



The Latvian National Resistance Movement and the Western Allies during German Occupation, 1941–1945

Uldis NEIBURGS

The Museum of the Occupation of Latvia

Keywords: *World War II, Latvian Resistance Movement, the Western Allies, the Nazi, Soviet occupation.*

Introduction

Research problems, terms and opportunities

Within the field of history, there has been little research on the theme “The Latvian National Resistance Movement and the Western Allies during German Occupation, 1941-1945”. Historians, while researching the Baltic issue during World War II, so far have focused their attention on the diplomacy of the United States and Great Britain and their relations with the Soviet Union (M a n t e n i e k s 2003; H i d e n 2004; L e r h i s 2010; S w a i n 2012, etc.). There has been no deeper and comprehensive research on wartime cooperation between the resistance movement in Latvia during the Nazi occupation, the Latvian diplomats in the West and the Western Allies. The topic of this research was chosen taking this into account, it stipulates that the three subjects - the resistance movement, the Latvian diplomats in the West and the activities of foreign and military intelligence services of the Western Allies – as well as interrelations and interactions among them will be researched simultaneously. Due to an illegal nature of resistance activities, a secretive nature of foreign intelligence services and other factors, research of these subjects is especially complex and time-consuming; documents necessary for research may be found in the archives of different countries.¹

¹ Latvijas Nacionālais arhīvs, Latvijas Valsts vēstures arhīvs, 293., P 69., P 82., P 252., P 1026. fonds; Latvijas Nacionālais arhīvs, Latvijas Valsts arhīvs, 1986. fonds, 1. apraksts, 99., 28635., 28636., 29669., 38864. lieta, 2263. fonds; Latvijas Republikas Ārlietu ministrijas arhīvs, Latvijas sūtniecības Londonā arhīvs, Latvijas sūtniecības Vašingtonā arhīvs, Latvijas sūtņa Stokholmā V. Salnā arhīvs; Bundesarchiv, Berlin, R 6, R 58, R 90, R 91, R 92, NS 19; National Archives II, College Park, MD, Record Group 59, 84, 165, 226; Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library, Hyde Park, NY, Record Group 220; Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace Archives, Stanford, CA, Bīlmanis Alfrēds, Cielēns Fēlikss, Salnais Voldemars; The National Archives, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, Foreign Office 188, 370, 371, 419, 490; Krigsarkivet, Stockholm, Försvarsstaben, C-byrå; Riksarkivet, Stockholm, „Sandler kommissionen”, Kommittéarkiv 984, Baltiska arkivet, Lettiska Hjälpkommittens Dokumentsamling; Leonida Siliņa personiskais arhīvs Stokholmā, etc.

Based on established scientific practice and the theoretical findings of contemporary historical research the term “national resistance movement” is used for the inhabitants of the Republic of Latvia who, under the occupation, pursued reinstatement of independent Latvia founded on 18 November, 1918 (Neiburgs 2012, 80–87). The term “the Western Allies”, recognized in historiography and broadly accepted, is used for the military-political alliance of Western countries, foremost the USA and Great Britain, founded to fight with National-Socialist Germany and form the so – called Axis during World War II. Although the coalition of all three great powers (USA, Great Britain, Soviet Union) was often called “the Allies” or “the Anti-Hitler Coalition” during the war and also in modern historiography of World War II, the author of this research thinks it is important to emphasize the difference between the Western Allies (USA, Great Britain) and the Soviet Union, since the only thing that united them was a common enemy (Nazi Germany) meanwhile their objectives and ideologies were diametrically opposite (Kissinger 1994, 394–422).

For a better understanding of the theoretical and practical questions of the resistance movement, it would be worth gaining a perspective in a shared discussion of Latvian, Lithuanian and Estonian scholars over manifestations of resistance movements in the Nazi occupied Baltic States as well as in Eastern Poland, i.e. the territories of Western Ukraine and Western Belarus during the Soviet and the Nazi occupations in 1939 and 1941 respectively. Exchange of views on research into the resistance movements and other problems in Latvia during the last decade (Neiburgs 2012, 76–79) has showed a need for a deeper look at the question (including the nature, similarities and differences in features, analysis and comparison of resistance movements in Nazi-occupied Western and Eastern Europe) of this topic and formation of new contextual concepts and approaches to historical research into resistance movements not only in Latvia but also in other occupied territories during World War II in general. This can be achieved through a longer period of time and is a task and goal for historians in the future.

Policy of the Western Allies regarding Latvia

During World War II Latvia lost its national independence and underwent Soviet-Nazi-Soviet occupations that followed one after the other. Latvia’s occupation on 17 June, 1940, through military threat and its subsequent annexation and incorporation into the USSR was an unlawful act of aggression that blatantly violated international law. From the legal point of view the same can be said about change of military rule in June-July 1941 when, after the outbreak of the German-USSR war, the territory of Latvia was subjugated to National-Socialist Germany that regarded Latvia not as a liberated independent state but rather as an occupied territory of the USSR. From the legal perspective both, the government of Latvian SSR, which evacuated to the USSR during the war, and the Latvian Self-Administration of the Land, which was formed under the Nazi occupation, were unlawful (Kangeris 2000).

In spite of a loss of real sovereignty, Latvia continued to exist de jure as a subject of international law during the war. It was manifested in the attitude of the Western Allied powers – the USA and Great Britain – which fought against the Axis states: they regarded subjugation of the Baltic States to the USSR and later to Germany unlawful and invalid. During the war, under complicated conditions marked by a loss of statehood, change of occupation rules and an uncertain international political situation, the only legal representatives of the Republic of Latvia were the holder of plenary powers Kārlis Zariņš, Ambassador to London, and his deputy Alfrēds Bīlmanis, Ambassador to Washington, D.C., whose statuses fully or with some reservation were also recognized by the governments of their countries of residence, Great Britain and the USA.²

After Germany's attack on the Soviet Union and Japan's attack on the USA, Great Britain and the USA became allies of the USSR against National-Socialist Germany and in the subsequent course of the war had to give priority to real politics over the principles of morale; consequently, they were forced to take into account the USSR's geopolitical interests and military contribution in the war against the Nazis. Although the Baltic diplomats abroad wanted to facilitate the victory of the Western democracies during the war, their efforts to officially join the Atlantic Charter, signed on 14 August, 1941, and the United Nations Declaration, adopted

² In the confidential report "Present relations of the chief United Nations with the Baltic States (Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia)" of US OSS Research and Analysis Branch on 22 October 1943 it is written that „the peculiar status accorded by the English Government to the diplomatic agents of the three Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania) may better be described than defined. It emerges from the exigencies of the present war rather than from diplomatic usages or treaty stipulations. [...] The Statesman's Yearbook for 1943 states categorically that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were admitted to the Soviet Union on August 3, 1940. One month later, September 5, the British diplomatic missions to those states were withdrawn. At the same time, The Foreign Office List and Diplomatic and Consular Book deleted the names of the three Baltic legations from the catalogue of foreign embassies in London. It still continues to enumerate the names of the Baltic diplomatic representatives among the personnel of the diplomatic corps, however. These diplomats are accorded various personal privileges and recognition. Thus, they fall into a classification not heretofore recognized in international relationships. [...] The United States alone extends full recognition to the Ministers from the Baltic States. This recognition falls well within the framework of our general policy on recognition of rights of small states and our non-recognition of rights based on military conquests. [...] What United States recognition of the three Baltic missions means in practice is not quite clear, since the Governments which these missions formerly represented no longer exist. The status of these missions is unlike those of Greece or of Yugoslavia or Norway which represent governments-in-exile. It is farther removed still from any parallel with Denmark's Legation which until recently represented the regular legal government functioning in Denmark. [...] The recognition accorded the Baltic missions here is therefore one for which it is difficult to find a parallel or precedent, but it seems clear that this recognition entails something less than recognition of the rights of these missions to represent their countries in international councils" (NA II, Record Group 331, Microfilm 1221).

on 4 January, 1942, were rejected. The statements earlier voiced by the British and American diplomats that the status of the Baltic States had not changed and their destiny would be decided at a post-war Peace Conference where the views of the Baltic residents would also be taken into account, were not followed with regard to Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania (L e r h i s 2007).

Irrespective of whether a closer drawing between the USA and Great Britain on one part and the USSR on the other was dictated by the former's concern about a possible armistice and agreement between the USSR and Germany, the Western Allies' sense of guilt for not being able to open the Second front earlier as it had promised or their recognition of the military might of the Red Army and belief that the USSR would become democratic and adopt a more humane stance in international relations or for any other reason, failing to apply and follow the fundamental principles of the Atlantic Charter and United Nations Declaration with regard to Eastern European states, the USA and Great Britain demonstrated disrespect of peoples' right for self-determination that the Western democratic powers had proclaimed themselves and collaborated with a criminal totalitarian Communist regime which resulted in almost half a century long subjugation of the Baltic States to the Soviet occupation rule.

Future research should give answers to the following questions: How might have demonstrated the US and Great Britain their firmer position towards the Soviet Union in practice, protected the interests of Eastern European states in a more determined way in 1941–1943 when the USSR needed US military and civil support? What might have been real results of a more determined position of the Western Allies after opening the Second front in 1944–1945, if they had fulfilled all promises given to the USSR? What might have been reaction of the USSR if the US and Great Britain had taken this position? What influence might have had different Western-USSR relations on the end of the war or even its course?

Resistance movement in Latvia under the Nazi occupation: overview

In the situation when the territory of Latvia was in the hands of one occupant, National-Socialist Germany, and under a threat of another occupation looming in the air from the side of the USSR, Latvians' aspirations for self-determination and desire to regain national independence were represented by the national resistance movement that spontaneously and gradually developed. Under these conditions, a weakening military might of Nazi Germany against the USSR was not in Latvians' interests. The resistance movement was mostly of a non-violent character and took different organized and unorganized forms. These forms included underground activities launched against the occupation regime by individuals and organizations outside the state and involved various political and social circles as well as formally legal activities secretly targeted at the occupation regime. Many participants of these activities worked in different administrative, economic, military and other authorities of the German occupation rule. During the war pro-Western sentiments prevailed in Latvian society, it had great hopes that Western (Great Britain and

USA) and Scandinavian (Sweden) countries will provide support and help restore Latvia's sovereignty.³ Various underground publications of the national resistance movement also voiced a belief in such a scenario although the Nazi propaganda used different tools trying to ruin these hopes.

During the German occupation various national resistance groups and organizations were set up, the largest of which – the Latvian Nationalist union, underground newspaper “Brīvā Latvija. Latvju Raksti”, the Latvian Central Council (LCC) – had a branched out network of subordinate structures that covered a big part of Latvia's territory. During the Nazi occupation almost 20 underground newspapers were published with circulation from a few dozen to several thousand copies. Newspaper information was passed by word of mouth and its effect was powerful enough to cause concern among the Nazis about an opposition and resulted in repressions against publishers and distributors of underground newspapers and leaflets. The number of national resistance movement members who took part in underground political activities in an organized form or resisted the German occupation rule with arms (Lieutenant Roberts Rubenis' battalion) exceeded several hundred, total membership of the national resistance movement, including unorganized resistance individuals, probably amounted to several thousand (Neiburgs 2012, 88–89).

The underground activities of the most of national resistance movement groups, organizations and individual members that began as early as 1941–1942 included resistance to the German occupation rule, fight for national interests, spreading of liberation views among possibly broadest circles of Latvian society. Although the aspirations and activities of the resistance movement were very diverse it opposed Latvians' recruitment to police battalions (Schutzmannschaft) and State Labour service (Reichsarbeitsdienst) and sending them to Germany as labour force in 1941–1942, mobilization to the legion, appealed to Latvians to protect people's life and stay in their native land in 1943–1944, etc. Despite the impact of the course of the German-USSR war and its local development (recruitment of the existing

³ In the secret review “Public Opinion in Baltic States towards Germany, the Soviet Union and Great Britain” prepared in the beginning of March, 1943 by Embassy of Great Britain in Sweden that was acknowledged also by the Special Reporting Section of US Embassy in Sweden as a good description of the current situation in Baltics, it was written that „fear is the dominating feeling about the Russians, hate is the feeling about the Germans. The Baltic States would be prepared to fight the Germans now if only they were certain of security from the Russian danger and of the integrity of their respective countries. [...] German assurances that Britain has sold out the Baltic States to Russia are not believed. It is recognized that neither Britain nor U.S.A. can help the Baltic States at present and that the Western Powers are in a delicate position vis-à-vis Russia and the question of Russia's neighboring countries. The Baltic States are fully aware of the Atlantic Charter and keep their faith in the Western Powers and believe that the salvation of the small countries will come from Britain. Russia's open claim on the Baltic States without any refutation being made by the other signatories to the Atlantic Charter nevertheless causes considerable apprehension in the Baltic States” (NA II, Record Group 59, Microfilm 1185, Roll. 4).

and potential members of the resistance movement to the legion, disbanding of General Jānis Kurelis' group, etc.), resistance remained "inward" oriented until the very end of the war and was limited to a particular site, Nazi occupied Latvia. Although resistance movement members failed to achieve their main political goal - to restore Latvia's statehood - for objective reasons, the movement made an important contribution to keeping alive the idea of Latvia's independence during the Nazi occupation, which had a long-lasting impact on subsequent resistance, and promoted disobedience to the Soviet regime in the post-war years.

The activities of the resistance movement were "inward" oriented as well as "outward" oriented, first and foremost those of the Latvian Central Council (hereinafter the LCC), formed in 1943–1944 mainly from former political figures, but its composition, goals and activities were not widely known to the Latvian public. Although the LCC did not openly oppose the policy of the Nazi occupation authorities which was against Latvia's national interests, the Holocaust in 1941, formation of the Latvian legion in 1943, etc. and mostly engaged in political debates, they adopted several legal and political declarations that were secretly sent to other countries; all that was part of efforts to restore Latvia's independence with the help of the Western Allies and Scandinavian countries. The LCC was also the main and almost the only national resistance organization that gathered materials and information on the situation and public opinion in Latvia under the Nazi occupation and sent to various institutions of the Western Allies through the Latvian diplomats in the West. The pro-Western sentiments of the LCC allowed it not to limit its activities to wishing victory to the USA and Great Britain in the war and voicing hopes that the Western powers will support the restoration of Latvia's independence, it also took action of a political, informative character (Ibid., 85–86).

Informative and political activities of the resistance movement and their influence on the West

The early attempts of the resistance movement to establish contact with the officials in Western and Scandinavian countries were unsuccessful and remained such until the spring-summer of 1943 when Voldemārs Salnais, former Latvian Ambassador to Sweden, interested in the situation in Nazi occupied Latvia started considering the idea of establishing a political centre of the resistance movement. He, like most Latvian diplomats abroad, were positive that the Western Allies will play a decisive role in the war, National-Socialist Germany will be defeated and everything possible must be done to inform the West that the people of Latvia want no rule of either Germany or the USSR, they are striving to restore independent Latvia. On 22 July journalist Leonids Siliņš successfully crossed the Baltic Sea and reached Gotland bringing much information on the situation in Nazi occupied Latvia. On 13 August the LCC under Konstantīns Čakste leadership was founded in Riga. The LCC built its political activities on the Constitution of 1922 as the

only basis for the restoration of the independent and democratic Republic of Latvia (Andersons, Siliņš 1994, 10-122; Swain 2009, 24–248).

The LCC managed to establish contact with the representatives of other Baltic resistance movement organizations, e.g., Supreme Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania, National Committee of the Republic of Estonia. These organizations announced several joint political declarations and tried to coordinate their future actions in a joint struggle for the restoration of independent states. Already in December 1943 Declaration of the Peoples of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia was signed and later sent to the West, in January-April 1944 at least three illegal political meetings took place in Riga and were attended by the representatives of the Baltic resistance movements (*Tōotan ustavaks jāāda...* 2004, 58–59, 770–773; *Lithuania under German Occupation...* 2005, 4–10, 592–595).

During the war the military intelligence services of the US and Great Britain were interested in Nazi occupied Baltic States and their position towards them was different from that of official diplomats of the Western Allies. Already in 1942 a special section for the Baltic States, Office of Strategic Services (OSS), was set up with the headquarters in Washington, D.C., US, but Special Reporting Section of the US Embassy in Sweden, headed by Harry Carlsson, was particularly active in gathering information about Nazi occupied Baltics. Heinrich Laretei, V. Salnais and Vytautas Gylys, former Ambassadors of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to Stockholm, contributed to keeping the Western Allies informed; Herschel V. Johnson, the US Ambassador to Sweden, received reports on a regular basis and forwarded them to the State Department in Washington, D.C., with his comments. In 1943–1944 an increasingly active advancement of the Red Army westward, to the borders of the Baltic States, also caused concern in the C-Bureau of the Swedish Defence Headquarters, that, among other activities, gathered military data on possible intervention of German armed forces to Sweden. Since it became clear that the defeat of National-Socialist Germany is close, the British Secret Intelligence Services (SIS), whose representative Colonel Alexander McKibbin actively worked in Stockholm during the war, also became interested in the situation on the Baltic coast (Neiburgs 2009, 98–112).

Neutral Sweden played a special role ensuring contacts between Nazi occupied Latvia and the Western Allies: the country was close to the Baltic countries, the embassies of the fighting parties, Germany, the USSR, the Western Allies as well as the agents of their intelligence services could carry out their activities undisturbed in Stockholm during the war. During World War II the government of Sweden implemented the general policy of the country with regard to Latvia, however, it changed from unprincipled submission to the political ambitions of the USSR in 1940–1941 to maneuvering between the interests of Germany and the Western Allies in the subsequent years of the war, to concern about an increasing influence of the USSR and threats to Sweden's sovereignty in the final phase of the war and the post-war period. Sweden maintained that Latvia was occupied by the USSR but its geographic proximity to the Baltic countries and the status of a neutral

state gave it a certain freedom, although restricted by the war, of actions; that allowed it to establish secret contacts and get information and several thousand people evacuated from Nazi occupied Latvia to the West. If Sweden had followed a different policy or in case it lacked any all that most probably would not have been possible, or at least at such scale (Carlgrén 1993, 70–84; Kangeris 1998, 191–208; Griër 2007, 152–166, etc.).

Due to cooperation between the LCC, Ambassador V. Salnais, diplomatic activities of Ambassadors K. Zariņš and A. Bīlmanis during the war materials and political declarations, e.g. Political Platform and Declaration of the LCC, Report of the Latvian Social-Democratic Workers Party on the Situation in Latvia and in the Other Baltic States, Report of the Representatives of the Free Trade Unions of the Baltic States “The Workers of the Baltic States under the German and Russian Occupation”, Memorandum signed by 188 (190) Latvian political and public representatives, Declaration of the LCC member Pauls Kalniņš, President of the last Latvian Parliament, K. Zariņš and A. Bīlmanis concerning the status of Latvian Envoys to Great Britain and USA, Statement of the LCC about Efforts to Restore the Independent Republic of Latvia, other documents on the situation in Nazi-occupied Latvia and strive of its population to regain freedom and independence reached the US State Department and the British Foreign Office (Neiburgs 2009, 252–271).

Information on a military and economic situation in Latvia that the Western Allies received helped British and American analysts understand Nazi Germany’s position and its change in the course of World War II. V. Salnais’s role was very important: he checked and critically evaluated information received from the resistance movement, other legal and secret sources and classified data. Thus the West was provided with information obtained not only from official sources (press, radio, etc.) but also from individuals, eyewitnesses as well as with original documents of the German occupation and Latvian authorities that were unknown for the public. Much of information that the Western Allies received from V. Salnais and the Latvian resistance movement was politically unfavourable for the US-Great Britain-USSR relations and was kept in secret until the end of the war. But it had no Nazi and Communist ideology or misinformation that the population of Latvia will join Germany in its fight for “the New Europe” or welcomes “liberation” by the USSR; all that was very important in the near future (*Stockholm Documents...* 2002, IX–XX).

Refugee evacuation operations to Sweden organized by the resistance movement

The period from January till November 1944, when several thousand of Latvian refugees came to Gotland by boats, during the campaigns organized by the LCC and the Swedish-Latvian Relief Committee (SLRC) in Stockholm and financially supported by the C-Bureau in Sweden (Captain Arthur Johansson and others) and the US War Refugee Board (WRB) (Iver C. Olsen and others) was especially

important and strengthened cooperation between the resistance movement in Nazi occupied Latvia and the Western Allies. It was difficult and dangerous to organize so massive refugee transportation since Sweden had officially proclaimed a policy of neutrality and the Nazis looked at it as spying and severely punished (Ericson 1995; Andrae 2004, 61–70, etc.).

Several different institutions organized refugee transportation: 1) the LCC in Riga and its groups in Ventspils led by V. Salnais, former Latvian Envoy to Sweden, and the SLRC in Stockholm; 2) the C-Bureau of the Military Intelligence Service of Sweden and its employees in Stockholm and Gotland; 3) the US Embassy in Sweden and the WRB mission in Stockholm under its guidance. Their functions were different (providing technical, financial support, organizing, navigating boats, transporting refugees, acquiring and passing information, etc.), there were disagreements and contradictions among them at times but they had common goals and interests which helped them unite their forces. All that was the basis for their cooperation and thousands of lives of Latvian people were saved. Organizational and practical work of Ventspils group, trafficking between Latvia and Sweden by Latvian boat ferrymen have not been sufficiently evaluated but these activities were much more significant than those in Riga and Kurzeme or the political circles of the LCC based in Sweden (Neiburgs 2011).

The Swedish Defence Headquarters was interested in obtaining military information on the situation in Latvia therefore transporting of political refugees from Latvia to Sweden was indirectly supported and tolerated. Meanwhile the US WRB participated in these campaigns and rescued victims from the Nazi persecutions for humanitarian purposes.⁴ From 31 January 1944 to 5 March 1945, 37 boat trips from Sweden to Latvia were organized and supported by the C-Bureau, from early June to late September 1944 – at least 18 WRB-financed boats with refugees from Latvia came to Sweden. 2 077 Latvian refugees (out of over 4 500) came to Sweden by themselves, 2 541 – by boats in these campaigns organized by the LCC, at least 957 out of them – to Gotland by boats supported by the Swedish C-Bureau and about 700 – by boats financed by the US WRB.⁵ Part of them were supported by the both, technically by Sweden and financially by the US,

⁴ Representative of US WRB in Sweden Iver C. Olsen in his report from 10 August 1944 to Director of US WRB in Washington, D.C. John W. Pehle pointed out that “I have made it clear to all three groups that their boats must be delivered to me in Stockholm upon demand, and that such time will come at the latest whenever the Russians are in command of the areas in which rescue operations in their respective countries can be carried out, and when it is clear that the danger of German persecution has cleared. I must say, however, that I feel very sorry for these Baltic peoples; they are in a hell of a mess and I see no answer to it. [...] I like the Estonians and Lithuanians very much - they are really fine people who can make this a better world to live in, and better because they are in it. I don't care for the Latvians very much; largely because they have a fairly general tendency to be quite unreliable, and are definitely trouble-makers” (RL, Record Group 220, WRB 1944–45, Records that were classified „secret”. R-Y, Box. 72: Sweden).

⁵ RA, „Sandler kommissionen”, Kommittéarkiv 984, F 1: Vol. 17, 18; RL, Record Group 220, File 72.

many refugees were taken across the Baltic Sea by Latvian ferrymen unsupported by the either, the C-Bureau or the WRB.

Non-accomplished plans of the resistance movement

A political goal of the resistance movement was to restore the sovereign state of Latvia by the Latvian armed forces at the time when the German Army was retreating and the invasion of the USSR had not begun, then declare Latvia's independence and form a provisional government; political support of the Western Allies and Scandinavian countries was expected.⁶ These plans failed because of the political situation, the LCC leaders K. Čakste, Bruno Kalniņš, Ludvigs Sēja were arrested by the Nazi security services, the Red Army launched an attack on the Baltic States in the summer of 1944. In general, the international and military situation during the final phase of the war was unfavourable for the Baltic States. Under these circumstances, the LCC had no opportunity to proclaim restoration of Latvia's independence and form a provisional government or to use the Latvian military forces on 8 September 1944 (S w a i n 2009, 248–255; *Virzība uz demokrātisko Eiropu...* 2010, 59–69, 71–77, 89–100).

On 14 November 1944 the core of General Kurelis' group was liquidated by the Nazis and merely 500 soldiers under Lieutenant Rubenis participated in a fight. On 18 November 8 Latvian officers were sentenced to death by the SS in a trial in Liepāja, over 1 300 were arrested and sent to concentration camps in Germany. The defeat of General Kurelis' group was a serious blow on the national resistance movement. Evaluating the situation, the actions of General Kurelis' group and the activities of the representatives of the LCC in Sweden and Kurzeme to launch an armed revolt, declare Latvia's independence and formation of a provisional government it may be concluded that the forces were passive, efforts uncoordinated and indecisive. The LCC leaders managed to avoid repressions of the Nazis and Soviets and fled to neutral Sweden. Such behaviour was against the goals of the resistance movement and resulted in a loss of a fight for the restoration of Latvia's independence (N e i b u r g s 2009, 242–243, 246–248).

⁶ US Ambassador to Sweden Herschel V. Johnson in his letters to the US Secretary from 5 July and 28 September, 1944, wrote that „the Latvian people seem to have a naive and almost childlike belief that somehow or other, possibly through the application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, their national independence is to be restored to them. This hope would appear to be very closely akin to wishful thinking in view of the extremely complicated situation which now exists in the Baltics area. [...] Moreover, on account of the contending Latvian, Soviet, and German interests and activities, the situation is necessarily highly involved and difficult to analyze. However, the following conclusions can be made: the entry of the Red Army through the „back door”, i.e., from the south by way of Lithuania, has taken the Germans as well as the Latvian underground organizations by surprise. The Latvian organizations had apparently been planning to proclaim a Latvian government during the interregnum between the German and Soviet occupations” (NA II, Record Group 59, Microfilm 1177, Roll. 16, Frame 735, Record Group 226, Entry 14, Box. 317, File 98325 R).

Conclusion

On 8 May, 1945, the situation in Western European and the Baltic States was different – for the former victory over National-Socialist Germany and the end of World War II meant freedom, meanwhile for the latter it meant Soviet occupation which lasted for almost half a century. Latvian people were deprived of the right to self-determine and restore the independent Republic of Latvia but contacts between the Latvian resistance movement and the Western Allies established during the wartime were maintained: information was systematically provided, the Baltic resistance movements and the Baltic diplomats in the West made political declarations, protested against propaganda of the USSR that Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania joined the Soviet Union under their own free will and accord therefor the Western Allies refused to recognize occupation of the Baltic States.

During the post-war years this information helped to form an understanding about the fate of the Baltic nations after World War II, an opinion of the US and Great Britain authorities about Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian refugees in the West, occupation of the Baltic states. Experience that the American, British and Swedish military intelligence services gained in boat campaigns, radio transmissions during the Cold War was used forming policy towards the USSR, their former ally. Although activities of the Baltic resistance movements and the Baltic diplomats in the West were of a small political capital, the USA and Great Britain were motivated to advocate Estonia's, Latvia's and Lithuania's sovereignty at wartime and post-war international conferences and the Baltic States – to start peaceful fights for their independence and seek international recognition in 1990–1991.

Analysis of historical sources, documents kept in the archives of Latvia, the USA, Great Britain, Sweden, Germany, Russia and other countries while conducting research “Latvian National Resistance Movement and Western Allies during German Occupation, 1941–1945” allows the author to evaluate cooperation between the Latvian national resistance movement in Nazi occupied Latvia, diplomats of Latvia abroad and the military intelligence services of the Western Allies during the wartime. However, some problems prevented to conduct a really comprehensive research of the subject: a lack of material on the operations carried out by the resistance movement and the foreign intelligence services, the OSS of the US and the C-Bureau of Sweden. Access to secret documents of the British SIS will enable to conduct detailed research into the role of underground Sweden-Latvia radio transmissions, what effect obtained information had on the activities of the Latvian resistance movement in Kurzeme during the final stage of the war. Cooperating with Estonian and Lithuanian historians still unknown documents may be found and new comparative studies on the Baltic resistance movements and their cooperation with the Western Allies during World War II will be produced in the future.

References

Books

- A n d e r s o n s, S i l i ņ š 1994 – Edgars Andersons, Leonids Siliņš u.c., *Latvijas Centrālā padome: Latviešu nacionālā pretestības kustība. 1943–1945*, Uppsala: LCP.
- A n d r a e 2004 – Carl G. Andrae, *Sverige och den stora flykten från Estland 1943–1944*, Uppsala: Kungl. Gustav Adolfs Akademien för svensk folkkultur.
- C a r l g r e n 1993 – Wilhelm M. Carlgren, *Sverige och Baltikum. Från mellankrigstid till efterkrigsår. En översikt*, Stockholm: Publica.
- G r i e r 2007 – Howard D. Grier, *Hitler/Dönitz and the Baltic Sea. The Third Reich's Last Hope, 1944–1945*, Annapolis: Naval Institute Press.
- K i s s i n g e r 1994 – Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, New York: Simon&Schuster.
- Lithuania under German Occupation...* 2005 – *Lithuania under German Occupation 1941–1945. Despatches from US Legation in Stockholm*, (ed. T. Remeikis), Vilnius: Vilnius University Press.
- Stockholm Documents...* 2002 – *Stockholm Documents. The German Occupation of Latvia. 1941–1945: What Did America Know? (Symposium of the Commission of the Historians of Latvia. Vol. 5)*, (ed. A. Ezergailis), Riga: Publishers of the Historical Institute of Latvia.
- Töotan ustavaks jääda...* 2004 – *Töotan ustavaks jääda... Eesti Vabariigi valitsus 1940–1992*, Tartu: Eesti Kirjanduse Selts.
- Virzība uz demokrātisko Eiropu...* 2010 – *Virzība uz demokrātisko Eiropu 2. pasaules kara laikā. Latvijas Centrālā padome un „Kurelieši”*: konferences materiāli, Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds.

Articles

- E r i c s o n 1995 – Lars Ericson, „Exodus och underrättelseinhämtning. Det svenska försvaret och Baltikum, hösten 1943 – våren 1945“, *Vårstormar. 1944 – Krigsslutet skönjes*, Stockholm: Probus, 83–127.
- H i d e n 2004 – John Hiden, „British Policy towards the Baltic States, 1939–1945”, *Lithuanian Historical Studies*, 9, 75–88.
- K a n g e r i s 1998 – Kārlis Kangeris, „Sweden, the Soviet Union and the Baltic Question 1940–1964. A Survey”, *Relations between the Nordic Countries and the Baltic Nations in the XX Century*, (ed. K. Hovi), Turku: University of Turku, 188–211.
- K a n g e r i s 2000 – Kārlis Kangeris, „Izvēles iespējas: “Jaunā Eiropa”, padomju republika vai neatkarīga valsts. Valststiesiskie jautājumi un “lielā politika” kara gados (1941–1945)”, *Latvija Otrajā pasaules karā (Latvijas Vēsturnieku komisijas raksti, 1. sēj.)*, Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 79–94.
- L e r h i s 2007 – Ainārs Lerhis, „Latvijas Republikas diplomāti Rietumvalstīs Latvijas interešu sardzē PSRS un Vācijas kara gados (1941–1945)”, *Akadēmiskā Dzīve*, 44, 40–46.
- L e r h i s 2010 – Ainārs Lerhis, „Baltijas valstu okupācijas neatzīšanas politika: Lielbritānijas un ASV ārpolitiskie lēmumi 1942.–1945. gadā”, *Latvijas Zinātņu Akadēmijas Vēstis. A daļa*, 1/2, 92–116.
- M a n t e n i e k s 2003 – Maris A. Manteniēks, „FDR and the Baltic States”, *Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Formation of the Modern World*, (eds. T.C. Howard, W.D. Pederson), Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, 93–121.

- Neiburgs 2009 – Uldis Neiburgs, „Pretošanās kustība nacionālsociālistiskās Vācijas okupētajā Latvijā (1941–1945): mazpētīti aspekti un to izpratne mūsdienās”, *Baltijas reģiona vēsture 20. gadsimta 40.–80. gados (Latvijas Vēsturnieku komisijas raksti, 24. sēj.)*, Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 98–136.
- Neiburgs 2009 – Uldis Neiburgs, „Latvijas Centrālā padome nacistu okupētajā Latvijā (1943–1945): izpētes aktualitātes un rezultāti”, *Okupācijas režīmi Baltijas valstīs 1940–1991 (Latvijas Vēsturnieku komisijas raksti, 25. sēj.)*, Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 235–279.
- Neiburgs 2011 – Uldis Neiburgs, „Zviedru un amerikāņu izlūkdienestu loma Latvijas Centrālās padomes organizētajās bēgļu laivu akcijās pāri Baltijas jūrai uz Zviedriju, 1944.–1945. gads”, *Otrais pasaules karš un Latvija: notikumi un sekas, 20. gadsimta 40.–60. gadi (Latvijas Vēsturnieku komisijas raksti, 27. sēj.)*, Rīga: Apgāds „Zinātne”, 170–194.
- Neiburgs 2012 – Uldis Neiburgs, „Pretošanās kustība nacionālsociālistiskās Vācijas okupētajā Latvijā (1941–1945): jēdzieniskā izpratne un teorētiskās nostādes”, *Latvijas Vēstures Institūta Žurnāls*, 3, 74–99.
- Swain 2009 – Geoffrey Swain, „Latvia’s Democratic Resistance: a Forgotten Episode from the Second World War”, *European History Quarterly*, 39: 2, 241–263.
- Swain 2012 – Geoffrey Swain, „The highest flights of circumlocutory art’: Britain, Latvia and Recognizing the Soviet Annexation of 1940”, *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 43: 3, 345–362.

Uldis Neiburgas

Latvijos tautinio pasipriešinimo judėjimas ir Vakarų sąjungininkai vokiečių okupacijos metais, 1941–1945

S a n t r a u k a

Pagrindinės sąvokos: *Antrasis pasaulinis karas, Latvijos pasipriešinimo judėjimas, Vakarų sąjungininkai, nacizmas, sovietų okupacija.*

Antrojo pasaulinio karo metais Latvija neteko valstybingumo ir patyrė sovietų, nacių ir dar kartą sovietų okupacijas. Dėl to sunku pasinaudoti teorinėmis išvargomis tiriant pasipriešinimo judėjimus nacių okupuotose Vakarų Europos šalyse, Latvijoje ir kitose Baltijos šalyse. Pasipriešinimo judėjimų tyrimai Vakarų Europos šalyse remiasi okupacinės valdžios ir okupuotų šalių gyventojų santykiais ir neatsižvelgia į kitokią Pietryčių Europos (Jugoslavijos, Graikijos) ir Centrinės Rytų Europos (Lenkijos, Lietuvos, Latvijos, Estijos) tautų patirtį, patyrusių keletą okupacijų. Pasipriešinimo judėjimo ištakas nacių okupuotose Baltijos šalyse galima suprasti tik nagrinėjant ypatingą tų šalių padėtį, kai kilo antrosios sovietų okupacijos pavojus.

Straipsnyje nagrinėjami ryšiai tarp Latvijos pasipriešinimo judėjimų nacių okupuotoje Latvijoje ir Vakarų sąjungininkų, JAV ir Didžiosios Britanijos užsienio karinių žvalgybų. Autorius nagrinėja, kaip informacija apie situaciją nacių okupuotoje Latvijoje, surinkta slaptosios Latvijos centrinės tarybos (LCT) Rygoje, buvo perduodama V. Salnajui, buvu-

siam Latvijas ambasadoriui Stokholme, ī JAV ir Didžiają Britaniją ir kaip LCT politiniai pranešimai pasiekdavo įvairias diplomatinės institucijas Vakaruose. Straipnyje aprašomos slaptos pabėgėlių gabenimo valtimis Baltijos jūra iš Latvijos į Švediją operacijos, kurias rengė LCT, rėmė sąjungininkų žvalgybos (Švedijos *C-byrå*, JAV *War Refugee Board* ir Didžiosios Britanijos *SIS*), ir generolo Janio Kurelio grupės pastangos atkurti Latvijos nepriklausomybę, tikintis Vakarų sąjungininkų paramos.

Uldis Neiburgs

The Latvian National Resistance Movement and the Western Allies during German Occupation, 1941–1945

S u m m a r y

Keywords: *World War II, Latvian Resistance Movement, Western Allies, Nazi, Soviet occupation.*

During World War II Latvia lost its statehood and experienced Soviet-Nazi-Soviet occupations during the following years. For that reason it is difficult to apply theoretical insights into resistance movements in Nazi occupied Western European countries, Latvia and the Baltic States in general. Research on resistance movements in Nazi occupied Western European countries are based on the relationships between the authorities of occupants and people in occupied countries and do not take into account different experiences of the South Eastern European nations (of Yugoslavia, Greece) and Central Eastern European nations (of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia) that underwent several occupations. The nature of the resistance movement in Nazi occupied Baltic States may be understood by looking at their unique situation, under a threat of a second Soviet occupation.

The research “Latvian National Resistance Movement and Western Allies during German Occupation, 1941–1945” deals with the relations between the resistance movement in Latvia during Nazi occupation and the Western Allies, the foreign and military intelligence services of the US and Great Britain. The author analyses how information on the situation in Nazi occupied Latvia, gathered by the Latvian Central Council (LCC) in Riga was sent to Voldemars Salnais, former Latvian Ambassador to Stockholm, to the US and Great Britain, and how the political declarations of the LCC reached various diplomatic institutions in the West. Secret refugee trafficking by boats across the Baltic Sea from Latvia to Sweden organized by the LCC and supported by the intelligence services: *C-byrå* of Sweden, the *War Refugee Board* of the US and the *SIS* of Great Britain, attempts of the LCC and General Janis Kurelis’ group to restore Latvia’s independence expecting support from the Western Allies are described in the paper.

U L D I S N E I B U R G S

The Museum of the Occupation of Latvia (1940-1991)

7 Raina Blvd.

LV-1050 Riga, Latvia

[uldis.neiburgs@omf.lv]