

International School of Social Sciences
Journalism and Mass Communication
MA Thesis
by PIA LAAKOLI

**PRESENTATION OF RUSSIANS IN AAMULEHTI AND KANSAN LEHTI: PRO- AND
ANTI RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA IN FIGHT FOR THE PUBLIC OPINION**

Foreword,

Propaganda is generally an interesting and versatile topic, including themes from wars, manipulation of the masses and Stalin to political campaigning, public relations and advertising. The reason why I find it particularly intriguing is because every authority keeps on repeating that it does not exist in “our” society, indicating that it does exist somewhere but not in our democratic and liberal society. The same applies to the Finnish Civil War; everybody in knows that it took place, however it remains as topic which is neither often nor publicly discussed.

I was very fortunate to be able to combine my interest under one topic and get a blessing for it from my supervisor. My research plan was ambitious, for I saw no point in doing secondary analysis or writing about a topic which has been covered million times over. Perhaps it also was the Nancy Drew in me that wanted to discover a new connection or to reveal a lots piece of information. I also wanted to do a research on a topic which would be interesting and written in a way that the actual content would be visible through the academic jargon.

I never realized how many hours I would be spending reading from micro fiche. Neither did I know how many books I'd end up carrying at home from different libraries. Hence I've been very lucky to have the best possible support. Isaac Newton said *“If I have seen further, it is because I have been standing on the shoulders of the giants”* . For me these giants have been Kaarle Nordenstreng, whom I was fortunate enough to have as a supervisor; his guidance through the jungle of ideas has been priceless. Also Jukka Pietiläinen has been kind enough to read through my thesis and offered valuable comments. Joan Löfgren has made good suggestions concerning the language. My friends have kept me sane through this process for which I'm forever in their dept.

Brief summary

In this thesis I will examine the image *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* gave of the Russians and how propagandistic methods were used in building that image. The interest lies in the way the image of Russians—positive and negative—was moulded to correspond with political aims; how both sides of the Civil War (the Reds and the Whites) used the image in rallying up for public approval and support for their respective causes in 1917-1918. I concentrate on identifying the image of a Russian and detecting the changes that image went through during 1917. In the process I aim at dissecting some of the propagandistic methods that were used in creating the image and later on, shifting it towards the direction where it could be used to agitate people for Civil War. My empirical data came from *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti*; since my study period was complete year 1917 and January 1918 there was quite a lot of data to analyze, therefore I picked those articles which clearly mentioned Russians for closer analysis. I used ordinal scale in the measuring the results and My research method can be classified as qualitative analysis of quantitative material.

The setting of the Finnish Civil War was quite the same as in other European countries: Whites against Reds, communism against capitalism or monarchy, the working class/ proletariat against bourgeois. The role of Russians in the Finnish Civil War was minor; most of the Russian military stationed in Finland left in order to support the revolution in their own country. However, they did have a part in the Finnish Civil War, not because of their role in the actual battle, but because the image of a Russian was exploited by both sides—Reds and Whites—in propaganda

My research findings were interesting to say the least. The official history has always maintained that the relationship between the Finnish Social Democrats and Russians was one with degree of camaraderie, mutual understanding, co-operation, hence making the general assumption that Social Democrats had a positive image of Russian troops. This was also the platform my hypothesis was based upon; that *Kansan Lehti*—being the voice of Social Democratic Party—would project a positive image of Russians to its readership. But as the empirical data indicates this did not happen: the image *Kansan Lehti* projects from January through March is that of no image at all and from July to September the image of Russian is very negative, even more so that that projected by *Aamulehti*.

From January through March also *Aamulehti* shows no interest towards Russians, from July to September—while *Kansan Lehti* is ranting about cruelty of Russian troops—*Aamulehti* maintains its neutral attitude towards Russians. From November 1917 to January 1918, which is the final sample period, *Aamulehti* projects a negative image of Russians, whereas *Kansan Lehti* for the first time presents Russians in rather neutral light.

There are also few other surprises, which this research has come across; major one of them being the association or reference in which the Russians were presented. The first sample period, from January through March, provided no association what so ever, the second sample period from July through September provided no real surprise, for both newspapers presented the Russians in association of themes described by official history: that of mischief and limitations on regained sovereignty.

It is the third sample period, which brings us the surprise, at least when it comes to the association in which *Kansan Lehti* presented Russians. During third sample period *Aamulehti* rather predictably associates the Russians with Finnish Social Democrats in mischief, however, *Kansan Lehti* unpredictably presents Russians in connection to much hated Finnish bourgeois and to dark period in Finnish history: the Oppression periods. What is remarkable in here is that both newspapers perceive Russians negatively because of their association and assumed co-operation with the Finnish “opposing side” i.e. it is the Finns who give bad name to Russians.

OUTLINE **4**

1. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM AND QUESTIONS **9**

1.1 The subject matter of the study	9
1.2 Hypothesis	10
1.3 Prior research	13
1.4 Significance of the study	15
1.5 Terminology	17
1.5.1 The events of spring 1918	17
1.5.2 The Reds and the Whites	19

2. THE SETTING: FINLAND IN EARLY 1900 **21**

2.1 Changing Regional Demographics	21
2.2 Layers of the Society	22
2.3 Symptoms of the WWI	24
2.3.1 Food Shortage	25
2.3.2 Unemployment	25
2.3.3 The Russian Troops	26
2.4 The political scene in 1905- 1917	27
2.4.1 The Social Democratic Party (Sosiaalidemokraattinen Puolue, SDP)	27
2.4.2 Finnish Nationalist Party (Suomalainen Puolue, SP).....	29
2.4.3. The Constitutional Finnish Nationalist Party (Nuorsuomalainen Puolue, NSP).....	30
2.4.4 The Agricultural Union Party (Maalaisliitto, ML).....	31
2.4.5 The Swedish Peoples Party (Ruotsalainen Kansan Puolue, RKP)	31
2.5 Overview	32
2.5.1 1900-1909.....	33
2.5.2 1909-1914.....	33
2.5.3 1914-1917.....	34

3. INTRODUCTION TO RELEVANT LITERATURE AND CONSEPTS **36**

3.1 Image of Russians	36
3.1.1 Before the Civil War: The myth of archenemies.....	36
3.1.2 In between: the directions taken 1917.....	38
3.1.3 After the Civil War: hatred campaigns to heal the nation.....	38

3.2 Propaganda	40
3.2.1 The literature.....	40
3.2.2 Definition of propaganda.....	42
3.2.3 What is Propaganda?.....	42
3.2.4 Why does propaganda exist?.....	43
3.2.5 Who are the Propagandists?.....	44
3.3 Constructing public opinion with propaganda	45
3.4 Techniques of propaganda	46
3.5 Wartime methods: Fear factor in propaganda	47
3.5.1 Power of rumours	48
3.5.2 Constructing an image of an enemy.....	49
3.5.3 “Us” versus “Them”.....	49
3.5.4 Hero stories.....	50
3.6 Peacetime methods	50
<u>4. METHOD AND MATERIAL</u>	51
4.1 Material	51
4.2 <i>Aamulehti</i> and <i>Kansan Lehti</i>	52
4.3 Method	52
4.4 Three levels of analysis	53
<u>5. PROPAGANDA IN <i>AAMULEHTI</i> AND <i>KANSAN LEHTI</i></u>	58
5.1 The image of Russians from January through March	58
5.1.1 January, <i>Aamulehti</i>	58
5.1.1.1 General features.....	58
5.1.1.2 Russians.....	60
5.1.2 February, <i>Aamulehti</i>	60
5.1.2.1 General features	60
5.1.3 March, <i>Aamulehti</i>	61
5.1.3.1 General features.....	61
5.1.3.2 The March Revolution.....	62
5.1.3.3 Neutrality.....	62
5.1.3.4 Gratefulness.....	63
5.1.3.5 Negativity.....	63
5.1.4 January, <i>Kansan Lehti</i>	64
5.1.4.1. General features.....	64
5.1.4.2 Russians.....	65

5.1.5 February, <i>Kansan Lehti</i>	66
5.1.5.1 General features.....	66
5.1.6 March, <i>Kansan Lehti</i>	67
5.1.6.1 General features.....	67
5.1.6.2 March Revolution.....	68
5.1.6.3 Heroism.....	68
5.1.6.4 The greater cause.....	69
5.1.6.5. Making the connection between the Finns and Russians.....	70
5.1.6.6. Excusing the violence.....	70
5.1.7 Aamulehti and Kansan Lehti; comparison of the themes and contrasting of the image of Russians from January through March	71
5.1.7.1 Russians as a news topic, First level of analysis (the measure unit: editorials per month).....	71
5.1.7.2 Analysing the sample, second level of analysis (measure unit: sentences per Russian related article).....	71
5.1.7.3 Categories of association.....	73
5.2 The image of Russians from June through September.....	73
5.2.1 June, <i>Aamulehti</i>	74
5.2.1.1 General features.....	73
5.2.1.2 Mischief.....	74
5.2.1.3 Explaining the behaviour of the Russian Troops.....	75
5.2.1.4 Limitations on sovereignty.....	76
5.2.2 August, <i>Aamulehti</i>	77
5.2.2.1 General features.....	77
5.2.2.2 Russian militia is ignoring the violence.....	77
5.2.3 September, <i>Aamulehti</i>	78
5.2.3.1 General features.....	78
5.2.3.2 Russian militia is supporting the violent behaviour of Trade and Workers' Unions'	78
5.2.4 June, <i>Kansan Lehti</i>	80
5.2.4.1 General features.....	80
5.2.4.2 Limitations on sovereignty.....	80
5.2.4.3 Mischief.....	82
5.2.4.4 Cruelty.....	82
5.2.4.5 Food shortage.....	83
5.2.5 August, <i>Kansan Lehti</i>	84
5.2.5.1 General features.....	84
5.2.5.2 Mischief.....	85

5.2.5.3	Violations on sovereignty and mischief.....	85
5.2.5.4	Connection between Russian and Finnish Bourgeois.....	86
5.2.6	September, <i>Kansan Lehti</i>	87
5.2.6.1	General features.....	87
5.2.6.2	Limitations on sovereignty as part of the class struggle.....	88
5.2.6.3	Camaraderie between Russian and Finnish working class.....	88
5.2.7	Aamulehti and Kansan Lehti; analysis comparison of the themes and contrasting of the image of Russians from June through September.....	89
5.2.7.1	Russians as a news topic, First level of analysis (the measure unit: editorials per month).....	89
5.2.7.2	Analysing the sample, second level of analysis (measure unit: sentences per Russian related article).....	90
5.3	The image of Russians from November 1917 to end of January 1918.....	94
5.3.1	November, <i>Aamulehti</i>	94
5.3.1.1	General features.....	94
5.3.1.2	Calls for action.....	95
5.3.1.3	Partners in crime: mischief of Russian troops and Social Democrats.....	96
5.3.2	December, <i>Aamulehti</i>	98
5.3.2.1	General features.....	98
5.3.2.2	Oppression period.....	98
5.3.2.3	Complaining that Russian militia is condoning the violence of SDP.....	99
5.3.3	January 1918, <i>Aamulehti</i>	100
5.3.3.1	General features.....	100
5.3.3.2	Interference to Finland's internal conflict.....	100
5.3.3.3	Claims of Russians assisting the Red Squad.....	101
5.3.4	November, <i>Kansan Lehti</i>	102
5.3.4.1	General features.....	102
5.3.4.2	Finnish- Russian regression.....	102
5.3.4.3	Claims of Russians assisting the Protective Guards.....	103
5.3.4.4	March Revolution.....	104
5.3.5	December, <i>Kansan Lehti</i>	104
5.3.5.1	General features.....	104
5.3.5.2	The different usage of oppression period.....	105
5.3.6	January 1918, <i>Kansan Lehti</i>	105
5.3.6.1	General features.....	105
5.3.6.2	Assisting the bourgeois.....	106
5.3.6.3	The example of fore fighters and camaraderie.....	106

5.3.7 <i>Aamulehti</i> and <i>Kansan Lehti</i> : analysis comparison of the themes and contrasting of the image of Russians from November 1917 through to the end of January 1918.....	107
5.3.7.1 Russians as a news topic, First level of analysis (the measure unit: editorials per month).....	107
5.3.7.2 Analysing the sample, second level of analysis (measure unit: sentences per Russian related article).....	108

6. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION **110**

6.1 Thoughts on the initial hypothesis.....	110
6.2 The image of a Russian.....	111
6.3 Change in an image of Russian: the public opinion formation process.....	114
6.4 Propaganda.....	117
6.5 Newspapers as research material.....	119

7. BIBLIOGRAPHY AND LITERATURE **121**

1. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM AND QUESTIONS

In 1917 the societal and political sphere in Finland was changing fast. On the societal level Finland was growing out of the agrarian model and slowly moving towards industrial society. This meant that old values, lifestyles and traditions were shattering and new ones were replacing them. In the political sphere the changes were internal as well as external; internal conflict between the bourgeois parties and the social democratic party was growing towards magnitude where parliamentary work would become impossible when both of the groups unwilling to compromise or recognize the opinion of the other. The clash of two opposing sides in the parliament was merely a reflection of what was happening in the society in general; the gap between two classes was growing wider and more visible. In external politics Finland was going through interesting times; Russian empire had fallen which initiated series of changes in Finland. The independence from Russia had been discussed but now the revolution and the end of Tsar Institution were actually making it possible. Russian granted Finland its independence in the beginning of December 1917. Unfortunately the inner conflict had escalated to the point where shortly after becoming independent a Civil War erupted in Finland

The setting of the Finnish Civil War was quite the same as in other European countries: Whites against Reds, communism against capitalism or monarchy, the working class/ proletariat against bourgeois. The role of Russians in the Finnish Civil War was minor; most of the Russian military stationed in Finland left in order to support the revolution in their own country. However, they did have a part in the Finnish Civil War, not because of their role in the actual battle, but because the image of a Russian was exploited by both sides—Reds and Whites—in propaganda.

1.1 The subject matter of the study

In this thesis I will examine the image *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* gave of the Russians and how propagandistic methods were used in building that image. The interest lies in the way the image of Russians—positive and negative—was moulded to correspond with political aims; how both sides of the Civil War (the Reds and the Whites) used the image in rallying up for public approval and support for their respective causes in 1917-1918. I concentrate on identifying the image of a Russian and detecting the changes that image went through during 1917. In the process I aim at dissecting some of the propagandistic methods that were used in creating the image and later on, shifting it towards the direction where it could be used to agitate people for Civil War.

My study is a micro level study i.e. it looks into the events and processes that took place in *Tampere*; it aims at finding out what were the sentiments of the people in *Tampere*. I have set three goals for this study; first, to identify the image of Russians that *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* painted for their readers during

1917. The second goal is to identify how that image changed and what the events were which might have had an impact on the transformation. The third goal is to identify some of the propaganda techniques used by *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* in creating a image of a Russian which suited their agenda.

The questions that I looked to answer:

- Mapping out the *image of a Russian*; comparing and contrasting the image *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* presented to their readers
 - What was the image of Russians?
 - How did it evolve during the 1917?
- To identify the propagandistic methods; which propaganda tools did the two newspapers employ in developing the image of Russians?

1.2 Hypothesis

I claim that the image of Russians was used as a part of the propagandistic methods that were deployed in “pushing” public opinion towards the Civil War. In 1917 Tampere, both sides—Whites and Reds—used anti- or pro- Russian propaganda to alter public opinion so that it was favourable for their respective political aims. Anti and pro- Russian propaganda also created an atmosphere which approved growing aggression hence slowly prepared the nation for Civil War.

My starting point is the proposition that in the beginning of 1917 both parties had rather neutral opinion towards the Russian population in Finland. In the beginning of the year there were no major clashes which would have caused ill feelings between the Russians who lived in Tampere and the native Tampereans. Because of the relatively harmonious co- existence that was still felt in the beginning of the 1917 the reporting of Russian related issues was few in amount and very neutral in tone. As the year progressed the inner turmoil in Finland began; there were political issues and social issues that were causing the upheaval. According to my hypothesis this was also the turning point for the reporting of Russian related issues; the neutral and non- interested reporting slowly changed. *Aamulehti* started to apply propagandistic methods to its reporting of Russian related issues and so did *Kansan Lehti*; during that year these two newspapers constructed their own image of Russian that was in accordance of their political stance and affiliations. *Kansan Lehti* projected a rather positive image of the Russians while *Aamulehti* projected a rather negative image. The reason why two newspapers published in the same city depicted such a different image of the Russians in Finland was due to the fact that these newspapers catered to completely different audiences, *Aamulehti* being the voice of the Nationalistic party as well as other bourgeois parties and *Kansan Lehti* being the voice of the Social democratic party and their supporters.

At this point it is important to note that even though both of the newspapers were highly politicized and were campaigning for their party neither of the newspapers had an official propagandistic agenda when it came to moulding of the image of Russians in Tampere¹; the propaganda and propagandistic methods in *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* appeared because the journalists were part of the society and the audience they wrote for and hence could not be unaffected by the events taking place around them. Impartiality and objectivity were unknown concepts due to the fact that both newspapers were part of the party press and were amongst the most important mouthpiece of their respective parties. I suggest that the propaganda—if it in the beginning can even be called propaganda—in both of the newspapers started out as heightened attention towards Russian related issues and proceeded into associating Russians with either positive issues (e.g. camaraderie, assistance) or negative issues (e.g. famine, violence). As the events escalated this type of association became intentional and the reporting turned into clearly pro- or anti- Russian.

What followed was a slow but certain change in public opinion; the audiences of *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* started to adopt the attitudes that their daily newspaper projected. The opinion formation process took the path described by Edward Doob in "*Public Opinion and Propaganda*" in 1966. He wrote that public opinion formation is a long process and based upon already existing attitudes. Doob identified several stages that the process of opinion formation holds; consistency, identification and displacement were the first three stages. *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* built upon the attitudes that their readers already held towards Russians; *Aamulehti* merely needed to confirm the suspicions, fears and feelings of dislike that its readers had towards Russians, whereas *Kansan Lehti* needed to bring forth the comraderie between Finnish and Russians and the bond between the the working class people. What was achieved was **consistency** of opinion: negative on the white side, positive on the red side.

The city of Tampere was already heavily divided and the opinion towards Russians was yet another issue which separated the two groups. The **identification** into Whites or Reds and building up of group identity of what by the end of the year would be opposing sides were built around several factors—money, prestige, sophistication just to name— but one of them most definitely was the opinion the group as a whole had towards Russians.

In the society where social upheaval is combined with famine and economic slump **displacement** of grievances very often takes place; the two opposing groups start to blame each other for their hardships. In Finland Whites started first blaming Russians and the misguided individuals whom the Russians had infected with communistic ideas i.e. the Reds and Reds started blaming the rich, lazy and fat factory owners who exploited the working class for greater profit.

The next three stages—rationalization, simplification and projection—started taking place by the end of the year when the new in- group and out- group had been formed. **Rationalization** basically meant that thoughts of extreme measures such as violence, taking up arms and forming of the two armed forces were justified on

¹ although there was plenty of propagation for other issues such as culture and Finnish nationalism (particularly in *Aamulehti*) and politics and social matters (particularly in *Kansan Lehti*)

the basis of violent nature of the Russians and the people infected with communism. Reds justified their extreme measures much in the same way; the fat and evil bourgeois wants to attack the honest and simple the working class man. Both of the sides claimed that they needed armed forces which would protect them from the other.

It was too complicated to think in terms of Russians and the few Finns infected with communism or factory managers and owners who were considered as the enemies of the working class hence **simplification** followed. This was when the Whites and Reds were truly formed; one was either a red or white, both sides showed intolerance towards people who had no opinion or affiliation. At this point it is important to note that the afore mentioned group was actually quite large in numbers; the image that every man and woman took arms is misleading at best, there were people who did not have an opinion, however in the stage of simplification many of them were forced to state their affiliation with the risk of being considered as a traitor. Simplification had made matters either Red or White which made projection easy.

Projection extended the extreme measures first meant towards few to all; all Reds were now Ruskiens and all the Whites were now people who wanted to keep the working class poor and hungry so that it could have more. Everybody in the other group was an enemy hence they could be killed without much of a thought. Finland hadn't been in a war in centuries, the men who were given rifles and ordered to go and fight had never seen not to mention been in a battle; for the most of them this was the first time they even held a gun.

Killing another man was not quite as easy as it sounded hence for self defence the final stage of opinion formation took place: compensation. **Compensation** is very common phenomenon in any war situation; through it the soldier justifies the violence to him/herself, usually by creating a cause. He/she becomes a warrior who fights for greater cause, he/ she is righteous. This phenomenon took place in the Finnish Civil War: the Reds were fighting against the class enemy in order to spread the ideals of socialism and the Whites were fighting against the cancer called communism.

The seven stages of opinion formation were reflected in the reporting done by *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti*, particularly in the nature and tone of the articles but also in the motives i.e. purpose of the articles. What is the purpose of heightened interest that *Aamulehti* shows towards hooliganism committed by Russian soldiers? Why is *Kansan Lehti* suddenly giving a lot of attention to news about friendly words spoken by Lenin, addressed to the Finnish proletariat? Articles helped to create an image, which led to formation of certain kind of public opinion that later on manifested in actions. I want to make clear that my study is not about these actions but about the image and the process of opinion formation as it appears in the reporting of these two newspapers, not as it appeared among the people.

1.3 Prior research

Most of the matters related to the Finnish Civil War have already been covered by other research hence the first problem I had to tackle was to find a new angle from which nobody has looked at the occurrence before. The second problem I have faced is the scarcity of literature discussing my topic which course is a good thing because it indicates that my topic is fresh, however, it has complicated my research and influenced the choice of method.

I have classified the prior research used in this thesis into two categories; first category is the general history of the events 1917- 1918 in Tampere region and in the whole of Finland. I started out by educating myself on the places, phases and events of the Civil War, as well as on the events leading to it. For the purpose of guiding me into the progress of the Civil War in Tampere I have found Heikki Ylikangas's "*Tie Tampereelle*"² (Road to Tampere) extremely useful. The book is a compact information package on the battles and military strategy leading to the victory of the Whites in Tampere, an event which in many ways forecasted the end of the whole war. Since my thesis aims at reconstructing part of the world view which the contemporaries of 1917 Tampere received from their newspapers, I find Ylikangas's humane approach to otherwise technical topic helpful in understanding the nature of the Civil War. Another author who has given a face to the Finnish Civil War is Jaakko Paavolainen with his "*Poliittiset väkivaltaisuuudet Suomessa 1918, 1 Punainen terrori*"³ (Political Violence in Finland 1918, 1 Red Terror) and "*Poliittiset väkivaltaisuuudet Suomessa 1918, 2 Valkoinen terrori*"⁴ (Political Violence in Finland 1918, 2 White Terror) by the same author. Jaakko Paavolainen paints a good picture of the political violence committed by the Reds and Whites during different phases of the war. His research can be considered ground breaking due to the fact that he was one of the first who discussed the White terror which for decades had remained a taboo- like topic that the White side had tried to deny and erase from the collective memory and, from the written history.

The second category of prior research has been the study of the field itself; in relation to the Civil War, what topics can be and are often researched? In these journeys to depths of Finnish Civil War literature I have hoped to confirm that the topic of my research is fresh, but moreover I have hoped to run into research literature that I could use in my own study. One of these researches is Mirja Turunen's dissertation "*Kouvolan veripellot*"⁵ (The Fields of Blood of Kouvola); she has done extensive research on political violence during and immediately after the Civil War. Especially interesting for my research is the part of Turunen's dissertation where she writes about a white newspaper using unconfirmed information and rumours of Red troops torturing their POWs before killing them. These news stories, as well as the word of mouth, about alleged torture led to massive executions of red soldiers in the aftermath of the Civil War as the

² Ylikangas, Heikki. *Tie Tampereelle*. Porvoo Helsinki Juva: WSOY, 1993.

³ Paavolainen, Jaakko. *Poliittiset väkivaltaisuuudet Suomessa 1918, 1 Punainen terrori*. Helsinki: Tammi, 1966.

⁴ Paavolainen, Jaakko. *Poliittiset väkivaltaisuuudet Suomessa 1918, 2 Valkoinen terrori*. Helsinki: Tammi, 1967.

⁵ Turunen, Mirja. *Veripellot- Sisällisodan surmatyöt Pohjois- kymenlaaksossa 1918*. Jyväskylä: Atena kustannus Oy, 2005.

winning side was avenging events which actually never happened. This part of Turunen's research goes into demonstrating the important role of newspapers in Civil War, as well as of the power the press had in moulding peoples' understanding of the events; the same type of influence I expected to see in my study of the image of Russians.

The authors which have proven most useful are those who have written about the image of Russians; Kari Immonen's dissertation "*Ryssästä saa puhua...*" (It Is Ok to Say Ruskie...) ⁶ discusses how the Soviet Union was represented in Finnish media during the time period of 1918- 1939 and the dissertation by Heikki Luostarinen, "*Perivihollinen*" (The Archenemy) ⁷ examines how the image of Russians turned into the image of the archenemy and how that concept was used in the war propaganda during the Winter- and Continuation Wars. The afore mentioned studies concentrate more on the Winter- and Continuance War periods and only briefly mention the Civil War. They also treat Finland as a one nation hence the compare- contrast analysis of how different layers of the society perceived Russians is completely missing. But what they do provide is the images and tones that should be kept an eye on when analysing the articles of *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti*; the seeds of the image of a Ruskie as the archenemy of a Finn were laid long before the Winter War.

"*Vapustaistelu, kansalaissota ja kapina*" (Liberation War, Civil War and a Rebellion) ⁸— dissertation by Turo Manninen— discusses the many names of the Civil War, and the propaganda distributed by the white side. Manninen has done his research on the nature and the reasons of the Civil War as they were seen, presented and used in the white war propaganda. Although the study leaves out the Red side of the story, it is a comprehensive compilation of the White perspective and propagandistic efforts during and after the Civil War.

A study that is very close to my thesis—not so much in its subject matter but rather in its methodology and mechanics—is a study conducted by Seppo Lehtovuori. Lehtovuori has conducted a comparative study of red and white war propaganda, concentrating on the battle descriptions of newspapers *Kansanlehti* and *Ilkka* concerning the battle in Pohjoishäme in 2.2- 20.3. In the study "*Kansanlehden ja Ilkan taistelukuvaukset ja propagandakirjoitukset Pohjoishämeen taisteluista 2.2- 20.3 1918*" ⁹ (The Battle Descriptions and Propagandistic Writings of the Battles in Pohjoishäme in 2.2- 20.3 1918) Lehtovuori examines how the battle was reported by the White and Red side and how it was used in war propaganda.

One of the few studies on writings prior to the Civil War is one by Hannu Soikkanen's "*Kansalaissota dokumentteina: Valkoista ja punaista sanankäyttöä*" ¹⁰ (Civil War in Documents. White and Red Writings), which looks into the official documents issued by the Red and White sides in the wake of and during the

⁶ Immonen, Kari. *Ryssästä saa puhua....Neuvostoliitto Suomalaisessa julkisuudessa ja kirjat julkisuuden muotona 1918-1939*. Helsinki: Otava, 1987.

⁷ Luostarinen, Heikki. *Perivihollinen*. Jyväskylä: Gummerus Oy, 1986.

⁸ Manninen, Turo. *Vapustaistelu, kansalaissota ja kapina. Taistelun luonne valkoisten sotapropagandassa vuonna 1918*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän Yliopisto, 1982.

⁹ Lehtovuori, Seppo. *Kansanlehden ja Ilkan taistelukuvaukset ja propagandakirjoitukset Pohjoishämeen taisteluista 2.2- 20.3 1918*. Tampere: Tampereen Yliopisto, 1969.

¹⁰ Soikkanen, Hannu. *Kansalaissota dokumentteina: Valkoista ja punaista sanankäyttöä*. Helsinki: Tammi, 1967.

Civil War. However, the study relies quite a lot on the official statements and documents given by politicians and administrators, therefore not quite as helpful as the title would let one assume. However, the research does describe the sentiments of the politicians and of the officers on both sides, which makes it perhaps easier to predict the sentiments of the common people.

1.4 Significance of study

The significance of this study is in the fact that the image of Russians in Finland and their presentation in newspapers during the period of 1917-1918 remains a topic not yet widely explored. During my research on the Finnish Civil War literature I ran over and over again into the same problem: the lack of comparative research. Most of the research either looks at the event from the White side or from the Red side hence we end up getting only half of the picture. The problem with half done images when it comes to the wars, is that the actions of the engaging parties are intertwined; the “truth” cannot be told by presenting only the actions or the reactions. There is also an academic vacuum in research studying the events leading to the Civil War; during and after probably provides more exciting topics, however we must always keep in mind that the Civil War did not flare up out of void but that there was a year full of events leading up to it. With my research I want to uncover one of these events; the change in the image of Russians.

The possibility that the image of Russians as presented in *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* might have been part of the events leading to the Civil War has either been overlooked or not yet discovered; in either case such an angle, at least to the best of my knowledge, has not been covered by any earlier research. With this research I aimed at constructing a prologue to the research of Kari Immonen and Heikki Luostarinen, for my study presents the image of Russians after its first alteration. In the years following the Civil War there were well organized, nationwide campaigns to tarnish the image of Russians and these campaigns were largely based on the feelings and images, which the Civil War had left into the minds of the people.

Last but not least, since both of the newspapers used as case examples are local newspapers, the study aims to create understanding on how these two Tamperean newspapers conducted themselves during the Civil War.

The second set of misperceptions that I want to correct with this research, is misperceptions concerning the nature of propaganda. I also intend to discuss the role of newspapers as mirrors of the society and the objectivity and impartiality of journalists. When the objectivity and impartiality of journalistic work is discussed, it should always be taken into consideration that also journalists are members of the community and society they write for.

Propaganda is often perceived as a dirty word, something sinister that is conducted in dictatorships and totalitarian regimes; what comes to mind is Hitler, Stalin and Saddam Hussein. What also comes to mind is massive co-ordinated campaign, designed by propaganda specialists: leaflets from the sky and radio

speeches. I would like to demonstrate with this study that propaganda is not always done on purpose or particular aim in mind. Propaganda campaigns can be conducted by anybody—an advertiser, a politician, a women rights activist or a newspaper. One does not need to educate oneself in different propaganda techniques in order to produce propagandistic material; the tendency for propaganda is in human nature, in the need to pursue the others to see the matters in our way. A simple example of involuntary production and practice of propaganda in everyday situation by an ordinary person, is a mother trying to make her children to eat vegetables. She uses different types of arguments in attempts of pursuing her children to agree with her i.e to pursue them to see the matter in her way. She is not educated in propaganda techniques yet she uses them in her argumentation: “you don’t grow if you don’t eat them” (fear appeal), “your sister eats them as well” (bandwagon), “if you eat them you will become strong” (illogical fallacy) and so on.

Most of the propaganda research concentrates on propaganda as an intentional activity and studies well planned propaganda campaigns e.g. Harold Lasswell’s study of propaganda during WWI, several studies on Nazi propaganda during WWII by Institution of Propaganda Analysis (IPA)¹¹ just to mention few. The research looking at propaganda as an unintentional activity does not exist except in theoretical level. According the best of my knowledge empirical studies, which would approach propaganda as part of person-to-person communication are extremely few and studies using Finland as a case example certainly do not exist. I would like to, with my research, begin to fill this gap.

Third misperception that this thesis seeks to correct is the credibility of newspapers as research material. I recognize that newspaper articles cannot be used as sources of historical information; they are subjective, sometimes even misleading. However, writings, whether on a clay, wall or on paper provide another type of information, information on a given society. Besides being a source of information, newspapers also function as mirrors of the society and of the public opinion in a given time period. In these instances what becomes important is precisely that bias, subjectivity and misleading story lines; why are the news events reported in the way they are reported? Why in America it wasn’t properly reported that there were no weapons of mass destruction found from Iraq? Why the American media doesn’t react to US casualties? Why the only image that CNN broadcasts is happy Iraqi children playing with the American soldiers? The information these articles provide is not in the content of the article but in the purpose of the article. When analysing my empirical data, in addition to text, I also pay attention to the tones and images that the article arouses: to the purpose of the article. By reading what is written in between the lines, a researcher can see glimpses of the world view a contemporary of the newspaper saw. That is where the credibility of newspapers as research material springs from.

To briefly sum up the importance of the research in questions lies in:

- uncovering anti- and pro Russian propaganda in *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti*, showing the change in the image of Russians

¹¹ American institute founded after the WWI.

- providing comparative research where both sides are presented during the time period, which is often discarded
- providing a prologue to already existing research on the image of Russians
- providing information on how *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* conducted themselves during the time period around the Civil War
- presenting propaganda as involuntary and random effort and newspapers as a viable research material

1.5 Terminology

1.5.1 The events of spring 1918

A civil war is often considered as something shameful because it breaks the illusion of the unified nation, it has a sinister character because it is all about killing ones own kind; not “us” defending ourselves against “them”, but “us” killing “us”. Since civil war is not glorious event in a nations history, there has always been a tendency of smoothing it over by rewriting the events and giving the war a righteous cause.

This was also true in Finland concerning the events in 1917-1918. History is always written by the winners and conquerors, so the first “official history” that came out was written by the white side; it was printed in the school books and taught to generations to come. Up to today there are three official histories existing on the proceedings of the Finnish Civil War: “Vapaussotahistoria” (history of the Liberation War)- “Luokkasotahistoria” (History of the Class War)- or “Kansalaisotahistoria” (history of the Civil War). The three official histories have been named according the angle the particular research takes on the events, but mainly: according to the angle it takes on the reasons of the war and on the concept of the enemy.

History is not about semantics, but semantics do reveal a lot about history; it is in order to take a look at the many names given to the events of 1918 have been given.

Liberation War (Vapaussota)¹²: Term often used by the White history and the liberation war history research; indicates that the Civil War in 1918 was actually about driving away the Russian militia, which still lingered in Finland after it had received its independence in December 1917. I will not be using this term, because it attempts to present the war as a war between two nations: Russia and Finland. Such presentation is not accurate, since the few members of Russian militia remaining in Finland joined the red side or simply did not participate. I shy away from this particular term also because it came into being after the war, and was a

¹² Partially from Turunen, Mirja. *Veripellot- Sisällisodan surmatyöt Pohjois- kymenlaaksossa 1918*. Jyväskylä: Atena kustannus Oy, 2005. and Ylikangas, Heikki. *Tie Tampereelle*. Porvoo Helsinki Juva: WSOY, 1993.

product of a campaign aimed at rewriting the history. Also, liberation war history has a tendency of placing all of the blame and the guilt on the Red side which in the light of *actual* history is rather ironic.

Coup D'tat: Implies that minor social guerrilla group attempted to take over the government. This term will not be used because it has a great contextual error; in fact in 1917 the Whites were the minority group in the society and in the parliament had only few more seats than Social Democrats. Another reason for forsaking this term is the fact that the size of the armed forces—70 000 on white side, 100 000 of the red side—speaks nothing of “minor guerrilla group”.

War Between Brothers (Veljessota): The term quite accurately describes the division of the nation into two, as well as the reality experienced by many families when the members of a family chose different sides. This term has national-romantic connotation hence has been used quite a lot in fictional literature on the events of Civil War, therefore it is not appropriate when the topic is the subject of academic research.

Red Rebellion (Punakapina): This term was used in the beginning of the Civil War by the Whites, which would make it at least authentic however, it gives a wrong impression of the size of the war and hence will not be used. The Finnish Civil War is recognized to be the second biggest Civil War in Europe (after the Spanish Civil War); within approximately three months over 30 000—1% of the total population—lost their lives. For comparison we can look at the casualties of American Civil War where 2% of people lost their lives, however, the time period was 4 years. The word “rebellion” does not accurately describe the magnitude of the events.

Revolution (Vallankumous): The term was used in the beginning of the war by the Red side but cannot be used due to the contextual error of the term; revolution, commonly associated with an overthrow of an old regime and giving the power to the people, was not the end result of the Finnish Civil War. Would the Red side have won the situation might be different.

Class War (Luokkasota): The term is used by the Class War historians and aims to describe the Civil War setting as proletariat against the bourgeoisie but is slightly inaccurate when the Finnish Civil War is concerned. The fact is that many agricultural workers and tenant farmers joined the White side because they shied away from the communist and pro-soviet line that the Red side started to cultivate in its polemics. I would not use the term also because the war in Finland actually didn't have much to do with the ideology but more with feelings of hatred and bitterness resulting from the centuries of social inequality.

Civil War (Kansalaissota/ Sisällissota): This term has been chosen and will be used throughout the thesis. It describes accurately the nature and the setting of the events in 1917-1918, without carrying any particular connotation. The term was also used by the Whites and Reds themselves during the first few months of the

Civil War hence it bears authenticity, which is the reason why esteemed researchers such as Heikki Ylikangas and Mirja Turunen have also chosen to use the term in their own research.

1.5.2 The Reds and the Whites

The terms “Whites” and “Reds” when discussing the Civil War and its opposing sides, are widely used in Finnish literature hence I have adopted the terms into the vocabulary of this thesis. In terminology the categorization of the people into two groups appears simple, however, the division was not quite as clear cut as the semantics lets one assume. Therefore, there is a real need to specify who the Whites and Reds actually were.

Whites (*Valkoiset*): were constructed from the political right, supporting the independence of the Finnish nation and culture from Russia. The White side was mainly bourgeoisie due to the fact that the political right gathered supporters from higher layers of social strata. However, when the two sides started actualizing at the end of 1917, many agricultural workers and tenant farmers joined the White side, because they did not agree with Marxist agenda that the Red side had adopted. The main political themes of the Whites were nationalistic and at times highly idealistic.

The White armed troops consisted mainly of agricultural workers and tenant farmers amounting to approximately 70 000 people. They called themselves “Protective Guard” and were anointed as the official governmental armed force. The troops received military assistance (training and arms) from Sweden and Germany.

Reds (*Punaiset*): were constructed of the political left and their supporters hence it is rather natural that people who identified with the Red side came mainly from industrial and agricultural labourers. What else characterized the Red side, was socialistic ideals harboured by the party, party press and the Trade and Workers Unions. However, as the events proceeded it became very obvious that a common line soldier had very little interest towards the political aspects of the war; for him the war was about getting even with the upper class.

The red armed forces totalled over 100 000 people, but lacked experienced leadership. The troops called themselves Red Squad and received support (mainly arms but also military officers) from Soviet-Russia. Some of the Russian militia remaining in Finland also joined the Red troops.

Both armed groups had officially assumed activity at the summer of 1917, but were more concerned with peace keeping activities, functioning as law and order enforcement in Finland after the Russian troops returned to Russia after the March Revolution. Initially both of the troops were unarmed and even co-operated with each other, but as the events started to escalate the co-operation ended as both of the troops and their supporters started to feel growing suspicion towards each other. Particularly after Russia’s October

Revolution both of the troops started to arm themselves against each other. The final blow to the growing distrust between the Reds and Whites came on the 25th of January when the White troops were declared as the “national guard” of the independent government of Finland. Few days later, on 28th of January the Civil War broke out.

2. THE SETTING: FINLAND IN THE EARLY 1900s

Finland undoubtedly was one of the most homogenous nations in Europe in the early 1900s, which often has resulted to the misperception that Finland was a unified nation. The reality of the early 1900s was quite different; deep social and economical gaps existed between layers of the society and that the nation—supposedly unified— was actually divided into two groups which experienced everyday life very differently.

2.1 Changing Regional Demographics

Finland was mainly a rural nation; the majority of people lived in the countryside and got their livelihood from agriculture. The urbanization process started late, was slow and did not take place in unison with the industrialization, as it did in many other countries. In Finland industrial and agricultural system co- existed rather harmoniously for decades. Industrialization did not result into farmers selling their land and going to cities for a factory job; the older generation remained in the countryside and continued with their old lifestyle. But the young generation did not: in the early 1900s it was becoming more and more clear that living of the land or working as an agricultural worker did not pay off; cities attracted particularly young adults from the countryside to move in and establish their own lives there. Every year 2- 3% of the population in Finland moved from place to another, great part of this movement was from the countryside to the cities and the high birth rate in the countryside guaranteed that in the future movement to the cities would increase. The development of the above mentioned trend can be seen in the demographics of the main cities, showing that the amount of people aged between 20- 30 was considerably high already in 1910.

Moving¹³ to a city did not necessarily mean moving into better life even though it did give the appearance of it; the amount and variety of consumer goods was greater and factory jobs paid more than agricultural work did, so seemingly there was more money to be spend. But for many, moving into a city merely meant being poor in the city instead of being poor in the countryside. Salaries in the cities were paid in cash, which was unfamiliar practice to many people coming from rural areas, where much of the work was paid in food products or in other tangible goods and money as a currency of exchange was somewhat rarely used. On the other hand, in the cities everything had to be paid for; expenditures for rent, firewood, food and fabric took much of ones monthly earnings.

In the cities the polarization between the bourgeois and the working class was more visible since both of the groups inhabited the same physical space. As WWI broke out, its side effects and scarcity of certain goods, became a pressing issue. The fact that the bourgeois did not seem to be suffering from the lack of milk products, potatoes, wheat, coffee and sugar raised feelings of bitterness among the the working class.

¹³ Haapala, Pertti. *Kun yhteiskunta hajosi, Suomi 1914-1920*. Helsinki: Painatuskeskus, 1995.

2.2 Layers of the Society

In homogenous society as Finland was in 1900s the financial situation, profession and social connections gained heightened importance as factors, which divided people into social groups. Three different classes emerged: the bourgeois and the aristocracy, the middle class, and the working class. In the Finnish language though, only two classes existed; one either belonged to the Gentry¹⁴ or to the Common Folk¹⁵.

The so- called the middle class was slightly looked down upon by both bourgeois and the working class because it was understood that the middle class did not accept their position in the social strata or tried to be better than they really were. The middle class had purchased its way up in the social ladder hence violated the commonly accepted thought that class differences were part of natural order of the societies and that people were defined into classes according mental and physical capabilities. Social upward mobility was possible from the working class to the middle class but not to the bourgeois, which was closed society and usually even married amongst themselves. Marriage was one way to rise in social strata, the other one was education which guaranteed a profession outside of manual labour. In the 1910s' there was some possibility for upward mobility, however, it was not happening with the magnitude that would have made social mobility an actual societal force.

The bourgeois and the aristocracy of Finland were actually Swedish of origin hence the first sign of the class was the language: the gentry spoke Swedish and the common folk Finnish. Other indicators of ones class were higher education, which was the privilege reserved to wealthy people, as well as roomy houses with servants and summer houses. The bourgeois also consumed luxury goods, used silk and satin for their clothing and decorative items in furnishing. Very tangible signs of ones class were a piano, dining room separate from the kitchen and a library.

Finnish bourgeois was very civilized when compared to the rest of the population but in comparison to the European bourgeois it was more simplistic in manner and thought.

The upper class claimed liberal thought and enlightenment which manifested in attempts to bring sophistication and cultural education to the common people and transfer the coarse man of the forests into the culturally educated man of the forests. In actuality the bourgeois was very conservative and although it wanted to provide education to the people, it also wanted the people to be informed of their place in the social strata.

In 1880s Finnish bourgeois was swept away by Fennomania: the idealization of Finnish language, culture and nature combined with the dream of Finland as an independent nation. As a result of Fennomania many of the bourgeois began using Finnish as their spoken language, translated or changed their last names from Swedish to Finnish- sounding and adopted Finnish culture as their own. Fennomania divided the bourgeois into two: to the approving and to the non- approving.

¹⁴ "Herrat" in Finnish

¹⁵ "Kansa" in Finnish

The middle class started to form after the industrialization increased its speed and the lower level managers and administrators started to differentiate themselves from the working class. These were the people, who had gained wealth or education and therefore could “buy” their way out of the working class. Being from the middle class implied that one had enough money to purchase middle size apartment and have a maid, as well as send one of their children through school. Tangible signs of a class were clothes that imitated those of the bourgeois, but were made of cheaper fabrics, as well as few decorative items at home. Although the middle class copied the style of the bourgeois, it did not live the life of luxury and differed greatly from the bourgeois in the level of education and in their cultural aspirations.

The Finnish the middle class came into being in the cities; in the countryside the division of the people into the Gentry and Folk remained strict. The group that comes nearest to the middle class in the countryside was the small scale farmers, who owned their own land, perhaps a bit forest and cattle but did not have enough money to gather savings.

The working class, as the title indicated, was the class that worked in hard manual jobs. The difference between the bourgeois, the middle class and the working class becomes clearer when looking at the role of women; the bourgeois women did not attend even to the lightest house work, the household run by servants. The middle class women usually did do some house work or all of it in case the family had no servants, however, she did not work outside the house. The working class women worked at the same jobs with men and took care of the household as well. In order to support the family every members’ contribution was essential hence the working class women could not afford to stay at home, as the bourgeois and the middle class women did. There was a societal pressure for the working class woman to give up her job after getting married, however, this was rarely financially possible and the women continued working or took up some light work as a seamstress or cleaner.

The working class had often only the very basic reading skills and no other education. They had countryside background and were as a rule poor. They were employed in industrial jobs, either in factories—women in fabric and men in lumber or iron—or in building sights. The salary that they received was more than what was paid for agricultural labor, however the life in cities was more expensive. In the best position were the members of the working class who were employed in factories, because usually the factory provided social services to their employees e.g. healthcare, housing and—in bigger cities—even schools and kindergartens. Over half of worker’s salary went to pay for the food, rest went to rent and clothing; the working class did not have any savings and rarely had finances to use for purposes other than living. Although the working class did not suffer from famine, the food it ate was one- sided: potatoes, milk and rye bread, meat products and fish were seldom consumed and vegetables or fruits nearly never. Among the working class coffee and sugar were considered as luxury items.

Other type of the working class was formed by the agricultural workers. They were either part- time seasonal workers, who travelled from house to another and received their salary in cash or full time workers

living in the house where they worked, receiving their salary in form of tangible goods e.g. full board, clothing and sometimes a farm animal (milking cow, lamb, chicken), the products of which they could sell to their own benefit.

In the early 1900s Finland and Finnish society were changing; it was slowly moving away from agricultural society towards industrial society, the people were moving to cities which were growing rather rapidly. The middle class was announcing itself and with its arrival the old class system was slowly, but surely, collapsing. New social reforms in 1905 changed the political system so that all the layers of the society had representation in the parliament. Class consciousness was rising, the working class was demanding better working conditions and salaries. In 1916 the “the working class party” the THE SDP gained majority in the parliament. There were clear signs of the fact that Finnish society was on its way towards big changes. Despite of all social commotion, before the beginning of WWI in 1914 nothing indicated that these changes would tear the nation into two and result into Civil War.

2.3 Symptoms of the First World War

World War I began in 1.8.1914 and Finland being part of Russian empire and having strategic importance as a buffer between Russia and its old enemy Sweden, the Marshall Law was extended also to Finland increasing the number of Russian soldiers from 30 000 to 100 000¹⁶. Finland never became an actual battle ground and the war demonstrated itself mainly in limitations on trade, regulations concerning economy and production, war censorship and eventually shortage of different food products. The offset of the war caused uncertainty and panic; the capital of Russia, St. Petersburg, was relatively close, which brought the war a bit too close for comfort: people started to stock food products and many moved to the countryside, where they felt they would be safer.

The following years, 1915- 1916 proved that the early assumptions about the nature of the war had been wrong; the subscriptions from Russian army boosted the national economy and the Russian troops stationed in Finland did the same for local economies. People settled down and enjoyed the prosperity.

The situation changed when the tide of the war turned unfavorable to Russia. The heavy losses in the WWI hurt the Tsar Institution and in March 1917 the people revolted, which led to abdication of the throne by Nikolai II. Consequently the year 1917 was the year when also the Finns started to experience the negative effects of the war. For long the export to Russia— particularly the export of paper, wood, metal and textiles— had been the corner stone of Finnish economy and its role had been further enhanced by the war due to the fact that the trade to England and Germany stopped. Between 1914-1917 the trade to and from Russia covered 85% of the Finnish export and about 70% of the import. When looking at these numbers it is

¹⁶ Most of the information of this sub-chapter is from Haapala, Pertti. *Kun yhteiskunta hajosi, Suomi 1914-1920*. Helsinki: Painatuskeskus, 1995.

very easy to understand why the year 1917, when Russia dramatically reduced its orders or then stopped them altogether, was devastating to the Finnish economy.

2.3.1 Food Shortage

Throughout the war there had been occasional scarcity of some food products, mainly of flour and grain and later on of butter and cheese, but to outright food shortage the situation turned in 1917. When Russia stopped importing flour to Finland the food shortage actualized in a whole different level; Finland had been completely dependent on the imported flour hence was unprepared to produce the amounts of flour that was suddenly required. Another by-product of the situation was caused by the combination of food shortage and profiteering, which together dragged the prices of everyday products extremely high while the salaries remained the same. The end result was the situation where people did not have money to buy food. The food shortage was soon politicized; it was used for juxtapositioning the society and the two opposing sides, which had already formed. The working class saw that it had to give up essentials of life, whereas the bourgeois needed to “tighten the belt” only when it came to extra and lifestyle expenditures. In such a setting it was easy to feel bitterness and put the blame on the bourgeois, since from where the working class was standing it seemed that the bourgeois were not affected at all by the food shortage. Rumours started to spread that food commissions—formed to regulate the food distribution—had hidden reserves of flour and butter, which they were selling ‘under the counter’ to people who could afford them. In already flammable atmosphere such information led to hooliganism; people started raiding warehouses of dairy farms and dairy product factories in search of hidden stocks.

The food shortage and its side effects were experienced particularly in the cities, while in the countryside people produced their own food products hence had always readily available supply.

2.3.2 Unemployment

The subscriptions made by the Russian army of iron, fabrics and such had kept the employment up, both in cities and in countryside there had even been occasional shortage of labour force. The mass unemployment started from the beginning of 1917 and coincided with the food shortage, which intensified the effect of both phenomena. After the March revolution Russia stopped the military orders for the same reason why she stopped the export of the flour to Finland: WWI had driven Russia to deep destitution and it simply did not have any to spare. The hit Finnish industry took was bad, because the war had employed 42 000 people, and the ‘relief work’ commissioned by Russian army employed another 30 000 people. From those altogether 20 000 people lost their jobs in the beginning of 1917. Laying off of such a great volume of people caused momentary vagrancy when the people relocated from cities to countryside or moved from one city to another in search of a new job. The upper class saw this movement of the working class as the source of hooliganism and moral decadence, blaming the working class for all the mischief taking place in the cities. Just like food

shortage, also the unemployment became a political issue that was very effectively used by the professional agitators, workers unions as well as politicians.

2.3.3 The Russian troops

Russian troops and military, as well as administrative officials, had been stationed in Finland as long as Finland had been part of Russian Grand duchy; these troops functioned as militia and were responsible of keeping the peace in the country. The purpose of administrative officials was to look after the Russian interests and to ‘oversee’ the execution of the autonomy.

The increased presence of the Russian militia during the WWI was not something out of the ordinary and generally was not ill received. As mentioned before, the sheer number of the troops (100 000 at best) was enough to boost the local economies; the troops bought supplies and contributed to the income of other shops as well as of leisure establishments. The general opinion towards the Russian troops was quite neutral and their presence in cities or in the countryside did not cause any disturbances in the lives of the locals; at the countryside the militia even made itself useful by participating in the work when extra hands were needed during the harvest season. On the other hand the presence of Russian officials was sometimes perceived as negative due to the fact that their ‘day command’ was to implement orders from the Russian Senate and the Tsar, which in many occasions were constrictive and caused great dissatisfaction among the people.

The situation chanced rather rapidly and dramatically after the March Revolution; the Tsar establishment stopped existing, Russia was in political and social disarray. The chain of command had been broken and the Russian Militia in Finland was left without supervision and clear leadership, which given the circumstance led to mischief and hooliganism. In the beginning the violence was targeted towards Russian military officials; when the news about the March Revolution reached Finland¹⁷, especially in Helsinki where Russian navy ships were located, mutinies broke out and several admirals were killed. Later on the looting and stealing, along with drunken violence and harassment of women spread out from cities to the countryside. Of course, it has to be pointed out that small number of the Militia was engaging in these acts, however, the newspapers— particularly the ‘White’ party press— had a tendency of exaggerating the magnitude of the hooliganism. After the March Revolution Russian militia were becoming a weighty burden and cause of grievance, not only because of the increased mischief, but also because the Finns still had to provide food supplies for them. When there was a shortage of food and then the little food available went to the Militia, it was natural that that the opinion towards them turned, in relatively short time period, sour.

¹⁷ It is estimated that about 80 military officials, most of them navy admirals, were killed during those couple of days. Westerlund, Lars (toim.). *Venäläissurmat Suomessa 1914- 1922*. Helsinki: Valtioneuvoston Kanslia, 2004.

Even though the mischief was not directed to any specific social group, the bourgeois found it particularly threatening and demanded heavy actions to be taken. Also the working class condemned the violence, after all, they experienced it as well. The appearance of hooliganism was partly the reason leading to the establishment of the Red and White security forces; in the beginning of the 1917 the two groups did not carry weapons but towards the end of 1917 the suspicions had reached the point where both of the sides started to arm themselves against the other. The birth of two security forces instead of one was direct manifestation of the depth and intensity of the division.

2.4 The political scene in 1905- 1917

The political scene in Finland¹⁸ started evolving in 1905, when—as a result of the Great Strike at that same year—Nikolai II signed the manifesto initiating several social reforms both in Russia and in Finland. Although the political movements had already started in the end of 1800 the real ‘race’ for organizing party agenda and regimenting the supporters started in 1906. The birth of political parties took place almost simultaneously; Finland’s political system was reorganized and the nation got its first democratic parliament, although one- chambered, and the equal and general right to vote. For the first time all the layers of the population had at least a hypothetical change to be heard.

2.4.1 The Social Democratic Party (Sosiaalidemokraattinen Puolue, SDP)

The biggest layer of the society in the beginning of the 1900s was the working class, which comprised constructed of agricultural and industrial workers. According to the SDP, in 1905 the working class constituted 61% of the total population therefore it was not a surprise that the SDP even started out as a party for the masses. The number of members reflected the real power relation, as well as the interest people had towards the social democratic movement; when the party was formed in 1899 it had 10 000 members and by the end of 1905 that number had grown into 85 000. In 1903 (the party convention in Forssa) the party took up what was clearly a Marxist ideology and by doing so, knowingly or unknowingly, drew the line that would in years to come divide the political scene into two opposing sides.

The social climate of the time forced a wedge between the different classes; landowners, landlords, independent entrepreneurs, administrative officers, industrialists—the bourgeois, as the SDP party activist Edvard Gylling categorized the group in 1908— started to identify with the political right. The working class: tenant farmers, industrial workers, agricultural workers and unemployed— category defined by Gylling— began to identify with the SDP.

With this rather black- or- white categorization of the population, Edvard Gylling defined who were the

¹⁸ Tommila, Päiviö: *Suomen lehdistön historia, sanomalehdistö suurlakosta talvisotaan*. Kuopio: Kustannuskiila Oy, 1987.

supporters of the SDP, which had an impact on the political agenda the party started to follow. At first the main target group of the party was industrial workers, however, the party leadership soon understood that since the percentage of the industrial workers in early 1900s was as low as 12%, the SDP could not gain real political power if its party propaganda was directed only to industrial workers. So, in 1908 (the party convention in Oulu) the SDP added the agricultural workers to its followers and the party achieved mass party status. Joining two groups coming from different surroundings— one from the countryside and other from the cities— was relatively easy due to the fact that the ideology the SDP propagated suited to address the problems of agricultural, as well as industrial workers. The message in simplified form demanded rule of the people instead of the bourgeois and social reforms in several levels.

In 1916 elections the SDP achieved a majority in the parliament; the number of seats it got along with the enormous amount supporters caused the other political parties to ally together against the SDP.

The Party Press

The SDP did not have as strong party press tradition as certain other parties, but soon after the 1905 Great Strike it began creating a wide web of party newspapers covering much of its support areas.

Since the working class was often uneducated (although able to read) starting from the beginning, the party press took up the role of an “educator”; in the agenda was the distribution of information on socialism and on importance of unified actions and Workers Unions. The amount of ideological content of a party newspaper depended often on the editor-in-chief and great differences can be observed from one newspaper to another. However, this does not go into saying that the party press published only ideological propaganda; first and foremost the party press was newspapers providing information about current events in Finland and abroad.

The second task of the party press was to unify the supporters of the SDP into one political entity, connecting the strongholds of the SDP to each other. The party press was mainly concentrated on the industrial centers (Turku, Tampere, Kotka, Viipuri), but when the agricultural workers joined the party also the party press started spreading to the countryside, where its polemics were well met by the masses of agricultural workers. The spreading of the party press to agricultural areas was a direct result of the SDP gaining a foothold in the countryside: the ever- growing number of local offices needed channels for communication.

The SDP as a party did not have the finances to establish newspapers; the Workers Unions and local offices of the party gathered the money from private and public donors for establishing a new newspaper. Since the money for the newspapers did not come from the party, the party did not have an official way to control what was written in its newspapers, but then again, such a control was hardly necessary. The journalists who wrote for the newspapers were as a rule politically opinionated and shared the ideology and were prominent members of the party. The party loyalty of the journalists was not characteristic only to the party press of the SDP but was a quality that the party press of every party shared. The control over the

ideological content was particularly important to the SDP, because before the party could become a true majority party maintaining its position, it had first to teach and communicate its cause and ideology to the people it represented. For this purpose it was essential that the party press propagated a unified ideological message.

2.4.2 Finnish Nationalist Party (Suomalainen Puolue, SP)

The Finnish- Nationalist party had existed for several decades before the Great Strike in 1905. The SP had a reputation— and for a good reason— of being the bourgeois party, as well as being capital centered. Both of the claims were accurate for all of the party administrators lived in Helsinki and 90% of them had an academic degree, which in the beginning of 1900s indicated a wealthy background.

The SP had nationalistic aims; it propagated for the development and spread of Finnish culture. The SP concerned itself with political matters such as the role of the constitution and aspects of autonomy, but it also put emphasis on striving for cultural independence and on attempts of positioning Finnish as the official language. Perhaps it was due to the Fennomania, cultural aspirations and the bourgeois profile, which led to the failure of recognizing the huge role social problems played in domestic politics and how crucial it would have been to address those matters.

In political linings the SP presented the right. The SP's the constitution based political agenda in addition to aims of national enlightenment and cultural greatness made it appealing to the upper layers of the society; the supporters of the SP were often, landowners, landlords, city administration officials, teachers, entrepreneurs and so on. The SP and the SDP were at the opposing ends of the political spectrum, the SP presenting the old system, whereas the SDP— power of the people from the people to the people— represented the 'new' direction towards which the politics in Europe were developing.

Party Press

Unlike the SDP, the SP had a good party press network already in 1906, including many big newspapers some of which had been published since the late 1800s. Considering the new political atmosphere in 1906 and the need to gain supporters as well as regiment the already existing members the 'problem' was that the SP's party press was centered in Helsinki area. The SP's members were willing and able to donate funds for establishing new newspapers located all over Finland, which lead to the private ownerships of the SP's party press.

Because of the private ownerships the SP had no direct channel for control over the content of its newspapers. However, there was hardly a need for such a channel because the owners of the newspapers were as rule influential members of the party administration. Private ownerships of the party press created a problem concerning the 'common voice'; the amount and tone of party propaganda depended much on the dedication of the owner. The lack of common voice was also a reflection of the disagreements within the SP,

which would later on result into formation of a new party. The SP was the only party where Secretary General (K.N. Rantakari 1906- 1911) was in direct contact with the editor's-in-chief of its party press and instructed them what was to be written and how it was to be written. After Rantakari changed position within the party administration the control over the party press loosened, which goes into showing how much individual personalities had to do with the official line not only of separate newspapers but also the party press as a whole.

2.4.3 The constitutional Finnish Nationalist Party (Nuorsuomalainen Puolue, NSP)

The NSP was established in 1894 when some members of the SP felt that they could no longer agree with the conservative mentality of the party. For the first time The constitutional Finnish Nationalists Party was officially organized for the 1907 parliamentary elections. The NSP had similar aims with the SP, the main difference being the NSP's liberal views on many political issues and the strong support it gave to the role of Finland's own the constitution. Although the NSP declared itself as peoples' party its administration was comprised of upper class and it gathered upper class supporters. The Party had 11 857 members in 1906, however, the number of the members declined when part of the supporters left the NSP to form their own party, the Agrarian Union.

The problem was that the NSP was a bit too liberal; its rather vague socio- political linings as well as inability to realize the importance of the countryside as a support area cost the party its success. The Party was also in constant inner turmoil concerning the NSP's official stance on questions related to Russia and the co- operation with the Swedish Party which was much criticized by some of the party members.

The Party Press

Considering that the NSP was not one of the biggest parties, it is surprising that it had the biggest party press, however most of the newspaper were regional and rather small in circulation. The party press reflected the inner turmoil which manifested itself in lack of central organization and common political linings. The NSP party press was not financially connected to the party hence could not be controlled through financial channels. The central administration of the party did sent out instruction to their newspapers but the way newspapers wrote about political issues depended much on how carefully the editor-in-chief wanted to follow the instruction and on what was his level of commitment to the cause. Because of the party's liberal views on the freedom of the speech and press the NSP was also shy on interfering too much on the content of its newspapers. However, most of the owners or editors-in-chiefs were members of the party administration hence the loyalty to the party was guaranteed.

2.4.4 The Agrarian Union Party (Maalaisliitto, ML)

The ML was formed officially in 1908 by former members of the NSP who felt that the Party was not active enough in addressing the political issues that were arising in the countryside. As the name of the Party indicates, Agrarian Union (ML) gained the support of people living and getting their livelihood from the countryside. In the beginning the ML experienced difficulties in positioning itself and finding its target group; people living in the countryside were either rich landowners who supported the SP or poor agricultural workers who supported the SDP. Finally ML found its niche among the independent “small size” farmers, whose political and social interests were not properly served by neither of the Parties. The ML’s political agenda formed around its “target group” and was to protect the rights of its members against city bureaucracy and to bring the issues that were important to them forth in the parliament.

The Party Press

What is most remarkable in the birth of the ML party press is that it came into being before the party did; newspapers started targeting their content to the people living in the countryside. The newspapers came into being already in 1906, whereas the party was formed in 1908. This feature must be noted because it differed from the general pattern of birth of the party press but also because it had an effect on the organization and on the functions of the entire ML party press.

The ML had the same problem with the SDP when it came to the location of its support areas: they were in areas far away from each other. Geographical disunity resulted into heightened importance of the party press as a connecting element of the party strongholds. Particularly during the first years, when the organization of the regional offices was weak, the party press was often responsible of regimenting and organizing the supporters and the party activities.

The ownership of the party newspapers was distributed to different organizations and publishing houses, it was not financed by the party, that, and the peculiar way the party press of the ML had created itself caused anomaly in the way it was controlled; unlike all the other party press, the party press of the ML was not controlled at all. In their editorials and articles newspapers had established a political agenda which the ML picked up; the owners, editors-in -chiefs and the journalists did not write against the political linings they themselves had drawn.

2.4.5 The Swedish Peoples Party (Ruotsalainen Kansan Puolue, RKP)

The Swedish Peoples Party was definitely at the losing end of the political reforms in 1905; until the reforms the RKP had been extremely elitist (almost aristocratic), small in size yet overwhelmingly influential. After the reforms the party found itself losing most of its political power and being outnumbered by Finnish “commoners”, which had far more supporters than the RKP did. As the Finnish

parties were forming, the RKP was reorganizing itself and its agenda: in its new program it declared that its agenda from now on was to protect the rights of Swedish speaking people in Finland. It also chose the pro-constitution line, which had been and was becoming increasingly popular.

The Party Press

The RKP clearly was not like the other Finnish parties, which also shone through its party press activity. Due to the fact that the party did not have any real political agenda the purpose of the party press of the RKP's was not in party propaganda; its main function was to unify the Swedish speaking people. The task was not an easy one, because even though the RKP was an elitist party most of the Swedish speaking people were either small size farmers or fishermen. The party press of the RKP functioned as a bandage that covered the social and financial differences existing among the Swedish speaking people.

The ownership pattern of the party press also differed greatly from the general model; the RKP's party press was privately owned and the ties to party administration were scarce. The people who worked in the newspapers were connected to the party administration but the party newspapers were run as companies that had to turn in profit hence if the political propaganda did not sell, it had to go. The importance was placed on the quality of the content.

There are claims that the RKP's party press cannot be labelled as party press because it lacked the political propaganda, however this is not quite accurate due to the fact that much like the party press of the ML, the party press of the RKP was more of an equal partner to the party than a organ taking orders from it. There was not any official channel through which the party administration could have influenced the content of its newspaper however, the party press often gave its support to the political and ideological linings made by the RKP.

2.5 Overview

The time period 1900s-1917 can easily be divided into three parts, each of which has very distinct features. Through observation of these periods the contribution of the Russian Revolutions becomes obvious; the Finnish Civil War indeed was the end result of circumstances created by the Russian Revolutions (March and October) and WWI. However, it was not a victim of them; much like the esteemed historian Pertti Haapala writes "*The Civil War did not just start, it was ignited.*"¹⁹

¹⁹ Haapala, Pertti. *Kun yhteiskunta hajosi, Suomi 1914- 1920*. p. 225

2.5.1 1900s-1909

Finnish people had very submissively accepted the division of people into the Gentry and the Folk; it had never caused uproar or claims of injustice, it rather had been considered as something rather practical since it clearly defined with whom one could associate and what behaviour was expected. This all started changing around 1906 when the social reforms by Nikolai II were put into effect. The equal right to vote, was introduced and the results of the 1907 elections— the ‘the working class party’ the SDP becoming overwhelmingly the largest party in the parliament — demonstrated the real societal power relations. Suddenly the class division, once considered natural, started to appear as inequality. The supporters of the SDP were empowered by the electoral victory, the problem was that in the parliament the SDP did not have power *de facto*. The SDP only had power *de jure*; what it lacked was the support of the senate and cooperation with the other parties which it did not even seek to establish. When the changes that the SDP, its party press, workers unions and numerous professional propagandists had rallied for did not occur the the working class did not blame the SDP, it blamed the bourgeois. Other parties— having more or less upper class profiles— were scared of loosing their status on the top of the food chain and were clinging on to the old class division.

The role of the party press and professional propagandists was stronger among the the working class since the the working class was not class conscious; for centuries it had recognized the bourgeois as a class, but for the the working class the whole concept of ‘class’ carried a notion of education and wealth— things that they did not have— hence the the working class did not perceive themselves as a class. The political propaganda and the outcome of the elections 1906 brought that to an end, the the working class was becoming class conscious. The party press of the SDP was propagating for rather radical ideas; the word “class struggle” and “war between classes” entered the editorials while political propaganda and anti-bourgeois agitation were increasing.

In addition to the politicisation of the press, another characteristic for the time period 1900s-1909 was the rapid growth in the number of publications.

2.5.2 1909-1914

Even though 1909-1914 was marked by serious societal differences, the difference had not yet escalated; people had common points keeping them united, the strongest one of them being Russians and the Second Oppression period. In 1909 Russia again started the Russification of Finland by taking away many of the rights it had granted in 1809. Censorship was tightened and policies with the purpose of drawing Finland back to the closeness of Russia were implemented. Autonomy was one of the things that all the Finns equally cherished hence when it became ‘under the attack’ the nation, regardless of class or party affiliation united against the oppressor in ‘passive resistance’. The party press of all of the parties directed their attention on Russian attacks against the Finnish the constitution instead of the other parties in the Finnish parliament.

Much of the population still lived at the countryside and there politics and other administrative matters did not actualize up to the same extent that they did in the cities, which still were rather empty. In 1909-1914 everybody had food on their table, house and a job, therefore, up until 1914 politics, class differences and class injustices remained as matters that affected activists and politically conscious but did not affect ordinary peoples' lives in any way.

2.5.3 1914-1917

The WWI started and brought along several changes. The first very visible one being the migration to the cities; WWI boosted up the national economy and the cities provided plenty of job opportunities for people willing to move there. And many, particularly young people from the countryside did: in cities salaries were better and life more exciting. Politics was still concerned with the Oppression period and in comparison to year to come the Workers Unions' propaganda was relatively mild; particularly year 1916 has been considered as season of 'quiet waters' on political, as well as and societal level. Of course the political and societal defects were still present and much of them had not seen any improvements, but the second Oppression period was at its high peak hence all the ills of the Finnish society were seen as the fault of the Tsar Institution and the Russian senate.

The news of the March Revolution and the Tsar abdicating the throne was received with joy in Finland; the spirit was that with the oppressor gone the social injustices of the Finnish society would disappear. Especially the the working class was expecting radical changes for the better and when they saw that nothing at all changed and in fact there was less employment, less food and less money the disillusionment was hard. The Tsar institution could no longer be blamed for the wrongs of the society, new cause for the suffering had to be named and the different layers of the same society chose to blame each other. The food shortage, unemployment and the failure of workers unions to raise salaries were easily pinned on the bourgeois as the violence, hooliganism and mischief were easily pinned on the workers unions, the SDP and the Russian troops.

In the beginning of the summer 1917 it was clear that the society had split into two; in the parliament all the other parties which had allied with each other against the SDP. Newspapers reflected the same black-and- whiteness; since independent newspapers did not exist, all the newspapers took firm stance which gave the people the impression that the whole country was in upheaval even though the reality was that majority of the people still did not participate or even want to participate in either of the movements. It is important to remark that food shortage and unemployment were not something Finns were unfamiliar with, new to the situation was the amounts of newspapers reporting of it and the usage of the national distress as a political weapon. The way the issues were framed in the newspapers made the situation seem more serious than it actually was and more importantly; newspapers stirred up negative emotions by blaming the other side for the hardships. This is not to say that the party press was to blame for the Civil War, after all it merely reflected the battle taking place in the parliament and in the society, however, it is possible that with their

writing, particularly the party press of the SDP, gave the people impression that there was no other possible outcome of the situation except the Civil War.

Through out the year 1917 there were strikes and mass conventions but they were rather peaceful in nature. In the spring these gatherings they were even joyous; people celebrated the becoming of the new era and the wind of change. The Russian October Revolution marks the spot when these expressions of peoples' opinion started to get rebellious and violent, October revolution also is the point when both sides started serious armament of their troops and extreme party activists started rallying for armed conflict as the final solution.

People were forced to take sides; by the end of the 1917, when the two camps had formed, armed themselves and saw no other course of action, many people were indeed coerced to choose whether they were with "us" or with "them". The nation had divided into two and it made very little difference that most of the changes e.g. 8 hour work day and better social benefits trade and workers unions and the SDP had been rallying for, had passed the senate in the end of the year. Both sides lacked the willingness to solve the conflict peacefully and in the beginning of 1918 the time when it would have been possible had passed. On 25th of January 1918 the senate declared the white troops as the official governmental militia. In the evening of 26th of January the Reds lit up a red lantern in a tower in Helsinki to mark the beginning of peoples' revolution. In the morning of 27th of January the Civil War officially began.

3. INTRODUCTION TO RELEVANT LITERATURE AND CONCEPTS

3.1 Image of Russians

Since the focus point of this research is the image of Russians it is in order to examine the literature related to the concept in question.

This research does not use history for its self-value but as a background reference, offering information for the analysis of the propaganda in *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* hence I have tried to select literature, which answers the question “which were the events that have had an impact on the image of Russians in Finland?” I have found great use for literature written by the esteemed historian Matti Klinge, whose research on the image of Russians I will present here. On certain areas of history Klinge can be rather controversial, however his theory on the image of Russians very accurate and something that I myself agree with. Second very good source has been Heikki Luostarinen, whose theories I will go through later in this chapter.

In relation to the image of Russians several “beliefs” can be found, one appearing most often is the belief that Finns and Russians have been archenemies since the early times. This myth gains importance because it is so widespread and it has transcended time in a way even strong ideologies have not been able to. Most of the Finns have been raised to believe that negative feelings towards Russians are part being a Finn and strangely enough indeed these feelings have become associated with Finnish mentality as strongly as having “guts”²⁰. What escapes the attention of many is the fact that most Finns have never actually been in personal contact with Russians hence the question where does this belief come from?

3.1.1 Before the Civil War: The myth of arch enemies

What Matti Klinge attacks against in his book “*Vihanveljistä Valtiososialismiin*”²¹ (From brothers of hatred to national socialism) is this notion that Finns and Russians have always been archenemies. The first argument which must be noted in the context of “age- old” Ruskiehatred is the matter of nationalism; fennomania i.e. nationalistic ideals appeared in Finland only in the beginning of 1900s. Klinge poses a question how could a country with no real feeling of nationality or national identity have hated another nation since the 1500s, as the myth tries to convince us? The Swedish aristocracy did harbour anti- Russian sentiments (1200s- 1809), however, these sentiments had little effect on the image the Finnish common people had on Russians. What common people knew of Russia was limited to the recognition that Russia was a foreign place they had heard of. Most of the common folk in the middle age did not know how to read hence the books written about Russia and Russians were useless as sources of information. Therefore it can

²⁰ ”sisu” in Finnish

²¹ Klinge, Matti. *Vihan veljistä valtiososialismiin*. Porvoo: WSOY, 1972.

be said that before 1809 ordinary Finns had no steady contact with Russians, the ones who did, recognized that Russians spoke different language and wore different clothes and had different religion, but as mentioned, when people do not understand the concept of nationality it is impossible to label people as belonging to this or that nationality. Russians were considered simply as different.

Second argument worth introducing has to do with motives of the alleged Ruskiehatred; it appears that there would have been none and more amazingly: that this hatred wouldn't have even existed. Since becoming part of Russian in 1809 Finland gained a special position which according modern terminology can be described as semi- autonomy, Russian interference to the country's existence was minimal. Finns welcomed their new "ruler" with enthusiasm; newspapers wrote praising articles where the warm and loving nature of the Tsar²² was often mentioned, as well as his great grace and wisdom for granting Finland its "special position" in the Russian Grand Duchy. People named their sons after the Tsars (Alexander and Nikolai) and their daughters after the Grand Duchess (Maria). In general 1800s was a period of which the recorded contemporary history spoke of as the "good old days".

The image of Russians remained mostly positive until the rule of Nikolai II (1894- 1917) and so called 'Oppression periods' (1899- 1905 and again 1909- 1917) when Tsar Nikolai II started the "russification" of Finland. With the first Oppression period the image of Russians started gaining negative connotation but as Klinge well points out the feelings of dissatisfaction were mainly directed on administrative, bureaucratic and political matters and targeted vaguely towards selected administrative officers. Particularly hated was the governor of Finland, general Bobrikoff, with whom most of the grievances were associated with. The Tsar was never officially blamed; the politicians and newspapers showed distressed about the line Nikolai II had taken, his oppressive politics concerning Finland were compared with politics of his predecessors. Mild criticism appeared but first and foremost it appears that politicians and administration along with common people had faith that the situation would be corrected by the Tsar after the WWI and Finland's special position would be reinstated. Although negative sentiments were in the air—particularly when the second Oppression period started— there still was no obvious hatred towards Russians. Matti Klinge ponders that if there had been such strong hatred towards Russians wouldn't it have resulted into some actions taken by the Russian administrators or censors? The fact that there are only few reports of any negative action or feelings towards the Russians strongly indicates that there were not many hostilities to report about.

The situation began to change again in 1917, when Finnish political left wing (the Reds) and the political right wing (the Whites) started to use Russians in their political polemics, a direction which became popular after the March Revolution. The March revolution was celebrated in Finland— as had been the end of Great Strike in 1905—as a national celebration. People were joyous and the bigger cities organized even festivities. The violence that occurred—Russian sailors killing their superior officers—was not brought forth

²² Alexander I

as a matter of great importance, what was declared was the solidarity and brotherhood. One asks, where is the deep and burning Ruskie hatred there?

3.1.2 In between: the directions taken in the 1917

The Russian issue became a political matter that everybody had an opinion on and soon the political parties started using the image of Russians in their polemics. Finnish society was deeply divided; social problems were very real and the country was in inner turmoil which had very little to do with Russia or Russians, although later sources heavily indicated so. Reds saw the March Revolution as a victory of the working class over the bourgeois and had high hopes of it also improving the position of the Finnish the working class. The bourgeois saw the same event—and moreover the Bolshevik Revolution—as the rising of the the working class against the bourgeois. White newspapers started paying attention to the hooliganism committed by Russian militia and characterized it as Russian trait, along with many other bad qualities which Russians, particularly Bolsheviks, were “known for”. Red newspapers took a different position; they used Russia as an example for action and commended on the bravery and nobleness of the Russian the working class, downplaying the hooliganism and concentrating all the negativity towards the bourgeois and the capitalists. This was the foundation on which several information campaigns would later be built upon, most notorious of them being that of Akateeminen Karjala Seura (Academic Carelia Society) in the beginning of 1920s²³; the campaign was more than clearly anti-Russian and anti-Soviet, it was also the campaign in which the myth of “Ruskie hatred” was first introduced to the public. The year 1917 really functioned as the turning point of the way Russians would be viewed from there on. It was not so much the reporting done during the Civil War (February- May, 1918) War but rather the reporting done before and after the war; the explanations for the events, cruel nature of the Russian militia, the atrocities which had taken place in Russia during the Bolshevik Revolution, the atrocities which the communist Russians had committed during the Civil War, and so on and so forth. The concept of "good Ruskie"; a term used particularly on the areas which had had good experiences of co- existence with Russians living in Finland, disappeared and was replaced with "The best Ruskie is the dead Ruskie"²³. The saying originates from the fictional war literature published after the Continuation War and still persists in the Finnish language today.

3.1.3 After the Civil War: hatred campaigns to heal the nation

Russians became the archenemy of the Finnish nation in the aftermath of the Civil War due to the fact that 'white history' put much of the blame on the Russian communists. One of the first official histories of the events 1917-1918 came out in 1919 and told the war from white perspective describing the event as Liberation War, the emancipation of Finns from the Russian oppression. This particular history heightened

²³ in Finnish: "Paras ryssä on kuollut ryssä."

the role of Russians in the Finnish Civil War up to the point where it outright declared that the war had been against the Russians and the few misguided the working class Finns who had been infected with communism. The purpose of the alternative history was to glorify the war and heal the nation; to gloss over and omit some events, to add and heighten the importance of other events.

The healing began with wide scale Ruskiehatred campaign initiated by Akateeminen Karjala Seura, AKS (Academic Carelia Society). The campaign was conducted in 1920- 1922 having such a deep impact that the polemics and argumentations of it were used in the Finnish Parliament up until late 1930s'. For demonstrating the nature of the campaign here are a set of rather lengthy quotes from an article which was one of the central "manifestos" of the campaign.

*"Look around you citizens! Isn't our country full of traitors, efialtes, whom have sold and still are selling their poor little country to their archenemy? Tens of thousands of our communists live off of the gold from the east, they are the minions of Ruskies and wait for the darkest night so that they can sell the blood of their countrymen to the enemy. It is not because of the hunger or coldness that they loose all of their dignity and do these things, they are not stupid, ignorant shepherds who cannot tell the good from evil. They do everything by knowing what they are doing, they do it on purpose....It would be fun to give each of these traitors a written copy of their family history and encourage them to look back few centuries. it might occur several times that he would come across pages which would cool down his Ruskie love. Perhaps his ancestors fell dead to his own doorstep being struck by a Russian sword. Perhaps his grandmother was tied down and taken to a burning house. Perhaps his little nephews were impaled by a Cossack. And it didn't occur only once in his family but several times for several generations..... Tens of thousands of us are kissing Ruskies. They are selling their country to Moscow whenever and without asking anything for return. They are as loyal as dogs, and cursed smell of a Russian draws it like carcass to a jackal. But we who drove Russians out of this country, we who know what kind of marks has Ruskie left into this country, we must learn and teach others to hate Russians so deeply and strongly that the roots of that hatred will not die even with death. Lets take the name of the devil out of your foul language and curses and let it be replaced by the word Ruskie. It is as good, it is better. For what ever harm has come to this country and what ever harm shall come there has always been Ruskie behind it in one way or another. We must bring to the attention of our children and make it clear to them that their feelings and emotions may sway but one shall remain: hatred towards Ruskie."*²⁴

Another quotation demonstrate the radicalism of the campaign and its fascist undertones

"....We know that you don't love Ruskies like some of your countrymen do, but we are asking, can you hate Ruskie. Hate it like an archenemy, like your ancestors hated, like the soldiers in the Liberation War hated and still hate. Or have you too been infected the flat spirit of modern times where Ruskie is, if not a dear one then at least unimportant thing. Ruskie is conniving and at times dangerous but also sweet and childlike, as one speech expressed it, and with whom it is good to be on friendly terms and

²⁴ Quoted by Klinge in *Vihan veljistä valtiososialismiin.* (Helsinki Porvoo: WSOY, 1972) p. 63- 64, translation my own.

*do business with....So I say, in the name of our honour and freedom may our motto be heard: hate and love! Death to Ruskies, what ever colour they may be. In the name of the spilled blood of our ancestors death to the destroyers and rapists of our homes relatives, and homeland, death to the separator of the Carelian tribe. in the name of lost honour and the coming greatness: death to Ruskies! In the name of coming greatness and rising nationalism, may to day a call of holy love and hate be heard throughout the Carelian Tribe and our homeland."*²⁵

Another authority Heikki Luostarinen—a professor of journalism and a well established authority in research on propaganda, war journalism and wartime communication— provides more information on the motives of the Ruskiehatred campaign. In his dissertation "The Archenemy"²⁶ Luostarinen writes much in the same lines with Klinge, adding an interesting thought related to the formation and importance of the image of the enemy "In the second case the enemy is the scapegoat and the threat which can be used in explaining the country's own conflicts and shortcomings and demand "gathering up the troupes"²⁷. He carries on presenting Matti Klinge's, thesis concerning the purpose behind presenting the Russians as the evil enemy "Well- known is Klinge's thesis according which AKS's 'Ruskiehatred'- program was the thought of unifying the nation that had been divided into two in the Civil War. The contamination of Finland by Bolshevism was the reason and explanation for the war..."²⁸. Luostarinen also writes that "...**the image of the enemy has in many cases been used in moulding of the national identity.**"²⁹. This theory applies well to the process of moulding the Finnish national identity; it was important to create an image to which Finns could compare and contrast themselves, so called 'us and them' setting. So: if Russians were untrustworthy Finns were honest, if Russians were lazy Finns were hardworking, if Russians were dirty then Finns appreciated clean homes and personal hygiene and so on and so forth. What demonstrates the power of propaganda is the end results of this anti- Russian campaign; in few years, centuries of Finnish inferiority had turned into feelings of Finnish superiority

3.2 Propaganda

3.2.1 The literature

When reading through existing literature on propaganda and public opinion formation one soon discovers that most of the literature is out-dated; even the latest pieces have been published in the 1970s. After that it

²⁵ Quoted by Klinge in *Vihan veljistä valtiosotalismiin.*(Porvoo Helsinki: WSOY, 1972.) p. 64, translation my own.

²⁶ Luostarinen, Heikki. *Perivihollinen.* Tampere: Vastapaino., 1986. translation my own. Translation has been done according the meaning, not from word to word. The bold characters and quotation marks are by Luostarinen)

²⁷ (Chapter 1.2 "Viholliskuvien synnyn ja sisällön selvittämisestä" p.29)

²⁸ (Chapter 1.2 "Viholliskuvien synnyn ja sisällön selvittämisestä" p.29)

²⁹ (Chapter 1.2 "Viholliskuvien synnyn ja sisällön selvittämisestä" p.26)

appears that the interest to propaganda research died out. Good and rather valid question is “why”; did the propaganda itself vanish or did the academia consider the society too democratic and media too free for propaganda to exist? A second rather interesting detail that I have come across, is the fact that mass communication and journalism seems to be much excluded from the discussion concerning propaganda; most of the propaganda theorists come from the field of sociology and political sciences (Lippmann), social psychology (Doob) or marketing and advertising (Bernays). Why? Common sense would have one expecting the busiest bees in the field of propaganda research would be the mass communication and media researchers, after all propaganda has always been and still is delivered through media. The little peculiarities that exist in propaganda and public opinion research make the topic even more exciting and the literature even more compelling.

Propaganda literature can be divided roughly into groups according to the time when they were published. What makes this very mechanical division possible is the fact that propaganda theories have evolved much in sync with the communication theories. Communication theories are undoubtedly children of their time; in them one can see the worldview contemporaries had and the faith they put on the humanity; much is same when it comes to propaganda theories. The first phase of propaganda research was partly affected by Harold D. Lasswell’s dissertation “*Propaganda Technique in World War*”³⁰; his research launched the theory claiming that propaganda’s influence on a human behaviour was huge. This line of thought was strengthened by the WWII and the propaganda machine of Nazi- Germany. Until late 40s’ it was widely believed among researchers that propaganda was allmighty force which could mould the mind of the masses; often used illustration is “hypodermic needle” for it was believed that messages delivered through propaganda sank into a person as if injected with hypodermic needle and that their effect was immediate.

In the late 1940s’ a new school of thought evolved, the Chicago School revolutionizing the communication theory by taking what can be described as more psychological approach to propaganda and its effects. In the light of new information and research the scholars came into conclusion that propaganda was not as powerful it was thought out to be; according to the new theory the effectiveness of propaganda depended on the individual. It was shown that from person to another the same propagandistic message generated different responses as well as different levels of salience, and that those responses were not immediate but happened within time.

To demonstrate the early direction of propaganda I will present literature by Bernays, and Lasswell. For the Chicago School propaganda theories the best samples are by authors Walter Lippmann and Leonard Doob. Even though the time would place Lippmann to the early direction of propaganda (he wrote in the 1920s’) his views are much more similar with those of the Chicago School.

³⁰ Lasswell, Harold D. *Propaganda technique in the World War*. Michigan: M.I.T Press, 1927.

3.2.2 Definition of Propaganda

The literature on propaganda is full of definition; it seems that every discipline writing about propaganda has felt the necessity to develop their own definition or slightly alter the already existing ones. This thesis in question uses the definition given by Harold D. Lasswell in "*Propaganda Technique in the World War*" "It (the term propaganda) refers solely to the control of the opinion by significant symbols, or, to speak more concretely and less accurately by stories, rumours, reports, pictures and other forms of social communication. Propaganda in the broadest sense is the technique of influencing human action by the manipulation of representations. These representations may take spoken, written, pictorial or musical form." When Lasswell's definition is applied to the subject matter of the present study the definition of propaganda is the following: in this thesis propaganda is considered as the intended or unintended effort to influence the opinion concerning Russians in Finland by manipulating and altering the representation of them in newspapers *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti*.

3.2.3 What is propaganda?

Bernays considered propaganda more or less as a tool to be used in public relations and marketing; in fact most of the case examples he presents in his book "*Propaganda*"³¹ are taken from the marketing and advertising world, which is no wonder considering that he worked as a public relations specialist. Bernays wrote in 1920s' that propaganda was "... a consistent, enduring effort to create or shape events to influence the relations of the public to an enterprise, idea or a group."³² He saw propaganda as a structure that could be filled either with good cause (increasing household hygiene) or bad cause (anti-Semitism), therefore making propaganda either sinister or beneficial depending on the cause "Yet whether, in any instance, propaganda is good or bad depends upon the merit of the cause urged, and the correctness of the information published."³³ Harold D. Lasswell's views on propaganda were much results of his dissertation on propaganda in the WWI and although he admits that propaganda can be used to other purposes as well he classifies propaganda as a wartime activity. To Lasswell propaganda was a tool or a weapon with four objectives: "to mobilize hatred against the enemy, to preserve the friendship of allies, to preserve the friendship and, if possible, to procure the cooperation of neutrals and to demoralize the enemy."³⁴ The notion which is very characteristic to the early propaganda theories—and which can be seen in the writings by Lasswell and Bernays—is the unquestioned faith on the power and capability of propaganda to alter the behavioural patterns and the thoughts of people.

The contribution of Chicago School into the propaganda theories jumps out from the views of another well recognized authority, a social scientist and psychologist Leonard Doob. He rebelled against Bernays's and Lasswell's mechanical notion of propaganda and the prevailing theory of "hypodermic needle";

³¹ Bernays, Edward L. *Propaganda*. New York: Liveright, , 1928.

³² chapter 2. "The new propaganda" p.52

³³ Chapter 2. "The new propaganda" p.48.

³⁴ Harold D. Lasswell, *Propaganda Technique in the World War* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., LTD. 1927. p. 195

according to Doob public opinion was an inbuilt system each human gained while growing up. In "*Public Opinion and Propaganda*"³⁵. He writes: "*in the culturally laden past, consequently, lie the basic determinants of the individual behaviour, of the attitudes he shares with others and hence of public opinion*"³⁶ He argued that since public opinion was an inbuilt system, a part of human nature so to speak, it could not be swayed by propaganda campaign but only by a long process of propagation. According to Doob, propaganda could not simply be 'applied', but in order for it to cause the desired change in public opinion the propagandist has to build his/her propaganda by using already existing attitudes and opinions of his/ her target group. What further differentiates Doob from Bernays and Lasswell is the broader context Doob gives to propaganda; he wrote that all long socialization processes, such as education for example, can be considered as propaganda. He writes "*Since propagandist is an individual who influences other individuals, apparently influencing others is considered dishonourable....But an educator is likewise an individual who influences other individuals.*"³⁷.

Walter Lippmann—a merited political scientist and a journalist—presents in his book "*Public Opinion*"³⁸, published in 1920, a view that is radically different from those of his contemporaries. Lippmann suggested that propaganda goes beyond and deeper than a campaign for a given cause, he suggested that propaganda is the attempt to influence peoples' worldview, the way people see the world around them. According to his theory, the image people constructed of the reality was not the actual reality but peoples' interpretation of it and that it was this interpretation of reality that people based their actions and thoughts on. Hence propaganda was an attempt to alter this interpretation of the reality "*But what is propaganda if not the attempt to alter the picture to which men respond to....*"³⁹. Lippmann did not see information itself as propaganda; he asserted that the information itself was very neutral but the way people interpreted it and reacted to it gave it its propagandistic character.

3.2.4 Why does propaganda exist?

What has to be noted in relation to the question why does propaganda exist is the critical attitude towards democracy shared by all of the authors regardless of their differing opinions on other aspects of propaganda. Bernays's answer to question "why does propaganda exist?" is simplistic; he saw propaganda as a means of organizing the mass thought and regimenting it so that it could be used in changing the society. Bernays asserts that "*The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society*"⁴⁰ by which he meant that propaganda exists and is natural part of democracy, because it organizes the cacophony of differing opinions into neat piles hence keeps democratic societies from falling apart. To Bernays propaganda was a mere tool to be used by the few in the ruling of

³⁵ Doob, Leonard W. *Public Opinion and Propaganda*. Connecticut: Archon Books, 1966.

³⁶ Chapter 4. "The cultural background of public opinion" p. 48.

³⁷ Chapter 11. "The cultural background of public opinion" p. 231

³⁸ Lippmann, Walter. *Public Opinion*. New York. Free Press, 1920.

³⁹ Chapter 1. "The world outside and the pictures in our heads" p.16

⁴⁰ chapter 1. "Organizing chaos" p.37

the many which also sums up Lasswell's thoughts; he considered propaganda as a tool of guiding people in their decision making process so that they could arrive to the "correct" opinion.

Doob explains the existence of propaganda in a way similar to that of Bernays; Doob saw the propaganda as means of creating conformity. He explained that the reason why propaganda seems to appear only during social conflicts is precisely due to the heightened need for creating group conformity.

Lippmann saw the existence of propaganda as part of human nature; to him propaganda was something that people actively created and used in interpreting their surroundings. "*For it is clear enough that under certain conditions men respond as powerfully to fictions as they do to realities and that in many cases they help to create the very fictions to which they respond...*"⁴¹. Lippman was also sceptical of the ability of humen to think clearly and form correct opinions which might be the reason why he readily agreed with Lasswell on the role of propaganda as a guide in opinion formation process.

3.2.5 Who are the Propagandists?

Bernays introduces propaganda as "*...the executive arm of the invisible government.*"⁴², the question therefore is: what invisible government? The manipulation of the masses, Bernays writes, should be conducted by "*invisible governors*" who would ideally be public relation specialists; the "*unmoved movers*" who propagate for a cause without being affected by the propaganda themselves. Lasswell on the other hand asserted that political scientists should be in charge of propaganda.

Lippmann agreed with Lasswell but took it even a bit further; he writes that "*My conclusion is that public opinions must be organized for the press....This organization I conceive to be in the first instance the task of a political science that has won its proper place as a formulator, in advance of a real decision instead of apologist critic or reporter after the decision has been made.*"⁴³.

Doob seems to be the only person from the three that does not elevate his own discipline or profession to the position of 'the propagandist'. Corresponding with the rest of his views on propaganda he asserts that propaganda cannot be a profession since everybody practices it; instead there are two types of propagandists the 'unintentional' and the 'intentional'. About the tendencies of the two groups he writes "*Intentional propagandists deliberately attempt to affect or control the behaviour of a group of individuals, unintentional propagandists unwittingly do so.*"⁴⁴

⁴¹ Chapter 1. "The world outside and the pictures in our heads" p.10

⁴² Chapter 2. "The new propaganda" p.48

⁴³ Chapter 1. "The world outside and the pictures in our heads" p.20

⁴⁴ Chapter. 11 "Nature of Propaganda" p. 246

3.3 Constructing public opinion with propaganda

Even as a word propaganda has a negative connotation; the practice of it is considered sinister, a matter associated with totalitarian regimes and dictatorships⁴⁵. Propaganda is not a taboo per se, it is just considered as a practice chiefly exercised during the Second World War by Nazis, then later on by Communist regimes hence is a subject of the past. And moreover, is a practice exercised by “them”, never by “us” and always for a negative cause, never for a positive.

In order to explore the nature of propaganda one must look beyond the negative connotation the term gained during the 20th century. The word propaganda first appeared in 1622 in a name of a Committee established by Pope Gregory XV “Congregatio de Propaganda Fide” (Congregation for Propagating the Faith) and meant propagation or spreading information about catholic religion to non-catholic countries. Looking at the matter from the point of view of the origin of the word it can be said that missionaries were the first propagandists. If we use the word propaganda in its original form, the concept of propaganda can then be explored without the pejorative connotation clouding the scientific study of the practice.

One of the characteristics which define propaganda is the dissemination of information for a certain purpose of for certain aim e.g. the Propaganda Fide had the purpose of spreading catholicism, hence the emphasis of the activity falls in influencing people with the disseminated information. The purpose is not in influencing peoples’ behavioural patterns—in any case this cannot be done due to the fact that propaganda does not follow the principles of hypodermic needle model—but simply to provide them with information according which people can do so if they please. Walter Lippman developed a theory where perceptions play a crucial role; according to his theory, people act upon the image they construct of the reality i.e. the way a person perceives the situation/ opinion/ information and so on, will determine his/ her behavioural patterns in situ. This theory makes it possible to consider propaganda not as written documents, leaflets, campaigns where information is either accurate or inaccurate, but rather as peoples’ perception of those documents, leaflets and campaigns.

Public opinion is always constructed by propaganda, or rather, with propagation of information. The process can be shed out of its psycho analytic shell and simplified into few steps. Selected information, tailored for addressing different types of people within the target group, is disseminated. People process and react to the information according their value systems, prior opinions and life experiences. In many occasions individuals end up consulting so- called “opinion leaders” of the community e.g. people having prior experience in the topic, people of authority, before deciding what is his/her “take” on the information he/she has been provided with. Whether the information has any impact at all depends firstly on the individual’s perception of the information; its message but also of its source, and only secondly on the times

⁴⁵ Bernays et al.

information is repeated. The verb “constructing” public opinion is very well fitted for describing the process; it in- holds that the process is gradual, manifold, interactive and is built upon something already existing.

3.4 Techniques of propaganda.

Propaganda uses array of techniques or tools and although propaganda is often discussed in mechanical and scientific manner, using terms e.g. process, dissemination of information, methods the matter comes down to a procedure as simple as usage of language and pictures. The tools are multiple and ever increasing, for example the development of technology alone creates several new techniques but what is listed in here, are techniques identified by the Institute of Propaganda Analysis which functioned during the WWI and WWII.in America. The decision to cover only those techniques is the result of the fact that the techniques listed by the Institute of Propaganda Analysis have been formed through academic research and they are developed around the same time period which my thesis looks into.

“Bandwagon

*You're either with us, or against us" appeals to an audience to join a ground swell of public opinion and activity because everybody else is joining. The "bandwagon" technique appeals to feelings of loyalty and nationalism, as well as the desire to be on the winning side. The technique tends to obscure the ethics of the activity at the expense of victory: better to belong to the winning side than be too concerned with the rightness of the means to achieve it.*⁴⁶

Doublespeak

Language deliberately constructed to disguise its actual meaning.

Euphenisms

Language used to make something not sound as bad as it is.

Glittering generalities

Words that have different positive meaning for individual subjects, but are linked to highly valued concepts. When these words are used, they demand approval without thinking, simply because such an important concept is involved. For example, when a person is asked to do something in 'defence of democracy' they are more likely to agree. The concept of democracy has a positive connotation to them because it is linked to a concept that they value. Words often used as glittering generalities are honour, glory, love of country, freedom and democracy

⁴⁶ All of the techniques presented here are quotes from http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Propaganda_techniques which introduce the techniques developed by the Institute of Propaganda Analysis in 1930s'

Name-calling

A form of an attack that draws a vague equivalence between a concept and a person, group or idea. By linking the person or idea being attacked to a negative symbol, the propagandist hopes that the audience will reject the person or the idea on the basis of the symbol, instead of looking at the available evidence.

Plain folks

Rhetoric with which speakers attempt to convince their audience that they, and their ideas, are "of the people"

Testimonials

The use of personal experience to convince a target group or and audience. By describing the successes or failures of ones own experience lends credibility to the information.

Transfer

A device by which the propagandist carries over the authority, sanction, and prestige of something we respect and revere to something he would have us accept."

3.5 Wartime methods: the Fear factor in propaganda

The techniques listed above, defined by the Institute for Propaganda Analysis, are what loosely might be identified as peacetime techniques; they do appear also in wartime but have entirely different magnitude and manifest in slightly different forms. Wartime techniques are different from peacetime because their use fear, hate and other negative emotions as fuel by providing/ producing information which aims to stir up these two emotions. If one would say that there is black and white propaganda, white being "harmless" persuasion techniques presented above, then wartime methods certainly would be labelled as black propaganda. The Institute for Propaganda Analysis identifies the usage of fear in different forms as one of the most powerful techniques in wartime propaganda.

"Fear

Fear is one of the most primordial human emotions and therefore lends itself to effective use by propagandists. Human beings can do great and terrible things when motivated by fear. Fear is essentially the survival instinct kicking in. Fear being fundamentally irrational, it is one of the techniques most widely used by propagandists. With such a broad spectrum of fear, the propagandizer can pick relevant phobias and incorporate them into his/her messages. The power of this propaganda technique can be multiplied when it is exploited in conjunction with uncertainty and doubt, resulting from ambiguous of the information at hand. In order to install fear, uncertainty and doubt, propagandists exploit general ignorance.⁴⁷

⁴⁷ All of the techniques presented here are quotes from http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Propaganda_techniques which introduce the techniques developed by the Institute of Propaganda Analysis in 1930s'

Fear appeal

When a propagandist warns members of [his/her] audience that disaster will result if [it does] not follow a particular course of action, [he/she] is using the fear appeal.

Selling fear

Another more destructive form of deception today is the selling of fear. Fear is the most debilitating of all human emotions. A fearful person will do anything, say anything, accept anything, reject anything, if it makes him feel more secure for his own, his family's or his country's security and safety, whether it actually accomplishes it or not. It works like a charm. A fearful people are the easiest to govern. Their freedom and liberty can be taken away, and they can be convinced to believe that it was done for their own good - to give them security. They can be convinced to give up their liberty - voluntarily."

3.5.1 Power of Rumours

Wartime propaganda uses rumours and ambiguous information which appeals to emotions rather than to sense. The ambiguity of the information is not always intentional for often accurate, detailed and timely information from the battle field is unattainable and secondly the dissemination of information which is considered too detailed will often be prohibited by the censorship, so that it would not compromise military strategies. Or, considering the technology and the level of society prior and after WWI, the ambiguity, untimeliness and lack of details may be the result of slow flow of information and of the simple fact that the information did not reach its target audience. Rumours have an important function in wartime propaganda because when there is little information provided, then, people are more apt to consider rumours as reliable information and form their perception of the situation according them. They are also very effective because after being published they gain a life of their own; selective memory causes people to remember rumours differently, parts of the rumour within the individual's interests are remembered while details not appealing to the individual are forgotten. Hence one rumour has the capability of addressing several audiences. The nature of rumours is such that they have a tendency to spread; an individual tells another what he/ she has read from the newspaper or seen on TV and the other tells it to third person and so on.

Among the most typical rumours are atrocity rumours, which have become the most valuable tool of pro- war propaganda, because not only do they demonize the enemy but they also create anger towards the enemy, which manifests in appeal for taking action. One of the most effective ways of creating consent for radical action is depicting the "other" as malignant, guilty of many wrong doings and horrors because people's sense of justice accepts the use of radical measures in order to stop the wrongdoer. To overstate: as a result of providing atrocity rumors as reliable and actual information one not only creates pro-war opinion but also a public opinion, which demands for drastic measures.

3.5.2 Constructing the image of an enemy

A book written by Sam Keen "*Faces of the Enemy: Reflections of the Hostile Imagination*"⁴⁸ explores the psychological factors that make us susceptible to wartime propaganda. This chapter intentionally avoids lapsing into psychology behind propaganda however, the basic message of the afore mentioned book is important. In its all simplicity Keen conducts that before ordinary humans are capable of killing or supporting the killing in their name, they must create for themselves a belief that an enemy is inhumane, a bestial being no longer worthy of life. Often dehumanizing the enemy also includes denying its name; since the enemy is not human it does not have a name but rather is given a "label" e.g. commie, Ruskie, Jap. "We" (whatever group we happens to be) are pure, just, strong and resolute. As can be observed the image of an enemy is partly through which "we" define ourselves. "We" are the opposite of the enemy and our measures are considered as justified because our cause is righteous whereas the measures of the enemy are horrid, barbarous and atrocious and their cause is naturally sinister. The image of the enemy is constructed with atrocity rumours, selected information about the enemy's activities and so on but more importantly it is constructed upon common fears and partly on past experiences of the enemy. Information used in constructing an image of the enemy usually plays upon few factors such as showing "credible" threat for one's life and culture and implying that the enemy is against all values and morals one holds dear.

3.5.3 "Us" versus "Them"

Wartime propaganda uses frequently "us" vs. "them" positioning; it is applied e.g. when constructing the image of an enemy. The mechanics of the technique are bilateral; at one side the setting divides people into two groups, presenting them in a very dualistic manner as opposites of each other. All the bad qualities that the "we" group is void of, can be found in "them", but non of the good qualities "we" have, are to be found in their character. This setting is very absolute and does not recognize the existence of variations within "them" or "us". On the other side the setting creates intense unity within the "us" group as it begins coming together in the "verge" of clear threat. The other individual differences, sub groups within a group disappear when faced with a common enemy. That is where the danger of "Us" and "them" lies; usually the positioning takes place for external conflict against another nationality or religion, however, when the "us" and "them" forms within one nationality, for internal conflict such as Civil War, its consequences are far- reaching. Formed unity and the division into two groups is near irreversible and remains in the social memory of a country almost as long as the country out grows the memory of the conflict.

Other terms for "us" and "them"-setting is "in- group" and "out- group" which perhaps is better suited when referring to internal conflict.

⁴⁸ Keen, Sam. *Faces of the Enemy: Reflections of the Hostile Imagination*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986

3.5.4 Hero stories

The hero stories are disseminated for their motivational value and usually describe a great victory, personal act of heroism, victory in a battle against great odds (David and Goliath setting) just to mention few. Hero stories are important in the actual battle field for keeping up the battle morale but also on the “home front” where they help in recruiting new soldiers and summon up spirit. The origin of hero stories is in the ancient world and they have, more or less, appeared during every conflict.

3.6 Peacetimes methods

Peacetime propaganda is often referred as information campaigns and not propaganda. Neither content of the activity nor techniques change, however since peacetime is identified with democracy and freedom and the term “propaganda” has opposite connotation it is not politically correct to use it outside wartime. If we maintain that propaganda is an attempt to influence people’s perception through information, then also peacetime information campaigns must be considered as propaganda. Even the most modest information campaigns have intent to influence how the target audience perceives e.g. a product, lifestyle, disease and so on for if there would not be such an intent there would be no point to organize these campaigns.

This leads to an interesting point made by Leonard Doob in his “Public opinion”⁴⁹; also education is form of influence on how individual perceives and interprets the reality around him/ her. This is yet again another demonstration of the duality of propaganda; the information which majority of the society agrees to be true and in accordance to commonly accepted values is considered knowledge and dissemination of that knowledge is considered as education. When the information includes aspects with which do not follow the norms set by the majority of the society is and when such information is spread it is labelled as propaganda. The same dualistic principle applies also when differences between two societies come into question; “their” media is full of propaganda and biased information, “our” media is independent and objective.

⁴⁹ Doob, Leonard D. *Public opinion and propaganda*. Connecticut: Archon books, 1966.

4. METHOD AND MATERIAL

4.1 Material

This thesis will take up a rather ambitious task; I have set the study period to be almost the whole year of 1917 and the first few weeks of the Civil War in February 1918. To follow the writings in *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti throughout 1917* is necessary because this research focuses on the change that took place in the reporting; by starting my analysis from January 1917 I will be able to define the *point zero* i.e. the frequency, tone and association in which Russian related issues were reported under normal circumstances. The *point zero* will function as a reference point which will help me to measure how great the change was, i.e. how far from the “normal way” of writing about Russian related topics did the reporting proceeded and when did these changes appear, do they follow the process of opinion formation described by Leonard Doob and do they co-inside with particular events in 1917?

Although *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* in 1917 were only 6 pages long and came out 6 times a week, the total number of pages one needs to go through when examining the whole news year is well over 3400, therefore I have decided to focus my attention more towards the editorials, which in the beginning of 1900s stated the official stance of the newspaper. However, since the newspapers of the early 20th century do not follow the modern layout—the most newsworthy events reported on the front page—it becomes necessary to pay attention to frequently published sections such as "From Russia"⁵⁰ which both of the newspapers of this study featured.

I've also divided the study period chronologically into 3 periods; from January through March, from July through September and finally from November 1917 through January 1918. The periods have been selected because each of them includes an event which can be considered as “image altering”. At the end of the first period March revolution ended the Tsar Institution, during the second period dissolution of the parliament by the Provisional Government took place which resulted into new elections where the bourgeois party alliance gained majority in the parliament. The third study period features the Bolshevik revolution and of course, the break out of the Civil War. All of these events had a potential of changing the way Russians were perceived. The main reason why the study period is divided according to the events taking place in Russia rather than in Finland, is due to the fact that the revolutions in Russia had an great impact on Finnish society, particularly on the political polemics of the main parties THE SDP and SP; all this was reflected in the reporting of the two newspapers, *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti*.

⁵⁰ The Finnish name for it being "Venäjältä"

4.2 *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti*

Aamulehti came out for the first time in December 1881 and from the beginning it declared its priority to be Finnish culture and language. *Aamulehti* was affiliated to bourgeois party Finnish Party and functioned as its voice horn concentrating mainly on providing sophistication to the nation. Also *Aamulehti* was regional and during its founding year had already circulation of 10000 which rose to 15600 by the 1917. *Aamulehti* came out six times a week and even though it was a party newspaper, it functioned partly as a commercial establishment which after financially hard beginning was able to generate profits.

Aamulehti advocated general enlightenment but particularly dear topic to it was advancing the position of Finnish culture among other European cultures. With all of its cultural interest and sophisticated aspirations it identified itself as a bourgeois newspaper and was identified not only with the Finnish Party but also among other bourgeois parties.

The first edition of *Kansan Lehti* was published in December 1898 and was the third newspaper with a tight connection to Social Democrats. The subject matter of articles was adapted to the interest of the social democrats and the tone was starting from the beginning very confrontational. *Kansan Lehti* was regional, circulating only on Tampere and Pirkanmaa municipality but it soon became one of the two main newspapers published in Tampere area. In the first years *Kansan Lehti* had circulation of 2500 but grew massively reaching the circulation of 17500 in the 1917. During first years of its existence *Kansan Lehti* came out only three times a week but as its circulation grew and financial situation improved it was published six times a week.

Kansan Lehti certainly was the voice horn of Social Democratic Party, having very firm attitudes on social issues which it gladly propagated to its readership. First and foremost, *Kansan Lehti* was a political establishment and not a commercial establishment; it received great deal of its finances as donations from the local offices of THE SDP and shared the ideological beliefs of the party. *Kansan lehti* was political newspaper, a party newspaper, and buying or ordering it was a statement of ones political beliefs. Reporting in *Kansan Lehti* was fierce however, the newspaper was still moderate considering other newspapers affiliated with Social Democratic party, which at times caused friction between *Kansan Lehti* and other newspapers.

4.3 Method

Usually a research can be categorized according to the research tradition it uses; quantitative or qualitative. This research uses neither and at the same time both; I extracted the best of both research traditions and combined them into something that I call *qualitative analysis of quantitative data*. My research measures change that took place in the society in 1917. To be able to detect the change there is a need to gather

longitudinal data; in the case of this research it more or less meant forsaking the idea of random sampling and deciding on one lengthy study period. In my research I *measure* change, but change is a quality which cannot be measured, it has either happened or it has not. The question therefore is: how to measure something that cannot be measured? The answer is: “ordinal scale”. To apply numerical scale to this research would be as useful as to talk about water in kilograms; it can be done but it will lessen the comprehension of the topic, to say that “3 degrees of change has occurred towards negative” might sound very scientific but it actually doesn’t say anything *about* the change. Using ordinal scale enables to describe the change in terms of greater/lesser, to negative/ to positive, instead of merely stating that it has occurred. The usage of longitudinal data and ordinal scale are the aspects of quantitative research tradition which will be used in this study.

The subject of my thesis, public opinion change through propagandistic material, combined with the nature of the empirical data; words, sentences, paragraphs i.e. newspaper articles, already make the assumptions of qualitative analysis, and rightfully so; the main aspect of this research is content analysis of the empirical data. Content analysis relies much on the judgement calls made by the researcher; particularly when the data *is* words and phrases which need to be categorized, the common sense of the researcher starts playing a role which perhaps is too big, keeping in mind that the task is to conduct a *scientific* research. I have tried to avoid this type of catastrophe by copying the categorization and coding method used by Edith Efron in 1971 in her pioneer study of bias in the media, “*The News Twisters*”⁵¹. The coding method Efron used relied on categorization; news articles were placed under different categories based on their subject matter; this was done in order to find out what were the topics that media covered and was there any bias in that. In order to define what image the news stories projected of the candidates she counted the words that she considered to be pro or anti “biased” towards a particular candidate. I feel confident that this categorization and coding system used by Efron some 30 years ago will also serve me well for there are clear similarities between the subject matters of our researches, but also because I have made few changes on her coding system based on suggestions made by Robert L. Stevenson et. al. in an article published in *Journalism Quarterly* in 1973 “Untwisting the News Twisters: A Replication of Efron’s study”⁵².

4.4 Three levels of analysis

I have decided upon analysis on three levels; first level will be the *frequency* with which news stories concerning Russians were published in *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti*. The goal is to find out how interesting/

⁵¹ Efron, Edith. *The News Twisters*. Los Angeles: Nash Publishing Co., 1971. Efron studied the network news coverage during 1968 presidential elections. The conclusion of her study was that all three networks she studied projected clear anti- Nixon attitudes in their reporting.

⁵² Stevenson et. al. particularly commented on the fact that Efron had allowed phrases and words to be coded into multiple categories and claimed that the conclusions of the study were results of that rather than actual bias in the reporting

often covered news topic the Russians and Russian related issues actually were. In this level of analysis the measurement unit is articles per month and “Russian related topic” is defined as an article in which association to Russia or Russians is either indicated in the title of the article or mentioned several times in the article itself.

	To be considered as	Examples
Russian related sentence	<p>where the “Russia”, “Russian people”, name of a Russian individual or political entity appear as an actor</p> <p>where the qualities of “Russia”, “Russian people”, political entity or of a Russian individual are described</p> <p>where actions of Russians or Russian individuals are reported</p> <p>where past, present or future actions of Russians or Russian individuals are speculated upon</p> <p>where past, present or future actions of Russians or Russian individuals are commented upon by statements or by usage of certain adjectives</p>	<p>“One of the reasons to food shortage is the Russian population in our country...”</p> <p>“Provisional government has sent...”</p> <p>“The oppressive methods of the provisional government...”</p> <p>“The proud nation of Russia...”</p> <p>“Our comrades...”</p> <p>“Russian troops have committed violent acts...”</p> <p>“Today general Tseyn arrived to Finland...”</p> <p>“If the provisional government continues...”</p> <p>“What is the meaning of these violations...”</p> <p>“</p> <p>“When general Tseyn arrived thousands were at the station to welcome him...”</p> <p>“Russian troops have brutally attacked...”</p> <p>“The violations on sovereignty must stop...”</p>
Non Russian related sentence	<p>official statements or transcripts of proceedings of political meetings of Russian Senate or Duma</p> <p>political documents i.e. proposals, decisions</p> <p>political or other speeches by the Tsar, Senate, Duma, Commissions, politician or any other political actor</p>	<p>“The Duma issues the following statement:”</p> <p>“Then representative of Tsar expressed his opinion on...”</p> <p>“The Russian Senate has decided...”</p> <p>“Fellow citizens...”</p> <p>“Greeting to the social democratic party of Finland...” EXCEPT open letters from the SDP to Russian Social Democrats</p>

	open letters to the people of Finland from the Tsar, Senate, Duma, Commissions, politician or any other political actor	“The Tsar Nikolai II wishes to communicate to his people...”
	translations of articles published by Russian newspapers	“In Thursday Isvestia of St. Petersburg wrote...”
	sentences concerning events taking place in Russia EXCEPT the Revolutions	“In St. Petersburg the people are silently opposing...”

The second level of analysis is applied only on those articles which are defined having clear association to Russia/ Russians; the content of these articles is divided into categories according the reference in which the Russians are presented. Throughout the analysis I assigned themes: food shortage, March and October revolution, violence, justifying violence, mischief, ignoring the mischief of the Social Democrats, supporting the mischief of Social Democrats, mischief with Social Democrats, limitations/ violations on sovereignty, heroism, fore- fighters, camaraderie, co- operation with Social Democrats, Russian and Finnish bourgeois, Russian and Finnish the working class. By assigning themes I hope to get an idea of the issues which were commonly associated with Russians. Does the notion of Russians appear in a news article which discusses famine? Is the bravery of Russian people mentioned in an article which covers the March Revolution? The task is very important because with it we begin to see glimpses of the image of Russians that a regular reader of *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* in 1917 was subjected to.

Themes raising from the material present the reference in which Russians in each month were presented hence I have concentrated on elaborating on those themes. In the analysis they are indicated in the sub headings of the paragraphs.

In the third level of the analysis I attempt to define a tone with which the two newspapers discuss Russian related issues; whether it can be described as pro- or anti- Russian. The purpose of this analysis is quite literally to count the words in an article which reflect **positive** (in my case pro- Russian), **negative** (anti- Russian) and **neutral** (matter-of- factly statements) sentiments. The measurement unit in the third level of analysis is words per article; the amount of attitude reflecting words in the given article will be compared to the total amount of words of that article.

	To be considered as	Examples
Positive sentence	where the “Russia”, “Russian people”, name of a Russian individual or political entity appear in good context	“Russian soldiers behaved themselves well and in appropriate manner...” “Russian militia stopped hooligans from...”

	<p>where positive qualities or characteristics are indicated in relation to Russian related actor</p> <p>approving of the actions taken by Russian related actor</p> <p>where actions reported are considered/ characterized as good by the writer</p> <p>Sentences where words e.g. heroism, sacrifice, self determination, freedom, camaraderie appear</p>	<p>“The proud nation of Russia...” “The great nation of Russia...”</p> <p>“The Provisional Government has finally replaced the much hated general governor Bobrikov...”</p> <p>“Russian officials have rightfully recognized the need...”</p> <p>“Our social democratic brothers in Russia...” “The Russian nation has finally taken control of their own destinies...”</p>
Negative sentence	<p>where the “Russia”, “Russian people”, name of a Russian individual or political entity appear in bad context</p> <p>where negative qualities or characteristics are indicated in relation to Russian related actor</p> <p>condemning actions taken by Russian related actor</p> <p>negative connotation of a word/ event/ quality gained by association to Russian related actor</p> <p>Sentences where words e.g. limitations or violations on sovereignty, mischief, violence, extra population, oppression, regression, military troops of a foreign country, bayonets appear</p> <p>irony, sarcasm</p>	<p>“Russian troops with their bayonets prevented members of parliament from entering...” “Provisional government demands that food reserves will be provided for...”</p> <p>“Drunken Russian soldiers...” “The regression of Russian capitalist bourgeois...”</p> <p>“The provisional Government has repeatedly violated...”</p> <p>“Bobrikovness is rising...” “The mischief of Social democrats and their Russian minions...”</p> <p>“Again the sovereignty of Finland has been violated...” “With foreign bayonets...” The regressional bourgeois of Russia...”</p> <p>“Perhaps it would right to give this oppressor the title of general governor of Finland...”</p>
Neutral sentence	<p>matter- of- fact statements</p>	<p>“The provisional government has not done so...”</p>

	matter- of- fact description of events or actions sentences where neither negative nor positive connotation can be found	“The Russian soldiers broke the door and entered the house...” ⁵³
--	---	--

To summarize shortly, the questions that I sought to answer with the analysis

- How interesting were the Russians/ Russian related issues as news stories? Was there an increase in the amount such news the closer to the Civil War the events proceeded?
- What were the topics associated with Russians/ Russian presence in Finland? How did *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* present Russians to their readers? As the events evolved was there a change in the topics commonly associated with Russians?
- Was the image of Russians the two newspapers gave to their readers negative or positive? Was there a change in that image during the year of 1917?

⁵³ These are the type of borderline cases which have caused me much grievance; the activity described is negative, however, the language used in describing it is neutral, neither conviction nor clear attitude cannot be found. For example “broke in” would be a word which carries conviction hence considered as negative, “broke the door and entered “ describes just the activity. I have been more strict with sentences where shooting and violence has been described; even if the language in them has been neutral, those activities were the ones negatively associated to Russian troops hence reporting that yet another incident of this kind has occurred in this research considered as negative.

5. IMAGE OF RUSSIANS IN AAMULEHTI AND KANSAN LEHTI

5.1 The image of Russians from January to the March

For a researcher the time period from January until the end of March provides little material for analysis; particularly editorials of January and February are almost completely void of any mention of Russians. In the hypothesis I state that in the beginning of the year both of the newspapers treated the topics related to Russians with neutrality, but I was not expecting to discover they did not treat the topics related to Russians at all. Even though the time period from January to March provides very little information on the image of Russians, the analysis of the newspapers does not go to waste; it can be used in mapping out the general characteristics of the journalistic styles of *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti*.

5.1.1 January, *Aamulehti*

5.1.1.1 General features

In January the editorials of *Aamulehti* clearly focuses on municipality administration with headlines such as “**The municipality of Tampere 1916**”, “**On something said in the municipality council meeting**”, “**More efficiency to the audit of accounts of rural districts**” and “**The log matter of Tampere’s Victuals Commission**”. It is clear that both of the newspapers were advocating for the matters important to their readership; in January *Aamulehti* was paying attention to “**The pay rise of the teachers of rural common schools**” and “**The retirement fund of the business employees**”.

The overlook on January’s topics demonstrates the difficulties *Aamulehti* had in seeing the forest from the trees; the causes of social problems from the ways they manifested in. Looking at the editorials it is clear that *Aamulehti* was aware of scarcity of certain food products, as well as rising prices of daily goods. It was also aware of the vicious circle created by low salaries and rising prices of food supplies; in 3.1.1917 the editorial of *Aamulehti* “**In the beginning of the year**” discusses the circumstances in which the New Year has started and mentions the problems caused by food shortage and its side effects. “*The continuous increasing of prices has made living difficult, but real destitution has been prevented by the income received from war industry....Great part of our nation lives in frugal circumstances hence the controversy resulting from the riches all sorts of profiteers have gained on the expense of their fellow men is even more blazing....There has been attempts to increase the prices of supplies as well as labour which has resulted into rise of prices that has had an effect on everybody but specially burdening they have been on low- wage administration officers and domestic staff....the expenses of the municipalities have risen exceedingly, so that there has been a necessity to make cut backs on the high*”

price addition⁵⁴. Several municipalities have altogether even declined the payment of it.”⁵⁵ The afore quotation exemplifies the “forest- from- the- trees” problem; it states that there is no real scarcity due to the profit from the army industry, but fails to realize that this profit benefited only the manufacturers and did not bring about any changes in the lives of the working class e.g. raise of salaries. The editorial also misidentifies to group most affected by the food shortage; it was not the lower level municipality administration officials with their average of 3442 Finn mark yearly income, but the factory workers whose average yearly income was only 1691 Finn marks⁵⁶.

In its style and ideology *Aamulehti* can be considered as a typical bourgeois newspaper; it values culture and markets sophistication, believes in law and in its own position in the upper end of the social strata. What shines through the editorials is the Darwinian belief that people are placed in the social strata according their capabilities hence inequality is natural part of society. Due to afore mentioned mentality *Aamulehti*, being part of party press of SP, had great difficulties in apprehending the success and popularity of the SDP, the people’s party. There is certain abasing hostility that can be seen in some of the editorials in January. Concerning the electoral victory of the SDP in 1916 *Aamulehti* writes in 4.1.1917 editorial “**In the beginning of the year, II**”: “*But in the issue of tenancy farmers they (the SDP) did not save any ammunition and that in addition to high prices of goods can be seen as the influences through which Social Democrats managed to get 103 of their candidates elected....On their own behalf other parties contributed to Social Democrats’ victory by imparting less participation that would have been required and imperative....The numbers show that the power relation of class parties have increased. It is another matter whether this is to be seen as beneficial to the greater good of the fatherland as if the reformative, with which we indicate both of the nationalistic parties, basing their pursuits on more ideological would have grown and been able to carry out their agenda aiming for common good.*”

In 1917 bourgeois still saw the common people as the early 1900s Fennomania had depicted them; as pure minded, hard working and simple people, who lived in the countryside, lived off the land and settled for little bowing in front of God and authority. The role bourgeois had given itself in relation to common folk was the role of the father and the educator, who would take this man of forests by the hand and guide him to the sunshine of sophistication. Even in modern societies it appears to be the upper class which supports social stagnation over progression and so it was also in 1917 Finland; the bourgeois was out of touch with

⁵⁴ ”kalliinan lisä” in Finnish. This bonus was put into effect in 1917 and quite literally was meant to compensate for the high prices. Whether the employer chose to pay high price bonus to his/her employees depended on his/ her’s good will.

⁵⁵ The translation is my own, when it has been possible I have tried to translate with word to word accuracy without leaving out any adjectives, phrases or words. Throughout the translation process I have strived to maintain the original style and the spirit of the writing; *Aamulehti* uses finer language and has more sophisticated style hence the wording e.g. “destitution” and “frugal”, *Kansan Lehti* uses simpler and more common language. I’ve also kept the punctuation in its original form and will be using the Finnish forms of the names of people as they appear in *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti*. When word- by- word translation has not been possible I have translated by meaning. I have decided to translate specific phrases such as the “high price addition” into Finnish, as well as some important words but as a general policy translation of the clips that I use as examples will not be provided in Finnish. The newspaper from which quotes have been taken will be indicated in the main body of the text.

⁵⁶ these figures are from Pertti Haapala’s book *Kun yhteiskunta hajosi, Suomi 1914- 1920* (Haapala, Pertti. *Kun yhteiskunta hajosi, Suomi 1914- 1920*. Helsinki: Painatuskeskus, 1995.) and present the average yearly income in 1913. It is my own assumption that the figures might be applicable to society in 1917 due the fact that level of wages changed very little since 1913.

the reality failing to recognize that the progress was already in the way and the society as it used to be no longer existed. When the people voted the SDP to electoral victory in 1916 the disillusionment for bourgeois was hard; it crushed the illusion of the Fennomanian man but moreover, shook the foundation to which the entire class system was built upon: the Darwinian world view. It rendered the bourgeois newspapers helpless in explaining the situation, for it was felt that it simply was not possible that people actually agreed with the political agenda of the SDP or that it would want to change the structures of the societal order. The prevailing explanation for the victory of the SDP was that Workers Unions and their professional speakers had seduced the people with their propagation of hatred towards bourgeois. In general *Aamulehti* is much more subtly in its finger- pointing and character defamation, however, its low opinion on Workers Unions and their speakers communicates across quite audibly in the editorial of 21.1.1917 “**On past and the present-day**”: “*During these times it is in the agenda, almost a general habit to agitate the folk, specially the poor the working class against the Christian religion, church and the prosperous citizens, the bourgeois, as it commonly calledOur purpose is to demonstrate to those inconsiderate blame- placers and bawling agitators and the people who listen to them....*”

5.1.1.2 Russians

There is one instance in January when Russians are mentioned; in 24.1.1917 *Aamulehti* writes in page three about the scarcity of potatoes and the causes of it. The final sentence of the article is the following “*The potato consumption of the extra people temporarily dwelling in our country is also a considerable cause for the prevailing scarcity of potatoes.*” Based on single reference, we cannot conclude anything of the overall attitude *Aamulehti* yielded, however, the negative tone of afore given example is a good example of the viewpoint bourgeois had of Russians. The bourgeois saw Finland already as semi- independent country; having the constitution meant sovereignty hence in their eyes Russians (in this case the article might indicate the troops to which Finland was obliged to provide food supplies) had no right to be in Finland. They were extra people and as the article indicates, great part of the reason why the Finns were experiencing famine.

5.1.2 February, *Aamulehti*

5.1.2.1 General features

Aamulehti was the mouthpiece of the bourgeois party SP, which in addition to politics was a firm advocator for Finnish culture and peoples’ sophistication. In February Finland celebrates its national epic Kalevala and its author Elias Lönnrot, both of the days are national holidays and in 1917 were held particularly dear by SP. In the content of *Aamulehti* this liaison showed as a boom of culturally poised editorials such as “**The day of kalevala. To the attention of the people and special interest groups**”, “**Childrens’ literature**” and “**From the educational frontier. References for deterring inactivity and mass influence**”. The ratio between topics

concerning cultural ideology and party politics is slightly disproportionate; out of the nine editorials featuring what can be identified as party agenda⁵⁷ altogether six (6/9) are on the cultural/ sophisticated aspirations of the party. The number is great in comparison to January's "cultural content" which was zero.

In February there is non what so ever reference to Russians, instead a peculiarity of the Finnish bourgeois— and the parties presenting them— makes an appearance: the anti- Swede attitudes. In 1900s Fennomania swept over the bourgeois—most of which had Swedish ancestry— and suddenly all matters Finnish: language, culture, arts, geography became something to admire and be inspired by. The change was great for until 1900s "Finnishness" was seen synonymous to vulgar behaviour and lack of sophistication. Not everybody agreed with the new direction. Some of the bourgeois still believed and spoke of Swedish peoples' superiority which of course irritated the others but particularly the Finnish born bourgeois; as the afore quotation shows, people had great conviction and the debate run at times extremely heated. After the March Revolution these small anti- Swede expressions started disappearing because the gradual radicalization of the Trade Organization and Workers Unions, along with the mischief of the Russian militia were drawing the bourgeois parties together based on the logic of "the enemy of my enemy is my friend".

5.1.3 March, *Aamulehti*

5.1.3.1 General features

In March matters start evolving; it is clear that under the regular editorials on municipality governance and cultural aspirations something had been brewing. Perhaps it was due to the situation in St.Petersburg and the clear political and social tensions in Tampere that made *Aamulehti* step up its political propaganda; in March we see clear increase in the number of editorials featuring party politics instead of the usual cultural issues. Out of thirteen editorials featuring party propaganda altogether nine feature political propaganda (9/13); the increase is significant when keeping in mind that until March cultural ideology has always come first. Particularly the topic of life insurance seems to have been of importance for four editorials discuss it all under the same title "**The features of organizing the procuring of life insurance in Finland**". Other themes evolve much around the issues in Tampere; "**Municipality as an employer**", "**White water fishing**" and the "**Living conditions in our city**" to exemplify few. The cultural themes in March almost without an exception discuss the building up of Finnish sophistication with titles such as "**Cultivation of Finnish sophistication**", "**Assembling cultural capital**". There are also two anti Swede- minded editorials "**Swedish country and what consistency requires**" declaring that if Finland is such and appalling country and its folk so common then why won't the Swedish minded simply pack their bags and leave for Sweden. Another article, "**The matter of nationality**" is in the same lines with the afore mentioned editorial and is of the opinion that Finland is only

⁵⁷ Loosely defined as matters which held particular interest to the party, policies and practices the party rallied support for, ideological content i.e. party agenda

for Finnish race. The appearance of these two anti- Swede editorials has to be remarked upon due to their aggressive hostility which is uncharacteristic of *Aamulehti*.

5.1.3.2 The March Revolution

Even though until 17.03.1917 there is no real indication of the events—strikes and peoples uprising— taking place in Russia since the end of February. The lack of articles concerning events in Russia can partly be explained by the censorship committee which inspected the content of the articles before the newspaper went to print; the writings which the committee saw inappropriate had to be left out. In most of the cases censorship affected only small section of an article and usually journalists replaced the censored paragraph or sentence with other, however, there are occasions when in purpose of making a point the journalist has replaced the censored part with dash line -----

The extent of censorship in March—several full length articles either include or are completely “dash lined”—indicate that there were attempts to report about the unrest in the capital St. Petersburg; *Aamulehti* had contacts in Russia, reporting about the progress of the revolution, but due to the censorship committee these reports were not published until 17.03.1917. Another clear indicator that heavy censorship was applied to all news coming from Russia is axing of the “From Russia” section which featured proceedings of Duma and other current events mainly from the capital. This section was published daily on page six and particularly in March followed the news from Duma very closely, but suddenly disappears in 07.03.1917. The revolution took place in 13.07.1917 but first time *Aamulehti* was able to write about it in 17.03.1917 when it ran the news story with headline “**On account of the great events**”.

5.1.3.3 Neutrality

Mostly the articles concentrate on the events and the brief references to Russians are always in relation to the event which the article reports about i.e. Russians and their behaviour was not yet a news topic in its own right. The first references to Russians in *Aamulehti* appear in 17.03. 1917 in the editorial “**On account of the great events**”; the editorial has twenty- two (22) sentences from which three (3) are Russian- related, which also goes to show that the emphasis in the articles was on the event and not on the Russians. The article is neutral in tone and in it can be observed the style *Aamulehti* used when discussing the actors of the March Revolution: “*The parliamentary form of governance is therefore the great result which the people of Russia have acquired for themselves after centuries of waiting and with the price of long-term suffer.*”

It is somewhat surprising that the image editorials and other articles of *Aamulehti* paint of Russian nation is very similar to the Fennomian description of the Finnish nation; simple yet proud people who humbly endure hardships without placing a complaint. It can only be speculated upon why the descriptions are so much alike; it is a fact that SP— the party behind *Aamulehti*— did not harbour the most warm feelings

towards the Russian governance but then again it was also perceived that the people of Russia were victims of the same regime. Or perhaps was this the general way the bourgeois saw the folk regardless of the nationality?

5.1.3.4 Gratefulness

The March Revolution was considered as a great event and people in Finland regardless of class were joyous for it was not only in Russia that the end of Tsar institution was thought to cure all the societal ills; also Finns believed so. The bourgeois saw that Tsar Institution gone Finland could rise up and fulfil its destiny as a sovereign and independent country; the working class thought that bringing down the Tsar institution would also shake the rule of the bourgeois and bring equality.

Contrary to beliefs of age- old Ruskiehatred described in the theory section of this thesis, as well as to false impressions of hatred towards Russians being social force in play at Tampere, there were feelings of gratitude and respect towards Russians. The editorial of 30.03.1917 “**On the day of celebration**” writes “*The people of Russia has wrenched the power into its own hands, deliberated itself and at the same time released our people from that oppressing slavery....We greet the great people of Russia who by liberating themselves liberated also the people of Finland from the same hardship under which also they have been. Grateful and thankful we think of those Russian heroes who have bled their lifeblood, sacrificed themselves for their fatherland’s emancipation and peoples’ rights. The burial day of these heroes is a great commemoration day also to the people of Finland who have now gained back the governmental rights deprived from it.*” Heroism is a theme often exploited by propaganda because it has a quality of inspiring and motivating people however, in the case of *Aamulehti* the hero worship springs more from the lavish language, inspired by a great historical moment than from propagandistic aims.

5.1.3.5 Negativity

There is only one editorial in March which gives slightly negative image of Russians; 23.03.1917 “**Emancipation turning into mischief?**” concerning mischief and fear of lapsing into it ”...*envy, malice, slander and vengeance that in the name of patriotism and the common good of the people directed to disagreeable government officials, officers and even to neighbours. Symptoms to all of this have also appeared in relation to noble Russian revolution.*” Even though the connotation of the quote does not communicate across strongly, it is clear that the intention is to connect Russians and violence together.

5.1.4 January, *Kansan Lehti*

5.1.4.1. General features

Kansan Lehti was very active in its party propaganda; in January alone fifteen editorials advocating the party/ Trade and Workers' Unions' agenda were published. The subject matter of January evolves around pay- rise which particularly Trade Unions were trying to initiate; editorials with titles such as "**The issue of pay- rise. Eminent pay- rise essential**", "**The wages and high- price- addition**" and "**The results of our demands for a pay- rise**" follow the development of the issue. Another theme rising is the growth of the Trade and Workers Unions: "**Organization of trades in Tampere. Considerable increase.**", "**About the Trade Organization movement**" and "**The Trade Organizations and the concentration of capitalist class' power**". *Kansan Lehti* also discussed socialism in January's editorials: "**The meaning of socialism**" and "**Socialistic study of the World War**".

Kansan Lehti was more frequent in publishing party propaganda and also more aggressive in the treatment of the "opposing side": the bourgeois. Issues were often framed to the mindset of evil vs. good, something that can be often identified in storylines of superhero comic books; the the working class is presented as the hero who through trials and tribulations achieves greatness while the evil capitalist bourgeois is the archenemy which tries to do all it can to suppress the hero. In 6.1.1917 editorial titled "**The municipality taxation**" *Kansan Lehti* wrote concerning the principles of taxation "*Working- class man has to pay the heavy taxes in the expense of food and clothing but to the rich the taxation is merely a pinch from the great amounts of money to be taken to a bank or in the worst case abstinence from an extravagance....From that reflected the desire of the capitalist to load the tax burden on the the working class so ruthlessly that even it alone gives all the reason to assume that the employers will do all in their powers to tax the working- class man until his last penny and not only from their actual income but also from their "starvation- allowance" that the factory owners have been forced to grant to their employees in the name of high- price- addition, because without those extra crumbs the the working class men would have not had the strength to stay alive.*"

Permanent feature in the party propaganda published in *Kansan Lehti* is the image of bourgeois/ capitalists as the greedy and well- fed oppressor who had made their fortunes in the expense of the the working class. The capitalist did not care about the life of a worker: if he/ she died the capitalist just replaced him/her with another. In the 16.1.1917 editorial "**The results of your demands for a pay- rise**" *Kansan Lehti* concluded "*During this modest and harmless pay- rise movement we have time and time again had to observe that the employer class of this country does not, not even one bit, care about the fate of their workers. Those almost endless opportunities for earning and hunting for profit that the situation has prepared for the capitalists, those manifold profits that they have harvested without much effort and which would give them now a good chance to improve the livelihood of their breadwinners have not made these messrs any more sympathetic towards their employees. Instead almost the opposite. As earlier they pay their employees as a little as possible and raise their salaries only when they are forced to.*"

For Trade and Workers' Unions to have any credibility and influence they needed mass support in the grassroots level. The easiest means of uniting different groups under one flag was to create a common enemy which is what *Kansan Lehti* does in above quoted article. The strategy is old and can be seen e.g. in the formation of the Allied Forces in WWII; nations having quite literally nothing in common, geographically far apart, not sharing a language, culture nationality, religion or history unite against common enemy, the Axis Powers. Similarly, of course in smaller scale and yet without arms, the agricultural workers, tenant farmers, iron and steel workers, paper and lumber workers, men and women united against the Bourgeois. By presenting the bourgeois as the ruthless enemy *Kansan Lehti* knowingly or unknowingly had done more than created the "us" and "them" setting; it had placed the two groups in the opposite corners and with its agitation was brewing up bitterness and aggression.

Kansan Lehti had a clear tendency of finger- pointing and blame- placing; most of the time the blame was placed on the bourgeois. What the newspaper gave to its readership was a clear impression that all the hardships the working class was going through were the fault of the bourgeois capitalist. This habit was eminent part of the writings on the high prices and scarcity of food products. In the 3.1.1917 editorial "**The year 1916 in our homecountry**" *Kansan Lehti* declares the following "*Pellerwo Association and the Butterproducers Union Valio which both receive handsome amount of government support have distinguished themselves in propagating for dragging the prices even higher.... To meet this end the producers have even been as ruthless as to create artificial food shortages. From their efforts the result has been constant rising of the prices regardless of all the counter measures that the consumers have taken.*". No doubt that most of the editorial is based on facts, however the ever- increasing writings about artificial food shortages and hidden stocks were particularly dangerous because they lead people into plausible but ultimately wrong conclusion that the capitalists were hiding the food just in order to see the people to die of hunger. It is obvious that such line of thought would lead into some sort of aggression; in this case it lead to general raiding of farm warehouses and Valio' s warehouses in 11.8.1917.

5.1.4.2 Russians

In January *Kansan Lehti* is almost void of any mention of Russians; there is only one instance when they are mentioned. In 23.1.1917 *Kansan Lehti*, under an article "**Religion, bourgeois and the proletariat**" published at page three there is a sentence "*The bourgeois gives the clergy the rank to function as a disciplinarian and mental militia*⁵⁸ *of the lower classes in constraining their revolutionary instincts.*" The reference to Russians is "*the militia*" which in itself is neutral term due to the fact that Russian troops functioned as militia in Finland, however, the context in which the term is used— discipline, restrictions on ones free will, control—gives it negative connotation.

⁵⁸ "santarmi" in Finnish. It is particularly the usage of this word which indicates that the writer of the article means a Russian member of the militia

Finns, regardless of class, did not share high opinion of particularly the lower ranks of the Russian militia. Real problems in relations between the militia and the people started developing in the beginning of 1917 when the troops, having not received salary in months and hearing bits and pieces of the commotion taking place in St. Petersburg started to apply mob law to their actions i.e. restricting peoples' freedom and activities, demanding bribes and so on. *Kansan Lehti* of course was aware that such instances were taking place, however, the general line with both of the newspapers was that of non- interest. Russians were not important topic, they were not newsworthy unless they were involved in something which was of general interest to the newspaper. With such lining the problems with Russian militia did not receive much attention. One cannot conclude that *Kansan Lehti* approved the mischief of Russian militia; the direction we see *Kansan Lehti* taking, particularly after the March Revolution, is that of ignoring the mischief and concentrating on the reporting where the militia can be presented in relatively positive light e.g. as heroes of revolution.

5.1.5 February, *Kansan Lehti*

5.1.5.1 General features

The editorials discussing the SDP party ideology in *Kansan Lehti* in February were few and did not deviate from the general line; from the fifteen editorials featuring party agenda only five (5/15) are purely ideological and the rest of them are political topics. The ideological content is centered mainly on two subjects: class theories and world according them. Titles such as “**Capitalism and the life blood of the the working class**”, “**The working class and petit bourgeoisie**” and “**Social democracy and bourgeois democracy**” were trying to create class consciousness among the working class which for centuries had not seen itself as a class or any other type of unity. The editorials about the philosophy of socialism e.g. “**Wage theories**” and “**Marx and liberty**” tried to educate the the working class of the deeper meaning of the the working class movement, however, it is questionable whether the ideological side ever achieved such attention that it would have been part of the movement in level other than superficial level.

Kansan Lehti seemed to have realized that the the working class did not necessarily want to read lengthy pieces about Marx, Engels and Jung or policy making processes of the SDP hence throughout January and February the editorials with party agenda concentrate on describing the wrongs of the society; the oppression of the the working class and the wrongdoings and wickedness of the capitalists. Titles such as “**Too comfortable conditions of the infirmaries. bourgeois newspapers are envying them**” discussing how the bourgeois feels too much money is spent on the healthcare of the poor, “**The right of the employer to fine his workers**” where writer explains how the employers are despotically fining employees from the little salary they receive and how Workers' Unions are trying to fight this , “**The worse paid members of the working class in our country are employed by agriculture**” preaching how the land owners expect the agricultural workers to work with non- existing salary and more than twelve hour working days and how the SDP is trying to

advocate for 8- hour working day. These are only few examples of the style *Kansan Lehti* presented the party agenda and discussed current affairs. What is also very characteristic of *Kansan Lehti* is that it goes to great lengths in illustrating the problem but rarely even tries to provide suggestions for solution, therefore it can be said that the objective of editorials was not to discuss but to agitate.

5.1.6 March, *Kansan Lehti*

5.1.6.1 General features

In March *Kansan Lehti* very much concentrated on campaigning for the need to unify the forces of the working class and there are several calls for workers to join the Workers' Unions. Editorials with titles **"Participation to the functions of the local office of social democrats"**, **"Finnish Trade Union. overlook on its activities in 1916"** and **"Organization of the unemployment aid in the paperworkers' union"** provide information on the activities of Trade Unions and the benefits one gains if joining either them or Workers' Unions'. However, it cannot really be implied that *Kansan Lehti* had increased its Trade- and Workers' Union propaganda for it is a permanent feature of the newspaper as well as the whole the working class movement; the power of the the working class was in its numbers.

The ratio between political propaganda and the ideological propaganda follows the lines of earlier months; out of fifteen editorials featuring party agenda only five (5/ 15) are of ideological content. The agitating style continues with titles such as **"55 penny salary and its consequences"**, **"Poor salaries and overtime work, few words about the salaries of the engine factory workers"** and **"Exploiter messrs and famine"**.

In March the "dialogue" between bourgeois and the working class newspapers— as exemplified between *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti*— increases; on 01.03.1917 the editorial of *Aamulehti* ponders over the organization of the life insurance with the title **"The features of organizing the procuring of life insurance in Finland"** and *Kansan Lehti* on 03.03.1917 how this life insurance is meant only for the protection of the bourgeois with editorial **"On the matter of peoples' insurance"**. Another good example is *Aamulehti's* editorial on 03.03.1917 **"On the matter of salary statistics"** which goes through salaries paid by different industries; *Kansan Lehti* reacts to that by publishing editorial in 07.03.1917 with the title **"55 penny salary and its consequences"**. And yet another incidence in 15.03.1917 when *Kansan Lehti* editorial **"Living conditions in cities. future prospects"** discussing the bad housing situation and the conditions of the lodgings provided by the factories which received a reply from *Aamulehti* the following day 16.03.1917 titled **"Living conditions in or city"** where the editorial puts up a defence by trying to illustrate that at least in Tampere the living conditions of the the working class are very good.

Such pickering over what was written in other newspapers and reacting on the claims made by some editorial are common particularly in *Aamulehti* which somewhat often defends itself or sets straight claims made by the the working class newspapers. Such tendency was a result of the unfortunate fact that the working class newspapers such as *Kansan Lehti* did have a liking for over dramatising the issues they wrote

about but at times it was more due to the fact that along with other bourgeois newspapers also *Aamulehti* was a bit out of touch with the realities of the the working class hence did not believe the issues *Kansan Lehti* wrote about to be true.

5.1.6.2 March Revolution

As with *Aamulehti*, it is clear that the editorial staff of *Kansan Lehti* was aware of the strikes and riots in St. Petersburg and was trying to report these news to their readers. The editorials do not feature anything that could be distinctly connected to the events in Russia; the usual reports of the proceeding in Russian senate appear but concerning the peoples' uprising the newspaper maintains silence. This is due to the tightened censorship which was applied also in Finland when the riots started; it was feared that if the uprising would become public knowledge the Russian garrisons in Finland would rebel. In the front page of 17.03.1917 edition, finally being allowed to announce the news of the March Revolution the newspaper declares "*Of short, incomplete and covered up crumps of information which we have so far have been allowed to publish the reader has already noticed that the grand empire of Russia has lived momentous moments....Because of this (the fall of censorship) we are in the opportunity of publishing in the following the brief description of the incidents in the capital of Russia during the days of revolution, the description of which is by the delivery of J.S.V.T from St. Petersburg and has already for few days been in our possession and in typeset but the publication of which the censorship officials have so far blocked.*".

Kansan Lehti runs the news story on its front page i.e. it changes the whole layout; ordinarily the front page features only the name and the date of the publication, the rest of it is reserved for advertisements but on the 17.03.1917 *Kansan Lehti* the front page opens with the title "**The revolution in Russia**". The importance given to the news of March Revolution is not in any way surprising considering the magnitude of the event and the meaning of it to the the working class movement, in comparison *Aamulehti* did not change its regular layout and reported the news of the revolution in the second page.

5.1.6.3 Heroism

Kansan Lehti does not even try to maintain the image of neutrality, it writes about the events but the tone is almost a story- telling like. For example in the front page of 17.03.1917 the lead story announcing the revolution opens as follows "*....And when the hunger and sufferey expanded into imbearable the people took the reins of their destinies into their own hands. The workers hurried from the factories into the streets and were joined by soldiers from one unit after another and soon was the revolution in full motion. Only thing missing was the central leadership....*".

The hero of the story *Kansan Lehti* is telling is not hard to identify: it is the Russian the working class. In 19.03.1917 editorial with the title "**The revolution and the call for it to the the working class**" writes "*The nearly endless progression of oppression measures has the people of Russia—and with it the people of Finland—had to*

bear before the cup of suffery was full and the means of the oppressor exploded into pieces.” The universal theme of “heroism springs from suffer” can often be seen in ancient classics e.g. “Iliad and odyssey” by Homer, myth of The twelve labours of Hercules, where the definition of a hero assumes trials and personal tribulations through which the hero has to travel before achieving his goal. Another motif that can be identified is the same that appears in *Aamulehti*; the characteristics of a fennomanian man.

Another quality of heroism—and rather Christian tradition—the selfless sacrifice of ones own life for the greater cause is demonstrated in the page two article of 29.03.1917 “**The commemoration of revolution- the commemoration of the class struggle**”: “*Through out the whole great empire are revolutionary forces coming together tomorrow, in the day for commemorating the heroes who fell at the revolution battles in St. Petersburg to honour the memory of were the first ones to raise their hands against the reigning system and sacrificed their lives for their close relatives by fighting for their class’s freedom.*” *Kansan Lehti* portrays Russian revolutionary forces as heroes who delivered the people, also Finns from the evils of the Tsar institution; as in all “deliverance” stories the ending is when the hero returns home and receives his/her people. The way *Kansan Lehti* describes the visit of Russian дума member Tsenteli in Tampere in “**The social democrat Tsenteli at Tampere**” (19.03.1917) falls nothing short of a hero’s return to home “*In addition there were people gathered to receive the member of дума so that the railway station square, Hämeenkatu street all the way to the rapid bridge were crowded....Before the beginning of this meeting the member of дума was introduced from the workers’ Union’s balcony to the crowds of several thousands assembled in front of the building, who with enthusiastic hurray shouts greeted the visitor.*”

5.1.6.4 The greater cause

Interesting change taking place towards the end of March is the change of tone in *Kansan Lehti* took; the agitative style decreases while ideological content increases. The manoeuvre— with or without an intent— glorifies the March Revolution, and elevating it to a symbolic level where the victory of Russian the working class over the Tsar institution represents the victory of the whole worlds the working class over the bourgeois or socialism/communism over capitalism. *Kansan Lehti* writes in 30.03.1917 in the editorial titled “**The meaning of Russian revolution**”: “*Whole Europe is in gratitude to the people of Russia. But particularly to those who have given their lives in the battle for freedom. Their blood has given vigour of growth to whole Europe’s seed of freedom.*” And then more blatantly in 29.03.1917 “**The commemoration of revolution- the commemoration of the class struggle**”: “*Russian comrades, fallen and still fighting in the battle lines greatest worth is perhaps that they, by striking the feet under Tsarism, have given us the opportunity to hold the Messrs more tightly accountable.*”

Giving a symbolic or greater meaning to a event is often seen in religious movements e.g. breaking of bread at the last supper or dying at the cross. In the articles of *Kansan Lehti* one can at times notice rather Christian undertones; for example in 29.03.1917 “**The commemoration of revolution- the commemoration of the class struggle**” in addition to attempts of trying to glorify the revolution, theme of blood as a vessel of deliverance i.e. crucifixion can also be observed: “*The Finnish the working class whose freedom these fallen*

heroes have paid with their blood....These proletariats these women and children crushed by the bloody fists of the Tsar's convulsion of death, these fore fighters who without fear stroke the first blow to the roots of the old system are blood in our blood."

5.1.6.5 Making the connection between the Finns and the Russians

Kansan Lehti realised the power of the example the March revolution had given and exploited it; from the beginning *Kansan Lehti* attempted to draw a connection between the Russian the working class and Finnish the working class. Before the revolution there is no detectable declarations of comraderie between Russian and Finnish the working class; *Kansan Lehti* does mention the the working class movement in Russia, but when it comes to illustrating patterns of activity or to the progress report most of the examples come from the English, French and American the working class movement.

After the March revolution has become a news item we see complete change of direction; now the newspapers does its best to associate with the Russian the working class. The 30.03.1917 editorial "**The meaning of Russian revolution**" is rather vocal in these attempts "*As the Finns have already for long time lived together with this people of Russia; we have heard the beating of its large heart; we have heard it yelp in pain and rejoice when the moment of freedom is near....Now we rejoice and at the same time joyfully declare that in between the our and Russian the working class there is not even the tiniest dissonance although the minions of the Tsarist regime have tried to provoke. As brothers we have been with our Russian class comrades in battle and as brothers we are in the unfolding enlightenment action."*

5.1.6.6 Excusing the violence

Kansan Lehti had a different take on the violence which appeared in Finland after the news of the Revolution. The fact remains that there was mischief when the crowds— not only Russian troops but also Workers' Unions' activists — took the streets hence *Kansan Lehti*, as a newspaper but also as a mouthpiece of the Finnish social democratic party, had to pay attention to it. The violence goes much unreported, which may be the result of many factors one of them most likely being that in Tampere such a looting and mischief did not appear hence reporting something happening in the other city seemed unimportant.

The conviction given in the few articles to violent incidents is non- existent; firstly it does not make its way to any of the editorials or even to the major articles in page two and three and when it does appear the reference is allusive and extremely general leaving out the "who, when, where and why". There is only one informative article written about incidents of mischief, "**Officers have been killed**" (19.03.1917) and is in its entirety as follows "*According to the news received by Uusi Aura newspaper it appear that in the course of military soldiers capturing (military) officials two officers been shot to death. According to hearsay these mentioned officers in a rude manner treated the soldiers when they came to capture them, which was when the soldiers shot a deadly discharge. In Pori in a similar situation been shot one officer and another has shot himself. As has been mentioned, in Helsinki more officers been killed."*

5.1.7 *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti*: comparison of the themes and contrasting of the image of Russians from January through end of March

5.1.7.1 Russians as a news topic, First level of analysis (the measure unit: editorials and articles per month)

	JANUARY		FEBRUARY		MARCH	
	articles/ issues	in %	articles/ issues	in %	articles / issues	in %
AAMULEHTI	1/ 24	4 %	0/ 24	0 %	7/ 27	26 %
KANSAN LEHTI	1/ 24	4 %	0/ 24	0 %	7/ 26	27 %

How interesting news topic the Russians actually were? How many articles mentioning the Russian were written in a month? As the percentages show the interest towards Russians on January through February is non-existent; the editorials where Russians are mentioned are so few that they do not portray any kind of image of Russian or give any clear idea how were the Russians received as a part of the society in Tampere. In March Russian related topics appear due to the March Revolution, which makes Russians a news topic. All the seven Russian related articles and editorials are published after the news of the Revolution broke in Finland but beyond that *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* both treated Russians as a news topic with non interest

The only real conclusion that can be made is the fact that in this case the absence of the subject speaks for itself. Would there have been problems with the Russian presence the newspapers would have reported it. Particularly *Aamulehti* saw the Russians as an “extra population”, would have written about negative issues if there would have been any.

5.1.7.2 Analysing the sample, second level of analysis (measure unit: sentences per Russian related article)⁵⁹

	AAMULEHTI 1.1. -30.3.1917	in %	KANSAN LEHTI 1.1. -30.3.1917	in %
total size of the sample (sentences)	302		886	

⁵⁹ The total size of the sample presents the total amount of sentences that I have analyzed from the month in question. Russian related sentences present the amount of sentences I have identified as “Russian related”. Positive, negative and neutral present the amount of sentences I have identified as having the afore mentioned connotation. What has been considered as “Russian related” and “positive, negative, neutral” are described in the page 47. “Tone of the sample” is assigned according the connotation which appears most often i.e. has the highest percentage. In this particular sample I have not analyzed each month as separate unit due to the fact that there simply is not enough for such an analysis hence this chart presents the entire sample i.e. from January through March. In rest of the samples each month will be analyzed as a separate unit.

Russian related sentences in the sample	34	11 % (of the total size)	56	6 % (of the total size)
Positive	10	29 %	32	57 %
Negative	4	12 %	2	4 %
Neutral	20	59 %	22	39 %
Tone of the sample	NEUTRAL	(total 100 %)	POSITIVE	(total 100 %)

March is really the first time when Russians enter the newspapers, but considering the amount of attention March Revolution received as a news topic, the amount of Russian related sentences is small. In *Aamulehti*, there are only six (6) editorials where Russian- related sentences appear and in most cases the reference is brief: only one or two sentences in length. From the total of six editorials four are neutral, one is positive and one negative, hence we can conclude that the general tone and the image *Aamulehti* projected of Russians in March was neutral. In *Kansan Lehti* there are altogether eight (8) articles with reference to Russians; from those eight, six are positive, one neutral and one negative hence we can claim that the overall image *Kansan Lehti* portrayed in March of Russians was positive.

When looking at the amount of articles, there is little difference, however, when we take the analysis to the second level—to the total amount of sentences and the number of positive/ negative sentences—we start to see clear differences; in March *Kansan Lehti* wrote fifty-six sentences on Russians, from which thirty- two (32/56) were positive, whereas *Aamulehti* wrote only thirty- four sentences of which ten (10/ 34) were positive. The difference between the two newspapers concerning the interest towards Russians is clear; the extent of the positive image these newspapers painted also gains clarity. When calculated in percentages, 29% of Russian related sentences are positive in *Aamulehti*, while the same number in *Kansan Lehti* is 57%.

As in *Aamulehti*, also in *Kansan Lehti* all of these references appear after the 17.03.1917, when news about March Revolution had been published. Only six percent (6%) of *Kansan Lehti*'s content in March discusses Russians where as the same number in *Aamulehti* is 11%. It is somewhat surprising to see that *Kansan Lehti* does not exploit their connection to the Russian socialism movement before the revolution, after all Russia was at the time the embodiment of the movement. One of the reasons certainly could have been the remembrants of Oppression period during which Russia was perceived in somewhat negative light and the only political influences originating from there were tighter regulations, more censorship, unpleasant administrative officials and refusals to requests. In such an atmosphere camaraderie does not found breeding ground. Another factor might have been as simple as the distance; much more weight was put on the local news due to the fact that most of the people had never visited another city, not to mention a country hence the journalists concentrated on news from the areas, which were in their readerships knowledge.

5.1.7.3 Categories of association

In March edition of *Aamulehti* one can already detect the beginnings of the most common issues with which bourgeois in Tampere, as well as all over the country, start to associate Russians with: first one is hunger, another being mischief and violence. In the next sample— June, August and September—I expect to see much of this line, especially emphasis put on the violence. *Aamulehti* began building up the negative image of Russians by using the mischief caused by the Russian soldiers as their main assault weapon. Also *Kansan Lehti* started building up the image of Russians; its image was positive and the main themes were camaraderie, the connection between Russian the working class and Finnish the working class. The Russians were introduced as fore-fighters and as an example, which Finnish the working class should follow.

5.2 The image of Russians from June to September

The first three months of the year 1917 offer very little indication to how Russians were perceived in Finland and what was the general opinion towards them; the second study period—from June to end of September—on the other hand, provides already much clearer image. Compared to the first study period this second study period also includes much more societal turmoil; many of the issues behind the societal conflict had been kept in a state of hibernation by the belief that the new era would bring changes. When March Revolution did not ease the circumstances in which Finns lived the escalation of events and radicalization of opinions started.

5.2 1 June, *Aamulehti*

5.2.1.1 General features

After the March Revolution the power in Russia was in the hands of what was commonly in Finland known as “Provisional Government”⁶⁰ which also had inherited the decision making power in matters relating to Finland. In the confusion which resulted determination of the Tsar Institution Finns saw an opportunity for independence. Therefore after the March revolution the questions of governmental sovereignty and the constitution were two topics which often appeared in form or another in the pages of *Aamulehti*. In June editorials “**Finn- minded’s reflections on the independence question**”, “**Finland’s interior matters**” and “**People and the parliament**” pondered over the question of governmental the constitution and the future of Finland.

Another theme was the situation of food shortage; editorials “**Our cities grain storage**”, “**Grain storages in the countryside**” and “**Agricultural matters in the current government**” listing the grams and kilograms of

⁶⁰ ”Väliaikaishallitus” in Finnish

grain left and pondering how to make storages last longer, reflect the urgency of the situation. the shortage of grain had deteriorated to such a level that in 17th of June the Finnish parliament issued an order with which, from the warehouses of producers, it seized all available grain as well as other products for the purpose of rationing the remaining supply.

It also appears that the time for ideological content in *Aamulehti* had passed; in June there is only one editorial which contains party ideology (“**Finnish university to Turku**”). The lack of cultural topics which *Aamulehti* was known for communicates the changes in the atmosphere; the country had moved from passive to active conflict of classes; there was no space for cultural ambitions. The disappearance of civilization and sophistication is the tragedy which accompanies serious conflicts; when people have to struggle for everyday survival they have very little interest to culture or education. In June people in Tampere were struggling with food shortage, mischief and general uncertainty; matters that were important to *Aamulehti* in the beginning of the year, the celebration of national epic Kalevala, Fennomanian ideals and education of the folk, had become unimportant.

5.2.1.2 Mischief

In the end of March there already were clear indications of the direction *Aamulehti* was developing the image of Russians; the topics with which of *Aamulehti* associated the Russians were those that caused the most disturbance in the society: mischief and food shortage.

In June the amount of mischief had grown and could no longer be explained with the “spirit of revolution”. It also had gained new meanings due to the fact that the nature of mischief had changed. Shortly after the March Revolution the mischief and violence had been targeted towards Russian officials— Military officers in particular— now it was targeted to Finnish nationals, particularly representatives of municipality officers and other administrators. Hence in June the new meaning *Aamulehti* assigned to the mischief of Russian troops was that it was to be interpreted as interference to Finland’s internal affairs. The editorial of *Aamulehti* in 9.6.1917 wrote with the title “**Maintaining the internal order**” “...it would make unnecessary the Russian troops which dwells in here that unduly interferes our internal affairs and consumes our puny food reserves.”

The notion that Russian troops were interfering Finland’s internal affairs is much connected to the key aspect of bourgeois parties’ political agenda: sovereignty from Russia. The way *Aamulehti* addressed the Russian troops in its articles is also representative of these sentiments; before the March Revolution the troops were at large referred as “Russian troops” or merely “troops”⁶¹ but after the disillusionment which followed the revolution and the failure of the Provisional Government make good on its promises, the Russian troops began to be referred as “the troops of a foreign country”, “troops of another country”⁶² or “foreign troops”.

⁶¹ ”Venäläinen sotaväki” or ”sotaväki” in Finnish

⁶² ”Vieraan maan sotaväki”, ”toisen maan sotaväki” or ”vieras sotaväki” in Finnish

5.2.1.3 Explaining the behaviour of the Russian Troops

There were still attempts to rephrase or explain the appearance of such behaviour; the editorial “**Mischief in our country**” in 6.6.1917 presents a good example of the variety of explanations assigned to the actions of the Russian troops. “*And when those agitators (of Trade Unions and Workers Unions) don’t have enough crowds to overthrow the Society then the troops of a foreign country are used to which, since it doesn’t know the affairs of our country and has been brought up in quite different circumstances has been made to be believe that the bourgeois in Finland oppresses the socialists and that they are because of that in need of help....*”. And in 9.6.1917 with the title “**Maintaining the internal order**” “*However this military force accustomed to different circumstances cannot with the best of will even begin to understand our societal affairs hence its helpfulness can easily be misused as has already happened.*” Among the most common excuses were that Russians had been raised in different circumstances than Finns and therefore did not understand the internal functions of the Finnish society.

The notions that communicate through the editorials in *Aamulehti* are very close to those that are used in the process of creating the “Us and Them” setting. First the differences between the nations are pointed out and explained with reasons that are irreversible; here *Aamulehti* explains the dissimilarity through different circumstances in which the individuals have been brought up. The irreversibility of the differences is crucial aspect of the “Us and Them” set up because it signifies the finality of the setting i.e. that nothing can be done to erase existing dissimilarities and is there anything more final than explaining the differences through childhood socialization processes and nurture? Second step in the process of creating “Us and Them” setting is to show inability one nationality to understand other due to these irreversible reasons.

Another rather permanent aspect to these pretences given to the conduct of the Russian troops was the involvement of Social Democrats. It is a fact that Russian troops did participate in Trade and Workers’ Unions “dubious” activities such as raiding food warehouses and official meetings but it has to be noted that the number of Russian troops participating in these activities was actually quite small. *Aamulehti* has a tendency of giving the impression that it was the the SDP which recruited the entirety of Russian troops and that it had done so by bending the truth. To exemplify; in 6.6.1917 “**Mischief in our country**” *Aamulehti* wrote “*Hence the local office of Social Democrats in the capital invites other country’s citizens to interfere our country’s internal affairs even such sensitive question as socialists’ stance on their own country’s parliament....At the end concerning the decision by Socialists of Helsinki it must be again note that Finland’s official Social Democracy does not withdraw from directly demanding for the Russian troops to interfere our country’s internal affairs but rather to pressure our country’s parliament and limit its authority to decision.*” Where the need to present Russian troops as passive actors who were innocent of the mischief they committed comes from, is a question of debate. Bourgeois did not yet want to burn bridges to Russian Provisional Government hence took non- judgemental stance to the mischief. It is also possible that in June *Aamulehti* saw the SDP as a bigger enemy than the Russian troops.

5.2.1.4 Limitations on sovereignty

The second association in which the Russians appear in June has nothing to do with mischief or Russian military: it has to do with the limitation the provisional government of Russia was starting to place on Finland's regained sovereignty. In 13.6.1917 editorial "**The interior affairs of Finland**" *Aamulehti* expressed its frustrations as follows "*Although parliament act directs that parliament has to assemble every year the fact that the assembly of the parliament depends on the Russian government implies essential limitations on Finnish sovereignty. And obviously that has pointedly been the aim of it because according to hearsay the Provisional Government of Russia has in this point been especially inflexible.*" The manifest Provisional Government had issued to Finland at the end of March had promised restoration of autonomous rights and non- interference to the governance except concerning Military issues and interest of Russians living in Finland. To Bourgeois parties this manifest represented the door to true sovereignty and perhaps even to independence. As the months passed the parliament saw no obvious changes and started to loose its faith on Provisional Government. The editorial of 7.6.1918 "**Finn- minded's reflections on the independence question**" is quite straight forward with its concerns "*Nationalism and Finnhatred are raising again their head in Russia!*"

The issue of limitation on the sovereignty was often tied to past Oppression periods and *Aamulehti* used the memory of these eras in reminding its readership of how life during the Oppression periods was. For example in 2.6.1917 "**Municipal and business rights of Russians**" *Aamulehti* writes "*But Bureaucratic and oppressive to Finland Russian then Government did not want to arrange these matters between both countries in legal and peaceable manner but resorted into violence which caused suffer to our country. It rejected the law proposals of the parliament and tried with force have its way in societal order.*" And in 13.6.1917 editorial "**The interior affairs of Finland**" "*This concept is very elastic because as we from very bitter experience know that almost any matter of Finland's interior affair has the Russians quarter been able to interpret as concern of Russian interest.*"

What added flavour to *Aamulehti's* writings about the limitations on sovereignty was the fact that the majority party THE SDP had slightly different take on the concept of sovereignty. The frustrations of Bourgeois parties resulting from the inability to influence THE SDP's line on a matter as important as the governmental the constitution were visible and vocal in the summer of 1917, keeping the matter in public eye.

5.2 2 August, *Aamulehti*

5.2.2.1 General features

In July the printing houses were closed due to strike and stayed closed until 9.8.1917. Especially the bourgeois newspapers suffered from the strike because it appeared that the strike was extended only to them while newspapers of the the working class such as *Kansan Lehti* were published like clock work. The topics *Aamulehti* focused in August were much to do with the current events, the most important of them being the

dissolution of the Finnish parliament by the Provisional Government. Editorials such as “**Dissolving the parliament**”, “**Tokoi’s senate in a state of disruption**” and “**Fruitless work of the parliament**” appear, discussing what brought Provisional Government’s decision about and how to proceed from there on. For the bourgeois parties dissolving of the parliament, even though they as well protested against it, presented an opportunity to take over the parliament. There would have to be new elections to which the parties started preparing immediately. Week after the news of dissolving the parliament *Aamulehti* published an editorial announcing electoral alliance between all the bourgeois parties under the title: “**Finnish parties’ electoral alliance**”.

The second topic that *Aamulehti* naturally focused in August was the elections; it appears that much concentration was put on the electoral work for topics discussing that can be identified as electoral issues begin appearing quite often. The issues related to food shortage and mischief had already been topics which were in the public eye and it is quite natural that the bourgeois party alliance incorporated these issues to their campaign. The alliance turned the topics against the SDP by campaigning that the food shortage was getting worse due to the unlawful looting and strikes which Trade and Workers’ Unions supported. The mischief was also considered as the fault of the above mentioned establishments and the SDP. In the light of bourgeois parties alliance and their electoral themes, it is not that surprising to find August almost void of any mention of Russians.

5.2.2.2 Russian militia is ignoring the violence

There are altogether seven articles which mention Russians at all, most of them have to do with the dissolving of the parliament and are rather neutral, three of them associate Russian soldier with ongoing mischief but frames the topic in a completely new way, different from what has been seen before. The editorial in 11.8.1917 “**Necessary extraditions in Turku**” is a good example of the new twist *Aamulehti* gave to the Russian mischief: “*Describing to the circumstances is that the city’s militia did not intervene to the proceedings of the matter but was content in remaining as a by-stander.*” Russian troops were not blamed for the mischief, they were now blamed for not keeping the order or intervening to the mischief caused by the working class hooligans. Another good example comes from the editorial of 15.8.1917 “**Disturbances relating to food products**”: “*In relation to these incidents, that newspapers have had detailed accounts on, has to be noted the indifference that the militia placed there for keeping the order has demonstrated, keeping aloof and being a by-stander to pillaging.*”

There is only one editorial where *Aamulehti* assigns responsibility for the mischief to Russian troops but even then it links the Social Democrats to it. In 30.8.1917 “**Soldier mischief**” concerning the violent act Russian troops have committed in lately in Finland “*Russian troops have violently intervened to our country’s internal affairs and has in many forms insulted our judicial system. ...When, as in Helsinki has the militia with the street mobs distresses the council, when, as in Malmi shot members of protective guard (which later will be declared as the White troops), when, like in Ilmajoki forcefully and in very low price taken hey, when, as in Pirkkala broke in*

to a cellar and rob it clean....If Russian state authorities cannot prevent Russian troops from joining the uncritical and unorganized street mobs for braking the legal order in our country, then it in here will loose all esteem.”

The afore quote is from the article which features particularly strong language hence differing from the neutral tone characteristic *Aamulehti*. The change from holding Russian troops responsible for the mischief, to blaming the “street mobs” i.e. the working class hooligans is not really surprising considering the fact that Bourgeois parties always remained more non- confrontational and non- engaging when it came to matters relating Russians.

5.2.3 September, *Aamulehti*

5.2.3.1 General features

Issues with food shortage continuing receiving some attention with titles such as “**Senate’s decision on confiscation of 1917 grain crops**” and “**Some views on the food product question**”. *Aamulehti* also raised the issues relating to strikes which had become continuous inconvenience which with their side- effects— street violence and disturbance— were quite visible also in Tampere. The editorials such as “**Anarchistic situation in our country**”, “**Threat of strike in the railroads**” and “**Question of working**” all of which are attempts to demonize the strikes, making the point why strikes are harmful to the the working class movement as well as to the whole nation.

However, the issue receiving the most attention in September is without a doubt the electoral issues; almost all of its editorials are in one way or another regarding the elections, which would be held in 1st of October. Most of the elections- related editorials attack the Social Democratic Party; titles such as “**Wrong democracy**”, “**Infamousness**”, “**How have the city socialists advocated for the matters of country folk**” discuss either, the horror images of what is to come if the SDP will continues having majority in the Parliament, how inadequate the work of the SDP has been or in general defamation of activities and characters of the SDP politics.

5.2.3.2 Russian militia is supporting the violent behaviour of Trade and Workers’ Unions’

In September *Aamulehti* takes the direction that *Kansan Lehti* had pursued in August: it joins two themes: *Aamulehti* connects the mischievous behaviour of the Russian troops and the unrest caused by the Trade and Workers’ Unions’. In 7.9.1917 editorial “**The resistance of unlawfulness**” concerning the disturbance caused by THE SDP related actors⁶³ “*And by acquiring help from Russian soldiers and seamen they have developed into society’s horror and danger.*” The same theme can be detected again in 23.9.1917 in curious piece of electoral

⁶³ The SDP related actors are here considered to be Trade and Workers’ Unions, regional offices of the party, professional speakers and party activists.

advertisement, appearing in page seven “**Soldier mischief and the elections**”: “*In the current era of revolution have the Russian troops placed in Finland regardless of bourgeois population but on the requests of socialists several times interfered in Finland’s internal affairs.... On socialists’ request was Russian militia joined in distressing Turku’s city council. The “bouncers” of social democrats held teacher Kaisla from the arms while Russian soldiers beat him in the face... On the request of socialists shot Russian militia at police station of Pori.*”.

Aamulehti made the connection between Social Democrats and the Russian troops already in August, however, the tone then was very neutral and almost defensive towards the Russian troops, giving the impression that the troops had been tricked into mischievous activities by lies and deceit spread by the SDP’s professional speakers. That apologetic tone in September is gone but still it communicates across clear that the arch enemy of the bourgeois is the social democrats, not the Russian troops

The mechanics of associating violent behaviour of Russian troops and the members of the SDP related actors is, as in the association made by *Kansan Lehti* between Finnish and Russian bourgeois very efficient way of creating a new image of an enemy is to link it to old and well established enemy. The the SDP related actors had not yet been characterized by violent behaviour, therefore, if *Aamulehti* wanted to portray the social democrats as monstrous and violent, it had to link them to a group which had already been introduced to the readership as barbarous: and that was the Russian troops.

The motivations behind presenting social democrats and the Russian troops as one can only be speculated on, however, considering that *Aamulehti* was campaigning for the bourgeois parties’ it is perhaps not too far fetched to assume that these motivations might be related to the elections. In the electoral campaign *Aamulehti* concentrated much on defamation of the SDP related actors and what would be more harmful than giving the readership an impression that the party which was in the decision making position had committed treason and joined the “enemy”?

What is remarkable and has to be noted is the fact that *Aamulehti* does not discuss violence and mischief of Russian troops in any other context except in relation to the Social Democrats.

5.2.4 June, *Kansan Lehti*

5.2.4.1 General features

The general features of *Kansan Lehti* in June are much in the same lines with *Aamulehti*; *Kansan Lehti* has dropped the little ideological propaganda it had, concentrating on addressing real issues; in June the main issue seems to be matters related to the the constitutional position of Finland. Editorials such as “**Towards the internal independence**”, “**No reforms but legal sabre**”, “**The the constitutional position of Finland**” and “**The independent republic of Finland**” speculate over “the the constitutional debate” which had been set between the the SDP and the bourgeois parties and between the Provisional Government of Russia and the Finland. Other topic which *Kansan Lehti*, as any newspaper in the summer of 1917, paid particular attention was the

food shortage. Russia had stopped all grain shipments to Finland and the country was now truly experiencing the reality of the fact that there were no grain reserves or even potential to produce sufficient amounts to feed the nation in the upcoming winter. Editorials “**State as a distributor of bread**”, “**On the matter of food products**”, “**The hopes for the crops in our country in June**” and “**The Supply of bread grain for next winter**” express the hard reality people were living and the ever growing hardships they would still have to endure. Other topics *Kansan Lehti* gave attention to in June were the living conditions of the The working class; “**On the working class’s living conditions**”, “**Land tenants matters in the parliament**”, and “**How does the the working class live nowadays**”. In the times of turmoil what becomes important are the very basic human needs, food, shelter and security, and in June the above mentioned three were topics *Kansan Lehti* focused on.

5.2.4.2 Limitations on sovereignty

The political parties behind *Aamulehti* (Bourgeois party coalition) and *Kansan Lehti* (the SDP) both agreed that great changes on the the constitutional position of Finland had to take place and they both disapproved the limitations the Provisional Government was placing on Finland’s regained autonomy. What they did not agree upon were the degree of changes and the ways to pursue them. *Kansan Lehti* certainly was more radical and agitative when it came to the tone of the articles, it also supported total and immediate independence from Russia; combined, these two matters resulted into fierce reporting concerning the limitations and violations on sovereignty.

In the editorial of 11.6.1917 “**Towards the internal independence**” *Kansan Lehti* wrote concerning the petition which was soon to be send to Provisional government of Russia about extenting the authority of the Finnish senate: “*The interference of a foreign power into Finland’s interior affairs and to our legislation in any form, unless it clearly concern the Empire’s general interest, is not right for the sake of which the parliament has when processing the motion add to it at least all the demands which Russian government has erased from the senate’s proposal.*” The same argumentation of non- interference of Russia to internal affairs of Finland and the protests towards the appearing oppression are repeated in different editorials and articles of *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* several times; the difference is that *Kansan Lehti* was very strong in its statements.

In 13.6.1917 article from page four “**The minions of the Tsarist powers surface again**” concerning the mild treatment of much hated Russian officials, captured during the revolution, paints rather dramatic image by using the state symbol of imperial Russia, the double headed eagle: “*And soon also the was heard the whir of the wings of imperial eagle and hawks of nationalism and chauvinism appeared to sight scenting of prey. We became to understand that even though the revolution had cut the wings of birds of prey, even the damn cannot cut their rapacity.*”

In 15.6.1917 editorial “**Additional party convention in Helsinki**” concerning the SDP’s party convention in- progress *Kansan Lehti* writes “*Finland’s independence aspirations have so far met resistance from behalf of Russian democracy. Even the fact that in securing our country’s autonomy from Russia’s political currents demands for international guarantees have been made has been taken as an insult. What would they say if we would make demands*

for sovereignty, announce Finns' aspiring to separate from Russia?" As mentioned earlier in the paragraph, the SDP campaigned for complete independence from Russia and as its voice horn *Kansan lehti* was very forthright of these aspirations. In its writings on the the constitutional status it often confronted the bourgeois parties for their relatively mild and conciliatory tone on these issues. The fact that *Aamulehti* concentrated more on the disapproving the acts of Provisional government but no so much on condemning them, did neither use such strong terms nor made direct declarations for independence was by *Kansan Lehti* interpreted as weakness.

Until the mid of June the fire spirited editorials and condemnation towards violations on sovereignty has been very loosely directed either to Provisional Government or Russian senate and the oppressive measures have not been strongly assigned to any particular group or people. This obscurity in placing blame ends in 19.6.1917 with the editorial "**Finland's governmental position**" where *Kansan Lehti* puts two and two together i.e. states that the oppression is caused by the Russian bourgeois "*Due to the class interests will the Russian ruling bourgeois sooner or later attempt to stamp and oppress Finland if it will have the opportunity whether it then will be more or less democratic, progressive or regressive. And because of that it preaches the ideology of Russian empire and sovereignty against the Finnish nations' demands for freedom....Finnish socialdemocracy therefore places the Finnish nations' demands for freedom against Russian bourgeois' demands for control....May it not be allowed that the governmental future of working peoples' majority be left to drift, depending on Russian bourgeois despotism.*"

Second attack against what *Kansan Lehti* perceived as the ruling Russian bourgeois is launched in 28.6.1917 titled "**The independent republic of Finland**" "*This has undeniably been spoken by no other than Russian bourgeois which leans to imperialism but speaks with revolutionary tongue and effective revolutionary vocabulary. They make the revolution and imperialism to mean one and the same. Imperialistic great power— to which the Russian capitalist classes interest are joined— the weakening of it, by the independence aspirations of those nations which by force have been tied to subservience to that great power, is that horrible "counter revolution" with which the bourgeois newspapers try to activate all the supporters of imperialistic power....It is natural that the purpose of Finland independence aspirations is not to advance the attack of German imperialism against revolutionary Russia and Russian imperialists' demands of establishing control of military interest in Finland is nothing but imperialist grand capitalists' excuse for maintaining their power— the understanding of class conscious proletariat does not speak that language.*" Knowing that the revolutionary forces in Russia were by June divided into two, knowing that October revolution where Bolsheviks would take power from the Mensheviks would happen it is somewhat easy to identify that the group *Kansan Lehti* speaks of—the grand capitalists, the imperialists—are Mensheviks.

5.2.4.3 Mischief

A curious feature is that the strong hero worship which was characteristic of *Kansan Lehti* after the March Revolution is no longer present in any of the writings concerning Russians in June. What appears are hostile articles towards Russian troops. In 15.6.1917 article from page four, "**Passport control in the Finnish border in Tornio**", *Kansan Lehti* writes about incident which took place during passport control in the northern

border “*Before the revolution caused passport control from travellers crossing over from Tornio border the most multiple of inconveniences. Even the worst personal insults were possible and neither women nor women were spared from them. Everything depended on the despotism of militia....In reality it (the renewed passport control system after March Revolution) in many ways even in these days equals with the militia system.*”

5.2.4.4 Cruelty

More heated article was published in the 29.6.1917 in page three when few Russian soldiers in Pori stormed into a match factory; the title of the article really explains it all “**Drunken Russian soldiers invaded working factory. Tortured there with their sabres aged working men. Perhaps looking for women**”. “*Immediately after entering the gate tried the soldiers go in to the factory to look at the women working in the factory....But the aged gatekeeper was left outside the door into the boiler room where soldiers with their sabres hit him four wounds, two of them into the head and two to shoulders, which one is 4 cm long.*” And yet another incident from Pori which received attention from *Kansan Lehti* in June, in page five 22.6.1917 “**Soldiers and Finns fought in Pori**” in relation to an account of a fight between Russian soldiers and Finnish hooligans, there is a description of Russian soldiers’ action against one of the by-standers, which is much similar to afore quoted. “*This was when the soldiers started torturing him. As he was lying in the street attacked the gang of soldiers him and beat him to the head with iron bars so that the area around other ear was completely mashed and temple had long bloody wound. Others kicked bleeding and tortured young man with their boot heels and others stoke him with sticks and fists. When he attempted to get up he was again beaten unconscious to cobblestone street after which the soldier started on their shoulders carrying him towards the barracks.*”.

The account of the events paints an extremely vivid image and gives an impression of Russian soldiers as cruel but more importantly, as inhumane. That the Russian soldiers were torturing an innocent young boy who was a mere by-stander, keeping on beating him even when he was on the ground, describes the Russian soldiers as a characters who have neither ethics— one does not kick man who is on the ground— nor morals, who are despotic, evil—for why else would one start beating a innocent youth who on top of all was a retired constable’s son—and violent.

The afore mentioned two news stories are in propaganda theories known as atrocity stories which have tendency of appearing when creating the image of an enemy which usually enters the picture when a nation is or is about to enter a war. The pattern is always the same and can be well demonstrated by propaganda distributed during any major conflict as well as by the examples in *Kansan Lehti*. The function of atrocity stories is manifold; they are meant for causing fear and dehumanize the enemy. The aspect of fear in atrocity stories functions as justification for counter action; when people are shown that there is need to be afraid exists, they are usually more willing to accept even radical actions to ease their fear. In modern times terrorism is used as that fear, justifying violations on human rights and personal privacy; in *Kansan Lehti* the fear is the randomness of the violent act, even a by-stander is not safe from the despotism of Russian soldier i.e. anybody could fall as a victim of it.

Dehumanizing the enemy is self-explanatory process: it is aimed at presenting the enemy as lacking all characters which makes us human e.g. ethics, morals, compassion, any feelings. Atrocity stories which function as dehumanizing the enemy usually give account of events which are so horrid and cruel that they cannot be committed anybody who is a human being; commonly used imaginary is corruption of innocence which personifies in children. For example during the crusades Vatican and church authorities told that pagans sacrificed infants, during the WWII allied Forces propaganda told that Nazis killed Jewish infants by smashing them to the ground⁶⁴, propaganda machine for the Attack against Iraq told that Saddam Hussein strapped dead children on top of taxis' parading them around in demonstrating what was the result of UN sanctions⁶⁵. In *Kansan Lehti* the dehumanizing factor is the nature of the victim—innocent youth—and continuation of violence after the victim had already fallen down.

Unlike *Aamulehti*, *Kansan Lehti* does not try to explain the violence committed by the Russian troops; it also does not indicate that Trade or Workers' Unions' would have been involved in the violence. The accounts of violent incidents do not appear in the front page and are incidents which took place elsewhere. Whether this indicates that there were no such incidents in Tampere can be only speculated; the fact that *Kansan Lehti* was reporting about violence of Russian troops in the other cities communicates that *Kansan Lehti* wanted to tarnish the image of Russian troops whether it was with news from the readerships' home city or from some other city. One of the motivations for this might have been the fact that the SDP with its strong independence aspirations wanted the Russian troops to leave Finland; giving negative image of them would be the ideal means for meeting that particular end.

5.2.4.5 Food shortage

Food shortage was getting worse and the realization of the situation— that there might not be enough food to sustain the nation through the winter— caused much discussion, some of which ended up to the pages of newspapers. In June limitations on the sovereignty, the constitutional issues and violence by Russian troops were most visible ones in *Kansan Lehti* but there are few editorials which need to be noted due to the fact that they add to the hostility which *Kansan Lehti* was expressing towards Russian troops. In 12.6.1917 there is a rather sarcastic editorial concerning what does the sentence “until the victorious end”, expressed by both sides of the WWI, “**The war until the victorious end**” “*Transportation, food products, labour force have been and still is taken away from us like from their own or invaded country. ...Barely at all lightened the revolution in this relation our burden. On the opposite it is still heavier to carry and general famine is already on the door step. Hunger has sat in the door step of the working class quarters during the whole war when Russia's ruling people have kept our country as a war camp as it was their own or invaded territory, but now is the hunger stepping over that door step—*

⁶⁴ e.g. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holocaust#Infants>

⁶⁵ e.g. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=%2Fnews%2F2003%2F05%2F25%2Fwirq25.xml>

and we are still pressed under military power, Russian militarism under without free chances to save what still can be saved.”.

It is clearly indicated that the food shortage in Finland is caused by the Russian troops. Another editorial on the topic appears in 30.6.1917 in “**The Supply of bread grain for next winter**” concerning the end of grain shipments from Russia: “*If we have to get along on our own because they in Russia, who keep or pretend to keep power in their hands see this country as an enemy country, then also we must take the same attitude....Why do we feed this foreign bunch, that we have not invited here and which we eagerly see to leave from here, why do we place the satisfaction of Russia’s military power always first, when the food products import from Russia has altogether in halt.*”

5.2.5 August, *Kansan Lehti*

5.2.5.1 General features

It can be said that in August *Kansan Lehti* has only one theme: mischief. Articles such as “**Soldier mischief**”, “**Military mischief in Lappeenranta**”, “**Soldiers in hooligan deeds in Rauma**” and “**Soldiers rollick in Jyväskylä**” appear and condemn the behaviour of the Russian troops. Another topic which appears in different contexts is limitations on sovereignty. In general *Kansan Lehti* writes much more about Russians and surprisingly enough the tone is far more negative than that of *Aamulehti*. Even if one does not count the page four and five articles concerning mischief of Russian troops, there are still much more in *Kansan Lehti* editorials which are Russian related.

Because of the attention paid to mischief which was not electoral topics, it almost appears that *Kansan Lehti* has not yet joined the electoral race. The SDP certainly was aware of the importance these elections held to the nation; why it in August still hadn’t really started addressing electoral issues or giving attention to upcoming elections could be the result of several matters. Perhaps the party leadership felt over- confident of its position, afterall the SDP would not enter the electoral race as the underdog; it had majority in the parliament and at least seemingly huge number of supporters.

5.2.5.2 Mischief

Kansan Lehti has clearly toned down its exclamations on the violent acts committed by Russian troops; they are still noted— usually in page five or six— however journalist’s attitude and opinion expressing commentaire along with the dramatic and descriptive language have all disappeared. For example page five article in 14.8.1917 “**Military mischief in Lappeenranta**” recounts for an incident which took place in the city of Lappeenranta: “*After the announcement of chief constable to Lappeenranta fortress area that the troops have by using self- help taken from prison, city and private citizens logs, that they have made bonfires to the beaches and have baked potatoes taken from other peoples potato patches. The chief of the fortress area has ordered to under take*

procedures for bringing the guilty into punishment as well as to compensate the respective persons damages caused.” The mischief was now reported in very matter- of- factly, without adjectives, superlatives or further description of details.

Another good example which demonstrated the changed tone is an page six article from 24.8.1917 **“Soldiers in hooligan deeds in Rauma”**: *“Yesterday an horrible bloody deed happened in Rauma. At dances held at Workers’ Union’ house soldiers got carried away and began to chase agricultural workers bailiff Osteri Jalonen who by incident had gone to dances and whom the citizens knew as a quiet and honest person. At that night the sailors hit wounds to some other Finns who now are receiving medical care in the hospital.”* In comparison to writings in earlier months, when graphic descriptions about bones shattering and blood were part of any reference to Russian troops and mischief, the writings in August are more professional, void of the story- telling quality.

5.2.5.3 Violations on sovereignty and mischief

Mischief in itself is not a theme which in August communicates across strongly, however, towards the end of the month mischief starts to be connected to violations on sovereignty. The new direction *Kansan Lehti* takes is connecting two popular themes into one; connecting violations on sovereignty to incidents of mischief. The “joint theme” starts appearing after the dissolution of the Finnish parliament by the Provisional Government which already strongly indicated that there is a connection. In 27.8.1917 in an open letter/ editorial **“Open letter to Russia’s socialist parties”** *Kansan lehti* writes *“. Perhaps you also know that from behalf of Russian officials there has been threats to use military violence towards our Parliament when it assembles next time for plenary session....even in the most regressive parties there for all we know are not even a one man who would dare to explain usage of Russian military power against the members of Parliament or other citizens of Finland as anything else as clear illegal violence....our cause is so right and in so strong base of peoples’ support that we can believe it eventually win in its own moral weight, the inner weight of historical progression, that no bayonet can hold back.”*

It is true that after the dissolution of the parliament the Russian officials insinuated that any attempts of the Parliament to assemble would be met with violence if necessary. Regardless of the warnings some members of Finnish Parliament tried to assemble according the schedule in 29th of August; they were met by armed Russian troops who had sealed parliamentary building and were guarding against people from entering. No blood was shed, no struggle followed and the members of the Parliament assembled in a location other than the Parliamentary building.

The dramatic language which was used in describing occurrences of mischief in earlier months appears again. Editorial **“Wednesday’s socialist spectacle”** in 29.8.1917 gives a good example of the style *“It is threatened to dissolve by Russian bayonets....Russian bayonets attacking defenceless modest in material means of defence members of Parliament which tries to fight for Finland’s justice”*. It is somewhat easy to comprehend the motivation of such editorials; *Kansan Lehti* advocated for independence from Russia, for it the Russian troops were “military forces of a foreign country” which had no purpose to be in Finland. At the same time the Provisional Government of Russia was limiting Finland’s sovereignty and used the Russian troops to

enforce the oppressive directives. When the Finnish Parliament attempted to assemble and was met by armed Russian soldiers it gave very concrete image of Finland's the constitution and sovereignty being under military attack; *Kansan Lehti* simply used that imaginary.

The fact is that *Aamulehti* did not connect violations on sovereignty to mischief of Russian troops and refrained from highlighting the involvement of Russian troops in the issue of dissolving the parliament or the incident taking place when members of the Parliament attempted to enter the building for plenary session. Whether *Kansan Lehti* had the purpose of giving the readership an impression that the Provisional Government of Russia was starting an armed assault against Finland can only be speculated on. When rallying for drastic measures the best way is always to "attack" peoples' sense of security. When people are afraid for their lives they are much more willing to submit into practices with which they normally would not agree with.

5.2.5.4 Connection between the Russian and Finnish Bourgeois

In August *Kansan Lehti* was combining themes; the second "joint theme" which appears is the Russian and Finnish bourgeois. In 20.8.1917 editorial "**Riots must be condemned**" concerning lawless strikes and violent riots organized by Trade and Workers' Union's *Kansan Lehti* wrote "*But the domestic and Russian regression have resorted into weaving plots for overthrowing the the working class movement....Russian and domestic enemies of the people probably wait for an opportunity to be let with violence to interfere with our circumstances, to execute armed dictatorship, from the safeguard of which they could perhaps destroy open the working class movement and prevent the Parliament from continuing its imperative work.*". What the afore editorial does is that it associates Russian bourgeois to the archenemy of the Finnish the working class: the Finnish bourgeois. Through this connection the readership is introduced to a image of Russian and Finnish bourgeois working together in order to suppress the Finnish the working class. Most effective way of creating a new enemy is to link it with the old and well established enemy which is exactly what *Kansan Lehti*, knowingly or unknowingly does. The same manoeuvre was also used in American 2002 when the newspapers began associating Al- Queda with Iraq⁶⁶.

In editorial 22.8.1917 "**To the working people of Finland!**" the same theme continues "*Because of that they (the Finnish bourgeois) with joy hurried to shake the hand of the Russian Government when the opportunity with the Russian bourgeois graving for seize arrived. Finnish and Russian regression again swore the mutual password: the order for the Parliament to dissolve is "legitimate". But the true purpose in the conspiracy of both countries regression aims further: suppression of Finnish democratic freedom.*" That *Kansan Lehti* merges the Finnish and Russian bourgeois is logical, afterall what was taking place all over Europe between bourgeois and the working class had been categorized as a class struggle and the bourgeois was the class enemy. When the framework was such, the nationality of the bourgeois made very little difference and it is true that the Provisional Government of Russia was more or less bourgeois government. By simplifying the situation and interpreting

⁶⁶ <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,132682,00.html>

the restriction on Finland's autonomy as yet another attempt of the bourgeois to suppress the the working class movement, *Kansan Lehti* could use the theme in the propagation for socialism and the the working class movement.

5.2.6 September, *Kansan Lehti*

5.2.6.1 General features

In September *Kansan Lehti* wakes up to the elections; the message of election campaign spreads is clear: bourgeois electoral alliance wants to maintain the status quo where the people under the oppression by Provisional Government of Russia is prominent feature because it serves their capitalist interest to keep the the working class in poverty and destitution. Titles such as “**Our struggle for power**”, “**Revolution elections**”, “**Capitalist class and peoples’ power against each other in the elections**”, “**Fight for Finland’s right**” and many others discuss the nature of the elections and the importance of them, as the destiny of Finland— according to *Kansan Lehti*— depended on them. The nature of the campaign, as it appears in *Kansan Lehti*, is defamative; the purpose of the editorials is not to discuss any important issues but rather to slander the opposing side. Considering that the country, particularly the the working class was suffering from outright famine, mass unemployment and ever increasing prices of everyday products it is striking that the only electoral theme of the Social Democratic Party was independence from Russia.

5.2.6.2 Limitations on sovereignty as part of the class struggle

Already in August had *Kansan Lehti* presented the connection between the Finnish and Russian bourgeois to its readership and framed the violations on Finnish sovereignty by the Provisional Government of Russia as yet another attempt of the bourgeois to oppress the the working class. Since violations on sovereignty and independence aspirations had become the official election themes of the SDP, *Kansan Lehti* continued its line of making the connection between Finnish and Russian bourgeois, highlighting it and preaching the meaning of it to the supporters of the party.

In 1.9.1917, in an editorial titled “**Our struggle for power**” concerning the struggle for political power between the Provisional Government and the social democratic party “*And as supporters of for this understanding (that Finland would not get the independence Provisional Government had promised it after the March Revolution) settled Russia’s imperialistic bourgeois and also part of Finnish bourgeois, its regressive element, who fears nothing more so much as peoples’ power....From the ravens of Russian government and Finnish regression it was blared that the plenary session was illegitimate....*” . Again in 3.9.1917 concerning the bourgeois newspapers attitude towards the “violence” used in prohibiting parliament from assembling “**Vile**”: “*When Russian ruling power stoops with armed force to prevent the working of Parliament, not many of these papers have even a word of*

complain to state on behalf of that violence. On the contrary they present themselves hideously joyful when foreign bayonets are to meet the peaceful representatives.” The same message of Russian- Finn bourgeois co- operation continues in 19.9.1917 editorial titled “**Capitalist class and peoples’ power against each other in the elections**”, “*To Tsarist power and its armed force has the bourgeois class power in Finland leaned on....If in Finland the foreign oppression’s interference this country’s affairs ends, if no armed force of foreign power is let inside Finland’s borders, is Finnish bourgeois’ power position in the backs of the crowds of people absolutely gone. If we are alone in this country without foreigners’ oppressive power, then Finnish bourgeois does not have the strength to rule the people but the people will carry out their will and begin to rule themselves.*”

The examples, making clear that the independence issue is part of the class struggle and Finnish bourgeois resistance of it and mild attitude on violations on sovereignty is due to their aim of keeping people under oppression, are numerous. The fact is that Finnish bourgeois was more modest in their independence aspiration, wanting sovereignty and gradually independence, however, the reasons for this were not the ones *Kansan Lehti* wrote; Bourgeois parties simply saw that Finland could neither sustain itself, nor was it institutionally strong and developed enough for complete independence.

5.2.6.3 Camaraderie of Russian and Finnish working class

A peculiar characteristic appears to the editorials of *Kansan Lehti* in mid September: the calls of camaraderie and co- operation between Russian and Finnish the working class. Since March the attitude of *Kansan lehti* towards Russians has been extremely negative, the image the newspaper projected to its readership describes Russians as violent, oppressive, cruel creatures but suddenly in mid September the positive and friendly natured texts appear. In 10.9.1917 editorial, “**War expedition against Finland**” concerning the oppressive measures Provisional Government had applied to Finland’s sovereignty “*In the fight for national independence Finnish nation has a reliable ally only in Russia’s proletariat....The revolution minded the working class will raise their voices. It sends its greetings to its Finnish comrades. Together with them they put objection against Russian ruling power’s imperialistic politics. With new vigour they will continue their fight against domestic and world’s imperialism.*”

March revolution had in retrospect been a disappointment for the the working class movement; the Tsar Institution had been abolished but bourgeois government had taken over, for the movement the result of the revolution was simply one imperial system replacing the other. The aspect *Kansan Lehti* began highlighting was that the Russian the working class was not responsible for wrongdoings of the bourgeois Provisional government, but that they were likewise victims of the imperialistic politics. In 11.9.1917, in an editorial “**Our the constitutional question and the our nation’s spirit**” concerning the broken promises made by Provisional Government *Kansan Lehti* wrote “*In the revolution we had seen Russia’s the working class’s artery pulsating and felt it same as our own nation’s the working class’ aspirations. It gave us the right to speak trustfully like brother to brother. And those millions of the the working class would have no doubt meant with every word of their promises.*”

The same theme of camaraderie through mutual suffers continues in an editorial 25.9.1917 “**The most important question of the elections**”: “*Its (Russian the working class) benefits are same with ours. Both of us in the ruling of capitalism are under the same oppression....Russian democracy undoubtedly wants to with armed force rise against their brothers. ...We can live side by side in good agreement and both work for improvement of our societal conditions.*”

Reason why *Kansan Lehti* ceases addressing Russians as one entity and begins using the phrases “Russian the working class” and “Russian proletariat” can be only speculated. Taking into consideration that in Russia the Bolshevik movement was becoming growingly popular as more and more people were disappointed to the outcome of the March Revolution, it might be that the SDP party- and the working class movement activists saw an opportunity for advancing their aims with the help of Bolsheviks. In 27.9.1917 *Kansan Lehti* publishes an open letter from Finnish Social Democratic party to Russia’s social democratic minded parties “*Russian Comrades! On behalf of Finland’s social democracy we greet with enthusiastic minds Russia’s revolutionary democracy’s victory over regressive bourgeois’s criminal takeover attempts. Vividly we have again felt that Your victories are also our peoples’ power’s dignified victories....With our sophisticated support you will show that Finland’s the working class’s aspirations for improving their position are not against Russian nation’s will and benefits...With your determined word you will show Russia’s Finland politics the direction which is not afraid, insult or oppose Finnish nation’s and parliaments right for sovereignty but willingly allows their application and development, trusting that freedom of peoples’ power in Finland as in Russia will lead to bright future for both nations’.*”

5.2.7 Aamulehti and Kansan Lehti: analysis comparison of the themes and contrasting of the image of Russians from June through end of September

5.2.7.1 Russians as a news topic, First level of analysis (the measure unit: editorials per month)

	JUNE		AUGUST		SEPTEMBER	
	articles/ issues	in %	articles/ issues	in %	articles/ issues	in %
AAMULEHTI	7/ 25	28 %	7/ 20	35 %	10/ 26	38 %
KANSAN LEHTI	15/ 25	60 %	14/ 28	50 %	14/ 25	44 %

How interesting news topic Russians actually were? How many articles mentioning Russians were written in a month? Comparing to the non interest of January through March the percentages clearly show that the interest to Russians as a news topic has risen considerably. Particularly *Kansan Lehti* gives quite a lot of attention to Russian related topics, whereas *Aamulehti* shows less interest. In *Aamulehti* the amount of attention rises as the parliamentary elections held in the beginning of October draw closer, which most likely

is caused by the increased reporting of violence committed by Russian troops together with Social Democrats. *Aamulehti* used as a scare tactics in electoral campaign against the the SDP while *Kansan Lehti* decreased the amount of Russian related content, concentrating on electoral campaigning for the SDP. Unlike *Aamulehti*, *Kansan Lehti* did not use Russian related election themes, which also goes to explaining why the electoral campaign did not increase the amount of Russian related content.

5.2.7.2 Analysing the sample, second level of analysis (measure unit: sentences per Russian related article)⁶⁷

AAMULEHTI

	JUNE	in %	AUGUST	in %	SEPTEMBER	in %
Total size of the sample (sentences/article)	252		254		205	
Russian related sentences in the sample (sentences/article)	67	27 % (of the total size)	40	16 % (of the total size)	59	29 % (of the total size)
Positive	6	9 %	2	5 %	3	5 %
Negative	29	43 %	18	45 %	37	63 %
Neutral	32	48 %	20	50 %	19	32 %
Tone of the month	NEUTRAL		NEUTRAL		NEGATIVE	
Reference	limitations on sovereignty, mischief		mischief		mischief	

⁶⁷ The total size of the sample presents the total amount of sentences that I have analyzed from the month in question. Russian related sentences present the amount of sentences I have identified as “Russian related”. Positive, negative and neutral present the amount of sentences I have identified as having the afore mentioned connotation. What has been considered as “Russian related” and “positive, negative, neutral” are described in the page 47. “Tone of the sample” is assigned according the connotation which appears most often i.e. has the highest percentage.

KANSAN LEHTI

	JUNE	in %	AUGUST	in %	SEPTEMBER	in %
Total size of the sample (sentences/article)	416		424		390	
Russian related sentences in the sample (sentences/article)	210	50 % (of the total size)	121	28 % (of the total size)	154	39 % (of the total size)
Positive	27	13 %	7	6 %	31	20 %
Negative	133	63 %	74	61 %	88	57 %
Neutral	50	24 %	40	33 %	35	23 %
Tone of the month	NEGATIVE		NEGATIVE		NEGATIVE	
Reference	limitations on sovereignty		mischief, violence		limitations on sovereignty, violence	

The second sample from June through September provides quite a lot of surprises which makes the study interesting. According to my hypothesis, the image of Russians *Kansan Lehti* projected to its readership should have remained positive and the image presented by *Aamulehti* should have turned negative, however, as we clearly see that is not the occasion.

The image *Kansan Lehti* projected turned negative; in March the opinion was very positive as the newspaper celebrated the Revolution, but already in June the tone is completely different; over half (63 %) of what is written in relation to Russians is negative!

Russians are presented in reference to limitations on sovereignty which the Provisional Government of Russia began implementing on Finnish autonomy. The question of sovereignty was mainly about placing new limitations but rather about not implementing the promised changes. Especially *Kansan Lehti* was very frustrated about this, because it had synonymized the end of Tsar Institution and the victory of the working class movement; by June it was becoming somewhat obvious that this was not the case. Moderation was not a quality characterizing *Kansan Lehti*; if it positioned itself against a topic it took its opposition all the way. In this context the minimal amount (13 %) of the positive content in the sample is understandable.

Aamulehti on the other hand is the newspaper characterized by neutrality and moderation which in a way makes it more like a modern newspaper. At the end of March the image *Aamulehti* projected of Russians was positive, because also the bourgeois saw that the March Revolution promised great future for Finland. In June the image of Russians in *Aamulehti* turned neutral, however, it must be noted that the

difference between the percentages of neutral and negative is minimal (48 % neutral content, 43 % negative content) hence it might be more in order to speak of “neutral, next to negative”. The reference in which *Aamulehti* presents Russians in June is similar with that of *Kansan Lehti*: the violations on sovereignty and on the promises made, but whereas *Kansan Lehti* expresses its opinion with strong statements and by dramatic language, *Aamulehti* prefers more conciliatory language and almost avoids expressing its opinion in any way that it could be held responsible for it. *Aamulehti* is clearly more diplomatic when it came to dealings with the Provisional Government of Russia, because the bourgeois parties still preferred working with it than going against it. *Kansan Lehti* had already lost its faith and was ready to cut the ties to the Provisional Government, which it considered as yet another bourgeois government. It is clear that in June *Aamulehti* concentrated more on the current events and the interest towards Russians is barely there; only about a quarter (27 %) of the sample is Russian related. Considering the neutral tone and the lack of repetition it is questionable, whether the content of *Aamulehti* influenced its readerships’ perception of Russians. In order to really mould an image what is needed is strong message and repetition, both being qualities that *Kansan Lehti*, but not *Aamulehti*, had.

But then again, what was the message? In August *Aamulehti* very clearly does its best to connect the Russian troops to Social Democratic related actors. Already in June there were some writings about how some troops had been persuaded into joining the Social Democrats in hooliganism, but in August the theme really becomes the primary context in which the Russians are presented. The issue is presented in such a way that it almost appears it is the Social Democrats, who are causing the mischief. The image *Aamulehti* projects in August is again “neutral, next to negative” (50 % neutral content, 45 % negative content) and the sole reference in which Russians are presented is mischief, but rather than presenting Russian troops as the active initiators of violence they are presented as participants of the violence practiced by social democrats. *Aamulehti*’s interest to Russians (16 % of the whole sample) is lower than it was in previous month, however, this is most likely due to the fact that much of the attention went to the actions of Social Democrats and editorials where Russians are mentioned in relation other than social democrats are almost non-existent.

Looking at the *Kansan Lehti* from the same time period, is as if looking at completely different world, where Russians are the cause of all mischief. The image given of Russians is that of thieves and murderers, who interfere to Finland’s internal affairs by using violence. Over half (61 %) of the Russian related content is negative and even though the attention paid to Russians in August is much lower than in June, only 28 % of the whole sample, the language is strong and communicated the message to the readership of *Kansan Lehti* more than adequately. The association in which Russians are presented in August is that of violence and cruelty; phrases such as “with foreign bayonets”, “soldier mischief” and “military troops of a foreign country”⁶⁸ start appearing. Social Democratic Party was rallying for full independence and it was quite vocal about its wish to send the Russian troops back to Russia, perhaps this motivated them to “overexpose” the

⁶⁸ ”vieraiden pistimet”, ”sotilasmielivalta”, ”vieraan maan sotilasväki” in Finnish

mischief Russian troops were committing. Russian troops were conducting themselves appropriately in Tampere, however, with constant writings about violent acts and general mischief committed by them in other cities, might have given the readership an impression that violence was characteristic feature of Russians. *Aamulehti* presents Russians as misguided and gullible people, who participate in violent acts because they don't know any better or "don't know enough about our country's circumstances". *Kansan Lehti* on the other hand presents them as violent subhuman, who lack all compassion, react to everything with violence and have a natural born tendency for oppressing others.

What is interesting at the end of August is the fact how *Kansan Lehti* frames the situation as part of the class struggle, making the connection between Finnish and Russian bourgeois and declaring that the violations on Finland's the constitution is yet another manifestation of capitalist bourgeois's attempt to oppress the the working class.

Presenting the violations on Finnish the constitution as part of the class struggle becomes a permanent trait for *Kansan Lehti* in September, as does associating the Russian troops with Social Democrats in *Aamulehti*. Since the parliament had been dissolved in August, Finland was waiting for new elections, which were to be held in 1st and 2nd of October. *Aamulehti* spent much of its editorial space for attacking Social Democrats by pointing out their political and characteristical inadequacies and advertising the electoral alliance of bourgeois parties. Surprisingly enough it appears that Russian related election themes were not a significant part of the campaigning, only 29 % of the total sample is Russian related. *Kansan Lehti*, being true to the SDP chose the oppression of the working class by the Finnish bourgeois as its only election theme; the Russian element of the element theme is related to the violations on sovereignty, which *Kansan Lehti* identifies as yet another example of Bourgeois oppression over the the working class. Phrases such as "Russian imperialists", "Russian bourgeois" and "Russian regression"⁶⁹ appear for describing the Russians. From the total sample, 39 % is Russian related which— keeping in mind the low interest on Russian related themes in August— is quite a lot. Knowing that in its rhetoric *Kansan Lehti* had connected the independence aspirations of Finland to the freedom aspirations of the the working class and considered Russian bourgeois and the bourgeois in general as the enemy of both causes, it does not come as a surprise that *Kansan Lehti* would increase its Russian related content.

The context in which *Aamulehti* presents Russians in September is the relation between the Russian troops and the Social democrats; usually the reference is that the Russian militia is not doing anything to stop the mischievous behaviour of Social Democrats. The image projected by *Aamulehti* has changed from neutral- next to negative into clearly negative: 63 % of the Russian related content is negative and only 32 % is neutral. It can be said that in September *Aamulehti* has finally taken a stance and communicates it across strongly to its readership. *Kansan Lehti* on the other hand produces a small surprise: after few months of gap in positive statements or articles, finally we see the positive attitude towards Russians making a return. The

⁶⁹ "Venäjän imperialistit", "Venäjän ylimystö" and "Venäjän taantumus" in Finnish

image *Kansan Lehti* projects in September still remains highly negative, 57 % of the Russian related content is negative, however, when looking at the percentage of positive content there is a considerable increase: whereas in June and August that percentage was under 8 %, now it has grown to 20 %. If it would not be for the timing, reintroducing the positive attitude towards Russian might not be significant, but because the positive statements are mainly made in the last week before the elections, the motivation behind the positive nuances comes into question. Bolshevism was spreading in Russia and the Provisional Government was struggling for keeping the power. In mid September there already had been one rising, which had been put down but regardless of that the Provisional Government was at the losing end of the power battle. Finnish Social Democrat activists were supportive of the Bolshevik movement due to the fact that they considered it as a true form of peoples' power. The rising of Bolshevik movement might have restored the hopes of Finnish Social Democrats, which would explain why the sudden positive attitude and the themes of cooperation and camaraderie appear. Much in the same way *Kansan Lehti* had synonymized Finnish and Russian bourgeois, it now connected the Finnish and Russian the working class together in brotherhood. At the same time *Aamulehti* was beginning to make the same connection: to associate the Finnish Social Democrats with the Bolsheviks in violence. Knowingly or unknowingly the newspapers had again changed the “us” and “them”- setting; whereas the setting before had been “us- the Finns” and “them- the Russians”, it was slowly changing into “us- the the working class of Finland and Russia and them- the bourgeois of Finland and Russia”.

5.3 The image of Russians from November 1917 to end of January 1918

Throughout the third study period we see the events escalating. Great events influencing the societal turmoil in Finland: the electoral victory of the bourgeois alliance over the social democratic party, general strike, October Revolution all sped up the direction Finland was going—towards the Civil War. The opinion towards Russians also was becoming a force at play which was used by both newspapers

5.3.1 November, *Aamulehti*

5.3.1.1 General features

In November *Aamulehti* focused substantial amount of attention to political and governmental issues; in October the bourgeois parties electoral alliance had gained majority in the parliament hence they were now in the position to make decisions on the future of the country, which did not please the Social Democrats. Editorials such as “**From the parliament**”, “**The question of government**”, “**The parliament has set the**

government” and “**The program of the new government**” *Aamulehti* discussed the aspects of newly elected parliament and informed its readership of the decision the government had made. By the end of 1917 the circumstances had gotten such that the societal turmoil could not be overlooked, editorials such as “**What is under way?**”, “**Happiness of the people**” and “**To the people of Finland**” all proclaimed the importance of maintaining societal order and urged people to remain calm.

Another matter which *Aamulehti* no longer overlooked was the malpractices and even violence which manifested in relation to strikes, particularly the general strike had woken up the bourgeois newspaper to the reality of mischief committed by Finns instead of Russians. In November the topic was discussed in relation to general strike which followed the “We Demand” manifest given by the social democrats, listing demands such as 8- hour work day and equal food distribution. The general strike was meant for strengthening the impact of the manifest hence took place 10- 16.11. 1917 but regardless of high aims and ideals the strike also initiated a wave of mischief committed by the more radical aspects of Social democrats. Editorials “**Anarchy in Turku**”, “**Days of Horror in Turku**”, “**A certain phenomenon of these days**”, “**The government has been threatened**” and “**The red terror**” attacked Social democratic party and the supporters of social democratic movement. Surprisingly enough *Aamulehti* only very briefly mentions the March⁷⁰ i.e. Bolshevik Revolution and even that brief indication appears in another article; the feeling that communicates is that the editorial staff of *Aamulehti* simply did not see it as a news worthy event.

5.3.1.2 Calls for action

From the language used in articles describing mischief committed by Russian troops, it becomes clear that *Aamulehti* has changed its neural position towards Russian. The tone used as well as the selection of words is uncharacteristically strong for *Aamulehti*. In an editorial 3.11.1917 “**Soldiers’ violence**” *Aamulehti* writes the following “....to place a blockade to soldiers rollicking and acts of horror. Now finally has the committee of Finnish territory and its legal investigation department seen it necessary to interfere to ever far developing soldiers’ anarchy and announce its judgement....If that isn’t capable of anything else than words, then steps in the necessity of Finns to proceed in keeping the rollickers in order.”. The language reminds much of the type *Kansan Lehti* was using June through September, however, for *Aamulehti* the calls for action, taking the matters in own hands, is new.

Kansan Lehti had been advocating for total independence from Russian, even if it meant entering violent conflict against Russia whereas *Aamulehti* had from June through September *Aamulehti* remained aloof concerning the question of independence, maintaining that the violations on Finnish sovereignty had to stop but also “condemning” the clean cut separation by radical measures Social Democrats were suggesting. Peculiarly enough in November *Aamulehti* voices the same rhetoric than *Kansan Lehti*; independence from

⁷⁰ The official name of the revolution is October Revolution which is due to the differences between Julianic and Gregorian calendar. According Julianic (western European) calendar the Bolshevik revolution took place in March

Russia even if it would mean by taking up arms. The same call for action can be observed in 9.11.1917 editorial "**The current position**" *Aamulehti* writes the following "*Citizen- freedom and personal immunity, those two of man's most precious individual treasures have become in danger and likewise has the certainty of keeping ones possessions been lost....In the name of Russian counter- espionage activity has Finnish homes been intruded and groundlessly imprisoned our citizens and kept them behind the bars.... Our tormented nation has no other option except to rise to justified self- defence, and do so immediately, so that these horrible incidents don't get to develop so far that our nation will be destroyed. As fast as possible unlawfulness' and violences' must be brought to an end.*".

Even though the call for action does not characterize the editorials in November it is worth of noting because it raises few interesting questions relating to image of Russians under speculation: why did the bourgeois parties after gaining majority in the parliament take up the rhetoric they had opposed when Social Democrats were the majority party; had the mischief of Russian troops gotten to the level where they seriously had become danger to the existence of Finnish Society?

The editorials writing about taking matters in own hand and calls for action, advertised establishing of militia- like troops which would protect Finnish people from the mischief. Propaganda such calls for action or taking matters into own hands are loosely categorized as "rallying up for the approval for action" i.e. building up a consent for action. most of the time these calls are connected to the inability of authorities to perform their tasks e.g. to protect peoples' liberty and property. First step is to point out clear danger or a threat which *Aamulehti* does in the editorial "**The current position**", the second step is to make evident that the authorities responsible are not capable, able or willing to do anything concerning the matter at hand which is what the editorial "**Soldiers' violence**" establishes. Third step is the call or suggestion for taking matters into own hands, preparing people to give their consent to the drastic measures which might take place. Unfortunately the suspicions between bourgeois and the working class has grown up to the level where having common "protections forces" was impossible hence both formed their own troops: bourgeois formed the Protection Guard and the Social Democrats formed Red Squad.

5.3.1.3 Partners in crime: mischief of Russian troops and Social Democrats

In September *Aamulehti* had made the connection between Russian troops and Social Democrats; in November this connection became the underlining feature of all Russian related writings. In 8.11.1917 a lengthy page seven article "**Horrid act of violence in Hausjärvi**", reporting mischief, begins. "*Twenty men dressed in sailors uniforms, among them also Finnish, has during night before Wednesday in arbitrary fashion committed all kinds of disturbances in houses of Hausjärvi.*". The same theme continues more explicitly in 11.11.1917 in an editorial titled "**What is going on**" "*Then one only needs to refer to their leaderships' (Social Democrats) solid liaison with local Russian troops and to that fervour which establishing Red Squads has been promoted, then everything becomes clear....perhaps already is in existence an agreement between Socialists and the Russian troops to remove the current government and of violent procedures with which this is to be carried out,*

because alone they are not capable of it or dear to embark on, when in their party there is plenty of also sensible and even patriotic members.”.

Even though the articles linked Social Democrats to Russian troops the articles presents Russians as passive by-standers or participants while social democrats are presented as initiators and active engagers in hooliganism and mischief. *Aamulehti* had a very strong conviction that associating with Russian troops, the military troops of a foreign country, was unpatriotic; the conception of Social Democrats being unpatriotic had first appeared in writing around September and had been becoming more commonly used ever since.

The same message of social democrats co-operating with the Russian troops in order to take over the government continues in an editorial 20.11.1917 “**The parliament has been threatened**”:*”Even though the Socialists cannot, which is already in advance clear, not even with the help of Russian troops, permanently forms as the violent ruler of the peoples’ majority, there might ahead appear turmoil which cause misery to the country and people in its entirety. We well know from the bitter experience how heavy nightmare the state of lawlessness forms and it might be that there is little difference in that oppression whether it is initiated by foreign power or by country’s own people....Surely them, who perhaps want to cause in Finland the same type of horrors which at the moment are taking place in primitive Russian circumstances, will soon find that the Finnish nation does not without a reason want to tear itself but will be assembling its strengths to be delivered from that degradation, that threatens our country, if Socialistic leadership with Russians help starts to terrorize Finland.”* It can of course be only speculated but it strongly appears that the troops bourgeois parties were forming, the Protection Guards, were not against Russian troops per se but rather to be used against the Social Democrats— or Socialists as *Aamulehti* calls them— if the situation would come to that.

The Civil War flared up in 28th of January 1918 but the signs of it are already apparent in November; bourgeois and the Social Democrats had formed two— by November— armed forces and they were now in the process of defining the enemy. In 22.11 from page article “**The red terror**” *Aamulehti* expresses its opinion of the situation “*After acquiring from their allies, the local Russian troops, bayonet rifles, embarked the Red Squad heroes then on harassing peaceful people and their activities....Party, which latest parliamentary elections showed the minority of our population stands behind, has after entering into alliance with the strangers’ military troops, under its dictatorship stomped the whole country’s rest of the society....this strike (general strike in November) was carried out by one of our nation’s party’s rebels with the assistance of Russian bayonets against legal police and administrative authority. Most depressing, shocking in it was our the working classes’ and foreigners armed co-operation against their fellow citizens, even if the hated bourgeois....We in this country have supposedly feared the mischievous elements of the Russian troops, but now we have been taught, who are the enemies of freedom and security in our country.”*

5.3.2 December, *Aamulehti*

5.3.2.1 General features

In December *Aamulehti* concentrated on quite a lot on political matters; seeing through the independence declaration and looking into implementations of new municipal laws. Editorials such as “**Our independence**”, “**The principles of Finland’s the constitution**” discussed and explained matters relating to independence whereas “**Moving from old municipal laws to new ones**”, “**On municipal election legislation**” and “**The obligation of declaring income for municipal taxation**” discussed the new municipal laws which had been passed and would be implemented. Another focus in editorials of December is attacks on Social Democrats; in editorials such as “**Against the anarchy**”, “**In our knees in front of the anarchy**” and “**Gun shipments**” *Aamulehti* expresses its opposition to acts of Social Democrats. In December the interest towards Russians is again low and the only time reference to Russians appears it is, as also in November, in association with Social Democrats.

5.3.2.2 Oppression period

The feature which appears in December is the tendency to compare the acts of Social Democrats to the acts which took place during the Oppression period, from the horrors of Tsarist oppression to the oppression practiced by Social Democrats. This feature was already visible in November, however, in December it really makes itself known. In 5.12.1917 a page four article “**Against the domestic oppression**” *Aamulehti* writes as follows “*Such a mischief and oppression to which one can seek equal from the darkest days of Tsarist rule, we the people from the countryside will put the utmost strongest objection*”. The same theme appears in 12.12.1917 editorial “**Gun shipments**”: “*But who guarantees that that it will continue so and has it been “keeping of order” that Red Squads armed with Russian rifles have at places practiced? They have behaved worse than the “punishment crusaders” during the Tsarist rule.*”

What *Aamulehti* does is that it wakes up the memories of much hated period in near history, the Oppression period, and uses the negative connotation in describing the acts of Social Democrats. Propaganda uses such assimilations quite a lot for it is easier to create negativity towards something people know of than to introduce a new source of negativity to them. The unpleasantness of the Oppression periods—the last one of them ending with the May revolution—were still in peoples’ memory hence when *Aamulehti* compared the behaviour of the Social Democrats and their Red Squads to the practices during the Oppression period the readership knew precisely what was meant by that. The association was also easy to make considering the fact that for the past few months *Aamulehti* had been synonymizing Social Democrats with Russian troops.

With the comparison between the acts of Social democrats and the acts which took place during the Oppression period the process of creating an enemy is completed, through different stages of simplifications,

reasoning, identification and association the new enemy is the social democrats because they are and their behaviour is perceived as that of the old enemy, the Tsarist rule and the Russian troops. The new enemy also poses the same threat that the old enemy used to pose.

5.3.2.3 Complaining that Russian militia is condoning the violence of the SDP

The second topic related to Russians in December concerns the inability of militia to keep order in the cities, particularly during riots. The general strike in November had again brought the issue up, for the previous time this theme appeared was in September. In 5.12.1917 in an editorial “**Against the anarchy**” *Aamulehti* reports the following “*And probably the play (mischievous behaviour of Social Democrats) would not have continued longer if the militia taking care of the city’s order would have conducted themselves with appropriate vigour to protect our city’s council from the ignorant intruders’ harassment. But when the Commandant of the order keeping authority was satisfied only to negotiate with the crowd practicing unlawfulness, it was clear that for the time being that the trustees of the municipality could not be freed.*” *Aamulehti* also seeks to connect the Social Democrats’ Red Squads and the Russian militia in 19.12.1917, page six article titled “**The days of Horror in Turku**”: “*Last night it was observed in an ongoing robbery that armed members of Red Squad and Russian soldiers watched the spectacle without interfering to it in any way.*” Even though there is truth behind the claim that the members of Red Squad were looking away when the target of crime was a member of bourgeois, the attempt here is to assign same qualities that were disapproved in the behaviour of Militia, to the behaviour of the Red Squad.

However, one must keep in mind that the event above given quotations discuss took place in Turku which is about 200 km from Tampere. The lack of such incidents reported in Tampere indicates that after the general strike had ended at the end of November mischief or riots did not continue and/ or Russian militia carried out their duties in a way that people living in Tampere had no complains which would end up to the editorials or other articles.

5.3.3 January 1918, *Aamulehti*

5.3.3.1 General features

New Year began in rather murky circumstances; there were strikes and general hooliganism, mischief and in some places armed encounters. In January it was also hard to tell who was to blame for all of the above; Russian troops were slowly but surely leaving Finland, however some remained and joined the Red Squads in mischievous activities. Red Squads were also starting to act on their own which was much reported. After the November revolution Russian militia was reclining from its role as a peacekeeping force and this in a way caused power vacuum; Protective Guards and Red Squads had been forming since the summer, however, now both of the groups were actively recruiting members, seeking weaponry and first and

foremost: taking part in armed encounters. The question of weaponry; whether the Red Squad had any, from where they had acquired them and the urgency of the Red Squad to disarm, was discussed under titles “**The question of police forces**”, “**Down weapons**”, “**Disarmament of loose armed gangs**”. The real issue behind the question of weaponry was: who is to become the official peacekeeping force of independent Finland, the Red Squad formed by the Social Democrats or the Protective Guard formed by the Bourgeois

Another topic which appears often in the editorials of *Aamulehti* in January are the matters related to independence; at the very end of December 1917⁷¹ Russia recognized Finland as a sovereign and independent country which in the beginning of January resulted into several other European countries doing the same. Editorials such as “**Finland’s independence**”, “**Independent Finland**”, “**Finland’s flag**” and “**Our flag question**” discuss the matters related to independence which at the end of December had actualized.

5.3.3.2 Interference to Finland’s internal conflict

The new Russian government began discharging troops from Finland in January which was experienced as relief on the bourgeois side. Part of the reason why the bourgeois parties wanted the Russian troops out of Finland had to do with the fact that Finland was now internationally recognized as an independent country hence having foreign country’s troops within its borders was an insult. However, other part of the reason had to do with the fact that some Russian troops were participating—either by joining the social democrats in mischief or by providing them with weapons and other supplies—in what was seen as Finland’s internal conflict.

In 18.1.1918 page four article “**Russian soldiers mischievous interference to internal affairs of independent Finland**” *Aamulehti* describes a incident taking place in Northern Finland “*When few customs attendants in Tornio 12th of this month noted in local customs watchmen’s hut to soldiers administering passport and personal search that they now don’t have anything to do with the local checks when Russia has recognized Finland as independent, left one of the soldiers to barracks from where instantly arrived a group of soldiers armed with rifles which began dragging customs attendants out from the hut, hit two customs guards with butts of rifles and threatened to pierce chief D. Hakonen and capture the custom guards. Russian military troops have lately embarked on ...practicing all sorts of mischief in the railway station in Tornio and shooting at people peacefully passing along the border line....*” Another writing with similar theme is in 20.1.1918 editorial “**Alarming rumours**” “*Obviously have Russian dark forces whipped in our country with the help of Red Squad of Helsinki and in that connection embark on similar (than in St. Petersburg) actions.... We have to take care that foreign powers neither from east nor south or west have reason to interfere in our affairs.*” Particularly *Aamulehti* held this matter secret and insisted that Russian troops would not take any part in the internal conflict which was looming in the horizon.

That Russian troops would not enter the conflict was important in many aspects but most important of them were the weapons; if the Red Squad would get the weapons lying in the barracks then they would obviously have an upper hand. In 28.1.1918, the day Civil War officially began, *Aamulehti* wrote in an

⁷¹ 31.12 according to www.uta.fi/suomi80/v18v1.htm

article “**Russian attempt**” “*Russians still attempt to maintain and even strengthen their power in Finland....After this have the Bolsheviks of Russia with all their means, even with the help of anarchist they have sent here, have attempted to arm our country’s hooligan component and at the same time to give the matter that shadow like all this would happen only and solely in the name of advancing the cause of the the working class. So have amongst the armed peoples’ mobs worked well known former Russian gendarmes and their minions.*”

5.3.3.3 Claims of Russian troops assisting the Red Squad

In few occasions the mischief of Russian troops appears in its original context, however, more are those occasions where Russian troops are described as taking part in the violence initiated by social democrats.

In 8.1.1918 in a page three article “**Red Squad rollicking in Savonlinna**” describing a incident in eastern part of Finland “*In the city captured the soldiers together with Red Squad phone and telegram stations. They occupied also station suite preventing the station officers from working. In the afternoon started the Red Squad together with the soldiers execute home searches and arrests.*” Same line of writings continue in 22.1.1918 page four article “**Anarchy increasing**” “*After finding resistance impossible and fearing that the whole factory will be shot into pieces, especially when Russian troops have said to threat to use canons, rushed the Protective Guard rifles in their hands out of the factory.*” It is a fact that Red Squad received arms and assistance from the Russian troops, in some cities such as Vyborg the help was more substantial than in others. It is hard to say what the situation was in Tampere because there are no writings concerning it and one is left to speculate whether this “silence” indicates that such a co- operation in Tampere did not exist.

Aamulehti does use quite a lot terms such as “with foreign weapons” or “with weapons acquired from foreign power” which would allow a cautious conclusion that the assistance Red Squads received from Russian troops came in form of weapons and not in form of troops willing to participate in the conflict. In 25.1.1918 editorial “**Disarmament of loose armed gangs**” *Aamulehti* writes “*But the fact that our people’s most irresponsible and insubordinate elements with brutal violence and guns acquired from foreigners wants to throw the country into perdition and drown the reputation of Finnish people and governmental independence, cannot lead to that kind of desperate opinion that the parliament and government have no means to deter this horrid danger.*” The same thoughts, expressed almost with same words appears in the 28.1.1918 editorial “**The destitution of the fatherland**” “*Part of country’s people together with foreign troops practices brutal violence against their own citizens....into which the most irresponsible part has embarked upon with crime and violence, supported by the worse elements of foreign country’s troops, with blood of ones own people in their hands.*”

5.3.4 November, *Kansan Lehti*

5.3.4.1 General features

In November *Kansan lehti* is more focused on the politics that in any other months, several editorials are actually summaries of minutes from parliamentary session or resolutions made by different political/politicized organs. Editorials such as “**Finland’s Trade Union’s meeting**”, “**The Parliament**”, “**Additional party convention**” and “**The question of the constitution in the parliament**” all report and discuss the proceedings of decision making and the direction the new parliament was taking Finland. One of the reasons why the political interest appears might have been the fact that the SDP was no longer the majority party hence did not have the absolute control over the political issues.

Another reason for the sudden interest to political matters might simply be because in November the several important decisions concerning Finland’s future as a sovereign country were made e.g. whether Finland would be a monarchy or a democracy, the question of Finland’s own army, the statutes defining prerogatives of president, parliament, senate (later on ministry) and so. Second topic which *Kansan Lehti* covered was matters relating to the general strike, editorials such as “**We demand**”, “**General Strike in Tampere**”, “**The war is prepared during the peace**”, “**Was it not enough?**” and “**What do bourgeois’ shouts of revenge mean**” discuss the strike itself but moreover, the results, indications and the achievements of it. Bolshevik Revolution is also discussed very briefly in “**Bolsheviks’ in power**” and “**Momentous moments**” but in comparison to the attention given to May revolution, the March Revolution went by fairly unnoticed.

5.3.4.2 Finnish- Russian regression

Social Democrats saw that the bourgeois parties had won the majority in parliament with the help of Russian regressive elements; Social Democrats insisted that by submitting to dissolving of the parliament in August the bourgeois parties had joined the regression practiced by the Provisional Government. In its “**We demand**” manifest published in the place of editorial 1.11.1917 *Kansan Lehti* states “*Seeking itself allies from Russian oppressors, Finland’s gentry parties last spring stepped to road of organized unlawfulness, even to the supporter of unlawful dissolving of our country’s parliament. When Russian government embarked with bayonets to stop our lawful parliament’s session, were the Finnish winds of oppression behind those bayonets....The country’s administration of affairs should be straightened to the standpoint of lawfulness so that it would bring an end to current unlawful system which have been born from joint schemes and takeovers of Russian- Finnish regression.*”

As Social Democrats had strong conviction of clean cut and complete independence from Russia they saw measures—based on ceremonial mandates and other legal proceedings— bourgeois parties were taking inadequate, interpreting them as unwillingness of separation from Russia. In an editorial 5.11.1917 “**Governmental position**” concerning bourgeois parties’ suggestion that Russia would maintain its power to call the parliamentary sessions in order in the beginning of each year, *Kansan Lehti* expresses sarcastically

its opinion: *“The regressional pack, to which Suomettarelaiset, part of Nuorsuomalaiset (both afore mentioned are bourgeois parties) and Russian government belong, are in the stance that Finland’s highest state power would be declared by manifest from the Russian government to be transferred to Finnish organs, either to “directorate” set by the parliamentary session or to “governmental administer”....Because Russian government must be allowed that that honour of giving the manifest, which not only by rejecting the statute of the constitution but also by otherwise organizing the matter it (Russian government) could always a bit deceive peoples’ power.”* The same theme continues in 7.11 1917 editorial titled **“Bourgeois’ takeover bustle”** *“As far as it has been brought to our attention part of that current plan of bourgeois parties alliances—behind which lately perhaps been persuaded Maalaisliittolaiset (Agrarian union party) party—that Russia’s government, against the July 8th law and lawful parliament’s several times expressed clear opinion, could by the permission of current parliament’s bourgeois alliance majority administer the highest state power in Finland for example by opening the years parliamentary session. In those “festive openings” Russia’s government would by the manifest drawn by Finland’s gentry would give up that right—even though it never lawfully possessed it!”*

As discussed earlier on, the Social Democrats had identified the Provisional Government of Russia as yet another bourgeois government hence making the struggle for independence part of the class struggle. Now that the bourgeois power had the decision making power on how to achieve sovereignty suspicions towards them and the motives behind the decisions made were high. Social Democrats perceived any admissions bourgeois parties gave to Provisional Government as attempt of Finnish capitalists to negotiate the situation so that they could have dictatorship over the Finnish the working class.

5.3.4.3 Claims of the Russian troops assisting the Protective Guards

Another aspect of the co- operation is the matter of arms; the term “Russian bayonets” had been used throughout the times and appears often in year 1917 as well as the term “foreign bayonets” which was commonly used through the summer in relation to mischief committed by Russian troops. As the wedge between bourgeois and the working class deepened the term started be applied in relation to Finnish actors. In an page five article **“Russian officers have armed the gentry of Lahti with guns and the wives of the gentry with truncheons”** *Kansan Lehti* 22.11.1917 published the following *“....The gentry of Lahti has therefore had with Russian officers close ongoing co- operation. The prove of which is also that one second lieutenant had promised to fetch 3000 soldiers for the help of authorities in Lahti....The above incident shows that bourgeois has used “foreign power” to strengthen their class position.”*

The reason why the matter of arms was important might be connected to the fact that Finland did not have reserve of fire arms; only people allowed to carry a gun were Russian troops, whom also controlled the reserves of arms located at garrisons. Another article concerning the topic appears in page two article **“With foreign bayonets”** in 26.11.1917 *“They have not even with one word mentioned their own Butcher Guards⁷² number of weapons, and also not from that that they have already earlier embarked upon measures of obtaining “foreign gunpower” for help....Besides we remember exceedingly well, that Russian bayonets during the rule of the Tsar on the*

⁷² Butcher Guard was a name Social Democrats began calling the Protective Guard established by the bourgeois

requests of Finnish bourgeois have always until the May Revolution been turned towards the chest of the the working class.”

What must be remarked is the fact that both parties the bourgeois and Social Democrats accused each other for acquiring weapons from Russian troops and there most certainly was truth behind both cases for there was a degree of co- operation between radical social democrats and Russian troops as well as bourgeois and the Russian higher military officers.

5.3.4.4 November Revolution

Kansan Lehti covers the March Revolution very briefly and there is very little of the enthusiasm seen after May revolution. The first indicator is that the news does not appear in the front page as did the breaking news of the May Revolution. Same themes of heroism, Russian proletariat as fore fighters and self determination appear, the tone is very positive but also, feelings of doubt are expressed. In the first news of Bolshevik revolution 9.11.1917 “**Bolsheviks’ in power**” *Kansan Lehti* writes “*Is the power of Bolsheviks enduring, how is the situation in vast countryside and among the soldiers in the front line, has the Bolshevik power been able to strengthen there, this we don’t have information at the moment. Hopefully the revolution of Russian proletariat will not be an attempt such as Paris Commune....With excitement Finland follows does the power of Bolsheviks strengthen so that they can proceed in realizing their program.*” The news in relation to the March Revolution appear only in three articles and even though those articles are all positive the amount of articles which give negative image of Russians are more in number.

5.3.5 December, *Kansan Lehti*

5.3.5.1 General features

In December *Kansan Lehti* continued to focus on political matters; with editorials such as “**Fight for parliamentary peoples’ power**”, “**Parliaments bourgeois declared Finland independent**” and “**Own national military**” *Kansan Lehti* was an active participant in the discussion over the independence and the constitution issues. The mischief of Social Democrats radical was now such a scale that the Social Democratic party had to intervene hence the editorials “**To Finland’s organized the working class**”, “**Against hooliganism**” and “**Purification of our lines must be done**” very strongly condemns the violent behaviour in the name of the the working class movement and repeats for the people to stay calm.

In December is the first month after January and February which presents no clear theme. Particularly in *Kansan Lehti* it is very easy to detect the themes in relation of which Russians are presented; last month these themes were Finnish and Russian regression and co- operation between Russian and Finnish bourgeois in terms of weapons trade. In December such theme, not to mention several, do not appear.

5.3.5.2 The different usage of Oppression period

The interesting feature in December is the usage of the Oppression period but in the different context than in *Aamulehti*. In 17.12.1917 an editorial, “**Own national military**” arguing against the idea of establishing national army “....when the bureaucracy of Russian Empire almost twenty years ago embarked on destroying our country’s autonomy was its first move the removal of Finnish troops....Even though it is agreed that Russian bourgeois considered Finnish troops harmful to their plans of destruction....”.The same theme appears in 22.12.1917 editorial “**Against hooliganism**” where *Kansan Lehti* rather sarcastically argues for recognizing the Russian militia as the official peacekeeping authority. “*The core of the question was precisely will they recognize in here the militia as the peace keeping authority, the leadership of which is trusted to ordination board or to Bobrikoff’s era police regulation....But the purpose is achieved, the Bobrikoffian law has been saved and the The working class movement has been shamed and to that aim it is worth of bourgeois to sacrifice individual peoples’ happiness and particularly possessions.*” The anti- Russian notion here is the word Bobrikoffian; last name of much despised General Governor of Finland, became later on an adjective used in describing all that was hated during the Oppression period. What differs from the usage of Oppression period as a tool in waking up hostile emotions is the fact that it is meant to raise hostile feelings towards Finns!

5.3.6 January 1918, *Kansan Lehti*

5.3.6.1 General features

In January *Kansan Lehti* focused mainly on topics related to class struggle; Russian November revolution had strengthened the ideological rhetoric hence the nature of the conflict was now more clearly identified as war between classes. In different parts of Finland Red Squads were already engaging in armed incidents against the Protective Guard. Editorials such as “**Senate’s power seizing attempts**”, “**Situation of class struggle in our country**” and “**The despair of Finnish proletariat and the bourgeois newspapers**” reported events and followed the proceeding of the situation carefully. Appeals for remaining calm and not engaging into violence are no longer present. There are several reasons for this however, one of the strongest might have been the issue of peacekeeping forces. What pushed the conflict from passive to active and from verbal assault to armed is combination of several elements such as not being able to influence to the matters of Finnish independence or form of governance, not having laws passed and so on but in January the final straw braking the camel’s back was the declaration of Protective Guard as the official troops of the Finnish Senate.

After that editorial in *Kansan Lehti* began writing about organizing the troops “**Red Squad and our party’s central organizations**”, “**Senate has been granted dictatorship**” and “**Gathering up the strengths of the proletariat**” encouraged people to join Red Squads and not the Protective Guards, instructed of proper behaviour under those banners, condemning unorganized hooliganism, however, not condemning organized

armed activities against the Protective Guard. The polemic behind joining the Red Squads was that the bourgeois was forming their own troops which were meant for killing the the working class. There were also few editorials concerning the politics “**The moments of death of municipal purse power**” and “**Municipality’s land policy**” but they all have very agitate tone and support the editorials on class struggle. It is also worth noting that *Kansan Lehti* does not discuss the matters related to independence.

5.3.6.2 Assisting the bourgeois

Kansan Lehti also blamed the opposing side for co- operating with the Russians, however, its angle on the topic was a bit different: it used the memory of Oppression period and presented that Finnish bourgeois would with the help of Russian bourgeois restore that setting so that they could despotically rule over the the working class; in 5.1.1918 editorial “**The past year**” *Kansan Lehti* wrote “*And as was expected the regressive element of the bourgeois positioned in opposition against already approved law and bursted into explanations that this law was “unfair” and “impossible” and so doing giving their support to Kerensian rulers which agreed with them....Noteworthy matter in this connection must also be mentioned that the bourgeois representatives did not see as their duty to arrive to those parliamentary session which after the order to dissolve, regardless of Kerensian bayonets, were attempted to organize.*” The theme continues in 19.1.1918 editorial “**The situation of class struggle in our country**” “*As long as Russian Tsarist regime was the support of Finnish exploiter (the Finnish bourgeois) against the the working class they used it always until the very end, among others during the war as a orders shackling all sorts of organized activities of the the working class....*”

5.3.6.3 The example of fore fighters and camaraderie

The theme that over powers all others in January is the calls of camaraderie and expressions of admirations that *Kansan Lehti* directs towards the Bolshevik government. In 3.1.1918 editorial “**Recognition of Finland’s independence**” *Kansan Lehti* writes “*When the great revolution which bursted out in the beginning of November wiped away the Provisional Government of Russia and the reigns in their hands took that class which starting from the beginning has declared the freedom of the oppressed people and precisely announced to give the people of Finland freedom and complete independence, explains the bourgeois that they don’t want to recognize or have anything to do with these “disgusting” and “despicable” Bolsheviks.*” The afore quotation expresses the “Us and Them”- setting as it was in January; bourgeois was “them” and “us” was the the working class, countries of origin did not matter for first and foremost identity people had was that of their class.

In 9.1.1918 open letter from the the SDP to Bolshevik Government, published as an editorial “**To our Russian comrades**” already speaks very clear language “*But because of its (the Bolshevik government) noble work and struggle has all class conscious the working class and soldiers to support, assist and advocate it with all strength and until the end!....In the name of these common ideals we greet you our Russian comrades...You who now are here in Finland by our side when one nation inspired by same ideal than great Russia’s class conscious comrades...*” Same theme of “togetherness” against the bourgeois continues in another open letter to

Bolshevik Government “**The declaration of Social Democratic party council**”, published as an editorial 25.1.1918 “*We understand that this type of procedures steeply embitters Russian revolutionary troops in Finland and even more so when these accusations are placed against that revolutionary military troops which without staggering from its principles recently recognized Finnish nation’s right for sovereignty and governmental independence. We the representatives of Finnish the working class will fight without staggering with you against this type of danger and provocative wave of slander advocated by the Finnish bourgeois and party council will issue recognition to honest representatives of Russian revolution, voicing steep disapproval against the counter revolutionary measures practiced by Finnish bourgeois newspapers.*”

5.3.7 Aamulehti and Kansan Lehti; analysis comparison of the themes and contrasting of the image of Russians from November through to the end of January 1918

5.3.7.1 Russians as a news topic, First level of analysis (the measure unit: editorials and articles per month)

	NOVEMBER		DECEMBER		JANUARY 1918	
	articles/ issues	in %	articles/ issues	in %	articles/ issues	in %
AAMULEHTI	12/ 22	54 %	7/ 23	30 %	10/ 24	42 %
KANSAN LEHTI	9/ 23	39 %	8/ 23	35 %	12/ 22	54 %

How interesting news topic Russians actually were? How many articles mentioning Russian were written in a month? During the third sample period—from November 1917 to January 1918—Russians as a news topic appears quite often in the pages of both of newspapers, monthly average for Russian related topics is 40 %. The amount of attention given to Russians from November 1917 to January 1918 is highly related to the fact that great changes were taking place in Russia; Bolshevik revolution, the transfer of power from Mensheviks to Bolsheviks made the country and its people interesting topic for *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti*. But moreover, from November 1917 to January 1918 Russians were relevant topic in relation to future of the country; firstly, it appeared that Finland’s independence depended on whether Russia would choose to recognize it and secondly the fact that Finland was heading towards a conflict was becoming more clear and *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* monitored carefully whether Russia would take sides or intervene in some other way. In comparison to earlier sample it is clear that while *Aamulehti* has maintained the amount of Russian related content, *Kansan Lehti* has slightly decreased its Russian related content.

5.3.7.2 Analysing the sample, second level of analysis (measure unit: sentences per Russian related article)⁷³

AAMULEHTI

	NOVEMBER	in %	DECEMBER	in %	JANUARY 1918	in %
Total size of the sample (sentences/article)	412		185		334	
Russian related sentences in the sample (sentences/article)	111	27 % (of the total size)	32	17 % (of the total size)	59	18 % (of the total size)
Positive	4	4 %	3	9 %	4	7 %
Negative	69	62 %	22	69 %	36	61 %
Neutral	38	34 %	7	22 %	14	24 %
Tone of the month		NEGATIVE		NEGATIVE		NEGATIVE
Reference	co- operation and mischievous activities with Social Democrats		allowing the mischief of Social Democrats, not keeping the order, Oppression period		co- operation and mischievous activities with Social Democrats	

KANSAN LEHTI

	NOVEMBER	in %	DECEMBER	in %	JANUARY 1918	in %
Total size of the sample (sentences/article)	264		227		350	

⁷³ The total size of the sample presents the total amount of sentences that I have analyzed from the month in question. Russian related sentences present the amount of sentences I have identified as “Russian related”. Positive, negative and neutral present the amount of sentences I have identified as having the afore mentioned connotation. What has been considered as “Russian related” and “positive, negative, neutral” are described in the page 47. “Tone of the sample” is assigned according the connotation which appears most often i.e. has the highest percentage.

Russian related sentences in the sample (sentences/article)	87	33 % (of the total size)	56	25 % (of the total size)	77	22 % (of the total size)
Positive	26	30 %	11	20 %	23	29 %
Negative	28	32 %	17	30 %	35	45 %
Neutral	33	38 %	28	50 %	20	26 %
Tone of the month		NEUTRAL		NEUTRAL		NEGATIVE
Reference	co- operation with Finnish bourgeois, regression		Oppression period		co- operation with Finnish bourgeois, oppression	

Comparing to the second sample period, the amount of Russian related content has remained the same in *Aamulehti*, however, in *Kansan Lehti* it has decreased considerably. What is most noteworthy, is the fact that the association or the reference in which Russians were presented has gone through a significant change; they are now presented in relation to their Finnish counterparts whom give them “bad name”. To illustrate: *Kansan lehti* applies the negative tone only to the Russian bourgeois and associates it with the Finnish bourgeois. However, the Russian bourgeois functions only as a background reference used in describing and explaining the sinister acts and the nature of the Finnish bourgeois. The same phenomenon can be seen *Aamulehti*: through associations to Finnish Social Democrats Russians gain their “bad name”.

What was the image that communited across? How did *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* present the Russians from November 1917 to January 1918? The extent with which both newspapers associate Russians to their Finnish counterparts makes it quite difficult to define what exactly was the image of a Russian in the end of the third sample period. Both of the newspapers, particularly *Kansan Lehti*, have “returned” back to the old references in which the Russians were presented in the beginning: regression, oppression and mischief, but now those topics were presented as activities Finns— the the working class or the bourgeois—engaged in.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

6.1 Thoughts on the initial hypothesis

The third sample brings the exploration of the empirical data to an end by presenting the point where the opinion towards Russians had arrived after nine months of moulding. The surprises are many, greatest one of them appearing in relation to *Kansan Lehti*. The original hypothesis does not come true; the representation of Russians in *Kansan Lehti* does not turn into positive after March and in fact March remains the only month when the opinion towards Russians in *Kansan Lehti* has been positive. In relation to *Aamulehti* the hypothesis is accurate; the representation of Russians turns from neutral to negative and stays that way until the break out of the Civil War in January 1918.

The fact that *Kansan Lehti* does not fit into the original hypothesis might be indication of several matters; one of them being the inaccuracy of the initial hypothesis, afterall it was constructed prior to processing of the empirical data and upon assumptions based on recorded history and similar opinion formation processes observed during the same time period and in alike circumstances. But if the initial hypothesis was inaccurate, why did it come true in the case example of *Aamulehti*? The hypothesis for both of the newspapers was based on same facts of history and similar opinion formation processes. If the inaccuracy would we caused by wrongness of the opinion formation process, then, it would have been projected also in the case example of *Aamulehti*, however, it did not. Hence the conclusion we are forced to arrive is that the variant, which distorts the hypothesis in relation to *Kansan Lehti*, is the historical facts.

To claim that it is the history, which distorts the hypothesis is quite harsh because the claim strongly indicates that there is incorrectness in the recorded history. History however, is always written by winners; in the 21st century a recognized fact is that there are occasions, when the official history does not quite correspond to the actual history. This certainly is true when it comes to the Finnish Civil War, the history of which was written partly in propagandistic purposes. Only in the sixties the “Red” side of the history began really surfacing, correcting some obvious misperceptions, which is a process that still continues. In the light of these facts the thought that the relationship between the Social Democrats i.e. Red side and Russian troops in Tampere might be incorrectly recorded to history, is plausible. Also, this research looks into *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* from a perspective and during a time period, which according to my best knowledge has not been covered. That aspect makes the thought of “new findings”: corrections to or specifying of old information even more conceivable.

6.2 The image of a Russian

The part of history my research clarifies is related to the relationship between Social Democrats and Russian troops in Tampere. The official history has always described that relationship as one with degree of camaraderie, mutual understanding, co-operation and so on, hence making the general assumption that Social Democrats had a positive image of Russian troops. This was also the platform my hypothesis was based upon; that *Kansan Lehti*—being the voice of Social Democratic Party—would project a positive image of Russians to its readership. But as the empirical data indicates this did not happen: the image *Kansan Lehti* projects during the first sample is that of no image at all and during the second sample the image of Russian is very negative, even more so that that projected by *Aamulehti*. During the first sample period also *Aamulehti* shows no interest towards Russians, during the second sample period—while *Kansan Lehti* is ranting about cruelty of Russian troops—*Aamulehti* maintains its neutral attitude towards Russians. During the third and final sample period *Aamulehti* projects a negative image of Russians, whereas *Kansan Lehti* for the first time presents Russians in rather neutral light. There are also few other surprises, which this research has come across; major one of them being the association or reference in which the Russians were presented. The first sample period provided no association what so ever, the second sample period provided no real surprise for both newspapers presented the Russians in association of themes described by official history: that of mischief and limitations on regained sovereignty. It is the third sample period, which brings us the surprise, at least when it comes to the association in which *Kansan Lehti* presented Russians. During third sample period *Aamulehti* rather predictably associates the Russians with Finnish Social Democrats in mischief, however, *Kansan Lehti* unpredictably presents Russians in connection to much hated Finnish bourgeois and to dark period in Finnish history: the Oppression periods. What is remarkable in here is that both newspapers perceive Russians negatively because of their association and assumed co-operation with the Finnish “opposing side” i.e. it is the Finns who give bad name to Russians.

The question, which naturally rises is: how is it possible that Finns give bad name to Russians and not vice versa? There is no doubt that during the second sample period both newspapers, particularly *Kansan Lehti* would have projected other than negative image of Russians. In the beginning of the third sample period both newspapers begin to associate their Finnish “opponent” to its Russian counterpart: *Aamulehti* synonymized Russian troops (and later on Bolsheviks) with Finnish Social democrats and *Kansan Lehti* synonymized Russian bourgeois to Finnish bourgeois. The bad qualities, which earlier were attached only to Russians were now transferred also to describe their Finnish counterparts.

Until this point it still was the Russians, who gave bad name to Finns, however, during the third sample period Russians began to be presented as passive participants in mischief (*Aamulehti*) and oppression and regression (*Kansan Lehti*) whereas Finnish bourgeois and Social Democrats are described as active participants of the assumed co-operation. The reason why the word “assumed” is used in here is the fact that in *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti*, editorials or articles, giving accounts of events where co-operation between Russians and Finns would have been mentioned, are very few. The accounts of real incidents of violence

taking place in Tampere either between the Russian troops and Protective Guard or between the Protective Guard and the Red Squad are also extremely few. This however does not mean that these incidents would have not taken place; it only suggests that either they were petty quarrels which were not worthy enough to be mentioned or that these incidents happened seldom enough hence not becoming an issue, which would have required much attention. In general the suggestions of the other side co- operating with Russians appears only during the third sample period and most mentioned aspect of the assumed co- operation seems to be firearms.

The question of weaponry was an important one at the end of 1917 mainly because it was considered to solve the outcome of the conflict: the understanding of the time was that if the situation would escalate into an armed conflict, the side having most firearms would merge out of it as a winner. In the light of official history, which has “accused” the Red side of taking arms from Russian troops, it is somewhat surprising to see that the Red side equally accused the White side of the same activity. The suspicions ran high at the end of 1917 and both sides suspected that the other was being assisted by their Russian counterpart; *Kansan Lehti* discussed such possibilities in few of its editorials by using terms such as “with foreign country’s guns” and “with the help of foreign power”⁷⁴ and *Aamulehti*, by using the exact same terms, accused the Social Democrats of involving a foreign power into independent Finland’s internal conflict. Most likely there was some arms trade particularly between the Red side and Russian troops, however, also *Kansan Lehti* makes it clear that it does not want the involvement of Russians, or any other country for that matter, into conflict which was considered Finland’s internal affair. *Kansan Lehti* does write about Russian revolutions as an example that Finnish the working class should follow and describes Russian proletariat as fore fighter of the the working class movement, but it does not invite Russians to join the conflict or encourage Russian troops to stay in Finland and fight side by side with the Finns against the class enemy.

What was also clear by the end of 1917 was the image of the enemy. Even though the Protective Guards and the Red Squats were originally formed for keeping the order in cities, protecting citizens chiefly against the external enemy , but by the third sample period—from November 1917 to January 1918—it was obvious that the enemy was internal. When the armament began at the end of the second sample period the Protective Guards and the Red squads were arming themselves against each other and not against the Russian troops. Speaking for this are two matters; firstly, as mentioned earlier, Russians are always described as passive participants and their role or involvement in conflict related activities is always referred in *Kansan Lehti*, as well as in *Aamulehti* with terms e.g. “with foreign country’s guns”, “with the help of foreign power”, “with foreign bayonets”⁷⁵. Secondly, both of the newspapers identify the enemy in a manner, which leaves little room for interpretation: in *Aamulehti* the enemy is “the worst elements of the Social

⁷⁴ ”vieraan maan asein”, ”vieraan vallan avulla” in Finnish

⁷⁵ ”vieraan maan aseilla”, ”vieraan vallan avulla” and ”vierain pistimin” in Finnish

Democrats”, “The Red Squads”, “the the working class hooligans”⁷⁶ and in *Kansan Lehti* “the Butcher Guards”, “Finnish- Russian regression”, “class enemy”⁷⁷ .

Derogatory words such as mischief, hooliganism and rollicking in relation to Russians are present throughout the year, particularly after the March Revolution when censorship diminished and the problems with Russian troops really began, but the extension of those terms to Finns starts from the beginning of the third sample period. Yet another peculiar feature, appearing in both *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* from the beginning of the third study period, is the comparison of the opposing side’s behaviour and activities to the Oppression period. Both newspapers equally use the memory of Oppression periods in creating negative feelings and demonstrating the horridness of the behaviour and nature of the opposing side.

At the end of all where has the opinion on Russians arrived? What do we know of the way how Russians were perceived in Tampere? The Russians, with whom people in Tampere were commonly in contact with, were Russian military troops. They lived in army bases in outskirts of the city, attending to matters e.g. supervising the construction of war related building projects such as trench digging, wall building commissioned by the Russian army. The troops also functioned as peacekeeping authority. It must be underlined that people did not have a clear conception of Russians they did not become in contact with; Russians living in Russia or the people and nation of Russia were concepts, which particularly to the the working class, did not actualize. For ordinary people Russia was a country, where Russians and the Tsar lived and nothing more.

In first sample period, it appears, that discluding some hated administrative officials who saw over the governance of Tampere, there were neither negative nor positive feelings towards Russians in Tampere. However, there was plenty of opinions towards the oppressive methods the Tsar was forcing on Finland but it is rather clear though that negative opinion was targeted towards the system and the political decisions. The feelings of negativity did not extent to the main group of Russians with which people mostly interacted on daily basis: the military troops.

Until the end of March the Russians did not cause problems but after the March Revolution had demolished the old hierarchical chain of command, soldiers began misusing their position. This is when the opinion of Russians began turning negative; the troops were consuming scarce food supplies and behaving mischievously. Rollicking, violent incidents, stealing and drunken behaviour established the bad reputation of Russian troops. During the second sample period Russians began to be considered as unified group; deed of a individual soldier was blamed on whole of the Russian troops. Both classes—bourgeois and the working class—shared the negative opinion towards Russians; particularly the the working class newspaper was very vocal about their stance on the topic.

During the third sample period the inner conflict was brewing up and both bourgeois and the working class began looking for affiliations, which caused change in the way Russians were perceived; firstly, the

⁷⁶ ”sosiaalidemokraattien huonoimmat ainekset”, ”Punakaartit” and ”työväen huuligaanit” in Finnish

⁷⁷ ”lahtarikaartit”, ”Suomalaisvenäläinen taantumus” and ”luokkavihollinen” in Finnish

Russians living in Russia had been introduced to the Finnish the working class through descriptions of March Revolution and now they were used as an example of the progress of the the working class movement. There was dual perception of Russians; proletariat was perceived well among Finnish the working class, whereas Russian bourgeois had negative connotation. The behaviour of Russians soldiers was condemned also by the the working class and Social Democrats were eager to rid Finland of the military troops.

Finnish bourgeois had equally divided Russians in to two separate social groups; on the other hand bourgeois maintained relations to the Provisional Government, working with it in order to arrange the matters relating to the constitution and independence issue. Bourgeois might have had rather neutral opinion of the upper class of Russia, however it was clear that it had negative image of the Russian troops. It saw them as dangerous element who, with their violence and association to the radical Social Democrats, were interfering to Finland’s internal affairs and insulting its the constitution. Bourgeois condemned the violence committed by the Russians troops and most certainly wanted them out of Finland. What happened is that the Finnish bourgeois developed rather approving attitude towards the Russian bourgeois and the Finnish the working class did the same towards Russian proletariat.

When Finland entered from passive to active conflict the association, real or imagined, between Russians and their Finnish counterparts was used by both sides in agitation and in stirring up hatred, not towards Russians but towards Finns. Due to escalation of the conflict but also due to association all the negativity once felt towards Russians was now directed to the Finnish opponent. What also transferred were the reasons, which had stirred the negative emotion to begin with e.g. violence, hooliganism, oppression, regression.

6.3 Change in a image of Russian: the public opinion formation process

The process can be loosely described by pattern Leonard Doob has developed and describes in “Public opinion and propaganda”⁷⁸

	AAMULEHTI	EXAMPLES	KANSAN LEHTI	EXAMPLES
1. CONSISTANCY	non interest negative confirms/ present the enduring opinion i.e. root setting towards Russians	no reporting, Russians are not a news topic	non interest negative confirms/ present the enduring opinion i.e. root setting towards Russians	no reporting, Russians are not a news topic
2. IDENTIFICATION	Brief positive identification with Russians after the	Russians have done what Finns would	Brief positive identification with Russians after the	Russians as “our brothers”, declaring

⁷⁸ Doob, Leonard D. *Public opinion and propaganda*. Conneticut. Archon books, 1966.

	<p>March revolution</p> <p>Negative identification Russians are “them” and Finns are “Us”</p>	<p>like to do: break free from the oppression</p> <p>“us & them”-setting appears, Russians commit mischief because they don’t understand our circumstances</p>	<p>March revolution</p> <p>Negative identification. Russians are “them” and Finns are “Us”</p> <p>the “Good vs. Evil”-setting appears</p>	<p>relation to Russia</p> <p>“us & them”-setting appears,</p> <p>Russians commit mischief because they are evil</p>
3. DISPLACEMENT	Russians as a cause for all wrongs of the Finnish society	1.famine, 2.violations on sovereignty 3.mischief	Russians as a cause for all wrongs of the Finnish society	1. mischief, 2. violations on sovereignty, 3.food shortage
4. RATIONALIZATION	such behaviour is accepted due to rationalization that it is in their nature	Russians commit mischief because social democrats have tricked them into it	such behaviour is accepted due to rationalization that it is in their nature	Russians violate Finnish sovereignty because they are oppressors by nature
5. SIMPLIFICATION	Russian troops and social democrats are connected to each other	Social democrats equals Russian troops co- operation with Russian troops in order to violently to overthrow the government	Finnish bourgeois and Russian bourgeois are connected to each other	Finnish capitalist equals Russian capitalist
6. PROJECTION	<p>All the negative qualities of Russian troops and provisional government, Tsar institution compare to the doings and behaviour of the Social democrats.</p> <p>The negative feelings towards Russian related actors become the</p>	<p>the mischief committed by the social democrats is compared to the mischief Russian troops practice</p> <p>The oppression practiced by Russia is</p>	<p>All the negative qualities Finnish bourgeois have become the negative qualities also Russian bourgeois have</p> <p>same feelings projected towards Russian bourgeois than Finnish bourgeois</p>	<p>Capitalists natural need to oppress the the working class equals Russia’s need to violate Finnish sovereignty</p> <p>Russian bourgeois is blamed for the violations on Finnish</p>

	<p>negative qualities also social democrats have</p> <p>same feelings projected towards social democrats than much hated Russians related actors</p>	<p>compared to the oppression of Socialists (e.g. freedom of speech issue in Nov.)</p>		<p>sovereignty because the provisional government is considered as “bourgeois government</p>
7. 2ND IDENTIFICATION	<p>Finnish people vs. Finnish social democrats (and perhaps also Bolsheviks?)</p> <p>new “Us & Them” or “in- group & out-group as Doob puts it”</p>		<p>the working class vs. bourgeois</p> <p>new “Us & Them” or “in- group & out-group as Doob puts it”</p>	<p>Appearance of the beginnings of positive identification towards Russians social democrats</p>
8. 2ND RATIONALIZATION	<p>The new enemy: social democrats.</p>	<p>they associate with our old enemy hence they are also our enemies</p> <p>they behave like the old “enemy” or even worse, hence they are our enemy</p> <p>they would like to destroy the whole society, sophistication and throw away the gained independence</p>	<p>the new enemy: bourgeois</p>	<p>they associate with our old enemy hence they are also our enemies</p> <p>they behave like the old “enemy” or even worse, hence they are our enemy</p> <p>they would like to rule over us</p>
10. END OF PROCESS: NEW PUBLIC OPINION	<p>No particular opinion towards Russians, however, all the negative qualities seen in Russians are now seen in the Finnish opposing side</p>	<p>Red Side is now associated with all the bad qualities Russians had e.g. mischief, violence</p>	<p>No particular opinion towards Russians, however, all the negative qualities seen in Russians are now seen in the Finnish opposing side</p>	<p>White Side is now associated with all the bad qualities Russians had e.g. oppression</p>

There are of course differences; the official history simplifies matters in creating a comprehensive timeline of the events, it presents one enemy, one cause and one progression of events, all taking place in one set of circumstances. The reality of at least the Finnish Civil War was that from place to another the circumstances were completely different, which naturally influenced the perception of the entire conflict. In areas where the problem with Russian troops was particularly bad e.g. in Vyborg the enemy would most likely have been perceived as external i.e. Russians, whereas in other places e.g. Lahti it was very clear that the enemy was internal, the Finnish Social Democrats.

My research is local; it describes circumstances and events in Tampere, by using information provided by local newspapers *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* I explore and reconstruct the image these two newspapers projected of Russians. I do not seek to explore the circumstances in other areas in Finland, also, my task is not to explore how other newspapers presented Russians. However, it must be recognized that there are even great differences from areas and newspapers to another.

6.4 Propaganda

Naturally it is impossible say whether the propagandistic methods in *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* were intentional or not; people who could have given an answer to that—journalists of the two newspapers, editors-in-chief—are dead. Official plans of propaganda campaign against Russians, describing which propaganda techniques to use have not, at least to the best of my knowledge, surfaced from the archives. Hence the discussion whether propaganda in the case example of *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* during 1917 was intentional or not can be conducted only in theoretical level by making modest assumption based on comparison between the case example and a known official propaganda campaign.

Propaganda campaigns e.g. in the “Ruskiehatred” campaign⁷⁹ initiated by the Academic Carelia Society⁸⁰ carry a negative tone, which does not change. The image of an enemy is clear and strong, the propaganda techniques used are the ones, which appeal on the target audiences’ emotions, not on the common sense or reasoning. Techniques based on arousing fear or hatred work well towards such aim, particularly when there is no other information source available. The enemy and the attitude towards it remains clear throughout the campaign. The campaign also has an aim or a goal, which it tries to achieve, a message it wants to communicate to its target audience

These aspects seem to be absent in *Aamulehti* or *Kansan Lehti* in relation to Russians. *Aamulehti* maintains neutrality towards Russians until the end of second study period—until the end of September to be precise. In *Kansan Lehti* the opinion towards Russians begins as positive but turns negative in June and stays in that way until the end of second study period—September to be accurate—however, in the beginning of

⁷⁹ the description and few quotes from the campaign material can be found from the page 30 of this thesis

⁸⁰ Akateeminen Karjala Seura in Finnish

the third study period the tone of *Kansan Lehti* turns neutral. In comparison to propaganda campaign that is known to be official, that of Academic Carelia Society (AKS), such changes in tone do not appear: the tone of the campaign begins as negative and ends as negative.

Another issue, which suggests against organized and intentional propaganda campaign is the fact that the image of an enemy is not strong enough and relies on vices, which are familiar to the society i.e can be reasoned. In *Aamulehti* the relation in which Russians are most commonly presented is mischief, limitations and violations on sovereignty hence the image seems to be that Russians are mischievous, thieves, oppressors and do not respect the law. In *Kansan Lehti* the most common association in which Russians appear is much the same except the emphasis is placed on the mischief. In the campaign by AKS the image of the enemy is: dirty, murderous, insane, alcoholic, lacking ethics and morals, eating children and so on. In this campaign the qualities are all of the type, which dehumanize and demonize the enemy by suggesting that somebody who has such qualities is not a human but a demon.

The third problem is that in *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* the enemy changes. In *Aamulehti* first the enemy is the oppressive Russian Government, then the mischievous Russian troops in Finland, then there is some negativity towards the Provisional Government, again in beginning of third study period the enemy is the mischievous Russian troops and then finally: the enemy is Finnish Social Democrats. *Kansan Lehti* has the same confusion, going through all the same “candidates” before arriving to the final enemy: the Finnish bourgeois. The campaign by AKS presented one clear unchangeable enemy and threat: the Russians.

At some extent, or until certain month, *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* both do have an aim; they want Russian troops to depart from Finland. Some of the reporting on incidents of violence and mischief committed by Russian troops goes to meet this particular end. However, then during the third sample period both of the newspapers cease “propagating” for the departure of Russian troops and instead begin propagating against each other, which indeed is the best description for the writings at the end of third sample period. When compared to the aim of the Ruskiehatred campaign of Academic Carelia Society: to make one nation to hate the other so strongly that those feelings would carry on to the generations to come—aim which was achieved—the aims of *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* look rather petty.

When compared to recognized propaganda campaign, it seems that the opinion change resulting from propagandistic writings in *Aamulehti* and *Kansan Lehti* was not a planned effort. The fact that the Russian related content is flaky—themes, associations and connotations changing—also speak against consistent and well planned campaign. However, in both of the newspapers there are clearly identifiable propaganda techniques⁸¹: hero stories in relation to March and November Revolutions, using fear when writing about mischievous behaviour of Russians, dehumanizing the Russian troops when writing about how they attack helpless elderly and innocent youth, creating “us” and “them”- setting when describing that they are brought up differently hence don’t understand us. The examples are numerous and continue.

⁸¹ These techniques are all elaborated on in the page 37 of this thesis

If there was no official propaganda campaign, why do the propagandistic techniques when writing about Russians exist? Is it possible that propaganda can also be unintentional activity, which can appear in all forms of communications? Did journalists unintentionally transferred their own attitudes to the paper; the way they perceived Russians or thought about Russia during 1917 reflected in their writing because they wanted to “persuade” their readership to share his/ her opinion. The appearance of propaganda in everyday communication asks more questions than can be answered. Perhaps the only argumentation, which can be made to support the above mentioned theory is the fact that propaganda existed before propaganda techniques had been identified. All propaganda techniques have been formed by going through multitude of text, from where difference styles that we now know as “bandwagon”, “dehumanizing” have been identified. Keeping this in mind, perhaps the thought that propaganda can be part of normal human communication process, does not get automatically dismissed.

6.5 Newspapers as research material

First version of history is written by journalists and printed in the pages of newspapers because that is what journalism does: records contemporary events as they happen. The procession of time turns these reports of contemporary events into historiography; a thought which perhaps did not cross journalists’ mind in 1917 or even in 2006. The murder investigation of the death of Grigori Rasputin or the whereabouts of the Romanov family after the revolution were news of contemporary events, but in 2006 those articles are versions of written history. By no means are they an objective version, for every person adds their own convictions and perceptions to the text. It is the task of historians to compare all the written information available of a certain event and construct as unbiased and objective version as possible. There are claims that newspapers cannot be considered as sources of official history, because of their personal bias and possible misperceptions and representations of truth but I, with this thesis, would like to argue against that view. Books, research reports, biographies, accounts of historical events, official documents and alike, all that the official history is constructed of, are written by somebody; by a person or people, who equally have convictions and perceptions of the topic they were writing of. Are the descriptions of events in 1917, written by historians, really more accurate and objective than description of those events by contemporary journalists of 1917? Are we conditioned to believe that they are because the content of books, written by historians, is taught in schools and the content of newspaper articles written by journalists is not?

Another argument against newspapers as sources of historical information is that each newspaper, particularly in 1900s, presents the reality as perceived e.g. by the editor-in-chief, a financier or gatekeepers such as or censorship committees. However, this is true also when it comes to history books; they also present a certain reality. Concerning Finnish Civil War alone there are many approaches— e.g. the Civil War, the liberation/ freedom war, class struggle approach—which look at the same event from completely

different point of view, producing research literature written from perspective that the particular approach perceives as reality of the event.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY AND LITERATURE

Bernays, Edward L. *Propaganda*. New York: Liveright, 1928.

Doob, Leonard W. *Public Opinion and Propaganda*. Connecticut: Archon Books, 1966.

Efron, Edith. *The News Twisters*. Los Angeles: Nash Publishing Co., 1971.

Haapala, Pertti. *Kun yhteiskunta hajosi, Suomi 1914- 1920*. Helsinki: Painatuskeskus, 1995.

Immonen, Kari. *Ryssästä saa puhua....Neuvostoliitto Suomalaisessa julkisuudessa ja kirjat julkisuuden muotona 1918-1939*. Helsinki: Otava, 1987.

Katz, Daniel (edit.). *Public opinion and Propaganda. Book of readings*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1954.

Klinge, Matti *Vihan veljistä valtiotalismiin*. Porvoo: WSOY, 1972.

Lasswell, Harold D. *Propaganda technique in the World War*. Michigan: M.I.T Press, 1927.

Lasswell Harold D. *Propaganda Technique in the World War. 2nd edition* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., LTD., 1927.

Lasswell, Harold. D., Daniel Lerner and Hans Speier. (edit.). 1980. "Propaganda and Communication in World History. Vol II" East-West Center Book, Hawaii.

Lehtovuori, Seppo. *Kansanlehdet ja Ilkan taistelukuvaukset ja propagandakirjoitukset Pohjoishämeen taisteluista 2.2- 20.3 1918*. Tampere: Tampereen Yliopisto, 1969

Luostarinen, Heikki. *Perivihollinen*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 1986.

Manninen, Turo. *Vapaustaistelu, kansalaissota ja kapina. Taistelun luonne valkoisten sotapropagandassa vuonna 1918*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän Yliopisto, 1982.

Nygård, Toivo, Salokangas, Raimo. *Suomen Lehdistön Historia 2- Sanomalehdistö Suurlakosta Talvisotaan*. Kuopio: Kustannuskiila Oy., 1987.

Paavolainen, Jaakko. *Poliittiset väkivaltaisuuudet Suomessa 1918, 2 Valkoinen terrori*. Helsinki: Tammi, 1967.

Paavolainen, Jaakko. *Poliittiset väkivaltaisuuudet Suomessa 1918, 1 Punainen terrori*. Helsinki: Tammi, 1966.

Soikkanen, Hannu. *Kansalaissota dokumentteina: Valkoista ja punaista sanankäyttöä*. Helsinki: Tammi, 1967.

Turunen, Mirja. *Veripellot- Sisällisodan surmatyöt Pohjois- kymenlaaksossa 1918*. Jyväskylä: Atena kustannus Oy., 2005.

Westerlund, Lars (toim.). *Venäläissurmat Suomessa 1914- 1922*. Helsinki: Valtioneuvoston Kanslia, 2004.

Welch/ Gomer. *Public Opinion. Its formation, measurement and impact*. California: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1975.

Ylikangas, Heikki. *Tie Tampereelle*. Porvoo Helsinki Juva: WSOY, 1993.

Propaganda techniques. Last update 2 July 2006. Cited 26 November 2006. Can be found at www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Propaganda_techniques

War, propaganda and the media. Last update. 31 March. Cited 26 November 2006 Can be found at www.globalissues.org/HumanRights/Media/Military.asp

Suomi 80, Itsenäistymisen vuodet 1917- 1918. Cited 26 November 2006. Can be found at www.uta.fi/suomi80/v18v1.htm

Suomen sisällissota. Cited 26 November 2006. Can be found at http://fi.wikipedia.org/wiki/Suomen_sis%C3%A4llissota

Holocaust. Cited 26 November 2006 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holocaust#Infants>

Telegraph. UK “Saddam’s parades of dead babies are exposed as cynical charades”. 25 May 2003. Cited 26 November 2006. Can be found at <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=%2Fnews%2F2003%2F05%2F25%2Fwirq25.xml>

FoxNews. com “Possible Saddam- Al Qaeda link seen in U.N oil-for-food programme” 20 September 2004. Cited 26 November 2006. Can be found at <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,132682,00.html>