

# **The Norm Against Anti-Personnel Landmines**

---

A Case Study of Finland's Accession to the Ottawa Convention

By Elia J.M. Elenius  
S1031228  
elia.elenius@suomi24.fi

11.6.2012

First Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Madeleine O. Hosli  
Second Supervisor: Dr. Michael F. Meffert

This study analyzes debates conducted at the Finnish parliament between the years 2001 and 2011 to find out key causal mechanisms that impacted Finland's decision to join the Ottawa Convention banning anti-personnel landmines in 2012. The study found empirical support for both constitutive and constraining effects which were necessary but not alone sufficient conditions for the decision. Without the left wing parties being receptive to moral persuasion there would not have been enough political will to push the issue forward and without peer pressure stemming from other countries and the ability of international institutions to lock in domestic decisions it is highly unlikely that the right wing parties would have yielded to accept the treaty. In the absence of the latter two, the right wing parties would not have been able to justify the accession decision.

Introduction	3
1. Theoretical Framework	6
2. Development of the International Norm Against Anti-personnel Landmines	10
2.1. Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons	11
2.2. Towards Ottawa	13
3. Methodology	16
3.1. Process Tracing and Primary Sources	16
3.2. Case Selection	17
3.3. Variables, Concepts and Indicators	17
3.4. Hypotheses	19
4. Case Study of Finland	20
4.1. The Finnish Security and Defence Policy 2001	20
4.1.1. General Debate 2001	20
4.1.2. Defence Committee Memorandum	25
4.2. The Finnish Security and Defence Policy 2004	26
4.2.1. General Debate 2004	26
4.2.2. Defence Committee Memorandum	31
4.3. The Finnish Security and Defence Policy 2009	33
4.4. Decision and Accession of 2011	34
4.4.1. Government Proposal HE 15/2011	35
4.4.2. General Debate 2011	35
4.4.3. Foreign Affairs Committee Memorandum	39
4.4.4. The Final Vote	41
4.5. Discussion of Results	41
Conclusion	45
Bibliography	48
Appendix:	51
Argument Frequency Data 2001	51
Argument Frequency Data 2004	52
Argument Frequency Data 2011	53

## Introduction

At a conference organized 6 September 2007 by the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, the Defence Minister of Finland Jyri Häkämies made the following remark: “given our geographical location, the three main security challenges for Finland today are Russia, Russia and Russia.”<sup>1</sup> Taking the perception of security challenges and geographical proximity with Russia into consideration this study asks the following research question: Why did Finland abandon cheap and effective antipersonnel landmines and joined the Ottawa Convention in 2012? This puzzle is incomprehensible from a realist paradigm of international relations. For all realist politics is organized in groups, individuals and groups act egoistically and the main motor is self-interest. The world is an anarchic self-help system and power politics and security are the main motives for state behavior.<sup>2</sup> While classical realists see the main aim of states to be power, neorealists see it to be security.<sup>3</sup> Some states, such as Canada, Belgium and Germany, did not use AP landmines during the time the Ottawa treaty came to the international political agenda, thus those states did not have any problems in signing the treaty.<sup>4</sup> For Finland however, landmines have always been an integral part of the defence doctrine.

Realists would understand if the incentive to abandon landmines would stem from power politics. For example the balance of threat or defensive realist’s such as Walt, claim that states aim to balance in opposition to the principal source of danger. States can also bandwagon with the principal source of danger, like Finland did during the Cold War, thus the term “Finlandization”. Bandwagoning can happen for two reasons, either for defensive purposes, as a form of appeasement, or for offensive purposes, to share the spoils of victory. An important variable for Walt is proximity to the principal source of danger.<sup>5</sup> Finland is situated next to Russia, but there are no pressures stemming from the Big Bear to ban landmines, after all Russia is one of the countries that has not joined the Ottawa Convention. A realist paradigm cannot give a satisfying explanation for why Finland joined the Ottawa treaty

---

<sup>1</sup> Jyri Häkämies (2007). Speech by Minister of defence Jyri Häkämies at CSIS in Washington. WWW: [http://www.defmin.fi/index.phtml?663\\_m=3335&l=en&s=270](http://www.defmin.fi/index.phtml?663_m=3335&l=en&s=270) (Last accessed 24 May 2012)

<sup>2</sup> Wohlforth, W.C. (1993). *The Elusive Balance: Power and Perception During Cold War*. / Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 133.

<sup>3</sup> Waltz, K.N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. / New York: Randon House.

<sup>4</sup> Price, R. (1998). Reversing Gun Sights: Transnational Civil Society Targets Land Mines – *International Organization*, 52(3), 614.

<sup>5</sup> Walt, S.M. (2009). Alliances in a Unipolar World – *World Politics*, 61(1), 86-120.

because of two reasons. First, because of the geographic proximity, and the perception of security challenges, the military utility of landmines is clear. Second, there is no talk that Finland would have done the landmine decision as an appeasement for Russia. Realism downplays the role of institutions, and labels them as an arena of low politics. In high politics, for example in security and defense, institutions are not relevant, as example Mearheimer argues.<sup>6</sup> Most institutionalists share the premise of states being rationally calculating actors and institutions are rules that constrain behavior. Neoliberal institutionalism sees that autonomous and self-interested actors create problems, and institutions are needed to overcome the collective action problem. For example when states play a prisoner's dilemma type of games over and over again, institutions create institutional memory which helps to monitor compliance.<sup>7</sup> Neo-liberalism is better at understanding the accession of Finland, but still fall short giving a convincing explanation because of its reliance on the distribution of power and material resources. Neo-liberal institutionalism does not account why interests evolved in the first place.

This study examines the accession of Finland from a sociological, or "constructivist", perspective. Sociological approach does not refute rationality, but treats institutions as intervening variables between actor preferences and policy outcomes. Institutions are not only formal rules stipulated in the treaties of international organizations that constrain behavior, but also norms and behavioral conventions matter.<sup>8</sup> It thus refutes the solely material and power based approaches. The main difference between material, or utility, based approaches and sociological approach is ontological. While utility based approaches treat interests as exogenously given, such as maximization of security or economic wellbeing, sociological approach treats interests as endogenous: interests are shaped through interaction and are constantly evolving. Institutions can thus change actor interests and even identity and transform the logic of action from utility calculation to logic of appropriateness that stem from identity. In the case of antipersonnel landmines, the use of landmines, despite their military utility and economic efficiency, was no longer seen as an appropriate behavior for a state which identifies itself as a developed western state and member of the European Union.

---

<sup>6</sup> Mearsheimer, J.J. (1994). The False promise of international Institutions – *International Security*, 15, 5-56.

<sup>7</sup> See example Stein, A.A. (1985). Coordination and Collaboration: Regimes in an Anarchic World – *International Organizations*, 36, 299-324.; and Snidal, D. (1985). Coordination versus Prisoners Dilemma: Implications for International Cooperation Regimes – *American Political Science Review*, 79, 923-42.

<sup>8</sup> Bulmer, S. (1993). The Governance of the European Union: A New Institutional Approach. – *Journal of Public Policy*, 12(4), 355.

This study is interested in why Finland joined the Ottawa Convention. The constructivist norms literature, and also literature handling specifically landmines, emphasizes two mechanisms. First is moral persuasion. Some actors might be morally persuaded to change their perception of a certain issue, such as mines, when they face new information. This can be also understood in terms of social learning. This mechanism is constitutive. In the case of landmines, the international civil society was able to set the issue on the international political agenda, by framing landmines from a military and security issue to humanitarian problem. This was possible because of the political opportunity structure provided by international humanitarian law, and especially the long standing principles of *jus in bello*, which requires civilian populations to be protected during conflict and that gains of a military action needs to be proportional by not causing unnecessary harm or suffering. The second is a more constraining mechanism. This mechanism is based on emulation and peer pressures that stem from identity. Actor may not have been morally persuaded, or internalized a new norm, but because of a given identity, such as a developed western state, it does not see that certain behavior is appropriate.

This study uses process tracing as its primary method to find out which of these two mechanisms played a role in the Finnish decision to join the Ottawa Convention. The issue is contemporary, since the landmine decision was made in November 2011. This study will tackle the issue by looking at justification made in the general debates conducted at the parliament during a ten year time span, in connection to the adoption of Finnish Security and Defence Policies (FSDP) 2001, 2004 and 2009 and the final government proposal of 2011. In addition, this study looks at justification presented for and against landmines in the FSDP's and in relevant Committee Memorandums. If the parliament votes on the issues, the relevant voting results are also presented.

By looking at the justification one can start to piece together the primary motor in Finland's landmine decision. In a parliamentary setting, actors, individual MPs and party groups, need to justify their decisions. Official justifications are not enough, since it is clear that the Ottawa Convention is already a well established institution with clearly stipulated principles. From the debates the researcher can extract the causal claims actors see as the reason for joining, but also not joining. Justifications are divided into two main categories, for and against, with two subcategories in each. In the "against" category there are security and economic justifications, the "for" category contains constitutive and constraining mechanisms.

This study has four parts. The first section goes through the constructivist norm theory and largely follows the work of Martha Finnemore. The second part summarizes the development process of the specific norm against antipersonnel landmines. The third part handles the methodology, case selection, concepts, variables, and their operationalization. The fourth part goes through the case of Finland. Each subsection of the case study goes through first the general debate conducted at the parliament and lists the argument frequency. Next the relevant committee memorandums are handled, followed by possible voting results. The last subsection, "Accession and Decision," goes first through the Government proposal, the general debate, followed by a Committee Statement and voting results. After a narrative of the process is drawn, the last subsection of part four discusses the findings.

The analysis found empirical support for constitutive and constraining mechanisms. Both, however, were necessary but not alone sufficient conditions for the decision. Without the left wing parties being receptive to moral persuasion and a new type of framing in the case of landmines, there would not have been enough political will to push the issue forward in the parliamentary agenda; and without peer pressure stemming from other countries and the ability of international institutions to lock in domestic decision, it is unlikely that the right wing parties would have ever yielded to favor the accession.

## **1. Theoretical framework**

There is a vast constructivist literature that challenges the premises of material based approaches. Price argues that "neo-liberalism is ill-suited to account for developments such as the unilateral renunciation of mines by dozens of states even before a widely accepted international treaty seemed likely."<sup>9</sup> Neoliberalism, like realism, assumes interests as exogenous and "privileges the state as the key site of agency, whereas the case at hand [AP landmines] the key impetus for normative change lies in processes engendered by transnational and nonstate sources of agency that generate interests."<sup>10</sup>

The main difference between the material and power based approaches and constructivism is ontological. Both neorealism and neoliberalism assume that actors drive to maximize their utility. Interests are exogenously given, such as the aim to maximize power, security or economic wellbeing. They do not address why such interest were evolved in the first place.

---

<sup>9</sup> Price 1998, 614.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

This also has some methodological implications which are further elaborated in the methodology section.

Norm is usually defined as a “standard of appropriate behavior for actors with a given identity”<sup>11</sup> There are several categories of norms, most common being constitutive and regulative.<sup>12</sup> Constitutive norms “create new actors, interests, or categories of action.”<sup>13</sup> Sovereignty is such a constitutive norm that has created a bundle of others norms, such as the regulative, action constraining norm of non intervention. Third, often neglected, category is prescriptive norm, it is a norm that demands action.<sup>14</sup> The constitutive norm category and the constitutive mechanism used to label a variable category in this study should not be mixed.

Norms are not material, but still very real. Norms can be recognized not only by conforming but also by nonconforming behavior. For instance when a state is forced to justify its use of landmines, it is evidence that such a norm against landmines does exist. If it would not exist, state would not need to justify its behavior.

How norms matter differs through the life cycle of the norm.<sup>15</sup> The life cycle can be divided into three stages: norm emergence, cascade and internalization. The tipping point between stage one and stage two refers to “a critical mass of relevant state actors” who accept the norm.<sup>16</sup>

Norm Emergence	Norm Cascade	Norm Internalization
Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3
Tipping Point		

Table 1: Norm life cycle<sup>17</sup>

During the emergence stage norms entrepreneurs have a crucial role. A well known example is the case of the Swiss Henry Dunant, who is credited to be behind the International

---

<sup>11</sup> Finnemore, M., Sikkink, K. (1998). International Norms Dynamics and Political Change – *International Organization*, 52(4), 887-917.  
<sup>12</sup> See example Searle, J. (1995). *The Construction of Social Reality*. / New York: The Free Press.  
<sup>13</sup> Finnemore et al 1998, 891.  
<sup>14</sup> Ibid, 891.  
<sup>15</sup> Ibid, 895.  
<sup>16</sup> Ibid.  
<sup>17</sup> Ibid, 896.

Committee of the Red Cross. In the case of the landmines, the name of Judy Williams is often raised to the front. She who received, together with the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, a Nobel Peace Prize for her efforts in 1997.<sup>18</sup> Norm entrepreneurs create new issues by framing them in a new way. Example landmines were framed as a humanitarian issue; instead a matter of traditional security and defense approach.<sup>19</sup> An important factor enabling the framing is the organizational platform.<sup>20</sup> If the norm does not originate from a state or a state led institution, for example UN or WTO, the institutional platform is often a NGO organized around a specific issue such as human rights or environment, for example Greenpeace and Amnesty International. These organizations can form dense international networks, or “transnational advocacy networks”, with other related NGOs, think tanks and experts that rally around the same issue. An example of such a network is also the International Campaign to Ban Landmines.

When the norm has emerged to the international agenda and norm entrepreneurs have, with the help of some organizational platform such as NGO network, persuaded and pressured critical mass of states to support the norm, a tipping point occurs.<sup>21</sup> A tipping point is cited not to occur before minimum of one-third of all states have adopted the norm.<sup>22</sup> In the landmines case, by May 1997 states that supported the Ottawa treaty reached sixty. By December of the same year, 124 countries had ratified the treaty.

The mechanism in the second stage is different than in the first. While in the first stage the dominant mechanism was reframing the issue by norm entrepreneurs, now the dominant method is socialization through peer pressure. Socialization is defined as the “induction of new members... into the ways of behavior that are preferred in the society”.<sup>23</sup> Finnemore argue that the socialization mechanisms “redefine appropriate behavior for the identity called “state” or some relevant subset of states such as “liberal” state or a European state.”<sup>24</sup>

There are two main mechanisms of how norms socialize new actors. For example Price argues that from the vast amount of mechanisms “the role of moral persuasion” and “the

---

<sup>18</sup> Price 1998, 618.

<sup>19</sup> Ruthenford, K.R. (2000). The Evolving Arms Control Agenda: Implications of the Role of NGOs in Banning Antipersonnel Landmines – *World Politics*, 53(1), 110.

<sup>20</sup> Finnemore et al 1998, 899.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid, 901.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> Barnes, J., Carter, M., Skidmore, M. (1980). *The World of Politics*. / New York: St. Martin’s Press, 35.

<sup>24</sup> Finnemore et al 1998, 902.



social pressure arising from identity politics and emulation are particularly crucial”.<sup>25</sup> Also Jeffrey Checkel distinguishes two mechanisms. First follows the idea of moral persuasion, Checkel labels this constitutive: “Norms are internalized and constitute a set of shared intersubjective understanding that make behavioral claims”.<sup>26</sup> The second is constraining in which the “non-state actors and policy networks are united in their support for a particular norm; they mobilize and coerce decision makers, who then instrumentally adopt” the norm.<sup>27</sup> The first is the dominant mechanism in the first stage of the norm life cycle, and can also be understood as framing; second can be understood as peer pressure among states. Finnemore gives three main motives for this pressure: legitimation, conformity and esteem.

Legitimacy is a concept that is relational. In a democracy it stems from the people. A state’s legitimacy in international society comes from other states. States can care about their international legitimacy also because it contributes to the domestic legitimacy of the state in the eyes of its citizens.<sup>28</sup> Membership in an institution works as a stamp that state acquires when it fulfills the requirement prescribed by the norm. Institutions restrain and “affect both of locking in domestic changes and of making credible a domestic commitment to a particular policy path.”<sup>29</sup> Institutions also give legitimacy to certain policy choice by giving political cover.<sup>30</sup> Esteem refers to the image of the state; state leaders want others to “to think well on themselves”.<sup>31</sup> Finland has been an advocate of humanitarian assistance for a long time and this can be argued to be the image that Finland wants to preserve. Conformity refers to peers. Norm conformity is a social proof that a state belongs to a certain group.<sup>32</sup> Quoting Axelrod “By conforming to the actions of those around us, we fulfill a psychological need to be part of a group.”<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Price 1998, 616.

<sup>26</sup> Checkel, J. (1997). International Norms and Domestic Politics: Bridging the Rationalist Constructivist Divide – *European Journal of International Relations*, 3, 477.

<sup>27</sup> Checkel 1997, 476.

<sup>28</sup> Finnemore et al 1998, 903.

<sup>29</sup> Stein, A.A. (2006). Neoliberal Institutionalism. / In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Snidal, D., Reus-Smit, C. (eds). Oxford: Oxford University press, 215. See also Grigorescu, A. (2003). International Organizations and Government Transparency: Linking the International and Domestic Realms. – *International Studies Quarterly*, 47, 643-67.

<sup>30</sup> Franck, T.M. (1988). Legitimacy in International System – *American Journal of International Law*, 82, 705-59.; and Hurd, I. (1999). Legitimacy and Authority in International Politics – *International Organization*, 53, 379-408.

<sup>31</sup> Finnemore et al 1998, 903.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> Axelrod, R. (1986). An Evolutionary Approach to Norms – *The American Political Science Review*, 80(4), 1105.

The theoretical approach of this study can be labeled as sociological institutionalism. Institutions can be understood as intervening variables between actor preferences and policy outcomes. However both actor preferences and institutions are in constant interaction with each other. This is the main criticism of constructivist based approaches towards neoliberalism and neorealism, which treats interests as exogenous. Interests are in constant change, and only by looking at the interests over time one can start to piece together more accurate picture of the social reality and understand change. This approach does not refute rationality. States and other actors, such as political parties, can act rationally, but they do it from their respected view of what is the interest. Interest are however conditional to the prevailing historical and cultural context. If an actor strives to maximize its utility for example, it is also behavior that the actor is socialized in. Methodologically interests can be pieced together by looking at the justification of actors. These can be found from statements of heads of states, declarations of international organizations such as United Nations, or debates conducted at international meetings, or as in this study, at the national parliaments.

## **2. Development of the International Norm against Anti-personnel Landmines**

Anti-personnel landmines (APL) are “designed to be exploded by the presence, proximity or contact of a person and will incapacitate, injure or kill one or more persons.”<sup>34</sup> Landmines left in the terrain cannot distinguish civilians from soldiers and are active for decades if not taken out. APLs are very cheap and cost efficient. Despite the international efforts mines still cause problem in the developing world. In 2010 there were 4191 new casualties in an affected area of 72 states.<sup>35</sup> This was despite 157 (the number of countries in 2012 is 159) countries having joined the Ottawa Treaty, comprising of approximately 80 percent of the states in the world.<sup>36</sup> There are still 12 countries that produce landmines as of 2011: China, Cuba, India, Iran, Myanmar, North Korea, Pakistan, Russia, Singapore, South Korea, United States and Vietnam.<sup>37</sup>

The effort to ban APLs is not a new phenomenon but an almost universal ban was not likely until very recently in the mid 1990s. This section provides an overview of the background of the ban from Geneva till Ottawa.

---

<sup>34</sup> Ottawa Convention, Article II. WWW: [www.icbl.org/treaty/text/english](http://www.icbl.org/treaty/text/english) (Last Accessed 3 May 2012)

<sup>35</sup> Landmine Monitor Report 2011 / International Campaign to Ban Landmines WWW: [www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2011/es/Major\\_findings.html](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2011/es/Major_findings.html) (Last Accessed 3 May 2012)

<sup>36</sup> Landmine Monitor Report 2011

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

## 2.1. *Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons*

The ban on landmines is based on international humanitarian law,<sup>38</sup> which in this case can be traced back to the long established literature of just war tradition. Just war refers to literature that handles moral aspects of warfare and gives criteria for “judging whether a war is just and whether it is fought by just means.”<sup>39</sup> There are two branches in just war tradition. The first category handles jus ad bellum, before the war, the second jus in bello, during the war. The latter category is an important one for the landmines case. Important criteria in jus in bello are discrimination: “[f]orce must never be applied in such a way as to make noncombatants and innocent person the intentional objects of attack. The only appropriate targets in war are combatants”, and proportionality: “[t]he quantity of force employed or threatened must always be morally proportionate to the end being sought in war”.<sup>40</sup> The just war tradition is old, but the landmines case can be viewed to have started some time after the World War II. In 1956 the International Committee of the Red Cross made draft rules, to improve the protection of civilian population.<sup>41</sup> This was the first time landmines were specifically stipulated as a problem weapon because of their indiscriminate nature.<sup>42</sup>

It was not however until the 1974 that a Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Law Applicable in armed Conflicts was held in Geneva. In 1977 two protocols were opened for signature.<sup>43</sup> From the vantage point of landmines, these protocols reinforced two main principles of humanitarian law. First, conflicting parties have to separate civilians from soldiers.<sup>44</sup> Second, the means of violence has legal limits.<sup>45</sup> This is argued to be the base for the “political opportunity structure” which enables addressing landmines.<sup>46</sup> During the conference, an expert group of nineteen countries, with the help of ICRC, convened three times to talk which conventional weapons are indiscriminate in nature. However, because of these certain weapon categories could lead to controversy if specified,

---

<sup>38</sup> Cottrell, M.P. (2009). Legitimacy and Institutional Replacement: The Convention of Certain Conventional Weapons and the Emergence of the Mine Ban Treaty – *International Organization*, 63, 227.

<sup>39</sup> Fixdal, M, Smith, D. (1998). Humanitarian intervention and Just War – *Mershon International Studies Review*, 42(2), 285.

<sup>40</sup> Phillips, R.L. (1984) *War and Justice*. / Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 12-13.

<sup>41</sup> Draft Rules for the Limitation of the Dangers incurred by the Civilian Population in Time of War. ICRC, 1956. WWW: [www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/full/420?OpenDocument](http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/full/420?OpenDocument) (Last Accessed 3 May 2012)

<sup>42</sup> Cotrell 2009, 227.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid, 228

<sup>44</sup> Article 51 of Protocol I (1977)

<sup>45</sup> Article 35 of Protocol I (1977)

<sup>46</sup> Cotrell 2009, 228.

the conference moved the talks to the UN.<sup>47</sup> The UN approved this move in 1977 and stated that “Convinced that the suffering of civilian populations and combatants could be significantly reduced if general agreement can be attained on the prohibition or restriction for humanitarian reasons of the use of specific conventional weapons, including any which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects...”<sup>48</sup> The resolution further acknowledged the work of the ICRC by “Recalling that the issue of prohibitions of the use of specific conventional weapons has been the subject of substantive discussion for a number of years, notably at the sessions of the Conference of Government Experts on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons held, under the auspices of the International Committee of the Red Cross.”<sup>49</sup> Finally a UN conference gathered in Geneva in 1979 and 1980 and concluded the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects.<sup>50</sup>

The ban on landmines however is in contradiction with the other criterion, proportionality, and consequently the argument that the humanitarian consequences do not exceed the military utility, has been present ever since. Landmines have a military utility, as it is evident from the statements made by experts at the Diplomatic Conferences: “use of antipersonnel mines is a generally accepted means of hampering enemy advance.”<sup>51</sup> Another expert report state that APLs are “most cost-efficient system” that the military can use.<sup>52</sup>

Compromise was arrived in the negotiations and landmines were decided to be regulated. Protocol II defined landmines and other related traps. It prohibited the use of landmines against civilian populations in any circumstances and defined the area where landmines could be used only to an area “which contains military objectives” and where their place could be “accurately recorded” or that the devices would have a “neutralizing mechanism”.<sup>53</sup> The CCW came available for signatures in 1980 and came into force in 1983.

The CCW had several problems. Cotrell example lists that it did not regulate production, sale or possession of landmines. There were no enforcement or verification mechanisms such as

---

<sup>47</sup> Maresca, L., Maslen, S. (2000). *The Banning of Anti-Personnel Landmines: The Legal Contribution of the International Committee of the Red Cross, 1955-1999.* / Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

<sup>48</sup> United Nations General Assembly Resolution 32/152 (1977)

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> Maresca et al 2000, 90.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid, 89.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid, 317.

<sup>53</sup> CCW Protocol II, Article V

review conferences on compliance. In addition the treaty text was vague. Cotrell gives an example of the “military objective”: states could decide themselves if the use of landmines have military objective or not. This gave plenty of room for reinterpretation.<sup>54</sup>

In sum, when the issue was adopted by the UN, it became a conventional arms control negotiations where state parties negotiated with each other. States were the primary actors, and were reluctant to bind themselves to strict international agreements that would constrain their actions in the field of security. However, this was about to change.

## 2.2. *Towards Ottawa*

The signing of the Ottawa treaty in 1997 is unique in many ways. The process involved a wide variety of non-state actors in addition to governments. In this process, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines was instrumental. Ruthenford demonstrates how NGOs were able to mold the international political agenda through two stage process.<sup>55</sup> The first stage is called “cognitive agenda setting”; the second is called “norm agenda setting”.<sup>56</sup> The first brought landmines issue to the international attention, the second changed the conception of landmines. This process can be placed into the first “norm emergence” stage of the norm life cycle.

Ruthenford divides the two stages into three categories: framing, schema and priming. Framing refers to the building blocks that are used to describe certain issue.<sup>57</sup> These building blocks are used to “promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described.”<sup>58</sup> Schema connects to framing, but reduces transaction costs people face when handling complicated information. Schema simplifies frames to a level that can be managed. Priming activates the schemas. Table two summarizes these components in both levels.

---

<sup>54</sup> Cotrell 2009, 230.

<sup>55</sup> Ruthenford 2000.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid, 78.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid.

<sup>58</sup> Entman, R. (1989). *Democracy without Citizens: Media and the Decay of American Politics*. / New York: Oxford University Press. Quoted from Ruthenford 2000, 78.

Agenda-Setting Components	Level One: Cognitive Agenda Setting	Level Two: Norm Agenda Setting
Framing	Landmines as a new issue: getting people to think about landmines as a humanitarian issue	Horrible effects and disproportionate consequences
Schema	Outrageous landmine statistics	Leadership games to control the landmine issue
Priming	Landmine victim stories	Incoherent arguments among anti-ban states

*Table 2: NGO Agenda Setting and Landmines*<sup>59</sup>

The CCW discussed previously received only small international attention, and only fifty-two states had ratified it.<sup>60</sup> Because of the slow progress of the CCW, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines was established in 1991. The campaign was launched in October 1992 with a joint effort of six NGOs: Handicap International, France; Human Rights Watch, United States; Medico international, Germany; Mines Advisory group, United Kingdom; Physicians for Human Rights, United States and the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation.<sup>61</sup> First international landmine conference was held in May 1993. The key tactic of the ICBL, according to Ruthenford, was to reframe the landmines as a humanitarian issue.

NGOs started to promote grim statistics. In the mid 1990s landmines killed twenty-six thousand people yearly, of which roughly 80 percent were civilians.<sup>62</sup> Because landmines do not always kill, the number of amputees in problem countries is big. In 1991 for example, Cambodia had thirty thousand amputees among a population of 8.5 million plus an additional five thousand amputees in refugee camps at the border of Thailand.<sup>63</sup> As an indicator of the magnitude, NGOs compared landmines with other taboo weapons: more people had died or injured by landmines than by biological, chemical or nuclear weapons.<sup>64</sup>

The priming phase was conducted with landmine victim stories. This was done to wake up policymakers and give faces to the statistics. Since landmines do not always kill, but often

<sup>59</sup> Ruthenford 2000, 80.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid, 86.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.

<sup>62</sup> Strada, G. (1994). The Horror of Landmines – *Scientific America*, 42.

<sup>63</sup> Stover, E., Charles, D. (1991). The Killing Minefields in Cambodia – *New Scientist*, 19, 27.

<sup>64</sup> Ruthenford 2000, 88.

amputate, pictures of victims were used. This fact also pointed out the idea of the utility of landmines: by not killing but only injuring, landmines would tie up more enemy resources. Landmines were also reported to have impacts on marginalized people, for example through denying access to agricultural lands which were infected by mines. Example Rae McGrath of Mines Advisory group stated that “deaths and injuries caused to innocent people, and the denial of ground for agricultural and other civilian purposes as a result of the presence of mines made it inevitable that the aid community must face up the issue.”<sup>65</sup>

When NGOs had placed the landmine issue on the political agenda, it was time for persuasion: “The main thesis is that the more NGOs could convince governments of the horrible effects of landmine use, especially the disproportionate civilian casualties, the greater the possibility of changing state perception and use of landmines.”<sup>66</sup> NGOs framed landmines as illegal under the international humanitarian law. This opportunity structure was offered by the Geneva Conventions discussed earlier. Landmines were framed not to be proportional. Their humanitarian costs outweigh their military utility. Second, they were indiscriminate; they could not distinguish civilians from combatants. By breaking the frame from military to humanitarian, NGOs were able to give themselves legitimacy to disseminate information.

Schema in the second stage was concerned with leadership. According to Ruthenford, major cleavage was between major powers, especially the USA, and NGOs with their state allies.<sup>67</sup> USA continued to argue that landmines were strategically important, for example to maintain peace between the two Koreas. However the key individuals were for the landmine ban, such as Princess Diana and Nelson Mandela. With their help the issue maintained at the agenda. Important aspect was that also the media was more inclined to support the NGOs.<sup>68</sup> At the priming stage, the victim stories again played a role. States were not able to dispute the humanitarian arguments presented. Instead the opposing side continued to argue with political and military arguments.<sup>69</sup> This proved not to be successful in many countries.

The political process of the Ottawa Treaty started in October 1996 when fifty governments and twenty-four observers met in Ottawa. The actual treaty was drafted by Austria during

---

<sup>65</sup> McGrath, R. (1994). *Landmines: Legacy of Conflict: A Manual for Development Workers*. / Oxford: Oxfam. Quoted from Ruthenford 2000, 91.

<sup>66</sup> Ruthenford 2000, 92.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid, 97.

<sup>68</sup> Williams, J. Goose, D. (1998). The international Campaign to Ban Landmines. / In *To Walk Without Fear: The Global Movement to ban Landmines*. Cameron, A.M., Tomlin, B.W., Lawson, R.J. (ed). Toronto: Oxford University Press, 23.

<sup>69</sup> Ruthenford 2000, 105.

1997. In 3 December 1997, 122 countries had signed the treaty. This point can be claimed to be a tipping point and mark the change in the norm life cycle from norm emergence to norms cascade. According to the theory, the mechanism of how states adopt a norm changes after the tipping point has been reached. Now the important variable is no longer the moral persuasion. The international pressures play a much bigger role. Finland joined the treaty over twelve years after the treaty came into force in 1999. Why did Finland join the Ottawa Treaty? The link between the domestic and international level in studying institutions is important. Domestic institutions should support the institution.<sup>70</sup> Did Finland join because political parties were morally persuaded into the humanitarian framing, and they viewed the humanitarian costs to outweigh the military utility of antipersonnel landmines, or was it because of more constraining reasons that stem from identity politics?

### **3. Methodology**

#### *3.1. Process Tracing and Primary Sources*

Norms reach the domestic arena through what Jeffrey Checkel calls empowerment. The concept refers to the early stage of norm adoption, when the norm is not yet a well established behavioral rule.<sup>71</sup> Empowerment process involves elite decision makers. Norm changing discourse or behavior of policy makers is necessary, but not sufficient, condition for norm adoption: “elites are ‘gatekeepers’ who ultimately control the political agenda”<sup>72</sup>

This study is within case analysis that uses process tracing as its method. Because it is expected that a single variable does not give a full explanation (see section hypotheses), process tracing can be argued to be the appropriate method. In George and Bennett’s words: “Process tracing in single cases... has the capacity for disproving claims that a single variable is necessary or sufficient for outcome”.<sup>73</sup> Process tracing is also justified because of the ontological stance of this research. Interests are not exogenously given, but evolve in time through interaction, thus only by finding correlation between given theoretical interest and empirical reality in one instance of a time is not sufficient.

This study looks at justifications of the decision to join the Ottawa Treaty over the course of ten years, to find out what were the primary mechanisms that played a role in the decision

---

<sup>70</sup> Dai, X. (2007). *International Institutions and National policies*. / Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>71</sup> Checkel 1997, 476.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.

<sup>73</sup> George, A.L., Bennett, A. (2005). *Case studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. / Cambridge: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, 220.



making process. When an actor makes a decision, in this case a political party or an individual MP, the decision needs to be justified. An actor does this by referring to common values or held beliefs. These values and beliefs can change across time as discussed in the theory section, through the hypothesized constitutive and constraining mechanisms.

The primary sources used are general debates conducted at the parliament, committee memorandums of the Defence and Foreign Affairs Committees and the Finnish Security and Defence Policies 2001, 2004 and 2009. These documents can be accessed through the online archive of the Finnish parliament.<sup>74</sup> From these documents the justifications of different actors can be drawn.

### *3.2. Case Selection*

Finland made the final decision to join the Ottawa Treaty in November 2011, making the case contemporary. This study analyzes general debates in the Finnish Parliament. The debates that will be analyzed are those in connection to the adoption of the Finnish Security and Defence Policy (FSDP). It can be expected that the most viral debate about landmines will be found in those parliamentary sessions where FSDP is on the agenda. The debates will then be analyzed each time a new policy is adopted until the final decision is made. In total this means four debates over the course of 10 years: FSDP 2001, FSDP 2004, FSDP 2009 and the final decision of 2011. The 2001 debate is the first instance to be analyzed because it is the first time the goal of joining the Ottawa Treaty is officially stipulated in the FSDP. In addition the justifications present in the FSDPs and relevant committees are used. During this timeframe there are four different governments in place with varying cabinet compositions.

### *3.3. Variables, concepts and indicators*

There are two main ways, treated here as independent variables, through which norm diffusion is argued to happen according to the norms literature. The mechanisms can be summarized into two broad categories: constitutive and constraining. In the constitutive category, norm is adopted through moral persuasion. Actor has been morally persuaded and has adopted the new frame in the issue of landmines: landmines are seen as a humanitarian issue instead of military and security.

Norm adoption through constraining mechanism can happen without an actor being morally persuaded. Finnemore gives three mechanisms that can be placed under the rubric of

---

<sup>74</sup> Finnish Parliament website: WWW: <http://www.eduskunta.fi>

constraining: legitimacy, esteem and conformity, as discussed in the theory section. Institutions are important in giving legitimacy to a chosen policy path and “lock in” decisions. This mechanism is operationalized by looking at arguments that refer to consistency of policy and related past policy choices. Esteem refers to the image of the state: state leaders want others to perceive them in a positive light. Conformity is closely related and refers to peer groups. Both of these mechanisms are operationalized by looking at justifications that refer to number of states that have joined or that certain specific group of states – such as “Nordic Countries” or “EU countries” – or statements which refer to statements made by other heads of state.

Variable	Indicators
Constraining	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Arguments referring to consistency of policy</li> <li>2. Arguments referring to reputation/image of Finland</li> <li>3. Arguments referring to other states/peer group</li> <li>4. Party position towards the Ottawa Treaty changing from negative to positive followed by a change in rhetoric emphasizing reputational/consistency issues</li> </ol>
Constitutive	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Arguments presented on humanitarian/moral grounds such as civilian victims or harm caused by landmines in other countries</li> <li>2. Actor (party or individual MP) position towards the Ottawa Treaty changing from negative to positive as more information comes available, followed by a change in rhetoric emphasizing humanitarian/moral issues</li> </ol>

*Table 3: Variables and indicators*

The main difference between the two variables is that constraining is more instrumental. The joining decision is an instrument to obtain a certain other objective, for example the urge to belong to a group or being thought well of. Constitutive disregards these other objectives and is made because something is perceived as the right thing to do even when facing some costs, for example disarmament for its own sake or because of humanitarian reasons. Instrumental reasons do not refute the constructivist logic. States react to constraining mechanism because they have a certain identity. For example Finland, as a member of the EU and being a Nordic country, would react to arguments referring to other EU or Nordic countries differently than China would as an Asian and non EU state. Thus certain behavior that is not appropriate for Finland can be so to some other country which does not share the same identity.

Arguments will be divided by party lines to find which actors in a given time argued through which lines. To identify the party preferences, arguments against the treaty will also be investigated. Parties are further divided into opposition and government. If a party changes its stance because of moral persuasion, it should be seen in the rhetoric of the party. Similarly, if a party changes its stance because of constraining mechanisms, there should be indicators found in the rhetoric.

#### *3.4. Hypotheses:*

H1: Finland joined to the Ottawa Convention because of constraining reasons.

This option has empirical support if there is minimal to zero indication towards moral persuasion in the parliamentary debates.

H2: Finland joined to the Ottawa Convention because of constitutive reasons.

This option has empirical support if there is minimal to zero indication towards constraint in the parliamentary debates.

H3: Finland joined to the Ottawa Convention because of a combination of constitutive and constraining mechanisms.

H3a: Constitutive primary, constraining secondary

This option has empirical support if both arguments were present, but there was more indication towards moral persuasion in the parliamentary debates.

H3b: Constraining primary, constitutive secondary

This option has empirical support if both arguments were present, but there was more indication towards constraints in the parliamentary debates.

H1 and H2 are very unlikely. It is expected that both mechanisms play some causal role in the foreign policy decision. H3 is thus the most likely hypothesis. Both mechanisms can be expected to strengthen as time passes. Moral persuasion can strengthen through time when actors are debating against each other and the information is more in the open. On the other hand, also constraints can mount as time passes: Finland is seen as an outlier.

## 4. Case Study of Finland

The First three sections (2001 to 2009) go through the general debates in connection to the adoption of the Finnish Security and Defence policy, followed by a Committee Statements of either the Defence or Foreign Affairs Committee and finally the possible voting patterns. In 2011, the general debate is in connection to the government proposal on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Antipersonnel Mines and on their Destruction, followed by Committee statement and the final vote. At each general debate sections a table summarizing argument frequency is given. The table is divided into opposition and government and argument frequencies are given by party. The table also shows how many seats the party has in the parliament out of 200. The table also shows the group position made in a group statement, if such statements are given during the debate. Note that a single speech can contain number of argument categories, for example both security and economic argument. Also, one MP can speak several times during the debate and speak against their group position. The translations of each separate argument and the name of the speakers can be found at the appendix.

### 4.1. The Finnish Security and Defence Policy 2001

#### 4.1.1. General Debate 2001

The Finnish Security and Defence Policy 2001 (FSDP 2001) is the first Security and Defence Policy that states the goal to join the Ottawa Convention. The previous policy was made in 1997, before the Ottawa process had finished. In the FSDP 2001 it is stated that “Finland supports an effective and global ban on anti-personnel landmines and is participating in the EU’s work to promote the objectives and global implementation of the Ottawa Convention.”<sup>75</sup> As a justification of not joining the Ottawa Convention earlier, the FSDP 2001 states that “Finland has refrained from acceding to the Ottawa Convention because it does not at the moment have the economic or technical means to undertake to destroy the mines banned by the Convention and replace with other means”.<sup>76</sup> However, the FSDP 2001 does state a goal to join the treaty by 2006 and to search for alternative weapon systems: “The work is continuing with a view to Finland acceding to the Convention in 2006 and destroying anti-personnel landmines by the end of 2010...”<sup>77</sup>, however, the FSDP 2001 leaves a backdoor to

---

<sup>75</sup> Finnish Security and Defence Policy 2001: Report by the Government to Parliament on 13 June 2001, 37.

<sup>76</sup> FSDP 2001, 38.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

the accession by continuing “...without compromising Finland’s credible defence capability.”<sup>78</sup>

The coalition government in place during the debate was so called rainbow coalition, containing six parties from left to right. The coalition partners were the Social Democratic Party (SDP), the center-right National Coalition Party (NCP), the left wing Left Alliance (LA), the environmentalist Green Party (GP), the linguistic Swedish People’s Party (SPP) and the center right conservative Christian Democratic Party (CDP). The opposition consisted from the agrarian Center Party and the populist True Finns.

The debate started by a statement by the Defense Minister Jan-Erik Enestam (SPP). Defence Minister Enestam re-stated the stance proposed by the government in the FSDP 2001 by acknowledging that Finland supports efficient and global ban for landmines and that the goal is to join the treaty by the year 2006, leaving however a backdoor that this must be done without compromising credible defence.<sup>79</sup> Defence Minister also stated that the joining and replacement systems will be handled again in relation to the 2004 Security and Defence Policy. Minister Enestam restated this statement once later in the debate, however now emphasizing that the condition of not hampering Finnish defence is a big constraint and that replacement systems are very expensive.<sup>80</sup> Defence Minister was the only one from the SPP to bring forth the mine issue during the parliamentary discussion.

The debate continued with group statements by each parliamentary party group, followed by a general debate. The senior coalition member and Prime Ministerial Party, Social Democrats, stated that their group views that Finland should join the treaty as soon as possible and that this would be in line with Finland’s line of supporting disarmament and humanitarian cooperation. Many MPs from the SDP spoke for the treaty. MP Ilkka Taipale referred to his 40 year membership in the Committee of Hundred (one of the oldest peace organizations in Finland) and the 60’s generation’s effort to promote a cultural change towards non-violence. MP Taipale stated that FSDP has a realist approach towards landmines and argued that nowhere landmine ban had come voluntarily, but only after wide ranging civil campaign.<sup>81</sup> MP Piia Viitanen in turn wished for a world without guns, missiles or landmines altogether.<sup>82</sup> MP Kimmo Kiljunen invoked controversy among the MPs of the SDP by comparing

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

<sup>79</sup> PTK 87/2001, 3.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid, 28.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid, 60 – 62.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid, 86.

landmines to chemical weapons. In his view, it is not possible to argue that landmines are strategically important to Finland, because then other states could argue in the similar manner. MP Kiljunen made an example of Iraq under Saddam Hussein, who could have used the argument that chemical weapons are strategically important. International disarmament, according to MP Kiljunen, cannot start from an assumption that some weapons are strategically important to individual countries.<sup>83</sup> MP Antero Kekkonen from the SDP rebutted that it is unjust to compare the two because landmines were a defensive weapon.<sup>84</sup>

All SDPs justifications except MP Viitanen's, which has an idealist approach towards landmines and weapons altogether, can be treated as constraining. The group statement refers to the long standing line, meaning previous commitments in other related fields that constrain Finnish policy. MP Taipale directly refers to the civil campaign that pressures states. There were however members of the parliament in the SDP that were against the treaty. Four MPs from the SDP argued against the ban from several angles. MP Esa Lahtela argued against Ottawa Convention on the grounds that banning landmines would promote the interests of gun manufacturers and the treaty is only a trick of the military-industrial lobby. According to MP Lahtela, banning mines would promote arms race, and that for example the Green Party should come along and support the ban of automatic weapons.<sup>85</sup> MP Matti Vähänäkki gave more traditional security argument and referred to Finland's geography with forests and lakes but also mentioned that Finland has a tradition to evacuate civilians from war zones during conflicts.<sup>86</sup> From this statement it is apparent that the argument of mines being hazardous to civilians years after the conflict has ended is not yet well grounded. MP Sakari Smeds used the economic argument and stated that instead of using the money on expensive replacement systems the funds should rather be used on healthcare or education.<sup>87</sup> MP Jukka Gustafsson directly attacked against the humanitarian argument by stating that Finland should not join the treaty because mines do harm in other countries. In his view landmines have a national, historical, symbolic and practical value, and that it is also a matter of expenses.<sup>88</sup>

The second biggest coalition partner, National Coalition Party, was the most vocal opponent of the Landmine Ban referring to security arguments five and economic arguments eight times during the debate. The group statement of NCP emphasized both the expensiveness of

---

<sup>83</sup> PTK 89/2001, 25 – 26.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid, 27.

<sup>85</sup> PTK 87/2001, 34.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid, 88.

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

<sup>88</sup> Ibid, 30.

replacing systems and the fact that the ban would compromise Finland's defence ability. Further justifications were that Finnish mines would not pose danger to civilians but only to the invading enemy.<sup>89</sup> Based on these arguments NCP viewed that Finland should not place strict deadlines for joining.<sup>90</sup> MPs of the NCP in general viewed landmines as an integral part of the territorial defence doctrine and often referred to the geographic location of Finland. MP Olli Nepponen example argued that credible defence requires landmines.<sup>91</sup> However, even more important argument was the funding issue. NCP's group statement referred to a lack of "political will" to increase the defence budget.<sup>92</sup> MP Eero Akaan-Penttilä stated that Finland has a long border to the east, but also that the GDP and the defence budget of Finland are the smallest in the Nordic Countries.<sup>93</sup> Also the statement of MP Jyrki Katainen brought up the issue of apparent lack of "political will" to fund replacing systems.<sup>94</sup>

The group statement of the Left Alliance referred to the 140 other states that had at the time joined the Ottawa Convention, and regretted that Finland was not among the ones within it.<sup>95</sup> MP Annika Lapintie viewed that more important than defence budget is good neighborly relations and that the accession date of 2006 should be binding. However, MP Jaakko Laakso from the Left Alliance argued against the group stance by stating that landmines are an important part of the defence doctrine. MP Laakso also referred to a peer group, but by arguing that Sweden's decision to join the Ottawa Convention was easy because Finland was Sweden's landmine.<sup>96</sup> From the statements of the Left Alliance it is apparent that the decisions of other countries play crucial role in the justifications.

The party that most clearly and consistently argued for humanitarian grounds was the Green Party. In the Group statement the Greens refute that the whole issue is about the Eastern border, but that by universalizing the treaty it would have an impact on human life all around the world. According to the Greens, international community needs to systematically promote the treaty because landmines destroy human life in problem countries.<sup>97</sup> MP Anni Sinnemäki

---

<sup>89</sup> Ibid, 14 – 15.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid, 15.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid, 31.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid, 15.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid, 33.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid, 66.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid, 17.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid, 50.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid, 30.

supported the group statement following similar justifications: the only way to support the treaty and to make it universal is to join it.<sup>98</sup>

The parliamentary group of Christian Democratic Party only shortly referred to the funding issue, by stating that because there are no funds at the moment, Finland should join the Ottawa treaty in the long run, not in a hurry.<sup>99</sup>

The parliamentary group of the main opposition party, Center Party, argued against the Ottawa Convention. In the group statement, CP viewed that there should be no stance towards Ottawa Treaty, because there are no plans how to replace the “central element of territorial defence”.<sup>100</sup> None of the MPs from CP argued for the Ottawa Convention. MP Kari Myllyniemi went so far as to argue that landmines should never be abandoned and that even talking about it decreases the security of Finland.<sup>101</sup> CP argued against the landmine ban by referring seven times to security arguments and three times to economic ones. It is noteworthy that only Center Party argued directly against international pressures during the debate. Example MP Mirja Ryyänen stated that international pressures are over exaggerated.<sup>102</sup> Also MP Markku Rossi stated that there is no reason to join and no country will downgrade Finland if it chooses not to participate to the treaty.<sup>103</sup> MP Lauri Oinonen suggested that Finland should do “international PR” by concentrating on minesweeping in problem countries rather than abandoning mines altogether.<sup>104</sup>

The only MP of the True Finns party referred both to economic and security arguments. According to MP Raimo Vistbacka, if landmines were abandoned it would require expensive border monitoring systems and because of the border is so long; it would require several milliards of Finnish Marks. MP Vistbacka also stated that no other EU country has such a border as Finland.<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> Ibid, 77 - 78.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid, 24.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid, 9.

<sup>101</sup> PTK 89/2001, 38.

<sup>102</sup> PTK 87/2001, 32.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid, 64.

<sup>104</sup> PTK 89/2001, 34.

<sup>105</sup> PTK 87/2001, 26.



Government			Number of arguments by category			
Party	Seats <sup>106</sup>	Group Position	Against		For	
			Security	Economic	Constitutive	Constraining
SDP	51	For	6	2	1	4
NCP	46	Against	5	8		
LA	20	For	1			2
GP	11	For			3	
SPP	11	For	1	1	1	
CDP	10	Against		1		
Opposition			Number of arguments by category			
Party	Seats	Group Position	Against		For	
			Security	Economic	Constitutive	Constraining
CP	48	Against	7	3		
TF	1	Against	1	1		

*Table 4: General debate 2001 argument frequency by party*

#### *4.1.2. Defence Committee Memorandum and Voting*

After the debate the FSDP 2001 was sent to the Defence Committee to which the Foreign Affairs and Treasury Committees needed to make statements to. In the memorandum of the treasury to the Defence Committee it is stated that the current funding framework does not allow investments on replacement systems.<sup>107</sup> The Foreign Affairs Committee's memorandum in turn holds important that Finland supports "efficient and global ban" for landmines and supports EU's actions to promote the Ottawa Treaty.<sup>108</sup> The Defence Committee states that resolving the landmine question is important in respect to the defence capability and on the ability to deter wide scale attack. The Defence Committee suggests that the FDSP 2004

<sup>106</sup> Official Statistics Finland (2004). Seats gained by party in Parliamentary elections in 1945 – 2003. WWW: [http://tilastokeskus.fi/til/evaa/2003/evaa\\_2003\\_2004-05-31\\_tau\\_008\\_en.html](http://tilastokeskus.fi/til/evaa/2003/evaa_2003_2004-05-31_tau_008_en.html) (Last Accessed 21 May 2012)

<sup>107</sup> VaVL 31/2001 vp

<sup>108</sup> UaVL 6/2001 vp, 11.

should make a stance on the issue of landmines.<sup>109</sup> There were no dissenting opinions in the Defence Committee memorandum.

The parliament voted on the FSDP 2001 on 19 December 2001. MP Raimo Vistbacka of the true Finns proposed that Parliament should denounce the abandoning of landmines until the Defence Forces gets sufficient funding to increase the defence ability.<sup>110</sup> The motion was denied by 172 yes and 4 no votes. The no votes included two MPs from the SDP, one from TF and one from CP.<sup>111</sup>

## **4.2. The Finnish Security and Defence Policy 2004**

### *4.2.1 General Debate 2004*

The Finnish Security and Defence Policy 2004 states that “Finland will accede to the Ottawa Convention, which prohibits anti-personnel landmines, in 2012 and destroy its landmines by 2016.”<sup>112</sup> The FSDP 2004 further continues that “Finland’s credible defence capability will be maintained by acquiring systems to replace mines in the period 2009-2016. The necessary additional funding for this will be allocated to the defence appropriations framework.”<sup>113</sup> There are two crucial differences to the FSDP 2001. First, the wording is now more definitive: “Finland *will* accede... [emphasis added]” and the previous wording, “without compromising Finland’s credible defence capability”<sup>114</sup>, that was used in the FSDP 2001, is no longer present. Second, the original accession and landmine demolition dates are postponed by six years from 2006 and 2010 to 2012 and 2016.

The coalition government in 2004 consisted of three parties. The senior coalition partner is the Center Party, and the junior partners are the Social Democratic Party and the Swedish People’s Party. The third big party, NCP, is now in the opposition along with the Christian Democrats, the Greens, the Left Alliance and the True Finns. Like in 2001, also in 2004 the issue of antipersonnel landmines invoked a heated discussion among the members of the parliament. The debate started with the opening statement of the Prime Minister Matti Vanhanen (CP). PM Vanhanen repeated the official government stance on landmines by referring to the dates of 2012 and 2016. PM Vanhanen continued that this policy was guided

---

<sup>109</sup> PuVM 2/2001, vp, 12.

<sup>110</sup> PTK 157/2001, 123.

<sup>111</sup> Voting spread, PTK 157/2001, Vote 3. WWW: <http://www.parliament.fi/aaanestysjakauma/3/157/2001> (Last Accessed 14 May 2012)

<sup>112</sup> FSDP 2004, 98.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid.

<sup>114</sup> FSDP 2001, 38.

to this direction by the previous FSDP from 2001, but now the published deadlines would be concrete.<sup>115</sup>

The stance of the Center Party towards Ottawa treaty had changed from 2001. In the group statement MP Kauko Juhantalo acknowledged that landmines have been an integral part of the Finnish defence doctrine, but that “international responsibilities” require Finland to join the landmine ban. The Center Party further informs that the date for the ban is now postponed nearly ten years, but that even more could have been afforded.<sup>116</sup> Almost all the remaining statements by the individual MPs of the CP argued that the policy of the CP is a consistent continuation of the past policy commitments. The CP further argued in the group statement, and through individual MPs, that this consistent policy was agreed also by the NCP in 2001. Example MP Antti Rantakangas argued that the past decision was not a weak promise, but a clear goal that was also supported by the NCP. MP Rantakangas emphasized that the decision which had been achieved now, and the postponing of the accession, was a “good compromise”.<sup>117</sup> MP Rauno Kettunen however did no longer see the mine question as a question of a past decision as such, but argued that the decision is in line with the long standing humanitarian policy of Finland. This differs from other statements of the CP, which avoided the use of the term “humanitarian” and only referred to consistency of policy in general and commitments made in the past. Two MPs from the CP, however, were still openly skeptical about the decision. MP Pekka Viikuna claimed that Finland is trying to be more sacred than the Pope of Rome, and that Finnish mines are not endangering anybody.<sup>118</sup> MP Lauri Oinonen made two statements. First MP Oinonen referred to the military utility of landmines and claimed that enemy attacking speed will triple, if landmines are abandoned.<sup>119</sup> In the second, he stated to understand the humanitarian ideas that are woken up when one sees grotesque amputated limbs, but continued that the Finnish mines are locked away and do not pose such a harm. In addition, MP Oinonen stated that the money could be spent somewhere else than on expensive replacing systems.<sup>120</sup> The CP justified the mine ban decision with constraining consistency arguments seven times during the debate and only once used directly humanitarian argument. Security arguments against the treaty were used twice and economic ones once.

---

<sup>115</sup> PTK 97/2004, 6.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid, 10 - 11.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid, 58.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid, 43.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid, 72.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid, 96.

The group statement of the SDP also emphasized the consistency of policy in their group statement by arguing that Finland has been an advocate of the mine ban in international forums during the past years and it would be contradictory now to act otherwise.<sup>121</sup> MP Arto Seppälä in turn referred the mine ban being important in respect to the “official image” of Finland.<sup>122</sup> Like CP, also the SDP attacked against the NCPs view of the mine ban, which they claimed not to be consistent with their past behavior.<sup>123</sup> Foreign Minister Erkki Tuomioja stated that Finland was lucky because the consistency of Finnish policy was no longer in the hands of the NCP.<sup>124</sup> Only one MP, MP Tero Rönni, from the SDP argued against the chosen policy path by invoking an economic argument. MP Rönni did not agree with the decision because it would increase the defence budget.<sup>125</sup> It is noteworthy to see that like CP, also SDP avoided using humanitarian arguments directly to justify the Ottawa Convention.

During the parliamentary debate the coalition partner Swedish People’s Party did not raise up the question of the Ottawa Convention.

In their group statement, the NCP argued that the earliest date to join the Ottawa Convention should be in 2020, after when the ignition mechanisms of the landmines have been outdated. In NCPs view the main argument for joining, the reputation of Finland, is not a sufficient reason to spend 300 million Euros on replacing systems. NCP also continues that the reputation argument is not verified.<sup>126</sup> The group statement no longer invoked the issue of military utility of landmines, but concentrated on the issue of costs. Individual MPs however still continued to argue for the military utility perspective. MP Ben Zyskowicz stated not to understand, that if one balances between national security and reputation, the reputation wins.<sup>127</sup> Similarly MP Marjukka Karttunen questioned how Finland’s reputation would suffer if Ottawa Convention was not signed and argued that better reputation would be acquired by keeping landmines, because then Finland would have a reputation as a country that has a credible defence.<sup>128</sup> MP Jere Lahti in turn pointed out that the FSDP still lists a wide scale attack as a possibility, and as long as it is a possibility, landmines are not obsolete.<sup>129</sup> MP Reijo Paananen went as far as to argue that landmines are the world’s *most* effective weapon

---

<sup>121</sup> Ibid, 11.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid, 93.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid, 35.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid, 40.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid, 87.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid, 15 - 16.

<sup>127</sup> Ibid, 36.

<sup>128</sup> PTK 98/2004, 40.

<sup>129</sup> PTK 97/2004, 60.

to deter an enemy attack.<sup>130</sup> Only MP Olli Nepponen was somewhat inclined to support the mine ban decision by arguing that even if there is no agreement yet what the replacing systems would be, Finland had committed itself not to produce more landmines in 1997, and thus the current decision is consistent with the past policy.<sup>131</sup> In sum, the largest opposition party NCP argued against the Ottawa Convention by using security arguments 12 times and economic arguments seven times. Many MPs directly attacked against the argument of reputation presented by MPs from other parties. Only one MP, MP Olli Nepponen, argued for the treaty by twice using constraining arguments.

Opposition party Christian Democrats were against the Ottawa. In their group statement, Christian Democrats viewed that the decision of not be part of the Ottawa had not stirred international criticism. Also the issue of mines being outdated soon was not an issue, because the ignitions could be easily replaced, according to CD. CD viewed that a small criticism from abroad is not a sufficient reason to spend hundreds of millions of Euros.<sup>132</sup> In a similar way, MP Leena Rauhala emphasized costs, by saying that dates are not as important as costs and that the millions could be used otherwise.<sup>133</sup> MP Sari Essayah argued for a security perspective by stating that landmines are defensive weapons that cannot be used for an attack and that mines suit the defence doctrine of Finland.<sup>134</sup>

The Green Party introduced a new kind of argument by directly attacking against the traditional territorial defence doctrine by reframing the concept of security. The Greens did not see state no longer as the key source of agency. In their only statement about mines, MP Tarja Cronberg in the group statement of the Green Party argued that Finland is not facing such an infantry threat from Russia that could be defended against or slowed down with mines. The statement continued that new security threats such as terrorism and infectious diseases disregard mines completely. Because of this, the Ottawa Treaty could be very well signed already in 2006 as was the original plan.<sup>135</sup> The argumentation has changed from 2001, when the Greens emphasized humanitarian issues.

---

<sup>130</sup> Ibid, 73.

<sup>131</sup> Ibid, 51.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid, 25.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid, 64.

<sup>134</sup> Ibid, 56.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid, 20.

The True Finns argued that also USA and Russia should be in the treaty if landmines will be destroyed and Finland should not spent hundreds of millions if there are landmines in use at the other side of the border.<sup>136</sup>

Government			Number of arguments by category			
Party	Seats <sup>137</sup>	Group Position	Against		For	
			Security	Economic	Constitutive	Constraining
CP	55	For	2	1	1	7
SDP	53	For		1		6
SPP	8	-				
Opposition			Number of arguments by category			
Party	Seats	Group Position	Against		For	
			Security	Economic	Constitutive	Constraining
NCP	40	Against	6	4		1
LA	19	For			4	2
GP	14	Against				
CDP	7	For	1	2		
TF	3	Against	1	1		
Other	1	-				

*Table 5: General debate 2004 argument frequency by party*

The Left Alliance was the party that most emphasized humanitarian issues during the 2004 debate. In their group statement MP Suvi-Anne Siimes criticized the debate on landmines to be nationalistic and defence oriented, and that the humanitarian objectives of the treaty had been lost.<sup>138</sup> MP Erkki Viitanen rebutted against all of those who argued that Finnish mines are not dangerous by asking why mines are prohibited if they were not dangerous.<sup>139</sup> MP Pentti Tiusanen's argument is a clear example of what Ruthenford called priming during the

<sup>136</sup> Ibid, 28.

<sup>137</sup> Official Statistics Finland (2004). Seats gained by party in Parliamentary elections in 1945 – 2003. WWW: [http://tilastokeskus.fi/til/evaa/2003/evaa\\_2003\\_2004-05-31\\_tau\\_008\\_en.html](http://tilastokeskus.fi/til/evaa/2003/evaa_2003_2004-05-31_tau_008_en.html) (Last accesses 21 May 2012)

<sup>138</sup> PTK 97/2004, 16.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid, 47.

cognitive agenda setting phase, by telling a story of his visit to the Orthopedic Hospital near Kabul where children and mothers were treated for their loss of upper and lower body parts. MP Tiusanen also presented a constraining argument that it is not possible that “N countries” minus Finland will join the treaty.<sup>140</sup> Also MP Outi Ojala argued that those countries that are outside, are giving justification for other countries to do the same.<sup>141</sup> By arguing in this vein, MP Ojala makes counter arguers to choose which group they want to belong to, invoking the issue of identity.

#### 4.2.2 Defence Committee Memorandum

At the end of the general debate MP Pulliainen (GP) made a proposal against the original motion of sending the FSDP to the Defence Committee and proposed that it should be sent to the Foreign Affairs Committee instead. The motion was denied 95-70, with one abstention. Allocation of votes can be seen in Table six. The Original motion (sending to Defence Committee) is “Yes” and the motion by MP Pulliainen is “No”.

	Yes	No	Abstained	Away
Center Party	41	4	0	10
SDP	7	36	1	8
NCP	33	2	0	6
Left Alliance	7	10	0	2
Green Party	0	10	0	4
Christian Democratic Party	4	1	0	1
True Finns	3	0	0	0

*Table 6: Committee Selection Voting<sup>142</sup>*

In the Defence Committee memorandum it is stated that the Committee had differing suggestions from the Defence Ministry (DM) and from the Foreign Affairs Ministry (FAM).<sup>143</sup> The end report of the separate Landmine Committee which was published in July 2004 did not give definitive answer when to join the Ottawa Convention but gave two sets of

<sup>140</sup> Ibid, 87

<sup>141</sup> Ibid, 36.

<sup>142</sup> Finnish Parliament, Voting Results. WWW: [www.eduskunta.fi/aanestysjakauma/1/100/2004](http://www.eduskunta.fi/aanestysjakauma/1/100/2004) (Last Accessed 13 May 2012)

<sup>143</sup> PuVM 1/2004, 17.

dates. The representatives from the DM suggested that Finland should join in 2012.<sup>144</sup> The FAM in turn suggested an earlier date of 2008. The representatives of FAM justified the earlier accession date with the credibility of Finland's foreign policy.<sup>145</sup> The Defence Committee states that important aspect in the current decision is the decision made in the European Union in 1997, where Finland among the other EU states declared to stop production or sales of landmines.<sup>146</sup> This decision, according to the Committee, prevents Finland to renew its stockpile of antipersonnel landmines even outside the Ottawa Treaty. The committee continues that the landmines would outdate in the beginning of the 2020s<sup>147</sup>. The Defence Committee memorandum ends to a conclusion that it supports the dates of 2012-2016 proposed by the FSDP 2004.<sup>148</sup>

Several MPs however left differing opinions to the memorandum. Tony Halme of the True Finns argued that appropriate joining date should be the year 2020, when the landmines outdate.<sup>149</sup> Bjarne Kallis of the Christian Democrats proposed that the ignition plugs of the landmines should be replaced so that the usage of them could be prolonged. According to MP Kallis, landmines will not outdate if this is done and reputational pressures towards Finland do not exist.<sup>150</sup> Seppo Lahtela of the Center Party proposed that landmines should be used as long as neighboring countries have landmines.<sup>151</sup>

The differing opinions were voted against in December 2004. In addition two other motions were presented to the parliament. MP Eero Akaan-Penttilä (NCP) with the support of Jyri Häkämies (NCP) proposed that the parliament should not support the government's decision to abandon working anti-personnel landmines.<sup>152</sup> MP Ulla Anttila (GP) with a support of MP Suvi-Anne Siimes (LA) proposed that the parliament should demand the government to sign the Ottawa Treaty by the end of March 2007.<sup>153</sup> None of these motions passed.

---

<sup>144</sup> The end report of the Defence Ministry's landmine working group 2004 (Puolustusministeriön jalkaväkimiinaselvitystyöryhmän loppurapotti 14.7.2004), 3.

<sup>145</sup> The end report of the Defence Ministry's landmine working group 2004 (Puolustusministeriön jalkaväkimiinaselvitystyöryhmän loppurapotti 14.7.2004), 7.

<sup>146</sup> PuVM 1/2004, 17.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid.

<sup>148</sup> Ibid, 18.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid, 41.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid, 44.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid, 45.

<sup>152</sup> PTK 144/2004, 3.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid.



### 4.3. The Finnish Security and Defence Policy 2009

The FSDP 2009 states that “Finland has pledged to join the Ottawa Mine Ban Convention in 2012 and to destroy its anti-personnel mine stockpiles by the end of 2016.”<sup>154</sup> The FSDP 2009 also states that “The Ottawa Convention banning anti-personnel mines has been widely implemented. Mine clearance, humanitarian mine action, disposal of explosive remnant of war as well as destruction of stockpiles, as laid down in the Convention, remain topical challenges.”<sup>155</sup>

The coalition government in 2009 consisted of the Center Party as a senior coalition partner and the National Coalition Party, the Green Party and the Swedish People’s Party as junior partners.

The debate on Ottawa Treaty in 2009 is considerably tamer than during the previous FSDP discussions. This can be explained by the fact that the wording of the 2004 decision was definitive in nature. Now, those actors who previously advocated the ban on landmines often brought up the issue of cluster munitions. For example the group statement of the Greens<sup>156</sup> and Left Alliance<sup>157</sup> both emphasized Finland’s role in international disarmament and referred to cluster munitions. Also MP Kimmo Kiljunen (SDP), a vocal advocate of the mine ban, argued for the cluster munitions ban.<sup>158</sup>

The True Finns, with the voice of MP Timo Soini, however brought up the issue of mines, and argued that the past decision was wrong since the country is facing increased budgetary constraints.<sup>159</sup>

MP Päivi Lipponen (SDP) argued in connection to the debate about defence budget that at the same time one cannot support cutting off defence budget, ban on landmines and credible defence. MP Lipponen stated that one of the defence strategies of Finland has been to build a mine field at the border if an aggression occurs. Now, according to her, when Finland has joined international agreement to ban landmines, the weapons must be replaced with more expensive weapons, otherwise the defence is not sustainable.<sup>160</sup>

---

<sup>154</sup> FSDP 2009, 104.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid, 20.

<sup>156</sup> PTK 6/2009, 16.

<sup>157</sup> Ibid, 14.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid, 31.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid, 21.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid, 91.

In 2009 the FSDP was sent to the Foreign Affairs Committee, to which the Treasury Committee, the Administration Committee and the Defence Committee give statements to. The 2009 memorandum of the Defence Committee emphasizes the United Nations framework as disarmament and arms monitoring forum.<sup>161</sup> It however acknowledges that some significant arms negotiations have occurred outside the UN framework, such as the Ottawa Treaty on antipersonnel landmines and Oslo Treaty on cluster munitions. Defence Committee continues that in the future, processes, such as Oslo and Ottawa, can occur and Finland should be involved in these. The Defence Committee however states that disarmament processes outside the UN framework need to be evaluated not only from humanitarian angles, but also the national defence and geographical coverage need to be taken into account.<sup>162</sup>

#### **4.4. Decision and Accession 2011 - 2012**

The coalition government of 2011, like in 2003, is also a so called rainbow coalition collecting wide range of parties from left to right. The senior coalition partner is now the NCP, and juniors are SDP, LA, SPP, GP and CDP. There are now two large groups in the opposition, the Center Party, and the True Finns.

The new government was formed in the spring 2011. The first handling government proposal HE 15/2011 on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Antipersonnel Mines and on their Destruction is held in the parliament in 27<sup>th</sup> of September 2011 at the first session of the fall season. The process goes on as the following. In the first session, a general debate is held and the proposal is sent to a committee. In this case, because the Ottawa Convention is an international treaty, the proposal is sent to the Foreign Affairs Committee to which the Law Committee and Administration Committee give statements to. In the second session the Foreign Affairs Committee memorandum is handled and the technical and legal form is approved. The parliament votes in the third session. This part first goes through the HE 15/2011, then the general debate, the justification of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and finally the voting results. The voting results are summarized in the Table eight.

##### *4.4.1 Government Proposal HE 15/2011*

---

<sup>161</sup> UaVM 5/2009, 23.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid.

The government proposal 15/2011 is a sixty page document. Half of the document is technical in nature and goes through the changes needed in national legislation and public administration to implement the conditions required by the Ottawa treaty. The other half justifies the joining decision and describes the economic and defence consequences of accession. For the purposes of this study, it is necessary to go through the justifications given in the proposal.

The HE 15/2011 states that according to international law, in a conflict situation, states cannot use certain weapons or means. The proposal lists principles which limit the conduct of war: discrimination principle which prohibits attacking civilian target, discrimination principle that prohibits the use of such force that cannot reliably fulfill the first principle, proportionality principle according to which prohibits such force in which the consequences to civilians would not outweigh the military utility, early warning principle which requires the warring parties to warn civilian population even before the outbreak of conflict so that civilian casualties can be minimized and finally, a principle that prohibits the use of such weapons that cause unnecessary harm or suffering.<sup>163</sup>

Based on the previous principles, the proposal continues that antipersonnel landmines cause significant humanitarian and economic harm across the world because they cannot separate civilians from combatants and can be active decades after the conflict is over.<sup>164</sup> The proposal gives credit to the efforts of the international civil society and particularly the International Campaign to Ban Landmines in promoting the ban on antipersonnel landmines. The proposal also points out the fact that so far 156 countries have joined the treaty (as of 27 September 2011).<sup>165</sup>

#### *4.4.2. General Debate*

The general debate of 2011 is as fierce as it was during 2001 and 2004. There are no group statements and individual MPs present their views and ask questions from the Ministers. There are some crucial differences to earlier debates. First one is that the True Finns have now increased their seats from earlier 11 to 39. This clearly shows in the number of arguments. The second is that the NCP, which is now the senior coalition partner holding the position of Prime Minister, is showing constraint. The third is that the Center Party, which is now in the

---

<sup>163</sup> HE 15/2011, 4 – 5.

<sup>164</sup> Ibid, 5.

<sup>165</sup> Ibid, 6.

opposition, has started to argue against their 2004 stance and follow more the behavior present in 2001. The argument frequencies in the general debate are summarized in the table seven.

The majority of NCPs statements about landmines are security oriented. MP Jukka Korpa example argues that the decision will lower the threshold of military intervention.<sup>166</sup> MP Janne Sankelo in turn refers to a study made by the Defence Forces which claim that enemy attacking speed will considerably increase if landmines are abandoned.<sup>167</sup> MP Heikki Autto in turn refer to the casualty rates of landmine victims being decreased considerably, from 25 000 in the 1990s to 4000 in 2009, even when Finland has been outside the treaty and joining would seriously harm Finnish defence.<sup>168</sup> MP Kimmo Sasi in turn argues that foreign and security policy need to be consistent but since the economic situation has worsened, Finland should consider postponing the accession.<sup>169</sup> MP Ben Zyskowicz however argues that the decision has already been made twice and it is too late to change it now. MP Zyscowicz points the blame on CP which according to him made a bad decision in 2004.<sup>170</sup> MP Zyscowicz makes the same argument later on and states that Finland cannot make a complete u-turn since the decision has been made twice in 2004 and 2009.<sup>171</sup>

The SDP makes a constraining consistency argument twice during the general debate. MP Jouni Backmann thinks it is strange that old coalition partners are now seemingly reversing their decision made in 2004 and 2009.<sup>172</sup> In similar vein MP Johannes Koskinen argues that the decision has been made twice with a wide consensus.<sup>173</sup>

The Left Alliance does not argue only that past decisions constrain, but refer continuously to humanitarian arguments, and also point out to the number of other countries that have signed the treaty both in Europe and in the other parts of the world. MP Annika Lapintie starts by stating that it should be remembered that the landmine decision is a humanitarian issue and still 4000 people yearly are victims of landmines. In addition, MP Lapintie points that 156 countries have so far signed the treaty.<sup>174</sup> Later on MP Lapintie reminds the parliament that only 40 countries are outside the treaty, Finland is the only EU country left outside and from

---

<sup>166</sup> PTK 27/2011, 25.

<sup>167</sup> Ibid, 5.

<sup>168</sup> Ibid, 23.

<sup>169</sup> Ibid, 15.

<sup>170</sup> Ibid, 8.

<sup>171</sup> Ibid, 11.

<sup>172</sup> Ibid, 9.

<sup>173</sup> Ibid, 12.

<sup>174</sup> Ibid, 8.

the states in Europe, only Russia in addition to Finland has not acceded.<sup>175</sup> Also MP Erkki Virtanen argues that the landmine ban was made because of humanitarian reasons.<sup>176</sup> MP Kari Uotila in turn argues that security is not reached with equipment at the border but with pragmatic and consistent foreign policy.<sup>177</sup> In one statement of MP Lapintie uses priming by stating that landmines kill children who are fetching water.<sup>178</sup>

Government			Number of arguments by category			
Party	Seats <sup>179</sup>	Group Position	Against		For	
			Security	Economic	Constitutive	Constraining
NCP	44	N/A	4	1		2
SDP	42	N/A				2
LA	14	N/A			4	4
GP	10	N/A			2	4
SPP	9	N/A				2
CDP	6	N/A				
Opposition			Number of arguments by category			
Party	Seats	Group Position	Against		For	
			Security	Economic	Constitutive	Constraining
CP	35	N/A	3	4		
TF	39	N/A	9	9		

*Table 7: General debate 2011 argument frequency by party*

The Green Party argued mainly through constraining lines but also referred to humanitarian arguments. MP Pekka Haavisto argued that the Ottawa Treaty had decreased the market share of landmines and because infected regions are usually poor, the actors do not have money to spend on replacing systems. Thus genuine disarmament occurs, and a weapon category that is

<sup>175</sup> Ibid, 19.

<sup>176</sup> Ibid, 13.

<sup>177</sup> Ibid, 10.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid, 17.

<sup>179</sup> Official Statistics Finland (2011). Parliamentary Elections. WWW: [http://stat.fi/til/evaa\\_2011\\_2011-04-29\\_tie\\_001\\_en.html](http://stat.fi/til/evaa_2011_2011-04-29_tie_001_en.html) (Accessed 21 May 2012)

harmful to women and children is taken out of circulation.<sup>180</sup> Later on MP Haavisto told that not only the landmine ban has a positive impact on conflict zones, but also that joining the treaty could have positive impact when Finland seeks a UN Security Council seat and the accession would have huge impact on Finland's reputation. MP in turn Anni Sinnemäki supported the notion that MP Zyskowicz made earlier by arguing that Finland needs to be consistent if it wants to maintain the image of reliable international contracting partner. MP Sinnemäki further stated that Finland is finally taking its place among "civilized nations" by expressing support to mine victims.<sup>181</sup>

The Defence Minister Stefan Wallin (SPP) argued that the issue is about reputation of Finland. According to DM Wallin, Finland has made the decision twice in 2004 and 2009 (note that 2001 is not counted in) and is the last EU country that has not ratified the treaty, with the exception of Poland. DM Wallin also points out that 156 countries so far have joined the treaty.<sup>182</sup> In another statement DM Wallin argues that the issue is really about how Finland represents itself as a credible international contracting partner.<sup>183</sup>

The opposition party True Finns presented themselves as an opponent of the treaty. Especially the True Finns saw the issue fully as a security matter. The MPs Ritva Elomaa<sup>184</sup> and Jussi Niinistö<sup>185</sup> both cited studies made by the defence forces or defence experts. MPs Pertti Virtanen<sup>186</sup>, Olli Immonen<sup>187</sup> and Jussi Halla-Aho<sup>188</sup> referred to the geographical position of Finland and the fact that Finland has a long border with Russia. The True Finns denounced that the fact that landmines are a problem in other countries should affect the policy of Finland. MP Lauri Oinonen for example argued that every country must think of themselves first.<sup>189</sup> MP Mika Niikko in turn directly argued that Finland should not show "solidarity" towards other countries.<sup>190</sup> In addition the true Finns brought up the issue of costs by nine times arguing that landmines are cost efficient and cheap weapons.

---

<sup>180</sup> PTK 27/2011, 14 – 15.

<sup>181</sup> Ibid, 11.

<sup>182</sup> Ibid, 7.

<sup>183</sup> Ibid, 18.

<sup>184</sup> Ibid, 14 – 15.

<sup>185</sup> Ibid, 18.

<sup>186</sup> Ibid, 9.

<sup>187</sup> Ibid, 20.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid, 24.

<sup>189</sup> Ibid, 5.

<sup>190</sup> Ibid, 22 – 23.

The Center Party argumentation differs dramatically from that of 2004 when the party was in the government with the SDP. The CP argues now with security and economic arguments against the Ottawa Treaty. Similarly as the True Finns, MP Eero Reijonen refers to expert studies which emphasize the military utility value of landmines.<sup>191</sup> MP Mikko Savola in turn argues that it is Finland's interest to stay out of Ottawa because landmines are cheap and efficient.<sup>192</sup> The global economic crisis also shows in the rhetoric of CP. Example MP Antti Rantakangas argues that the economic situation is very different from 2004 and 2009 and that Finland should thus reconsider the timeframe of joining.<sup>193</sup> Also MP Timo V. Korhonen argues that since the military already faces spending cuts replacement systems will not guarantee credible defence to the whole country.<sup>194</sup>

#### *4.4.3. Foreign Affairs Committee Memorandum*

After the general debate the government proposal is sent to the Foreign Affairs Committee to which the Law Committee and administration committees give statements to. The Foreign Affairs Committee gave its memorandum on 15<sup>th</sup> of November 2011. The committee heard representatives from the government, military and NGOs. NGOs present were Finnish Red Cross, Finnish Peace Union and Church's Foreign Aid organization.<sup>195</sup>

The Foreign Affairs Committee supported the government proposal 15/2011 with one dissenting opinion from the True Finns. At its justification the memorandum states that protection of civilian population during a war is one of the central elements of international rules and despite international efforts, such as the Geneva Process, antipersonnel landmines have continued to inflict suffering on civilian population across the world, especially in the developing countries.<sup>196</sup> The memorandum gives credit to international society which took the AP landmine issue on its agenda with the strong support from NGO sector.<sup>197</sup> According to the memorandum, the goal of the Ottawa process was humanitarian.<sup>198</sup>

The memorandum continues that the original plan of Finland was to join the Ottawa Treaty in 2006, but the FSDP 2004 postponed the decision to 2012. The accession commitment was

---

<sup>191</sup> Ibid, 9.

<sup>192</sup> Ibid, 20.

<sup>193</sup> Ibid, 10.

<sup>194</sup> Ibid, 27.

<sup>195</sup> UaVM 2/2011, 1.

<sup>196</sup> Ibid, 2.

<sup>197</sup> UaVM 2/2011, 2 – 3.

<sup>198</sup> Ibid, 3.

restated in FSDP 2009.<sup>199</sup> The justification for postponing is, according to the memorandum, to assure the acquisition of replacement systems and their funding.<sup>200</sup> The memorandum acknowledges that the current financial crisis has added pressures to once again postpone the accession, but however, the accession can be agreed based on previous commitments made in 2004 and 2009.<sup>201</sup> The policy is, according to the memorandum, consistent policy of Finland to reinforce international norms, even when Finland has not been part of the problem.<sup>202</sup>

The official statement part of the Foreign affairs Committee that the parliament votes on can be translated the following: Finland has been active in development and implementation of international humanitarian law. Finland takes part in all central treaties of humanitarian law. The Committee holds it to be consistent that Finland will join the Ottawa treaty based on the previous policy commitments agreed upon in the Parliament.<sup>203</sup>

The True Finns left a dissenting opinion and proposed that the parliament discard the government proposal HE 15/2011. The True Finn members of the Foreign Affairs Committee argue that nothing can replace the added value that antipersonnel landmines give to the Finnish defence.<sup>204</sup> According to the dissenting opinion, every state has a right to defend its territorial integrity and AP-landmines are suitable for this task. True Finns could agree to abandon landmines if other countries would, especially Russia, show reciprocity and abandon their stockpiles of landmines.<sup>205</sup> True Finns also argue that there are no basis for wide ranging mine ban since the ban has not been made in UN framework nor have consent from the Security Council. In addition the 38 countries outside the treaty represent half of the world's population.<sup>206</sup>

#### *4.4.4. The Final Vote*

The final voting results are summarized in the table below. There is not a single “no” vote among the government parties. The coalition holds. However there are many MPs in the government parties that are absent from the voting. The opposition party True Finns voted against the treaty and only three MPs were absent. The voting behavior of opposition party

---

<sup>199</sup> Ibid, 4.

<sup>200</sup> Ibid.

<sup>201</sup> Ibid.

<sup>202</sup> Ibid, 4 – 5.

<sup>203</sup> Ibid, 5.

<sup>204</sup> Ibid, 9.

<sup>205</sup> Ibid, 10.

<sup>206</sup> Ibid.



CP is split in half with 17 supporting, 11 against and seven away. None of the MPs voted empty.

Party	Gov./Opp.	Yes	No	Absent	Empty
NCP	Gov.	31	0	13	0
SDP	Gov.	31	0	10	0
GP	Gov.	9	0	1	0
True Finns	Opp.	0	36	3	0
CP	Opp.	17	11	7	0
CDP	Gov.	6	0	0	0
LA	Gov.	9	0	3	0
SPP	Gov.	6	0	4	0

Table 8: Voting results<sup>207</sup>

**4.5. Discussion of Results**

The research question of this study is why Finland joined the Ottawa Convention? The norm theory posits that there are two main mechanisms through which norm adoption, or socialization, to new norms happen. Constitutive works through moral persuasion and social learning. When an actor faces new information it can change how the issue is perceived. In the case of landmines the international civil society was able to reframe the landmine issue from pure security and military matter to a humanitarian problem. From the official justification that are present in the FSDPs, Committee Memorandums and the final Government Proposal, one could draw a conclusion that after 12 years since the Ottawa Treaty came into force, Finland was morally persuaded and finally internalized the norm against landmines. This view is however contradicted by the justifications given and debate conducted at the parliament between 2001 and 2011.

The way in which different actors perceive the issue throughout the ten year span does not change in a meaningful way. Actors who in 2001 argued for security angles do not start to justify the accession with humanitarian arguments. This goes also the other way around, even when some actors consistently argue for security perspective it does not change the perception of those actors who are positively inclined towards the accession. For example although SDP’s group position was positive towards the Ottawa treaty already in 2001, many individual MPs argued against it by using security arguments. During the ten year period, SDP showed a more unified front and internal opposition decreased. The justifications, however, were primarily constraining. It is noteworthy to mention, that some of the antipathy

---

<sup>207</sup> Voting spread, PTK 76/2011. WWW: <http://www.eduskunta.fi/aanestysjakakauma/2/76/2011> (Last Accessed 15 May 2012)

towards Ottawa among MPs of the SDP was stemming from the perception that the alternative to landmines would be a techno army. This is evident from statement that referred to the military industrial lobby.

Also CP and NCP favored constraining arguments when their group positions changed to positive. The indicator four presented in the methodology section – party position towards the Ottawa treaty changing from negative to positive followed by a change in rhetoric emphasizing reputational/consistency issues – was present both in the case of CP in 2004 and NCP in 2011. In 2001 the CP used security arguments seven times and economic arguments three, but in 2004 security arguments dropped to three and economic to one, while constraining arguments increased to eight. The pessimistic stance of the CP however reflected in the time frame of the accession. The original accession date of 2006 was postponed till 2012. Also in the final vote of 2011 the CP was divided: 17 voted yes and 11 no. This can be explained by the fact that in 2011 CP was an opposition party and thus experiencing less constraint. The behavior also supports the idea that the right side of the political spectrum had only instrumentally adopted the mine stance. The process of the NCPs mine stance follows similar lines. NCP used security and economic arguments throughout the process, but finally yielded and the rhetoric started to emphasize constraining justifications.

What is surprising is that although humanitarian arguments are slightly more present towards the end of the process, this increase is not dramatic. Those actors who are inclined towards the accession rather argue through constraining lines by referring to the number of other countries that have joined or that Finland is an outlier among a peer group. Especially references to the aggregate number of states inside the Ottawa Treaty, is often present in the debate. Table nine shows the total number of arguments used and also aggregate number of justifications by party. Constraining justifications were used 41 times during the debate and constitutive only 17 times. Only the Left Alliance and the Green Party relied heavily on constitutive justifications. NCP relied most heavily on security arguments, referring to the matter 21 times. The second is Center Party with 12 and third the True Finns with 11 justifications. The NCP and the CP which both yielded in favor of the Ottawa Convention use primarily constraining justifications for the accession. Economic justifications were most popular among the NCP.

	Security	Economic	Constitutive	Constraining
SDP	6	2	1	13
CP	12	8	1	9
NCP	21	17	0	4
LA	1	0	8	8
CDP	1	3	0	0
GP	0	0	6	5
SPP	1	1	1	2
TF	11	8	0	0
Total	53	39	17	41

*Table 9: Argument frequency 2001 – 2011*

During the debates actors consistently referred to studies that supported their own perception of the issue. Actors who represented the right side of the political spectrum tended to refer to studies made by the military or defence forces and emphasize the military utility of antipersonnel landmines. Similarly the left side of the political spectrum referred to studies made by peace organizations and NGOs which supported their perception. Even same numbers provided by the same organization could be used either to support or oppose the Ottawa treaty. For example MP Heikki Autto (NCP) referred to the death toll of 4000 in 2010 being small compared to the early 1990s and MP Annika Lapintie (LA) used the same number to demonstrate that landmines still cause human suffering. This kind of behavior, where actor uses arguments that support their own world view, is supporting the constructivist logic. Rational models assume that actors, whether government or individual political leaders, act rationally and perceive the world systematically arriving into decisions through “an open intellectual process: goals are ordered, a search is made for relevant information, a wide range of alternatives is considered, and the option that maximizes the benefits while minimizing costs is selected”.<sup>208</sup> Different actors had different cognitive frames or belief systems that can be treated as lenses through which the actor views the world. For the right side of the political spectrum, the lens through which AP-landmines were viewed is security. On the other hand, actors whose world view was originally inclined towards disarmament and solidarity quickly internalized the humanitarian logic. Generally the latter group consisted of the left wing parties. These findings refute the “rational actor” model and support findings made in the field

<sup>208</sup> Rosati, J.A. (1995). A Cognitive Approach to the Study of Foreign Policy. / In Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in its Second Generations. Neack L., Haney, P.J., Hey, J.A.K. (ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 50.

of political psychology. Objective reality is filtered through subjective belief system which strives to consistency.<sup>209</sup> In a seminal piece, Robert Jervis writes: “It is often impossible to explain crucial decisions and policies without reference to the decision makers’ belief about the world and their images of others”.<sup>210</sup> This also means that, in the case of Finland, the norm against landmines has not reached the last phase of the norm life cycle, internalization.

When it comes to the hypotheses presented in section 3.5, it can be concluded that both mechanisms played a role. However, when looking at the frequency of justification used, the constitutive arguments were not present as often as constraining. Moral persuasion during the ten year span analyzed has also less support, since the indicator two presented in the Table four of the methodology is not present: no party which was originally opposing the treaty started in any given point justify the accession on humanitarian grounds, this applies both to CP in 2004 and NCP in 2011.<sup>211</sup> Only exception is one statement in 2004 by Rauno Kettunen (CP) who argued that the decision is in line with Finland’s long standing *humanitarian* policy.<sup>212</sup> Even this can be interpreted to be somewhat constraining, because it refers to earlier policy commitments. However, the statement is allocated to the constitutive category because MP Kettunen has accepted the issue being framed as humanitarian. To answer the research question however, why Finland joined the Ottawa treaty, in the light of the results, hypotheses H3b - constraining primary, constitutive secondary - has the strongest empirical support. This option was hypothesized to have support if both constitutive and constraining justification were present in the debates, but there was more indication towards constraining. It can be said however that both mechanisms are necessary but alone not sufficient reason for joining. Without the left wing parties being morally persuaded already in the beginning phases of the process, the decision would never have been arrived to the parliament. For example Jeffrey Checkel calls elites “‘gatekeepers’ who ultimately control the political agenda”.<sup>213</sup> However, it is as much unlikely that the parties on the right, who are maintaining a very realist picture of world politics and advocate a strong national defence, would have ever yielded towards the accession without international pressures stemming from the fact that majority of states in the

---

<sup>209</sup> Holsti, O. (1962). The Belief System and National Images: A Case Study. – *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 6(3), 244.

<sup>210</sup> Jervis, R. (1976). *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. / New jersey: Princeton University Press, 28.

<sup>211</sup> The indicator was formulated: “Actor (party or individual MP) position towards the Ottawa Treaty changing from negative to positive as more information comes available, followed by a change in rhetoric emphasizing humanitarian/moral issues”

<sup>212</sup> PTK 97/2004, 74.

<sup>213</sup> Checkel 1997, 476.

world had acceded to the treaty and that Finland was an outlier in the EU and in the world. Even when Finland faced strong economic constraints after the financial crisis, Finland's identity as a reliable international contracting partner prevented it from reversing the past decisions, a justification present in the rhetoric of the NCP during 2011 debate. Also, the fact that the left wing parties did not use humanitarian arguments as often, even when it is the official justification found from the FSDP's, but relied on referring to other states, supports that the left wing parties perceived this argument to be more effective in persuading the conservatives than moral persuasion based on humanitarian arguments. Although landmine victim stories, so called "priming", did happen, this was consistently rebutted by the counter arguers by statements such as Finland was not partaking in the problem since Finnish antipersonnel landmines are in warehouses. In many points, by referring to other states, the left wing parties invoked a question of identity by making the opponent choose to which group Finland belongs. Even among the group of the True Finns it was acknowledged that it is an exception that a "civilized nation" such as Finland is outside the treaty.

These empirical findings are also consistent with the predictions of the norm life cycle, which posits that after the norm cascade has been reached, the dominant mechanism is no longer moral persuasion, but peer pressure which works through legitimacy, esteem and conformity. Legitimacy of a state comes from other states. This is why the number of other states was frequently referred to. Esteem referred to image, of what other states think of Finland. Because of this many actors were concerned about the impact of being out of Ottawa Treaty to Finland's image. Conformity referred to the need of states being part of a certain group. This explains statements which argued that "civilized nations" should not use indiscriminate weapons, but also references to smaller peer groups such as the European Union which was present in the official justifications.

## **Conclusion**

This study was a case study of Finland's recent decision to join the Ottawa Treaty banning antipersonnel landmines and asked a research question of why Finland joined the Ottawa Convention? The research used process tracing as a method to analyze justifications for the accession. The theoretical approach of this study can be labeled as sociological institutionalism. Institutions work as an intervening variable between actor preferences and policy outcomes. These preferences however are not exogenously given but stem from within – endogenously – and are shaped by interaction. This study looked at two mechanisms how

preferences can be reshaped: by constitutive and constraining mechanisms. Before the actual case study, this study reviewed the evolution of the norm against landmines. Unlike during the Geneva negotiations, in the Ottawa process, the international civil society was in a key position to promote and keep the issue on the international political agenda, by framing landmines from a military and security issue to a humanitarian problem. This was possible because of the political opportunity structure provided by the international humanitarian law, and especially the long standing principles of *jus in bello*, which requires civilian populations to be protected during a conflict and that gains of a military action needs to be proportional and not cause unnecessary harm or suffering. Majority of landmine studies, such as the work of Price and Rutheford cited in this study, concentrate on the international level of analysis. This study complements these studies, but also norms literature in general, by looking at the domestic level.

By analyzing the debates conducted at the Finnish Parliament between the years 2001 and 2011 this study found empirical evidence that from the hypothesized constitutive and constraining mechanisms, both played a role in the Finland's decision. Without the left wing parties being receptive to the moral persuasion and re-framing of the landmine issue already in the beginning phases of the process, it is unlikely that the right wing parties would have had enough political will to push the change forward. On the other hand, the constraints posed by the identity of Finland as a developed western "civilized state", member of the European Union and a credible international contracting partner prevented it to reverse the political decision even after facing increased economic constraint after the financial crisis.

The findings support the notion that the constraining mechanism is more important than moral persuasion after the norm cascade has been reached. For Finland, it was no longer appropriate behavior to use landmines as a mean to defend the country, not only because of their indiscriminate nature and humanitarian reasons, but also because of peer pressure stemming from shared identity. Future studies could compare discussions in other cases before and after the norm cascade has been reached to further find empirical support for this finding. The other interesting finding was the clear cut division between the left and the right. Future studies could devise an analysis that would use left-right divide as a predictor for landmine stance, but also for other kind of disarmament. Not only could one look at whether left promote more disarmament than the right but also which of the two mechanisms works better at socializing to emerging norms. Are for example the left wing parties more receptive to moral persuasion and right wing parties to peer pressure? A noteworthy finding is also the lack of successful

moral persuasion. Individual MPs, but also the group statements of the parties, tended to cite information that supported their own belief systems. This supports the findings made in the field of political psychology: individuals strive to cognitive consistency by filtering out information that work against their belief system and emphasize supporting evidence. Future study could go even further and move from the domestic level of analysis to individual level and investigate in which circumstances and through what mechanisms individuals are receptive to information that works against their belief systems. These questions however were out of the scope of this study.

Was the issue “right” decision is in the hands of the perceiver and depends on how actor defines interests. If the issue is perceived solely from a military-security vantage point it was the “wrong” decision. Landmine ban does decrease the defence capability against a traditional wide scale military invasion. If one however has a more cosmopolitan worldview and emphasizes humanitarian aspects, and incorporates a moral calculus into the decision making, the landmine decision was the “right” decision. Landmines are indiscriminate weapons which cause wide scale human suffering. These two perceptions were the main divide among the Finnish parliament. Only time will tell whether there will ever be a strong internalized international norm against landmines similar to chemical and biological weapons.

## **Bibliography**

- Axelrod, R. (1986). An Evolutionary Approach to Norms – *The American political Science Review*, 80(4), 1095 – 1111.
- Barnes, J., Carter, M., Skidmore, M. (1980). *The World of Politics*. / New York: St. Martin's Press
- Bulmer, S. (1993). The Governance of the European Union: A New Institutional Approach. – *Journal of Public Policy*, 13(4), 351 – 380.
- Checkel, J. (1997). International Norms and Domestic Politics: Bridging the Rationalist Constructivist Divide – *European Journal of International Relations*, 3, 473 – 495.
- Cottrell, M.P. (2009). Legitimacy and Institutional Replacement: The Convention of Certain Conventional Weapons and the Emergence of the Mine Ban Treaty – *International Organization*, 63, 217 – 248.
- Dai, X. (2007). *International Institutions and National policies*. / Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Entman, R. (1989). *Democracy without Citizens: Media and the Decay of American Politics*. / New York: Oxford University Press.
- Finnemore, M., Sikkink, K. (1998). International Norms Dynamics and Political Change – *International Organization*, 52(4), 887 – 917.
- Franck, T.M. (1988). Legitimacy in International System – *American Journal of International Law*, 82, 705 – 759.
- George, A.L., Bennett, A. (2005). *Case studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. / Cambridge: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs.
- Grigorescu, A. (2003). International Organizations and Government Transparency: Linking the International and Domestic Realms. – *International Studies Quarterly*, 47, 643 – 67.
- Holsti, O. (1962). The Belief System and National Images: A Case Study. – *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 6(3), 244 – 252.
- Hurd, I. (1999). Legitimacy and Authority in International Politics – *International Organization*, 53, 379 – 408.



- Jervis, R. (1976). *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. / New jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Landmine Monitor Report 2011 / International Campaign to Ban Landmines WWW: [www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2011/es/Major\\_findings.html](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2011/es/Major_findings.html) (Last (Accessed 3 May 2012)
- Maresca, L., Maslen, S. (2000). *The Banning of Anti-Personnel Landmines: The Legal Contribution of the International Committee of the Red Cross, 1955-1999*. / Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- McGrath, R. (1994). *Landmines: Legacy of Conflict: A Manual for Development Workers*. / Oxford: Oxfam.
- Mearsheimer, J.J. (1994). The False promise of international Institutions – *International Security*, 15, 5 – 56.
- Phillips, R.L. (1984) *War and Justice*. / Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Price, R. (1998). Reversing Gun Sughts: Transnational Civil Society Targets Land Mines – *International Organization*, 52(3), 613 – 644.
- Rosati, J.A. (1995). A Cognitive Approach to the Study of Foreign Policy. / *Foreing Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in its Second Generations*. Neack L., Haney, P.J., Hey, J.A.K. (ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 49 – 70.
- Ruthenford, K.R. (2000). The Evolving Arms Control Agenda: Implications of the Role of NGOs in Banning Antipersonnel Landmines – *World Politics*, 53(1), 74 – 114.
- Searle, J. (1995). *The Construction of Social Reality*. / New York: The Free Press.
- Snidal, D. (1985). Coordination versus Prisoners Dilemma: Implications for International Cooperation Regimes – *American Political Science Review*, 79, 923 – 942.
- Stein, A.A. (2006). Neoliberal Institutionalism. / *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Snidal, D., Reus-Smit, C. (eds). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stein, A.A. (1985). Coordination and Collaboration: Regimes in an Anarchic World – *International Organizations*, 36, 299 – 324.
- Strada, G. (1994). The Horror of Landmines – *Scientific America*, 42.
- Wohlforth, W.C. (1993). *The Elusive Balance: Power and Perception During Cold War*. / Ithaca: Cornell University Press

Walt, S.M. (2009). Alliances in a Unipolar World – *World Politics*, 61(1), 86 – 120.

Waltz, K.N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. / New York: Random House.

Williams, J. Goose, D. (1998). The international Campaign to Ban Landmines. / *To Walk Without Fear: The Global Movement to ban Landmines*. Cameron, A.M., Tomlin, B.W., Lawson, R.J. (ed.). Toronto: Oxford University Press.

## Appendix

All data is translated by the researcher from the original Finnish language to English with respect to the original meaning. All sources, for example “PTK 87/2001”, use the same abbreviation that is present at the online archive of the Finnish Parliament. If one wants to extract the original Finnish text it can be done by entering the abbreviation, for example “PTK 87/2001”, to the search engine at <http://www.eduskunta.fi>.

### Argument Frequency Data 2001

#### Government

Party	Against		For	
	Security	Economic	Constitutive	Constraining
SDP	1 <sup>1</sup> 2 <sup>2</sup> 3 <sup>3</sup> 4 <sup>4</sup> 5 <sup>5</sup> 6 <sup>6</sup>	1 <sup>7</sup> 2 <sup>8</sup>	1 <sup>9</sup>	1 <sup>10</sup> 2 <sup>11</sup> 3 <sup>12</sup> 4 <sup>13</sup>
LA	1 <sup>14</sup>			1 <sup>15</sup> 2 <sup>16</sup>
NCP	1 <sup>17</sup> 2 <sup>18</sup> 3 <sup>19</sup> 4 <sup>20</sup> 5 <sup>21</sup>	1 <sup>22</sup> 2 <sup>23</sup> 3 <sup>24</sup> 4 <sup>25</sup> 5 <sup>26</sup> 6 <sup>27</sup> 7 <sup>28</sup> 8 <sup>29</sup>		
GP			1 <sup>30</sup> 2 <sup>31</sup> 3 <sup>32</sup>	
SPP	1 <sup>33</sup>	1 <sup>34</sup>	1 <sup>35</sup>	
CDP		1 <sup>36</sup>		

#### Opposition

Party	Against		For	
	Security	Economic	Constitutive	Constraining
CP	1 <sup>37</sup> 2 <sup>38</sup> 3 <sup>39</sup> 4 <sup>40</sup> 5 <sup>41</sup> 6 <sup>42</sup> 7 <sup>43</sup>	1 <sup>44</sup> 2 <sup>45</sup> 3 <sup>46</sup>		
TF	1 <sup>47</sup>	1 <sup>48</sup>		

## Argument Frequency Data 2004

### Government

Party	Against		For	
	Security	Economic	Constitutive	Constraining
CP	1 <sup>49</sup> 2 <sup>50</sup>	1 <sup>51</sup>	1 <sup>52</sup>	1 <sup>53</sup> 2 <sup>54</sup> 3 <sup>55</sup> 4 <sup>56</sup> 5 <sup>57</sup> 6 <sup>58</sup> 7 <sup>59</sup> 8 <sup>60</sup>
SDP		1 <sup>61</sup>		1 <sup>62</sup> 2 <sup>63</sup> 3 <sup>64</sup> 4 <sup>65</sup> 5 <sup>66</sup> 6 <sup>67</sup> 7 <sup>68</sup>
SPP				

### Opposition

Party	Against		For	
	Security	Economic	Constitutive	Constraining
NCP	1 <sup>69</sup> 2 <sup>70</sup> 3 <sup>71</sup> 4 <sup>72</sup> 5 <sup>73</sup> 6 <sup>74</sup> 7 <sup>75</sup> 8 <sup>76</sup> 9 <sup>77</sup> 10 <sup>78</sup> 11 <sup>79</sup> 12 <sup>80</sup>	1 <sup>81</sup> 2 <sup>82</sup> 3 <sup>83</sup> 4 <sup>84</sup> 5 <sup>85</sup> 6 <sup>86</sup> 7 <sup>87</sup>		1 <sup>88</sup> 2 <sup>89</sup>
CDP	1 <sup>90</sup>	1 <sup>91</sup> 2 <sup>92</sup>		
GP				1 <sup>93</sup>
TF	1 <sup>94</sup>	1 <sup>95</sup>		
LA			1 <sup>96</sup> 2 <sup>97</sup> 3 <sup>98</sup> 4 <sup>99</sup>	1 <sup>100</sup> 2 <sup>101</sup>

## Argument Frequency Data 2011

### Government

Party	Against		For	
	Security	Economic	Constitutive	Constraining
NCP	1 <sup>102</sup> 2 <sup>103</sup> 3 <sup>104</sup> 4 <sup>105</sup>	1 <sup>106</sup> 2 <sup>107</sup>		1 <sup>108</sup> 2 <sup>109</sup>
SDP				1 <sup>110</sup> 2 <sup>111</sup>
LA			1 <sup>112</sup> 2 <sup>113</sup> 3 <sup>114</sup> 4 <sup>115</sup>	1 <sup>116</sup> 2 <sup>117</sup> 3 <sup>118</sup> 4 <sup>119</sup>
GP			1 <sup>120</sup> 2 <sup>121</sup>	1 <sup>122</sup> 2 <sup>123</sup> 3 <sup>124</sup> 4 <sup>125</sup>
SPP				1 <sup>126</sup> 2 <sup>127</sup>
CDP				

### Opposition

Party	Against		For	
	Security	Economic	Constitutive	Constraining
CP	1 <sup>128</sup> 2 <sup>129</sup> 3 <sup>130</sup>	1 <sup>131</sup> 2 <sup>132</sup> 3 <sup>133</sup> 4 <sup>134</sup>		1 <sup>135</sup>
TF	1 <sup>136</sup> 2 <sup>137</sup> 3 <sup>138</sup> 4 <sup>139</sup> 5 <sup>140</sup> 6 <sup>141</sup> 7 <sup>142</sup> 8 <sup>143</sup> 9 <sup>144</sup>	1 <sup>145</sup> 2 <sup>146</sup> 3 <sup>147</sup> 4 <sup>148</sup> 5 <sup>149</sup> 6 <sup>150</sup>		

---

<sup>1</sup> PTK 87/2001, 30: Jukka Gustafsson: I do not agree with the Green party, that Finland should join because it has an impact elsewhere. In my view, landmines have national, political and historical symbolic and practical value. It is also a question of money and expenses.

<sup>2</sup> PTK 87/2001, 34: Esa Lahtela: Apparently there have been skilled lobbyists at Ottawa, gun manufacturers, who lobbied representatives so they could sell new weapons. We have to understand this in Finland, so we do not fall into this trap. This would create arms race, because weapons are replaced with different kinds of efficient systems. Because of this, the Greens should come to that group, who want to abandon automatic weapons. Those are used for attacking. Mines are for defense.

<sup>3</sup> PTK 87/2001: Matti Vähänäkki: In my opinion, Finland should, as for now, abstain from joining the landmines treaty. Circumstances in Finland, with vast forests and many lakes do not pose danger. Our country's tradition is to evacuate civilian populations away from the battle zones in an early stage.

<sup>4</sup> PTK 89/2001, 17: Esa Lahtela: Behind the mine ban is the military industrial lobby.

<sup>5</sup> PTK 89/2001, 25: Matti Saari: Landmines are cheap and defensive weapon system. It would be useful to negotiate an exception for us in the use of landmines.

<sup>6</sup> PTK 89/2001, 27: Antero Kekkonen: Comparing chemical weapons to landmines is unjustified. Chemical weapons are not defensive weapons like landmines are.

<sup>7</sup> PTK 87/2001, 30: Jukka Gustafsson: I do not agree with the Green party, that Finland should join because it has an impact elsewhere. In my view, landmines have national, political and historical symbolic and practical value. It is also a question of money and expenses.

<sup>8</sup> PTK 87/2001, 87: Sakari Smeds: New weapon systems that would replace already existing mines would be costly. Citizens would rather want these funds be spent on healthcare or on the education of our children.

<sup>9</sup> PTK 87/2001, 86: Piia Viitanen: ... When this summer I started Harry Potter books, there was a magic mirror which showed the world as the viewer would want it to be, not like it is. After this debate, if I would go in front of the mirror, I would see a world where there would not be any guns, no missile systems, and no landmines.

<sup>10</sup> PTK 87/2001, 8: Antero Kekkonen: Social Democratic Parliamentary Group views that Finland, in accordance with the Finnish policy of supporting international disarmament and humanitarian co-operation, has to join the Ottawa Treaty as soon as possible.

<sup>11</sup> PTK 87/2001, 60-62: Ilkka Taipale: Soon 40 years as a member of the Committee of Hundred I have followed this cultural change and trying to promote it. 60's generation placed their will against their fathers in an attempt to promote non-violent culture across generations. [...] National Defense Doctrine has taken realistic approach to landmines. They will be abandoned. This has not happened voluntarily anywhere in the world, but as a result of wide ranging civil campaign.

<sup>12</sup> PTK 87/2001, 8: Antero Kekkonen: Social Democratic Parliamentary Group views that Finland, in accordance with the Finnish policy of supporting international disarmament and humanitarian co-operation, has to join the Ottawa Treaty as soon as possible.

<sup>13</sup> PTK 89/2001, 25 - 26: Kimmo Kiljunen: The bigger question in the landmines case is that it is tied into international agreement framework, to the Ottawa Convention, where over hundred states have already committed themselves. In international disarmament one cannot begin from the assumption that the weapon is strategically important to some country, if this assumption is made, international disarmament is impossible. I have just visited Iraq for example, and one could imagine Saddam Hussein to argue that biological weapons are strategically important for Iraq.

<sup>14</sup> PTK 87/2001, 50: Jaakko Laakso: Landmines have been and still are important segment of our defense ability. Finland has used, and is planning to use, landmines responsibly. Like I stated, when Ottawa Treaty was signed and Sweden among the first ones was signing it, Washington Post wrote, that it is easy to do, because Finland is Sweden's landmine. It is thus hard to agree on strict deadlines on joining the treaty when we do not have systems that would credibly replace landmines, or money to create those systems.

<sup>15</sup> PTK 87/2001, 17: Outi Ojala: Left Alliance regrets, that our country has not joined the treaty like 140 other countries have done.

<sup>16</sup> PTK 87/2001, 37: Annika Lapintie: Good neighborly relations and disarmament are much more efficient [than spending more money], and defense policy should concentrate on this much more. Because of this, I feel it is very important that joining the Ottawa treaty in 2006 will be binding.

<sup>17</sup> PTK 87/2001, 14-15: Ilkka Kanerva: System that would replace antipersonnel landmines would be very expensive. There will not be sufficient funds to replace the current system in the coming years. Finland should not commit itself to strict deadlines, because there is not enough political will to allocate more money. Finland

---

cannot afford to abandon landmines without endangering its defense. Landmines are for defense and very useful in a country such as Finland.

<sup>18</sup> PTK 87/2001, 31, Olli Nepponen: It is a pleasure to support previous speaker's opinion about landmines (Gustafsson/SDP). Credible defense requires [landmines]. Money that is needed to replace them is so grand, that it cannot be found.

<sup>19</sup> PTK 87/2001, 33: Eero Akaan-Penttilä: I absolutely cannot understand, how Finnish people could abandon them [landmines]. Our GDP is the smallest of the Nordic Countries. In a matter of fact we have the longest border to the East, and vice versa, our defense budgets relation to our GDP, if compared to Sweden and Norway.

<sup>20</sup> PTK 87/2001: Riitta Korhonen: For Finland, antipersonnel landmines are defensive weapon that Finland keeps in warehouses and used only in a situation where Finland needs to defend against aggression. Investment of 4 milliard to destroy landmines in this economic situation is unrealistic.

<sup>21</sup> PTK 87/2001, 101: Pekka Ravi: In principle, it is good that Finland is supporting efficient and global ban for landmines. However, we must first investigate how can we replace this, in the case of enemy intrusion, very important aspect of our territorial defense, and can we really afford to fill the hole that abandoning them would create.

<sup>22</sup> PTK 87/2001, 33: Eero Akaan-Penttilä: I absolutely cannot understand, how Finnish people could abandon them [landmines]. : Our GDP is the smallest of the Nordic Countries. In a matter of fact we have the longest border to the East, and vice versa, our defense budgets relation to our GDP, if compared to Sweden and Norway.

<sup>23</sup> PTK 87/2001, 14-15: Ilkka Kanerva: System that would replace antipersonnel landmines would be very expensive. There will not be sufficient funds to replace the current system in the coming years. Finland should not commit itself to strict deadlines, because there is not enough political will to allocate more money. Finland cannot afford to abandon landmines without endangering its defense. Landmines are for defense and very useful in a country such as Finland.

<sup>24</sup> PTK 87/2001, 31, Olli Nepponen: It is a pleasure to support previous speaker's opinion about landmines (Gustafsson/SDP). Credible defense requires [landmines]. Money that is needed to replace them is so grand, that it cannot be found.

<sup>25</sup> PTK 87/2001, 57: Juha Karpio: In our country, mines have been used only during war and they have been swiped of afterwards and there have been no casualties during peace. Landmines are still the cheapest way to slow the enemy down.

<sup>26</sup> PTK 87/2001, 66: Jyrki Katainen: Landmine ban sound in fact more noble that it is, especially because it does not treat different parts of the world equally. Like NCP group statement point out, in Finland there is no single mine on the ground, they are in warehouses. ... it would be very unlikely to find political will in the parliament to increase defense budget to fund replacing systems. According to some estimates, the replacing system would cost even four milliard Finnish marks.

<sup>27</sup> PTK 87/2001: Riitta Korhonen: For Finland, antipersonnel landmines are defensive weapon that Finland keeps in warehouses and used only in a situation where Finland needs to defend against aggression. Investing four milliard, to destroy landmines in this economic situation, is unrealistic.

<sup>28</sup> PTK 87/2001, 101: Pekka Ravi: In principle, it is good that Finland is supporting efficient and global ban for landmines. However, we must first investigate how we could replace this, in the case of enemy intrusion, very important aspect of our territorial defense, and can we really afford to fill the hole that abandoning them would create.

<sup>29</sup> PTK 89/2991, 16: Seppo Kanerva: Mines cannot be abandoned without replacing system. Like is apparent from the statements of others, we can see clearly that we cannot abandon them because there is no money.

<sup>30</sup> PTK 87/2001, 30: Ulla Anttila: Greens support the signing of the Landmines treaty. The question is not what happens at the border, meaning that nothing happens, but the issue is, that if Finland signs the treaty, it has great impact on those countries, where this question is a problem. Landmines destroy human life all around the world, and if the international community cannot promote the treaty systematically, it sets an bad example to those countries, which do not follow the basic principles of the treaty in practice. Thus, in my opinion, signing of the treaty, and that the government has a positive stance on it, will have very positive impact internationally.

<sup>31</sup> PTK 87/2001, 39: Ulla Anttila: About landmines, I must state, that the treaty is very important in connection to other kind of disarmament. This must not be forgotten.

<sup>32</sup> PTK 87/2001,77-78: Anni Sinnemäki: On the other hand, joining the Ottawa treaty is important in the respect of universalizing this treaty, to get it worldwide. In addition, some brought up, that we could ban all

---

kinds of other weapons. I agree that disarmament in general is a good thing, and this is one of those issues. Thus, Finland should join the treaty because it is the only real way to support it.

<sup>33</sup> PTK 87/2001, 28: Defense Minister Jan-Erik Enestam: As in my previous speech was stated, the goal is to join the treaty by the year 2006 and disarm the landmines by the year 2010, without jeopardizing our defense ability. This is very obvious constraint... Replacement systems are very expensive.

<sup>34</sup> PTK 87/2001, 28: Defense Minister Jan-Erik Enestam: As in my previous speech was stated, the goal is to join the treaty by the year 2006 and disarm the landmines by the year 2010, without jeopardizing our defense ability. This is very obvious constraint... Replacement systems are very expensive.

<sup>35</sup> PTK 87/2001, 3: Defense Minister Jan-Erik Enestam: Finland supports efficient and global ban for antipersonnel landmines in accordance with the goals of the Ottawa Treaty.

<sup>36</sup> PTK 87/2001, 24: Ismo Seivästö: Replacing antipersonnel landmines would cost 4 to 5 milliard, and there is no such money right now. Finland should join Ottawa treaty in the long run, not in a rush.

<sup>37</sup> PTK 87/2001, 9: Juha Korkea-aho: The opinion of the Center Party is that a statement abandoning antipersonnel landmines should not be made because there are no plans, fiscal or other, on how to replace this central element of territorial defense.

<sup>38</sup> PTK 87/2001, 32: Mirja Ryyänen: I think international pressures have been strongly over exaggerated.

<sup>39</sup> PTK 87/2001, 64: Markku Rossi: I am exact opposite of MP Taipale. There is no reason for Finland to join the Ottawa treaty, not even in a long run, at least not during this decade. We need landmines also for defense. Finland has long borders and it means very much. No country will downgrade Finland if it will not join the Ottawa Treaty.

<sup>40</sup> PTK 87/2001, 99: Lauri Oinonen: Still, there is no reason to sign the Ottawa treaty, because the treaty's conditions do not fulfill even beyond our borders. From the vantage point of Finland's defense, especially territorial one, mines are efficient, cheap, domestic and 100 percent safe defensive weapon.

<sup>41</sup> PTK 89, 2001: Mauri Salo: Credible defence in the whole country is a guarantor of peace at our borders. When we make sure that landmines, which are in warehouses at the moment, can be placed quickly, it also gives as feeling of safety.

<sup>42</sup> PTK 89/2001: 34: Lauri Oinonen: Finland cannot afford to abandon landmines, they are necessary. I would like to specify my point made last time on how Finland could do international PR. Finland is in the top when it comes to mine sweeping. Finland could get international points with this, not by signing a treaty, which is impossible to us, like the Ottawa Treaty is.

<sup>43</sup> PTK 89/2001, 38: Kari Myllyniemi: Finland can never abandon landmines. Even talking about it reduces the perception that Finland is willing to defend its territory with all the means necessary. Mines cannot be even replaced, and it would even cost at least 4 to 5 milliard marks.

<sup>44</sup> ERROR

<sup>45</sup> PTK 87/2001, 56: Aulis Ranta-Muotio: Landmines are cheap weapon that are used only in a real need against attacking enemy and during peace mines are in warehouse. It is better to be active in mine sweeping, than to join the treaty after the fact.

<sup>46</sup> PTK 89/2001, 38: Kari Myllyniemi: Finland can never abandon landmines. Even talking about it reduces the perception that Finland is willing to defend its territory with all the means necessary. Mines cannot be even replaced, and it would even cost at least 4 to 5 milliard marks.

<sup>47</sup> PTK 87/2001, 26: Raimo Vistbacka: Finland has a very long border with Russia, border, which no other EU country yet have. If landmines would be abandoned, it would require expensive border monitoring system that would cover the whole long border. The price of such would be several milliard Finnish Marks.

<sup>48</sup> PTK 87/2001, 26: Raimo Vistbacka: Finland has a very long border with Russia, border, which no other EU country yet have. If landmines would be abandoned, it would require expensive border monitoring system that would cover the whole long border. The price of such would be several milliard Finnish Marks.

<sup>49</sup> PTK 97/2004, 43: Pekka Vilkkunen: About the mine question: absolutely we are too hygienic, we are more sacred than Pope himself. Those mines are not endangering anybody when they are in stock and big countries aren't in the treaty at all.

<sup>50</sup> PTK 97/2004, 72: Lauri Oinonen: Our territorial defence ability deteriorates if we abandon landmines. The attacker can come with a triple speed, when antipersonnel landmines are not guarding other mines.

<sup>51</sup> PTK 97/2004, 96: Lauri Oinonen: I fully understand the humanitarian ideas that are born when one sees mine shredder limbs, but they are not caused by Finnish mines. We know our mines are locked away. Because of this I see it necessary to ponder this question rationally, but also to think do we have reasons to spend the money on replacing systems, we could instead allocate the money to somewhere else.



---

<sup>52</sup> PTK 97/2004, 74: Rauno Kettunen: Because our eastern neighbor or the USA has not signed the treaty, we should have also abstained. However, the line of the government should be viewed as a positive signal to other countries outside the Ottawa Treaty. The decision is in line with our long standing international humanitarian policy.

<sup>53</sup> PTK 97/2004, 6: PM Matti Vanhanen: Finland joins the Landmines banning Ottawa Treaty in the year 2012. This will mean that landmines will be given away by the end of 2016. Replacing systems will be acquired during the years 2009-2016. Already in previous security and defense strategy guided to this direction. Now joining will get a concrete date and a decision will be made for to its approval.

<sup>54</sup> PTK 97/2004, 10-11: Kauko Juhantalo: (Group statement) Public debate has concentrated especially on landmines and Nato option. Landmines have been integral part of our defense. International responsibilities however require us to join the Ottawa landmines Treaty, based on the timeframe agreed upon here. Wide ranging conversation on the issue has been beneficial. Based on rational arguments the timeframe, that also National Coalition Party during the last government agreed upon, of joining has been postponed nearly ten years. Even more could have been afforded. To replace landmines the Defense Forces will get additional 200 million euros.

<sup>55</sup> PTK 97/2004, 33: PM Matti Vanhanen: Foreign and security policy should not be conducted so that now one decision is made, but later will be said that after next elections it will change. Every time a decision is made, it will be in force. This kind on continuity one could wish also in this hard landmines question, in which we have lined our action in 1997 and 2001. We have given a clear signal from Finland what is our goal.

<sup>56</sup> PTK 97/2004, 44: PM Matti vanhanen: I have told without contradictions, that when last time a goal was set, now we make a clear decision and define what are the consequences.

<sup>57</sup> PTK 97/2004, 45: Olavi Ala-Nissilä: Offcourse consistency is important in foreign and security policy in the parliament also for the big parties.

<sup>58</sup> PTK 97/2004: Aulis Ranta-Muotio: There has been no contradiction in this proposal in connection to mines. We just thought the time frame is too quick, so that we could have joined in 2006 and give away the mines in 2010.

<sup>59</sup> PTK 97/2004, 58: Antti Rantakangas: It has been good, that the history of this decision has been brought up. In the last policy in 2001, the last government made a decision, that was also supported by NCP, that Finland will join the Ottawa Treaty in 2006 and mines would be given away in 2012 [wrong date]. This was not a weak promise, as MP Zyskowitz has depicted, but a clear goal of the government, The current line is a good compromise. Ottawa treaty will be joined in 2012, and mines given away in 2016.

<sup>60</sup> PTK 98/2004, 40: Klaus Pentti: By doing this decision we respect contracts made earlier, but prolong the accession date, which is good economically and for seeking replacement systems.

<sup>61</sup> PTK 97/2004, 87: Tero Rönni: Our economic situation will be tough in the future, so I cannot agree on the increase of the defence budget. Mines should be where they are now, and let them be outdated on their own. There are all kinds of Kioto's and Ottawa's which we have signed among the first wave without looking carefully what we are doing.

<sup>62</sup> PTK 97/2004, 11 Liisa Jaakonsaari: (Group Statement) It is good, that the decision is done. Finland has represented itself as an advocate for the mine ban for over seven year In international forums. It would be contradictory to act otherwise.

<sup>63</sup> PTK 97/2004, 35: Liisa Jaakonsaari: To the NCP I would like to say, that you have continuously argued that there is no reason to be worried about what is thought of us abroad. Obviously there is not. But from what one should be worried about is that if Finnish politics is not consistent. Finland has consistently driven the landmine ban, because of this it is upmost important that the government has come to this decision. The question is about the consistency of policy.

<sup>64</sup> PTK 97/2004, 40: FM Erkki Tuomioja: In my opinion we have after long internal talks arrived at a time frame which is realistic, fundable and also preserves the consistency of Finland's policy. Luckily that consistency is no longer in the hands of NCP which has changed its views drastically.

<sup>65</sup> PTK 97/2004: Liisa Jaakonsaari: What has stayed unclear is NCPs mine policy because example from Zyskowitz's statement it is clear that NCP is against the Ottawa Treaty. This is very inconsistent if you have been involved in a policy for the past seven years which has driven mine ban.

<sup>66</sup> PTK 97/2004, 59: Lauri Kähkönen: The decision to postpone the mine ban is a just compromise.

<sup>67</sup> PTK 97/2004, 93: Arto Seppälä: Respecting national decisions is an important issue in respect to the official image of Finland.

---

<sup>68</sup> PTK 98/2004, 29: Kalevi Olin: My own interest is precisely the one that was pointed to the FM: what is the foreign policy viewpoint of this issue, because we are viewed as very reliable, small country, which is reliable contracting partner in international arena.

<sup>69</sup> PTK 97/2004, 36: Ben Zyskowitz: Landmines are necessary and beneficial defensive weapons. They strengthen our national security and are locked away during peace. Even in the times of crisis, the only ones who will step on them is the enemy soldier. I do not agree with the line of the government. It is said that this decision is necessary for the reputation of Finland. I do not understand, that if the scale balances between national security and reputation, that the reputation would weight more.

<sup>70</sup> PTK 97/2004, 60: Jere Lahti: In the interim report of 2003 by the Ministry of Defence it was stated that in a military sense landmines are good defence strategy that is based on a conscription army because they are simple and cheap. If however in the future the threat models change, that we are not faced with the danger of wide scale attack, then landmines become obsolete. This kind of change has not happened. The threat of wide scale attack has decreased but is still possible.

<sup>71</sup> PTK 97/2004, 66: The decision to ban mines showed that our political system is capable of making decisions that are not beneficial for Finland. There are no arguments that make sense from the vantage point of defence policy, and the foreign policy justifications are at least weak. In other words, the decision was completely political. Mines are the single most important part of our defence because our long border cannot be efficiently defended without allocating more money and soldiers than is possible to get. From the vantage point of foreign policy mine ban could be understood if there would be detrimental effects to our foreign relations. There is however no such effect, not at least in such a scale that we must react to it. The effects of foreign policy is hard to measure, because everybody looks at the issue from the view point of their constituency. President Halonen's constituency seems to be consisting of peace activists, who would rather see unilateral disarmament without replacing systems.

<sup>72</sup> PTK 97/2004, 70: Eero Akaan-Penttilä: Landmines are not out dated defensive weapons in the Finnish terrain. It is a good weapon in a territorial defence and safeguards the troops.

<sup>73</sup> PTK 97/2004, 73: Reijo Paananen: In the mine debate I wonder why we are abandoning, in relation to its costs, the worlds most effective weapon to deter enemy attack. According to calculation mine ban will cost about 300 000 million euros. Is it wise to change totally working and cost efficient defence system?

<sup>74</sup> PTK 97/2004, 91: Juhani Sjöblom: Landmine ban has been proved to be nationally unnecessary several times during the past years. Finland is civilized user of mines. In that respect we are a positive exception among the countries who are outside of the Ottawa Convention.

<sup>75</sup> PTK 98/2004, 13, Eero Akaan Penttilä: Akaan-Penttilä cites mine report: "Mine weapons is very cost efficient weapons, because in our conditions it slows down the operative forces of more advanced militaries."

<sup>76</sup> PTK 98/2004, 20: Petri Salo: Finland's defence hasn't at decreased least during the time that we have spent outside the Ottawa Treaty. Despite the international pressure we have kept weapon system that is appropriate in a military sense.

<sup>77</sup> PTK 98/2004, 22: Tuija Nurmi: Mines are poor nations defensive weapon, not a weapon of aggression.

<sup>78</sup> PTK 98/2004, 37: Marja Tiura: It is understandable that those EU countries which are surrounded by sea or other NATO countries are willing to abandon mines, but Finland has long border with Russia. We cannot replace mines with a weapon system that is as cheap and effective. Don't we have better use for the 300 million euros?

<sup>79</sup> PTK 98/2004, 39: Pertti Hemmilä: Anywhere in the world it will be understood if we stay out of Ottawa because of our history and geographic location.

<sup>80</sup> PTK 98/2004, 40: Marjukka Karttunen: How Finland's reputation would suffer if we would choose not to join Ottawa Convention and left landmines outdate on their own? Our international reputation would actually benefit from not joining, because we need to have a credible defence.

<sup>81</sup> PTK 97/2004, 15-17: Jyrki Katainen: One of the most publicly discussed decisions made in the strategy is the governments stand on Finland joining the Ottawa Landmines Treaty by the year 2012. This decision is not supported by the parliamentary group of NCP. In our opinion Finland should join the Ottawa treaty earliest by the year 2020. Mines can be given away when their ignitions have out dated and there is certainty on replacing system which will be as cheap. There is no rationality in replacing working system and pay over 300 million euros just because some Finns have experienced that this is beneficial for our country's reputation. The central argument for joining, that Finland's reputation would suffer, has not been able to verify. PM Vanhanen himself few weeks ago in the parliament mentioned, that Finnish mine policy does not stir any meaningful international interest.

---

<sup>82</sup> PTK 97/2004, 60: Jere Lahti: In the interim report of 2003 by the Ministry of Defence it was stated that in a military sense landmines are good defence strategy that is based on a conscription army because they are simple and cheap. If however in the future the threat models change, that we are not faced with the danger of wide scale attack, then landmines become obsolete. This kind of change has not happened. The threat of wide scale attack has decreased but is still possible.

<sup>83</sup> PTK 97/2004, 42: Jyrki Katainen: What comes to NCPs mine stance, if you read the last national defense strategy, it can easily be read that It stated there is no economic or technical options to replace mines at the moment, and those options have not widened in any rational or realistic way. This is why NCP proposes the deadline to be postponed to 2020 at the earliest.

<sup>84</sup> PTK 97/2004, 73: Reijo Paananen: It the mine debate I wonder why we are abandoning, in relation to its costs, the worlds most effective weapon to deter enemy attack. According to calculation mine ban will cost about 300 000 million euros. Is it wise to change totally working and cost efficient defence system?

<sup>85</sup> PTK 98/2004, 15: Jan Vapaavuori: Finland should not join the Ottawa Treaty at least as long as the ignitions haven't outdated, meaning somewhere in the 2020s. If the current President has pushed mine ban even before the Ottawa Treaty had established, it is not good enough argument for joining. It is not sufficient reason to spend the money of the tax payers.

<sup>86</sup> PTK 98/2004, 32: Arto Satonen: I wish that the parliament could reason independently in reversing this decision. It is totally unacceptable to spend tax payer's money only to polish our image. We could build hundreds of nursing homes or fix schools with this money. The pressure we face is minimal.

<sup>87</sup> PTK 98/2004, 37: Marja Tiura: it is understandable that those EU countries which are surrounded by sea or other NATO countries are willing to abandon mines, but Finland has long border with Russia. We cannot replace mines with a weapon system that is as cheap and effective. Don't we have better use for the 300 million euros?

<sup>88</sup> PTK 97/2004, 50-51: Olli Nepponen: Government has brought to the table clear and consistent brief. There is nothing surprising because these questions have been lined both in the parliament and public debate. Shortly on the landmines: In the last policy it was stated that the time frame is too fast. I would like to remind however that Finland made a commitment not to produce more mines in 1997.

<sup>89</sup> PTK 98/2004: Olli Nepponen: Mines are outdated and they have to be replaced sooner or later. We have bound ourselves in 1997 to a treaty that states that we can no longer produce or buy more landmines.

<sup>90</sup> PTK 97/2004, 56: Sari Essayah: Landmines are a defensive weapon, they cannot be used for attacking, so they would seem to suit Finland's defence doctrine that is based on regional defence.

<sup>91</sup> PTK 97/2004, 25: Bjarne Kallis (ryhmäpuheenvuoro) In my opinion the speaker of the house, General Häggblom and partly also prime minister have clearly stated that this does not stir as wide international opposition as it has been stated earlier, that Finland would have been criticized when we have not joined the Ottawa treaty. Argument has also been that landmines will out date. But as is now clear, that we are not criticized, and the mines do not outdate, the ignitions do but are easily replaced, it raises the question why are we so vulnerable to small criticism that we are willing to throw 200 to 300 million euros away. The mines are in stock, they are not threatening anybody. Can we really afford to give away weapons, that will cost 200 to 300 million euros?

<sup>92</sup> PTK 97/2004, 64: Leena Rauhala: For me the dates are not as important as the costs. I would rather see that those hundreds of millions that are used for replacing systems would be spent otherwise.

<sup>93</sup> PTK 98/2004: Ulla Anttila, 28: I wish that FM Tuomioja could handle this issue from the viewpoint of foreign policy. It is understandable that DF Kääriäinen sees this issue as a defence issue, but I would see it important that Finland joins according to the time table agreed by previous government, meaning to join in 2006 and abolish in 2010.

<sup>94</sup> PTK 97/2004, 28: Tony Halme: In principle this means that both USA and Russia should be part of the treaty when Finland starts to destroy landmines and replace them with other weapon systems. We do not have any reason to sacrifice hundreds of millions if there are masses of landmines only few kilometers away from the state border.

<sup>95</sup> PTK 97/2004, 28: Tony Halme: In principle this means that both USA and Russia should be part of the treaty when Finland starts to destroy landmines and replace them with other weapon systems. We do not have any reason to sacrifice hundreds of millions if there are masses of landmines only few kilometers away from the state border.

<sup>96</sup> PTK 97/2004, 16: Suvi-Anne Siimes: The conclusions that are made from the analysis are following their own paths. They are still very national and defense oriented. For example in the case of mines, the humanitarian goals of Ottawa treaty are lost fully, and the vantage point is only as long as our eastern border.

---

<sup>97</sup> PTK 97/2004, 47: Erkki Virtanen: Secondly, if mines would not be dangerous, why then the Ottawa Treaty has been made?

<sup>98</sup> PTK 87/2004, 84: Pentti Tiusanen: MP Lahtela, go and visit a Orthopedic Hospital near Kabul and its prosthetic workshop. I went there in 2000, and it was a horrific sight: people, who did not have upper or lower body parts, five year old without legs, mother that had no hand, all done by mines. We cannot think that we make a treaty where is N countries minus Finland.

<sup>99</sup> PTK 97/2004, 88: Erkki Virtanen: My understanding is that the basis of the treaty is the general understanding that it would be good for the world and for the people if there would be no mines that people could without their consent to step on.

<sup>100</sup> PTK 97/2004, 36: Outi Ojala: First off, to MP Zyskowicz and NCP: You should introduce yourself to the statement of the Head of the ICRC published in Suomen Kuvalehti, where is stated that those countries who are outside of the Ottawa Treaty are giving justification to others around the globe to use landmines.

<sup>101</sup> PTK 87/2004, 84: Pentti Tiusanen: MP Lahtela, go and visit a Orthopedic Hospital near Kabul and its prosthetic workshop. I went there in 2000, and it was a horrific sight: people, who did not have upper or lower body parts, five year old without legs, mother that had no hand, all done by mines. We cannot think that we make a treaty where is N countries minus Finland.

<sup>102</sup> PTK 27/2011, 5: Janne Sankelo: According to a study by the Defence Forces, the landmine ban will mean increases in the attacking speed of the enemy and in the casualty rates of our own troops. Landmines can be and has been replaced with other systems. However, because the full funding that was promised has not been actualized, it has led to a situation in which the Defence Forces have had to cut their other functions.

<sup>103</sup> PTK 27/2011, 16: Pauli Kiuru: If history teaches us something it is that naivety is not the way things should be handled. In the 1930s weapons acquisition was mishandled and that mistake was paid with Finnish blood. After that we have learned something and bought weapons, but now we are unilaterally abandoning these. I agree with MP Sasi and Satonen.

<sup>104</sup> PTK 27/2011, 23: Heikki Autto: The number of victims caused by landmines has decreased from 25 000 yearly from 1990s to 4000 in 2009 according to organizations that deal with the issue. This has happened without Finland. I repeat, this has happened without Finland being part of Ottawa treaty. Joining would concretely only impact Finnish defence. Is this consequence acceptable because of some assumed and controversial image gain? My own stance as a Finnish man, officer in the reserve and member of the parliament is, that it is not acceptable.

<sup>105</sup> PTK 27/2011, 25: Jukka Kopra: Finland's decision to join the Ottawa will lower the threshold of militarily intervene on our issues. This is a fact.

<sup>106</sup> PTK 27/2011, 14: Heikki Autto: I would like to read from FSDP 2009 [cite the plans about increasing defence budget by 2% annually). Now when we know these increases will not be made, there is no foundation to bring forth past decision.

<sup>107</sup> PTK 27/2011, 15: Kimmo Sasi: Foreign and security policy needs to be consistent and the premise to this decision has been given in 2004. However politics must follow time. Defence forces are facing great budgetary constraints and it justifies to consider this situation, and then in the dialogue between government and parliament to think if the time frame should be further adjusted. MP Johannes Koskinen brought up the date of 2020 would be good.

<sup>108</sup> PTK 27/2011, 8: Ben Zyskowicz: On Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> of April 2004 I said the following: "Like it has been said, only enemy soldier will step on Finnish mines, and when we need them because of our security and defence, we should no give them away." However the government of Matti Vanhanen, led by the CP, decided in 2004 to join the treaty. This has been decided again in 2009, so my own view is that the train has passed the station in this issue matter. Finland's foreign policy needs to be consistent and predictable, and I don't see that we could make a u-turn on this one. The original decision made by the government of Vanhanen was a wrong one.

<sup>109</sup> PTK 27/2011, 11: Ben Zyskowicz: When it comes to Finland's reputation, in the year 2004 Finland had not yet constrained itself to the Ottawa Treaty, so we saw that Finland reputation could not be endangered. It is completely different situation now. Finnish government has made this decision twice, that Finland is on board. If we would make a u-turn, it would have a different meaning.

<sup>110</sup> PTK 27/2011, 9: Jouni Backman: This is a stance discussion. Now when we are fulfilling decision that have been made with varying coalitions in 2004 and 2009 – the first had SDP the second didn't – old coalition partners are reversing their own decisions, not to even mention MP Soini whose own troops are backing away behind their own General.

<sup>111</sup> PTK 27/2011, 12: Johannes Koskinen: It has been acknowledged many times, that this decision has been made two times with a wide consensus.

---

<sup>112</sup> PTK 27/2011, 8: Annika Lapintie: In my opinion it is good to remember that this international agreement has started from a premise that landmines, anti personnel mines, do not separate civilians from soldiers, but around the globe 4000 people have died last year even when this agreement has been in force since 1999. 156 countries in the world have signed this treaty just because of these humanitarian reasons.

<sup>113</sup> PTK 27/2011, 13: Erkki Virtanen: Ottawa treaty has been made because of humanitarian reasons. Landmines are – elsewhere than Finland, here they do not pose danger – one of the most tragic weapons for civilians and especially children.

<sup>114</sup> PTK 27/2011, 17: Annika Lapintie: This is really strange that we speak about unilateral disarmament when 156 countries have joined a convention precisely because landmines are a humanitarian problem – because they kill women and children who are fetching water.

<sup>115</sup> PTK 27/2011, 19: Annika Lapintie: Ottawa Convention entered into force already in 1999. 156 countries have ratified the treaty. There are only 40 countries outside and Finland is the only EU country who has not signed the treaty. From all the European countries only Russia has kept landmines. Landmines are grave humanitarian problem. Civilized nation should not keep weapons that cause disproportionate suffering to civilians. The problem of landmines is that they do not separate soldiers and civilians but handicap people even decades after the conflict.

<sup>116</sup> PTK 27/2011, 8: Annika Lapintie: In my opinion it is good to remember that this international agreement has started from a premise that landmines, anti personnel mines, do not separate civilians from soldiers, but around the globe 4000 people have died last year even when this agreement has been in force since 1999. 156 countries in the world have signed this treaty just because of these humanitarian reasons.

<sup>117</sup> PTK 27/2011, 10: Kari Uotila: Offcourse landmine issue is important and replacing systems need to be build but I would emphasize the idea of wider concept of security. Best security is acquired with rational and consistent foreign policy, not what kind of equipment we have at the border.

<sup>118</sup> PTK 27/2011, 17: Annika Lapintie: This is really strange that we speak about unilateral disarmament when 156 countries have joined a convention precisely because landmines are a humanitarian problem – because they kill women and children who are fetching water.

<sup>119</sup> PTK 27/2011, 19: Annika Lapintie: Ottawa Convention entered into force already in 1999. 156 countries have ratified the treaty. There are only 40 countries outside and Finland is the only EU country who has not signed the treaty. From all the European countries only Russia has kept landmines. Landmines are grave humanitarian problem. Despite the active use of landmines has almost ended, the Landmine Monitor reported in 2010 almost 4000 mine victim. Seventy percent of these were civilians. Civilized nation should not keep weapons that cause disproportionate suffering to civilians. The problem of landmines is that they do not separate soldiers and civilians but handicap people even decades after the conflict.

<sup>120</sup> PTK 27/2011, 14 - 15: Pekka Haavisto: My understanding is that the market share of landmines has started to diminish in those region where these problems are faced: some Asian countries, Caucasus, Africa. These regions normally don't have money to spend, if they are used in asymmetric purposes – I mean groups and such – to obtain expensive replacement systems, and then this type of weapon, weapon type that is harmful for civilians, is not used – weapon type that is harmful to women and children.

<sup>121</sup> PTK 27/2011, 21: Pekka Haavisto: I'm sure I am not the only one who has experience from mine fields. My experience is working six years for the UN in Bosnia, Kosovo, Serbia and later in Afghanistan, where mines have been used. Mine maps are usually destroyed. It is impossible to sweep 100 percent of the mines. Civilians move mines to lands that belong to other ethnic minority. Children touch remnants of war. I would have hoped that the FM would have been here to talk about the issue of what it means to be a part of an international agreement. I believe that is has a huge impact on Finnish reputation. I believe that how we behave on international disarmament matters when we seek UN Security Council membership. We are followed in these matters.

<sup>122</sup> PTK 27/2011, 8: Pekka Haavisto: I support the treaty and I see two issues here. First is the Finland's responsibility in international disarmament and support of this. We are known as a country who has been active disarmament negotiator both in nuclear and conventional arms issues, and this has increased security in the world. Now when we have to abandon something ourselves, it has been problematic. In my opinion, in the name of consistency we have to take responsibility that sometimes we have to abandon some of our own weapons. Second is the national defence issue. I am sure that we will hear good arguments from our ministers this fall on how to modernize our military.

<sup>123</sup> PTK 27/2011, 10: Anni Sinnemäki: In my opinion it is also important that Finland is reliable and credible negotiating partner in the international forums. This decision, to join the Ottawa Convention, has been made twice, like it has been already mentioned in this room.

---

<sup>124</sup> PTK 27/2011, 11: Anni Sinnemäki: Like it was apparent from the discussion between MP Zyskowicz and Rantakangas, we cannot make international commitments that we change each time we have a new government in power. We are here talking about international commitment in which Finland is a part of building a world without landmines which have caused problems for thousands of people. Finland is finally taking its place among civilized countries and express its support for the victims of mines and also support other countries to join the treaty.

<sup>125</sup> PTK 27/2011, 21: Pekka Haavisto: I'm sure I am not the only one who has experience from mine fields. My experience is working six years for the UN in Bosnia, Kosovo, Serbia and later in Afghanistan, where mines have been used. Mine maps are usually destroyed. It is impossible to sweep 100 percent of the mines. Civilians move mines to lands that belong to other ethnic minority. Children touch remnants of war. I would have hoped that the FM would have been here to talk about the issue of what it means to be a part of an international agreement. I believe that it has a huge impact on Finnish reputation. I believe that how we behave on international disarmament matters when we seek UN Security Council membership. We are followed in these matters.

<sup>126</sup> PTK 27/2011, 7: DM Stefan Wallin: In this issue matter, which belongs to the jurisprudence of the Foreign Ministry, who handles international treaties, it is good to remember that the actual decision concerning the Ottawa Convention has been made two times in 2004 and again in 2009. In both cases it was made in connection to the FSDP. It was decided then, already in 2004, that Finland will join this treaty in 2012. Now when the government proposal is here, the paper is political but also technical and consistent next step to those two past decisions. Also the issue here is the reputation of Finland. 156 countries have joined the treaty. From EU countries Finland is actually the only one who has not ratified the treaty – Poland has agreed on it but not yet ratified.

<sup>127</sup> PTK 27/2011, 18: DM Stefan Wallin: This question is really also about how Finland as an international credible contracting partner presents itself.

<sup>128</sup> PTK 27/2011, 9: Eero Reijonen: AP-landmines are defensive weapons which are cheap and efficient. This we should all remember. Experts have studied that from if looking at the economic cost and efficiency, landmines cannot be replaced.

<sup>129</sup> PTK 27/2011, 20: Mikko Savola: Landmines are very efficient way to defend. Their purpose is not only harm the enemy but to guide them from a bad area to lines that are more easily defensible. It is in Finland's interest to stay out of the Ottawa Treaty.

<sup>130</sup> PTK 27/2011, 27: Timo V. Korhonen: At this moment, at this economic situation, when in the background looms spending cuts of 200 millions to our defence budget, it is not credible that mines can be replaced so that the whole country can be defended.

<sup>131</sup> PTK 27/2011, 9: Eero Reijonen: AP-landmines are defensive weapons which are cheap and efficient. This we should all remember. Experts have studied that from if looking at the cost and efficiency, landmines cannot be replaced.

<sup>132</sup> PTK 27/2011, 10: Antti Rantakangas: We should at least reconsider the timeframe of this decision in this economic situation. 2004 and 2009 was completely different situation economically and Finland had the opportunity to build credible replacing system.

<sup>133</sup> PTK 27/2011, 13: Mikko Savola: In principle we have committed to the Ottawa Treaty. However now, as it has been emphasized, we must act according to the times. Now that we know the economic situation and also spending cuts are made in Defence Forces we should understand that bad decision can also be reversed. This is the reason why we have a parliament and elections.

<sup>134</sup> PTK 27/2011, 27: Timo V. Korhonen: At this moment, at this economic situation, when in the background looms spending cuts of 200 millions to our defence budget, it is not credible that mines can be replaced so that the whole country can be defended.

<sup>135</sup> PTK 27/2011, 15: To MP Backman I would like to say that SDP has their own Commander in Chief, who surely has a big role in this treaty which the parliament has approved because we are consistent.

<sup>136</sup> PTK 27/2011, 5: Lauri Oinonen: Every country should, as should Finland, think first what is best for their own country. The threat of an enemy attack is always present, and don't we have an efficient defence system, which landmines are part of, because of that?

<sup>137</sup> PTK 27/2011, 6: Tom Packalen: I can only ask that what price are we paying from this new Finlandization towards the west? How many of us have really thought of the consequences to our defence? Mines are a defensive weapon. The Ottawa Treaty and the consequences of it to our defence was one of the reasons I came into politics.

---

<sup>138</sup> PTK 27/2011, 9, Pertti Virtanen: Finland is the only country that has over thousand kilometers of border with Russia.

<sup>139</sup> PTK 27/2011, 13-14: Ritva Elomaa: Landmines have been tailor made for Finland by defence experts. They are affordable way to maintain Finnish defence.

<sup>140</sup> PTK 27/2011, 18: Jussi Niinistö: According to a survey made by Officer's Union, ratifyin the Ottawa Convention will weaken our ability to defend the whole country. Landmines are not for attacking. They save lives and they create losses for the enemy, In addition, the psychological effects of mines, "mine horror", is big.

<sup>141</sup> PTK 27/2011, 20: Olli Immonen: Like MP Niinistö told earlier, landmines are economically efficient defensive weapons and replacing these at the moment is impossible. In addition there are only few defenders at the long border, which increases the importance of mines in this country.

<sup>142</sup> PTK 27/2011, 22 – 23: Mika Niikko: Finland is a small country, and when taking into account our resources it is not smart to weaken the defences of an independent country in any way. Finland should not show solidarity by abandoning landmines.

<sup>143</sup> PTK 27/2011, 24: Jussi Halla-Aho: Different issues have their costs and benefits. However, hiububg tge Ittawa treaty has only costs, and such decision should not be made. It is true that western, so called civilized, nation being outside the treaty is exceptional but so is Finland. Finland has a large territory and long border, but small economy and population. We need cheap systems that do not bind large numbers of manpower.

<sup>144</sup> PTK 27/2011, 26: Juho Eerola: Finland should not join the Ottawa treaty. Mines are efficient and cheap and replacement systems will cost much more. No child will be injured because we are not in.

<sup>145</sup> PTK 27/2011, 13-14: Ritva Elomaa: Landmines have been tailor made for Finland by defence experts. They are affordable way to maintain Finnish defence.

<sup>146</sup> PTK 27/2011, 16: Reijo Hongisto: At the moment our economic situation is really constrained. If we would decide not to join the Ottawa treaty it would mean savings of over 200 million.

<sup>147</sup> PTK 27/2011, 20: Olli Immonen: Like MP Niinistö told earlier, landmines are economically efficient defensive weapons and replacing these at the moment is impossible. In addition there are only few defenders at the long border, which increases the importance of mines in this country.

<sup>148</sup> PTK 27/2011, 24: Jussi Halla-Aho: Different issues have their costs and benefits. However, hiububg tge Ittawa treaty has only costs, and such decision should not be made. It is true that western, so called civilized, nation being outside the treaty is exceptional but so is Finland. Finland has a large territory and long border, but small economy and population. We need cheap systems that do not bind large numbers of manpower.

<sup>149</sup> PTK 27/2011, 25: Ari jalonen: Like I mentioned in the beginning, money is in large parts the issue here. This price tag conversation needs to

<sup>150</sup> PTK 27/2011, 26: Juho Eerola: Finland should not join the Ottawa treaty. Mines are efficient and cheap and replacement systems will cost much more. No child will be injured because we are not in.