuri, and would seriously impair Finland's security. In order to prove her good will, however, Finland now offered to cede, in return for territorial compensation, a considerably larger area on the Carelian Isthmus than before, viz., the territory south of the Vammeljoki-Lintulanjoki-Kaukjärvi line. Although the demand for the cession of Kalastajasaarento had been based upon nothing but the assertion that the frontier there was inconveniently and artificially drawn, Finland agreed, in order to show her good will, to cede the western part of Kalastajasaarento up to the Pummanki fjord in return for territorial compensation. The territory that was thus to be ceded was of first-class military importance, as had been emphasized many times by the Soviet Union, but the territory offered in exchange for it was of no military importance. As, besides, the territory to be ceded by Finland was densely populated, the Soviet Union would have to compensate the losses suffered by Finnish citizens. Finland could not agree to the demolition of the fortifications on the Carelian Isthmus, »as the measures which the Finnish Government has adopted on the frontier, are solely due to considerations of defence and security». At the end of its proposals the Finnish Government stressed the fact that »the sacrifices which, for the sake of improving neighbourly relations and of consolidating peace, Finland agrees to make for the benefit of the Soviet Union, are very heavy for the Finnish people, as they

concern areas of very old Finnish habitation — areas which for many centuries have belonged to the State territory of Finland». (Document No. 18).

When the Finnish representatives, M. J. K. Paasikivi and M. Väinö Tanner, had left for Moscow on October 31st, 1939, the President of the Council of People's Commissars of the Soviet Union and Commissar for Foreign Affairs, M. V. Molotov, delivered a speech at a meeting of the Supreme Council, in which among other things, he dealt with the negotiations that had been carried on with Finland. He emphasized the necessity of the security of the Soviet Union and particularly of Leningrad. He declared that the Soviet Government was especially interested in the Gulf of Finland, that approach to Leningrad from the sea, as well as in the frontier which was at a distance of only 30 kilometres from Leningrad». In this connection he thought it necessary to mention that »the population of Leningrad was about 3,5 million, or approximately as large as the total population of Finland, which was 3,650,000». In his opinion, the proposals put forward by the Soviet Union in the negotiations with Finland were »modest and were confined to the minimum, short of which it was impossible to guarantee the security of the Soviet Union and preserve friendly relations with Finland». After describing the demands made by the Soviet Union in some detail he said that an attempt to prevent the conclusion of the proposed treaty would cause Finland »great harm». He therefore expressed the hope that the leading men in Finland would not allow any extraneous pressure to influence them and criticised, on the ground that it was incompatible with a policy of neutrality, the message of the President of the United States to the President of the Supreme Council of the Soviet Union expressing the hope that the friendly and peaceful relations between the Soviet Union and Finland would be maintained and developed. (Document No. 16.)

When the speech of M. Molotov became known, the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs published a communiqué on November 1st, 1939, stating that the publication of the views of the Soviet Union at a moment when the Finnish delegation had just left Helsinki had created a new situation and jeopardised the continuation of the negotiations. Finland, for her part, had »in an independent and unbiased manner, not being subject to the influence of any

foreign Power, endeavoured to find a solution to the questions submitted to her, however difficult they might be, for the sake of the neutral policy she had adopted». She had tried to appreciate the efforts of the Soviet Union to make the security of Leningrad more effective, though without endangering Finland's own security. With regard to M. Molotov's reference that it was the right and duty of the Soviet Union to take effective measures to ensure its security in the Gulf of Finland and on the frontier close to Leningrad, the Finnish Foreign Ministry pointed out that »in the Non-Aggression Treaty concluded with Finland in 1932, the Soviet Union undertook to respect the Finnish-Soviet frontier as defined by the Tartu peace treaty and to settle all disputes between these countries by peaceful means». (Document No. 17.)

In his speech delivered on November 1st on the occasion of a defence celebration, M. Erkkö said that the Government was backed by a unanimous nation, that the speech of M. Molotov only gave an idea of the attitude of the Soviet Union, but not of Finland's attitude. He added that Finland would continue to take her stand on the principles of neutrality and the right to self-defence and carry on negotiations only on the basis of those treaties which were still in force between Finland and the Soviet Union. If these treaties were not observed, what guarantee could there be that any new treaties would be respected? Conscious of the justice of her cause and her historical experiences, Finland knew that right would prove victorious in the end.

Up to the time of the speech of M. Molotov the negotiations had been conducted confidentially in accordance with diplomatic custom. The Finnish Government had taken great care to prevent proposals, the discussion of which had not been concluded, from becoming public property. In a speech delivered at the meeting of the Heads of the Northern States in Stockholm on October 19th, President Kallio stated that the Soviet Union had raised grave questions, but that the Finnish Government had not referred to them specifically in public, but had made special efforts so that the arrival at an understanding should not be jeopardised by the proposals of the other party to the negotiations becoming public property. The matter might then become a question of prestige for the Soviet Union and the achievement of a compromise might become more

difficult than before. It was precisely in this respect that the situation had changed when the Finnish delegates, on November 3rd, presented to the Soviet Government the reply approved by the Finnish Government on October 31st described above. The Soviet Government, however, considered the concessions made by the Finnish Government inadequate. So far as the Carelian Isthmus was concerned, the Soviet Government was prepared to move the frontier line suggested in its memorandum of October 23rd slightly farther south, but in the west it was still to run to Koivisto and comprise Koivisto Island. On the other hand, the Soviet Government withdrew its proposal regarding the demolition of the fortifications on the Isthmus on both sides and the removal of permanent troops from the frontier territory of the Isthmus. It proved impossible to come to an understanding with regard to the adjustment of the frontier on the Carelian Isthmus, as the Finnish Government could not agree to the cession of territory demanded by the Soviet Government without endangering Finland's own security.

As regards the ceding of a base to the Soviet Union at Hanko, the Soviet Government did not withdraw this demand. It proposed alternatively, it is true, that the islands of Hermansö, Kooön, Hästö-Busö, Ekön, Långskär, Furuskär and some other islands not specified by name should be ceded to the Soviet Union as a base. According to this alternative, too, the Soviet Fleet was to be granted the right of using the harbour of Lappohja as an anchorage. Further the Soviet Government proposed that, if the Finnish Government did not consider that its neutrality allowed it to lease the territory to the Soviet Union for establishing a base, it should sell this territory to the Soviet Government. In that case the base would be Soviet Union territory, and, in the opinion of the Soviet Government such a procedure would not conflict with Finland's policy of neutrality. (Documents Nos. 19 and 20.)

In view of the fact that the second alternative concerning the Soviet Union base did not in reality differ from its former proposal for the cession of a base on the Cape of Hanko, the Finnish Government did not see its way to accept it (documents Nos. 19 and 21).

As regards Suursaari the Finnish representatives offered the Soviet Union, in the last stage of the negotiations, the southern part

of this island in exchange for territorial compensation. However, the Soviet Government did not accept this proposal, but demanded the cession of the whole island. In regard to Kalastajasaarento the Soviet Government promised to consider the compromise proposed by the Finnish Government, according to which Finland would agree to cede the western part of Kalastajasaarento belonging to her, situated to the north of Pummanki fjord, in exchange for territorial compensation.

The negotiations reached a deadlock on November 13th. It had become evident that it was impossible to come to an agreement as long as the Soviet Government insisted on a base at the entrance to the Gulf of Finland and the frontier referred to on the Carelian Isthmus. On leaving Moscow on November 13th, however, the Finnish representatives expressed the hope that subsequent negotiations might lead to a result satisfactory to both parties (document No. 22).

After the negotiations had come to a standstill, the Soviet Union embarked on an organised radio and press propaganda against Finland, even personally abusing some members of the Finnish Government. Soviet aeroplanes, which had flown over the Finnish side of the frontier while the Moscow negotiations were still proceeding, made themselves constantly guilty of violating Finnish territory after the breakdown of the negotiations. On November 26th the Soviet authorities aggravated the situation to the extreme by falsely asserting that Soviet troops in the vicinity of the village of Mainila on the Carelian Isthmus had been exposed to gunfire from the Finnish side of the frontier. The Soviet Government lodged a protest founded on this alleged frontier incident and demanded that the Finnish troops on the Carelian Isthmus, who the Soviet Government alleged threatened Leningrad, should immediately be withdrawn to a distance of 20—25 km from the frontier. (Document No. 23). In its refutation on November 27th of the assertion that firing had occurred from the Finnish side, the Finnish Government proposed, to avoid any misunderstanding, that a joint investigation be held. At the same time the Finnish Government stated that no guns were situated on the Finnish side within range of the frontier. Finland further proposed that negotiations should be instituted with a view to withdrawing troops on both sides from the

immediate neighbourhood of the frontier. This proposal was made in principle and left it to be decided by negotiation to what point the troops should be withdrawn. (Document No. 24).

On the following day (November 28th) the Soviet Government rejected the proposal of the Finnish Government and contrary to the express stipulations contained therein, unilaterally denounced the Non-Aggression Treaty between Finland and the Soviet Union (document No. 25).

On the following day (November 29th), before the Finnish Minister in Moscow had had time to deliver Finland's reply to the last note of the Soviet Government, the latter broke off diplomatic relations with Finland (document No. 26). The reply of the Finnish Government was, nevertheless, delivered to the Soviet Government. In its reply the Finnish Government proposed the adoption of the procedure prescribed by the Non-Aggression Treaty or alternatively that the settlement of the dispute should be submitted to neutral arbitration. Further, Finland stated that, in order to furnish signal proof of her sincere wish to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union, she was prepared to come to an understanding in regard to the withdrawal of the defence troops on the Carelian Isthmus to such a distance from Leningrad that it could not be claimed that they threatened its security (document No. 27). On November 29th the Soviet authorities asserted that Finnish military patrols had crossed the frontier of the Soviet Union near Pummanki in Petsamo. This came under the same category as the Mainila incident. The Finnish frontier guards had remained on the Finnish side of the frontier. Whereas on the contrary, a Soviet military detachment had crossed the frontier the day before near Pummanki and had captured and removed three Finnish frontier guardsmen across the frontier.

On November 30th, the Soviet Union opened hostilities against Finland. The Soviet Government further rejected the offer of mediation made on the same day by the Government of the United States, which Finland had immediately accepted.

The Finnish National Coalition Government formed on December 1st still endeavoured after the attack by the Soviet Union to reach an amicable solution by inquiring of the Soviet Government through the Swedish Government, whether it was prepared to continue

negotiations. At the same time the Finnish Government stated that, should the reply be in the affirmative, it would put forward new, positive proposals. However, the reply of the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union was in the negative.

When the Finnish Government submitted the Finnish-Russian dispute to the League of Nations on the basis of Articles 11 and 15 of the Covenant (document No. 28), M. Molotov informed the Secretary General of the League of Nations, in reply to a letter dated December 5th, inviting him to take part in dealing with the matter in the League of Nations, that the Soviet Union was not at war with Finland, but that it had concluded a pact of mutual assistance on December 2nd »with the Democratic Republic of Finland», the Government of which had presented a request to the Soviet Government that it should put an end by armed force to the state of war created by the »former» rulers of Finland.

At a meeting held on December 9th the Council of the League of Nations resolved to submit the matter to the Assembly. To the telegram of the Committee appointed by the Assembly for dealing with the Finnish-Russian conflict, dated December 11th, urging the cessation of hostilities and the acceptance of the offer of mediation of the League of Nations, the Soviet Government replied on December 12th that for the reasons previously stated it could not take part in a discussion of the Finnish question. On December 14th the Assembly passed a resolution, as proposed by the above-mentioned Committee, condemning the action of the Soviet Union and calling upon all its members and states that were not members of the League of Nations to render Finland every material and humanitarian assistance. On the same day the Council of the League of Nations passed a resolution stating that the Soviet Union, having itself transgressed the Covenant of the League of Nations, was no longer a member of the League of Nations. Finland refrained from taking part in the deliberations, as she was an interested party. (Documents Nos. 30, 32—34).

In a speech broadcast in Russian on December 15th the Minister for Foreign Affairs, M. Tanner, addressed an open question to the Commissar of the People, M. Molotov, asking whether he was prepared to renew negotiations in order to prevent further bloodshed (document No. 35). M. Molotov made no reply, but the Tass agency

repeated the former statement in a brief official communique, that the Soviet Government did not recognise any other Finnish Government than the so-called »Kuusinen Government» and could not therefore take into consideration proposals made by Finland to renew negotiations.

Finland has explained her standpoint with the greatest possible clarity. In his speech on December 8th Mr. Ryti, the Prime Minister, stated publicly that Finland, forced to go to war, was fighting in a just and honourable cause (document No. 29). In its plenary session on December 10th the Finnish Parliament addressed an appeal to all civilised nations to render active aid in this struggle of the Finnish nation for its existence and for the joint cause of humanity (document No. 31).

DOCUMENTS

1.

TREATY OF NON-AGGRESSION AND PACIFIC SETTLEMENT
OF DISPUTES, CONCLUDED AT HELSINKI ON JANUARY 21st,
1932, BETWEEN FINLAND AND THE U.S.S.R.¹⁾

Translation.

The President of the Republic of Finland, of the one part, and
The Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics, of the other part,

Actuated by the desire to contribute to the maintenance of general
peace;

Being convinced that the conclusion of the undertakings mentioned
below and the pacific settlement of any dispute whatsoever between
the Republic of Finland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
is in the interests of both High Contracting Parties and will contribute
towards the development of friendly and neighbourly relations
between the two countries;

Declaring that none of the international obligations which they
have hitherto assumed debar the pacific development of their
mutual relations or is incompatible with the present Treaty;

Being desirous of confirming and completing the General Pact of
August 27th, 1928, for the Renunciation of War;

Have resolved to conclude the present Treaty and have for that
purpose appointed:

¹⁾ The Instruments of ratification were exchanged at Moscow on August
9th, 1932.

The President of the Republic of Finland:

Baron A. S. *Yrjö-Koskinen*, Minister for Foreign Affairs; and

The Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Monsieur Jean *Maïsky*, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary;

Who, having exchanged their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions:

Article 1.

1. The High Contracting Parties mutually guarantee the inviolability of the existing frontiers between the Republic of Finland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as fixed by the Treaty of Peace concluded at Tartu on October 14th, 1920, which shall remain the firm foundation of their relations, and reciprocally undertake to refrain from any act of aggression directed against each other.

2. Any act of violence attacking the integrity and inviolability of the territory or the political independence of the other High Contracting Party shall be regarded as an act of aggression, even if it is committed without declaration of war and avoids warlike manifestations.

Protocol to Article 1.

In conformity with the provisions of Article 4 of the present Treaty, the Agreement of June 1st, 1922, regarding measures ensuring the inviolability of the frontiers shall not be affected by the provisions of the present Treaty and shall continue to remain fully in force.

Article 2.

1. Should either High Contracting Party be the object of aggression on the part of one or more third Powers, the other High Contracting Party undertakes to maintain neutrality throughout the duration of the conflict.

2. Should either High Contracting Party resort to aggression against a third Power, the other High Contracting Party may denounce the present Treaty without notice.

Article 3.

Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes not to become a party to any treaty, agreement or convention which is openly hostile to the other Party or contrary, whether formally or in substance, to the present Treaty.

Article 4.

The obligations mentioned in the preceding Articles of the present Treaty may in no case affect or modify the international rights or obligations of the High Contracting Parties under agreements concluded or undertakings assumed before the coming into force of the present Treaty, in so far as such agreements contain no elements of aggression within the meaning of the present Treaty.

Article 5.

The High Contracting Parties declare that they will always endeavour to settle in a spirit of justice any disputes of whatever nature or origin which may arise between them, and will resort exclusively to pacific means of settling such disputes. For this purpose, the High Contracting Parties undertake to submit any disputes which may arise between them after the signature of the present Treaty, and which it may not have been possible to settle through diplomatic proceedings within a reasonable time, to a procedure of conciliation before a joint conciliation commission whose powers, composition and working shall be fixed by a special supplementary Convention, which shall form an integral part of the present Treaty and which the High Contracting Parties undertake to conclude as soon as possible and in any event before the present Treaty is ratified. Conciliation procedure shall also be applied in the event of any dispute as to the application or interpretation of a Convention concluded between the High Contracting Parties, and particularly the question whether the mutual undertaking as to non-aggression has or has not been violated.

Article 6.

The present Treaty shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Moscow.

Article 7.

The present Treaty shall come into force on the exchange of the instruments of ratification.

Article 8.

The present Treaty is concluded for three years. If it is not denounced by either of the High Contracting Parties after previous notice of not less than six months before the expiry of that period, it shall be deemed to be automatically renewed for a further period of two years.

Article 9.

The present Treaty is drawn up in duplicate in French, in the town of Helsinki, the 21st day of January, 1932.

In faith whereof the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have thereto affixed their seals.

(L. S.) (Signed) *A. S. Yrjö-Koskinen.*

(L. S.) (Signed) *J. Maisky.*

PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

1. In signing the present Treaty of Non-Aggression and Pacific Settlement of Disputes, concluded between the Republic of Finland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on to-day's date, the High Contracting Parties agree to take the necessary steps to ratify it within the shortest possible period and to exchange the instruments of ratification as soon as possible and in any event within thirty days after its ratification by the competent bodies of the Republic of Finland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

2. The High Contracting Parties declare that subsequent denunciation of the present Treaty before its termination or annulment shall neither cancel nor restrict the undertakings arising from the Pact for the Renunciation of War signed at Paris on August 27th, 1928.

Helsinki, January 21st, 1932.

(L. S.) (Signed) *A. S. Yrjö-Koskinen.*

(L. S.) (Signed) *J. Maisky.*

2.

CONVENTION OF CONCILIATION, CONCLUDED AT HELSINKI
ON APRIL 22nd, 1932, BETWEEN FINLAND AND THE U.S.S.R.¹⁾

Translation.

In accordance with the provisions of Article 5 of the Treaty of Non-Aggression and Pacific Settlement of Disputes concluded on January 21st, 1932, between Finland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

The President of the Republic of Finland and

The Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Have decided to conclude a Conciliation Convention and have appointed for that purpose:

The President of the Republic of Finland:

Baron A. S. *Yrjö-Koskinen*, Minister for Foreign Affairs; and

The Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Monsieur Jean *Maïsky*, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary;

Which Plenipotentiaries, having exchanged their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions:

Article 1.

The High Contracting Parties mutually undertake to submit to a Conciliation Commission for amicable settlement, in accordance with the provisions of the present Convention, all disputes of whatsoever nature which may arise between them on account of circumstances occurring after the signature of the Treaty of Non-Aggression and Pacific Settlement of Disputes between Finland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and which cannot be settled within a reasonable time through the diplomatic channel. This undertaking

¹⁾The Instruments of ratification were exchanged at Moscow on August 9th, 1932.

also refers in particular to any possible differences regarding the interpretation and enforcement of conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded between the High Contracting Parties.

Article 2.

The Conciliation Commission provided for in Article 1 shall consist of four members, of whom each of the High Contracting Parties shall appoint two from among its nationals for each session of the Commission.

Either High Contracting Party shall be entitled to have recourse to experts appointed by itself, who may sit on the Commission in an advisory capacity. Either High Contracting Party may also, if both Parties on the Commission agree, arrange for persons, whose evidence it may consider useful, to be heard.

Each session shall be presided over by one of the members of the Commission who is a national of the country in whose territory the Commission is sitting.

Article 3.

It shall be the duty of the Conciliation Commission to clear up the questions at issue which have been submitted to it, to collect all necessary information for that purpose and to make such proposals for the settlement of disputes as it may consider equitable, and it shall recommend the High Contracting Parties to accept such proposals through the diplomatic channel.

Should the Conciliation Commission, during a session, fail to agree on a joint proposal concerning a question submitted to it, and should the High Contracting Parties subsequently fail to reach an agreement for the settlement of the dispute within a reasonable time, it is understood that the dispute may, on the request of either High Contracting Party, be again submitted to a procedure of conciliation.

Article 4.

The Conciliation Commission shall meet at the request of either High Contracting Party communicated to the other through the diplomatic channel, on a date to be fixed by mutual agreement between the High Contracting Parties.

The Commission shall meet not later than one month after the receipt of the said application.

As a general rule, the Commission shall not meet oftener than once a year, except in urgent cases. In such event, the Government which has proposed the holding of one urgent session shall inform the other Government of the circumstances giving rise to such application.

The session shall not normally last longer than fifteen days, unless the High Contracting Parties jointly decide otherwise.

The Commission shall sit alternately at Moscow and Helsinki. The first meeting shall be held at Moscow.

Article 5.

Not less than fifteen days before the meeting of the Conciliation Commission, each High Contracting Party shall communicate to the other, through the diplomatic channel, a list of the questions which it desires to have examined by the Commission at that session.

Article 6.

Unless the High Contracting Parties jointly decide otherwise, the Conciliation Commission shall itself determine its procedure.

Article 7.

The Commission of Conciliation shall be deemed to form a quorum only if all the members duly convened are present.

Should any member be unable to attend the proceedings of the Commission, the High Contracting Party concerned shall appoint a substitute for him within not more than thirty days after his inability to attend has been ascertained.

The decisions of the Commissions shall be taken by the unanimous agreement of its members.

Article 8.

The High Contracting Parties undertake to assist the Conciliation Commission in carrying out its tasks, and more particularly to supply it, as far as is possible, with all necessary information and documents.

Article 9.

The Conciliation Commission shall draw up a report on the disputes which have been submitted to it. This report shall be supplied before the end of the session during which the questions at issue have been examined, unless the High Contracting Parties decide by mutual agreement to extend that time-limit.

The report shall contain proposals for the settlement of every question at issue submitted to the Commission, if such proposals have been accepted by all the members of the Commission.

Should the Commission fail to agree on joint proposals, the report shall contain the proposals of both parties on the Commission.

Article 10.

The Conciliation Commission's report shall be signed by all its members. It shall be communicated at once to each High Contracting Party.

Article 11.

Each High Contracting Party undertakes to inform the other, within a reasonable time-limit, which shall in no case exceed three months, whether it accepts the Commission's joint proposals contained in its report.

Article 12.

The Conciliation Commission's report may not be published, either in full or in part, without the consent of both High Contracting Parties.

Article 13.

The emoluments of members of the Conciliation Commission and of the experts or other persons employed by each High Contracting Party shall be paid by the Party concerned.

All other expenses arising out of the working of the Commission shall be paid in equal shares by each Party.

Article 14.

While the conciliation procedure is in progress, the High Contracting Parties undertake to refrain from any steps in their power which

might have a prejudicial effect on the Conciliation Commission's proposals regarding the questions submitted to it.

Article 15.

The present Convention shall constitute an integral part of the Treaty of Non-Aggression and Pacific Settlement of Disputes concluded on January 21st, 1932, between Finland and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and shall be regarded as ratified by the actual fact of the ratification of the aforesaid Treaty.

It shall come into force simultaneously with the said Treaty of Non-Aggression and shall remain in force for the same period as that Treaty.

Article 16.

The present Convention is drawn up in French, in duplicate, at Helsinki, the 22nd day of April, 1932.

In faith whereof the Plenipotentiaries have signed this Convention and have thereto affixed their seals.

(L. S.) (Signed) *A. S. Yrjö-Koskinen.*
(L. S.) (Signed) *J. Maisky.*

3.

CONVENTION FOR THE DEFINITION OF AGGRESSION, CONCLUDED AT LONDON ON JULY 3rd, 1933.¹⁾

Translation.

His Majesty the King of Roumania, the President of the Estonian Republic, the President of the Latvian Republic, the President of the Polish Republic, the President of the Turkish Republic, the Central

1) Finland acceded to the Convention on July 22nd, 1933, and its Instrument of ratification was deposited at Moscow on January 31st, 1934.

Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, His Imperial Majesty the Shah of Persia, and his Majesty the King of Afghanistan;

Being desirous of consolidating the peaceful relations existing between their countries;

Mindful of the fact that the Briand-Kellogg Pact, of which they are signatories, prohibits all aggression;

Deeming it necessary, in the interests of the general security, to define aggression as specifically as possible, in order to obviate any pretext whereby it might be justified;

And noting that all States have an equal right to independence, security, the defence of their territories, and the free development of their institutions;

And desirous, in the interest of the general peace, to ensure to all peoples the inviolability of the territory of their countries;

And judging it expedient, in the interest of the general peace, to bring into force, as between their countries, precise rules defining aggression, until such time as those rules shall become universal;

Have decided, with the aforesaid objects, to conclude the present Convention, and have duly authorised for the purpose:

His Majesty the King of Roumania:

M. Nicholas *Titulescu*, Minister for Foreign Affairs;

The President of the Estonian Republic:

Dr. Oskar *Kallas*, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary in London;

The President of the Latvian Republic:

M. Waldemar *Salnais*, Minister for Foreign Affairs;

The President of the Polish Republic:

M. Edouard *Raczynski*, Permanent Delegate to the League of Nations, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary;

The President of the Turkish Republic:

Tevfik *Rüştü* Bey, Minister for Foreign Affairs;

The Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

M. Maxime *Litvinoff*, People's Commissary for Foreign Affairs;

His Imperial Majesty the Shah of Persia:

Fatollah Khan *Noury Esfandiary*, Chargé d'Affaires in London;

His Majesty the King of Afghanistan:

Ali Mohammed Khan, Minister of Education:
Who have agreed on the following provisions:

Article 1.

Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes to accept in its relations with each of the other Parties, from the date of the entry into force of the present Convention, the definition of aggression as explained in the report dated May 24th, 1933, of the Committee on Security Questions (Politis report) to the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, which report was made in consequence of the proposal of the Soviet delegation.

Article 2.

Accordingly, the aggressor in an international conflict shall, subject to the agreements in force between the parties to the dispute, be considered to be that State which is the first to commit any of the following actions:

- (1) Declaration of war upon another State;
- (2) Invasion by its armed forces, with or without a declaration of war, of the territory of another State;
- (3) Attack by its land, naval or air forces, with or without a declaration of war, on the territory, vessels or aircraft of another State;
- (4) Naval blockade of the coasts or ports of another State;
- (5) Provision of support to armed bands formed in its territory which have invaded the territory of another State, or refusal, notwithstanding the request of the invaded State, to take, in its own territory, all the measures in its power to deprive those bands of all assistance or protection.

Article 3.

No political, military, economic or other considerations may serve as an excuse or justification for the aggression referred to in Article 2. (For examples, see Annex.)

Article 4.

The present Convention shall be ratified by each of the High Contracting Parties in accordance with its laws.

The instruments of ratification shall be deposited by each of the High Contracting Parties with the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

As soon as the instruments of ratification have been deposited by two of the High Contracting Parties, the present Convention shall come into force as between those two Parties. The Convention shall come into force as regards each of the other High Contracting Parties when it deposits its instruments of ratification.

Each deposit of instruments of ratification shall immediately be notified by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to all the signatories of the present Convention.

Article 5.

The present Convention has been signed in eight copies, of which each of the High Contracting Parties has received one.

In faith whereof the above-named Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention and have thereto affixed their seals.

Done in London, July 3rd, 1933.

(L. S.) (Signed) N. *Titulescu*.
 (L. S.) (Signed) O. *Kallas*.
 (L. S.) (Signed) Waldemaras *Salnais*.
 (L. S.) (Signed) E. *Raczynski*.
 (L. S.) (Signed) Tevfik *Rüştü*.
 (L. S.) (Signed) Maxime *Litvinoff*.
 (L. S.) (Signed) Ali *Mohammed Khan*.
 (L. S.) (Signed) F. *Noury Esfandiary*.

ANNEX TO ARTICLE 3 OF THE CONVENTION RELATING TO
THE DEFINITION OF AGGRESSION.

The High Contracting Parties signatories of the Convention relating to the definition of aggression,

Desiring, subject to the express reservation that the absolute

validity of the rule laid down in Article 3 of that Convention shall be in no way restricted, to furnish certain indications for determining the aggressor,

Declare that no act of aggression within the meaning of Article 2 of that Convention can be justified on either of the following grounds, among others:

A. *The internal condition of a State:*

E.g., its political, economic or social structure; alleged defects in its administration; disturbances due to strikes, revolutions, counter-revolutions, or civil war.

B. *The international conduct of a State:*

E.g., the violation or threatened violation of the material or moral rights or interests of a foreign State or its nationals; the rupture of diplomatic or economic relations; economic or financial boycotts; disputes relating to economic, financial or other obligations towards foreign States; frontier incidents not forming any of the cases of aggression specified in Article 2.

The High Contracting Parties further agree to recognise that the present Convention can never legitimate any violations of international law that may be implied in the circumstances comprised in the above list.

(L. S.) (Signed) N. *Titulescu*.

(L. S.) (Signed) O. *Kallas*.

(L. S.) (Signed) Waldemaras *Salnais*.

(L. S.) (Signed) E. *Raczynski*.

(L. S.) (Signed) Tefvik *Rüştü*.

(L. S.) (Signed) Maxime *Litvinoff*.

(L. S.) (Signed) Ali *Mohammed Khan*.

(L. S.) (Signed) F. *Noury Esfandiary*.

PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

It is hereby agreed between the High Contracting Parties that should one or more of the other States immediately adjacent to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics accede in the future to the present Convention, the said accession shall confer on the State or

States in question the same rights and shall impose on them the same obligations as those conferred and imposed on the ordinary signatories.

Done at London on July 3rd, 1933.

(Signed) Maxime *Litvinoff.*
 S. *Salnais.*
 N. *Titulescu.*
 Ali *Mohammed.*
 F. *Noury Esfandiary.*
 O. *Kallas.*
 E. *Raczynski.*
 T. *Rüştü.*

4.

PROTOCOL RENEWING UNTIL DECEMBER 31st, 1945, THE TREATY OF NON-AGGRESSION AND PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES CONCLUDED ON JANUARY 21st, 1932, BETWEEN FINLAND AND THE U.S.S.R., SIGNED AT MOSCOW ON APRIL 7th, 1934.¹⁾

Translation.

The President of Finland and the Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

Being anxious to establish as sound a basis as possible for the development of relations between their countries,

Desirous of giving one another a further proof of the immutability and soundness of the pacific and friendly relations happily established between them,

Prompted by the desire to contribute to the maintenance of general peace and the stability and peaceful development of relations between States in Eastern Europe, and

Noting that the conclusion of the Treaty signed on January 21st, 1932, at Helsinki, between Finland and the Union of Soviet

¹⁾ The Instruments of ratification were exchanged at Helsinki on December 19th, 1934.

Socialist Republics has had a beneficent influence on their relations and on the solution of the above-mentioned problems,

Have decided to sign the present Protocol and have for that purpose appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the Republic of Finland:

Baron Aarno *Yrjö-Koskinen*, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Finland at Moscow;

The Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

M. Maxime Maximovitch *Litvinoff*, Member of the Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs;

Who, having exchanged their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed on the following provisions:

Article 1.

Notwithstanding the provisions concerning the time-limit and methods of expiry of the Treaty regarding non-aggression and the pacific settlement of disputes, concluded at Helsinki on January 21st, 1932, between Finland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which provisions appear in Article 8 of the said Treaty, that Treaty shall remain in force until December 31st, 1945.

Article 2.

The present Protocol is drawn up in duplicate in French. It shall be ratified at the earliest possible date, and the instruments of ratification thereof shall be exchanged between the High Contracting Parties at Helsinki.

The present Protocol shall come into force on the exchange of the instruments of ratification.

In faith whereof the above-mentioned Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Protocol and have thereto affixed their seals.

Done at Moscow, this 7th day of April, 1934.

(L. S.) A. S. *Yrjö-Koskinen*.

(L. S.) M. *Litvinoff*.

5.

NEUTRALITY DECLARATION OF FINLAND, ISSUED AT
HELSINKI ON SEPTEMBER 1st, 1939*Translation.*

It is hereby declared that Finland will observe strict neutrality during the war which has broken out between Germany and Poland.

With regard to Finland's neutrality, those provisions are applicable, which, in conformity with the Declaration of May 27th, 1938, between Finland, Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, have been issued by the Decree of June 3rd, 1938, containing certain rules of neutrality.

Helsinki, September 1st, 1939.

Kyösti Kallio

President of the Republic.

Eljas Erkko

Minister for Foreign Affairs.

6.

STATEMENT PUBLISHED ON SEPTEMBER 1st, 1939,
REGARDING THE NEUTRALITY DECLARATIONS
OF THE NORTHERN COUNTRIES.*Translation.*

By neutrality declarations, published to-day, the Governments of the Northern Countries have made known their intention to observe strict neutrality during the war which has now broken out. The rules of neutrality referred to in the Declaration of May 27th, 1938, between Finland, Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden will be applied.

¹⁾ On September 3rd and 15th, 1939, Finnish neutrality declarations were issued in regard to France and Great Britain as well as other States participating in the war which has broken out.

7.

NEUTRALITY DECLARATION OF THE U.S.S.R., COMMUNICATED BY M. MOLOTOV, COMMISSAR FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TO M. YRJÖ-KOSKINEN, FINNISH MINISTER AT MOSCOW, WITH A NOTE OF SEPTEMBER 17TH, 1939.

Translation.

Monsieur le Ministre,

In transmitting to you the enclosed copy of the Soviet Government's Note of September 17th to the Polish Ambassador in Moscow, I have the honour, on the instructions of my Government, to inform you that the U.S.S.R. will pursue a policy of neutrality in her relations with Finland.

Accept, Monsieur le Ministre, the assurance of my high consideration.

Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R.

V. Molotov.

September 17th, 1939.

M. Yrjö-Koskinen,

Envoy Extraordinary and Minister
Plenipotentiary of Finland,
Finnish Legation,
Moscow.

Translation of Enclosure.

Monsieur l'Ambassadeur,

The Polish-German war has shown the internal bankruptcy of the Polish State. During the course of ten days' hostilities Poland has lost all her industrial areas and cultural centres. Warsaw, as the capital of Poland, no longer exists. The Polish Government has disintegrated and no longer shows any sign of life. This means that the Polish State and its Government have, in point of fact, ceased to exist. In the same way, the Agreements concluded between the U.S.S.R. and Poland have ceased to operate. Left to her own devices and bereft of leadership, Poland has become a suitable field for all manner of hazards and surprises, which may constitute a threat to the U.S.S.R. For these reasons the Soviet Government,

who have hitherto been neutral, cannot any longer preserve a neutral attitude towards these facts. The Soviet Government also cannot view with indifference the fact that the kindred Ukrainian and White Russian people, who live on Polish territory and who are at the mercy of fate, should be left defenceless. In these circumstances, the Soviet Government have directed the High Command of the Red Army to order the troops to cross the frontier and take under their protection the life and property of the population of the Western Ukraine and Western White Russia.

At the same time the Soviet Government propose to take all measures to extricate the Polish people from the unfortunate war into which it was dragged by its unwise leaders.

Accept, Monsieur l'Ambassadeur, the assurance of my high consideration.

Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R.

V. Molotov.

September 17th, 1939.

M. W. Grzybowski,

Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Poland,
Polish Embassy,
Moscow.

8.

STATEMENT OF M. ERKKO, MINISTER FOR FOREIGN
AFFAIRS, TO THE FINNISH NEWS SERVICE ON SEP-
TEMBER 18th, 1939, WITH REFERENCE TO THE
NEUTRALITY DECLARATION OF THE U.S.S.R.

Translation.

As mentioned in an official news item, the Soviet Government have, when informing the Finnish Legation in Moscow of their declaration of war against Poland, stated at the same time that they will pursue neutral relations with Finland. This information has been

received in Finland with great satisfaction, and it is in harmony with the spirit of the peaceful and amicable discussions which Finland has had with the Foreign Commissariat of the U.S.S.R.

9.

COMMUNIQUE ISSUED AFTER THE CONFERENCE OF THE PRIME MINISTERS AND FOREIGN MINISTERS OF THE NORTHERN COUNTRIES, AT COPENHAGEN ON SEPTEMBER 18th, 1939.

The Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden and the Minister of Iceland to Denmark discussed at a meeting in Copenhagen on the 18th and 19th September the conditions of their countries in the calamitous war which has broken out. They confirm once again the steadfast will of their countries to carry on a strictly equitable policy of neutrality in their relations with the parties in conflict. They are determined to pursue this policy in close collaboration with each other and to co-operate in its execution with other states inspired by similar intentions. The Northern Countries are convinced that neither of the groups of powers have any desire whatsoever to see any of these countries involved in the hostilities.

Just as the three Scandinavian Countries in the year 1914 by a joint note to the belligerent powers maintained the rights of neutral states to trade and to traffic on the high seas, so the Northern Countries are now determined, in order to safeguard their own economic life, to uphold their right to continue their traditional commercial relations with all states including the belligerent powers. They have reason to trust that they will be able through open negotiations with the opposing parties to arrive at an understanding with both parties to the effect that this commercial intercourse be respected.

In the face of the manifold difficulties and losses which the war in any circumstances will inflict also upon the Northern peoples in their daily existence and in their economic life, they intend by intimate co-operation to alleviate the difficulties to the greatest

possible extent. It has been decided that the special Committees set up in view of the war conditions, shall enter at the earliest date into mutual negotiations on all appropriate issues.

The Ministers taking part in the discussions appeal to their peoples to face the anxieties and privations of the war time with calmness and composure. They give expression to their conviction that it is in the interest, not only of the Northern peoples, but of all nations that throughout the war there remains a group of states which may facilitate that reconciliation of the belligerent nations which the future must bring.

10.

REPORTS OF M. YRJÖ-KOSKINEN, FINNISH MINISTER AT MOSCOW. TO M. ERKKO, MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS. ON OCTOBER 5th, 1939.

Translation.

a) *Telegram sent on October 5th, 1939 at 20.07:*

Molotov invited Yrjö-Koskinen in the evening to the Kremlin: he requests Erkkö or a delegate here to discuss concrete political questions. Reply if possible already the day after to-morrow. Details in later telegrams.

b) *Telegram sent on October 5th, 1939 at 22.45:*

Molotov asked me to call on him to-day at three o'clock and reported: The Soviet Government have taken account of the Finnish Government's explanations regarding their desire to develop both the political and commercial relations between the two nations. Now that the international situation has altered on account of the war, the Soviet Government desire an exchange of views with the Finnish Government in regard to certain concrete questions of a political character. To this I remarked: The Finnish Government have also repeatedly notified their willingness to maintain and develop their political relations with the Soviet Union, but in my latest conversations with you the only concrete question broached concerned the intensification of commercial relations, for which conversations I received the necessary instructions by to-day's

courier. After pointing out that the improvement of political relations had also been discussed in greater detail in Helsinki between M. Viljanen¹⁾ and the Soviet Minister, he expressed the hope that the Minister for Foreign Affairs would come here, or that the Government would authorise some other person specifically for the purpose of conversations on these subjects. To my question as to whether he could inform me in greater detail what concrete questions he primarily had in mind, he made no reply, but repeated his previous request, adding: The Government hope that the conversations can be started as soon as possible. He asked for a reply, if possible, already by the day after to-morrow. When I asked whether, in the circumstances, there was cause to open commercial negotiations, he answered: You can do as you like, the Soviet Government are positively inclined towards them. On his own initiative he mentioned that the negotiations with Latvia and Lithuania would, it was hoped, be concluded within two or three days.

11.

NOTES OF M. ERKKO, MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS.
CONCERNING HIS CONVERSATION WITH M. DEREVIANSKI.
MINISTER OF THE U.S.S.R. AT HELSINKI, ON OCTOBER
8th, 1939.

Translation.

Derevianski reported that he had an important communication to make. Owing to the delay in answering the inquiry about the invitation to the Minister for Foreign Affairs to visit Moscow, feeling in Moscow was running high because the answer came so late.

Erkko: The Finnish Government have not unnecessarily delayed their answer and its dispatch, but have dealt with the matter in the normal order and sent off the answer as soon as the matter had been

¹⁾ V. M. J. Viljanen, Managing Director of the Federation of Finnish Industries.

dealt with to a finish. There had not been any question of a time limit.

Derevianski: Finland has adopted quite a different attitude to the invitation than the Baltic States, and this may have an adverse effect on the course of affairs.

Erkko: I have no knowledge as to how the Baltic States were invited to Moscow; Finland has dealt with the matter as a normal affair and in the normal course.

Derevianski: Molotov made remarks earlier to which no answer came from Finland. Why does not the Foreign Minister come himself?

Erkko: I have no knowledge as to what you mean by your remarks, for there have not been any such inquiries and conversations. The initiatives came from Finland.¹⁾

Derevianski: The grave situation in the world would demand a rapid settlement of the questions between Finland and the Soviet Union. Has Paasikivi extensive powers?

Erkko: Paasikivi has the powers which a person possesses who goes to converse about matters in the form now under discussion. He cannot make decisions any more than any other delegate can, because the approval of the Finnish Government or the consent of Parliament, depending on the nature of the case, is necessary for decisions, and moreover he is bound by the provisions of the Constitution.

Derevianski: I repeat that the international situation is grave. The Soviet Union wishes to establish in the Baltic area a state of affairs which would prevent the Soviet Union and her neighbours from becoming the victims of war. The difficulties in the way of commercial relations have also had the effect that they too should be settled. These are crucial questions.

Erkko: Finland has always desired to live in peace and with that in mind she has also joined the group of Northern Countries, which are inspired by the same idea. Finland is also a neutral state and cannot attach herself to any grouping of Great Powers or any Great Power. As regards the organisation of trade Finland has always desired, already because of the nature of her economic life, to establish her

¹⁾ M. Erkko had in mind the reopening of the commercial negotiations.

commercial relations on a normal footing. But Finland cannot approve of arrangements which would expose her independent position to danger. We hope that the Soviet Union will take this too into account. On her own behalf Finland has always been prepared on these conditions to show understanding in regard to the Soviet Union's needs, provided they do not injure Finland's own interests.

Derevianski: The Soviet Union is not considering anything that would expose Finland's independence and security to danger. It is not her purpose to injure the independence of Finland. The Soviet Union has shown from the very beginning by word and deed a desire to preserve peace. Therefore, every circumstance that might imperil the results of the negotiations now about to begin should be avoided. Are we in Finland aware of the gravity of the negotiations? Could not the delegation be altered?

Erkko: Finland has chosen a person of the greatest possible authority to negotiate. He was the chairman of the Tartu Peace Delegation and a former Prime Minister. The fact that no information is available regarding the details of the intended negotiations makes it difficult for us to judge how grave these negotiations may be. But this is not Finland's fault. The Soviet Government could have established contact with Finland already earlier through her Minister, if she had wished. I hope that the negotiations will proceed normally and peacefully.

Derevianski: The example of the Baltic States shows that negotiations can be successfully managed.

Erkko: It is impossible to conceive that Finland could approve of an arrangement such as has been intended there.

Derevianski: Joint military measures are not always dangerous. For instance, the Aaland question, which has been jointly arranged with Sweden.

Erkko: The Aaland question is different. An amendment of the agreement was negotiated with Sweden, but Finland alone equips and constructs and pays for the fortifications; there will be no Swedish garrisons there.

The conversation ended with Derevianski's asking, when Paasikivi would leave, whereupon I said that his departure would take place, if at all possible, on Monday (October 9th, 1939).

12.

INSTRUCTIONS OF OCTOBER 9th, 1939, FOR THE DELEGATE OF THE FINNISH GOVERNMENT, M. J. K. PAASIKIVI, MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY, CONCERNING THE DISCUSSIONS OF A POLITICAL NATURE TO BE HELD AT MOSCOW.

Translation.

General.

From the Finnish point of view the basis of the discussions should be Finland's political position and in this respect particular attention should be paid to the following points of view:

The historical basis for Finland's political position is formed firstly by the fact that Finland's frontiers are hundreds of years old, secondly by the fact that the same population has for generations lived in and cultivated this country and thirdly by the fact that the inhabitants have created through their work a distinct Finnish nation and civilization.

All questions affecting the relations between Finland and the Soviet Union have been settled and regulated by the Treaty of Peace concluded between the two countries. An additional basis for the political relations between the two countries consists of the Treaty of Non-Aggression concluded between them and of the Supplementary Agreement relating to the definition of the term »aggression».

The aim and object of Finland's foreign policy has been to maintain and promote friendly relations with all neighbouring states. Finland has been and still is in close co-operation with the other Northern Countries that are in the same position as herself, in which she has in view two basic objects, viz., the safeguarding of peace and an uncompromising effort to keep out of every dispute. By adopting such an attitude Finland has shown her aims to the world. In accordance herewith, Finland has already before the outbreak of the present armed conflict notified her status of a neutral state in the same way as those states in the same position which have pursued and are pursuing a policy of neutrality similar to that of Finland.

Already Finland's limited size as such is a guarantee that Finland could not be a danger to any other country. In order to substantiate

her firm resolve to uphold her policy of neutrality Finland has notified her uncompromising decision to defend her neutrality even by force of arms. Hereby Finland wants to show that she will not allow anybody to make use of her against anybody.

These general remarks put the Delegate under the obligation from the very beginning to maintain a clear deprecatory attitude towards any proposals which might endanger Finland's political position as explained above or her policy of neutrality.

Irrespective of what proposals the Soviet Union may put forward with regard to Finland's territorial or political integrity, the Delegate must point out that no Finnish delegate — even if he be a Cabinet minister — is entitled to give promises which are in contradiction to Finland's Constitutional Laws, and that the Government and Diet have to approve any agreements in the order prescribed for them and in accordance with the parliamentary system prevailing in Finland.

*Instructions in anticipation of questions which may come up
for discussion.*

It may be concluded from the statement made on October 8th, 1939, by Minister Derevianski to Mr. Erkko, Minister for Foreign Affairs, that the Soviet Union has the intention to secure military bases in the region of the Baltic Sea to an extent that would enable the Soviet Union with the aid of these bases to control the military situation in that region.

If the Soviet Union makes proposals regarding the creation of Soviet Union military bases on the Finnish mainland or e.g. on the Aaland Islands, such proposals should be rejected and any discussion thereof refused. The same applies to any proposals referring to frontier adjustments on the Carelian Isthmus. — With further reference to Aaland, it should be pointed out that Finland has not granted any foreign Power access thereto. Finland is bound to take into consideration the importance of this territory for her contact with the rest of the world. In order to safeguard these vital interests and to be able in an efficient way to carry out her policy of neutrality — which her neighbours have noted with satisfaction — Finland considers it her right to build fortifications on Aaland if circumstances demand it.

No consideration can be given to proposals regarding the cession, in one form or another, of Finnish ports for disposal by the Soviet Union. On the other hand Finland is prepared to take steps to ensure that the transit traffic of the Soviet Union be carried on normally and without disturbances, subject, however, to Finland being in charge of the transport over Finnish territory. The settlement of the transit question would supplement the efforts to promote the economic relations between Finland and the Soviet Union. In order to enable both countries to establish closer contact than hitherto in the economic field Finland has made a proposal to the Soviet Union regarding the conclusion of a commercial treaty.

If the question of the islands in the Gulf of Finland comes up for discussion, any treatment of them as a group should be avoided and the islands each time referred to should be specified. If the question of Suursaari is touched upon, it should be insisted that it be left out of discussion. Considering from a military point of view the geographical position of some other islands — Seiskari, Lavansaari, Tytärsaari—a discussion thereof could be agreed to as an extreme concession. However, this discussion could only take place provided that 1) any arrangement made would be on a reciprocal basis and 2) the compensation to be given to Finland would be of such a nature that it would prove to the world the reasonableness of the arrangement. In this connection it should also be ensured that the inhabitants bound to leave the islands would receive compensation. Such an arrangement might possibly be contemplated, if the Diet approve of it, and it should afford evidence of Finland's willingness to pay regard to the security requirements of the Soviet Union.

The compensation required from the Soviet Union should be taken from Eastern Carelia or from the coast of the Arctic Ocean. In this connection it should be pointed out to the Soviet Union that territories to be ceded as compensation from districts adjoining Finland's eastern border have not the same value as territories to be ceded by Finland. Hence the territorial compensation to be given to Finland should be larger than the territorial cessions required of her. To this end the cession of e.g. the eastern part of the Kalastajasaarento and Repola or Repola and Porajärvi might be considered.

If the Soviet Union suggests the conclusion of a treaty of mutual assistance between Finland and the Soviet Union it should be

pointed out that such a treaty is not compatible with Finland's policy of neutrality, *inter alia* taking into consideration that Finland has announced her resolution not to enter into any alliances, this being an essential part of the policy of neutrality pursued by Finland in common with the other Northern Countries. Finland also fears that she might become involved in war, if she were engaged in a policy of alliances. It should be pointed out that diplomatic conversations have revealed the satisfaction of the Soviet Union with the policy of neutrality which Finland has adopted as a Northern Country.

Helsinki, October 9th, 1939.

13.

MEMORANDUM OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE U.S.S.R.,
HANDED IN MOSCOW ON OCTOBER 14th, 1939, BY
MM. STALIN AND MOLOTOV TO M. PAASIKIVI.

Translation.

In the negotiations with Finland, the Soviet Union is mainly concerned with the settlement of two questions:

- a) Securing the safety of Leningrad,
- b) Becoming satisfied that Finland will maintain firm, friendly relations with the Soviet Union.

Both points are essential for the purpose of preserving against external hostile aggression the integrity of the Soviet Union coast of the Gulf of Finland and also of the coast of Estonia whose independence the Soviet Union has undertaken to defend.

In order to fulfil this duty, it is necessary:

- 1) To make it possible to block the opening of the Gulf of Finland by means of artillery fire from both coasts of the Gulf of Finland in order to prevent warships and transport ships of the enemy from penetrating to the waters of the Gulf of Finland;
- 2) To make it possible to prevent the access of the enemy to those islands in the Gulf of Finland which are situated west and north-west of the entrance to Leningrad;

3) To have the Finnish frontier on the Carelian Isthmus which is now at a distance of 32 km from Leningrad, i.e. within the range of long-distance artillery, moved somewhat farther northwards and north-westwards.

A separate question arises with regard to the Kalastajasaarento in Petsamo, where the frontier is unskilfully and artificially drawn and has to be adjusted in accordance with the annexed map.

With the preceding as a basis it is necessary to settle the following questions by having in view a mutual arrangement and common interests:—

1) Leasing to the Soviet Union for a period of 30 years the port of Hanko and a territory adjoining thereto, situated within a radius of 5—6 nautical miles southwards and eastwards and within a radius of 3 nautical miles westwards and northwards, for the purpose of creating a naval base with coastal artillery capable of blocking by artillery fire together with the naval base Paldiski on the southern coast of the Gulf of Finland, the access to the Gulf of Finland. For the protection of the naval base the Finnish Government should permit the Government of the Soviet Union to keep in the port of Hanko the following garrison:

- 1 Infantry regiment,
 - 2 Anti-aircraft battery groups,
 - 2 Air-force regiments,
 - 1 Battalion of armoured cars, altogether not more than 5000 men.
- 2) Granting to the naval forces of the Soviet Union the right of using the bay of Lappohja as an anchorage.

3) Ceding to the Soviet Union, in exchange for other territories, the following territories:

The islands Suursaari, Seiskari, Lavansaari, Tytärsaari and Koivisto, part of the Carelian Isthmus from the village of Lipola to the southern border of the town of Koivisto, and the western parts of the Kalastajasaarento, in all 2,761 km² in accordance with the annexed map.

4) In exchange for the territories mentioned in paragraph 3, the Soviet Union cedes to the Republic of Finland Soviet Union territory in the districts of Repola and Porajärvi to the extent of 5,529 km² in accordance with the annexed map.

5) Strengthening the Treaty of Non-Aggression between the Soviet

Union and Finland by including therein a paragraph according to which the Contracting Parties undertake not to join any groups or alliances directly or indirectly hostile to either of the Contracting Parties.

6) Suppression of the fortified zones situated on both sides of the frontier between Finland and the Soviet Union and leaving Frontier Guard troops only at the frontier.

7) The Soviet Union does not object to the fortifying of the Aaland Islands by Finland's own work provided that no foreign Power, Sweden included, has anything to do with the question of fortifying the Aaland Islands.

14.

MEMORANDUM OF THE FINNISH GOVERNMENT HANDED
IN MOSCOW ON OCTOBER 23rd, 1939, BY MM. PAASIKIVI
AND TANNER TO MM. STALIN AND MOLOTOV.

Translation.

After carefully examining the proposal of the Government of the Soviet Union for the regulation of relations between Finland and the Soviet Union, the Finnish Government hereby define their attitude as follows:

Finland understands the efforts which the Soviet Union is making to render the defence of Leningrad more secure. As she had repeatedly stated before, Finland wishes her relations with the Soviet Union to remain friendly and good. To enable both these objects to be achieved, Finland is willing, for her part, to consider ways and means of meeting the requirements of the Soviet Union. This, of course, is subject to the proviso that Finland's own security requirements shall be given all due consideration and that care shall be taken to uphold Finland's complete neutrality. Such a policy represents the best possible contribution to the reinforcement of peace in Northern Europe, whilst, in Finland's opinion, it is at the same time the policy most advantageous to her neighbour—the Soviet Union.

The Finnish Government are convinced that, given mutual good-

will, it is possible, without detriment to Finland's security and without violating her neutrality, to achieve the objects referred to above and which the Soviet Union's memorandum to Finland itself indicates as the basis of Soviet policy.

To achieve these objects, the Finnish Government are prepared to agree to the arrangements indicated below, subject to their being approved also by the Finnish Parliament:

- 1) The Finnish Government are prepared to make an agreement to the effect that the following islands situated in the Gulf of Finland be ceded to the Soviet Union against territorial compensation: Seiskari, Peninsaari, Lavansaari and the Tytärsaari islands. In addition, the Finnish Government are willing to discuss an arrangement concerning Suursaari which shall take due account of the interests of both parties.

- 2) In view of the proximity of Leningrad to the Finnish frontier and in order to enable the security of that city to be increased through a frontier adjustment, the Finnish Government are prepared, in return for territorial compensation, to make an agreement providing for the adjustment of the frontier on the Isthmus of Carelia at those points at which the frontier is, in this respect, inconvenient to the Soviet Union. The frontier would run from Rajajoki, east of Haapala, straight to the Gulf of Finland on the eastern side of the church of Kellomäki. Thus the so-called Kuokkala salient would disappear. At the same time, the frontier would be moved 13 kilometres westward at this point. Finland is unable to consider a frontier adjustment of the magnitude of that contemplated in the Soviet Union's proposal, because Finland's own position and security would be thereby endangered. Moreover, the territory in question is a very densely populated district long inhabited by a Finnish population, and its cession would mean dragging tens of thousands of Finnish citizens out of their homes and removing them elsewhere.

- 3) So far as the port of Hanko, with the adjoining territory, and the bay of Lappohja are concerned, the Finnish Government are bound to uphold Finland's integrity. The mere cession of military bases to a foreign Power is in itself incompatible with

unconditional neutrality, as this is understood in Finland and elsewhere. The idea that armed forces of a foreign Power would be stationed on Finnish territory continuously over a long period cannot be accepted by Finland; these forces could also be used for an attack upon Finland. Such an arrangement would be a source of constant disagreement and unnecessary irritation, and this would not conduce to an improvement in the relations between the two countries, which is the aim of the present arrangement.

4) The Soviet Union has intimated her desire to strengthen the Non-Aggression Treaty between herself and Finland by an undertaking between the Contracting Parties that they would not join any groups or alliances of States directly or indirectly hostile to either of the Contracting Parties. The Finnish Government are, however, of opinion that Article 3 of the said Non-Aggression Treaty, prohibiting adherence to agreements of every kind which are openly hostile to the other Contracting Party and which conflict, either in form or in substance, with the said Treaty, already covers everything which States entertaining friendly relations can reasonably claim from each other in this respect, without endangering their good relations with other States and the attitude of strict neutrality. The Finnish Government are prepared, if the Soviet Union so wishes, to give at any time a further assurance that they will honestly fulfil the said obligations. As regards Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Non-Aggression Treaty, in which the Contracting Parties undertake to observe neutrality in cases where the other Contracting Party becomes the victim of aggression by a third State, the Finnish Government would be prepared, as an earnest of good-will, to have this paragraph redrafted in clearer and more definite terms, so that the Contracting Parties would be pledged not to support such an aggressor State; the term »support» should not, however, be construed to cover any attitude in conformity with the general rules of neutrality such as continuance of normal exchange of goods and transit trade.

5) The Finnish Government note with satisfaction that the Soviet Union does not object to the fortification of the Aaland Islands at Finland's own undertaking. This being so, the Finnish

Government wish to state that it has always been their intention that this fortification should be carried out by Finland herself at her own expense and to such extent as may be required to maintain the neutrality of the said islands, having regard to the neutrality obligations of the Convention of 1921 which are still in force.

15.

MEMORANDUM OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE U.S.S.R.,
HANDED AT MOSCOW ON OCTOBER 23rd, 1939, BY MM.
STALIN AND MOLOTOV TO MM. PAASIKIVI AND TANNER.

Translation.

With reference to the Finnish Government's memorandum of October 23rd, the Government of the Soviet Union beg to state that, in accordance with the views defined in the memorandum of the Government of the Soviet Union of October 14th, the proposals advanced by them represent their minimum terms, the attitude having been dictated by the fundamental security requirements of the Soviet Union and particularly of the city of Leningrad with its 3½ million inhabitants. These proposals were expressly put forward as minimum terms and, further to this, the Soviet Union withdrew their proposal for the conclusion of a mutual assistance agreement between the Soviet Union and Finland, in order to enable Finland to maintain her strict neutrality. At the same time, the Government of the Soviet Union abandoned their proposal concerning the non-fortification of the Aaland Islands or their fortification in co-operation with the Soviet Union, substituting for these proposals their assent to the fortification of the Aaland Islands by Finland herself. The Soviet Union made these important concessions, as she relied upon Finland's friendly attitude and was also confident that Finland could agree to the minimum proposals made in the Union's memorandum of October 14th.

The exchange of views between the representatives of the Soviet Union (Molotov, Stalin) and those of Finland (Tanner, Paasikivi) on October 23rd enabled both parties to understand each other's

views better, but at the same time revealed a divergence between them. Taking into account the results of this conversation and in order to pay due regard to the Finnish Government's wishes, the Government of the Soviet Union wish to make the following statement:

1) The Government of the Soviet Union are unable to withdraw their proposal that a naval base be placed at the disposal of the Soviet Union in Hanko, since they regard this proposal as an absolutely essential minimum condition for the safeguarding of the defence of Leningrad. In this connection, the Government of the Soviet Union, amending their memorandum of October 14th, would find it possible to limit to 4,000 men the land force for the protection of the naval base, and to maintain this force on the territory of Hanko only up to the end of the war between England, France and Germany in Europe.

2) The Government of the Soviet Union find it impossible to agree to the proposal that a strip of 10 versts of Finnish territory on the Isthmus of Carelia should—as proposed in the Finnish Government's memorandum of October 23rd—be ceded in return for the territory to be ceded by the Soviet Union. The Government of the Soviet Union find such a step quite inadequate as a means of providing a minimum of security for Leningrad at the eastern end of the Gulf of Finland. Being desirous, however, of meeting Finland in an accommodating spirit, the Government of the Soviet Union would find it possible, as an extreme concession, to amend their original proposal in some measure by reducing, in the manner shown in the annexed map, the area of the Isthmus of Carelia to be ceded by Finland to the Soviet Union against territorial compensation; in this connection, the original proposal of the Government of the Soviet Union regarding the Island of Koivisto remains unaltered.

3) The Soviet Government find it necessary to maintain the other proposals contained in the Soviet Government's memorandum of October 14th.

4) The Soviet Government accept the Finnish Government's proposal regarding the amendment of Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Non-Aggression Treaty.

34.

EXTRACTS FROM SPEECH OF M. MOLOTOV, COMMISSAR
FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TO THE SUPREME SOVIET,
ON OCTOBER 31st, 1939.

Translation.

Our relations to Finland are in a special position. This is mainly because in Finland various external influences on the part of a third Power are becoming increasingly apparent. Unprejudiced people must, however, admit that the same problems concerning the security of the Soviet Union and especially of Leningrad that formed the subject of negotiations with Estonia, must also be the subject of negotiations with Finland. It may be said that in certain respects the security problems of the Soviet Union in this case are of a still more acute character, seeing that the largest town in the Soviet Union after Moscow, namely Leningrad, lies only 32 km from the Finnish frontier. This means that Leningrad lies at a shorter distance from another country than is necessary in order to bombard this town with modern long-range guns. On the other hand the approaches to Leningrad by sea are also dependent to a large extent on the inimical or friendly attitude towards the Soviet Union adopted by Finland, to which country the shore of the whole northern part of the Gulf of Finland belongs as well as all the islands lying in the central part of that gulf. In view of this circumstance and of the situation created in Europe it can be expected that Finland will give proof of the necessary understanding.

What is it that has formed the basis of the relations of the Soviet Union towards Finland during all these years? Of course, the basis of these relations is the peace treaty of 1920 of the same type as our treaties with our other neighbours on the Baltic. The Soviet Union has of its own free will acknowledged Finland's independence and autonomous existence. It is beyond all doubt that only the Soviet Union, which acknowledges the principle of the free development of nationalities, could have done so. It must be said that no other Government except the Soviet Union Government could agree to the presence of an independent Finland at the very gates of Leningrad. Eloquent proof of this is found in the experiment of the »democratic» Kerenski-Tereceli Government, to say nothing of the

Government of Prince Lvoff-Miliukoff and in a still higher degree of the Tsarist Government. There is no doubt that this important consideration could serve to improve Soviet-Finnish relations, in which Finland, as we see, is no less interested than the Soviet Union.

On our initiative Soviet-Finnish negotiations were opened recently. What is the subject of these negotiations? It is not difficult to understand that in the present international situation, when in the centre of Europe the greatest Powers are involved in a war which is full of surprises and dangers to all European countries, it is not only the right, but also the duty of the Soviet Union to adopt serious measures for strengthening its security. It is natural that in the present case the Soviet Government take a special interest in the Gulf of Finland, this approach by sea to Leningrad, as well as in the territorial frontier which, situated at a distance of about 30 km, constitutes a threat to Leningrad. I would remind you that the population of Leningrad amounts to 3½ million people, which is about equal to the population of the whole of Finland, which amounts to 3,650,000. We need scarcely waste time on the stories which the foreign press is spreading about the proposals of the Soviet Union during the negotiations with Finland. Some assert that the Soviet Union »demands» the town of Viipuri and an area north of Lake Ladoga. Let us say that this is pure invention and lies. Others make out that the Soviet Union demands the Aaland Islands. This too is invention and lies. Mention is also made of certain claims the Soviet Union is supposed to have against Sweden and Norway. This unforgivable lie does not even merit contradiction.

In reality our proposals in the negotiations with Finland are modest and they are confined to the minimum, short of which it is impossible to ensure the safety of the Soviet Union and preserve friendly relations with Finland. We instituted discussions with representatives of Finland. For this purpose the Ministers Paasikivi and Tanner were sent to Moscow by their Government. We proposed the conclusion of a Soviet Russian—Finnish pact of mutual assistance of approximately the same kind as our mutual assistance pacts with the other Baltic States. As the Finnish Government declared to us that the conclusion of such a pact would conflict with Finland's position of absolute neutrality, we did not insist on our proposals.

We then offered to proceed to the discussion of concrete questions, which interest us from the point of view of the security of the Soviet Union and especially of Leningrad both from the sea in the Gulf of Finland and from the land, seeing that the frontier passes so close to Leningrad. We proposed that it should be agreed to withdraw the Soviet—Finnish frontier a few dozen kilometres northwards from Leningrad on the Carelian Isthmus. In return we offered Finland part of the Soviet-Carelian territory. This must be regarded as compensation for the territory that Finland would give up to the Soviet Union. We also proposed that we should come to an agreement concerning the lease for a fixed period of a small sector of Finnish territory near the entrance to the Gulf of Finland in order that we could establish a naval base there. In view of the existence of a Soviet naval base at the southern entrance to the Gulf of Finland, namely Paldiski, concerning which an agreement had been concluded in the Soviet—Estonian pact of mutual assistance, the establishment of a naval base at the northern entrance to the Gulf of Finland would fully ensure the security of the latter against enemy aggression by other states. We have no doubt that the establishment of this base is consonant not only with the interests of the Soviet Union, but also with Finland's security. Our other proposals and especially the one referring to the exchange of territory, certain islands in the Gulf of Finland and part of the peninsulas of Kalastajasaarento and Pummanki for an area in Soviet Carelia of twice the size, do not seem to arouse objections on the part of the Finnish Government.

The differences of opinion in regard to some of our proposals have not yet been settled and the concessions made by Finland in this respect, e.g., a partial cession of territory on the Carelian Isthmus, are obviously not of a kind to lead to results. Subsequently we made a number of fresh offers in order to come to an agreement with Finland. We said that, if our most important proposals were accepted, we should be prepared to waive our objections to the Aaland Islands being fortified, on which the Finnish Government have insisted for a long time. We made the proviso, however, that we would give up our objections to the fortifying of the Aaland Islands on condition that Finland carried out these fortifications with her own resources, without the participation of any other state, unless the Soviet Union

participated in them. We further proposed to Finland the disarmament of the fortified areas along the whole Soviet—Finnish frontier on the Carelian Isthmus, which should be entirely consonant with Finland's interests. In addition, we expressed a wish to strengthen the Soviet—Finnish pact of non-aggression by means of mutual, supplementary guarantees. Finally the improvement of the political relations between the Soviet Union and Finland would certainly also constitute an excellent basis for the development of the economic relations between our two countries.

We are thus prepared to meet Finland on questions which specially interest that country. Nor do we believe that on the part of Finland excuses are being sought with a view to upsetting the proposed convention. This would not accord with the friendly policy in the Soviet—Finnish relations and would, of course, do Finland great harm. We feel certain that the leading men in Finland correctly realise the importance of improving friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Finland and that Finnish statesmen will not allow themselves to be influenced by any pressure or anti-Soviet instigation, from whatever quarter it may come.

I must tell you, however, that even the President of the United States has found it proper to intervene in these questions, which is difficult to bring into consonance with the policy of American neutrality. In his message to Comrade Kalinin of October 12th President Roosevelt expressed the hope that friendly and peaceful relations between the Soviet Union and Finland might be maintained and developed. One might believe that matters were shaping better for the United States, among other things with the Philippines and Cuba, which have for a long time demanded liberty and independence from the United States without being able to obtain it, than is the case with the Soviet Union and Finland, which long since obtained from the Soviet Union liberty and independence as a state, Kalinin replied to Roosevelt's message as follows: »I think I should remind you, Mr President, that the independence of the Finnish Republic as a State was recognised spontaneously by the Soviet Government on December 31st, 1917, and that the sovereignty of Finland is guaranteed by the Treaty of Peace between the R.S.F.S.R. and Finland signed on October 14th, 1920. The above-mentioned acts on the part of the Soviet Government determined the fundamental principles of

the relations between the Soviet Union and Finland. It is in accordance with those principles that the present negotiations are being conducted. Notwithstanding the tendencious versions spread by some who evidently have not the peace of Europe at heart, the sole object of the negotiations in question is to establish closer relations between the Soviet Union and Finland and to strengthen the friendly co-operation between the two countries, in order to ensure the security of the Soviet Union and that of Finland.»

After this explicit and clear reply of the President of the Supreme Soviet it should be perfectly clear that, if goodwill is shown, Finland will agree to our proposals, which, far from conflicting with Finland's national and political interests, strengthen her external security and create a solid basis which will make it possible to develop the political and economic relations between our countries in a high degree.

17.

STATEMENT OF THE MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF FINLAND ON NOVEMBER 1st, 1939.

Translation.

With reference to the speech which Foreign Commissar Molotov made yesterday in Moscow, the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs issues the following statement:

The U.S.S.R. has stated that it desires to discuss with Finland the questions mentioned by Foreign Commissar Molotov. Commissar Molotov has created a new situation by giving publicity to the point of view of the U.S.S.R. at a moment when the Finnish delegates had just departed from Helsinki to deliver the Finnish Government's reply to the Soviet Government. So far the negotiations have been confidential, and Finland has, independently and without influence on the part of any foreign power whatsoever, impartially tried to find a solution to the questions put forward, however difficult they are, owing to the neutral policy which Finland has adopted. In doing so Finland has likewise been desirous of considering the aims of the

U.S.S.R. to increase the security of Leningrad, however without imperilling Finland's own safety.

It is too early to express any opinion as to whether Commissar Molotov's statement will affect, in any manner, the point of view of the Finnish Government. The statement has, at all events, caused a natural delay to occur in the continuation of the negotiations.

Because Commissar Molotov made the remark in his speech, that the U.S.S.R. has a right and a duty to resort to effective measures which are intended to protect its security in the Gulf of Finland and on the frontier next to Leningrad, the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs points out that the U.S.S.R. has pledged itself, in the treaty of 1932 with Finland concerning non-aggression, to respect the frontiers between Finland and the U.S.S.R., which were established in the Treaty of Peace of Tartu, and to settle all disputes between the two countries by pacific means. Finland trusts that the U.S.S.R. respects this treaty, the continuation of the validity of which until the end of 1945 was agreed upon between Finland and the U.S.S.R. in 1934.

18.

MEMORANDUM OF THE FINNISH GOVERNMENT, HANDED IN MOSCOW ON NOVEMBER 3rd, 1939, BY MM. PAASIKIVI AND TANNER TO M. MOLOTOV, COMMISSAR FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Translation.

From the negotiations which have taken place between the delegates of the Governments of the Republic of Finland and the U.S.S.R. for the settlement of political relations between the two countries, it is clear that there are considerable differences between the views of the two Governments. These views are set out respectively in the memorandum of the Government of Finland of October 25th and in those of the Government of the U.S.S.R. dated October 14th and October 23rd.

The Government of Finland, being still desirous of reaching a solution of the questions which are still pending, has examined the

desiderata put forward by the Government of the U.S.S.R., and in this connection desires to make it clear that, further to what has already been stated, its attitude may be defined as follows:

1) The Government of Finland feels obliged to maintain the attitude which it has taken up from the outset regarding the proposal that it should lease the port of Hanko and the surrounding district to the Government of the U.S.S.R. and place the bay of Lappohja at the disposal of the naval forces of the U.S.S.R. for use as an anchorage. The Government of Finland takes its stand on the integrity and neutrality of Finland. It cannot consent to the stationing of troops in Finnish territory or to the use of that territory as a naval base, in any way whatsoever. Such proceedings would be incompatible with the sovereignty of Finland, her international position and her attitude of strict neutrality. Furthermore, in its last proposal, the Government of the U.S.S.R. recognised the principle that the absolute neutrality of Finland is to be maintained.

2) The Government of Finland is still ready to conclude a treaty for the cession to the U.S.S.R., in return for territorial compensation, of certain outer islands in the Gulf of Finland—namely, Seiskari, Peninsaari and Lavansaari, together with both the Tytärsaari and their territorial waters—as it has already intimated in its memorandum of October 23rd. Furthermore, the Government of Finland is prepared to discuss a settlement in regard to Suursaari of such a nature as to allow for the requirements of the security of Leningrad, as stressed by the U.S.S.R., and also for the security of Finland. In this connection, the Government of Finland draws attention to the provisions of Articles 13 and 14 of the Treaty of Peace of Tartu.

3) The memorandum put forward by the U.S.S.R. on October 23rd slightly modified the line of demarcation in the Isthmus of Carelia proposed by the U.S.S.R. in its memorandum of October 14th. In its desire to give proof of its goodwill towards the desiderata of the U.S.S.R. in the matter of increasing the security of the city of Leningrad, the Government of Finland, to reach an agreement, agrees to make very heavy sacrifices whereby the Finnish people will be deeply affected. It cannot, however,

possibly accept the new line of demarcation set out in the memorandum of the Government of the U.S.S.R. and in the map annexed thereto. The new line would lie much too close to Finland's chief port of export and to the heart of the whole of Eastern Finland. Apart from these drawbacks, it would mean throwing over considerations essential to the security of Finland. This would imply a departure from the very principle that the purpose of the arrangement demanded is to make proper allowance for the security of both parties. After careful consideration, the Government of Finland desires to state that, in return for acceptable territorial compensation, it could agree to the cession of a somewhat more extensive territory on the northern coast at the end of the Gulf of Finland than it had previously proposed. The new frontier would follow the line of demarcation indicated on the map attached—namely, the mouth of the Vammeljoki — Vammeljoki — the River Lintula — Kaukjärvi — the present frontier (frontier-post No. 70).

4) The Government of the U.S.S.R. has intimated, as a separate matter, that it desires a modification of the frontier of the Fishermen's Peninsula at Petsamo—now, in its opinion, inconvenient and artificial—which would mean the cession to the U.S.S.R. of the whole of the western part of the Fishermen's Peninsula at present belonging to Finland. The U.S.S.R. has not justified this demand on grounds of military defence, nor have facts been adduced which would call for such a territorial sacrifice on the part of Finland or which could convince the Government of Finland of the real need for a modification of the frontier. Nevertheless, in proof of its good-will, the Finnish Government is prepared to negotiate, in return for territorial compensation, the cession to the U.S.S.R. of the western part of the Fishermen's Peninsula as far as Pummanki Fjord in the south. In this connection, it would be appropriate to revise Articles 6-8 of the Treaty of Peace of Tartu, as they contain provisions which have not in practice been applied or which are no longer compatible with the practical requirements of the present time.

5) In its first memorandum, the Government of the U.S.S.R. intimated that, as compensation, it contemplated ceding to the

Republic of Finland a piece of territory forming part of the districts of Repola and Porajärvi, as indicated on the map handed to the Government of Finland. As regards the question of territorial compensation, the Government of Finland feels obliged to draw attention to the following facts, which should not be overlooked in any effort to reach an equitable arrangement:

a) As the Government of the U.S.S.R. has itself observed, the territories which Finland now considers ceding to the Government of the U.S.S.R. are very different in value from those which the U.S.S.R. has proposed ceding to Finland. Finland will lose mainland and island territory and, in addition, territorial waters of importance to herself. To the U.S.S.R.—as the latter has itself made clear—these territories are of paramount military importance. But, in exchange, Finland would obtain territories of no corresponding value either from the military or the economic point of view. These facts should therefore be taken into account in fixing the extent of the territorial compensation.

b) When the matter is settled, sufficient time must be allowed for the enumeration and evaluation of the losses sustained by the Finnish State and Finnish citizens in consequence of the exchange of territories. In the territories which Finland considers ceding to the U.S.S.R. are situated buildings, railways, roads, barracks, schools, etc., belonging to the State, and other buildings belonging to private persons. In fixing the extent of the territory to be ceded by the U.S.S.R., allowance will have to be made for the value of the immovable property, situated on the territory, and the U.S.S.R. should also pay to the Finnish State monetary compensation representing the value of the immovable property belonging to private persons, so that the latter may be indemnified. A commission of experts should be set up to work out a practical settlement in these matters, and the commission should be allowed sufficient time for the performance of its duties.

6) In its memorandum of October 23rd, the Government of the U.S.S.R. intimated its agreement with the proposal made by

the Government of Finland for the amplification of the Treaty of Non-Aggression between the two countries. The draft protocol is annexed hereto.¹⁾

7) The Government of the U.S.S.R. proposes that the fortified zone along the frontier between Finland and the U.S.S.R. in the Carelian Isthmus be destroyed and that no troops be stationed there other than those belonging to the ordinary frontier-guard. The measures taken by the Government of Finland on the frontier are dictated solely by considerations of defence and security, and Finland cannot, for these reasons, abandon them. But she is also obliged to provide for the safety of her frontiers by the strict neutrality on which the policy of her Government is based. The measures adopted by Finland in the matter of fortifications are also dictated by that principle. In normal times, the only troops stationed by the Government of Finland in the frontier-zone have been frontier-guards.

8) The Government of Finland notes that the U.S.S.R. is not opposed to Finland's fortifying the Aaland Islands by her own means, in its efforts to guarantee the neutrality of those islands, as the Government of Finland had intended.

The Government of Finland has examined the above proposals with the greatest care. Its negative attitude towards certain proposals of the U.S.S.R. does not mean that it would have refused to take a sympathetic view of the U.S.S.R. Government's desires in the matter of increasing the security of Leningrad. The Government of Finland has indeed taken those desires into account in accepting the proposals of the Government of the U.S.S.R. as fully as practical possibilities allow.

The Government of Finland, acting in the name of a unanimous people, has thus given the U.S.S.R. positive proof of its desire to understand the considerations of security to which the U.S.S.R. attaches importance and, similarly, in its efforts to reach a satisfactory settlement of political relations, it has gone as far as its independence, security and neutrality permit. The concessions

¹⁾ The Finnish representatives did not submit the draft protocol to the Soviet representatives, as the signing of the protocol became a question of minor importance.

which Finland agrees to make to the U.S.S.R. in order to improve neighbourly relations and ensure peace represent a very heavy sacrifice for the Finnish people, as they affect an area which has been inhabited by a Finnish population since very ancient date and which, for centuries, has formed part of Finland's political territory.

Finally, the Finnish Government desires to state that the conclusion of such a treaty would require the approval of the Finnish House of Representatives, in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Finnish Constitution.

19.

COMMUNICATION HANDED DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS IN MOSCOW ON NOVEMBER 9th, 1939, BY M. PAASIKIVI TO M. MOLOTOV, COMMISSAR FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Translation.

At the last meeting, a proposal was made by the U.S.S.R. that Finland, in the event of her not being able to grant the U.S.S.R. a military base at Hanko, should grant such a base in the islands situated in the vicinity of Hanko—namely, Hermansö, Koön and Hästö-Busö—together with an anchorage in the port of Lappohja.

Having submitted this proposal to our Government, we are now in a position to present its reply. Our Government is of the opinion that the reasons which prevent our granting a military base at Hanko apply also to the islands in question. Finland cannot grant to a foreign Power military bases on her own territory and within the confines of her frontiers. In the course of the previous meetings, we explained these reasons repeatedly. In the circumstances, the Finnish Government does not find it possible to accept the proposal in question.

J. K. Paasikivi.

20.

LETTER OF M. MOLOTOV, COMMISSAR FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HANDED IN MOSCOW ON NOVEMBER 9th, 1939, TO MM. PAASIKIVI AND TANNER.

Translation.

Having taken note of the memorandum of the Finnish Government which you handed to me to-day (November 9th), I find that in this

memorandum the declaration of the Government of the U.S.S.R. dated November 3rd, has been incorrectly set forth.

In point of fact, on the 3rd instant, the Government of the U.S.S.R. made the following proposals:

1) The Government of the U.S.S.R., taking into consideration the declaration of the Finnish Government that it cannot consent to a garrison or naval base of another Power being situated »on the territory of Finland», proposed to the Finnish Government that a corresponding piece of territory situated in the vicinity of the port of Hanko should be sold to the U.S.S.R. This solution would mean that the objection that such a piece of land formed part of the territory of Finland would cease to apply, since, after having been sold to the U.S.S.R., it would, *ipso facto*, become Soviet territory.

2) Furthermore, the Government of the U.S.S.R. stated that it would propose to the Finnish Government that if, for any reason, a piece of land situated in the vicinity of Hanko could not be sold or exchanged, the islands of Hermansö, Koön, Hästö-Busö, Långskär, Furuskär, Ekön and certain other islands situated near them should be sold or exchanged, as the Finnish Government agreed to do on a previous occasion, when it ceded to the U.S.S.R. certain islands in the Gulf of Finland and some territory on the Carelian Isthmus.

By reason of the foregoing, I consider that the objection contained in the memorandum of M. Paasikivi and M. Tanner, dated the 9th instant, that »Finland cannot grant to a foreign Power military bases on its territory and within the confines of its frontiers» is unfounded and indicates a misinterpretation of the attitude of the Government of the U.S.S.R.

It is obvious that if either the region of Hanko or the islands situated to the east of Hanko were sold or exchanged for a corresponding piece of territory in the U.S.S.R., they could no longer form part of the territory of Finland or be situated within the confines of the Finnish frontiers.

Accordingly, I return your memorandum of November 9th.

V. Molotov.

34.

LETTER OF MM. PAASIKIVI AND TANNER, HANDED IN
MOSCOW ON NOVEMBER 10th, 1939, TO M. MOLOTOV,
COMMISSAR FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Translation.

To M. V. Molotov,

We have the honour to acknowledge the receipt, last night, of your letter relating to the negotiations now proceeding between us, together with the memorandum enclosed, which we had handed to you at the last meeting and which you have returned to us. We now beg to state as follows:

After the meeting held on the 3rd (or, more correctly, the 4th) of this month, we informed our Government that the U.S.S.R. was still desirous of obtaining in the Hanko peninsula territory for a military base, and that the cession of that territory could be effected, as the Finnish Government might prefer, by grant of lease, or by sale or exchange.

We stated furthermore that the U.S.S.R. proposed alternatively, and under the same conditions, the cession of the islands situated in the vicinity of Hanko—namely, Hermansö, Koön and Hästö-Busö—together with an anchorage in the port of Lappohja. The attitude of the Government of the U.S.S.R. was thus explained to the Finnish Government in a perfectly correct manner.

On November 8th, we received a reply, according to which the Finnish Government does not consider it possible to agree to cede in any form whatsoever territories situated at Hanko or in any other regions of the Finnish coast with a view to their being employed for the establishment of military bases. It was in virtue of these instructions that we drew up the brief memorandum referred to above.

The three islands mentioned by the U.S.S.R. at the meeting on November 3rd (4th) (Hermansö, Koön and Hästö-Busö) are surrounded by Finnish territory and territorial waters. They would thus be within the confines of the Finnish frontiers, even in the event of Finland having ceded them to another Power. As regards the other islands (Långskär, Furuskär, Ekön, etc.) referred to in your letter of yesterday, which would further considerably increase the territory

in question, these were not mentioned at the meeting on the 3rd (4th) of this month.

In its reply, dated October 31st, 1939, the Finnish Government briefly explained the reasons for which, having regard to the international situation of Finland, her policy of absolute neutrality, and her firm resolve to remain outside any group of great Powers and to hold aloof from any wars and conflicts between them, it cannot consent to the cession of Hanko or any islands situated in the immediate proximity of the Finnish mainland as military bases to any foreign Power.

The Finnish Government, which is sincerely desirous of strengthening its relations with the U.S.S.R., has declared its readiness to make substantial concessions in order to meet the wishes of the U.S.S.R. In this connection, however, it cannot go so far as to renounce the vital interests of its country, as would be the case if a military base situated at the entry to the Gulf of Finland were ceded to a foreign Power.

Lastly, we desire to express on behalf of the Finnish Government our sincere hope that an agreement may be concluded between Finland and the U.S.S.R. on the basis of the concessions proposed to the U.S.S.R. by Finland.

J. K. Paasikivi. Väinö Tanner.

22.

LETTER OF MM. PAASIKIVI AND TANNER, HANDED IN
MOSCOW ON NOVEMBER 13th, 1939, TO M. MOLOTOV.
COMMISSAR FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Translation.

Monsieur le President,

In view of the fact that, during the negotiations which we have been conducting with yourself and M. Stalin, we have unfortunately not succeeded in finding a basis for the projected treaty between the U.S.S.R. and Finland, we have felt it desirable to leave this evening for Helsinki.

In informing you of this and thanking you for the kindness which has been shown us, we would express the hope that at some future date the negotiations may bring about a result satisfactory to both parties.

J. K. Paasikivi. Väinö Tanner.

23.

NOTE OF M. MOLOTOV, COMMISSAR FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HANDED ON NOVEMBER 26th, 1939, TO M. YRJÖ-KOSKINEN,
FINNISH MINISTER AT MOSCOW.

Translation.

Monsieur le Ministre,

According to information received from the headquarters of the Red Army, our troops posted on the Carelian Isthmus, in the vicinity of the village of Mainila, were the object to-day, November 26th, at 3.45 p.m., of unexpected artillery fire from Finnish territory. In all, seven cannon-shots were fired, killing three privates and one non-commissioned officer and wounding seven privates and two men belonging to the military command. The Soviet troops, who had strict orders not to allow themselves to be provoked, did not retaliate. In bringing the foregoing to your knowledge, the Soviet Government consider it desirable to stress the fact that, during the recent negotiations with M. Tanner and M. Paasikivi, they had directed their attention to the danger resulting from the concentration of large regular forces in the immediate proximity of the frontier near Leningrad. In consequence of the provocative firing on Soviet troops from Finnish territory, the Soviet Government are obliged to declare now that the concentration of Finnish troops in the vicinity of Leningrad, not only constitutes a menace to Leningrad, but is, in fact, an act hostile to the U.S.S.R. which has already resulted in aggression against the Soviet troops and caused casualties. The Government of the U.S.S.R. have no intention of exaggerating the importance of this revolting act committed by troops belonging to the Finnish Army—owing perhaps to a lack of proper guidance on the part of their superiors—but they desire that

revolting acts of this nature shall not be committed in future. In consequence, the Government of the U.S.S.R., while protesting energetically against what has happened, propose that the Finnish Government should, without delay, withdraw their troops on the Carelian Isthmus from the frontier to a distance of 20-25 kilometres, and thus preclude all possibility of a repetition of provocative acts.

Molotov.

November 26th, 1939.

24.

NOTE OF M. YRJÖ-KOSKINEN, FINNISH MINISTER AT MOSCOW, HANDED ON NOVEMBER 27th, 1939, TO M. MOLOTOV, COMMISSAR FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Translation.

Monsieur le Commissaire du Peuple,

In reply to your letter of the 26th instant, I have the honour, acting on instructions from my Government, to inform you as follows:

After the alleged violation of the frontier, the Government of Finland immediately ordered an inquiry. It was found that the cannon-shots mentioned in your letter were not fired from the Finnish side. It appears, on the contrary, on investigation, that there was firing on November 26th from 15.45 to 16.05 o'clock (Soviet time) on the Soviet side of the frontier in the vicinity of the village of Mainila, which you mentioned. On the Finnish side the points could be seen where the shots had fallen, close to the village of Mainila, situated not more than 800 metres from the frontier, beyond an open field. From the explosions caused by the seven shots which were heard, it was clear that the point where the arm or arms in question were fired was at a distance of about 1½—2 kilometres south-east of the place where the shots exploded. The competent frontier-guard post made a note of the shots, in the official record, at the actual moment of the incident.

In view of these circumstances, it seems possible that the question may be of an accident which occurred in the course of firing practice on the Soviet side and which, according to your communication, unfortunately caused the loss of human lives. In consequence,

it is my duty to reject your protest and to state that Finland has committed no hostile act against the U.S.S.R. such as you allege to have taken place.

In your letter you also alluded to the declarations addressed to M. Paasikivi and M. Tanner during their visit to Moscow, concerning the danger resulting from the concentration of regular troops in the immediate vicinity of the frontier near Leningrad. In this connection, I desire to direct your attention to the fact that, on the Finnish side, the troops stationed in the immediate vicinity of the frontier consist principally of the frontier guard forces; on the other hand, no guns, for instance, have been placed in position whose range would reach beyond the frontier. Although there are thus no concrete grounds for withdrawing the troops from the frontier-line, as you propose, my Government is prepared, none the less, to open conversations with a view to the mutual withdrawal of troops to a certain distance from the frontier.

It was with pleasure that I noted your statement that the Government of the U.S.S.R. have no intention of exaggerating the importance of the frontier incident which, according to your letter, is alleged to have taken place. I am happy to have been able to dispel this misunderstanding the very day after the receipt of your proposal.

Nevertheless, in order that no misunderstanding may persist in the matter, my Government propose that the frontier commissioners of the two countries on the Carelian Isthmus should be instructed to carry out a joint inquiry into the incident in question, in conformity with the Convention concerning Frontier Commissioners, concluded on September 24th, 1928.

A. S. Yrjö-Koskinen.

25.

NOTE OF M. MOLOTOV, COMMISSAR FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HANDED ON NOVEMBER 28th, 1939, TO M. YRJÖ-KOSKINEN.
FINNISH MINISTER AT MOSCOW.

Translation.

Monsieur le Ministre,

The Finnish Government's reply to the note from the Government of the U.S.S.R., dated November 26th, 1939, is a document which

reflects the deep-rooted hostility of the Finnish Government towards the U.S.S.R. and is the cause of extreme tension in the relations between the two countries.

1) The fact that the Finnish Government deny that Finnish troops opened artillery fire on Soviet troops and caused casualties can be explained only by a desire to mislead public opinion and make light of those casualties. Nothing but a lack of responsibility and disdain for public opinion can account for the attempt to explain away this reprehensible incident by alleging firing practice by the Soviet artillery on the actual frontier-line within sight of Finnish troops.

2) The refusal of the Finnish Government to withdraw the troops who committed this hostile act of firing on Soviet troops, and the demand of that Government for the simultaneous withdrawal of the Finnish and Soviet troops, a demand which would appear to be based on the principle of equality, reveals clearly the hostile desire of the Finnish Government to expose Leningrad to danger. There can, indeed, be no question of equality in the situation of the Finnish and Soviet troops. The Soviet troops do not constitute a menace to Finland's vital centres, as these troops are posted hundreds of kilometres away from such places, whereas the Finnish troops, stationed at a distance of 32 kilometres from Leningrad — a vital centre of the U.S.S.R., with a population of 3½ million—menace that town directly. It is needless to stress the fact that actually the Soviet troops cannot be withdrawn anywhere, since their withdrawal to a distance of 20-25 kilometres from the frontier would mean that they would have to be posted in the suburbs of Leningrad, which would be absurd from the point of view of the safety of that city. The proposal of the Government of the U.S.S.R. that the Finnish troops should be withdrawn to beyond a distance of 20—25 kilometres from the frontier represents a minimum, since it is not designed to create equality of situation as between the Finnish and Soviet troops, but simply to attenuate the disproportion that now exists. If the Finnish Government refuse to accept this minimum proposal, it means that it is their intention that Leningrad should remain under a direct threat from their troops.

3) In concentrating a large number of regular troops in the immediate vicinity of Leningrad and subjecting that important vital

centre of the U.S.S.R. to a direct threat, the Finnish Government have committed a hostile act against the U.S.S.R. which is incompatible with the Treaty of Non-Aggression concluded between the two States. The refusal of the Finnish Government, after the criminal artillery fire directed at the Soviet troops, to withdraw their troops a distance of 20-25 kilometres shows that the Finnish Government desire to persist in their hostile attitude towards the U.S.S.R., that they have no intention of complying with the provisions of the Treaty of Non-Aggression and that they have decided to keep Leningrad under a perpetual menace. The Government of the U.S.S.R. cannot, however, admit that one of the parties should be allowed to violate the Treaty of Non-Aggression, while the other party respects it. In consequence, the Government of the U.S.S.R. are obliged to state that they consider themselves, as from to-day, released from the obligations ensuing from the Treaty of Non-Aggression concluded between the U.S.S.R. and Finland, obligations which are being systematically violated by the Finnish Government.

Molotov.

26.

NOTE OF M. MOLOTOV, COMMISSAR FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HANDED ON NOVEMBER 29th, 1939, TO M. YRJÖ-KOSKINEN,
FINNISH MINISTER AT MOSCOW.

Translation.

Monsieur le Ministre,

Attacks on Soviet troops by Finnish troops are known to be continuing, not only on the Carelian Isthmus but also at other parts of the frontier between the U.S.S.R. and Finland. The Government of the U.S.S.R. can no longer tolerate such a situation. As a result of the situation thus created, for which the Finnish Government alone is responsible, the Government of the U.S.S.R. can no longer maintain normal relations with Finland and find themselves compelled to recall their political and economic representatives from Finland.

Molotov.

34.

NOTE OF M. YRJÖ-KOSKINEN, FINNISH MINISTER AT MOSCOW, HANDED ON NOVEMBER 29th, 1939, TO M. MOLOTOV, COMMISSAR FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Translation.

Monsieur le Commissaire du Peuple,

In reply to your letter of the 28th instant, I have the honour to inform you as follows;

It is clear from my letter of November 28th that Finland has not violated the territorial integrity of the U.S.S.R. With the object of establishing this fact in a manner admitting of no doubt, my Government proposed that the frontier commissioners of the two countries on the Carelian Isthmus should be instructed to carry out a joint inquiry into the incident in question, as provided in the Convention concerning Frontier Commissioners concluded on September 24th, 1928. In my letter, I also directed attention to the fact that the troops posted in the vicinity of the frontier on the Finnish side consist principally of regular troops belonging to the frontier-guard who cannot constitute a menace of any kind to the security of Leningrad. My Government consider that the denunciation of the Treaty of Non-Aggression was not justified; under the Protocol of 1934, this treaty is to remain in force, without any possibility of denunciation, until the end of the year 1945.

My Government desire to stress more particularly Article 5 of the Treaty of Non-Aggression, in which the two Contracting Parties have declared that they will endeavour to settle in a spirit of justice any dispute of whatever nature or origin which may arise between them and will resort exclusively to pacific means of settling such disputes. For this purpose, the two Contracting Parties undertook to submit any disputes which might arise between them, and which it might not have been possible to settle through diplomatic proceedings within a reasonable time, to a procedure of conciliation before a joint conciliation commission. According to the said article, conciliation procedure must also be applied more particularly in the event of any dispute as to the question whether the mutual undertaking as to non-aggression has or has not been violated.

Referring to the foregoing, my Government propose that, in

conformity with Article 5 of the Treaty of Non-Aggression and the provisions of the Convention of Conciliation annexed to that treaty, a conciliation commission should be convened without delay to examine the dispute which has just arisen. Finland is prepared, alternatively, to submit the settlement of the dispute to neutral arbitration.

In order to furnish signal proof of their sincere wish to reach an agreement with the Government of the U.S.S.R. and with the object of disproving the Soviet Government's allegation that Finland has adopted a hostile attitude towards the U.S.S.R. and is desirous of menacing the safety of Leningrad, my Government are prepared to come to an understanding with the Government of the U.S.S.R. concerning the withdrawal of the defence troops on the Carelian Isthmus, with the exception of the units of frontier-guards and Customs officials, to such a distance from Leningrad that it can no longer be claimed that they threaten the security of that town.

A. S. Yrjö-Koskinen.

28.

LETTER OF M. HOLSTI, DELEGATE OF FINLAND TO THE
LEAGUE OF NATIONS, HANDED ON DECEMBER 3rd, 1939,
TO M. AVENOL, SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE
LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, with which Finland, since the signature of the Treaty of Peace at Tartu in 1920, has maintained neighbourly relations and signed a Pact of Non-Aggression which should have expired only in 1945, unexpectedly attacked on the morning of November 30th, 1939, not only frontier positions, but also open Finnish towns, spreading death and destruction among the civilian population, more particularly by attacks from the air. Finland has never engaged in any undertaking directed against her powerful neighbour. She has continually made every effort to live at peace with her. Nevertheless, alleging so-called frontier incidents and adducing Finland's alleged refusal to acquiesce in the strengthening of the security of Leningrad, the Union of Soviet Socialist

Republics first denounced the abovementioned Pact of Non-Aggression and then refused the Finnish Government's proposal to have recourse to the mediation of a neutral Power. In consequence, acting on instructions from my Government, I have the honour to bring the foregoing facts to your knowledge and to request you, in virtue of Articles 11 and 15 of the Covenant, forthwith to summon a meeting of the Council and the Assembly and to ask them to take the necessary measures to put an end to the aggression. I will forward to you in due course a complete statement of the reasons and circumstances which have led my Government to request the intervention of the League of Nations in a dispute which has brought two of its Members into conflict with one another.

Rudolf Holsti.

29.

SPEECH OF M. RYTI, PRIME MINISTER, BROADCAST ON DECEMBER 8th, 1939.

For nine days we have been at war with the Soviet Union. Without the slightest cause on our part, and ruthlessly violating numerous agreements she had concluded with us and duly ratified, as well as a number of other international agreements and obligations, the Soviet Union has attacked us on all our frontiers, on land, in the air and at sea, and has begun to employ all the instruments of destruction that modern technics have created, to break the will of our people and put an end to our existence as an independent sovereign nation. Unprotected towns and populated centres have been bombed from the air, women and children have been machine-gunned, poison gas has been used in battle with our troops, all methods of warfare which are prohibited in the name of humanity by international agreements, to which the Soviet Union is a party. The Bible story of King Ahab and poor Naboth repeats itself in a new form. A mighty and rich nation wishes by crime and fraud to deprive a weak and poor nation of its vineyard and add it to its own extensive gardens. But the moral of this story will also repeat itself, in that wrongdoing and violence will bring their own revenge. On

the plea that the security of Leningrad and the Soviet Union needed to be increased, the Soviet Government, in the course of negotiations begun on their initiative, demand certain Finnish territories. These negotiations were entered into by the Finnish Government with the honest purpose of arriving by these means at a peaceful settlement which would satisfy the reasonable demands of both parties and correspond to their justified interests. The Finnish people, let it be said, neither asks nor demands of the Soviet Union or of others anything else than to be left in peace in order to work as an independent free nation for the development and aggrandizement of its prosperity and its culture. It understands that because of her geographical situation Finland is and will always be Russia's neighbour, and therefore it also understands that good and trustful relations with this eastern neighbour are in the interest of both nations. Nevertheless, it cannot submit to dependence on the Soviet Union's pleasure, nor imperil its security and independence or abstain from that policy of peace and neutrality which it has adopted. Starting from these points of view, Finland negotiated with the Soviet Union. Yet, instead of continuing the negotiations, the Soviet Union broke off diplomatic relations and with a ruthlessness rarely paralleled in history, launched an attack intended to be annihilating. Even after this the Finnish Government, striving to the last to utilize every opportunity for the achievement of a peaceful solution, intimated their willingness to discuss with the Soviet Union the possibility of a peaceful solution and to bring forward new proposals which they believed would satisfy reasonable Russian hopes in regard to the increased security of the Soviet Union and Leningrad without meanwhile imperilling Finland's own security. This action, too, was ignored by the Soviet Union. It was obvious that there was no question on their side merely of increasing the security of Leningrad along the path of peaceful negotiations, but that they desired war for the realisation of far-reaching, purely imperialistic aims. The present Soviet Government have forgotten the principles of self-determination for small nations proclaimed by Lenin, forgotten the fair assurances of the Soviet Union's will to peace, and of her efforts to protect peace; a cold and coarse imperialism, of which the Soviet Union has for the past two decades accused other nations, has revealed itself as the guiding star and ultimate aim of the present Government

of the Soviet Union. Taking advantage of the present unhappy state of the world, when civilised European nations mutilate each other in bitter fratricidal strife, the Soviet Union endeavours to realise Russia's thousand-year old imperialistic aims. Finland, because of her geographical position, is numbered among the first victims of this world tragedy.

It looks, however, as though the Soviet Union, in part at least, had embarked on this violence trusting to false assumptions and a faulty intelligence service. Thus it has set up at Terijoki a new, supposedly democratic Finnish Government led by Kuusinen, apparently under the impression that it would be able with the aid of this shadow Cabinet to entice at least some part of the Finnish people over to its side. In this hope it will be disappointed. M. Kuusinen and his »democracy» are so well known in Finland, that the only people who can be expected to rally round him are at the most a handful of those »rouble-Communists» who have worked during the whole period of our independence against this country, within and without its borders. M. Kuusinen's power in Finland will never extend one inch beyond the points of the red army bayonets protecting him, and will not last a moment longer than those bayonets are around him. His proclamations, which breathe an unfathomable personal lust for revenge on his former Finnish co-workers, arouse in the Finnish people only disgust, his talk about democracy is recognised by the Finnish people as bitter irony. M. Kuusinen has been too long away from Finland and lived too long in other circumstances and in a different atmosphere for him to understand the state of mind and the ideals of present-day Finland, and as little does he know that real democracy which the Finnish people themselves have developed for themselves and behind which they stand as one man, and those economic and cultural circumstances which the Finnish people have created by hard work during their independence and in which they live. Messieurs Stalin and Molotov will be woefully disappointed, if in their policy in regard to Finland they have counted on any gain from this tool of theirs, his »Government» or his »democracy» or his agitation. The standard of enlightenment is much too high in Finland for any other attitude towards this kind of thing than contempt.

In another important respect as well, the action taken against Finland was based on incorrect information and an error of calculation.

If it was supposed in Moscow that the defensive capacity and spirit of the Finnish army and the nation could be broken by the savage destruction of towns, the murder of women and children, the use of poison gas and by other similar means which the whole civilised world abhors, the result will be disappointment. The Finnish people are at this moment wholly united, unanimous and firm as steel, ready for the greatest sacrifices on behalf of their independence and their existence, for they are fully aware of what awaits them under the rule of men like M. Kuusinen. If we are compelled to do so, we shall fight to the end, even after the end. The conquest of Finland will not be in the nature of a parade march, but will demand at every step heavy sacrifices of the attacker. An ultimate condition of successful war is also a just and honourable cause for which to fight. We Finns have this lofty and sacred cause; we fight for our independence and our existence; we fight for our homes, our families, our children, for the right of future generations to live; we fight for an order of human justice against rough violence; we fight for everything enduring and valuable in the cultural development of the world so far. But for what are the Russian workers and peasants fighting?

30.

AIDE-MEMOIRE OF M. HOLSTI, DELEGATE OF FINLAND TO THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, HANDED ON DECEMBER 9th, 1939, TO M. AVENOL, SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Translation.

The Frontiers of Finland.

By the Treaties of Peace and Non-Aggression, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics expressly, and of its own free will, recognised the political frontiers of Finland. The territorial composition of Finland has, moreover, been fixed for centuries past. The western section of the frontier crossing the Isthmus of Carelia goes back to the year 1323, and the eastern section to 1618. As regards the frontier running north from Lake Ladoga, the southern section (as

far as Nurmes) goes back to 1618, and the northern section to 1595. The modifications of the frontier on the Arctic coast took place in 1920, when, in accordance with a promise made in 1864, the U.S.S.R. ceded the Petsamo region to Finland in compensation for territory which was then incorporated in Russia. This arrangement was also intended to compensate Finland for the loss of free access to the Arctic Ocean in 1826, when the territory previously regarded as belonging jointly to Russia, Finland and Norway was partitioned between Russia and Norway. From 1809 to 1917, during which period Finland was united to Russia as a Grand-Duchy enjoying complete internal autonomy, her frontiers with Russia were exactly delimited.

*Negotiations between Finland and the Union of
Soviet Socialist Republics.*

In the course of the negotiations in October-November 1939, to which the Government of the U.S.S.R. invited the Government of Finland on October 5th last, the U.S.S.R. made detailed proposals prejudicial to the territorial integrity of Finland.

The majority of the proposals of the U.S.S.R. were actuated by strategic considerations which it was attempted to justify by a desire to guarantee the security of Leningrad. In point of fact, these considerations had already been taken into account in the Peace Treaty of Tartu, whereby the outer islands in the Gulf of Finland and the Islands of Suursaari were demilitarised. The treaty further provided that certain fortifications on the Finnish side of the Isthmus of Carelia were to be destroyed and that freedom of military action on the eastern coast of the Gulf of Finland was to be subject to certain restrictions. Finland has scrupulously observed all her undertakings. Now the U.S.S.R. has made proposals regarding the cession of certain territories by Finland by grant of lease or by exchange. In order to reach an agreement with the U.S.S.R., Finland has adopted the most conciliatory attitude possible. The limit of the concessions beyond which Finland has thought it impossible to go was determined by the two following considerations:

1) Compliance with the considerations of security advanced by the U.S.S.R. must not be allowed to prejudice Finland's security or her possibilities of defence;

2) The policy of neutrality pursued by Finland and recognised even by the U.S.S.R. must not be jeopardised.

The proposals to which the U.S.S.R. firmly adhered were for the cession of a naval base at the entrance to the Gulf of Finland and a modification of the frontier on the Isthmus of Carelia. They would have meant the renunciation of the above-mentioned principles.

In the counter-proposals whereby Finland endeavoured to discover new means of satisfying the demands of the U.S.S.R., it was finally contemplated—in addition to partial acceptance of the territorial demands of the U.S.S.R. on the coast of the Arctic Ocean—to agree to the cession to the U.S.S.R. of five of the outer islands in the Gulf of Finland and the southern part of the Island of Suursaari, together with the removal of the line of demarcation to a distance of approximately 20-25 kilometres from the very ancient frontiers on the Isthmus of Carelia in the north-eastern part of the Gulf of Finland. The cession of these territories, which from the remotest times have been inhabited by a Finnish population, would have meant the renunciation of the principles of nationality recognised by the founders of the U.S.S.R. Nevertheless, the Government of Finland were ready to make this heavy sacrifice, in order to meet the demands of her great neighbour.

There was a limit beyond which the Government of Finland considered it impossible to go in making concessions. The principle that its importance or the size of one of its towns entitles a State to require the cession of territory from a smaller State is unknown in the political life of the West. A large country is protected by its very size. To require a small State to renounce its means of defence is tantamount to destroying that State's liberty. By giving up its means of defence, the small State either falls under the domination of the great Power by which the demands were presented or becomes the battlefield of great Powers. The U.S.S.R. is not exposed to any danger of indirect aggression by a great Power through Finnish territory. The most effective way of guaranteeing it against such a danger for all time is to allow the Finnish people the possibility of ensuring—as it is firmly determined to do—the application of its policy of neutrality by effective defence designed to maintain the independence of its country, and not to deprive it of that possibility.

The negotiations conducted in Moscow were broken off by the U.S.S.R. on November 13th. In Finland, however, the hope was explicitly expressed that negotiations would be continued and conducted to a successful conclusion. The Soviet allegation that the »intransigent« attitude of Finland towards the territorial demands of the U.S.S.R. was prompted by certain foreign Powers is devoid of all foundation. Indeed, the fundamental instinct of self-preservation obliges every State to organise its defence and independence on solid foundations. The same instinct of self-preservation also obliges the small States to hold aloof from the conflicts of the great Powers and scrupulously to maintain their neutrality. The allegation that in the negotiations Finland gave evidence of intransigence and of a hostile attitude towards the U.S.S.R. is untrue, as Finland advanced no demands and preferred no threats against the U.S.S.R. Far from threatening, she was prepared to make concessions to her neighbour in the national and military spheres which should have afforded a sufficient guarantee for the security of Leningrad.

Even during the negotiations in Moscow, the air forces of the U.S.S.R. committed several violations of the territorial integrity of Finland. Between October 10th and November 14th about thirty such violations were recorded. Finland drew the attention of the U.S.S.R. to this fact through diplomatic channels, but she was careful not to exaggerate its importance, so as to avoid tension in the relations of the two countries and also in order to facilitate the negotiations then in progress. After the negotiations were broken off, the U.S.S.R. embarked upon a systematic campaign of wireless and Press propaganda against Finland, but it was not until November 26th that the anti-Finnish measures began to take on a more aggressive and cynical tone. This last phase continued until November 30th. on which date the aggression of the U.S.S.R. against Finland took place.

It was on the first-mentioned date—that is, November 26th—that the U.S.S.R. launched an accusation against Finland to the effect that Finnish troops had opened fire with guns on the Soviet troops lying on the other side of the frontier in the neighbourhood of the village of Mainila, on the Carelian Isthmus. The Government of the U.S.S.R. professed to conclude from this that the concentration of Finnish troops in the vicinity of the frontier threatened the city of Leningrad and constituted a hostile act against the U.S.S.R. They

proposed that the Government of Finland should, without delay, withdraw their troops on the Isthmus of Carelia to a distance of 20-25 kilometres from the frontier to preclude the possibility, so they declared, of the renewal of such provocation.

Finland, being ready to prove her innocence and desiring to avoid any possible misunderstanding, proposed, on November 27th, a joint inquiry to elucidate the circumstances in which the alleged incident had taken place, and declared, *inter alia*, that there was no artillery in the immediate vicinity of the frontier. She further proposed negotiations with a view to the withdrawal of the troops on both sides of the frontier. In reply, the Government of the U.S.S.R., on November 29th, unilaterally denounced the Treaty of Non-Aggression, in flagrant contradiction of the treaty's express provisions.

Finland then proposed the conciliation procedure laid down in the treaty, which was to be employed more particularly to ascertain whether the non-aggression obligation had been violated. Alternatively, she declared herself willing to submit the dispute to neutral arbitration, in order to furnish conclusive proof of her desire to reach agreement with the U.S.S.R. and to rebut the latter's allegations. Finland declared herself willing to come to an agreement with the U.S.S.R. for the withdrawal of her defence troops on the Isthmus of Carelia to such a distance from Leningrad that any possibility of a threat to the safety of that city would be eliminated.

Outbreak of Hostilities.

But before the Minister of Finland in Moscow had an opportunity of transmitting Finland's reply to the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, the U.S.S.R., on the evening of November 29th, broke off diplomatic relations. Nevertheless, the Finnish reply to the notifications of the U.S.S.R. regarding the denunciation of the Non-Aggression Treaty was handed to the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs immediately after 12 o'clock on the night of November 29th-30th. The note should have fully convinced the Government of the U.S.S.R. of Finland's unwavering desire to reach an agreement regarding the removal of her troops on the Isthmus of Carelia away from the U.S.S.R.; but on November 30th, the latter nevertheless began its aggression against Finland.

The wireless propaganda of the U.S.S.R. against Finland reached

its climax on the evening of November 29th and during the following night, Finland being accused, without foundation, of several violations of the frontier, although, to avoid any possibility of incidents, the Finnish troops and frontier-guards had been withdrawn to a stated distance from the frontier, and therefore unquestionably remained throughout on Finnish territory, refraining from all military action. The Soviet troops, on the other hand, crossed the frontier near Pummanki, to the north-east of Petsamo, as early as the evening of November 29th¹⁾ and captured three Finnish frontier-guards.

The above-mentioned Soviet allegations were denied by Finland the same evening, and the serious violation of the frontier was concisely reported. Little by little, however, it became clear that the U.S.S.R. had decided to open hostilities against Finland, though the latter could not expect them to begin so soon—the following day in fact—particularly as no declaration of war or even ultimatum had been sent. Still less was it to be imagined that the U.S.S.R. would open hostilities against the civil population too.

On November 30th, Soviet aeroplanes appeared above Helsinki about 9 a.m. and bombarded the city and the neighbouring aerodrome. The attack was repeated the same day about 2.30 p.m., and on this occasion dozens of civilians, chiefly women and children, were killed. The bombs destroyed several private houses and caused numerous fires. The same day, Soviet aeroplanes also bombarded other towns, such as Viipuri, Turku, Lahti and Kotka, together with various places in the interior of the country—*e.g.*, Enso, a large State factory. The destruction and material damage caused by these bombardments chiefly affected the civil population. The bombardments did not even spare the buildings specially protected by Article 27 of the Convention forming part of the Fourth General Hague Convention of 1907 respecting the laws and customs of war on land. A church in Helsinki and a hospital in Enso were, for example, set on fire by bombs. Altogether, 85 persons, including 65 at Helsinki, were killed during the bombardments carried out on the first day. The following day there was a further bombardment of several towns and other centres of population; there were several

¹⁾ More accurately on November 28th.

dozen casualties in districts on the Carelian Isthmus and on the eastern frontier, and much damage was done. The sole purpose of these air attacks was, without doubt, to annihilate the civil population and cause material damage. It may, perhaps, be suggested that the bombs fell accidentally on objectives other than those aimed at. But low-flying aeroplanes were seen to turn the fire of their machine-guns directly on private houses, schools, and women and children rushing to take shelter.

The land and naval forces have shown the same cruelty and the same flagrant disregard for the elementary laws of warfare; they have spared neither women, children, nor even shipwrecked civilians.

Hostilities in general began on the morning of November 30th, when the troops of the U.S.S.R. crossed the frontier and attacked the Finnish troops at several points on the Carelian Isthmus and on the eastern frontier from Lake Ladoga to Petsamo. Hitherto, the Soviet troops have occupied part of Petsamo and certain other places, the defence of which was abandoned for military reasons. Furthermore, a Soviet warship bombarded the Finnish coast in the neighbourhood of the Island of Russarö, but was obliged to withdraw after sustaining losses. Certain islands in the Gulf of Finland, which were demilitarised at the demand of the U.S.S.R. under the Treaty of Peace concluded at Tartu in 1920, have now been occupied by the armed forces of the U.S.S.R., which have taken advantage of the position. Hostilities are still proceeding throughout the length of the country's frontiers.

It is clear from the foregoing that the U.S.S.R. has unquestionably undertaken against Finland action within the meaning of Article II, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the International Convention for the Definition of the Aggressor, concluded in London on July 3rd, 1933, on the initiative of the U.S.S.R.; Finland acceded to the Convention in 1934. Hence the U.S.S.R., even in its own view, should be regarded as an aggressor.

As early as the day following the opening of hostilities, the U.S.S.R. broadcast the intimation that it had set up a new »democratic» Government for Finland in the village of Terijoki on Finnish territory on the Isthmus of Carelia, near the Finnish-Soviet frontier. This Government is composed of Finnish Communists, almost all of whom fled to Russia twenty years ago and who had been guilty of

high treason and rebellion, of which offences some of them have even been convicted by the courts. Such a body, set up by a foreign Power. Finland—as presumably all foreign States do—regards as devoid of all importance and entirely without standing. The legal Government of Finland is still in the capital of the country, notwithstanding the allegations of the U.S.S.R.

On the day on which the troops of the U.S.S.R. attacked the territory of Finland, the United States offered their good offices with a view to the pacific settlement of the dispute. This offer was arrogantly rejected by the U.S.S.R., whereas Finland, though the injured party, gratefully accepted it. Finland has even gone further in her efforts in favour of peace in the North, and general peace. Attempting to overlook the great injustice she had suffered and her irreparable losses of both human lives and property, on December 4th she approached the Government of the U.S.S.R., through the Minister of Sweden in Moscow, with a proposal for the re-opening of negotiations. At the same time, she declared her willingness to make new proposals with a view to the satisfactory settlement of the questions pending between herself and the U.S.S.R. This proposal was also rejected by the latter, which disputed the Swedish Minister's right to represent the interests of Finland, and replied that it was only prepared to negotiate with the above-mentioned Government, which it had itself set up at the frontier of Finland.

The U.S.S.R. has thus clearly demonstrated its intention, regardless of everything, to continue its armed attack by every means until it has Finland at its mercy and can destroy both her independence and her existence, despite the fact that M. Molotov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., affirmed the contrary in a speech delivered in the course of the negotiations mentioned above.

31.

APPEAL OF THE FINNISH PARLIAMENT. ADOPTED AT ITS PLENARY SESSION ON DECEMBER 10th, 1939.

The people of Finland, who have always honestly endeavoured to build up their future in mutual understanding with all other nations

and on the foundation of peaceful labour, are being ruthlessly attacked by their eastern neighbour without the slightest cause on the part of Finland. The conflict was thrust upon us. We have had no choice. The Finnish people fight for their independence, their liberty and their honour. We defend the country of our birth, our democratic constitution, our religion, our homes and everything civilised nations hold sacred. So far we still fight alone against the enemy invader, although in actual truth the struggle denotes the defence of the welfare of all humanity. We have already given proof of our will to do our best in this battle, but we trust that the civilised world, which has already revealed its deep sympathy for us, will not leave us alone in our struggle with a numerically superior enemy. Our position as the outpost of western civilisation gives us the right to expect the active assistance of other civilised nations. To all these nations the Finnish Parliament addresses this appeal.

32.

EXPOSÉ OF M. HOLSTI, DELEGATE TO THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, PRESENTED AT THE SESSION OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS ON DECEMBER 11th, 1939.

A week ago, the Finnish Government requested the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to summon the Council and the Assembly in order to deal with the sudden Soviet aggression of which Finland was the victim. You are met here to-day to consider this request after the decision, taken by the Council on December 9th, to the effect that the appeal of Finland should be brought before the Assembly.

On behalf of Finland, I have the great honour to offer my warm thanks to you and, through you, to your respective Governments, for the celerity with which you have answered that appeal. This constitutes a clear proof to the whole world that, notwithstanding the enormous political difficulties of the present moment, the fundamental idea of the League of Nations is still living enough and strong enough to be converted into practical energy. Through the kind-

ness of the Secretary-General, I have had the honour to transmit to Members of the Assembly a series of documents which give a clear and faithful picture of the way in which we have, during recent days, been treated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which is also a Member of the League. I venture to hope that it will be possible for me to supply further documents to the Committee which is to prepare the report. You have been in a position to get to the very root of the conflict. The documents have given you full information. I do not wish, therefore, to go over all the details again, but I should like to deal with the question more particularly from the moral standpoint and to deduce the practical consequences.

We have all seen the wave of indignation aroused throughout the world by the Soviet aggression against Finland. This is, above all, a moral reaction against an unprecedented act of violence. I desire to express here the profound gratitude of the whole Finnish people for this expression of world conscience. No judgment is sterner than that pronounced against oneself. It sometimes happens that an individual or a nation in the first place voices opinions that bear witness to a high moral level, and then subsequently becomes the first to act in complete contradiction to its own principles. In the present conflict, we should recall what the Soviet Union has said in the League of Nations and observe how it passes judgment on itself in regard to its aggression against Finland.

At the Assembly meeting of September 21st, 1937, the first delegate of the U.S.S.R. said, in the course of his speech:

»I think the time has come to make an end of this dangerous propaganda weapon of aggression; that it is time for those to whom the interests of peace are really dear to tell the parrots in high places that nonsense repeated day by day does not cease thereby to be nonsense; that a spade should be called a spade and aggression aggression, with whatever slogan it decorates itself; . . . there is no international justification for aggression, armed intervention, invasion of other States and breaches of international treaties which it cloaks.

»It is time also to tell these avowed preachers of hate that it is not for them to profess concern for the interests of humanity; that they who have resurrected the most savage and long-dead

theories of the heathen and dark ages may not dare to speak in the name of modern Europe; that they who burn the finest creations of the human spirit, who persecute the most brilliant representatives of art, science and literature, they who are despised by the entire world of culture, only make themselves ridiculous when they prate of saving civilisation, and use that plea to preach a crusade against other peoples.»

The Soviet representative continued:

»Yet I am firmly convinced that a resolute policy pursued by the League of Nations in one case of aggression would rid us of all the other cases. Then—and only then—would all States become convinced that aggression does not pay, that aggression should not be undertaken . . . and then will be attained our common ideal of a universal League, preserved as an instrument of peace. But we shall attain that ideal, not by the circulation of questionnaires, but only by collectively repelling the aggressor, by collectively defending peace, which we all need and the fruits of which we all shall enjoy.»

It was with these thoughts, expressed by the Soviet delegate, that the Assembly closed its discussions in the hall which had up till then served as its meeting-place. A week later it was sitting for the first time in this magnificent setting, the new headquarters of the League of Nations. The delegate of Finland had the honour to be first to speak there. Deeply conscious of the importance of that historic moment, I then said:

»I am sure that I shall be faithfully interpreting the feelings of all the delegations here present when I express the earnest hope that this new building will remain for ever the home in which all noble ideas and humanitarian intentions will find a warm and generous welcome. May all the peoples of the world realise that their true enemies are not neighbouring nations, but the miseries and sufferings of mankind . . .

»Since earliest times, man has sought to satisfy his false ambitions in devastation and oppression. The voice of the mothers, who by their sufferings have created new generations, has, alas, found too little echo. Yet, women have their own conception of honour—I would even say the most noble conception: love

which sacrifices itself for creative life. The more this vibrant voice, borne aloft by a sentiment of honour and duty, is heard in this hall the more strongly will the maintenance of peace be guaranteed in the world and the more highly will creative work be esteemed in all branches of life.»

It should perhaps be pointed out that the extract which I have just quoted from the speech of the representative of the Soviet Union is not an exception. On the contrary, since the day when Soviet delegates entered the League of Nations, its Members have grown accustomed to such speeches. Amongst the initiatives taken by the Soviet Union and regarded by it as effective for the purpose of safeguarding peace and particularly for the maintenance of good neighbourly relations, I would draw your attention to its proposal for the definition of the aggressor and the application of the principle of non-aggression.

In my letter of December 7th to the Secretary-General, I referred to the Treaty of Non-Aggression and for the Pacific Settlement of Disputes of January 21st, 1932, and to the Conciliation Convention of April 22nd of the same year. The reasons for this Soviet policy were given by the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, amongst other occasions, during the Council session which was held in London in March 1936, in the following declaration of principle:

The »attitude of the Soviet Union is predetermined by its general policy of struggling for peace, for the collective organisation of security and for the maintenance of one of the instruments of peace—the existing League of Nations. We consider that one cannot struggle for peace without at the same time defending the integrity of international obligations, particularly such as have direct bearing on the maintenance of existing frontiers, on armaments and on political or military aggression.»

We must not forget these principles and this attitude of the Soviet Union during recent years when we are passing judgment from the moral standpoint on the way in which the Soviet Union has acted towards Finland since October 5th last, the date on which my Government was invited to enter into negotiations which led up to hostilities.

During the last fortnight, the Soviet army, fleet and air force have sown death and destruction throughout our country, have terrorised the civilian population and have done everything in their power to break down the resistance of our defence forces; but the whole Finnish people remains faithful to its Government.

Nothing could afford better proof of the moral baseness of the Soviet Government than this attempt to prevent Finland from making her voice heard in this, the most important meeting-place of the world, the League of Nations. In a little frontier village, the Soviet Union has created a self-styled democratic Government composed of traitors in Soviet pay.

World opinion was not slow to pass judgment on this perfidy. Let me draw your attention to what the Soviet Government said at the meeting on September 28th, 1937:

»It was quite clear that, according to international law, it ought to give no assistance to the rebels against the lawful Government; any assistance given to the rebels in the form of war material, and more particularly in the form of men, would be a flagrant violation of international law; the recognition of the rebel leader as head of the Government did not make the position any better, because in that case any revolt or rebellion could be legalised simply by saying that the rebels were the Government; the recognition of the rebels as the lawful Government was in itself a form of intervention.»

Such were the words of the Soviet delegate. In this case, the Soviet Government have sought to use international methods of a yet more scandalous character. After the rupture of diplomatic relations between Finland and the U.S.S.R., the Finnish Government having requested Sweden to administer their affairs in Moscow, the Soviet Government refused to accept such representation. The Finnish Government then turned to the United States, which had offered them their good offices; but the U.S.S.R. again refused.

At the beginning of my speech, I said that I wished to deal with the conflict essentially from the moral standpoint. You know with what growing horror the whole world witnesses the conduct of the U.S.S.R. In what I have already said, I have sought to show that, throughout the time during which the U.S.S.R. has been co-operating with

the League of Nations, at every session at Geneva, it has been enunciating principles which now, in the eyes of the world, rebound upon itself. Is it possible to imagine a more contemptible position than that in which the U.S.S.R. has placed itself in its international relations?

But, greatly as the Finnish people are touched by the sympathies of the whole civilised world, strongly as they are convinced of the political hypocrisy of the Soviet Government, demonstrations of friendship, marks of encouragement, and the passing of judgement on the aggression are not enough. To be able to stand up against this treacherous aggression, the Finnish people have need of every possible practical support and assistance, and not merely of words of encouragement. The world's tears of indignation have gone to our hearts; Finland herself has shed tears enough in these last days. But we cannot protect the Finnish people from the bullets, the bombs, the shrapnels, and the gas of the aggressor by international resolutions.

With an energy and endurance that call forth the admiration of the entire world, Finland is fighting for nothing less than her life. But everywhere throughout the world where, in these terrible days, there is a feeling of profound disgust at the action of the Soviet, it is perfectly well known that Finland is fighting also for the highest political ideals of all the nations.

Yesterday the Finnish Parliament issued a proclamation to the peoples of the world. I should like to read it to you.

[The text of the proclamation is published as Document No. 31].

When the Finnish Government asked you to meet, it thought that you would find means to transform the world's sympathy into practical help. Finland asks only to live in peace and to secure her own existence by contributing her humble share to the creation of a happier future for mankind.

Gentlemen, bring back peace to Finland, and all the peoples and individuals who, in these tragic days, will hearten the Finnish people with their sympathy in its struggle for life, will bless you as the upholders of the highest ideals of the League of Nations.

Gentlemen, do your duty! The Finnish people is doing its duty to the civilised world and paying the cost with its most precious possession, its own life.

33.

REPORT AND RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE ASSEMBLY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, DATED DECEMBER 14th, 1939.

Introduction.

The first duty of the Assembly, which is seized in virtue of Article 15 of the Covenant, is to endeavour »to effect a settlement of the dispute« referred to it.

The Government of the U.S.S.R. having announced that they had decided not to send representatives to the Assembly, the following telegram was despatched to Moscow on December 11th after the first meeting of the Committee set up by the Assembly:

»The Committee set up by the Assembly, which is seized in virtue of Article 15 of the Covenant, addresses an urgent appeal to the Government of the U.S.S.R. and to the Finnish Government to cease hostilities and open immediate negotiations through the mediation of the Assembly with a view to restoring peace. Finland, which is present, accepts. Should be grateful if you would inform me before to-morrow (Tuesday) evening if the Government of the U.S.S.R. is prepared to accept this appeal and cease hostilities forthwith.»

The Government of the U.S.S.R. replied on December 12th as follows:

»The Government of the U.S.S.R. thanks you, Monsieur le President, for kind invitation to take part in discussion of the Finnish question. At the same time, the Government of the U.S.S.R. begs to inform you that it cannot accept this invitation for the reasons set out in the telegram of December 4th from the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs sent in reply to Monsieur Avenol's communication.»¹⁾

¹⁾ The reply of the U.S.S.R. Government dated December 4th to the invitation addressed to it by the Secretary-General reads as follows:

»In accordance with instructions from the U.S.S.R. Government, I have the honour to inform you that that Government considers unjustified proposal to convene December 9th Council League of Nations and December 11th Assembly League of Nations on the initiative of M. Rodolphe Holsti and in virtue of Article 11, paragraph 1, of the League Covenant.

»The U.S.S.R. is not at war with Finland and does not threaten the Finnish nation with war. Consequently, reference to Article 11, paragraph 1,

In view of the absence of a delegation of the Government of the U.S.S.R. and as a result of the examination of the reasons it adduces in explanation of that absence, it is unfortunately clear that to attempt at the present time to obtain the cessation of hostilities and the restoration of normal peaceful relations between Finland and the U.S.S.R. through mediation and conciliation would be fruitless.

The Assembly has therefore the duty of publishing the report provided for in the Covenant »containing a statement of the facts of the dispute and the recommendations which are deemed just and proper in regard thereto«.

I.

To establish the circumstances of the dispute, the Assembly has had before it the documents furnished by the Finnish delegation. As the Secretary-General has been apprised of the views of the Soviet Government only through the brief telegram from M. Molotov dated December 4th, 1939, it has been thought desirable, in order to

is unjustified. Soviet Union maintains peaceful relations with the Democratic Republic of Finland, whose Government signed with the U.S.S.R. on December 2nd Pact of Assistance and Friendship. This Pact settled all the questions which the Soviet Government had fruitlessly discussed with delegates former Finnish Government now divested of its power.

»By its declaration of December 1st, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Finland requested the Soviet Government to lend assistance to that Republic by armed forces with a view to the joint liquidation at the earliest possible moment of the very dangerous seat of war created in Finland by its former rulers. In these circumstances, appeal of M. Rodolphe Holsti to the League cannot justify convocation of the Council and the Assembly, especially as the persons on whose behalf M. Rodolphe Holsti has approached the League cannot be regarded as mandatories of the Finnish people.

»If, notwithstanding considerations set out above, Council and Assembly are convened to consider the appeal of M. Rodolphe Holsti, U.S.S.R. Government would be unable to take part in these meetings. This decision is also based on the fact that the communication from the Secretary-General of the League concerning convocation Council and Assembly reproduces the text of the letter from M. Rodolphe Holsti, which is full of insults and calumnies against the Soviet Government, this being incompatible with the respect due to the U.S.S.R.»

ensure the impartiality of this statement, to refer to the official documents published in the *communiqués* of the Tass Agency.

Below will be found a statement of the undisputed facts that emerge from the Finnish and Soviet documents and, in the case of disputed points, the versions given by both Governments.

*The Moscow Negotiations between Finland and the U.S.S.R.
(October 12th-November 13th, 1939).*

1. On October 5th, the Finnish Government was invited by the Soviet Government to exchange views on political questions. Finland decided to accept the invitation and send delegates to Moscow.

2. In the circumstances, the news that the Soviet Government had invited the Finnish Government to negotiate with it made a certain impression, not only in Finland, but in many other countries.

On October 11th, just as the Finnish delegation was arriving in Moscow, President Roosevelt sent a personal letter to M. Kalinin, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, expressing »the earnest hope that the Soviet Union will make no demands on Finland which are inconsistent with the maintenance and development of amicable and peaceful relations between the two countries and the independence of each«.

The Soviet Government replied on October 12th: »I think I should remind you, Mr. President, that the independence of the Finnish Republic as a State was recognised spontaneously by the Soviet Government on December 31st, 1917, and that the sovereignty of Finland is guaranteed by the Treaty of Peace between the R.S.F.S.R. and Finland signed on October 14th, 1920. The above-mentioned acts on the part of the Soviet Government determined the fundamental principles of the relations between the Soviet Union and Finland. It is in accordance with those principles that the present negotiations between the Soviet Government and the Finnish Government are being conducted. Notwithstanding the tendentious versions put about by some who evidently have not the peace of Europe at heart, the sole object of the negotiations in question is to establish closer relations between the Soviet Union and Finland and to strengthen the friendly co-operation between the two countries, in order to ensure the security of the Soviet Union and that of Finland.»

[After this (paragraphs 3—11 b) the course of the negotiations is described in the report in accordance with the memoranda¹⁾ of the Governments of Finland and Soviet Russia. In addition, the official statement published by the Tass agency on November 11th is mentioned, in which it is said that Finland refused to accept the minimum demands of the Soviet Union and even displayed an increasingly unyielding attitude by increasing her forces in the proximity of Leningrad from 2 or 3 divisions to 7 divisions.

An account is given in the report concerning the final phase of the crisis between Finland and the Soviet Union after the negotiations had been broken off, the following documents being referred to: the note of the Soviet Government of November 26th (the Mainila incident), the reply of the Finnish Government of November 27th, the note of the Soviet Government of November 28th (the denouncement of the non-aggression pact), the reply of the Finnish Government of November 29th.²⁾

The breaking off of diplomatic relations between Finland and the Soviet Union is described in the report in the following manner:]

The rupture of relations was stated to be due to the fact that the Government of the U.S.S.R. could no longer tolerate »attacks on the Soviet troops by the Finnish troops», which were continuing not only on the Carelian Isthmus but also in other frontier regions.

c) *M. Molotov's Speech.*

At the moment when the Finnish Minister was notified of the rupture of relations, M. Molotov delivered a broadcast speech, in which he said:

»The hostile policy that the present Finnish Government is pursuing towards our country obliges us to take immediate steps to ensure the external security of the State ... From such a Government and from its mad military clique there is nothing now to be expected but fresh violent provocations ... The Soviet Government has come to the conclusion that it can no longer maintain normal relations with the Finnish Government, and for that reason it has thought it necessary to recall its political and economic representatives immediately from Finland.»

1) Documents Nos. 13, 14, 15, 18, 21.

2) Documents Nos. 23, 24, 25, 27.

The President of the Council of People's Commissars then proceeded to deny the »ill-intentioned calumnies» of the foreign Press hostile to the U.S.S.R. The Soviet Government had no intention of taking and annexing Finnish territory and, had Finland's policy towards it been friendly, would have been prepared to discuss in a favourable sense even such questions as that of the union of the Karelian people living in the principal districts of the present Soviet Karelia with the nearly-related Finnish people in a single independent Finnish State. Nor had the Government of the U.S.S.R. any intention of infringing the independence of Finland or of interfering in her domestic and foreign affairs.

»We regard Finland», he said, »whatever may be the regime in existence there, as an independent State, sovereign in all its domestic and foreign policy. We are most anxious that the Finnish people should itself decide its internal and external affairs as it thinks best. The peoples of the U.S.S.R. did all that was necessary in the past to create an independent Finland. In the future, too, the peoples of our country are ready to help the Finnish people to secure its free and independent development.

»Nor has the U.S.S.R. any intention of injuring in any degree the interests of other States in Finland. The question of the relations between Finland and other States is entirely one for Finland herself, and not a matter in which the U.S.S.R. considers that it has any right to interfere. The object of the steps we are taking is solely to ensure the security of the U.S.S.R., and particularly of Leningrad, with its 3% million inhabitants. In the present atmosphere, raised to white heat by the war, we cannot allow the solution of this vital and urgent problem to depend upon the ill-will of those who at present govern Finland. That problem must be solved by the efforts of the U.S.S.R. itself, in friendly co-operation with the Finnish people. We are sure that the favourable solution of this problem of the security of Leningrad will lay the foundations of an indissoluble friendship between the U.S.S.R. and Finland.»

Soviet Troops cross the Frontier.

12. On November 30th, at 8 a.m., the troops of the Leningrad military area crossed the frontier on the Isthmus of Karelia and in several other regions. The order had been given by the High Com-

mand of the Red Army, on account, according to the Tass Agency's *communiqué*, of »fresh armed provocations on the part of the Finnish military clique».

According to the same *communiqué*, these provocations had taken place during the night at various points on the frontier. While Soviet troops were entering Finland, Soviet aircraft »dropped bombs on the aerodromes at Viipuri and Helsinki.

The Finnish Government gives a different version of these events; the Soviet troops crossed the frontier as early as the evening of November 29th,¹⁾ near Pummanki, on the Rybachy Peninsula, and on the morning of the 30th, while the Soviet troops were crossing the frontier at various points, Soviet aircraft bombed not merely the aerodromes but the towns of Helsinki and Viipuri, as well as several other places.

13. On December 2nd, the Tass Agency announced that »M. Kuusinen, President of the Popular Government and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Finland, has addressed an official declaration to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. concerning the formation of the Popular Government of Finland and has proposed to establish diplomatic relations between the Democratic Republic of Finland and the Soviet Union. The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. has decided to recognise the Popular Government of Finland and to establish diplomatic relations between the U.S.S.R. and the Democratic Republic of Finland».

The Finnish Government points out that the reference is to a »phantom government» set up by the U.S.S.R. in the village of Terijoki, near the frontier. It is composed of Finnish communists, most of whom took refuge in Soviet territory after the civil war of 1918.

14. Since that date, while the Soviet Government maintains diplomatic relations and has concluded a »pact of mutual assistance and friendship» with this »popular government», whose powers are limited to the portion of Finnish territory occupied by the Soviet troops, the Finnish Government, reconstituted on the basis of the national union of all parties, and still recognised by all the Powers

1) More exactly on November 28th.

except the U.S.S.R., is directing the Finnish nation's resistance to the Soviet forces.

Offers of Good Offices and Offers of Negotiations subsequent to the Outbreak of Hostilities.

15. A few hours after the entry of the Soviet troops into Finland, the diplomatic representatives of the United States at Helsinki and at Moscow communicated to the Finnish and Soviet Governments the text of a statement made on the previous day by the United States Secretary of State. According to his statement, the United States Government, »without in any way becoming involved in the merits of the dispute and limiting its interest to the solution of the dispute by peaceful processes only . . . would, if agreeable to both Parties, gladly extend its good offices».

This offer was accepted by Finland alone.

The Soviet Government also rejected, on December 4th, a Finnish proposal transmitted by the Minister of Sweden at Moscow for the opening of fresh negotiations with a view to an agreement. The Soviet Government replied that it recognised only the »Popular Government of the Republic of Finland».

16. The existence of this »Popular Government» was also one of the reasons given by the Soviet Government for its refusal to sit on the Council or in the Assembly if they examined Finland's appeal.

II.

The facts set forth above have to be considered in relation to the legal situation arising from the commitments by which the two countries are bound.

Since the recognition of the independence and sovereignty of the Finnish State, the latter has concluded with the U.S.S.R. a number of treaties. Moreover, both States are Parties to the Pact of Paris of 1928 and the Convention of 1933 defining the aggressor, and both are Members of the League of Nations.

1) The Treaty of Peace signed at Tartu on October 14th, 1920, between Finland and the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic recalls in its Preamble that in 1917 Finland was proclaimed an independent State and that Russia had recognised the independence and

sovereignty of the Finnish State within the frontiers of the Grand-Duchy of Finland. This Treaty fixes, *inter alia*, the frontier »between the States of Russia and Finland», the limit of the territorial waters of the contracting Powers, the military neutralisation of certain Finnish islands in the Gulf of Finland, etc.

2) As regards the territorial frontier between the two States from Lake Ladoga to the Arctic Ocean, the Republic of Finland and the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic signed at Helsinki on June 1st, 1922, a Convention regarding measures taken in order to ensure peace at the frontier. This Convention established and delimited a zone on both sides of and along the frontier. Each of the two contracting Parties undertook, *inter alia*, with a view to ensuring the inviolability of the frontier, not to maintain within the limits of its zone armed forces other than the regular military units or groups belonging to the regular frontier guard, whose total strength might not exceed 2,500 men on either side. The distribution of the armed forces in the frontier zones was to be carried out under the supervision of each country, which was to communicate to the other Party information regarding such distribution. The establishment of organisations in the frontier zones for the avowed purpose of preparing, encouraging or supporting attacks on the territory of the other Party was unconditionally prohibited. The Russo-Finnish Central Mixed Commission was to have the duty of supervising the carrying-out of the provisions of the Convention; it was to act through the Frontier Sub-Commissions and Local Supervisory Committees.

3) As regards the frontier on the Carelian Isthmus, the two Governments exchanged at Helsinki on September 24th, 1928, notes whereby Finland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics each appointed a frontier commissioner in order to prevent the occurrence of local incidents on the common frontier on that Isthmus or to facilitate their prompt settlement. The frontier commissioners of the two Parties were to deal jointly with frontier incidents, including cases where shots had been fired from the territory of one of the Parties at persons belonging to the frontier guard, or at other persons, or into the territory of the other Party. When such incidents occurred, the commissioners were to take appropriate measures to settle them in the easiest and quickest way. Incidents regarding

which the commissioners were unable to agree were to be dealt with through diplomatic channels.

4) Under the General Pact for the Renunciation of War dated August 27th, 1928 (Paris Pact), the Parties solemnly declared in the names of their respective peoples that they condemned recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and renounced it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another. They further agreed that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or whatever origin they might be, which might arise among them, should never be sought except by pacific means.

5) Desirous »of confirming and completing the General Pact of August 27th, 1928, for the Renunciation of War«, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Finland signed at Helsinki on January 21st, 1932, a Treaty of Non-Aggression and Pacific Settlement of Disputes. Under the terms of Article 1 of this Treaty, the »High Contracting Parties mutually guarantee the inviolability of the existing frontiers between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of Finland, as fixed by the Treaty of Peace concluded at Tartu on October 14th, 1920, which shall remain the firm foundation of their relations, and reciprocally undertake to refrain from any act of aggression directed against each other. Any act of violence attacking the integrity and inviolability of the territory or the political independence of the other High Contracting Party shall be regarded as an act of aggression, even if it is committed without declaration of war and avoids warlike manifestations«. A »Protocol to Article 1« maintains fully in force »the Agreement of June 1st, 1922, regarding Measures ensuring the Inviolability of the Frontiers«. Under Article 5, the High Contracting Parties declare that they will always endeavour to settle in a spirit of justice any disputes of whatever nature or origin which may arise between them, and will resort exclusively to pacific means of settling such disputes. For this purpose, the High Contracting Parties undertake to submit any disputes which may arise between them after the signature of the Treaty, and which it may not have been possible to settle through diplomatic proceedings within a reasonable time, to a procedure of conciliation before a joint conciliation commission. Conciliation procedure shall also be applied in the event of any dispute as to the application or interpre-

tation of a convention concluded between the High Contracting Parties, and particularly the question whether the mutual undertaking as to non-aggression has or has not been violated.

In the Protocol of Signature, the High Contracting Parties declare that subsequent denunciation of the Treaty before its termination or annulment shall neither cancel nor restrict the undertakings arising from the Pact for the Renunciation of War signed at Paris on August 27th, 1928.

6) The Conciliation Commission provided for in Article 5 of the Treaty of Non-Aggression of January 21st, 1932, was set up by a Convention signed at Helsinki on April 22nd, 1932.

7) Finland acceded on January 31st, 1934, to the Convention for the Definition of Aggression concluded in London on July 3rd, 1933, between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and various other Powers immediately adjacent to it. In the Preamble to that Convention, the parties declare that they deem it necessary, in the interest of the general security, to define aggression as specifically as possible in order to obviate any pretext whereby it might be justified; they note that all States have an equal right to independence, security, the defence of their territories and the free development of their institutions.

Under Article I, each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes to accept in its relations with each of the other Parties, . . . »the definition of aggression as explained in the report dated May 24th, 1933, of the Committee on Security Questions (Politis Report) to the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, which report was made in consequence of the Soviet delegation's proposal».

Under Article II, the aggressor in an armed conflict shall, subject to the agreements in force between the parties to the dispute, be considered to be that State which is the first to commit any of the following actions:

2) Invasion by its armed forces, with or without a declaration of war, of the territory of another State;

3) Attack by its land, naval, or air forces, with or without a declaration of war, on the territory, vessels or aircraft of another State;

4) Naval blockade of the coast or ports of another State.

Article III stipulates that no political, military, economic or other consideration may serve as an excuse or justification for the aggression referred to in Article II. Under the terms of the Annex to this Article III, the High Contracting Parties, desiring, »subject to the express reservation that the absolute validity of the rule laid down in Article III . . . shall be in no way restricted», to furnish certain indications for determining the aggressor, declare that no act of aggression within the meaning of Article II of the Convention can be justified on either of the following grounds:

A. — The internal condition of a State: *e.g.*, its political, economic or social structure; alleged defects in its administration; disturbances due to strikes, revolutions, counter-revolutions or civil war.

B. — The international conduct of a State: *e.g.*, the violation or threatened violation of the material or moral rights or interests of a foreign State or its nationals; the rupture of diplomatic or economic relations; . . . frontier incidents not forming any of the cases of aggression specified in Article II.

The accession of Finland to this Convention for the Definition of Aggression was given in virtue of the attached Protocol of Signature dated July 3rd. 1933, which reads as follows:

»It is hereby agreed between the High Contracting Parties that, should one or more of the other States immediately adjacent to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics accede in the future to the present Convention, the said accession shall confer on the State or States in question the same rights and shall impose on them the same obligations as those conferred and imposed on the ordinary signatories.»

8) The Treaty of Non-Aggression and Pacific Settlement of Disputes concluded between Finland and the U.S.S.R. on January 21st, 1932, was extended to December 31st, 1945, by a Protocol signed at Moscow on April 7th, 1934.

9) By Article 12 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Members of the League agree that, if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, they will submit the matter either to arbitration or judicial settlement or to inquiry by

the Council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the judicial decision or the report by the Council.

III.

If the attitude and the acts of the two Governments in the course of the last few weeks are considered with reference to international commitments, the conclusions reached are as follows:

I. In the course of the various stages of the dispute the Finnish Government has not rejected any peaceful procedure.

1) It agreed to enter into direct negotiations with the Soviet Government, although the invitation it received from that Government at the beginning of October contained no explanation of the nature or scope of the negotiations contemplated.

In the course of those negotiations, although it was entitled to invoke the treaties it had signed with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to reject any proposal infringing the territorial integrity of Finland, it agreed to contemplate cessions of territory, and when it received the Soviet proposals, it submitted counter-proposals which, in its opinion, went as far as it was possible for it to go.

2) When the dispute arose regarding the Mainila incident, the Finnish Government proposed that the frontier commissioners of the two countries should jointly proceed to carry out an inquiry, as provided for in the above-mentioned Exchange of Notes dated September 24th, 1928.

3) Faced with the denunciation by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of the Non-Aggression Treaty of January 21st, 1932—the denunciation being based on the accusation that Finland had systematically violated that Treaty—the Finnish Government, in a note which, owing to the rupture of diplomatic relations by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, it was not possible to hand over at Moscow in time, asked for the application of the conciliation procedure laid down by that Treaty for cases of a dispute as to whether the mutual non-aggression undertaking had been violated.

4) In the same note (which could not be handed in at Moscow) the Finnish Government proposed the convening of a conciliation commission or, alternatively, neutral arbitration.

5) When requested by the Soviet Government on November 26th to remove its frontier troops on the Isthmus of Karelia forthwith to a distance of 20-25 kilometres, the Finnish Government replied that it was ready to enter into negotiations for a reciprocal withdrawal to a certain distance from the frontier.

The Soviet Government having made it known that its proposal regarding the withdrawal of Finnish troops to a distance of 20-25 kilometres was a minimum proposal, the Finnish Government, in its note of November 29th, which could not be handed to the Soviet Government, declared itself ready to come to an agreement with the latter for the removal of the defence troops on the Karelian Isthmus, except frontier guards and Customs officials, to a distance from Leningrad such that they could no longer be held to menace the security of that city.

6) After the outbreak of hostilities, the Finnish Government accepted the offer of good offices made by the United States Government.

7) On December 3rd, the Finnish Government referred the matter to the Council of the League of Nations under Articles 11 and 15 of the Covenant.

On December 4th, it vainly endeavoured to transmit to the Soviet Government, through the Minister of Sweden at Moscow, a proposal for the opening of fresh negotiations for an agreement.

II. The attitude and acts of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the other hand, have been incompatible with the commitments entered into by that country.

1) In the course of the negotiations at Moscow with the Finnish Government, it made to that Government proposals for cessions of territory. It stated that these proposals »represented its minimum conditions, its attitude having been dictated by the fundamental security requirements of the Soviet Union and, particularly, of the city of Leningrad«.

Under the terms of Article 1 of the Treaty of Non-Aggression of January 21st, 1932, the two countries had, however, undertaken mutually to guarantee the inviolability of the existing frontiers as fixed by the Treaty of Peace concluded at Dorpat on October 14th, 1920, which was to remain the firm foundation of their relations.

2) After the Mainila incident, the Soviet Government insisted on the unilateral withdrawal of the Finnish frontier troops on the Karelian Isthmus to a distance of 20 to 25 kilometres. It made no reply to the Finnish Government's proposal that the commissioners of the two countries should be instructed to carry out a joint inquiry as provided for in the Exchange of Notes of September 24th, 1928.

3) The Soviet Government interpreted the Finnish Government's refusal to accept immediately a unilateral withdrawal of its forces for 20-25 kilometres as indicating the wish of the latter Government to keep Leningrad under a constant menace. On the ground that the Finnish Government was systematically violating the Treaty of Non-Aggression, the Soviet Government declared that it regarded itself as released from the undertakings assumed by it under that Treaty. The Treaty in question, which had been prolonged by the Protocol of April 7th, 1934, until December 31st, 1945, laid down, however, that a procedure of conciliation would be applied in the event of any dispute on the question whether the mutual undertakings as to non-aggression had or had not been violated.

4) Even if one of the Parties could, without first resorting to the conciliation procedure, have declared that the Treaty of Non-Aggression no longer existed because the other Party had violated it, the Protocol of Signature of January 21st, 1932, declares that subsequent denunciation of this Treaty before its termination shall neither cancel nor restrict the undertakings arising from the Pact for the Renunciation of War signed on August 27th, 1928, which the Treaty of Non-Aggression between Finland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was intended to confirm and complete.

5) The invasion of Finland by the land forces and the bombardments carried out by the naval and air forces of Soviet Russia are incompatible with the Pact for the Renunciation of War of August 27th, 1928, and with the provisions of Article 12 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

6) It is impossible to argue that the operations of the Soviet forces in Finland do not constitute resort to war within the meaning of the Pact of Paris or Article 12 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Finland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are bound by the Convention for the Definition of Aggression signed at London

on July 3rd, 1933. According to Article II of this Convention the aggressor in an armed conflict shall be considered to be that State which is the first to invade by its armed forces, with or without a declaration of war, the territory of another State or to attack by its land, naval or air forces, with or without a declaration of war, the territory, vessels or aircraft of another State.

Under the terms of Article III »no political, military, economic or other consideration may serve as an excuse or justification for the aggression referred to in Article II«.

The order to enter Finland was given to the Soviet troops on the ground of »further armed provocation«. The reference was to frontier incidents or alleged frontier incidents. In the Annex, however, to Article II of the Convention, it is declared that no act of aggression within the meaning of Article II of the Convention can be justified by frontier incidents not forming any of the cases of aggression specified in Article II.

7) After having broken off diplomatic relations with the Finnish Government and rejected the good offices of the United States Government, the Soviet Government refused to send representatives to the Council or Assembly, on the ground that it was not in a state of war with Finland and was not threatening the Finnish people with war. This affirmation was based, *inter alia*, on the fact that the Soviet Government maintained peaceful relations with the »Democratic Republic of Finland« and that it had signed with the latter, a Pact of Assistance and Friendship »settling all the questions which the Soviet Government had fruitlessly discussed with the delegates of the former Finnish Government, now divested of its power«.

The so-called »former Finnish Government« is the regular Government of the Republic of Finland. It is composed of all the important parties in the Parliament, whose unanimous confidence it enjoys. The Parliament is freely elected by the Finnish people. The last elections took place in July of this year. The Government is thus based on respect for democratic institutions.

The Soviet Government invokes in support of its attitude the relations which it maintains with a so-called government of its own creation which cannot, either *de jure* or *de facto*, be regarded as the Government of the Republic of Finland. That fact therefore cannot serve the Soviet Government as justification for its refusal

to follow, for the settlement of its dispute with Finland, the procedure laid down in Article 15 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Furthermore, in so refusing, the Soviet Government is failing to observe its obligation to respect the sovereignty and independence of Finland, and is also directly contravening the very definite obligations laid down in the Convention for the Definition of Aggression, which it signed and in the preparation of which it took a decisive part.

The whole object of this Convention, indeed, is to ensure that no political, military, economic or other considerations shall serve as an excuse or justification for aggression. The Annex to Article III specifies that aggression cannot be justified either by the international conduct of a State, for example: the violation or threatened violation of the material or moral rights or interests of a foreign State; or by the internal condition of a State, for example: its political, economic or social structure: alleged defects in its administration; disturbances due to strikes, revolutions, counter-revolutions or civil war.

It follows from these findings that the Soviet Government has violated, not only its special political agreements with Finland, but also Article 12 of the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Pact of Paris.

Resolution.

The Assembly:

Whereas, by the aggression which it has committed against Finland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has failed to observe not only its special agreements with Finland but also Article 12 of the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Pact of Paris;

And whereas, immediately before committing that aggression, it denounced, without legal justification, the Treaty of Non-Aggression which it had concluded with Finland in 1932, and which was to remain in force until the end of 1945:

Solemnly condemns the action taken by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics against the State of Finland;

Urgently appeals to every Member of the League to provide Finland with such material and humanitarian assistance as may be in its power and to refrain from any action which might weaken Finland's power of resistance;

Authorises the Secretary-General to lend the aid of his technical services in the organisation of the aforesaid assistance to Finland;

And likewise authorises the Secretary-General, in virtue of the Assembly resolution of October 4th, 1937, to consult non-member States with a view to possible co-operation.

II.

Whereas, notwithstanding an invitation extended to it on two occasions, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has refused to be present at the examination of its dispute with Finland before the Council and the Assembly;

And whereas, by thus refusing to recognise the duty of the Council and the Assembly as regards the execution of Article 15 of the Covenant, it has failed to observe one of the League's most essential covenants for the safeguarding of peace and the security of nations;

And whereas it has vainly attempted to justify its refusal on the ground of the relations which it has established with an alleged Government which is neither *de jure* nor *de facto* the Government recognised by the people of Finland in accordance with the free working of their institutions;

And whereas the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has not merely violated a covenant of the League, but has by its own action placed itself outside the Covenant;

And whereas the Council is competent under Article 16 of the Covenant to consider what consequences should follow from this situation:

Recommends the Council to pronounce upon the question.

34.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE
LEAGUE OF NATIONS, DATED DECEMBER 14th, 1939.

The Council,

Having taken cognisance of the resolution adopted by the Assembly on December 14th 1939 regarding the appeal of the Finnish Government,

1. Associates itself with the condemnation by the Assembly of the action of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics against the Finnish State, and

2. For the reasons set forth in the resolution of the Assembly, In virtue of Article 16, paragraph 4, of the Covenant,

Finds, that, by its act, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has placed itself outside the League of Nations. It follows that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is no longer a Member of the League.

35.

MESSAGE OF M. TANNER, MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
ADDRESSED ON DECEMBER 15th, 1939, TO M. MOLOTOV,
COMMISSAR FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Translation.

M. Foreign Commissar Molotov,

A few weeks ago M. Paasikivi and I were engaged in negotiations with you and M. Stalin. These negotiations concerned the demands brought forward by the Soviet Union for the surrender of territory. Although there is no legal justification for such demands on the part of the Soviet Union, we were prepared, in the name of the Finnish Government, to consent to extremely far-reaching concessions. We did this to preserve the peace. On her own behalf Finland had no wishes to present.

In these negotiations we failed to find a common basis. Nevertheless on our departure, we, speaking for Finland, expressed the hope that the negotiations might be continued until a settlement satisfactory to both parties had been reached.

They have not continued. The blame lies solely with the Soviet Union, which has been unwilling to continue them. To prevent even an opportunity from occurring, you broke off diplomatic relations. You refused the offer of mediation by the Government of the United States. Similarly, you refused to consider the proposal made by us through the Government of Sweden for the resumption of negotiations, in spite of the fact that the Finnish Government intimated that they would be able to make new positive proposals for a solution of the conflict. In answer to these efforts on the Finnish side to bring about a peaceful settlement the Soviet Union has attacked our peaceful country. In this connection, over and above everything else, civilians have been barbarously bombed, women and children killed.

Your last act has been to turn down the proposal by the League of Nations for the cessation of hostilities and the opening of negotiations. This is all the more peculiar in that both Finland and the Soviet Union are members of the League of Nations.

By acting in this manner you have shown that you do not wish to hear our proposals. To avoid hearing them you have closed all doors between us.

The air, however, is still open. And by this path, with the radio as a medium, I now approach you with a view to putting to you a few questions.

During the negotiations you stated that the sole purpose of the territorial demands presented by the Soviet Union was to secure the Soviet Union and in particular the city of Leningrad against possible attacks by a third Power.

Was this your true purpose?

If it was, the concessions made by Finland were in our opinion sufficient for the realisation of this purpose. We have, in addition, notified you of our readiness to consider even greater concessions.

Subsequent events have meanwhile been calculated to give rise to the idea that the Soviet Union has all along nursed aims of a more far-reaching character. Your aim seems to have been to gain possession of the whole of Finland, to restore the frontiers of Tsarist Russia.

If this is your aim, you can be sure that Finland will defend herself to the last. The Finnish people are not minded to lose their independence and liberty. The Finnish people will never be brought to

submit to an alien yoke. It is useless to try to achieve this even by means of such »democratic« Governments as that led by your paid Assistant Kuusinen. That Government has no support whatever in Finland. The Finnish workers belong to the Social-Democratic Party, as the support given to this Party at last summer's elections, 42.5 per cent of all the votes polled, reveals. That it has no supporters among the Finnish farmers either, that I suppose is equally clear to you. Behind the Finnish Government and the policy they are pursuing is a unanimous Parliament. And behind Parliament is a unanimous nation. Attempts to sow discord among us are vain. The appointment of the Kuusinen Cabinet has awakened no echo on this side of the frontier.

The Soviet Union has wished to appear as the champion of peace. It has also proclaimed that it respects the right of small nations to self-determination. When I recently visited the big agricultural exhibition in Moscow, I read on the wall of one of the buildings a stirring sentence of your leader M. Stalin: »The Soviet Union does not covet an inch of the soil of other states, but will also defend every inch of her own soil.« There is good reason at this moment to save that programmatic phrase from sinking into oblivion.

M. Molotov!

How can you reconcile these principles proclaimed by the Soviet Union with your present attack on small, peaceloving Finland?

I beg you to answer this question.

When we parted in Moscow we declared that we were prepared to continue our efforts to reach, along the path of negotiations, an agreement satisfactory to both parties. We are still prepared to do so and are also prepared, as we have notified you, to present new proposals. This readiness springs from our love of peace and our wish to avoid unnecessary bloodshed.

Already the first sixteen days of the war have shown that the war will be fierce and demand many victims.

Why shed blood so long as there are other possibilities still unexamined?

Are you prepared to resume our negotiations and thus give practical proof that your principles are more than mere window-dressing?

M. Molotov!

I ask you to reply through the same medium as my question is put to you.

If no answer comes, or if your answer is in the negative, then the whole world, which already now watches the Soviet Union's measures with surprise, will know what value to set on the Soviet Union's principles and promises.