

# Finnish History Writing Through Japanese Eyes

## Presentation and Reception of Shifting Interpretations of the Finnish Participation in WWII



Wataru Yamazaki

University of Helsinki

Faculty of Social Sciences

Master's Thesis

Master's Programme in European  
and Nordic Studies (ENS)

Social Sciences Track

May 2019



Tiedekunta/Osasto Fakultet/Sektion – Faculty Faculty of Social Sciences		Laitos/Institution– Department	
Tekijä/Författare – Author Wataru Yamazaki			
Työn nimi / Arbetets titel – Title Finnish History Writing Through Japanese Eyes: Presentation and Reception of Shifting Interpretations of the Finnish Participation in WWII			
Oppiaine /Läroämne – Subject Social Sciences Track / Master's Programme in European and Nordic Studies			
Työn laji/Arbetets art – Level Master's Thesis		Aika/Datum – Month and year May 2019	Sivumäärä/ Sidoantal – Number of pages 62
Tiivistelmä/Referat – Abstract			
<p>The legacies of WWI often have central position in shaping national memory and in many occasions create national myth that shapes historical understanding in certain ways. The issues often trigger heated debate on how to interpret history in national and transnational context. Such is true for Finland.</p> <p>The history of the historiography of Finnish participation in WWII is a process of national interpretations being challenged from outside, notably researchers from Anglophone regions. The debate surrounding such challenges made from external perspectives are still topic of debate in the current context and calls for deconstructing the national myth to incorporate national history into European context are made. While the details of the Anglophone challenges are found in previous literature, how other researchers outside of Finland explained Finnish history of WWII are not well documented.</p> <p>To expand the landscape of the Finnish history research in other regions, this research will focus on the history writing of Japanese historians on Finnish WWII history. The literature that will be analysed are those published in Japan between 1951 and 2017, which includes works aimed at academic and public audience. Analysis will be made using conceptual history approach to understand the text “as they were written” through comparing them with the context within which it was written. The context includes both historiography of the Finnish WWII in available literature in English by Finnish and Anglophone authors, as well as Japanese sociopolitical and historiographical context of <i>seiyōshi</i> (Western History).</p> <p>Through the analysis, several findings were identified. Key findings include the shift in the nomenclature of the wars from wartime names, Soviet Finnish War, to translation of Finnish names, shift in the “problem space” of the Finnish history in Japanese literature, both of which originates to the clarification of the niche by the contributions from early historians. Another feature was relatively quick presentation and acceptance of Anglophone interpretations regarding the origins of the wars, though with variations between historians. This is most likely due to external perspective they share with those from Anglophone regions.</p> <p>The central finding of this research was the very strong emphasis on the small state in virtually all Japanese literature. While the notions appear in Finnish and Anglophone literature, the genre trope of the Western History research resonates strongly in the literature, especially the notions to “learn from the Occident”.</p>			
Avainsanat – Nyckelord – Keywords			
Finnish history, Conceptual History, Japanese history, history writing, Finland, Japan, Winter War, Continuation War, World War Two, WWII			
Säilytyspaikka – Förvaringställe – Where deposited			
Helsinki University Library – E-thesis Service.			
Muita tietoja – Övriga uppgifter – Additional information			

# Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction .....	1
Background .....	1
Research landscape .....	2
Research Question .....	3
Chapter Structure .....	4
Significance of Research.....	4
Chapter 2: Methodological and Theoretical Background.....	6
Chapter 3: Historiographical Context of Finnish Participation of WWII.....	10
Chapter 4: Finnish history through Japanese eyes .....	15
Japanese historiography .....	15
1950s - Early Attempts .....	19
1960s and 1970s Early Momose, and rising interest.....	27
1980s - Rise in topic, pioneer continues .....	32
1990s - Significant Increase.....	36
2000s and 2010s Continuation and New Generations .....	43
Chapter 5: Conclusion.....	50
Bibliography .....	56
Japanese Literatures on Finnish History .....	56
Other Literatures .....	58
Appendix: Biographies of Key Researchers .....	62

# Chapter 1: Introduction

## Background

The historical experience of WWII in the European context, the discourse differs between states significantly. Often the experience and national history that arise from the Second World War occupy a key position in its self-consciousness as a nation. In Finland, such key position is often highlighted and the “two wars” fought between 1939 and 1944 is regarded as the point of national unity where Finns showed their strength in defending their own country. The “myth” of Finnish war experience created a central view on how to interpret the events in that period to fit the story.

Although such a view with nationalistic flavour still holds true, the transnational trend to reflect and reconsider the past, especially its difficult aspect is gaining strength. The prime example is the Holocaust research, which offers critical eyes towards nationalistic, narrow views by offering a reconsideration of the national history and reflect upon the collaboration and other difficult past. Stockholm-Banke points out that the Holocaust offers benchmark as to “what Europe should be and for what it must avoid becoming”.<sup>1</sup> Such reflections and critical eyes on the past is now incorporated as *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, expanding the concept of German origin, which is increasingly being independent of initial geographical specificity.

The issues with legacies of WWII and its difficult past exist in East Asia, in more, if not similar, conflicting and politicised manner. The relations between Japan and surrounding states, which were the main battlefield and under imperial rules of the Japanese empire, has been shadowed by how the “historical consciousness” issues are treated, specifically textbooks, comfort women and other issues arising from expansionist and colonial policy through the 1920s until 1945. The politicised landscape surrounding history writing of WWII, as well as its centrality offers an interesting case of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in the Asian context.

At the same time, what Europe and East Asia have in common is the position as the border where the East and the West met in close proximity. In the Finnish context, foreign policy was coordinated in order to ensure the survival of the state based on realism and lessons from the WWII experience led its position in proximity to the USSR. In East Asian context, Japan and

---

<sup>1</sup> Stockholm Banke, Cecilie Felicia. "Remembering Europe's Heart of Darkness: Legacies of the Holocaust in Post-War European Societies." In *A European Memory? : Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*, edited by Pakier, Małgorzata and Bo Stråth, 163-174. New York: Berghahn Books, 2010.

South Korea stood as the vanguard of the Western bloc, while the USSR, North Korea and the People's Republic of China stood as the East, creating a fundamental divide between the two. Perhaps the end of such confrontational relations is more important in the *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, as it opened up the Eastern European space as well as Asian Eastern bloc to have a dialogue with the Western bloc, creating an opportunity for the topic to resurface and question the "national myth", especially in the European context.

## Research landscape

Research on Finnish history writing, especially its evolution is becoming the target of such reflection in recent years, due in part to the aforementioned trend. In that context, the Finnish history writing is described as nationalistic, partly in contents, but also the framework that is used to conceptualise the events.<sup>2</sup>

The history of the historiography of Finnish WWII is a process in which such "national myth" has been challenged from external perspectives, from the Anglophone regions. The challenges began debates and slowly incorporated into the dominant narrative among Finnish historians. Such a process is discussed by several commentators such as Kinnunen and Jokisipilä<sup>3</sup>, Hietanen,<sup>4</sup> and Meinander.<sup>5</sup>

Though the Anglophone challenges and external perspectives are documented and discussed in major literature on the topic, the same cannot be said in other parts of the world. Obviously, the niche position of the Finnish history research, as well as accessibility of the research from other parts of the world, hinders incorporating research outputs from other regions. Another barrier is also rooted in the niche position that Finnish, or even Nordic, history research in Japan. Because of the limited research landscape, with only a handful of researchers on this topic, the research about these historians did not exist or at least existed as a section in the annotated bibliographies of the books. This study will examine this gap and

---

<sup>2</sup> Meinander, Henrik. "A Separate Story? Interpretations of Finland in the Second World War." In *Nordic Narratives of the Second World War: National Historiographies Revisited*, 71. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2011, 71.

<sup>3</sup> Kinnunen, Tiina and Markku Jokisipilä. "Shifting Images of "our Wars": Finnish Memory Culture of World War II." In *Finland in World War II: History, Memory, Interpretations*, edited by Kinnunen, Tiina and Ville Kivimäki, 435-482. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2012.

<sup>4</sup> Hietanen, Silvo. "General Information." *Scandinavian Journal of History* 12, no. 4 (1987): 359-363. doi:10.1080/03468758708579127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03468758708579127>.

<sup>5</sup> Meinander, Henrik. "A Separate Story? Interpretations of Finland in the Second World War."

attempts to clarify the historiography of Finnish participation in WWII in Japan and make it available for the wider research community as a basis for future research.

## **Research Question**

Having the gap in mind, this research will analyse how the historians in Japan explained Finnish participation in WWII in the post-war period, specifically between 1945 and 2018, and how it reflects the context within which they were written. The context includes both the socio-political situations that are surrounding the Japanese historians, the research output that is available from outside of Japan, and wider historiographical trends of study of European regions in Japan. History writing cannot exist independent of the context within which they are written, and by analysing the materials that way, it will highlight the implications that the research had vis-a-vis political changes that post-war Japan has experienced. The act of writing the history of the “others”, a nation on the other side of the Eurasian continent, from Japan would carry certain differences arising from different contexts, audiences, and conclusions it draws. In content, the history writing will be about events in Finland during WWII, but the explanations, narratives, and conclusions it draws would reflect such differences.

With that core question in mind, this study will examine the history writing of WWII in Finland from Japanese perspective to understand what lies in the illocutionary dimension of the texts and what lead to Japanese historians to Finnish history in the first place and why they are explained in certain ways. Because the context includes both national context in Japan, and the international historiographical context in academia among historians from Finland and elsewhere, this study will examine the overall trend and shifts within the two concurrent contexts and attempts to find connections between the contexts and the writing itself.

While the researcher’s aims can be found in the literature, this research is interested in the implications that the publications had within the context. Thus, what researchers intended to do, and what effect the publication had might not always be the same. Despite that, the comparison between the context and the content of the text offers a new look into the historiography as a purpose to look into the implications of them in the society in which it was published. The niche position of Finnish history research offers limited authors to look into, and highlight the nature of such phenomenon, yet wide enough for this research to incorporate multiple authors and viewpoints.

## Chapter Structure

After this Introduction, the methodology and the theoretical background will be mentioned in Chapter 2, specifically the Conceptual history approach and the data that will be used. Chapter 3 will focus on providing the historiography of Finnish WWII and its evolution, especially focusing on debates surrounding the origins of the war. Chapter 4 first provides the wider trend in Japanese historiography since the start of the Meiji era in the late 19th Century and how the history writing of the European states, under *seiyōshi* discipline, has evolved. Then a closer look at the Japanese literature on Finnish history will be conducted. Because of the wide scope ranging from 1945 to 2017, Chapter 4 will be divided into several subchapters. The structure will utilise periodization based on decades. Due to the varying occurrence of the sources in different decades, some of them will be combined to have sections ranging for 20 years, notably in the 1960s and 1970s and after 2000s. Subchapters will be divided based on the authors. Then Chapter 5 will attempt to contextualise the findings and conceptual trends into wider contexts, as mentioned earlier. Then the research will highlight prospects for future research based on the findings. The Appendix includes key authors' short biographies, clarifying their generational group as well as their career as historians.

## Significance of Research

This research aims to clarify the post-war evolution of Finnish history writing done by Japanese researchers, as they were not known due to its niche position as well as the language barrier. Such research would clarify several aspects of Finnish history research. First, this will allow researchers interested in the topic to understand the historiographical development of the research done in Japan without the issue of the language barrier. It will contribute to the internationalisation of the Finnish history research of this period.

Second, this will connect the research made in Finland to the research done in Japan through a comparative perspective. This will allow for new point of reference to research on Finnish WWII history from a non-West, non-European view. Finnish history went through processes of rejecting national myth, from contributions from outside, especially debates around “separate war” and “driftwood theory (*ajopuuteoria*)”. It will offer foundations in understanding how the conflicting interpretations and concepts in the interpretations are received across the national border, and more importantly the border between “the West” and

“the East” exist in the history writing in Japan.

Third, it will offer reference points from the niche to understand wider historiography of *seiyōshi* (Western History), a subdivision of history research common in Japan which stands side-by-side with *nihonshi* (Japanese History) and *tōyōshi* (Eastern History). Since Finnish history research from Japan is also located within the realm of *seiyōshi*, and in turn highlights the historiography of Japanese *seiyōshi* research, through a niche within the category.

Fourth, this research will offer foundations to understand the interest in Finland in Japanese society. The materials analysed in this research are elements that will form the basis for those interested in Finland and they also reflect the “standard view” on Finland among the Japanese in an indirect way as the books written by academics would usually serve functions to respond to such views especially introductory books aimed at such audience. Thus, it helps the researchers to understand such “standard views” in Japan and how they responded to those views, if any. Having the recent rise in popularity of the Finnish WWII history in Japan, with implications in Finland,<sup>6</sup> this research will clarify the historical trajectory of such boom and offers partial foundations in explaining the fascinations in Japan towards Japan.

---

<sup>6</sup> Notably the success of the crowdfunding project from the Panssarimuseo in Parola. See Hujanen, Miikka. "Japanilaiset Turistit Ihastelevat Kelvotonta Suomalaispanssaria – Museon Johtaja Hämällä: ”Enemmän Rahaa Kuin Suomesta”." *Iltasanomat*, 2016. <https://www.is.fi/kotimaa/art-2000001271402.html>.



## Chapter 2: Methodological and Theoretical Background

To achieve the goal, emphasis will be placed on how the concepts are being utilised in the explanations in the works. Concepts are “focal points of interpretation and understanding”<sup>7</sup> in the explanations of history, and by analysing the concepts; the approach allows analysis on how the historians interpret the history, as well as reasons behind why certain concepts are being used in the explanation. This approach will extract the semantic tools used to explain the historical phenomenon, the Finnish-Soviet wars between 1939 and 1944 and then allow for comparison between the Japanese and Finnish research. Since the same phenomenon is explained, and Japanese research makes use of primary and secondary sources from Finland and elsewhere, the use of concepts will inevitably show similarities. Yet history writing of one’s own country, the writing of history within Europe, and writing a history of the Occident from the Orient will inevitably show key differences as well.

Notable forerunner using this approach include Skinner and Koselleck.<sup>8</sup> The approach offers ways to analyse the historical development of the concept and its implications. They used the approach to analyse historical works with an emphasis on the emergence, proliferation, and evolution of key political concepts that will lead to modern political thought. Both Skinner and Koselleck are interested in the evolution of the concepts, but their scope is somewhat different. Koselleck’s interest is rooted in the change of the concept but at the macro-level, in other words, the formation and natures of the concepts utilised. Koselleck’s approach is to reveal the shift from the set of “topological” concepts to “temporal concepts of movement”.<sup>9</sup> Because of that, the Koselleck’s approach would emphasise the general trend and decontextualize the concepts and place it in the larger context of historical shift. Skinner is more interested in the process that concepts gain legitimacy and how it connects to the ideological and practical situations of the period.<sup>10</sup> His approach also emphasises the importance of placing the text in the linguistic context, in other words,

---

<sup>7</sup> Steinmetz, Willibald, Michael Freeden, and Javier Fernández Sebastián. *Conceptual History in the European Space*. New York: Berghahn, 2017, 1

<sup>8</sup> Koselleck, Reinhart and Todd Samuel Presner. *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts*. Cultural Memory in the Present. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 2002.

<sup>9</sup> Palonen, Kari. *Politics and Conceptual Histories: Rhetorical and Temporal Perspectives*. Baden-Baden : [London]: Nomos; Bloomsbury, 2014, 59

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

context among a series of writings from the same period.<sup>11</sup>

Of the two approaches, this research is taking is more in line with Skinner's as this research aims to analyse the process in which the "established theories" in the Finnish history and placing the process in the political and social situation that surrounds the texts in which the historians wrote.

Skinner's approach is, as described by Tully, boils down to five steps. 1) Building on the "speech act" proposed by Austin, Searle, and Grice, who in turn built their theory based on Wittgenstein's pragmatic approach, Skinner approached historical texts as part of "speech act".<sup>12</sup> By using the "speech act" theory, Skinner identified the importance of the illocutionary forces that are used in the writing to fully understand the historical texts. 2) To achieve that, he located the works in the linguistic context in which the work was written, in other words, among the texts from the same time. 3) He then analysed how the writings challenged the conventions that existed in the linguistic context, to re-characterise the political actions connected to the convention. 4) For such comparison, the conventions must be identified, and for that, analysis on the "minor" works which did not become classics in the later period, is necessary. The closer look at concepts could happen only after that, and the building elements of the political ideology can be analysed through the concepts that have both descriptive and evaluative functions. 5) Tully then describes another step in analysing the process that the change is incorporated into the conventions through means of dissemination.<sup>13</sup>

Although Skinner's aim was to analyse the historical trajectory of the modern political thought, and how the roots could be identified in the writing of the classical texts of political thought, his approach could be utilised to fit other purposes, especially for comparison. By understanding concepts and texts "as authors wrote and understood it", including its illocutionary forces behind the text, it offers great tools for comparison across national, transnational and international borders. Such is true for this research, aiming to compare the Japanese historiography of Finnish WWII with that of Finland or Anglophone regions.

The Skinnerian approach would offer a starting point for the research, but because of the different materials used, as well as different goals, the approach will not follow exactly what Skinner was doing. One notable difference is the comparative aspect of this research.

---

<sup>11</sup> Tully, James. *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and His Critics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988, 9.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 15.

Historical works, especially those written for the academic audience and by academic historians, cannot be written independently of the research output from elsewhere by other researchers. Thus, in this research, analysis of the Japanese works, and comparison of them with works from elsewhere, notably that from Finland as well as Anglophone research, must be done to contextualise it.

For the purpose of this research, several differences must be addressed, as the aims differ between that of Skinner and that of this research. The first step is the starting point for consideration, and the illocutionary forces of the writing will be the core part of the research, emphasising what lies behind the text, both the forces that lead to the author to produce certain explanations, as well as its implications.

With regards to the linguistic context, or “minor” works that contain the convention, this research will need to make some adjustment. The target of analysis in this research is a mixture of books targeted for the academic audience, in the forms of monograph and papers, and those targeted for general readers, in the forms of general history books and *shinsho*, latter being larger in size. The academic dimension of the context is easily identifiable as the context of it is the academic works produced elsewhere, notably Finland and Anglophone regions. However, the non-academic dimension of the context, which the sources are also attempting to challenge, are less visible from the data within this research. In theory, it is possible to observe and compare the conventions among ordinary people by using materials like newspaper articles and other publications on Finland, with elements of its history. However, such research is out of scope because of practical limits, leaving rooms for future research. Since the non-academic context is indirectly visible through sources that is aimed at such an audience, as a myth that is being rejected in historians’ works, they will be used to analyse such context. Additionally, this research will instead make use of academic literature on the topic of Japanese reception of Finnish branding,<sup>14</sup> and pre-war reporting of the Winter War,<sup>15</sup> to remedy the invisibility.

In terms of data, this research will primarily deal with academic writings written by Japanese historians about the Finnish-Soviet wars between 1939 and 1944. Chronologically,

---

<sup>14</sup> Ipatti, Laura. "At the Roots of the 'Finland Boom'." *Scandinavian Journal of History* 44, no. 1 (2019): 103-130. doi:10.1080/03468755.2018.1502680. <https://doi-org.libproxy.helsinki.fi/10.1080/03468755.2018.1502680>.

<sup>15</sup> Tahira, Mitsuru. "Soren no Taigai Bocho Seisaku O Meguru Nihon Genronkai no Doko: Soren-Finrando Senso (Fuyu Senso) Ki O Chushin Ni." *Seiji Keizai Shigaku* no. 591 (2016): 13-36.

the sources will range from the 1950s, right after the end of the Pacific War, all the way into the present. However, since the historians will also deal with less-academic publications aimed at the general public, such books outside of the academic realm will supplement the sources to illustrate the wider landscape. Due to the availability as well as the practical scope of this research, works will be selected based on its significance, especially those published after the 1970s. Key authors include Saitō Masaki, Kuwaki Tsutomu, Momose Hiroshi, Umemoto Hiroshi, Saiki Nobuo, and Ishino Yuko.

For comparison, the works written in English will be used as well, especially those cited in Japanese research, due to the language limitation of the author. The majority of the research in this topic is indeed written in Finnish and Swedish, as mentioned, and to fully grasp the Finnish research landscape, it is necessary to consult those sources to enable full comparison. By using the English sources, this research limits itself to contributions from Anglophone regions, specifically the U.K. and the U.S. where the research on this topic has been done. However, from the recent historiographical research available in English, it is generally understood that during the 1960s, the dominant interpretation of the wars in 1939 and 1944 has been challenged by Anglophone researchers, both for the Winter War and the Continuation War. The contributions from those researchers in Anglophone regions sparked debates in Finland, leading to a reconsideration of the standard views in Finland.<sup>16</sup> From the previous research, the “sparks” came from the Anglophone researchers and is often marked as the turning point in historiography of Finland in WWII in contemporary sources.

In this research, an attempt was made to make sure Finnish views or responses to the contributions from outside are included. The translated works in English tends to be general history books, translated in order to present Finnish history to the foreign readers. Yet these often reflect the Finnish views as well as responses to the challenges made from outside. Also, such works from Finland are often more accessible for researchers in Japan and are cited more than those in Finnish due to the proficiency issues. By using the sources in English, both written by Anglophone researchers as well as Finnish researchers, it allows for comparison in terms of the view and conflict in the Finnish historiography, but also how the views propagated into the sources in Japan.

---

<sup>16</sup> Meinander, Henrik. "A Separate Story? Interpretations of Finland in the Second World War." In *Nordic Narratives of the Second World War: National Historiographies Revisited*, 59. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2011.

## Chapter 3: Historiographical Context of Finnish Participation of WWII

To understand the context within which the Japanese historians have written their work, the research published in Finland and those written from other perspectives, notably the contributions from Anglophone historians, must be outlined. As mentioned, this section will utilise works written in English, and make use of recent accounts on the topic as a basis to explain the evolution of historiography of Finnish WWII.

The wartime Finnish interpretations of the war had several elements to fit the political situations at the time. The Winter War is explained as a blatant attack towards a peace-loving country, and the Soviet Union was to be blamed for. The Soviet interpretation about its security concern is mostly rejected in such views.<sup>17</sup> In the second phase of the war from 1941, the war is explained as a “continuation” of the Winter War, and at the same time “separate” from the German offensive that started in June 1941. In effect, such a view rejected any cooperation between Germany and Finland, as well as emphasising the notions of “fighting its own war” until 1944. In effect, the “own war” was explained as a war to reclaim the territories that were ceded in 1940.

This interpretive framework characterises the first two decades of Finnish history writing of WWII. “Finland and World War II” published by John Wuorinen<sup>18</sup> is one of the earliest work written in English. Current research shows that this anonymous manuscript for this book is written by Arvi Korhonen, who is known to be very close to the politics, especially to J. K. Paasikivi the Prime Minister at the time.<sup>19</sup> A Similar view is presented by Jutikkala in 1962.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> The official publication from Finnish government reflect the view. See *The Development of Finnish-Soviet Relations During the Autumn of 1939: In the Light of Official Documents*. Helsinki: Suomen Kirja, 1940. and *Finland Reveals Her Secret Documents on Soviet Policy, March 1940 - June 1941 : The Attitude of the USSR to Finland After the Peace of Moscow*. New York: Wilfred Funk, 1941.

<sup>18</sup> John H. Wuorinen, eds. *Finland and World War II, 1939-1944*. New York: Ronald Press, 1948.

<sup>19</sup> Ahtiainen, Pekka and Jukka Tervonen. "A Journey into Finnish Historiography from the End of the 19th Century to the Present Day." In *Nordic Historiography in the 20th Century*, edited by Meyer, Frank and Jan Eivind Myhre, 50-79. Oslo: Department of History, University of Oslo, 2000.

<sup>20</sup> Jutikkala, Eino, Kauko Pirinen, and Paul Sjöblom. *A History of Finland*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1962.

The WWII section is written by Jutikkala, as mentioned in Acknowledgement.

It is worth mentioning that both Jutikkala and Korhonen were both very close to the power centres of the Finnish government. Korhonen was known to be close to J. K. Paasikivi and served as a Deputy Director of the Military History Office of the General Headquarters of the Finnish military.<sup>21</sup> Jutikkala is one of the students of Korhonen, and was involved in the propaganda and censorship in the military during the war, and was also a secretary to two wartime Prime Ministers, Risto Ryti and Jukka Rangell.<sup>22</sup>

The important aspect of the historiography of WWII in Finland is that such continuation of the wartime views was challenged by scholars from Anglophone regions, notably the U.K. and the U.S. Anderson criticised that Finnish government in 1939 neglected the urgency of the Soviet concerns for security and the intransigent attitude of the Finnish government, notably the Defence Minister Niukkanen and the Foreign Minister Erkko<sup>23</sup> was the failure on the Finnish behalf to avoid the outbreak in November 1939.

Similar criticism was raised for the so-called “driftwood” theory, which explains the position of Finland in 1940-1941 as driftwood, incapable of deciding its own fate, and pushed by currents of the great power. In 1957, Charles L. Lundin, a British historian, published his work on the Finnish diplomacy between 1940 and 1941.<sup>24</sup> His contribution was followed by Crosby, American historian, and Upton, a British historian that revealed the details of the Finnish-German cooperation, and offered a strong case against the views held by Jutikkala and Korhonen.

The challenges from these Anglophone researchers were not received well in Finland. Jutikkala, who published his book five years after Lundin’s, heavily criticises “an ivory tower theoretician out of touch with harsh reality” for not understanding the reasons behind the Finnish decision to move closer to Nazi Germany.<sup>25</sup>

It took some time for Finnish historians to accept such a view. One of such example could be seen in Mauno Jokipii’s work,<sup>26</sup> where he provided details of the military cooperation

---

<sup>21</sup> Jutikkala, Eino. "Korhonen, Arvi (1890 - 1967)." Accessed April 30, 2019. <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:sks-kbg-007003>.

<sup>22</sup> Tommila, Päiviö. "Jutikkala, Eino (1907 - 2006)." Accessed April 30, 2019. <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:sks-kbg-007054>.

<sup>23</sup> Anderson, Albin T. "Origins of the Winter War: A Study of Russo-Finnish Diplomacy." *World Politics* 6, no. 2 (1954): 169-189.

<sup>24</sup> Lundin, Charles Leonard. *Finland in the Second World War*. Indiana University Publications. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1957.

<sup>25</sup> Jutikkala Pirinen and Sjöblom, *A History of Finland*.

<sup>26</sup> Jokipii, Mauno. "Finland's Entrance into the Continuation War." *Revue Internationale D'Histoire Militaire* no. 53 (1983): 85-103. Most likely based on his research for his monograph *Jatkosodan synty: tutkimuksia Saksan ja Suomen sotilaallisesta yhteistyöstä*

between Germany and Finland prior to the outbreak in June 1941. Though such notions of “separate war” and “driftwood” are visible in the same decade, as can be seen from Klinge’s work.<sup>27</sup> Overall, the emphasis on the limitation of the Finnish-German cooperation could be seen in later works on the topic.

In the same decade, work on new topics of WWII became available in English. Rautkallio’s work on the Holocaust in Finland presents how the notions of “separate war” provides an interpretive framework for the Holocaust.<sup>28</sup> This work is significant as it marks the early stage of “Europeanisation” of Finnish history. The Holocaust and reconsideration of national history surrounding the topic expanded in the 1980s in Western Europe, characterised by *Historikerstreit* in Germany and reconsiderations of wartime activities at national levels.<sup>29</sup> The trend intensified as the Cold War tensions disappeared in the 1990s. The stories from Eastern Europe, where much of the extermination took place, were now visible and incorporated into European level, concurrently with the expansion of the EU and NATO.

Rautkallio’s book came during that process to present the Holocaust in such a way that it fits the national narrative of the war. In Rautkallio’s mind, Finland was friendly to the Jewish population. Despite the deportations of Jewish refugees, based on the public outrage and the Jewish soldiers in the Finnish army, he claims that there was no anti-Semitic sentiment in Finland, and presents Finland as different from Nazi Germany. What is interesting with Rautkallio’s work is less about the similarities with the similar arguments in Western Europe, but how the narrative is constructed to serve the “separate war” explanations. The documented eight refugees, “those eight” are mentioned as the only victims whom Finland victimised through sending them to Nazi Germany, but overall narrative emphasises the Finnish “rescue” of the Jewish populations.

The “Europeanisation” causes new questions and debates among the Finnish historians. The issue surrounding Holocaust continues to be sensitive issues, especially after contributions from Silvennoinen revealed evidence of cooperation between Finnish Security

---

1940–41 published in 1987.

<sup>27</sup> Klinge, Matti. *A Brief History of Finland*. Helsinki: Otava, 1981.

<sup>28</sup> Rautkallio, Hannu. *Finland and the Holocaust: The Rescue of Finland's Jews*. New York: Holocaust Library, 1987.

<sup>29</sup> Stockholm Banke, Cecilie Felicia. "Remembering Europe's Heart of Darkness: Legacies of the Holocaust in Post-War European Societies." In *A European Memory?: Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*, edited by Pakier, Małgorzata and Bo Stråth, 163-174. New York: Berghahn Books, 2010.

Police, Valpo and its German counterpart stationed in Finland during the Continuation War.<sup>30</sup> The paper revealed far more extensive deportation than was explained before, and provides details on the conscious cooperation between the two organisations.

Some historians presented scepticism towards considering the culpability of Finland regarding the issue and thus shown concerns towards “Europeanising” the national history. A notable example in English is a chapter written by Meinander.<sup>31</sup> He is known for his work on WWII history which incorporated that of Swedish-speaking population in Finland. In the chapter he wrote, he presents the evolution of the Finnish historiography with regards to the various stages, and how the nationalistic “separate war” interpretation persisted among the public and how the fall of the Soviet Union gave way for new nationalistic views in Finland. In the latter part, he questions if the Western trend of “holocaustification” of WWII is applicable in Finnish context and raises concerns for such move, emphasising different position that Finland stands compared to that of Western Europe or other part of Norden.<sup>32</sup>

Recent work on Finnish WWII history available in English deals with diplomatic, military and social dimensions of the war.<sup>33</sup> The very last chapter of this 600-page book deals with the issues of Holocaust and anti-Semitism in wartime Finland, and how Finnish historians have kept silence about the issue, or present the case in accordance with the national narrative, like that of Rautkallio.<sup>34</sup>

The volume *Finland's Holocaust Silences of History*<sup>35</sup> published a year later provides even more detailed views on the details of the culpability and extent of the anti-Semitism in pre-war and wartime Finland. In this work, Meinander's account is heavily criticised for being nationalistic and playing down on the importance of what he called the “holocaustification” of the war.<sup>36</sup>

Although this debate is between Finnish historians, what is presented here is another debate that was triggered by external challenges made towards “national myths” within Europe. In similar nature to those happened in 1960s, the Finnish historiography scene is

---

<sup>30</sup> Silvennoinen, Oula. *Salaiset Aseveljet: Suomen Ja Saksan Turvallisuuspoliisiyhteistyö 1933-1944*. Helsingissä: Otava, 2008.

<sup>31</sup> Meinander, Henrik. "A Separate Story? Interpretations of Finland in the Second World War."

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 74.

<sup>33</sup> Kinnunen, Tiina, and Ville Kivimäki. *Finland in World War II: History, Memory, Interpretations*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

<sup>34</sup> Rautkallio, *Finland and the Holocaust: The Rescue of Finland's Jews*.

<sup>35</sup> Muir, Simo, and Hana Worthen. *Finland's Holocaust: Silences of History*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.



experiencing a new kind of questioning and debate.

From looking at 65 years of Finnish historiography of WWII, one can see the struggles to reject the wartime explanations, and understanding the limitations of the explanations. The reflections and critical eyes on the wartime explanations came from the Anglophone researchers, who did not have the same background as well as political connections to the state government like many Finnish historians did. After the end of the Cold War, attempts to critically view the national history, driven by the transnational trend in Europe, started to look at cooperation and gaps in the earlier research started to appear. The “Europeanisation” trend is still ongoing and is debated among researchers.

To bring the topic into specific enough level while retaining the relevance, this research will focus on the arguments used in the origins of the wars occurred between Finland and the Soviet Union between 1939 and 1944. The look into the historiography of the Finnish WWII revolves around how the outbreak of the two wars are explained, and thus offers clear points in analysing the reception among the Japanese materials. The origins of the war often contain explanations on how the two parties became hostile against each other, and the evaluative functions of the concepts are best visible in explaining the outbreak. As it will be described in the following section, the origins of the Winter War and the Continuation War, especially the latter, were the target of the debate in the historiography of the Finnish WWII and continues to be the central issue.

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 50.

## Chapter 4: Finnish history through Japanese eyes

### Japanese historiography

To understand the Japanese historiography of Finnish WWII history, the historiographical development in Japan should be outlined. The niche of Finnish history and Nordic history research in the Japanese context is under the category of *seiyōshi*, western history. The typical categorisation of history in Japanese academia first divides between Japanese history (*nihonshi*) and World History (*sekaishi*) and divides the latter into Western and Eastern (*seiyō* and *tōyō*). Koyama notes that this three-part construct of the discipline is unique to modern East Asia and is common between Japan and South Korea.<sup>37</sup>

The effects arising from such division as well as the development of the discipline cannot be ignored, as this unique construct reflects the Japanese historical understanding, as well as attitudes that historians had in this discipline. The fact that such division of national, Asian and Western history is in current Japanese institutions and education strengthens the importance even further.

The European history research in modern Japan started in the Meiji era, from around 1870s. After 400 years of shogunate rule and isolation from the western influences, Japan paved its way to becoming a modernised state. In that process, the Meiji government started researching the Western states in order to bring Japan on par with the “modernised West”. The motivation behind the urgency is usually explained by the rising threat from the British Empire in the region against China, and seeing technological disparity compared to the British or American. In a way, the Meiji government in its infancy was feeling the need, as a small power, to catch up with the great powers like Britain or the U.S. Thus the research on the Western powers primarily focused itself on great powers like Prussia, Russia, Britain, France and the U.S. Among them, the Prussian model was largely adopted in legal, military and educational systems, with elements from other powers in other areas.<sup>38</sup> The research on the Western states was serving the purpose to find examples and draw lessons from these states that could be applied to the state-building project for the Meiji government. The slogan

---

<sup>37</sup> Lim, Jie-Hyun. "Kokuminshi no Fuseki Toshite no Sekaishi: Nihon to Chōsen Ni Okeru "Aikokuteki Sekaishi" to Sono Kekka Toshite Shōjiru Yōroppa Chūshinshugi Ni Tsuite (Higashi Ajia no Seiyōshigaku)." *Shisō* no. 1091 (2015): 6.

In initial translator's note by Koyama Satoshi.

<sup>38</sup> Martin, Bernd. *Japan and Germany in the Modern World*. Providence, RI u.a: Berghahn Books, 1995.

*datsua nyūō*, “leaving Asia and enter Europe” used during this era represents such European orientations. In this context, Japanese historical writing imports historical methods from Europe, to overcome the solely Japanese scope of history from pre-modern shogunate period.<sup>39</sup> In this process, the study of the World history preceded that of “national” history of Japan, and the European history was utilised as a mirror to identify the national history of Japan to define it through deviations from the European example.<sup>40</sup> The research of the *seiyōshi* served the purpose of the national project of modernisation.<sup>41</sup>

Japan established its position as a “great power” through the Sino-Japanese War of 1895 and Russo-Japanese War of 1905, together with Anglo-Japanese alliance earlier. As Japan established its position as the great power, its interest shifted from the West to Japan and Asia.<sup>42</sup> However, the interest in Asia was to serve the Japanese imperialism so that the target of their imperialism, the Orient for the Japanese empire, could be constructed.<sup>43</sup> The ideas like “Great East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere”, an ideology to justify Japanese expansionism to “fight the White imperialism is based on such ideas of Asia.

The whole “Japan as great power” project fails in 1945 with the defeat and devastation. The failure was a national experience that left people in disarray for the future. The disarray that John Dower called “*kyodatsu*”<sup>44</sup> lead to reflections and much of the post-war historical writing was characterised by turning away from the pre-war nationalist history and reflection of the process that lead to the war. The remorse among the intellectuals, as well as the general public was very strong in the 1950s.<sup>45</sup> Much of the intellectuals in the post-war era was dominated by Marxists, who were imprisoned by the wartime government based on their ideology and resistance towards the war effort and even those who distanced themselves from

---

<sup>39</sup> Brownlee, John. "Nationalism and Historical Scholarship in Twentieth Century Japan." In *International Symposium Historiography and Japanese Consciousness of Values and Norms*, edited by Fogel, Joshua A., 137-143. Kyōto, 2003. 137.

<sup>40</sup> Lim, Jie-Hyun. "Kokuminshi no Fuseki Toshite no Sekaishi: Nihon to Chōsen Ni Okeru "Aikokuteki Sekaishi" to Sono Kekka Toshite Shōjiru Yōroppa Chūshinshugi Ni Tsuite (Higashi Ajia no Seiyōshigaku)." *Shisō* no. 1091 (2015): 10-11.

<sup>41</sup> Odanaka, Naoki. "Higasi Ajia no Seiyōshi to "Guroobaru Historii"." *Shisō* no. 1091 (March, 2015): 2.

<sup>42</sup> Momose, Hiroshi. *Shōkoku: Rekishi Ni Miru Rinen to Genjitsu*. Iwanami Shoten, 1988, 313.

<sup>43</sup> Lim, "Kokuminshi no Fuseki Toshite no Sekaishi: Nihon to Chōsen Ni Okeru "Aikokuteki Sekaishi" to Sono Kekka Toshite Shōjiru Yōroppa Chūshinshugi Ni Tsuite (Higashi Ajia no Seiyōshigaku)," 16.

<sup>44</sup> Dower, John W. *Embracing Defeat*. London: Penguin Press, 2000, 87-89.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 237.

the Communist Party found its appeal.<sup>46</sup> In a way, Japan's post-war period started with the rejection of the pre-war projects to become the Asian great power.<sup>47</sup>

Lim points out that this shift back to World history, essentially study of the Western states, were initiated by, and in line with, the policies of the American occupation authorities.<sup>48</sup> The root of the pre-war "mistakes" of Japan that had to be reflected upon, in such context, was the remnants of the pre-modern systems and "deviated modern". Lim points out that the process from pre-modern, feudal systems to capitalism in Europe gained popularity in World History research and gradually expanded its scope into other regions like Eastern Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East in the 1970s.<sup>49</sup>

Gradually, the self-perception changed to the other side, as a small power, sandwiched between the East and the West, close to hot spots of the Cold War in Korea. In immediate post-war Japan, interest in small states in Europe grew. Initially, the interest in Denmark, Sweden, and Switzerland grew as the examples to learn from. In a way, this interest towards these small states idealised the images of these states and created myths about the situation, noted by Murai.<sup>50</sup> In a way, this rise was a resurgence of *datsua nyūō*, as a result of the break and reflection on the pre-war Japanese empire. The only difference was that this time, the interest was focused on the small states, instead of the major powers, based on the shift in self-perception. Again, Asia was neglected, as they struggled to gain independence after the void left behind by the Japanese empire, as 10 years of occupation between 1945 and 1952 stripped Japanese government of diplomatic relations of its own under the occupation authority. Korean War occurred behind the curtain, and Japan's economy flourished with the war as a forward base for American operation in the Korean peninsula.

After signing the peace treaty in 1952, Japan adopted the Yoshida Doctrine. The doctrine, promoted by Prime Minister Yoshida defined post-war Japanese diplomacy that focuses on economic development without possessing military power, utilising the pacifist constitution.

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 235-236.

<sup>47</sup> Iokibe, Makoto. *Sengo Nihon Gaikōshi*. Dai 2 satsu ed. Tōkyō: Yūhikaku, 2000, 317.

<sup>48</sup> Lim, "Kokuminshi no Fuseki Toshite no Sekaishi: Nihon to Chōsen Ni Okeru "Aikokuteki Sekaishi" to Sono Kekka Toshite Shōjiru Yōroppa Chūshinshugi Ni Tsuite (Higashi Ajia no Seiyōshigaku).", 23.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 24.

Lim conceptualises the *seiyōshi* (Western history) as almost synonymous to *sekaishi* (World History) in this work.

<sup>50</sup> Momose, Hiroshi, Satoru Kumano, and Makoto Murai. *Hokuōshi* [History of Northern Europe]. New ed. Vol. 21 Yamakawa Shuppan Sha, 1998. I

The foreword mentions strong influence from German history research as well.

This direction was a response to the U.S. requests to remilitarise after the occupation, and effectively kept the burden on defence at the bare minimum by outsourcing to the U.S. forces stationed in Japan, utilising the U.S. strategic considerations in the Far East.<sup>51</sup> Yoshida doctrine is essentially a direction rooted in the small state-ism of Prime Minister Yoshida that Japan in 1952 did not have capabilities to seek both the increasing defence in the Cold War tensions and economic development.<sup>52</sup>

The economic development brought Japan as an economic major power in the 1970s, with very limited Self Defence Force. Backed by the economic power, Japan started to take initiative in Asia, especially ASEAN states under Fukuda Doctrine, with generous development aids and pledge not to become a military power.<sup>53</sup> The continuation of small state perception with its status as an economic great power gave birth to a peculiar hybrid perspective of itself. The oil crisis of 1973 revealed the instability of the “economic major power” which had implications globally, but in Japan, the instability undermined the position as economic power, and the peculiar combination of small military power with great economic power. The distorted self-identity is a topic of debate in the 1970s<sup>54</sup>, and the limitations were realised during this period, rooted in confusion of overarching direction to comprehend the peculiar position vis-a-vis the Cold War tensions. Yet fundamental reconsideration of the security was not realised and the Security Alliance from the 1950s merely continued to exist as the core of Japan’s diplomacy.

The question of self-perception is deeply rooted in the security policy, especially after the economic development after the 1970s. This period saw the renewal of the security alliance, as well as increased tensions with the Vietnam War. The orientations towards Asia was established under the Fukuda Doctrine, confirming that Japan would stay as an economic power, without military dimension. The diplomacy in Asia focused on development aid towards Asia, as a strategic tool for an “economic major power”.<sup>55</sup>

Nakasone government in the early 1980s sought to strengthen the defence capabilities, after increased tensions in the late 1970s and US-Japan tensions regarding trade. The economy reached record-high, and notions of “Japan as number one” gained popularity in the early 1980s. The peculiar phenomenon is that the term “Finlandization” has gained popularity in Japan, as something that Japan should avoid becoming, notably the comments made by

---

<sup>51</sup> Iokibe., *Sengo Nihon Gaikōshi*, 75-79.

<sup>52</sup> Momose, *Shōkoku: Rekishi Ni Miru Rinen to Genjitsu*, 325-326.

<sup>53</sup> Iokibe, *Sengo Nihon Gaikōshi*, 177.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 189.

Prime Minister Nakasone in 1984,<sup>56</sup> which marks a different attitude towards the small state, and being used as a securitised discussion on how Japan should be. Yet among the intellectuals, the great power orientation, both economic and military, was discussed with suspicion, and calls for continued small state identity continued to exist, as noted by Momose.<sup>57</sup>

With the end of the Cold War in the late 1980s, Japan, and later in Asia, experienced economic crises. The bubble economy burst and the subsequent economic crisis in Asia brought damage and questioning of the economic great power orientation. Japan sought more proactive policies, and participation in PKO has been increased after the Gulf War and increased even further after 2001. As Iokibe notes, the end of the Cold War also meant the end of the Yoshida Doctrine and started a diverging discussion about how Japan should proceed.<sup>58</sup> Especially after Abe administration that came back to power in 2012, development towards assertive and proactive diplomatic policies, including possession of increased military capabilities are apparent. Such move came concurrently with the rise of nationalism in Japan, a gradual process exacerbated by increased threat in East Asia, notably the ballistic missiles from North Korea, and rise of China as a military and economic power.

## 1950s - Early Attempts

### Kuwaki Tsutomu, Ozaki Yoshi, Baba Shigenori - The First Attempt

One of the first books on Finland in post-war Japan is “Culture of Finland (*finrando no bunka*)”,<sup>59</sup> a handbook on Finnish culture published by Nordic Cultural Society of Japan in 1951, edited by Kuwaki Tsutomu, the Chairman of the organisation.

The chapters in the book are contributed by the members of the Society and deal with different aspects of Finnish culture, such as literature, music, architecture and more. It should be noted that although all of them are enthusiasts of Finland and has expertise in certain fields, the list of authors do not include profession historian, though many are academics in archaeology's, linguistics, and philosophy.

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., 187-190.

<sup>56</sup> Momose, Hiroshi and Yūko Ishino, eds. *Finrando O Shirutame no 44 Shō*. Area Studies. [44 Chapters to Understand Finland]. Vol. 69. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 2008, 204.

<sup>57</sup> Momose, *Shōkoku: Rekishi ni miru Rinen to Genjitsu*, 329-330

<sup>58</sup> Iokibe, *Sengo Nihon Gaikōshi*, 313.

<sup>59</sup> Kuwaki, Tsutomu, Yoshi Ozaki, Yasumoto Tokunaga, Tadashi Iijima, Mosuke Morita, Minao Shibata, Kayoko Ichikawa, et al. *Finrando no Bunka*. Hokuō Bunka Sōsho. [Culture

Kuwaki Tsutomu is a university professor at Kyoritsu Women's University at the time of writing, His specialisation is in philosophy, and as a part of academic exchange, he spent time in Europe, and had been teaching at University of Helsinki as a Japanese language teacher in 1941-1944. His contribution to Japanese language teaching in Finland is well documented by Ogawa.<sup>60</sup>

There are some mentions of the history of Finland in this book, but the period between 1939 and 1944 is not written with significant details. Though some concepts present in the brief mention require some attention. Although there is a chapter on history on Finnic people, the description terminates after the Finnish Civil War in 1918. The “recent” development of the Soviet-Finnish War is left out as they are not within the scope of the chapter.<sup>61</sup>

The only relevant mention of the period between 1939 and 1944 can be found in the introductory chapter by Kuwaki and the timeline in the appendix though Kuwaki's description stays within his personal experience in Helsinki as a professor at University of Helsinki.

In the timeline, compiled by Baba Shigenori, one of the authors, mentions the Winter War as “Soviet-Finnish War (*sofin senso*)”, and the Continuation War as “Second Soviet-Finnish War (*dai niji so fin sensō*)”. Based on Tabira's research,<sup>62</sup> the reported names of the Winter War and the subsequent Continuation War during the wartime newspapers were using the “Soviet Finnish War” terminology, and it is used in this literature as well.

### **Saitō Masami- Finnish Struggle for Asian Lessons**

In the same year as the “Finnish Culture” was published, another important work was published. “Anguish for Independence: History of Finland (*dokuritsu e no kumon: finrando no rekishi*)”<sup>63</sup> by Saitō Masami. The book is aimed at the general public, focusing on the process leading up to Finnish independence, as well as the wars that newly independent republic experienced. This book is a *shinsho*, a paperback series on a certain topic intended to

---

of Finland]. Vol. 1 The Nordic Cultural Society of Japan, 1951.

<sup>60</sup> Ogawa, Yoshimi. *Oshu Ni Okeru Senzen no Nihongo Koza: Jittai to Haikei* [Japanese Courses in Pre-War Europe: Situation and Background] Kazama Shobō, 2010.

<sup>61</sup> Kuwaki, Yoshi Ozaki, Yasumoto, Iijima, Morita, Shibata, Ichikawa, et al. *Finrando no Bunka*, 14.

<sup>62</sup> Tahira, Mitsuru. "Soren no Taigai Bocho Seisaku O Meguru Nihon Genronkai no Doko: Soren-Finrando Senso (Fuyu Senso) Ki O Chushin Ni." *Seiji Keizai Shigaku* no. 591 (2016): 13-36.

<sup>63</sup> Saitō, Masami. *Dokuritsu E no Kumon: Finrando no Rekishi* [Agony Towards

provide accurate knowledge for the general reader. As mentioned by later researcher, this book was one of the first thorough accounts of this period of Finnish history published in Japan.

Saitō is a journalist who spent his time in Stockholm during the war as a correspondent for Dōmei News Agency between 1941 and 1946 and was also a member of the Nordic Cultural Society of Japan.<sup>64</sup> This might explain why the work by Kuwaki did not include sections on the WWII period.

The content of this work is, as the title clearly set itself, written to explain the struggle and anguish of the Finnish people to attain independence. His narrative contains sympathy towards Finland, but at the same time, the narrative does not blindly accept the Finnish narrative that was prevalent in this period. Another feature of this work is his attempt to offer a comparative perspective between Finland and Asia. The introduction of his book clearly states the aim of this book rooted in the Asian situation. He states that there is a “storm” of independence movements in India, Pakistan, Philippines, the communist revolution in China, as well as resistance towards colonisers in Iran, Indochina and Malays, and Asia has finally woken up.<sup>65</sup> He goes on to characterise the mid-19th and 20th Century as the era of such “storm” in Europe, and Finland was the typical example of such struggle for independence and serves as “torch lighting the dark and hard way for Asia in confusion”.<sup>66</sup> Based on this perspective, he focuses on the process that leads to Finnish independence starting with Swedish era. He often draws comparisons between Asian situations, especially in relation to Japanese policies in China.<sup>67</sup> Such orientations to “learn lessons from Finland” is reflected in his interest, as well as his concluding section. The reasons for post-war Finnish diplomacy’s success is explained as “the attitude to be a good neighbour to the Soviet Union, resulting in not seeking foreign support for its security. The spirit in maintaining its own independence and peace on its own is noted as the reason why Finland has a unique position different from “satellite states” of East Europe.”<sup>68</sup>

As mentioned, his narrative is sympathetic, but it does not mean his accounts lack balance,

---

Independence: History of Finland]. Iwanamishoten, 1951.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid. From author information on Japanese colophon at the back.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., ii.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid. Translation found on Momose, Hiroshi. "Small States Perceptions in Finland and Japan--A Reflection on Postwar Years." *Acta Slavica Iaponica* 14, (1996):50, <http://hdl.handle.net/2115/8091>.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., 95. Comparison between Russification policy during Russian era and similar policies enforced by Japanese empire in China.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 177.



especially regarding the two wars between 1939 and 1944. For the development leading up to November 1939 is explained in detail. What is striking is the emphasis on the security situation surrounding the USSR in 1939, and a detailed account on the intentions behind the Soviet actions in November 1939. He describes the Soviet intervention into Baltics, East Poland, and Finland as a defensive action against Germany,<sup>69</sup> and describing impatience in the negotiations on Soviet's behalf prior to the Winter War. Citing Molotov's speech made in October 1939, he explains that the "influence of the third country" that Molotov mentions was, in fact, Germany and shows the necessity for the USSR to secure borders near Leningrad was vital in the defence against Germany.

Saitō further states that Finland, the U.K., France, and the U.S. all misinterpreted the Soviet claims for "the influence from the third country" Molotov referred to was France and the U.K., and all considered the offensive in November 1939 as an invasion. In his interpretation, the Soviet Union was unable to correct the misinterpretation with Franco-British-American side as they were allied with Nazi Germany at that point.<sup>70</sup> Based on this interpretation, he describes Finnish reactions as

"Instead, Finland felt a threat to its independence and took the direction the Soviet Union was most fearing for. That is to run towards Germany to rely on their power for its national security"<sup>71</sup>

He uses the political elites' pro-German attitudes in Finland as an example of such a movement. One of the major examples he uses is the trip P. E. Svinhufvud made during the latter part of the Winter War. He claims Svinhufvud met Hitler in Berlin and Ribbentrop in Italy,<sup>72</sup> although contemporary sources seem to agree they did not meet, and Svinhufvud only met Pope Pius XII<sup>73</sup>. Regardless of the factual accuracy, Svinhufvud's actions in that period illustrate his pro-German attitude that continues since the Civil War era. Saitō points such actions of the political elites led Finland to have limited options in the latter part of the "Second Soviet-Finnish War".

Following the criticism on the pro-German attitude among Finnish political elites, Saitō's explanation about the outbreak of the "Continuation War" blames the pro-Germany elites, notably Svinhufvud. The Finnish narrative on the war about the war being "the

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 161.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., pp. 162-163.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., p. 168.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., p. 169.

<sup>73</sup> Häikiö, Martti. "Svinhufvud, Pehr Evind (1861 - 1944)." Accessed May 3, 2019. <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:sks-kbg-000501>.

continuation of the Winter War” is clearly presented, and he acknowledges the lack of intention on Finnish side to “fight as part of the axis”<sup>74</sup>, yet also acknowledges the very fact that Germany troops were in the territory and fighting alongside the Finns.

From the luxury of hindsight, there are factual errors from the luxury of hindsight, such as Svinhufvud’s trip and the nature of Finnish-German cooperation in the *välirauha* period and the nature of Lapland War.<sup>75</sup> Despite such issues, the narrative in this work contains strong attempts to give balanced accounts, incorporating both Soviet and Finnish views. In term of the names of the war, the same conceptual trend can be found, similar to other works in this period. The emphasis on the small state, as well as attitude to “learn from Europe” is very strong in this work, in line with similar interest in other European small states.

### **Onoe Masao - Diplomatic Historian in Soviet History**

Another work of this period provides a detailed account on the “Winter War” by a diplomatic historian. *1939 Nen no Soviето Finrando Sensō*, a bulletin paper by Onoe Masao, a historian on Soviet foreign policy history, was published in 1955.<sup>76</sup> This contribution is likely to be part of his larger work on his topic. In this work, Onoe uses Soviet foreign policy documents compiled by Chatham House<sup>77</sup> as well as Finnish documents published by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland.<sup>78</sup> This is likely to be the first work on this topic by a professional historian.

This paper provides a more detailed account of how the pre-war negotiation was carried out between the Finnish and Soviet delegations in 1939, using primary sources from both sides. Because his interest is in Soviet foreign policy, the conclusions he draws from the documents focus on the implications of “Soviet Finnish War” in 1939 for the USSR.

The war, in his explanation, had considerable gain for the Soviets in terms of territory, and the loss Finland suffered was devastating, to the extent that the war was “reckless”. The gain on the Soviet side was so large that “Molotov had to add “the security of Murmansk and

---

<sup>74</sup> Saitō, Masami. *Dokuritsu E no Kumon: Finrando no Rekishi*, 170-171.

<sup>75</sup> “The fighting was nominal in nature, and in reality, the withdrawal happened in coordination with both sides, avoiding contact against each other. The German troops withdrew to Norway.” *Ibid.*, 174.

<sup>76</sup> Onoe, Masao. "1939 Nen no Soviето Finrando Sensō." *Kobe Law Journal* 5, no. 1 (1955): 228-259.

<sup>77</sup> Degras, Jane and Jane Degras. *Soviet Documents on Foreign Policy. Vol. 3, 1933-1941*. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1953.

<sup>78</sup> *The Development of Finnish-Soviet Relations during the Autumn of 1939: In the Light of*

its railway” in the list of explanations which he did not use before the war”.<sup>79</sup> Onoe also scrutinise the official line of Soviet historiography about how the war contributed to establishing “The Eastern Front” against the Nazis and security in the Baltic region, and how the elites in the U.S. and Britain did not recognise the contribution. Onoe rejects “Eastern front” narratives as justifications and its effects on the fight against Nazi Germany for the Allies. He goes further to point out that Soviet criticism on the expulsion of the USSR from the League of Nations based on the “what-aboutism”, criticising Franco-British imperialists as well as the League that is dominated by them. In Onoe’s interpretation, the official line does not provide how the “reverse course” of the Soviet Union, which granted four Baltic states independence as part of liberation from imperial Russia for self-determination, and invading the same territory just after 20 years.<sup>80</sup> Onoe concludes Soviet what-aboutism cannot be considered legitimate until the Soviet Union provides a sound argument to this reversal, and criticise the Soviet Union received with the Winter War was a “considerable minus”.<sup>81</sup> He also evaluates the war as a military failure and how the restructuring of the Red Army contributed to the war against Nazi Germany a few years later.

Overall, though the emphasis in the evaluation is on the Soviet side of the story, this paper provides details about how the diplomatic negotiation was conducted and how the war started, progressed and ended, based on primary documents that researchers had access to in the 1950s. The detail extends to what happened in the League of Nations that led to the expulsion of the USSR and the Franco-British plan for aid was also documented in detail. The interpretation seems to be critical of the Soviet Union’s actions and its discrepancy in the explanations. It is an interesting case of external researchers writing a Soviet diplomatic history, producing explanations very critical of the Soviet Union, and in turn taking interpretation closer to that of Finland at the time.

### **Hokuōshi - The First general history book on Nordic history in post-war Japan**

Another important work was published in the same year, “Northern European History (*hokuō shi*)<sup>82</sup>” written by Tsunoda Bun’ei, Kougo Eiichi, and Kuwaki Tsutomu. In the

---

*Official Documents.*

<sup>79</sup> Onoe, "1939 Nen no Sovieto Finrando Sensō.", 257.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 258.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 259.

<sup>82</sup> Tsunoda, Bun'ei, Tsutomu Kuwaki, and Eiichi Kōgo. *Hokuōshi*. Sekai Kakkokushi. [History of Northern Europe]. Vol. 6 Yamakawa Shuppan, 1955.

foreword, Tsunoda acknowledges the lack of historians working on Northern Europe or Eastern Europe in Japan, with the exception of Russian history. In fact, as established above, Kuwaki is a researcher in philosophy by profession. Tsunoda is a historian specialised in Ancient history of Asia and Europe through bridging archaeology and history.<sup>83</sup> Kōgo is a journalist who spent the wartime years in Stockholm as a correspondent, just like Saitō.<sup>84</sup> The profiles of the author confirms the limited research landscape in the 1950s on the history of Norden. This work is part of the series 18-book-series “World History (*sekai kakkoku shi*)” dealt with the history of different regions or countries, such as Britain, France, Germany, Americas, etc. Japanese publisher, Yamakawa Shuppan, is well known for its specialisation in history books, including school textbooks, as well as history books for the general public to this day. This series has been in print for at least until 1982, with 7th edition,<sup>85</sup> and with Yamakawa’s specialisation in history books and popularity, this would have been one of the popular books for the general public interested in Nordic history in terms of availability.

In this book, the region *hokuō* includes all of Norden, thus Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland, and Iceland. What is interesting is that this book also includes Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania as part of *hokuō*. In the contemporary use of the word *hokuō* usually refers to a similar area to the Norden. The issue is that by definition *hokuō* is short for *kita yooroppa*,<sup>86</sup> thus the concept sometimes refers to wider geographical areas that include trans-Baltic areas as well as the UK and Ireland. Just as the Nordicity is confused in Europe and Norden itself, Japanese use of the term is problematically complicated.

With regards to the Finnish history, this book offers a very limited account for the period of Finnish history this research is concerned with, especially after the war broke out in November 1939. Because of its ambitious goal of writing history of 8 different trans-Baltic states from the prehistory all the way to the present, i.e. 1955, the structure of the book blurs the continuity of the process as well as relations between the 8 states. In that context, the Winter War marks the start of the section about the World War II in the Nordic region, yet the development leading into its outbreak is not mentioned in detail, and the preceding section on Finland leaves its narrative in 1938 when President Kallio enacted restrictions on

---

<sup>83</sup> The Paleological Society of Japan. "Tsunoda Bun'ei Shi no Shōkai." Accessed May 3, 2019. <https://www.kodaigaku.org/tunodaroom/tunodaroom.html>.

<sup>84</sup> Kōgo, Eiichi. *Yoroppa Tokuhain no Shuki* [Memoir of Correspondent in Europe] Ozaki Shobō, 1948.

<sup>85</sup> Based on the copy available at Helsinki University Library. It is possible that this book was in print as late as 90s, until the updated version by Momose et al. was published in 1998.

<sup>86</sup> The word *hokuō* consists of character *hoku* (north) and *o* (Europe). Thus conceptually it is

IKL<sup>87</sup>. What is even more interesting is the lack of mention about Finland continues throughout the chapter on WWII. The Winter War was used as the breaking point of the ideas for Nordic neutrality and cooperation in the Interwar years, and the subsequent narrative focuses on the Scandinavian states and its experience, such as occupation and efforts to maintain neutrality.

The section on the annexation of the three Baltic States should coincide with the Finnish-Soviet negotiations and Petsamo disputes in *välirauha* period, but reference to Finland is lacking as well. In this book's narrative, the Winter War marks the breakdown of the Nordic unity, but the war ends in the background, and Continuation War is not even mentioned and ends abruptly in 1944 with the Moscow Armistice.

There are several possible explanations to this strange lack of Finland in the picture, like an erased person from the group photo of Norden. The biggest one is the number of important events during the mid-1930s and 1940s in this region, making the already ambitious aim to compile a history of the 8 states near impossible. Another factor that could have contributed to the "Scandinavian bias" of the narrative is the profile of the authors. Based on the foreword of the book, the sections about Nordic experiences of WWII is written by Kōgo, and the following section about Baltic experiences was by Tsunoda. No attribution of the third section in the chapter about Swedish experience is mentioned. Kuwaki, who must have some knowledge on the Finnish experience has not contributed to this chapter. Kōgo was a correspondent for Tokyo Nichinichi Shinbun and was in Stockholm between 1941, right before the launch of the Operation Barbarossa, until 1947.<sup>88</sup> His contribution in this chapter might be the cause of the "Scandinavian bias" of the narrative.

Overall, the first attempt in compiling a book on "Nordic History", or in reality a Trans-Baltic history of 8 states resulted in neglecting Finnish experience of WWII. This book offers interesting use of the Winter War as a "Nordic event". The lack of the description on the Finnish front, and "Scandinavian bias" offers two features of the research landscape in Finland. First is that there was no expert in this topic in the 1950s, and the other is the conception of the Nordic region as a "similar unit of states that could be organised and explained in a book. Regardless of the reasons why this appears in this work, it offers views into how limited it was to write something on the topic in the 1950s.

---

the same as *kita yooroppa* (Northern Europe).

<sup>87</sup> Isanmaallinen Kansan liikke, a right-wing fascist party in 1930s.

<sup>88</sup> Kōgo, *Yoroppa Tokuhain no Shuki*.

## 1960s and 1970s Early Momose, and rising interest

### Momose Hiroshi - Pioneer in the Field

As noted by Sumida, previously, the research on East or Northern Europe was nearly non-existent in Japan, and available materials were written by authors who lived in the Norden or as an extension both as an academic and as a journalist, or written by historians working on Russian history as a chapter in the history of Soviet Union.

In the 1960s, Momose Hiroshi, a historian with a background in international relations history started to publish papers about Finnish-Soviet wars. His career started with Soviet foreign policy history, and gradually shifted the research focus on the “Small powers”. His early papers suggest his interest in the Great powers vs Small Powers in the contemporary international relations, and Finland became his case study for this interest in small powers.

Momose’s first paper about Finland appears in 1961,<sup>89</sup> and subsequent papers between 1961 until 1970 deals with different parts of the history relating to the Winter War. He publishes a monograph, *Tō Hokuō Gaikō shi Josetsu: Soren Finrando Kankei No Kenkyū* (Introduction on Eastern, Northern European Diplomatic History: Research on Soviet-Finnish Relations)<sup>90</sup> on the diplomatic relations leading up to the peace treaty after the Winter War in 1940. The papers by him prior to this book shows the research process towards the contents of the book, thus this research will focus on this monograph, which is still one of the most detailed account on this topic in Japanese to this day. In the same decade, he publishes a paper, detailing the origins of the Continuation War.<sup>91</sup> It supplements the earlier monograph that focused on the prehistory of the Winter War and only made passing mentions in the concluding sections.

This book constitutes the most detailed accounts on the diplomatic history leading up to the end of the Winter War, and probably still the most detailed in Japanese to this day. This book separates the relations in five chapters, the background, the development and the change, negotiations in 1939, and the war.

In his view, the Winter War was a conflict where the policies of the USSR as a “Major

---

<sup>89</sup> Momose, Hiroshi. "Ryō Taisenkan no "Shōkoku" Mondai Ni Kansuru Oboegaki: Scandinavia Shokoku O Jirei Toshite -1-." *Rekishi Hyōron* no. 135 (1961): 13-20.

<sup>90</sup> Momose, Hiroshi. *Tō Hokuō Gaikōshi Josetsu: Soren-Finrando Kankei no Kenkyū* [Introduction on Eastern, Northern European Diplomatic History: Research on Soviet-Finnish Relations]. Tokyo: Fukumurashuppan, 1970.

<sup>91</sup> Momose, Hiroshi. "Finrando no Taiso Kankei 1940-1941 Nen: "Keizoku Sensō" Zenshi Ni Kansuru Oboegaki." *Acta Slavica Iaponica* 16, (1972): 209-249.

power” seeking to secure its Western border from military perspective collided with the policy of Finland, a “Small power” attempting to protect its sovereignty, supported by anti-Russian nationalism among the populace, and the dramatic end to the collision.<sup>92</sup>

The account on the secret negotiation that took place in 1938-1939 with the initiative of Boris Yartsev, emissary of the USSR, bypassing the Minister in Helsinki. In it, the Finnish rejection to the offers the Soviet side proposed, including participation in the militarisation of Åland, are explained based on the government’s attempt to survive vis-a-vis the rising nationalistic sentiment and controlling it. The disbanding of IKL earlier had, in his narrative, a performance aimed at the USSR to control anti-Soviet sentiments.<sup>93</sup> The more official negotiations after the invasion of Poland in 1939 is described in a similar manner. The overall process that leads to the war in his narrative is the long-term conflict between Finland and the USSR, and mutual distrust and misunderstanding between the two parties lead to confrontation in November 1939. Although it is explained as a necessity for pioneering work to provide the context of the matter, the extensive coverage of the process towards independence and the diplomatic history of independent Finland suggests his emphasis and conceptualisation of the origins of the Winter War.

Momose’s monograph primarily dealt with the outbreak of the Winter War, but mentions about Continuation War was only mentioned as an epilogue to the Winter War. As somewhat of a supplement to the limit, he published a 40-page paper “Finrando no Taiso Kankei 1940-1941 Nen: "Keizoku Sensō" Zenshi Ni Kansuru Oboegaki” in 1972.<sup>94</sup> By this point, contributions from H. P. Crosby and A. F. Upton has been published, and their views that challenged Finnish views are debated, as described earlier. This paper presents those views and the debate, just after it became available.

Key elements of the paper are possibly the first presentation of the debate surrounding the origins of the Continuation War in Japanese. He describes both the research landscape of the issues surrounding the origins of the war, and how different researchers presented the Finnish participation to WWII. The challenges made by Anglophone researchers are presented in detail and based on their contributions, he draws out his version of the narrative during the *välirauha* period. His interpretation is, as with his earlier monograph on the origins of the Winter War, has a long-term scope. Based on his diplomatic history interest, the

---

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., 303.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., 167.

<sup>94</sup> Momose, Hiroshi. "Finrando no Taiso Kankei 1940-1941 Nen: "Keizoku Sensō" Zenshi Ni Kansuru Oboegaki." *Acta Slavica Iaponica* 16, (1972): 209-249.

origins of the Continuation War is described as a process where Finland, after failing to secure its independence through neutrality, shifted its foreign policy based on balancing between major powers. Such balancing orientation automatically leads to limited cooperation with Germany and subsequent chaotic war and reliance on Germany. Though he points out, quoting Crosby's question,<sup>95</sup> that war with the Soviet Union was almost inevitable at this point, and the issue originates in the wider policy of the Soviet Union towards Finland, rather than short-term events during the *välirauha* period.

The interesting spatial concept Momose uses is the idea of "Eastern-Northern Europe", indicating Finland as part of both Northern and Eastern Europe. While he acknowledges the peculiarity in understanding the region in such a way, he mentions the aim of his monograph to contextualise the development in Finland during 1930s and presenting the similarities with the two regions with regards to its historical development and issues they had to face.<sup>96</sup> This regional concept has roots in his wider interest in the diplomacy of the small state, and the Eastern and Northern Europe was the inclusive region of the constellation of small states in the interwar period. From his interest and perspective, the regional conceptualisation is logical.

Overall, the contribution from Momose resonates best with the Anglophone historians, and his explanations on the Finnish participation to WWII has long-term, and wider geographical scope in explaining the conflict.

### **Shimizu Ryōzō - Overview by International Legal Historian**

Another work published in this period deals with Finnish diplomatic history throughout its independence. The article by Shimizu<sup>97</sup> describes the diplomatic history between Finland and the Soviet Union since 1917 when Finland declared independence, until the time of writing in the early 1970s. This paper has been published after Momose's ground-breaking work and summarises the historical development of the diplomatic relations between the two states. Shimizu himself seems to be legal historian, interested in international law and has

---

<sup>95</sup> Crosby, Hans Peter. *Suomen Valinta 1941*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä, 1967, 23, 232-237.

<sup>96</sup> Momose, Hiroshi. *Tō Hokuō Gaikōshi Josetsu: Soren-Finrando Kankei no Kenkyū* [Introduction on Eastern, Northern European Diplomatic History: Research on Soviet-Finnish Relations], 339.

<sup>97</sup> Ryōzō Shimizu. "Finrando Gaikōshi Shō." *Kokushikan Daigaku Seikei Ronsō* no. 18 (1973): 75-108.



received his doctorate in 1980 in that topic.<sup>98</sup>

Shimizu's narrative on the Finnish diplomatic history starts with the independence in 1917, but he identifies strong continuity in the Finnish-Russian relations under Empire and Finnish-Soviet relations after the Russian revolution. He comments the continuity as "a long series of wars, or history of public hostility between the two",<sup>99</sup> indicating his long-term perspective on the origins of the conflict.

Throughout the paper, Finland is portrayed as the victim of the great power on several occasions. In his version of the Winter War's outbreak, there are several features worth noting. First, the arms cession proposals in the pre-war negotiations are criticised as obsolete. According to the unnamed military expert in Finland, the security of Leningrad could be achieved by just securing the southern coast of the Gulf of Finland and without the northern coast in Finland.<sup>100</sup> Second, he highlights the lack of declaration of war from the Soviet side, on November 30th, and mentions this use of force as the first occasion where the Soviet Union utilised the military option to achieve political goals.<sup>101</sup> The resistance of the Finnish army in the initial stages of the war is highlighted as a miracle.<sup>102</sup>

His narrative of the Continuation War is also similar to the Finnish line of explanation at the time in that it accepts separate war thesis to a large extent. The subchapter title "Unstable peace and second Soviet-Finnish War" already suggests the notion of *välirauha* in the argument, and in turn supports the argument of "continuation". The pro-German attitude on the Finnish side is explained as an inevitable result from the "multiple changes in Soviet attitudes"<sup>103</sup> that led Finland to seek closer cooperation with Nazi Germany. However, he also mentions German presence in the Finnish Lapland, and Luftwaffe's flight path to Hanko and Leningrad being "as if they took off from Finnish airbases"<sup>104</sup> that led the Soviet Union

---

<sup>98</sup> Shimizu, Ryōzō. "Kokusai Hō Ni Okeru Dentō to Kakushin." Kokushikan University, 1980.

<sup>99</sup> Ryōzō, "Finrando Gaikōshi Shō.", 76.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., 94.

Momose's later work has reference for such view. Claimed to be from Hugo Österman, Finnish Army Commander. See Momose, Hiroshi. "Fuyusensō Gen'Inron Saikō." *The Study of the International Relations* 22, (1995a): 13-32.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., p. 96.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid.

Use of words like "the results of the Finnish army surprised the world" and "remarkable resistance"

<sup>103</sup> Ibid., 102-103.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., 104.

He repeats conditional statements, suggesting attempts to leave the statement ambiguous.

to start an offensive against Finland on June 1941, citing Eskelinen's work.<sup>105</sup> The outbreak is explained so that the Soviet Union understood these set of "as if" it was legitimate reasons to launch an attack on Finland, thereby giving Finland *causus belli* to defend itself.

Though the separate war thesis is supported here, the supporting argument for the "separated nature" is somewhat unique. Together with the reluctance on Finnish behalf to participate in the offensive against Leningrad and Murmansk railway, he uses the Finnish empathy towards, and their attempts to save the Jewish population in Finland from Nazi extermination policy, indicating Finnish knowledge on what happened in Norway and Estonia.<sup>106</sup> He goes on to say that Finland successfully protected the Jewish population by granting them citizenship, and the Jewish soldiers in the Finnish army "irritated the Germans".<sup>107</sup> This is a clear sign of using Finnish line of argument to distance the "Continuation War" from the concurrent German offensive, but cooperation is hinted through the use of "as if", different from Finnish traditional lines, usually denying cooperation at all.

So far as this research could find, Shimizu's account is the first work which supports the separate war thesis through not only the lack of military cooperation but the difference in policies towards the Jewish population. Though by this point, notable works on Jewish status in Finland was published has not been published at the point of writing, at least in English.<sup>108</sup> The narrative seems to be similar in line with Rautkallio's work, or rather nationalistic views in Finland on the matter prior to the scrutiny in 1979,<sup>109</sup> though mentions of "those eight" deported Jews are lacking from Shimizu's brief mention about the matter.

In any case, Shimizu's paper is characterised by very strong effects of nationalistic narratives from Finland, notably the separate war debate, but more strikingly the use of Holocaust, or Finnish resistance towards it in wartime Finland, to characterise Finland as the "hero" with regards to the Holocaust.

---

<sup>105</sup> Eskelinen, Heikki. "Independence and After." In *Finland: Creation and Construction*, edited by Kallas, Hillar and Sylvie Nickels, 40-60. London: Allen and Unwin, 1968.

<sup>106</sup> Ryōzō, "Finrando Gaikōshi Shō.", 104-105.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 104.

<sup>108</sup> Holmila, Antero. "Varieties of Silence: Collective Memory of the Holocaust in Finland." In *Finland in World War II: History, Memory, Interpretations*, edited by Kinnunen, Tiina and Ville Kivimäki, 526-560. Leiden: BRILL, 2011.

So far as Holmila's analysis go, the 1960s and 1970s were starting point of discourse about Finnish participation in Holocaust, marked by Elina Sana's work in 1979, which is after this paper was published.

<sup>109</sup> The "patriotic framework" Holmila mentions.

## 1980s - Rise in topic, pioneer continues

### Hokuō Gendaishi - Filling the Gap

Yamakawa Shuppan is, as mentioned, one of the major publishers in Japan specialising in history related books and school textbooks. On top of the World History series, Yamakawa published another series titled *Sekai Gendaishi* (World Contemporary History), and Nordic History had another volume dedicated in the series and was authored by Momose, who at this point has published his monograph on the Winter War.

The volume on the Nordics, under the title Hokuo Gendaishi (Nordic Contemporary History), was published in 1981<sup>110</sup> and deals mostly on 19th and 20th Century history in the region. In this volume, the scope is narrower than the previous volume by Sumida in terms of the chronology, but also the geographic region, as Momose's work deals only with five Nordic states, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Iceland, and Finland.

This book's general aim is to provide chronology and events of the Nordic history, and thus thorough analysis on specific questions are not discussed in detail, and author's position is less visible in such work. But the examples and chronology utilised in the narrative offer enough to work with.

With regards to the Winter War, the emphasis is on the course of events. However, the ways some examples are presented shows similar views to his previous monograph. The use of conflict between Paasikivi and Mannerheim's "realist" view based on security-based intentions of the Soviet Union, and hardliners in the government, notably Foreign Minister Erkko, supported by general anti-Soviet sentiments of the populace, shows the intransigent attitude of the government.<sup>111</sup> The failure of the 1939 negotiation is characterised by the conflict between such hard-line attitude and the Soviet Union's security-based demands. These are all in line with his monograph published earlier.

The prelude to the Continuation War is more detailed. At the beginning of his chronology of post-Winter War Finland, he mentions the Soviet policy towards the Nordic defence cooperation that squeezed on Finland for security assurance might have had adverse effects for the Soviet Union.<sup>112</sup> He draws out the strong pressure from the Soviet Union increased threat perception for the Finns, and the political elites changed orientation towards Nazi

---

<sup>110</sup> Momose, Hiroshi. *Hokuō Gendaishi*. Sekai Gendaishi. [Contemporary History of Northern Europe]. Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppan, 1980.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., 249.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., 266.

Germany. Petsamo dispute, granting transit rights to the Germany military stationed in Northern Norway, and operational cooperation for the Operation Barbarossa are mentioned as the steps of this change.<sup>113</sup>

The “separate war” argument is also clearly explained, though his narrative focuses on why such views become dominant, rather than its validity. The attempts from Finland to present that case are explained using reluctance towards participating in certain offensives that Germany wanted.<sup>114</sup>

Overall, the events and the narrative is, as expected, similar to his earlier works. This book might be the first book where details of Finnish-German cooperation, published by Krosby and Upton, has been published in Japan in an accessible format for a general readership.

### **Takeda Tatsuo - Diplomat Writing Nordic History**

In the 1950s, the contributors in this field consisted of scholars and journalists who spend their time in the Norden, such as Saitō, Kuwaki, and Kōgo. Momose’s contribution is also rooted in his first research visit to Finland in 1960s, and others follow a similar way. Thus it is natural to have others who spent their time in the Norden to publish books on Nordic history.

Takeda Tatsuo is a diplomat who started his career in 1954 as a young diplomat and studied at Stockholm University to become an expert in Scandinavia in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He served at embassies in Stockholm and Copenhagen and later taught at several universities in Japan. Thus he is quite fluent in Swedish and uses sources written in Swedish, and other Scandinavian languages on top of English and Japanese sources.

*Tatakau Hokuo: Kosen ka, Churitsu ka, Teiko ka, Fukuju ka* (Norden Fights: Resistance, Neutrality, or Obedience) is the first book on the Nordic history from Takeda, and was published in 1981.<sup>115</sup> It focused on the different Nordic experience of World War II, though the earlier period is explained in some detail to supplement the focus.

Already from the title, as well as the chapter title, there is a clear sign of emotional narrative being used. The chapter title for Finland comes first, and titled “Finland -Tragic Small State-”, suggesting the direction of the narrative. The introduction strengthens the idea

---

<sup>113</sup> Ibid., 268-269.

<sup>114</sup> Ibid., 281-282.

<sup>115</sup> Takeda, Tatsuo. *Tatakau Hokuō: Kōsenka, Chūritsu Ka, Fukujū Ka* [Norden Fights:

of emotional narrative. The Finnish experience is described as being drawn into two wars against the Soviet Union,<sup>116</sup> and for the latter part of the war, being dragged into German side after being pressured by two great powers.<sup>117</sup> This description seems to suggest forms of driftwood theory that was being rejected around this time in Finland with contributions from Upton and Krosby. The notions of victimhood among the Norden is very strong in his presentation of the Nordic 4<sup>118</sup> and the general narrative is to portray Norden as a group of victims pressured and invaded by great powers.

He acknowledges the separate war thesis, using the direct translation of the term, and suggests his version of interpretation regarding the nature of Finnish-German cooperation prior to the Continuation War. He presents details of the pre-war cooperation of Finnish and German military in operational planning, notably the meetings between General Heinrichs and Colonel Buschenhagen.<sup>119</sup> His explanation focuses more on the Finnish reluctance in participating the German operations and follows it with the *ajopuuteoria*-like frame where Finland had not many options left, alone between two great powers.

Even so, he proposes that unlike the Winter War, Finland could avoid being involved in the Continuation War, even though there was a strong effort from the Soviet Union to keep her in their sphere of influence. His conclusion is that Finland had aspirations to regain the territory lost after 1940, and such sentiment amalgamated itself with the long-standing pro-German attitudes among the population, leading her into deeper cooperation with Nazi Germany. His personal view is clearly stated as “I personally agree with the Finnish explanation that the second Finnish- Soviet war was not “cooperative war”<sup>120</sup> with Germany, and accepts so-called “Separate war” thesis. However, in effect, Finland supported Germany’s war effort, thus understands it as “compound war”.<sup>121</sup> In other words, his attitude is two-fold, with *de jure* nature and *de facto* nature of the war. Later in the text, he reminds the reader that it was the Soviet Union who first broke ties with Finland, and puts the blame on the expansion of long-standing distrust between the two states, clearly noting the long

---

Resistance, Neutrality or Obidience] Takagishobō, 1981.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid., 2..

<sup>117</sup> Ibid.

<sup>118</sup> This work only includes Denmark, Norway, Finland and Sweden as the main focus, with supplement on the Baltics. Iceland is missing from his narrative.

<sup>119</sup> Clearly drawing on Krosby’s contribution, which he cites in his bibliography. The work does not contain footnotes or direct references.

<sup>120</sup> Takeda, *Tatakau Hokuō: Kōsenka, Chūritsu Ka, Fukujū Ka*, 58

<sup>121</sup> Ibid.

term origins of the conflict.<sup>122</sup>

### **Umemoto Hiroshi - Military Historian and Miracle of the Winter War**

Another first in this period was the works focused on the military history of Finnish WWII in Japan. As noted by contemporary Finnish authors, the Winter War and the Continuation War attracted many military historians from abroad. Japan was no exception, and 1980s saw signs of such interest, as far as published books are concerned.

The work *Secchu no Kiseki* (Miracle in the Snow, Ihme Lumessa, as given by the author) by Umemoto Hiroshi is a non-fiction book about the Winter War, especially focusing on the “miracle”.<sup>123</sup> Although this is not an academic book per se, the contribution by Umemoto opens new lines of interest in this period of Finnish history. The work is compiled with personal accounts of Finnish soldiers, and the narrative is focused on the front-lines, rather than the politics.

As the title suggests, the book is heavily focused on the success of the Finnish Army in withstanding the numerically stronger Soviet Army, and how valiant the soldiers were in the battlefield, told using memoirs and records of the soldiers. Yet Umemoto explains the political situation in enough detail to contextualise the conflict.

What is striking is the fact that he starts his narrative from the Russo-Japanese War through the eyes of Mannerheim. He even goes on to state that “from this point [when Mannerheim returned to Finland after Russian revolution], General Mannerheim’s career and fate became synonymous to the history and the fate of Finland”.<sup>124</sup> After a brief account on the Helsinki’s first air raid on 30 November 1939, he swiftly moves to explain the brief history of the Finnish Civil War, and following the Finnish intervention into Estonian War of Independence. What is interesting is that he is using the events in 1918, and the Soviet interpretations of the Civil War and the Winter War to illustrate the threat perception of both Finland and the Soviet Union. His narrative emphasises the development since the Finnish independence as the cause of the escalating conflict, especially the mutual distrust between the two states. Both the security concerns and fears towards foreign powers taking control of Finland, as well as the reasons behind the Finnish intransigent attitude. The criticism towards such hard-line stance, as well as optimism among the Finnish government, is also included.

---

<sup>122</sup> Ibid., 63.

<sup>123</sup> Umemoto, Hiroshi. *Secchū no Kiseki* [Miracles in the Snow] Dainipponkaiga, 1989.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid., 8. Text within [ ] added by author of this paper.

In explaining the Mainila incident, and initial attack, he presents the case that the incident could not have been launched from the Finnish side and that detailed plans for attacking Finland existed among the Red Army as early as 1927, based on captured documents,<sup>125</sup> and its launch materialised in summer of 1939.

Umemoto uses *fuyu sensō* for much of the work but also uses the first *so fin sensō* and even the Finnish *talvisota* in transliteration, which is somewhat rare amongst other sources.

Although the emphasis of the “miracle” that Finland could achieve, this work does its best to provide stories from both sides. The emphasis on the long-term issue between Finland and the Soviet Union is drawn in a concise, but clear manner.

## 1990s - Significant Increase

### Matti Klinge - First translation and Branding Effort

Translation of the Finnish works has been close to non-existent in Japan, especially the books on history. Within the scope of this research, the translation of the book *Katsaus Suomen Historiaan*, under the title, *Finrando Shōshi*<sup>126</sup> is the first occurrence of Finnish history text of any kind was made available in Japanese. As the pioneer of the field, Momose Hiroshi translated the book and was published in 1990.

Content-wise, it is equivalent of the English version the author of this research had access to, and has no added contents for the Japanese audiences. What is interesting is the publisher of the book was the Embassy of Finland in Japan. With the wide language selection of this book available, it seems that it is part of the publicity project from the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs to prepare material about Finnish history.

### Takeda Tatsuo - Accessible History of Norden, Nationalistic Turn?

In the 1990s, Takeda published two works on the diplomatic history of the Norden.<sup>127</sup> First was a shinsho format book on the history of Norden, but unlike his earlier work, his work incorporates all Nordic 5, including Iceland this time. The work attempts to draw out

---

<sup>125</sup> Ibid., 19.

<sup>126</sup> Klinge, Matti. *Finrando Shōshi* [Brief History of Finland]. Translated by Momose, Hiroshi. Japanese 2nd ed. 1990.

<sup>127</sup> Takeda, Tatsuo. *Monogatari Hokuō no Rekishi: Moderu Kokka no Keisei* [Tale of Nordic History: Formation of the Model State]. Vol. 1131 Chūō Kōronsha, 1993.

the diplomatic history of the region throughout the history, starting from Viking era all the way to the end of the Cold War, which is very ambitious given that the book is only about 300 pages long in a small paperback. The work is, as commented by Takeda himself, intended to give general readers some idea about the synopsis of the Nordic history and how it unfolded. Thus this book has a very limited account on the period of Finnish history this research is interested in.

As with any author, the narratives and examples in the work are similar to his earlier work, and for this case, because of the wider scope, it is scaled down version of the earlier one with regards to the WWII era narrative, though there are some features to note. The biggest is the use of the term “Hundred-Day War” to refer to the Winter War. Up until this point, the work has not been used in other works available in Japan, and rarely used on non-Japanese materials either.<sup>128</sup> Though Takeda uses it as an alternative name for the Winter War, it is of interest to note as he uses not only “Soviet Finnish War”,<sup>129</sup> the dominant name in Japan, the Winter War, the Finnish official name, and “hundred-day war” which is very uncommon. Because of the nature of this work, the direct reference to where the term came from is unavailable. Because of some other events of the similar name elsewhere in European history, it is unlikely to see such term come up to refer to the war between Finland and the Soviet Union between 1939 and 1940.

Second work was the more extensive book on the diplomatic history of Norden, but focused more on World War II, just like his earlier work.<sup>130</sup> However, the focus is slightly different in that this work in 1998 is focused on Nordic history to explain the situations and development surrounding neutral Sweden, as clearly stated in the introduction. Thus the account on Finland, Iceland, Denmark, and Norway is relatively short compared to that of Sweden.

Again, this work is generally the same as what he published in 1981, but the striking difference is the strength of the Finnish narrative in explaining the origins of the Continuation

---

<sup>128</sup> The term is used elsewhere, so far as limited search has provided. Prior to this book, there is one use by Rintala, Marvin. *Four Finns: Political Profiles*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

In contemporary source, Sander, Gordon F. *The Hundred Day Winter War: Finland's Gallant Stand Against the Soviet Army*. Modern War Studies. 2013. also uses the term, but the usage is limited compared to other terms.

<sup>129</sup> Though in this work, the actual wording is first and second of *taiso sensō*, literally “war against Soviet Union”, though synonymous enough.

<sup>130</sup> Takeda, Tatsuo. *Hokuō no Gaikō: Tatakau Shōkoku no Sōkoku to Genjitsu* [Diplomacy of the Norden: Conflicts and Realities of the Fighting Small Powers] Tokai Daigaku



War. Though his earlier work also had some elements of it, but balancing seems to be less pronounced in this work.

The way this work presents the process leading up to the outbreak in June 1941 is somewhat less clear about the interpretation than his work. In this narrative, the closer cooperation with Germany in the *välirauha* period is explained through German exploitation of the pressure from the Soviet Union towards Finland, specifically the threat towards war, and isolated trade relation. Such a move connected itself to the Finnish domestic sentiment to regain the lost territories. The military contacts between Finland and Germany in early 1941, as well as closer diplomatic relations, are all signs of such moves.

The Finnish position regarding the war, that it is a “separate war” that is also a “continuation of the Winter War” and defensive in nature, is clearly presented.<sup>131</sup> Though he presents the issues with the “defensive” part of the argument, he states that Finland and Germany had no secret agreement for the offensive against the Soviet Union and that the unique Finnish position could not be understood by the allied forces.<sup>132</sup> In all of this part, Wuorinen’s work in 1965 is quoted. He adds “though such comments are numerous, the fact that they collaborated in the offensive against the Soviet Union stays true, nevertheless”<sup>133</sup> which could be interpreted as an attempt for balancing the view.

In this section, he utilises works from Wuorinen<sup>134</sup> and Puntila’s work,<sup>135</sup> both of which strongly reflects Finnish interpretations of the matter. Wuorinen has been analysed earlier and there is no doubt he held views closer to that of Finnish historians at the time. The translation of Korhonen’s work, as well as his own work on the matter, proves the case. Puntila was close to the politicians, and was serving as secretary to the Prime Minister Ryti and Rangell, and was involved in State Information Agency responsible for censorship and propaganda during the Continuation War.<sup>136</sup> All of these facts explain the very strong Finnish narrative based on the quotes.

With regards to the origins of the Winter War, it isn’t as clear as it was for the

---

Shuppankai, 1998.

<sup>131</sup> Ibid., 121.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid.

<sup>134</sup> Wuorinen, John H. *A History of Finland*. New York: Published for American-Scandinavian Foundation by Columbia University Press, 1965.

<sup>135</sup> Puntila, Lauri Aadolf. *The Political History of Finland 1809-1966*. Helsinki: Otava, 1974.

<sup>136</sup> Eskola, Seikko. "Puntila, Lauri Aadolf (1907 - 1988)." Accessed April 30, 2019. <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:sks-kbg-004802>. 2019. <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:sks-kbg-004802>.

Continuation War. He clearly mentions the hard-line attitude of the government at the time as well as Paasikivi and Mannerheim's security-oriented interpretations are presented. The development, as well as legacies of the Winter War in this work, emphasises the heroic resistance of Finland against the Soviet Union on several occasions. The use of the term "Hundred Day War" is also present in this work, similar to his work in 1993.

Overall, this work offers an interesting case of writing general Nordic history to explain Swedish neutrality. However, the references he has used carries over the Finnish views from the immediate post-war decades, and the challenges made in the 1970s seems to be lacking from his narrative. Of course, the Finnish history is not necessarily a primary focus, but it nevertheless offers a case of Finnish history narratives in Japan carrying over Finnish narratives in bulk.

### **Momose Hiroshi- Continuous Update**

Momose's continued research on the topic can be observed through numbers of papers and books. Among them are several updates to his earlier monograph, especially to include newly available sources. The paper *Fuyusenso Gen'inron Saiko* (Rethinking Origins of the Winter War)<sup>137</sup> is one example of such papers.

By this time, Finnish involvement in the Mainila incident, as claimed by the Soviet Union at the time, is rejected, which is in line with his conclusions from earlier, but this work incorporates the Finnish research results that rejected the Soviet claim in 1939.

Likewise, his explanation of the conflict within the government on whether concessions to the Soviet Union should be made. As seen in Anderson, there was a debate on placing blame on the hardliners in the government, notably Eljas Erkko, for the escalation of tensions in pre-war negotiations.<sup>138</sup> With the partial opening of Soviet documents, his paper clarifies the Erkko's position in that he also had ideas for concessions, resembling that of Mannerheim and Paasikivi. Others in the government, like Inkilä, the secretary to the Prime Minister Cajander, had similar ideas. Momose draws out a clearer picture of the Cajander government as a government with a lack of domestic leadership in a deadlock between the domestic

---

<sup>137</sup> Momose, Hiroshi. "Fuyusenō Gen'Inron Saikō." *The Study of the International Relations* 22, (1995): 13-32. <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/110000439254/>.

<sup>138</sup> Anderson, Albin T. "Origins of the Winter War: A Study of Russo-Finnish Diplomacy." *World Politics* 6, no. 2 (1954): 169-189.

public opinion towards nationalism, and worsening international situations.<sup>139</sup>

This paper is one of the many papers by Momose that shows his continuous work on updating his work from the 1970s, in response to more sources being available and newer research being published.

### **Hokuōshi - Updated Edition, Expanded Authors**

The first *Hokuōshi* published in 1955 by Yamakawa Shuppan was, as mentioned, one of the earliest attempts to write a book on this topic in post-war Japan.<sup>140</sup> The book suffered from lack of right expertise to compile such a book at that time and left a lot to be desired, especially about the WWII section. Some of the issues, especially the limited account on WWII were remedied by Momose's earlier contribution on the contemporary Nordic history from the same publisher, but the limited account, scope of writing general history of 8 states, and other issues needed new contribution.

Yamakawa published a new edition of their series on world history in the 1990s, and the volume on Nordic history was published in 1998.<sup>141</sup> The work was edited by Momose, Murai Makoto, who is a historian working on Danish history, and Kumai Satoshi, Viking history expert, with few more contributors in different fields, both region and time period, including Matti Klinge. The parts that are relevant to this research is written solely by Momose.

As with his earlier works, his interpretation of the Winter War is presented as a conflict that occurred with long-term distrust between the two. The Soviet side feared the history of the pro-German attitude of Finland, such as the offensive into the East Karelia after the Civil War, also known as the *Heimosota*, and reliance on the German military in the Civil War by the Whites. The fear was exacerbated by the growing nationalism in Finland. Faced with the growing threat of German military build-up, Soviet demands were made based on the security concern. However, such urgency of the Soviet side was not understood in Finland, and the government could not accept territorial demands that undermine neutrality and sovereignty, especially because the Cajander government was struggling to manage growing nationalistic sentiment.<sup>142</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> Momose, Hiroshi. "Fuyusensō Gen'Inron Saikō.", 21.

<sup>140</sup> Tsunoda, Bun'ei, Tsutomu Kuwaki, and Eiichi Kōgo. *Hokuōshi*. Sekai Kakkokushi. [History of Northern Europe].

<sup>141</sup> Momose, Hiroshi, Satoru Kumano, and Makoto Murai. *Hokuōshi* [History of Northern Europe]. new ed. Vol. 21 Yamakawa Shuppan Sha, 1998.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*, 341-342.

The explanation of the Continuation War is very much based on his earlier paper on the matter. He acknowledges the Finnish-German cooperation, especially transit rights. With regards to the operational cooperation between Finland and Germany, it is clearly mentioned as a result of recent research, and the driftwood theory has been rejected.<sup>143</sup> The “separate war” and associated “regaining lost territory” explanation is also clearly rejected in this work, through the fact that Finnish military invaded East Karelia, as well as indirectly supporting siege of Leningrad by occupying much of the Russian Karelian region. The latter half of explanation is somewhat new, which did not appear in his earlier works in the 1970s.

The interesting thing is that the terms used in this work have slightly changed from the earlier work. Momose’s work all used terms based on Finnish, such as *fuyu sensō* and *keizoku sensō*, the Winter War and the Continuation War, respectively. However, because the dominant terms in Japan were the First and the Second of the *so-fin sensō*, Soviet-Finnish War, his works also referred to that name as well, mentioning the different usage of the name in Japan and abroad. In this work in 1998, such reference is not made at all, and the Japanese translation of the Finnish terms are used throughout the section.

This might be due to the increased knowledge and research in Japan on this topic. The foreword of this work mentions Sumida’s earlier volume from Yamakawa, and its limitation rooted in the lack of researchers in Japan on the Nordic History. Editors mention despite difficulty with language and material acquisition, the research on Nordic history has seen some progress, forming research landscape that includes experts in each of the Nordics, covering most of the time period. The list of 14 contributors to this work, as well as academic society specialising in Nordic and Baltic history shows such increase.<sup>144</sup>

### **Umemoto Hiroshi - The Second Miracle in Karelia**

Umemoto, who published another volume on the Continuation War in 1999. Titled *Ryūketsu no Natsu* (Bloody Summer, *Verinen Kesä* as given by the author),<sup>145</sup> this volume deals with the June 1944 offensive in Karelian front. Again, this work is in a similar style to his earlier work and deals with front line soldiers and the development of the conflict during the war.

Umemoto has been working on the Finnish military history since his first book. He

---

<sup>143</sup> Ibid., 354.

<sup>144</sup> Association of Balto-Scandinavian Studies, which was formed in 1982. Also mentioned in Momose. *Hokuō Gendaishi*.

translated memoirs from Finnish fighter pilots, namely Juutilainen,<sup>146</sup> Luukkanen<sup>147</sup> as well as works by military historian Keskinen<sup>148</sup> between 1989 and 2000.

Although the main topic of this book is about the offensive in 1944, the outbreak, as well as the process leading up to the war, is explained in a concise manner. His narrative of the *välirauha* period describes how Finland had limited choice, confronted by increased demands from the USSR and offers from Germany. At the same time, the long-term pro-German attitude dating back to the Civil War, as well as the strong hostility towards Russia and aspirations to take back the lost territory is emphasised as the motives behind cooperation with Germany.<sup>149</sup> As a work focused on military history, the examples are drawn from military cooperation for the most part. The Waffen-SS volunteers from Finland is compared with the Finnish Jaeger battalion of the Prussian Army, and generous arms trade from Germany using captured equipment from occupied areas are mentioned.<sup>150</sup>

The “separate war” attitude of the wartime Finnish government is clearly mentioned, but counter-examples are included in his narrative, and in effect, the “separate war” explanation is largely rejected. The Finnish prior knowledge of the German offensive, prior German presence in Finland, as well as the roles Finnish airbases took part in the initial stage of the offensive, are all mentioned, presenting a case against the “separate war” views.<sup>151</sup>

The notions of “regaining lost territory” is also challenged. In the very first chapter of the historical narrative provides how the occupation of Petrozavodsk, or Äänislinna under Finnish occupation, was a clear contradiction with the official line. He explains that by crossing the old border of 1939 into East Karelia, was driven by opportunistic aims of the right wing, together with military considerations to gain a buffer zone to hold the old border.<sup>152</sup> The irredentist aims to incorporate whole Finnic population into Greater Finland is also mentioned.<sup>153</sup>

---

<sup>145</sup> Umemoto, Hiroshi. *Ryūketsu no Natsu* [Bloody Summer] Dainippon Kaiga, 1999.

<sup>146</sup> Juutilainen, Ilmari. *Finrando Kūgun Sentōkitai* [Finnish Air Force Fighter Squadron]. Translated by Umemoto, Hiroshi. Tokyo: Dainippon Kaiga, 1997.

<sup>147</sup> Luukanen, Eino Antero. *Finrando Jōkū no Sentōki* [Fighters Above Finland]. Translated by Umemoto, Hiroshi Dainippon Kaiga, 1999.

<sup>148</sup> Stenman, Kari and Kalevi Keskinen. *Niji Taisen no Finrando Kūgun Ēsu* [Aces of Finland in World War Two]. Translated by Umemoto, Hiroshi and Watanabe Yōji. Vol. Sekai no Sentōki Ēsu 4 Dainippon Kaiga, 2000.

<sup>149</sup> Umemoto, *Ryūketsu no Natsu*, 9.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid. 9 and 11.

<sup>152</sup> Ibid., 7.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid., 13.

As with his earlier work, the emphasis on the “miracle” is present in this work. The summer 1944 offensive is considered as “the return of the miracle of the Winter War”<sup>154</sup> and the miracle brought was defending its independence, rare experience only shared by the U.K. at the heavy cost.<sup>155</sup> The cost is justified through comparing the fate of Finland and that of the three Baltic States, emphasising the relatively lighter civilian casualties.<sup>156</sup>

The work provides concise, yet detailed enough explanations of the process which the Continuation War took place. As with his earlier work, the heroism of the Finnish army is emphasised, but the war is not glorified in a sense that the work also identifies limitations of the Finnish nationalistic explanations.

## 2000s and 2010s Continuation and New Generations

### Saiki Nobuo - Military Historian

As mentioned, military history is another field of interest from Japan. Umemoto has contributed with his translations and own work, but there are more authors who were interested in military history, and they contributed significantly on the specialised magazines on the topic. With visits to military museums and former frontlines in Europe, the articles of such visits were published in magazines, expanding the visibility of the Finnish military and its history to the specialised audience.

Saiki Nobuo is one of them and continues to be the specialist in the military aspect of Finnish history. The recent rise in interest among fans of Japanese pop culture is largely supported by his career and expertise in this topic.

He published a book *Finrando gun Nyūmon* (Introduction to Finnish Military) in 2007.<sup>157</sup> In the same year, another author Nakayama has published another work, focusing on the air battles in Finland.<sup>158</sup> The interest in the air battles in Norden or practically Finland can be

---

<sup>154</sup> Ibid., 404.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid., 405.

<sup>156</sup> Ibid.

<sup>157</sup> Saiki, Nobuo. *Finrando Gun Nyūmon: Kyokuhoku no Senjo O Seishita Jojishi (Karewara) no Yusha Tachi* [Introduction to the Finnish Army: The Heroes of Kalevala Who Ruled the Battlefield of the North]. Vol. 23 Ikarosushuppan, 2007.

<sup>158</sup> Nakayama, Masahiro. *Hokuō Kūsenshi: Naze Finrando Kūgun Wa Taikoku Soren Kūgun Ni Kateta Noka* [History of Air Battles in Northern Europe: Why the Finnish Air Force Could Win Against the Soviet Air Force]. Vol. 001 Hobby Japan, 2017.

The volume was republished as a new edition in 2017, original was published in 2007 under the same title.

seen prior to Nakayama's work. In the late 90s, Umemoto has translated many memoirs and research on Finnish Air Force, including memoirs from Finnish ace pilot, Juutilainen. This work is interesting in that it frames itself as a Nordic history of air battles, yet its narrative primarily focuses on Finland. The 2000s can be characterised by the increased interest in the military aspect of the war.

Saiki's work acts as an introductory volume into the military aspect of the wars in Finland in 1939 and 1944. Unlike the earlier works by Umemoto, which focused on certain phases of the Winter War and the Continuation War respectively, the scope is wider and with more chronological development at the diplomatic level, while focusing on frontlines as well. The first half of the book is dedicated to the explanation of the history behind the Finnish military, with emphasis on the period between 1939 and 1944.

Perhaps due to the work's focus, a substantial amount of the account about the pre-Winter War development is written with Mannerheim on the spotlight. The intransigent responses of the Finnish government in 1939 negotiation is mentioned, and its "sheer absurdly unrealistic and optimistic views"<sup>159</sup> on the government's behalf repeatedly in the section before November 1939. His narrative emphasizes the conflict between the government's optimism and Mannerheim's pessimism and understanding of the imminent war. The demands from the Soviet was, in his interpretation, selfish and unreasonable one to be made for a neighbour without invasive intent.<sup>160</sup>

The long-term distrust between Finland and the Soviet Union, as well as the wider European situation in later 1930s, is also very clearly explained. What his work differs slightly is the examples used to contextualise the threat perception of the Soviet Union. As established, other authors like Saitō and Momose explains Soviet's fear through the German intervention, requested by the White government during the Finnish Civil War, and in connection to such interpretation, the "foreign power" in Molotov's speech in 1940 is understood as Germany. Saiki draws the same picture but instead uses the fact that Finland was cooperative towards the British intervention into the Russian Civil War,<sup>161</sup> which led to Soviet's fear towards Finland becoming a springboard for the Western powers to intervene.

Likewise, the rising nationalism in Finland at the time, like AKS and IKL, was not used either. Instead, the military buildup of Finland, as well as increased defence and a closer

---

<sup>159</sup> Saiki. *Finrando Gun Nyumon: Kyokuhoku no Senjo O Seishita Jojishi (Karewara) no Yusha Tachi*, 39.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*, 89.

<sup>161</sup> *Ibid.*, 86.

dialogue with other Western militaries are mentioned as the triggers that exacerbated the threat perception of the Soviet Union.<sup>162</sup> The process of worsening distrust is clear from this narrative, but he employs justification for the Finnish side. In his interpretation, it is natural for a state to engage in security cooperation with others if her neighbour was “increasing ‘expansionist motivation’ while possessing massive military capabilities that are so great her own military cannot possibly resist”.<sup>163</sup> The issue was that such move reminded the Soviet Union of the chaos in the Russian Civil War.

### **David Kirby - Anglophone Research Brought to Japan**

As mentioned, there are limited numbers of works by non-Japanese authors that are available in Japanese on this topic, and one of the exceptions was the short book by Matti Klinge.<sup>164</sup> Another example of such exception appears in 2008.

The work, *A Brief History of Finland* by David Kirby was translated and published in Japan.<sup>165</sup> This work is, as the title suggests, an introductory book on Finnish history, but unlike Klinge’s work, this is written by a British historian who worked on trans-Baltic history extensively. In a way, his contribution could be characterised in a similar manner to earlier works like Kirby and Upton, whose works triggered a rethinking of Finnish history from outside.

The work was initiated by Momose to bring the book in Japan, and the translated edition has an additional foreword by the author, as well as translator’s afterword written by Momose, and Ishino, another researcher of Finnish history, especially the notions of *Suur-Suomi* ideas in the works of Kalevala researchers. The afterword provides yet another reference point, as well as explanations on Kirby’s work from Japanese researchers, which is equally important.

### **Momose Hiroshi – Second Monograph, Filling the Gap**

Momose published another monograph, after contributing to the field with various books

---

<sup>162</sup> Ibid., 87.

<sup>163</sup> Ibid.

<sup>164</sup> Klinge, Matti. *Finrando Shōshi* [Brief History of Finland]. Translated by Momose, Hiroshi. Japanese 2nd ed. 1990.

<sup>165</sup> Kirby, David. *Finland no Rekishi*. Sekai Rekishi Sōsho. [Concise History of Finland]. Translated by Momose, Hiroshi, Yūko Ishino, Mariko Azuma and Miki Nishikawa. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 2008.



and translations, on the immediate post-war period in Finland. Titled *Shōkoku Gaikō no Riarizumu: Sengo Finrando 1944-1948 Nen* (Realism of the Small State: Post-War Finland 1944-1948),<sup>166</sup> this monograph focuses on the “realism” of Finnish diplomacy after the war, often credited to J. K. Paasikivi. This monograph is deeply rooted in his interest in small states in the international relations of WWII and how it contrasts with that of great powers that were researched extensively. His main goals were to clarify the historical trajectories of the small state, its diplomatic policies and limitation, as well as relationship between the internal politics and diplomacy of the small state using Finland during the immediate post-war period, specifically between 1944 and 1948 as a case study.<sup>167</sup>

Although the main focus of this work is slightly later than what this research is interested in, sections on the historical context of the issue offer a look at Momose’s interpretations of the Finnish participation in WWII. Based on his third goal in this work, the emphasis is placed on the political process in Finland that lead to some of the key decisions during this time. As with his earlier works, the interpretations are in line with his earlier works. His narrative about the process before the Winter War follows his earlier paper on the topic published in 1995, and much is true for the Continuation War section. Together with his monograph on the Winter War, as well as another one on the history of small state notions in international relations<sup>168</sup>

### **Ishino Yūko – Historian Interested in Finnish Irredentism**

As briefly mentioned in preceding sections, Ishino has been working with Momose to publish several books on Finnish history such as Kirby’s work,<sup>169</sup> Japanese translation of *Historian Tuulet*, a Finnish history textbook,<sup>170</sup> as well as introductory work on Finland,<sup>171</sup>

---

<sup>166</sup> Momose, Hiroshi. *Shōkoku Gaikō no Riarizumu: Sengo Finrando 1944-1948 Nen* [Realism of the Small State: Post-War Finland 1944-1948]. Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 2011.

<sup>167</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.

<sup>168</sup> Momose, Hiroshi. *Shōkoku: Rekishi Ni Miru Rinen to Genjitsu* Iwanami Shoten, 1988.

<sup>169</sup> Kirby, David. *Finland no Rekishi*. Sekai Rekishi Sōsho. [Concise History of Finland]. Translated by Momose, Hiroshi, Yūko Ishino, Mariko Azuma and Miki Nishikawa. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 2008.

<sup>170</sup> Rinta-Aho, Harri, Marjaana Niemi, Päivi Siltala-Keinänen, and Olli Lehtonen. *Sekaiishi no Nakano Finland no Rekishi*. Sekai no Kyokasho Shirizu 33. Translated by Momose, Hiroshi, Yuko Ishino and Ai Takase. Tokyo: Akashi shoten, 2011.

<sup>171</sup> Momose, Hiroshi and Yūko Ishino, eds. *Finrando O Shirutame no 44 Shō*. Area Studies. [44 Chapters to Understand Finland]. Vol. 69. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 2008.

similar in idea to that of Kuwaki's. Her own work was published in 2012,<sup>172</sup> based on her doctoral dissertation on the origins and evolutions of *Suur-Suomi*, Greater Finland, ideology using Finnish researchers on Kalevala, focusing on the political implications of the works in the independent Finnish Republic.

Five years later, she publishes a *shinsho* paperback on Finnish history from Swedish rule until the present.<sup>173</sup> This work is, based on the limited finding of this research, the first of its kind since Saitō's. Momose had numerous contributions in this field, but his general history books were Nordic in scope. The interpretations largely follow earlier works by Momose and others, but there are notable differences compared with them.

With regards to the origins of the Winter War, she identifies long-term origins of the conflict and the threat perception of the Soviet Union. Partly due to her interest in the rising nationalism in the 1920s and 1930s, such process is explained in detail, including the government's attempt to contain the rise. The lack of understanding of the Soviet security concern and resulting hardliner attitude on Finnish behalf is also identified and used as a factor in the process leading to the outbreak in November 1939.<sup>174</sup> The Finnish involvement of Mainila incident, the immediate *causis belli* for the Soviet Union, is clearly rejected as a fabrication from the Soviet side based on the current research.<sup>175</sup>

The notable feature is the inclusion of details regarding the development of the war, in other words, the military aspect of the war. Earlier works by Momose focused on the diplomatic relations and international relations aspect, and the development at the frontlines was mentioned between the main development in politics and diplomacy. Contributions from Umemoto, Nakayama, and Saiki published before this work allowed her to include more details on the matter in this general overview of Finnish history. Also worth noting is that the Japanese translation of Sarjanen's work on the history of Simo Häyhä,<sup>176</sup> the legendary Finnish sniper, is mentioned in this section.<sup>177</sup> The section and Sarjanen's book on Häyhä

---

<sup>172</sup> Ishino, Yūko. "Dai Finrando" Shisō no Tanjō to Hensen: Jojishi Karewara to Chishikijin [The Origins and Transition of "Greater Finland" Idea: The Epic Kalevala and Academics]. Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 2012.

<sup>173</sup> Ishino, Yūko. *Monogatari Finrando no Rekishi: Hokuō Senshinkoku "Baruto Kai no Otome" no 800 Nen* [Story of Finnish History: 800 years of the Developed Nordic Country "The Beauty of the Baltic"]. Vol. 2456 Chuōkōron Shinsha, 2017.

<sup>174</sup> Ibid., 150.

<sup>175</sup> Ibid., 151.

<sup>176</sup> Sarjanen, Petri. *Shiroi Shinigami* [Valkoinen Kuolema]. Translated by Furuichi, Mayumi Alpha Polis, 2013.

<sup>177</sup> Ishino, *Monogatari Finrando no Rekishi: Hokuō Senshinkoku "Baruto Kai no Otome" no 800 Nen*, 156.

reflect the Japanese public's knowledge on the Winter War and offer an interesting case of Internet popularity contributing to the knowledge of the niche.<sup>178</sup>

Her view on the *välirauha* period and the outbreak of the Continuation War is best described in the section titles. Right after her narrative on Winter War is concluded with the Moscow Peace Treaty and the miracles, the section is titled "Approach towards Hitler - Support from the Nazi Germany"<sup>179</sup> basically acknowledging both the closer ties with Germany and rejecting the *ajopuu* notions of Finland being incapable of decisions. The prior knowledge of the offensive is clearly mentioned as well, rejecting the "separate war" explanation.<sup>180</sup>

Even more explicit is the following section, titled "Invasion through "the Continuation War"- Dreams of the Greater Finland",<sup>181</sup> leaving no room for the Finnish wartime notions of separate war to "regain lost territory". The Continuation War is treated as a point where Finland had an opportunity to realise the irredentist aims once again after the *heimosota* in the 1920s. Linking the preceding explanation on the Greater Finland ideas, she makes it clear that Finland had irredentist aims even prior to the war, and also clearly mentions the cooperation with Germany. In her narrative, the aspirations to gain East Karelia merged with the strategic considerations, both for military and diplomatic, and lead the Finnish Army to cross the 1940 border.<sup>182</sup>

The emphasis on the irredentism again reflects her research interest in the notions of Greater Finland, which is more pronounced than in Momose's version. The difference could be explained through the difference in research focus, but also the scope of the works differed between Momose's works had Nordic scope rather than the national scope focused on Finland.

As a new generation of researchers in this field, and the fact that her 2017 work is a history book for the general public with solely Finnish scope, Ishino's contribution offers updated, and accessible knowledge on Finnish history, incorporating both diplomatic dimension of the WWII, as well as military aspect of the war in concise 290-page book. The

---

<sup>178</sup> See Embassy of Finland in Japan. Twitter Post. March 13, 2012, 23:37. <https://twitter.com/FinEmbTokyo/status/179818403865960448>. Also cover page of Sarjanen, Petri. *Shiroi Shinigami* [Valkoinen Kuolema] has mentions of overwhelming popularity on Japanese internet.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid., 161.

<sup>180</sup> Ibid., 163.

<sup>181</sup> Ibid., 164.

<sup>182</sup> Ishino, *Dai Finrando" Shisō no Tanjō to Hensen: Jojishi Karewara to Chishikijin*, 59.

national scope of her 2017 book shows both change in the Japanese market where such book with “narrow” focus could be published, as well as reflecting the expansion in research landscape in both quantity and variety, as noted by Momose.

## Chapter 5: Conclusion

Having analysed the contents of the Japanese history writing of the Finnish participation of WWII, this section will contextualise the trends with the wider historiographical and socio-political trends.

The first notable conceptual difference in Japanese works is the use of the term *so fin sensō* (Soviet-Finnish War). Based on Momose's earlier accounts,<sup>183</sup> as well as the general agreement of earlier sources, the name has been used in Japan, and the wars were understood as the first and second of the *so fin sensō*. Together with the overwhelming interest in the Soviet Union, due in part to its proximity and threat perception both during and after the war, this use of the term highlights the interest in this war based on the interest in the Soviet Union. Research by Tabira on wartime press coverage of the Winter War confirms such interest and conceptualising frameworks of the Soviet actions.<sup>184</sup> Momose has been working on the Soviet Union in this period, and other earlier sources on the Winter War and the Continuation War are written by historians working with the Soviet Union.

The shift in the names of the war has much to do with Momose's contribution as a pioneer in this field. The various works, as well as an increase in the research community, contributed to the use of the terms *fuyu sensō* and *keizoku sensō*. The gradual change occurred as materials in Japanese increased, many of which were contributions from Momose.

In terms of the spatial concept to locate the events, there are two notable variants. The first is the usage of *hokuō*. As mentioned before, this term itself etymologically means "northern part of Europe", but the usage of the term usually refers to the Nordic five. What is interesting is that the boundary of *hokuō* varies between authors, especially those focused on the military aspect of the war. Nakayama's book is titled as the air battles of the *hokuō*,<sup>185</sup> yet the content, as well as the subtitle, focuses on Finland. Sumida's *Hokuōshi* includes a strong sense of the Scandinavian centric narrative of the period, further blurring what *hokuō* is. With

---

<sup>183</sup> Momose, Hiroshi. "Soren=Finrando Senso O Meguru Shiryo, Bunken Ni Tsuite: Sono Kenkyushi Teki Oboegaki." *Acta Slavica Iaponica* 11, (1967): 103-121. <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/110000189181/>.

<sup>184</sup> Tahira, Mitsuru. "Soren no Taigai Bōchō Seisaku O Meguru Nihon Genronkai no Dōkō: Soren-Finrando Senso (Fuyu Senso) Ki O Chushin Ni." *Seiji Keizai Shigaku* no. 591 (2016): 13-36.

<sup>185</sup> Nakayama, Masahiro. *Hokuō Kūsenshi: Naze Finrando Kūgun Wa Taikoku Soren Kūgun Ni Kateta Noka* [History of Air Battles in Northern Europe: Why the Finnish Air Force Could

both cases, it is probably due to practical limitation, yet it is a case of a blurred definition of *hokuō*, cognate with the term Nordic or Scandinavia in English scholarship.

The inclusion of the Nordic dimension in many of the Japanese works is also affected by its niche position. As emphasised in the old and new version of the *Hokuōshi* from Yamakawa Shuppan,<sup>186</sup> the research community on all of the Nordic five was very limited until the 1990s, limiting knowledge on the region. The conceptualisation of the region as a single unit could be explained in other ways than the practical limitation. The *hokuō* category is also a result of Japanese ideas of Nordics being similar, rooted in the niche position as well as external perspective. The similarities are often emphasised in the Nordics as well, especially within the rings of Nordic cooperation, official or otherwise, yet the definitional confusion of what it is to be Nordic are also discussed in the region. These ideas surrounding Norden is very much visible from some of the literature in Japan, though the critical debate about it seems to be less pronounced.

Another was the even wider conceptualisation of the region. Momose conceptualises the region as Eastern-Northern Europe, as highlighted in his first monograph.<sup>187</sup> This unique demarcation is rooted in his interest in the European small states, and similarities found between Northern and Eastern Europe when analysing the diplomacy of Finland during 1920s and 1930s. Although unique, he mentions that such similarity is commented by some Finnish researchers as “similarity that Finnish people do not consider”.<sup>188</sup>

The Japanese researchers were quick to accept the challenges made against the “continuation” of the wartime views in Finland from Anglophone researchers. The views from Lundin, Upton, and Krosby’s criticism were presented to the academic community in Japanese almost immediately by Momose. The notion of *ajopuu* is rejected already in the 1970s, but the positions of Finland varies from author to author. This could be rooted in the

---

Win Against the Soviet Air Force]. Vol. 001 Hobby Japan, 2017.

<sup>186</sup> Momose, Kumano, and Murai. *Hokuōshi* [History of Northern Europe].

<sup>187</sup> Momose, Hiroshi. *Tō Hokuō Gaikōshi Josetsu: Soren-Finrando Kankei no Kenkyū* [Introduction on Eastern, Northern European Diplomatic History: Research on Soviet-Finnish Relations].

<sup>188</sup> Momose, Hiroshi. *Shōkoku Gaikō no Riarizumu: Sengo Finrando 1944-1948 Nen* [Realism of the Small State: Post-War Finland 1944-1948], 9.

He cites Vares, Vesa. *Rajankäyntiä Sivistyksen Nimissä: Suomalaiset Ja Väli-Eurooppa Maailmansotien Välillä* Helsinki : Suomen historiallinen seura, 2003. [https://kansalliskirjasto.finna.fi/Record/doria.10024\\_40755](https://kansalliskirjasto.finna.fi/Record/doria.10024_40755).

common element that Anglophone and Japanese researchers share the external perspective. Together with the practical limitations, the materials, especially those from Onoe, Momose, and Shimizu have a strong emphasis on the international relations of the 1930s and 1940s rooted in their research interest. Similarly, some of the Anglophone researchers like Lundin, Upton, and Krosby all have external, as well as diplomatic, or international relations interest with a wider scope. Such similarities are likely to be the root in the quick acceptance of the Anglophone challenges made in the 1960s.

The most striking elements common in Japanese literature is the strong and continuous emphasis on “small power”. It is often utilised to highlight the miracles of the small state like Finland, especially in the works focused on military history. Just like the ideas surrounding Nordicity, the small state perception also appears in Finnish and Anglophone materials, so it seems like a simple carryover. However, the small state interest in post-war Japanese context has a wider implication.

As mentioned, post-war Japan marked a *Stunde Null*-like concept of end and the new start, obviously with the debatable extent of the “end” of the old system. The small state interest is part of the resurged *datsua nyūō* targeted at European small states to learn new lessons from. Interest in Finland could also be located in this context, as a “similar” small state that Japan could learn from. Though Saitō’s work stands out as an early work but with strong Asian context embedded in it from the start. Sometimes, the interest rooted in this trend has elements of glorification of the miracles, such element of “learning lessons”, a genre trope of the *seiyōshi* discipline, is definitely embedded in the research, shifting it in a certain way.

Although the element of “learning lessons” continued, its content slightly differs between those from the 1950s and 1980s, when literature on military history rose. The emphasis on the neutrality and careful diplomatic policies based on the failed lessons from WWII, as found in Saitō’s work, emphasises the Finnish efforts to be a “good neighbourhood” highlights the effort for peace, the emphasis on the valiant resistance found in Umemoto, latter works of Takeda and Saiki goes in line with the interest fundamental security reconsiderations of the 1980s in Japan could be considered as a promotion of armed neutrality of Sweden. The promotions for increased defence commitment was what drove Prime Minister Nakasone to utilise the “Finlandization” as an argument for such move, but with more informed authors such as the three, the emphasis on defence capabilities of Finland and its “success” in maintaining independence contributes to the same promotion. Although it differs slightly from Momose’s account on the matter, in identifying the trend to emphasise

the “valiant defence” in Norden in 1970s,<sup>189</sup> considering the chronological proximity of his work to the events he was describing, the works from the three authors could be located in the same trend, based on the continuing discussion about the extent of defence commitment in the 1980s.

The interest and is also accelerated by the myth that is common among the general public. It has been included in many of the works in its introduction as the common myth about Finland that the historians are trying to reject. Even the most recent work by Ishino includes a chapter about “Asian origin myth” of the Finns, and similar rejection of the misconception in Japan about the Asian origins of the Finnish people are repeated. The myth is based on the linguistic theories assuming the same linguistic category for Finnish and Japanese, so-called “Ural-Altai” family.<sup>190</sup> Such ideas of kinship survive to this day in current Japanese society and probably contributed to the interest from Japan. The kinship, although rejected, appears in recent works, and thus reflects a strong interpretive framework of the Japanese public about Finland. This notion of kinship is one of the factors contributing to the positive images of Finland from Japan, noted by several authors.<sup>191</sup>

The recent rise in the literature solely on Finland, as well as wider topics, are signs of a wider research community but also the rise of the new generation of researchers. Momose’s initial contribution as a professional historian in this field has been central in the Japanese literature on the topic. With researchers like Saiki, Umemoto, and Ishino, the newer generations of researchers have more Finnish scope to their research, and fact that they can publish works solely focused on Finland is a sign of shifting environment in Japan. As Ishino comments in her latest book, what Finland means to ordinary Japanese person might be changing from idealised small state to a “normal” state with weaker myth. The increase in knowledge and continuous contributions from these researchers might be the root of this shift.

The post-Cold War literature on Finland is, in a way, a continuation of the rising interest, as described earlier. Further clarifications of the gaps in the literature appear to be the aims of many works. Yet considering the socio-political situations of the post-Cold War Japan, some comments about connections between the context in Japan and the works must be made. With

---

<sup>189</sup> Momose, Hiroshi. *Shōkoku: Rekishi Ni Miru Rinen to Genjitsu* Iwanami Shoten, 1988, 333.

<sup>190</sup> Ishino. *Monogatari Finrando no Rekishi: Hokuō Senshinkoku "Baruto Kai no Otome" no 800 Nen* [Story of Finnish History: 800 years of the Developed Nordic Country "The Beauty of the Baltic"], 3

<sup>191</sup> See Ipatti, At the Root of “Finland Boom”.



Momose's monograph in 2011, it is a continuation of his topic, as he mentions in the afterword.<sup>192</sup> It serves as the clarifications on the origins and political process that lead to the confusion about the nature of "realism" of the Cold War Finnish foreign policy, highlighted by Nakasone's use of the term "Finlandization". His research on the period between 1944-1944 is first chapter of the post-war Finland and how the Paasikivi-Kekkonen line of the diplomacy was formulated, at least with regards to Paasikivi's initial contribution. The monograph shed light on the doctrine that was misrepresented by the Japanese politician preoccupied with the U.S.-Japan relations in the Cold War tensions.

As for Ishino's monograph, a new trend can be identified. Her main research topic, articulated in her monograph in 2012, revolves around the rise of nationalism and irredentist aims in pre-war Finland through the research on Kalevala. This interest in nationalism coincides with the rise of nationalism and what Iokibe called "the resurgence of the history and geography", referring to the rise of historical conflict that was controlled or put aside by the bipolar world order during the Cold War.<sup>193</sup> In the Japanese context, the early 2000s marked a shift away from the Yoshida Doctrine's economic emphasis and resulting pacifist notions, as well as the gradual rise of tensions between neighbouring states and nationalism. Ishino's research to find the root and elements of Finnish nationalism in the 1920s and 1930s within the context of the contemporary rise of nationalism.

This research was an attempt for a micro-level analysis of the *seiyōshi* research through a niche research topic on Finland and opens up prospects for future research. The contextualisation, which this research attempted to formulate, could be strengthened through incorporating interviews and oral histories from the authors themselves. As most of the authors who wrote after the 1970s are still in the research community, their accounts through interviews on the context of their research would offer valuable sources that act as stronger foundations for such contextualisation. More thorough research on the post-war Japanese situation, as well as its historiography, is required to strengthen the observations this research has identified.

Recent research on the historiography of the discipline calls for contextualising this East Asian phenomenon in the transnational context, and even wider context, without the implications of the Orient/Occident dichotomy embedded in the discipline.<sup>194</sup> Together with

---

<sup>192</sup> Momose, Hiroshi. *Shōkoku Gaikō no Riarizumu: Sengo Finrando 1944-1948 Nen* [Realism of the Small State: Post-War Finland 1944-1948], 231.

<sup>193</sup> Iokibe, Sengo *Nihon Gaikōshi*, 306.

<sup>194</sup> Lim, Jie-Hyun. "Kokuminshi no Fuseki Toshite no Sekaishi: Nihon to Chōsen Ni Okeru

the “Europeanisation” trend in the national history writing in the European region, this research would offer foundations for expanded comparison of Finnish history research in Japan as a niche in the *seiyōshi* discipline, and as a new reference point in the historiography of Finnish participation of WWII. The former would offer openings for comparison within East Asia especially that from South Korea, as it was compared in Lim’s research, especially considering even closer proximity of South Korea of the Cold War tensions as well as stronger notions of “break away from Japanese occupation” would offer interesting comparison of the Finnish history writing in two East Asian states.

As for the latter, a comparison of the Japanese and Finnish literature has been conducted in this research with limited scales, but gaps can be identified. The biggest of which is the Finnish efforts for branding in Japan. Based on Ipatti’s research, the Finland boom seemed to have started in the 1960s, based on documents from the Embassy of Finland in Tokyo and Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.<sup>195</sup> This research confirms the result of the branding effort through Japanese publications about Finnish history, though more thorough comparison and contextualisation is needed in this regard. Considering connections like Momose’s translation of Klinge’s book,<sup>196</sup> and his contribution being recognised by Finnish government of the First Knight of the White Rose of Finland,<sup>197</sup> the reception of Japanese contributions in Finland, the other side of the story, could offer even more coherent picture. In this regard, academic exchange from Japan, like research visits by researchers dealt in this research, as well as from Finland would be interesting research to be conducted in the future.

---

"Aikokuteki Sekaishi" to Sono Kekka Toshite Shōjiru Yōroppa Chūshinshugi Ni Tsuite (Higashi Ajia no Seiyōshigaku)," 29. and Koyama, Satoshi. "*Shigakushi*" no Sen O Hikinaosu: *Histriography Ni Okeru "Kindai" O Dou Toraeruka (Tokushū: Gaikoku Shika Ga Yomitoku "Kindai Nihon no Hisutoriogurafii")* [Redrawing the Boundaries of "Metahistory": Ways to Interpret Modernity in Historiographies (Special Issue: Reviews of "Historiography of Modern Japan" by Historians of Foreign Histories)]. Vol. 77 2016.

<sup>195</sup> Ipatti, Laura. "At the Roots of the 'Finland Boom'," 103-130.

<sup>196</sup> Klinge, Matti. *Finrando Shōshi* [Brief History of Finland].

<sup>197</sup> Momose, Hiroshi and Yūko Ishino, eds. *Finrando O Shirutame no 44 Shō*. [44 Chapters to Understand Finland].

## Bibliography

### Japanese Literatures on Finnish History

- Ishino, Yūko. *"Dai Finrando" Shisō no Tanjō to Hensen: Jojishi Karewara to Chishikijin* [The Origins and Transition of "Greater Finland" Idea: The Epic Kalevala and Academics]. Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 2012.
- Ishino, Yūko. *Monogatari Finrando no Rekishi: Hokuō Senshinkoku "Baruto Kai no Otome" no 800 Nen* [Story of Finnish History: 800 years of the Developed Nordic Country "The Beauty of the Baltic"]. Vol. 2456 Chuōkōron Shinsha, 2017.
- Juutilainen, Ilmari. *Finrando Kūgun Sentōkitai* [Finnish Air Force Fighter Squadron]. Translated by Umemoto, Hiroshi. Tokyo: Dainippon Kaiga, 1997.
- Kirby, David. *Finland no Rekishi*. Sekai Rekishi Sōsho. [Concise History of Finland]. Translated by Momose, Hiroshi, Yūko Ishino, Mariko Azuma and Miki Nishikawa. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 2008.
- Klinge, Matti. *Finrando Shōshi* [Brief History of Finland]. Translated by Momose, Hiroshi. Japanese 2nd ed. 1990.
- Kōgo, Eiichi. *Yoroppa Tokuhain no Shuki* [Memoir of Correspondent in Europe] Ozaki Shobō, 1948.
- Kuwaki, Tsutomu, Yoshi Ozaki, Yasumoto Tokunaga, Tadashi Iijima, Mosuke Morita, Minao Shibata, Kayoko Ichikawa, et al. *Finrando no Bunka*. Hokuō Bunka Sōsho. [Culture of Finland]. Vol. 1 The Nordic Cultural Society of Japan, 1951.
- Luukanen, Eino Antero. *Finrando Jōkū no Sentōki* [Fighters Above Finland]. Translated by Umemoto, Hiroshi Dainippon Kaiga, 1999.
- Momose, Hiroshi. "Finrando no Taiso Kankei 1940-1941 Nen: "Keizoku Sensō" Zenshi Ni Kansuru Oboegaki." *Acta Slavica Iaponica* 16, (1972): 209-249.
- Momose, Hiroshi. "Fuyusensō Gen'Inron Saikō." *The Study of the International Relations* 22, (1995a): 13-32. <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/110000439254/>.
- Momose, Hiroshi. *Hokuō Gendaishi*. Sekai Gendaishi. [Contemporary History of Northern Europe]. Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppan, 1980.
- Momose, Hiroshi. "Postwar Finland in the Eyes of a Japanese Researcher." *Balto-Scandia* no. 12 (1995b): 1-17.
- Momose, Hiroshi. "Ryō Taisenkan no "Shōkoku" Mondai Ni Kansuru Oboegaki: Scandinavia Shokoku O Jirei Toshite -1-." *Rekishi Hyōron* no. 135 (1961): 13-20. <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/40003830874/>.
- Momose, Hiroshi. "Sengo Finland Shi Shiron: Nihon Tono Kakawari De Nani Ga Mieruka." *Balto-Scandia* no. 23 (2006): 1-76. <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/40007479269/>.
- Momose, Hiroshi. *Shōkoku Gaikō no Riarizumu: Sengo Finrando 1944-1948 Nen* [Realism of the Small State: Post-War Finland 1944-1948]. Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 2011.

- Momose, Hiroshi. *Shōkoku: Rekishi Ni Miru Rinen to Genjitsu* Iwanami Shoten, 1988.
- Momose, Hiroshi. "Small States Perceptions in Finland and Japan--A Reflection on Postwar Years." *Acta Slavica Iaponica* 14, (1996): 35-58. <http://hdl.handle.net/2115/8091>.
- Momose, Hiroshi. "Soren=Finrando Senso O Meguru Shiryo, Bunken Ni Tsuite: Sono Kenkyushi Teki Oboegaki." *Acta Slavica Iaponica* 11, (1967): 103-121. <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/110000189181/>.
- Momose, Hiroshi. *Tō Hokuō Gaikōshi Josetsu: Soren-Finrando Kankei no Kenkyū* [Introduction on Eastern, Northern European Diplomatic History: Research on Soviet-Finnish Relations]. Tokyo: Fukumurashuppan, 1970.
- Momose, Hiroshi and Yūko Ishino, eds. *Finrando O Shirutame no 44 Shō*. Area Studies. [44 Chapters to Understand Finland]. Vol. 69. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 2008.
- Momose, Hiroshi, Satoru Kumano, and Makoto Murai. *Hokuōshi* [History of Northern Europe]. new ed. Vol. 21 Yamakawa Shuppan Sha, 1998.
- Nakayama, Masahiro. *Hokuō Kūsenshi: Naze Finrando Kūgun Wa Taikoku Soren Kūgun Ni Kateta Noka* [History of Air Battles in Northern Europe: Why the Finnish Air Force Could Win Against the Soviet Air Force]. Vol. 001 Hobby Japan, 2017.
- Onoe, Masao. "1939 Nen no Sovieto Finrando Sensō." *Kobe Law Journal* 5, no. 1 (1955): 228-259.
- Rinta-Aho, Harri, Marjaana Niemi, Päivi Siltala-Keinänen, and Olli Lehtonen. *Sekaishi no Nakano Finland no Rekishi*. Sekai no Kyokasho Shirizu 33. Translated by Momose, Hiroshi, Yuko Ishino and Ai Takase. Tokyo: Akashi shoten, 2011.
- Ryōzō Shimizu. "Finrando Gaikōshi Shō." *Kokushikan Daigaku Seikei Ronsō* no. 18 (1973): 75-108.
- Saiki, Nobuo. *Finrando Gun Nyumon: Kyokuhoku no Senjo O Seishita Jojishi (Karewara) no Yusha Tachi* [Introduction to the Finnish Army: The Heros of Kalevala Who Ruled the Battlefield of the North]. Vol. 23 Ikarosushuppan, 2007.
- Saitō, Masami. *Dokuritsu E no Kumon: Finrando no Rekishi* [Agony Towards Independence: History of Finland]. Vol. Aoban-79 Iwanamishoten, 1951.
- Sarjanen, Petri. *Shiroi Shinigami* [Valkoinen Kuolema]. Translated by Furuichi, Mayumi Alpha Polis, 2013.
- Shimizu, Ryōzō. "Kokusai Hō Ni Okeru Dentō to Kakushin." Kokushikan University, 1980.
- Stenman, Kari and Kalevi Keskinen. *Niji Taisen no Finrando Kugun Ēsu* [Aces of Finland in World War Two]. Translated by Umemoto, Hiroshi and Watanabe Yōji. Vol. Sekai no Sentōki Ēsu 4 Dainippon Kaiga, 2000.
- Tahira, Mitsuru. "Soren no Taigai Bōchō Seisaku O Meguru Nihon Genronkai no Dōkō: Soren-Finrando Senso (Fuyu Senso)Ki O Chushin Ni." *Seiji Keizai Shigaku* no. 591 (2016): 13-36.
- Takeda, Tatsuo. *Hokuō no Gaikō: Tatakau Shōkoku no Sōkoku to Genjitsu* [Diplomacy of the Norden: Conflicts and Realities of the Fighting Small Powers] Tokai Daigaku Shuppankai, 1998.

- Takeda, Tatsuo. *Monogatari Hokuō no Rekishi: Moderu Kokka no Keisei* [Tale of Nordic History: Formation of the Model State]. Vol. 1131 Chūō Kōronsha, 1993.
- Takeda, Tatsuo. *Tatakau Hokuō: Kōsenka, Chūritsu Ka, Fukujū Ka* [Norden Fights: Resistance, Neutrality or Obidience] Takagishobō, 1981.
- Tsunoda, Bun'ei, Tsutomu Kuwaki, and Eiichi Kōgo. *Hokuōshi*. Sekai Kakkokushi. [History of Northern Europe]. Vol. 6 Yamakawa Shuppan, 1955.
- Umemoto, Hiroshi. *Ryūketsu no Natsu* [Bloody Summer] Dainippon Kaiga, 1999.
- Umemoto, Hiroshi. *Secchū no Kiseki* [Miracles in the Snow] Dainipponkaiga, 1989.

## Other Literatures

- The Development of Finnish-Soviet Relations during the Autumn of 1939: In the Light of Official Documents*. Helsinki: Suomen Kirja, 1940.
- Finland Reveals Her Secret Documents on Soviet Policy, March 1940 - June 1941: The Attitude of the USSR to Finland After the Peace of Moscow*. New York: Wilfred Funk, 1941.
- Ahtiainen, Pekka and Jukka Tervonen. "A Journey into Finnish Historiography from the End of the 19th Century to the Present Day." In *Nordic Historiography in the 20th Century*, edited by Meyer, Frank and Jan Eivind Myhre, 50-79. Oslo: Department of History, University of Oslo, 2000.
- Anderson, Albin T. "Origins of the Winter War: A Study of Russo-Finnish Diplomacy." *World Politics* 6, no. 2 (1954): 169-189.
- Brownlee, John. "Nationalism and Historical Scholarship in Twentieth Century Japan." In *International Symposium Historiography and Japanese Consciousness of Values and Norms*, edited by Fogel, Joshua A., 137-143. Kyōto, 2003.
- Dallin, David J. and Leon Dennen. *Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy 1939-1942*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942.
- Degras, Jane and Jane Degras. *Soviet Documents on Foreign Policy. Vol. 3, 1933-1941*. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1953.
- Dower, John W. *Embracing Defeat*. London: Penguin Press, 2000.
- Embassy of Finland in Japan. "Twitter Post." March 13, 2012, 23:37. <https://twitter.com/FinEmbTokyo/status/179818403865960448>.
- Eskelinen, Heikki. "Independence and After." In *Finland : Creation and Construction*, edited by Kallas, Hillar and Sylvie Nickels, 40-60. London: Allen and Unwin, 1968.
- Eskola, Seikko. "Puntila, Lauri Aadolf (1907 - 1988)." Accessed April 30, 2019. <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:sks-kbg-004802>.
- Häikiö, Martti. "Svinhufvud, Pehr Evind (1861 - 1944)." Accessed May 3, 2019. <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:sks-kbg-000501>.

- Hietanen, Silvo. "General Information." *Scandinavian Journal of History* 12, no. 4 (1987): 359-363. doi:10.1080/03468758708579127.
- Holmila, Antero. "Varieties of Silence: Collective Memory of the Holocaust in Finland." In *Finland in World War II: History, Memory, Interpretations*, edited by Kinnunen, Tiina and Ville Kivimäki, 526-560. Leiden: BRILL, 2011.
- Hujanen, Miikka. "Japanilaiset Turistit Ihastelevat Kelvotonta Suomalaispanssaria – Museon Johtaja Hämillään: ”Enemmän Rahaa Kuin Suomesta”." *Iltasanomat*, 2016. <https://www.is.fi/kotimaa/art-2000001271402.html>.
- Iokibe, Makoto and Makoto Iokibe. *Sengo Nihon Gaikōshi*. Dai 2 satsu ed. Tōkyō: Yūhikaku, 2000.
- Ipatti, Laura. "At the Roots of the 'Finland Boom'." *Scandinavian Journal of History* 44, no. 1 (2019): 103-130. doi:10.1080/03468755.2018.1502680. <https://doi-org.libproxy.helsinki.fi/10.1080/03468755.2018.1502680>.
- Jakobson, Max. *The Diplomacy of the Winter War: An Account Of the Russo-Finnish War, 1939-1940*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- John H. Wuorinen, eds. *Finland and World War II, 1939-1944*. New York: Ronald Press, 1948.
- Jokipii, Mauno. "Finland's Entrance into the Continuation War." *Revue Internationale D'Histoire Militaire* no. 53 (1982): 85-103.
- Jokipii, Mauno. *Jatkosodan Synty: Tutkimuksia Saksan Ja Suomen Sotilaallisesta Yhteistyöstä 1940-41*. Helsingissä: Otava, 1987.
- Jutikkala, Eino. "Korhonen, Arvi (1890 - 1967)." . Accessed April 30, 2019. <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:sks-kbg-007003>.
- Jutikkala, Eino, Kauko Pirinen, and Paul Sjöblom. *A History of Finland*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1962.
- Kinnunen, Tiina and Markku Jokisipilä. "Shifting Images of "our Wars": Finnish Memory Culture of World War II." In *Finland in World War II: History, Memory, Interpretations*, edited by Kinnunen, Tiina and Ville Kivimäki, 435-482. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2012.
- Kinnunen, Tiina, Tiina Kinnunen, and Ville Kivimäki. *Finland in World War II: History, Memory, Interpretations*. History of Warfare. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Kirby, David. *A Concise History of Finland*. Cambridge Concise Histories. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Kivimäki, Ville. "Between Defeat and Victory: Finnish Memory Culture of the Second World War." *Scandinavian Journal of History* 37, no. 4 (2012): 482-504. doi:10.1080/03468755.2012.680178.
- Klinge, Matti. *A Brief History of Finland*. Helsinki: Otava, 1981.
- Koselleck, Reinhart and Todd Samuel Presner. *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts*. Cultural Memory in the Present. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 2002.

- Koyama, Satoshi. *"Shigakushi" no Sen O Hikinaosu: Histrigraphy Ni Okeru "Kindai" O Dou Toraeruka* (&Tokushū&; *Gaikoku Shika Ga Yomitoku "Kindai Nihon no Hisutoriogurafii"*) [Redrawing the Boundaries of "Metahistory": Ways to Interpret Modernity in Historiographies&Special Issue&; Reviews of "Histrigraphy of Modern Japan" by Historians of Foreign Histories)]. Vol. 77 2016.
- Krosby, H. Peter. *Finland, Germany, and the Soviet Union, 1940-1941: The Petsamo Dispute*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.
- Krosby, Hans Peter. *Suomen Valinta 1941*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä, 1967.
- Lim, Jie-Hyun. "Kokuminshi no Fuseki Toshite no Sekaishi: Nihon to Chōsen Ni Okeru "Aikokuteki Sekaishi" to Sono Kekka Toshite Shōjiru Yōroppa Chūshinshugi Ni Tsuite (Higashi Ajia no Seiyōshigaku)." *Shisō* no. 1091 (2015): 6-32.
- Lundin, Charles Leonard. *Finland in the Second World War*. Indiana University Publications. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1957.
- Martin, Bernd. *Japan and Germany in the Modern World*. Providence, RI u.a: Berghahn Books, 1995.
- Meinander, Henrik. "A Separate Story? Interpretations of Finland in the Second World War." In *Nordic Narratives of the Second World War: National Historiographies Revisited*, 55-77. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2011.
- Minoru, Ozawa. *Jo* (&Tokushū&; *Gaikoku Shika Ga Yomitoku "Kindai Nihon no Hisutoriogurafii"*) [Introduction&Special Issue&; Reviews of "Histrigraphy of Modern Japan" by Historians of Foreign Histories)]. Vol. 77 2016.
- Muir, Simo, Simo Muir, and Hana Worthen. *Finland's Holocaust: Silences of History*. The Holocaust and its Contexts. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Odanaka, Naoki. "Higasi Ajia no Seiyōshi to "Guroobaru Historii"." *Shisō* no. 1091 (March, 2015): 2-5.
- Ogawa, Yoshimi. *Oshu Ni Okeru Senzen no Nihongo Koza: Jittai to Haikei* [Japanese Courses in Pre-War Europe: Situation and Background] 風間書房, 2010.
- Pakier, Małgorzata, Małgorzata Pakier, and Bo Stråth. *A European Memory?: Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*. Studies in Contemporary European History. New York: Berghahn Books, 2010.
- Palonen, Kari. *Quentin Skinner: History, Politics, Rhetoric*. Key Contemporary Thinkers. Cambridge: Polity, 2003.
- Puntila, Lauri Aadolf. *The Political History of Finland 1809-1966*. Helsinki: Otava, 1974.
- Rautkallio, Hannu. *Finland and the Holocaust: The Rescue of Finland's Jews*. New York: Holocaust Library, 1987.
- Rintala, Marvin. *Four Finns: Political Profiles*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.
- Sander, Gordon F. *The Hundred Day Winter War: Finland's Gallant Stand Against the Soviet Army*. Modern War Studies. 2013.

- Silvennoinen, Oula. "Salaiset Aseveljet: Suomen Ja Saksan Turvallisuuspoliisiyhteistyö 1933-1944." Otava, 2008.
- Steinmetz, Willibald, Willibald Steinmetz, Michael Freeden, and Javier Fernández Sebastián. *Conceptual History in the European Space*. European Conceptual History. New York: Berghahn, 2017.
- Stenius, Henrik, Henrik Stenius, Mirja Österberg, and Johan Östling. *Nordic Narratives of the Second World War : National Historiographies Revisited*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2011. <https://helka.finna.fi/Record/helka.2392638>.
- Stockholm Banke, Cecilie Felicia. "Remembering Europe's Heart of Darkness: Legacies of the Holocaust in Post-War European Societies." In *A European Memory? : Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*, edited by Pakier, Małgorzata and Bo Stråth, 163-174. New York: Berghahn Books, 2010.
- The Paleological Society of Japan. "Tsunoda Bun'Ei Shi no Shōkai." . Accessed May 3, 2019. <https://www.kodaigaku.org/tunodaroom/tunodaroom.html>.
- Tommila, Päiviö. "Jutikkala, Eino (1907 - 2006)." . Accessed April 30, 2019. <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:sks-kbg-007054>.
- Tully, James and James Tully. *Meaning and Context : Quentin Skinner and His Critics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Vares, Vesa. *Rajankäyntiä Sivistyksen Nimissä : Suomalaiset Ja Väli-Eurooppa Maailmansotien Välillä* Helsinki : Suomen historiallinen seura, 2003. [https://kansalliskirjasto.finna.fi/Record/doria.10024\\_40755](https://kansalliskirjasto.finna.fi/Record/doria.10024_40755).
- Vehviläinen, Olli and Gerard McAlester. *Finland in the Second World War: Between Germany and Russia*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2002.
- Wuorinen, John H. *A History of Finland*. New York: Published for American-Scandinavian Foundation by Columbia University Press, 1965.



## Appendix: Biographies of Key Researchers

### **Kuwaki Tsutomu**

Born in 1913. He was a philosopher specialised in German philosophy, especially works of Heidegger. He graduated from Kyūshū Imperial University in 1937 and worked as an assistant at the university from 1938. In 1939, he travelled to Europe as a German-Japan exchange program. He started working as a Japanese lecturer at University of Helsinki from 1941, and taught there until 1944, when the Continuation War ended, and returned to Japan. He taught at Kyoritsu Women's University and Chuo University after the war. He was one of the founding members of the Nordic Cultural Society of Japan, and contributed to academic exchange between Japan and Finland. He passed away in 15<sup>th</sup> February, 2000.

### **Momose, Hiroshi**

Born in 1932 in Tokyo. He received his doctoral degree at University of Tokyo. He specializes in international relations history and has taught at various universities across Japan including Tsuda College, Hokkaido University, and Hiroshima University. He has published works on Finnish history, textbooks for international relations with emphasis on small state as actors in international relations. For his contribution, he was awarded the Insignia of Knight, First Class, in the Order of the White Rose of Finland. He is currently the Chairman of the Nordic Cultural Society of Japan, and the Chairman for the Association for Balto-Scandinavian Studies.

### **Takeda, Tatsuo**

Born in 1928 in Hokkaido. He became a diplomat in 1954, and was sent to Stockholm University for language training in Swedish. He then served at Japanese embassies in Sweden, Denmark, Istanbul, as a staff responsible for Nordic region in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as well as staff at Imperial Household Agency. After retiring, he taught at Tokai University, Osaka University of Foreign Studies and Rikkyo University. He has written numerous books on diplomacy, Nordic states, as well as other regions he has served. He is a Board Member for the Nordic Cultural Association of Japan.

### **Umemoto, Hiroshi**

Born in 1958, he has been active as a military historian and translator since 1980s,

especially topics in WWII. He published his first work, *Secchu no Kiseki*, a nonfiction on the Winter War in 1989. As a magazine editor, he works with plastic model magazine, *Hobby Japan* magazine, with the name Ichimura, Hiroshi. His translated works include memoirs of ace pilots from Finland and the Pacific front, military history books.

### **Saiki, Nobuo**

Born in 1960, he is a military historian and international relations researcher on Finnish security policies. He has been working in military history, specifically about tanks and land battles of WWII, and has published numerous volumes based on his frequent visit to Europe. He also translated several books on the topic. He is one of the very few active military historian, interested in Finnish military, and played crucial role in helping popularise the topic in Japan within the military history aficionados.

### **Ishino, Yuko**

Born in 1974 in Kanagawa. She graduated from Tsuda College, receiving doctorate in international relations on Kalevala research in 2011. She has been working with Momose with various translations and books on Finnish history, and has published her monograph in 2012, and another general Finnish history book in 2017. She is currently a professor at Kokushikan University, and member of the Association for Balto-Scandinavian Studies.